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## Table 1. Main indicators of migration in the Russian Federation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Reference date/period</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1</strong> Total resident population</td>
<td>143,347,1 thousand</td>
<td>1 January 2013</td>
<td>Rosstat *Estimate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2</strong> Stock of foreign born</td>
<td>11,194,710 thousand (and 45,454,463 not stated)</td>
<td>14-25 October 2010</td>
<td>Rosstat, Census 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3</strong> Stock of foreign population (including stateless)</td>
<td>865,238 thousand (and 4,135,071 not stated)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4</strong> Stock of Temporary residence permits (TRP) holders</td>
<td>423,182 thousand</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5</strong> Stock of Permanent residence permit (PRP) holders</td>
<td>229,845 thousand</td>
<td>31 Dec. 2012</td>
<td>FMS**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6</strong> Stock of refugee status holders</td>
<td>763 persons</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7</strong> Stock of temporary asylum permit holders</td>
<td>2413 persons</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>8</strong> Flows of permanent type immigration</td>
<td>417,681 thousand</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Rosstat, data based on migrants registration in the place of residence and place of stay for 9 months and longer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>9</strong> Flows of permanent type emigration</td>
<td>122,751 thousand</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>10</strong> Net migration</td>
<td>294,930 thousand</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>11</strong> Issued Temporary residence permits</td>
<td>220,883 thousand</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>12</strong> Issued Residence (permanent) permits</td>
<td>125,947 thousand</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>13</strong> Applications for refugee status</td>
<td>1242 persons (94 granted)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>14</strong> Applications for temporary asylum</td>
<td>1078 persons (656 granted)</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>FMS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>15</strong> Inflow of temporary migrant-workers</td>
<td>1,403,622 thousand regular work permits (quota based) issued; 1,284,8 thousand patents (work in households) sold, 44,1 thousand – quota free work permits for selected professions (skilled professionals) issued 11,8. special work permits issued for highly-skilled specialists</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>FMS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>16</strong> Citizenship acquisition</td>
<td>95,7 thousand</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Rosstat – Federal State Statistics Service of Russia
** FMS – Federal Migration Service of Russia
Summary

International migration trends and scale. The scale of international migration in Russia is primarily determined by temporary forms of mobility. Flows of labour migration in 2012 exceeded permanent-type immigration 6.4 times. In 2012 and especially — in 2013 Temporary labour migration and has been in the focus of public debate and interests due to some

Permanent-type migration flows. In 2012 immigration to Russia amounted to 418 thousand that was 17% as big as in 2011. The largest number of immigrants, 88 thousand, came from Uzbekistan, whose share went up from 18% in 2011 to 21% in 2012. About 12% of the immigrants had been residents of Ukraine (49 thousand), 11% of Kazakhstan (45 thousand), 10% of the flow was contributed by Armenia (41 thousand), 9% by Tajikistan and 8% by Kyrgyzstan (42 and 35 thousand respectively).

Registered emigration increased dramatically: 3.3 times since 2011. These changes are connected with the transfer of Rosstat (since 2011) to a new methodology of long-term migrants count, that included new categories of migrants registered at a place of stay for 9 months and over, in addition to traditionally counted migrants registered at a place of residence. In 2012 Russian statistics counted a lot of “emigrants” whose registration at a place of stay was processed in 2011 and expired in 2012. All of them automatically were considered to have moved to the country of the previous residence. Thus, the main destination countries where almost the same as the countries of immigrants’ previous residence demonstrating dramatic increase in flows. The number of departures to Uzbekistan increased 14 times in the space of a year — from 2.32 thousand in 2011 to 32 thousand in 2012; Kyrgyzstan and Tajikistan showed a tenfold increase in departures (from one to 10 thousand for each country). The 2012 net migration volume amounted to 294 thousand persons, a 7.8% decrease from the 2011 value

Residence permits. In 2012 the RF authorities issued 347 thousand residence permits (both temporary and permanent), that was a 26.1% increase since 2011. Nationals of only five countries were the main recipients of residence permits, having about 68% of all issued documents: Ukraine (16%), Uzbekistan (15%) Armenia (14%) Kazakhstan (11%) and Tajikistan (11%).

Stock of residence permits holders at the end of 2012 amounted to 653 thousand and 25.5% increase since 2011. 5 countries of citizenship were in the top-list, accumulating also about 68% of the total stock- Ukraine (17%), Uzbekistan (16%), Armenia (14%), Tajikistan (12%) and Azerbaijan (about 10%). Besides these immigrants there are about 200-250 thousand of long-term foreign migrants legally residing in Russia without residence permit on the basis of long-term visa or being a university student etc.

Russia continues to develop the State Program targeted at stimulation of repatriation to the RF. Stock of the Program participants and their family members since 2011 increased twofold
and in 2012 it exceeded 125 thousand persons, the same scale of increase was registered for the flows (56 thousand in 2012).

Temporary labour migration flows to Russia continued to grow in 2012, compared to 2011. In 2012, Russian migration authorities issued about three million documents permitting citizens of 141 countries to work in Russia. Specifically, 1.4 million foreigners obtained work permits (a 15% increase from 2011), and 1.3 million citizens of countries with no entry visa requirement bought patents (almost 50% above the 2011 value). Russia exceeded the pre-crisis, 2008 level in work permits issued (1.35 million), when the value had been at its highest for the entire period of observation.

The majority of labour migrants are citizens of the CIS countries with visa-free entry to Russia: their ratio in issued work permits amounted to 84 percent in 2012, and if patents are taken into account – to about 92 percent. Citizens of 10 states made for almost 95% of the entire inflow in 2012. Nationals of Uzbekistan remain overwhelmingly in the lead, at around 42% of all issued work permits. The number of migrants from Uzbekistan which obtained work permits reached an unprecedented figure of almost 590 thousand persons. With a tremendous gap Uzbekistan is followed by Tajikistan (218 thousand), Ukraine (151 thousand) and Kyrgyzstan (about 92 thousand). Some of the countries that are among the top ten had never been a part of the USSR: China (97 thousand), North Korea (37 thousand), and Turkey (26 thousand permits). The number of migrants from Uzbekistan grew almost by 25% compared to 2011; the flows from Ukraine increased by 18%, from Tajikistan, Kyrgyzstan and Moldova by 10%. Among the top sending countries outside of the former USSR, Turkey and Serbia demonstrated the largest growth from 2011, at 43 and 36 percent respectively. More than a half of all patents (licenses to work in private households) were bought by the citizens of Uzbekistan, thus the total number of permitting documents issued for the nationals on this country exceeded one million.

The occupational structure of migrant-workers in Russia is determined by the predominance of citizens of Central Asia countries among labor migrants. In 2012, as well as in 2011, more than 30 per cent of all migrant workers were low-skilled. More than 20 per cent were employed as skilled workers, machine operators and equipment fitters, 25 per cent were employed in mining operations, construction and repair work. Only 4 per cent were employed as directors and managers.

The stock of foreign students in the Russian universities is growing constantly. In 2012/2013 academic year their total number increased to 172 thousand, or by 7% since 2011. About 75% of the stock represented the citizens of former USSR republics. The main countries of students’ origin are Kazakhstan (34 thousand), Belarus (26 thousand), Turkmenistan (12 thousand). Uzbekistan and Azerbaijan (about 11 thousand).; China is leading among the non-former-USSR countries (although demonstrating a slight decrease from about 9.2 thousand students in 2011).
Naturalization. About 95 thousand persons were naturalized in Russia in 2012, that showed a 30% decrease since 2011. In the middle of 2009 and especially in the end of 2011, the rules of naturalization in Russia were revised and became more strict. Main categories of simplified procedures were revoked. Restrictive changes in legislation not only led to decrease in the total numbers of citizenship acquisitions but changed the proportions between groups of applicants. In 2012 the main group of naturalized foreigner were the participants of the State Program of repatriation (32.7% of all naturalized persons). In 2012 the main countries of the previous citizenship of naturalized foreigners were Kazakhstan (15%), Uzbekistan, Armenia, Ukraine (13-14%) and Tajikistan 10%.

Migration policy. The most recent novelties in legislation – both those put in force and planned to be introduced soon - deal with establishment of harsher penalties for violating the rules of foreigner entry and stay in Russia, and for organizing illegal migration. A 3-year ban for entry to the RF is imposed for foreigners that had overstayed the permitted period in Russia without relevant documents. In the end of 2013 an important amendment to the law on legal status of the foreign citizens in the RF reduced the allowed period of stay in the RF of foreigners from visa-free countries from 90 days since every entry, to total 90 days within every half of a year (180 days). This limitation is addressed to those who do not have work permit or another document that proves legal purpose of stay in the RF. In the end of 2013 a law (“On elastic flats” or “On fictitious registration”) put in force a strict responsibility for flats owners which assist foreigners in registration at a place of stay without planning to let them reside in this place. In the nearest future a package of legal acts is expected to be adopted, that imply a reform of the system of residence permits issuance and methodology of regulation of foreigners’ access to the Russian labour market.
New developments in migration policy

In the end of 2012 – 2013 the developments in the migration policy went on by two directions. On the one hand, work was carried out on the preparation of the legislation reform in the system of temporary and permanent residence permits, as well as employment of foreign citizens in Russia. This work is a part of the implementation plan of the Russian State Migration Policy Concept, which was adopted in June 2012. Preparation of the laws in draft took more time than it was planned, because of the documents’ importance it needed repeated discussions in different expert circles. Package of the documents is still in the process of revision.

On the other hand, a number of laws were prepared and adopted rather quickly, most part of them were implied toughening of the migration regulations, strengthening of responsibility for violation of the rules dealing with foreign citizens stay and employment in Russia. Adoption of these laws was accompanied by a very active campaign in the mass media. Most of the adopted regulations corresponded to the statements of the RF President election program (2012).

Migration was in the focus of discussion among politicians and representatives of mass media in 2013, mostly in the negative context. The growth of attention to migration was provoked by several accidents with human victims. They raised a sharp response in the society (especially in local communities) as well as the reaction of the authorities. Incident on one of the Moscow retail markets in August 2013 was provoked by a citizen of Russia, who belonged to one of the Northern Caucasus ethnic groups: during a police operation on a retail market, he attacked and severely injured a policeman. However, the measures were undertaken against foreigners. They resulted in raids in marketplaces and other possible locations of migrants, creation of the first camp for migrants in Moscow district Golyanovo. Many of the illegal migrants that were detained within this campaign appeared to be the citizens of the states with visa entry regime: Viet Nam, some Arab states and others. Keeping conditions for the detained persons in the tent camp arouse protests from the side of the non-governmental human rights organizations. There were problems about catering (unusual food) and lack of hot water supply. Almost all of the detained migrants were later deported from Russia.

The second case was provoked by the murder of a young Muscovite by the citizen of Azerbaijan in Moscow district Biryulevo on 10 October 2013. It resulted in protest actions of

---

3 See comments in mass media (in English): http://ruptly.tv/vod/view/2877/russia-police-sweep-markets-after-cop-hospitalised;
5 http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-europe-19197095
the representatives of the local community, but most of all – in the activity of the Russian nationalists; the protests were accompanied by public disorders. 

These events resulted in intensification of anti-migrant attitudes in the society. From the side of the authorities the reaction took a form of campaigns of coping illegal migration, raids and deportations. Within the framework of the election campaign for the Mayor of Moscow position almost every candidate promised to reduce migrants inflow, and the primary candidate (who won the elections) – Sergey Sobyanin – in his pre-election addresses noted, that without migrants Moscow would become the safest city, and as for the Moscow needs in labour force, they can be satisfied by migrants from other regions of Russia.

It can be said, that in 2013 not only the level of anti-migrant attitudes increased significantly, but the manner of the discussion around the migration theme became rigid as well. Some parliamentarians suggest to introduce a compulsory “entry deposit” of about 1 thousand USD to be done by each migrant coming to Russia from the CIS states to guarantee that possible expenses for deportation will be covered by migrants themselves and not by the Russian taxpayers.

The others suggest to establish visa regime with CIS countries. However the leading politicians, including the President, do not support this idea, explaining that visa-regime will destroy good neighbourliness and existing close ties between Russia and the CIS countries.

In the autumn of 2013 the President Administration informed, that there would probably be introduced a position of a migration ombudsman or a commissioner on interethnic concerns and migration policy in RF, who will be subordinated to the head of the state directly.

The problems of migrants’ adaptation and integration are widely discussed in the RF. First steps in accordance with the main directions of the Concept of the State Migration Policy of the RF for the period till 2025 are made. The key problems of adaptation are now the principal part of the FMS activity. Among the achievements there are: formation of Centres promoting adaptation and integration, agreements with religious associations, diasporas and other non-governmental organizations. According to the Concept one of the main aims of the State migration policy is creating the infrastructure promoting adaptation and integration. The measures include creating conditions for developing the culture of international and interreligious relations, Russian language teaching, law awareness, promotion of access to social, medical services and educational resources, creation of special programs promoting the process etc.

9 Marina Gritzuk. Впустят под залог. Migrants will be let in of the security deposit.
http://www.rg.ru/2013/06/17/migrancy-site.html
11 http://www.ntv.ru/novosti/678920
New regulations that were adopted or already came into force

Quite a few changes in legislation led to a simplification of the migration regime for selected groups of foreigners in Russia.

1) In the end of December 2012 an amendment to the Law on legal status of foreign citizens abrogated the requirement of obtaining a work permit for foreigners who have temporary residence permit. Thus, the rule that was in force before January 2007 was reestablished.

2) On June 18, 2013 a law was adopted, targeted at the simplification of the Russian citizenship acquisition for the persons who came to Russia within the framework of the Program of support for voluntary resettlement of compatriots living abroad. Foreigners who have a registration in a place of residence in one of the RF regions chosen by them for permanent residence in accordance with the State Program can be granted the Russian citizenship within a simplified procedure (even simpler than had been implemented earlier). In particular, five years term of temporary residence on the RF territory, permanent residence permit, evidence of the availability of the legal means of livelihood source, as well as the evidence for proficiency in Russian language are not compulsory for this category of applicants. And what is more important, the criteria under which foreign citizens will be able to participate in the Program are expected to be significantly broadened.

3) On July 23, 2013 a Federal law on amendments to the Law on the legal status of the foreign citizens and some other legal acts was adopted; it is targeted at creation of additional favourable conditions foreign citizens and stateless persons to study in the Russian Federation. It allowed to extend the period of stay of a foreign student in the RF and what is the most important - foreign students were also permitted to combine studies with work wherever they want on the basis of a work permit (with some exemptions)

The rest of the amendments adopted heightened the responsibility of the migrants and Russian citizens who accept foreign workers for violations of the migration regime.

On July 23, 2013, a package of amendments was adopted to a number of legislative acts, that established a prohibition for issuance of work permits for the foreigners who during previous five years were subject to administrative banishment, deportation or re-admission.

- Unconditional prohibition was introduced for entry into Russia for the foreigners and persons without citizenship, if they provided forged deeds, and in the previous residence period did not pay taxes, fines or did not reimbursed the costs of their banishment. In the last case, the prohibition is enabled from the moment of complete clearing off of the debt.

- According to the amendments, foreigners who during previous 10 years were repeatedly deported from Russia, will not be able to get work permit in Russia. Administrative
responsibility for violation of regulations in the sphere of migration is aggravated. The list of violations for which the foreigners would be unconditionally deported from Russia will be expanded. Labour migrants detained iteratively for employment without work permit would be deported on a compulsory basis. Higher penalties for repeated migration legislation violations and for those violations that were committed in Moscow, Saint-Petersburg, Moscow and Leningrad regions will be introduced.

On November 3, 2013 the President of Russia signed the law that prohibits granting Russian citizenship to persons, who were expelled, deported, or were the subject of readmission from the RF territory. The law was adopted by the State Duma on October 25, and approved by the Council of Federation on October 30.

On December 15, 2013 the RF parliament adopted in the third reading the law on so called “elastic flats” (or Fictitious registration). It established criminal liability (applied to the dwellings owners) for the fictitious registration, including the RF nationals and foreign citizens as well. Under the conditions of strongest deficiency of affordable tenancy and compulsory requirement to the foreigners (and Russian citizens too) to be registered somewhere, a formal registration became widespread.

The host provides for the migrant a possibility to be registered at his or hers address for a fee. In some “elastic flats” number of those registered can reach several dozens of persons. It is suggested to consider residing not at the registration address to be an infringement of the law and establish high level of fines for the tenants and the flat owners. A significant fine of 100 to 500 thousand rubles (from 3 up to over 15 thousand USD) is provided, or compulsory work (for the period up to three years), or deprivation of liberty for the same period (up to three years). Before the draft of the law was adopted many experts noted unjustified severity of punishment for administrative violation and the impossibility to put the law into practice.

In the end of December 2013, a package of laws was adopted, introducing the changes to the legislation concerning entry, residence and legal status of foreigners in RF.

- Changes were introduced to the RF Crime Code (article on the illegal migration organization), that moved illegal migration organization to the category of crimes of medium gravity. This provides increase of the penalties for such activity from two hundred to three hundred thousand rubles (about 10 000 USD), and maximum deprivation of liberty term — from two to five years. With the signs of organized group, deprivation of liberty term can be increased up to seven years.

- Changes in the Federal law “On the terms of exits from Russian Federation and entries to the Russian Federation” established a prohibition of entry into Russia during three

13 Migration Service publishes on its website information of the detected cases of registration of dozens and hundreds of foreigners for some fee and possible
14 See, for example, “The flats are “elastic” – the law is “leaden”, Rosbalt, Moscow [http://www.rosbalt.ru/moscow/2013/03/29/1111786.html](http://www.rosbalt.ru/moscow/2013/03/29/1111786.html)
years\textsuperscript{15} from the day of departure from Russia for the foreign citizens, who while previously residing on our territory did not leave the country before expiry of the thirty-days term after the end of allowed short stay period. For repeated entry into Russia of a person under such prohibition criminal liability is provided now.

According to information released by the FMS of Russia, by the middle of January 2014, entry to the RF territory was closed for 500 thousand of foreign citizens, who stayed in Russia longer than it was allowed by the law (90 days)\textsuperscript{16}. To make it possible to check if the exit is prohibited FMS provided an on-line service on its website\textsuperscript{17}.

- Federal Law adopted on December 28 2013 introduced an important amendment to the law on legal status of the foreign citizens in the RF. It limited the allowed period of stay in the RF of foreigners from visa-free countries from 90 days since every entry, to total 90 days within every half of a year (180 days). This limitation is not addressed to those who, for instance, have work permit, "patent", who study in the RF, as well as to the holders of temporary or permanent residence permits. For foreigners with a concrete and documentary proven purpose of entry and stay in the RF the period will be extended.

Previously all foreigners from visa-free countries could stay in Russia for 90 days irrespectively of purpose of entry, availability of a work permit etc. Many of such migrants in order not to violate the rules, left Russia and immediately reentered, thus, de-facto staying in the RF almost permanently. Since January 2014 if a person does not have a work permit or another document allowing to extend duration of stay, he or she can stay in Russia for only 90 days in total within every half of a year (180 days). Such a limitation (90 days within 180 days) previously was implemented only the citizens of the states with an entry visa requirement. This measure is supposed to cope irregular labour migration, to make “latent” labour migrants declare their real purpose of entry and obtain work permits or patents.

- The same Law introduced amendments to the law On the Procedure for Exit from the Russian Federation and Entry into the Russian Federation that imply prohibition of entry to the RF for 3 years since the day of the exit, if a foreigner or a stateless person had overstayed total period of 90 days within every half of a year during their previous visit to the RF.

\textsuperscript{15} Now the extension of this period up to ten years is under discussion http://www.rg.ru/2013/04/04/viezdanons.html Federal Migration Service introduced a special web service that allows a foreigner to check if entry is prohibited: see http://services.fms.gov.ru/

\textsuperscript{16} Information released by the head of the press-centre of the Federal Migration Service of Russia: http://www.newsru.com/russia/14jan2014/migr.html

\textsuperscript{17} http://services.fms.gov.ru/ See the link to: Проверка наличия оснований для неразрешения въезда на территорию Российской Федерации иностранным гражданам и лицам без гражданства по линии ФМС России
Oncoming changes

On December 20 the lower chamber of the RF parliament - Duma - adopted one more Law on compulsory Russian language and history test for all foreigners that intend not only to get a long-term status, but also for almost all temporary migrant workers (except highly-skilled specialists). The law was supposed to come into force in January 2015 but the higher chamber of the RF parliament- the Council of Federation found the law not to be ready as it contained some juridical contradictions. The draft law was suggested to be reworked, coordinated with the federal law On education and then again discussed at the session of the Council of Federation.

(In 2012 the requirement of Russian language test was established for migrant-workers employed in housing maintenance and retail trade, where lack of proficiency in Russian complicated communications with the local population. In 2013 new categories of foreigners were included into the list – applicants for residence permits and temporary migrant workers applying for work permit (except highly-skilled specialists). The criteria of certification will differ for long-term immigrants and temporary migrant-workers. The latest must know around 800 words and be able to write an application or fill in a form).

A number of laws in draft are under consideration in Duma (Parliament)

Scheduled work of FMS on changing the migration legislation was being carried out on following primary directions:

- modernization (reform) of the institutions of temporary residence permit and permanent residence permit;
- improvement of the procedure of determination of the Russian Federation need in foreign workers and their involvement in labour activity.

It is suggested that system of temporary residence permits should be filled with new meaning (about the regulation that is currently in force see the chapter on administrative data on issued residence permits), establishing a differentiated approach to the migration flows depending on the purpose and terms of foreign citizens residence on the Russian Federation territory. It is suggested to keep three types of legal status for foreigners’ stay (residence) in Russia: temporary stay (up to 90 days), temporary residence (from 90 days to 5 years), permanent residence (up to 10 years and indefinitely further on, or until the acquiring of the RF citizenship).

18 РИА Новости http://ria.ru/society/20131220/985492452.html#ixzz2o29voPJK
20 The text is cited from the report prepared by the FMS of Russia specialists
After 90 days of stay a foreigner would have to make a decision on the purpose of stay, which should be considered to be a basis for the TRP issuance. The purposes that are supposed to be taken into account are as follows:

- education;
- work;
- family reunification;
- medical treatment;
- resettlement to the Russian Federation;
- asylum;
- investments to the economy;
- other purposes (the list can be supplemented in the course of following suggestions discussion).

FMS suggests issuance of temporary residence permit with different terms of validity depending on the declared and confirmed (with documents) purpose. For example, validity term for the temporary residence permit with purpose to work would be defined by the labour (civil) contract, but will not exceed 5 years. For those with treatment purpose or for the family reunification validity period may last 1 year and longer. Maximum validity term of the temporary residence permit will be 5 years. Every 5 years the permit can be prolonged, if the purpose of residence declared upon its issuance is still relevant.

Permanent residence permit would be issued to the economic migrants with the use of points-based system, developed on the principles similar to those being implemented in a number of Western countries.

Regarding the concerns of labour migration, diversification of approaches for involvement of workers of different qualification levels are being under discussion. Regarding low-skilled workers, it is supposed to implement a system of “limits”, which should be defined as a share of foreign workers to the total number of employees on the enterprise, instead of quotas for work permits.

It is planned to develop an occupational shortage list, which will allow professionals of different categories get access to the labour market through a simplified procedure. So far, FMS suggestions in the field of working migration were not approved unequivocally and are being actively discussed in the expert community.

**International cooperation**

Russia continued to develop bilateral cooperation with other countries in migration and related concerns.
On February 17, 2012 the Agreement on temporary work of the citizens of one state on the territory of the other state was signed between the Government of the Russian Federation and the Government of Mongolia.

On June 7, 2012 during a State visit of V.V. Putin, the President of the Russian Federation, to the Republic of Kazakhstan (the city of Astana) the Agreement on the terms of stay of the Russian Federation citizens on the territory of Kazakhstan and terms of stay of Kazakhstan citizens on the territory of the Russian Federation was signed. At the same time two more documents were signed, namely, the Readmission Agreement between the Government of the Russian Federation and the Government of the Republic of Kazakhstan and the Executive Protocol on the procedure of its realization.

On February 8, 2013 the Agreement on the terms of stay of the citizens of the Republic of Tajikistan on the territory of the Russian Federation was signed.

On March 22, 2013 during a State visit of Xi Jinping, the Chairman of the People’s Republic of China to the Russian Federation, the Agreement on cooperation in coping illegal migration was signed between the Government of the Russian Federation and the Government of the People’s Republic of China.

4) In late October in Moscow a Protocol was signed between Russia and Tajikistan that implies issuance of work permits to the citizens of Tajikistan for 3 years instead of one, and prolongation of their temporary residence in Russia without leaving the country (that was compulsory after 12 months of stay for regular work permits holders).

State Program of repatriation of compatriots residing abroad

The State Program of assistance for voluntary resettlement (repatriation) of compatriots residing abroad has been implemented since 2006. It is supposed to attract Russian speaking people that were born in Russia or are descendants of Russian born migrants. In accordance with the definition - compatriots, eligible to participate in the Programme are the people, who “know the Russian language, were brought up in the tradition of the Russian culture and do not want to lose connection to Russia, and who are most likely to have good abilities for adaptation and quick inclusion into positive social relations of Russian society”\(^{21}\). The first years of the Program implementation were not very successful, however since 2010 it became more efficient, because after the rules of naturalization for the majority of foreigners became more complicated many migrants started using this channel of immigration and naturalization (table 2). Now the participants of the Program are allowed to settle in 40 regions of Russia (instead of 12 regions in the first years of the Program implementation).

In 2011-2012 this Program involved many more participants than in the previous years probably because all the other channels of simplified immigration and naturalization dramatically narrowed or were closed.

**Table 2. Participation in the Programme of assistance in the voluntary return of compatriots, thousands**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>9 months 2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Arrived</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme participants</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>11.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family members</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>11.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>56.9</td>
<td>22.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stock of persons registered at the regional migration authorities at the end of the period</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme participants</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>30.7</td>
<td>61.8</td>
<td>72.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family members</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>51.9</td>
<td>62.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>57.5</td>
<td>113.8</td>
<td>135.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: FMS of Russia Statistical report 1-RD*

The main countries of origin of the Program participants come from Uzbekistan, Kazakhstan, Armenia, Moldova and Tajikistan (fig. 1).

**Fig. 1. Main countries of origin of the Program participants which arrived in the RF in 2012**

---

22 Data on the Program participants that were registered in a place of residence or place of stay for 9 months and over are included in the Rosstat statistics on migration flows
Source: FMS of Russia. Monitoring of execution of the State Program of Support to voluntary return to the Russian Federation of compatriots residing abroad in the 4 quarter of 2012.\(^{23}\)

This channel is expected to be developed taking into account intention of the authorities to attract more Russian-speaking immigrants possibly of Slavic origin. As it has been mentioned participants of the Program already have and will get more privileges in citizenship acquisition. Permission to settle in many regions of Russia may also contribute to the Program’s attractiveness.

Permanent type migration

Flows of international migrants registered by Rosstat

Commentaries on statistics. The information used in this paragraph comes from two data sources: first, official data from the Federal State Statistics Service on persons registered at the place of residence and, since 2011, at a place of temporary stay for nine months and longer.

The second source is administrative data of the Russian Federal Migration Service on the number of foreign nationals which obtained temporary and permanent residence permits in the Russian Federation.

It can be said of both these kinds of data that the growth of indicators in 2011–2012, and possibly 2013 (figures 2 and 16), reflects serious changes in methodology of data collection as well as changes to Russian legislation concerning the status of foreigners in Russia and acquisition of the Russian citizenship.

Since the official statistics on migration in Russia now is going through a period of transition, it would be difficult to assess its quality and comparability with the administrative data collected by FMS. Both kinds of statistics have their limitations: Rosstat data reflects not only migration but also registration procedures at the place of residence and, since 2011, at a place of stay for a period exceeding nine months.

In its turn, the sharp growth of FMS indicators concerning issued temporary and permanent residence permits (see fig.16), happened due to the changes in legislation on citizenship acquisition that have occurred in the recent years. Since late 2011, almost all foreign nationals have been required to obtain a permanent residence permit if they plan to apply for the Russian citizenship. A permanent residence permit, in its turn, can only be obtained in exchange for a previously issued temporary residence permit. Temporary and permanent residence permit statistics now include new categories of foreigners that were absent in it before. Up to the end of 2011, citizens of Kyrgyzstan, Kazakhstan and Belarus very seldom applied for a temporary or permanent residence permit, because most of them could obtain Russian citizenship immediately upon arrival without intermediary terms and statuses. Now like all the others they must go through those two consecutive statuses and obtain the corresponding residence permits.

As FMS data since 2012 include almost all foreign nationals moving to Russia, it can be interpreted as immigration statistics and used for the purposes of estimating sizes of migration flows. Obtaining a temporary residence permit (the first of the “long-term” statuses, lasting between one and three years) can considered to be a confirmation of permanent type migration to Russia. The permanent residence permit is the next step leading up to Russian citizenship, and there is a time lag between arriving in the country and obtaining it, equal to the duration of the temporary residence permit. However, this is no reason to altogether ignore
Rosstat data. We have noted several times that the practice of obtaining Russian citizenship via Russian consulates, before actually moving to the country, is widespread in the CIS region. Such migrants appear as Russian citizens in Rosstat reports, and it would be wrong not to take them into account.

As noted in the chapter on Russian migration policy, fundamental changes are expected in the temporary and permanent residence permit system. A temporary residence permit will be issued to all foreigners intending to stay in Russia for longer than 90 days. Temporary residence permits will be diversified by purpose. The permanent residence permit is to remain second in the series of statuses, and a point-based system will be used to assess the eligibility of economic migrants for it.

**International long-term migration flows according to Federal State Statistics Service data.**

The report from last year contains a detailed explanation of the new methods used by Rosstat, and the risks they entail. It is worth briefly mentioning that the primary statistics forms, for statistical registration of arrival (departure) (see fig.15), would previously only be filled in upon registering at the place of residence.

When the second type of registration, \textit{at the place of stay}, was put into practice in the middle of 1990-ies, migrants were not included into statistics, even though the duration of such a registration could be long and often exceeded 1 year. Since 2011, statistical forms have also been filled in for those registered at a place of stay for a period of nine months or longer\textsuperscript{24}. The expiry date is fixed in the statistical form and is entered into the Rosstat database immediately upon counting the arrival. When the expiry date of the temporary registration comes, the migrant is automatically counted as an emigrant (or out-migrant in case in internal migration) to his or her place of previous residence. It means that international migrants are counted as having left for their country of their previous residence. It is highly probable that such migrants do not in fact leave at all, but obtain a new registration, or leave for a very short period of time to return back soon. Thus the increase in migration turnover in recent years reflects, to a significant extent, the procedures of registration and its expiry (for the same persons) rather than actual flows.

Among all the international migrants who arrived in Russia in 2012, over 31% were registered at the place of residence (the “true” migrants), while 69% registered at a place of stay for nine

\textsuperscript{24} While changing methodology of data collection Rosstat took into account the peculiarities of the legislation. Russian citizens have a right not to be registered at a new place of stay or residence for ninety days after arrival; after three months, they are required to register, whether at the place of residence or at the place of stay. If the duration of that registration exceeds nine months, which adds up, with the original three months, to a period of one year or longer, this will meet \textit{UN criteria} for permanent-type migration. Foreign nationals arriving in Russia for a period exceeding 72 hours are required to register within a week of their arrival in Russia. For most of them, however, the initial registration is made for 90-days. Extension is possible upon presenting an employment or study contract or a certain type of visa. Thus if a foreigner’s registration is extended for over nine months, this will also add up to a year or longer, including the initial three-month registration.
months or longer. For internal migration flows, the same proportion is 59.3% to 29.4% respectively; a further 11.3% were counted as having returned to their place of residence after a temporary absence. (As it has been noted, people in this category are not migrants either, since their “return” is counted automatically upon expiry of their temporary registration at a place of stay).

A special form for statistical registration of departure (fig. 15) is used to measure emigration among holders of “permanent” registration, upon their de-registration. Thus statistics for this category of migrants reflect actual departures for their countries of subsequent residence. (In internal migration measurement, departures are counted automatically upon registration of arrival, using information on the migrant’s place of previous residence)

Presented here is a description of long-term migration flows, as we believe the data to be relatively reliable with regard to certain structural features.

As far back as 2011, when the new migration counting methods were first implemented and showed a sharp increase in the immigration flow (fig.2), one could expect that an inevitable increase in the number of departures would be reflected in the statistics as soon as the temporary registrations expired.

**Fig. 2. Flows of international migration in Russia, thousands**

![Graph showing immigration, emigration, and net migration in Russia from 2000 to 2012.](image)

*Source: Rosstat*

In a significant number of cases, the registration duration for international temporary migrants was under two years. In 2012 Rosstat published separate data sets on duration of registration for migrants registered at a place of residence and place of stay. The latest category was distributed by periods of registration (fig. 3). More than half of the migrants register for a period of less than two years, which could also be the case in 2011. Thus it could be anticipated that the departure date for the majority of them would be in 2012, which would lead to an increase in “emigration.”
Fig. 3. International and internal migrant distribution in Russia by registration duration, 2012, %

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Registration Duration</th>
<th>International</th>
<th>Internal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5+</td>
<td>2,7</td>
<td>12,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 years</td>
<td>7,4</td>
<td>6,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 years</td>
<td>29,5</td>
<td>18,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 years</td>
<td>19,3</td>
<td>14,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>33,5</td>
<td>31,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 months - one year</td>
<td>16,8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Rosstat

The assumption was thoroughly confirmed by 2012 data. While immigration increased by 17% (from 356 thousand persons in 2011 to 417 thousand in 2012), the emigration flow grew 3.3 times (from 37 thousand in 2011 to 122 thousand in 2012).

Given the short registration durations for a significant number of migrants, it is reasonable to assume that the same persons appear in the statistics of arrivals and departures with a short time lag. This explains the similarity in basic characteristics of immigration and emigration flows by country of origin and destination, for instance, such variables as nationality, country of birth, etc.

In the first seven months of 2013, 261.9 thousand immigrants have entered Russia, and emigration (including the registration expiry count) has exceeded 100 thousand persons. The net migration has reached 162 thousand. Compared to the same period in 2012, immigration has increased by 31.4%, emigration by 12%, and net migration by about 20%.

What is actually happening with the departures is extremely difficult to understand. Instead of a chronic, and understandable, underreporting of emigration we now deal with formal registration expiry that, in a large number of cases, is not accompanied by emigration. In the near future Rosstat plans to receive data from the FMS in electronic format, that will allow some quality control, namely in counting actual arrivals, stays and departures.

25 [http://www.gks.ru/bgd/free/b13_00/IssWWW.exe/Stg/dk08/8-0.htm](http://www.gks.ru/bgd/free/b13_00/IssWWW.exe/Stg/dk08/8-0.htm) Demographics as of 1 August 2013
Immigration

As in previous years, about 90 percent of all migrants arrived in Russia from other CIS countries (table 3). The largest number of immigrants, 88 thousand, came from Uzbekistan, whose share went up from 18% in 2011 to 21% in 2012. About 12% of the immigrants had been residents of Ukraine (49 thousand), 11% of Kazakhstan (45 thousand), 10% of the flow was contributed by Armenia (41 thousand), 9% by Tajikistan and 8% by Kyrgyzstan (42 and 35 thousand respectively).

Table 3. Number of immigrants arriving in Russia from the top 20 countries of previous residence in 2007–2012, thousands.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>287,0</td>
<td>281,6</td>
<td>279,9</td>
<td>191,7</td>
<td>356,5</td>
<td>417,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armenia</td>
<td>30,8</td>
<td>35,2</td>
<td>35,8</td>
<td>19,9</td>
<td>32,7</td>
<td>37,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azerbaijan</td>
<td>21,0</td>
<td>23,3</td>
<td>22,9</td>
<td>14,5</td>
<td>22,3</td>
<td>22,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baltic states</td>
<td>1,9</td>
<td>1,6</td>
<td>1,6</td>
<td>1,9</td>
<td>3,7</td>
<td>3,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belarus</td>
<td>6,0</td>
<td>5,9</td>
<td>5,5</td>
<td>4,9</td>
<td>10,2</td>
<td>16,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>1,7</td>
<td>1,2</td>
<td>0,8</td>
<td>1,4</td>
<td>7,1</td>
<td>8,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic People's Republic of Korea</td>
<td>0,1</td>
<td>0,1</td>
<td>0,1</td>
<td>0,1</td>
<td>1,9</td>
<td>4,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>10,6</td>
<td>8,8</td>
<td>7,5</td>
<td>5,2</td>
<td>7,3</td>
<td>7,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>3,2</td>
<td>3,1</td>
<td>2,6</td>
<td>2,6</td>
<td>4,5</td>
<td>4,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>0,1</td>
<td>0,1</td>
<td>0,1</td>
<td>0,1</td>
<td>1,4</td>
<td>1,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>1,1</td>
<td>1,0</td>
<td>0,9</td>
<td>0,8</td>
<td>1,2</td>
<td>1,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kazakhstan</td>
<td>40,3</td>
<td>40,0</td>
<td>38,8</td>
<td>27,9</td>
<td>36,5</td>
<td>45,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyrgyzstan</td>
<td>24,7</td>
<td>24,0</td>
<td>23,3</td>
<td>20,9</td>
<td>41,6</td>
<td>34,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moldova</td>
<td>14,1</td>
<td>15,5</td>
<td>16,4</td>
<td>11,8</td>
<td>19,6</td>
<td>23,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tajikistan</td>
<td>17,3</td>
<td>20,7</td>
<td>27,0</td>
<td>18,2</td>
<td>35,1</td>
<td>41,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>0,3</td>
<td>0,4</td>
<td>0,4</td>
<td>0,6</td>
<td>1,8</td>
<td>2,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkmenistan</td>
<td>4,8</td>
<td>4,0</td>
<td>3,3</td>
<td>2,3</td>
<td>4,5</td>
<td>5,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukraine</td>
<td>51,5</td>
<td>49,1</td>
<td>45,9</td>
<td>27,5</td>
<td>43,6</td>
<td>49,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>0,6</td>
<td>0,6</td>
<td>0,6</td>
<td>0,7</td>
<td>0,9</td>
<td>1,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uzbekistan</td>
<td>52,8</td>
<td>43,5</td>
<td>42,5</td>
<td>24,1</td>
<td>64,5</td>
<td>87,9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viet Nam</td>
<td>0,9</td>
<td>0,7</td>
<td>1,0</td>
<td>0,9</td>
<td>3,3</td>
<td>3,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3,2</td>
<td>2,9</td>
<td>3,0</td>
<td>5,5</td>
<td>12,7</td>
<td>16,1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Rosstat

There was a considerable increase in immigration from almost every CIS country: the flow from Belarus increased by 62%, from Uzbekistan by 40%, from Kazakhstan by 25%, from Moldova and Tajikistan by a fifth, from Ukraine and Armenia by 13%. The flow from Azerbaijan did not change. Only Kyrgyzstan showed a decrease, by as much as 17%. This may be partly attributed to a more complicated naturalization procedure for Kyrgyz nationals and a (probably temporary) waning of Russia’s migration attractiveness for citizens of the country. (It ought to
be noted that data from the Statistics Committee of Kyrgyzstan have shown an even greater drop in emigration to Russia in 2012: almost 80% compared to 2011.\textsuperscript{26)}

Throughout 2011 and 2012, there was a significant increase in the number of migrants from selected non-CIS states: it quadrupled for South Korea, more than doubled for North Korea and Syria, and rose by 80% for Italy.

**Fig.4. Share of migrants arriving to Russia from regions of the CIS and Kazakhstan, %.**

![Graph showing share of migrants arriving to Russia from regions of the CIS and Kazakhstan, %](image)

While most source countries are showing an increase in the absolute volume of migration to Russia, changes in flow ratios (by country) have not been significant (fig.4). Despite an increase in immigration from Uzbekistan, the sharp drop in the number of arrivals from Kyrgyzstan between 2011 and 2012 made for a virtually unchanged share of Central Asia in the number of immigrants. Among European CIS countries, only Belarus showed an increase in immigration, leveling out the slight decrease in the number of migrants from Moldova and Ukraine. The share of arrivals from all the countries of Transcaucasia continued to decrease.

**Emigration**

The number of emigrants registered by Rosstat grew from 36 to almost 123 thousand persons, or 3.3 times, over the year (table 4). To a major extent, the new counting methods essentially reflect the movement of return, or circular, migrants. Those are people who have to remain in Russia for extended periods of time due to a number of reasons, but do not hold permanent or temporary residence permits and thus cannot register at a place of residence.

The unusually sharp increase in the number of “departures” to certain countries confirms the notion that the growth is mostly related to the introduction of new counting methods and the

\textsuperscript{26} Demographic yearbook of Kyrgyz Republic 2008-2012. Page 278

instability of indicators during the transition. The number of departures to Uzbekistan increased 14 times in the space of a year — from 2.32 thousand in 2011 to 32 thousand in 2012; Kyrgyzstan and Tajikistan show a tenfold increase in departures (from one to 10 thousand for either country). Mass expiry of registrations issued in the previous year increased the number of departures to countries outside the former USSR: eight times in the case of Vietnam, four times for Turkey and twenty times for India.

Conversely, the traditional emigration countries — Germany, Israel, and the US — showed a decrease in flows. This may be partly due to the fact that — as Rosstat data showed - most of the immigrants from these countries are Russian citizens that could be registered for extended periods without needing a visa or a contract of employment or education. (It means that registration expiry date may come not in 2012 but much later).

An overwhelming majority of foreign citizens have limits set on their registration periods if they do not hold a permanent or temporary residence permit or a similar document. Even students arriving to study at universities must renew their registration annually at the location of their college, university or dormitory facilities. Thus for a significant portion of migrants, departure is registered a year after the registration of arrival.

Table 4. Number of emigrants from Russia to the top 20 countries of the next residence in 2007–2012, thousands.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>47.0</td>
<td>39.5</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>33.6</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>122.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armenia</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azerbaijan</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baltic states</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belarus</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic People’s Republic of Korea</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kazakhstan</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyrgyzstan</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moldova</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tajikistan</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkmenistan</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukraine</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uzbekistan</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>31.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viet Nam</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top – 20</td>
<td>42.1</td>
<td>34.7</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>28.8</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td>113.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Net migration

The 2012 net migration volume amounted to 294 thousand persons, a 7.8% decrease from the 2011 figure. The decrease was predictable, since after the introduction of new rules for statistical accounting, emigration could be expected to grow, and eventually did in 2012. Trends from recent years show that the positive net migration, at least as calculated based on Rosstat data, is not only compensating for natural population decline, but exceeds it significantly already: by a factor of two in 2012, and as much as 70 times (!) in 2012. (fig. 5)

Fig. 5. Net migration and natural increase (decrease) in the Russian Federation, thousands.

![Net migration and natural increase graph](image)

*Source: Rosstat*

The value of net migration (294.9 thousand) was formed by net immigration, which amounted to 297 thousand persons, as well as net emigration, amounting to minus 2.057 thousand.

**Table 5. Net migration in the RF in 2007-2012, thousands**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>239.9</td>
<td>242.1</td>
<td>247.4</td>
<td>158.1</td>
<td>319.8</td>
<td>294.930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top countries of net Immigration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armenia</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>34.2</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>31.7</td>
<td>31.998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azerbaijan</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>18.102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>baltic states</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>2.422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belarus</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>10.249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>4.189</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Russia’s migration exchange with Uzbekistan (table 5) showed the largest growth (56 thousand, or over a fifth of all net immigration); Ukraine and Kazakhstan had a 12% increase each, Armenia and Tajikistan 10% each. The proportions remained virtually unchanged compared to 2011. Some non-CIS countries also had a positive net migration with Russia, including China (+4.2 thousand), Turkey (1.2 thousand), and Vietnam (2.4 thousand).

A small migration loss for the Russian Federation was formed primarily in the exchange with the USA (420 persons, or 21% of the net emigration), Canada (14%), Finland (11%) and Spain (7%), which is virtually identical to the 2011 indicators.

Due to the data quality-related problems outlined above, we refrain from commenting on the veracity of net migration figures, as a certain amount of time and checking procedures are needed (including those requiring the assistance of Migration Service specialists) in order to evaluate the effect of repeat registrations, formal departure counting at registration expiry, and other factors.
Profiles of international migrants

Countries of birth

In 2012, Rosstat began *for the first time* to elaborate the data on the place of birth of migrants who arrived during the year. The data showed, firstly, that migrants returning to their country of birth account for a large part of the flow, and secondly, that Russia is the country of birth for quite a significant part of the migrants.

Out of 417 thousand international migrants who moved to Russia in 2012, 8.4% had been born in Russia, 80.2% in other CIS states, and 11.3% in other countries.

Table 6. Composition of immigrants by countries of birth, 2012, %

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country of the previous residence</th>
<th>Born in Russia</th>
<th>Born in the country of previous residence</th>
<th>Born in a CIS country (other than previous residence for migrants from CIS)</th>
<th>Born in another country</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Immigration total</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>91.5</td>
<td>80.2</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIS</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>91.4</td>
<td>91.4</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armenia</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>87.1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azerbaijan</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>92.1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belarus</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>77.3</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kazakhstan</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>81.8</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyrgyzstan</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>91.8</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moldova</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>86.4</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tajikistan</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>96.7</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkmenistan</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>86.4</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uzbekistan</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>92.9</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukraine</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>76.3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other countries, including:</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>80.8</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baltic states</td>
<td>37.1</td>
<td>53.2</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>67.4</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>92.3</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>52.0</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>98.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>99.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syria</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>89.1</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>48.7</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>94.5</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viet Nam</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>97.2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The values may not sum to 100% due to rounding; Source: Rosstat

The share of Russian natives was the largest for arrivals from Germany (67%), Israel (52%), and the USA (33%), i.e. countries outside the former Soviet republics which had received the largest emigration flows from Russia in the 1980s and 1990s. Among immigrants from Germany, only 14% were born in that country, and 18% in other CIS states.
Among migrants arriving from CIS countries, natives of Russia accounted for only 7.6% on average, and by far not in every case was their share relatively large. There were relatively many Russian-born among immigrants from Ukraine (18%), Belarus (15%) and Kazakhstan (14%).

A feature of migration trends in the recent years is the arrival in Russia of young Central Asians, born shortly before or after the dissolution of the USSR. This is confirmed by a preponderance of local natives in these flows: in 2012, that indicator was 86% for Kyrgyzstan and 92% for Uzbekistan. The highest percentage of natives of their country of previous residence was among those arriving from non-CIS states that had not manifested a significant amount of emigration to Russia in the past: China (99% born in the PRC) and Turkey (95% Turkish-born) (table 6).

Among emigrants, the share of Russian natives averaged 16 percent (table 7). Russian-born migrants make up about a quarter of the outflow to Belarus and Ukraine, and 29% of departures to Kazakhstan. Thus it is return migrants departing for their country of birth who represent the majority of emigration to CIS countries.

Table 7. Composition of emigrants by countries of birth, 2012, %

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Countries of the next residence</th>
<th>Born in Russia</th>
<th>Born in the country of the next residence</th>
<th>Born in CIS country (other than country of the next residence)</th>
<th>Born in another country</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emigration total</td>
<td>15,7</td>
<td>71,5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To CIS states</td>
<td>9,3</td>
<td>90,0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azerbaijan</td>
<td>9,2</td>
<td>88,0</td>
<td>1,7</td>
<td>1,2</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armenia</td>
<td>2,6</td>
<td>90,1</td>
<td>4,5</td>
<td>2,8</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baltic states</td>
<td>50,9</td>
<td>39,3</td>
<td>8,5</td>
<td>1,3</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belarus</td>
<td>25,3</td>
<td>67,0</td>
<td>6,3</td>
<td>1,4</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kazakhstan</td>
<td>28,8</td>
<td>67,4</td>
<td>3,3</td>
<td>0,5</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyrgyzstan</td>
<td>3,0</td>
<td>94,9</td>
<td>1,9</td>
<td>0,3</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moldova</td>
<td>8,3</td>
<td>86,4</td>
<td>4,8</td>
<td>0,5</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tajikistan</td>
<td>1,8</td>
<td>97,0</td>
<td>0,9</td>
<td>0,3</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkmenistan</td>
<td>4,8</td>
<td>92,9</td>
<td>1,9</td>
<td>0,4</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uzbekistan</td>
<td>1,0</td>
<td>97,9</td>
<td>0,9</td>
<td>0,2</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukraine</td>
<td>23,7</td>
<td>71,2</td>
<td>3,8</td>
<td>1,3</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other countries including</td>
<td>38,2</td>
<td>55,6</td>
<td>6,2</td>
<td>0,1</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baltic states</td>
<td>50,9</td>
<td>39,3</td>
<td>8,5</td>
<td>1,3</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>1,5</td>
<td>98,1</td>
<td>0,2</td>
<td>0,1</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>84,5</td>
<td>2,4</td>
<td>2,1</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>79,3</td>
<td>4,2</td>
<td>15,4</td>
<td>1,1</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>1,3</td>
<td>98,5</td>
<td>0,1</td>
<td>0,1</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>74,1</td>
<td>12,4</td>
<td>11,5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syria</td>
<td>0,6</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>5,1</td>
<td>1,3</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>10,1</td>
<td>87,6</td>
<td>1,5</td>
<td>0,8</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viet Nam</td>
<td>1,4</td>
<td>97,8</td>
<td>0,3</td>
<td>0,5</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Rosstat
Non-CIS countries show a different picture. In this flow, migrants born in Russia are the majority: 74% of departures to Israel and almost 80% of departures to the USA and Germany. Larger still is the share of natives of the destination country in the outflows to Turkey and China (up to 90%). It is highly probable that this is a manifestation of the drawback in the new counting methods for long-term migrants, wherein a formal departure is counted upon the expiry of registration at a place of stay for migrants who are not Russian citizens and require an entry visa — even though in actuality it was most likely a mere re-registration.

**Citizenship of international migrants**

Amendments to the citizenship legislation resulted in predictable shifts in the composition of counted migrants. Previously, due to a widespread practice of simplified and quick citizenship acquisition the majority of immigrants would register at the place of residence only after acquiring citizenship. Entering as foreigners, they are registered by statistics as Russian citizens. The restrictions introduced in 2011 (and the privileges abolished in 2009) made it a necessity for foreign nationals to spend between a year and a half and six years in their existing citizenship status. Thus Russian statistics began to receive more correct data in terms of migrants’ citizenship. In 2012, the share of foreigners in the immigration flow rose to 68% (from 57% in 2011) (fig.6). Doubtlessly, the new rules for counting migrants with a temporary registration for a period exceeding nine months had also contributed to the shift in the ratios of Russian nationals to foreigners in migration flows. Foreigners are subject to a system of rules limiting the duration of their registration at a place of stay; it is usually much shorter than for Russian citizens. Hence, when statistics are formed, departures are more frequently counted for foreigners upon the expiry of their temporary registration.

**Fig. 6. Proportion of foreigners and the RF citizens in international migration flows in 2009-2012, %**

**Fig.6 (a) Immigrants**
Migrants' composition by citizenship varies strongly depending on the country of previous residence. The greatest number of Russian citizens was among immigrants from traditional countries of emigration (outside the CIS area): Germany (almost 90%), the USA and Israel (69% and 66%). We can safely say that migrants arriving in Russia from states that had previously been the major destinations of “true” emigration (as opposed to moving to another former Soviet republic) are former residents and natives of Russia who, for some reasons or other, are returning to Russia either permanently or for a relatively long period of time.

The large share of Russian citizens among immigrants from Kyrgyzstan, the Baltic states and certain CIS countries is probably a reflection of the practice of granting Russian citizenship via consular offices of the Russian MFA (particularly in the countries mentioned) (table 8). In other words, naturalization precedes migration, allowing such migrants to immediately gain access to the Russian labour market, and generally, to avoid many of the problems related to moving to a new country.

Also, as was the case with countries of birth, there is a very large percentage of citizens of the sending country among migrants arriving from Uzbekistan (over 85%) and Tajikistan (over 70%), as well as certain countries outside the CIS: India, Vietnam, China (96–98%) and Turkey (88%). It is worth noting that due to internal political reasons, some countries send a relatively large number of stateless persons to Russia; for example, their share in the immigration flow from Georgia has reached 9.2%; the same share is 3.5% for the Baltic states (most are migrant from Latvia), and 2.5% each for Armenia and Azerbaijan.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country of the previous residence</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>RF citizens</th>
<th>Citizens of the country of previous residence</th>
<th>Other country</th>
<th>Stateless</th>
<th>Not stated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>30,4</td>
<td>67,6</td>
<td>0,2</td>
<td>1,2</td>
<td>0,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armenia</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>22,2</td>
<td>74,0</td>
<td>0,5</td>
<td>2,5</td>
<td>0,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azerbaijan</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>20,4</td>
<td>76,0</td>
<td>0,5</td>
<td>2,5</td>
<td>0,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baltic states</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>63,0</td>
<td>32,1</td>
<td>0,5</td>
<td>3,5</td>
<td>1,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belarus</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>24,5</td>
<td>74,4</td>
<td>0,4</td>
<td>0,4</td>
<td>0,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1,3</td>
<td>98,2</td>
<td>0,2</td>
<td>0,1</td>
<td>0,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>34,3</td>
<td>54,3</td>
<td>1,0</td>
<td>9,2</td>
<td>1,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>87,7</td>
<td>10,5</td>
<td>0,8</td>
<td>0,1</td>
<td>0,9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3,3</td>
<td>96,2</td>
<td>0,4</td>
<td>0,1</td>
<td>0,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>65,8</td>
<td>32,2</td>
<td>1,0</td>
<td>0,3</td>
<td>0,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kazakhstan</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>47,6</td>
<td>49,7</td>
<td>0,5</td>
<td>1,6</td>
<td>0,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyrgyzstan</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>64,9</td>
<td>33,6</td>
<td>0,3</td>
<td>0,5</td>
<td>0,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moldova</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>47,7</td>
<td>50,3</td>
<td>0,7</td>
<td>0,8</td>
<td>0,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syria</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>29,0</td>
<td>66,4</td>
<td>2,7</td>
<td>1,7</td>
<td>0,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tajikistan</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>22,9</td>
<td>75,5</td>
<td>0,6</td>
<td>0,5</td>
<td>0,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>9,7</td>
<td>88,4</td>
<td>1,2</td>
<td>0,3</td>
<td>0,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkmenistan</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>44,8</td>
<td>51,7</td>
<td>0,6</td>
<td>2,1</td>
<td>0,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukraine</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>27,6</td>
<td>70,8</td>
<td>0,5</td>
<td>0,8</td>
<td>0,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>69,3</td>
<td>26,2</td>
<td>3,3</td>
<td>0,5</td>
<td>0,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uzbekistan</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>13,1</td>
<td>85,2</td>
<td>0,4</td>
<td>0,7</td>
<td>0,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viet Nam</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2,5</td>
<td>96,2</td>
<td>0,2</td>
<td>0,2</td>
<td>0,9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total CIS</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>30,1</td>
<td>68,2</td>
<td>0,1</td>
<td>1,1</td>
<td>0,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total immigrants outside CIS</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>33,0</td>
<td>63,7</td>
<td>0,8</td>
<td>1,9</td>
<td>0,6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Rosstat

A migrant’s country of previous residence is not necessarily his or her country of citizenship. 3.3% of immigrants from the USA were citizens of other countries, and 2.7% of those from Syria. On average, the share of such persons made up 0.2% of the flow.

The emigration flow, as counted by Rosstat, was also characterized by differences in its composition by citizenship (table 9).

The most considerable percentage of the Russian citizens were recorded among those departing for countries of the so-called “far abroad” — the USA and Germany (92 and 97 percent respectively), Israel (80%) and the Baltic states (82%). The share of Russian citizens was also big among persons leaving for Kazakhstan (80%), Kyrgyzstan (72%), and Moldova (59%).
Table 9. Percentage of foreigners and the RF citizens in emigration flow by countries of the next residence and citizenship 2012, %

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country of the next residence</th>
<th>RF citizens</th>
<th>Citizens of the country of the next residence</th>
<th>Other country</th>
<th>Stateless</th>
<th>Not stated</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total emigrants</td>
<td>38,0</td>
<td>60,6</td>
<td>0,1</td>
<td>0,3</td>
<td>0,9</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armenia</td>
<td>22,7</td>
<td>75,6</td>
<td>0,3</td>
<td>0,7</td>
<td>0,6</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azerbaijan</td>
<td>32,0</td>
<td>65,5</td>
<td>0,6</td>
<td>0,8</td>
<td>1,1</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baltic states</td>
<td>82,5</td>
<td>15,1</td>
<td>0,4</td>
<td>1,7</td>
<td>0,4</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belarus</td>
<td>38,9</td>
<td>60,2</td>
<td>0,4</td>
<td>0,1</td>
<td>0,3</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>2,0</td>
<td>97,7</td>
<td>0,3</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>58,9</td>
<td>35,2</td>
<td>0,6</td>
<td>4,4</td>
<td>0,9</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>96,5</td>
<td>2,0</td>
<td>0,3</td>
<td>0,1</td>
<td>1,1</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>1,6</td>
<td>98,3</td>
<td>0,1</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>86,1</td>
<td>12,0</td>
<td>0,5</td>
<td>0,3</td>
<td>1,2</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kazakhstan</td>
<td>80,4</td>
<td>18,2</td>
<td>0,4</td>
<td>0,4</td>
<td>0,6</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyrgyzstan</td>
<td>72,3</td>
<td>25,9</td>
<td>0,2</td>
<td>0,2</td>
<td>1,5</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moldova</td>
<td>59,2</td>
<td>39,1</td>
<td>0,4</td>
<td>0,6</td>
<td>0,6</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syria</td>
<td>11,4</td>
<td>84,2</td>
<td>3,2</td>
<td>0,6</td>
<td>0,6</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tajikistan</td>
<td>21,7</td>
<td>76,3</td>
<td>0,5</td>
<td>0,5</td>
<td>1,0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>12,4</td>
<td>86,6</td>
<td>0,7</td>
<td>0,1</td>
<td>0,2</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkmenistan</td>
<td>31,0</td>
<td>67,4</td>
<td>0,6</td>
<td>0,6</td>
<td>0,5</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukraine</td>
<td>44,1</td>
<td>52,1</td>
<td>0,3</td>
<td>0,3</td>
<td>3,2</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>92,4</td>
<td>6,0</td>
<td>0,2</td>
<td>0,5</td>
<td>0,9</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uzbekistan</td>
<td>6,2</td>
<td>93,1</td>
<td>0,3</td>
<td>0,1</td>
<td>0,3</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnam</td>
<td>1,1</td>
<td>98,6</td>
<td>0,2</td>
<td>0,1</td>
<td>0,1</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total to CIS</td>
<td>34,2</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0,1</td>
<td>0,3</td>
<td>1,0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total emigrants outside CIS</td>
<td>51,5</td>
<td>47,3</td>
<td>0,3</td>
<td>0,4</td>
<td>0,5</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Rosstat

Conversely, some of the destination countries mostly have their own citizens depart for them: a share of 93% among departures to Uzbekistan, 98% to China and Vietnam, and 87% to Turkey. This was probably a manifestation of the place-of-stay registration expiry effect, whereby a departure for the country of previous residence was automatically recorded in the Rosstat database. This seems to be the most likely explanation for such large shares of citizens of the aforementioned countries.

Sex and age composition
Males made up the majority of the immigration flow, and still more pronouncedly the emigration flow, in 2012, at 63% of arrivals and 71% of departures. In total, the share of women
among emigrants went down from 50 percent to 29, which breaks down to a drop of as much as 20 percentage points for CIS countries (46% to 26%), and 15 points for the rest (57% to 42%).

Thus looking at the dynamics of the share of women in migration flows (fig. 7), we cannot speak of a feminization of migration to Russia. After a slight increase of the share of women in the inflow between 2002 and 2006 and the outflow between 2004 and 2007, the indicators are falling. However, the 2012 drop to 29% does seem to some degree an artificial one. There is likely a counting error whose nature remains to be understood in several years’ time, when the application of the new methods has yielded enough data. For now, we can conjecture that long-term temporary registration is obtained by certain categories of labour migrants, who are overwhelmingly male. Less women are now showing up on both the arrival and the departure statistics, since the more numerous cohorts of male migrants (mainly labour migrants) are categorized as having left the country upon the expiry of their temporary registration.

**Fig. 7. Share of women in international migration flows, %**

a) Immigration

![Graph showing the share of women in immigration from 1999 to 2012 for Total, CIS, and Other categories.]

b) Emigration

![Graph showing the share of women in emigration from 1999 to 2012 for Total, CIS, and Other categories.]

*Source: Rosstat*
Naturally, the male-to-female ratio in the flows depends on the country of previous or subsequent residence. Permanent-type migration from and to the countries sending to Russia temporary labour migrants to Russia is also characterized by a large share of men in the flows: 73% of arrivals to Uzbekistan and 86% of departures to that country, as many as 92% of arrivals from and 86% of departures to Turkey, 77% of arrivals from and 87% of departures to Tajikistan. As already noted in this report, it is citizens of these countries that most frequently have temporary registration, and the outflows are mostly formed by migrants who arrived in Russia a year or two ago.

Only a limited number of countries show a relatively high percentage of women (fig. 8). Only for Kazakhstan did they make up over half of the immigrant flow. There are noticeably more women in the outflows to non-ex-USSR countries: Germany (60%), the USA and Israel (fig.9).

**Fig. 8. Male and female shares in 2012 immigrant flows to Russia, percent**

![Male and female shares in 2012 immigrant flows to Russia, percent](image)

*Source: Rosstat*
The age composition of international migrants is characterized by fairly large differences between flows from and to individual countries (table 10). There was a large share of elderly people among immigrants from the European part of the CIS and former USSR (Ukraine, Belarus, the Baltic states).

Table 10. Aggregated age group distribution of international migrants arriving in and departing from Russia in 2012, percent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Immigrants</th>
<th>0-14</th>
<th>15-39</th>
<th>40-59</th>
<th>60+</th>
<th>Emigrants</th>
<th>0-14</th>
<th>15-39</th>
<th>40-59</th>
<th>60+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7,1</td>
<td>61,2</td>
<td>25,1</td>
<td>6,6</td>
<td>5,2</td>
<td>65,1</td>
<td>25,4</td>
<td>4,3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armenia</td>
<td></td>
<td>6,5</td>
<td>56,4</td>
<td>29,5</td>
<td>7,6</td>
<td>5,3</td>
<td>56,2</td>
<td>32,8</td>
<td>5,7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azerbaijan</td>
<td></td>
<td>6,9</td>
<td>66,3</td>
<td>24,4</td>
<td>2,4</td>
<td>6,8</td>
<td>61,4</td>
<td>29,4</td>
<td>2,4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belarus</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,3</td>
<td>54,9</td>
<td>34,8</td>
<td>7,0</td>
<td>4,6</td>
<td>50,1</td>
<td>36,0</td>
<td>9,3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td></td>
<td>0,8</td>
<td>65,5</td>
<td>33,1</td>
<td>0,5</td>
<td>0,5</td>
<td>63,3</td>
<td>35,8</td>
<td>0,4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td></td>
<td>6,5</td>
<td>40,7</td>
<td>34,5</td>
<td>18,2</td>
<td>3,8</td>
<td>46,7</td>
<td>32,8</td>
<td>16,8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td></td>
<td>6,2</td>
<td>55,8</td>
<td>28,4</td>
<td>9,6</td>
<td>7,6</td>
<td>52,7</td>
<td>31,3</td>
<td>8,4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td></td>
<td>9,6</td>
<td>26,3</td>
<td>37,4</td>
<td>26,7</td>
<td>12,6</td>
<td>49,2</td>
<td>25,3</td>
<td>12,9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,5</td>
<td>94,9</td>
<td>3,4</td>
<td>0,3</td>
<td>0,5</td>
<td>98,0</td>
<td>1,5</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel</td>
<td></td>
<td>13,7</td>
<td>41,4</td>
<td>28,6</td>
<td>16,3</td>
<td>10,2</td>
<td>45,9</td>
<td>18,9</td>
<td>24,9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kazakhstan</td>
<td></td>
<td>13,4</td>
<td>55,5</td>
<td>20,5</td>
<td>10,6</td>
<td>11,1</td>
<td>63,7</td>
<td>18,8</td>
<td>6,4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Rosstat
The medium age of migrants was young: 35 years for arrivals and 33 years for departures (fig. 10). Migrants moving between Russia and the Baltic states were relatively older, while those arriving from or departing to Central Asian countries were younger.

Fig. 10. Medium age of international migration in Russia, 2012, years

Source: based on Rosstat data

**Educational attainment**

Migrant distribution by main education group was virtually the same in 2011 and 2012. There is still a large share of persons not specifying their level of education (fig. 11), but this is most likely to do with the work of officials filling in arrival counting sheets. In many cases (particularly
during registration at a place of stay), statistical forms for the migrant are filled in post-registration, based on administrative records in which education level is not a required variable.

**Fig.11. Educational attainment of international migrants, 2012. %**

![Diagram showing educational attainment of immigrants and emigrants, 2012. %](image)

*Source: based on Rosstat data*

On average the ratio of immigrants having tertiary education made 14%; however, the value was much higher for many countries: over 30% for Germany, Israel and the USA, 20 to 24 percent for Belarus, Ukraine and Kazakhstan. Nor is a small percentage of people with higher education a rare incidence; the smallest percentages were among migrants arriving from Uzbekistan, Tajikistan and Azerbaijan, as well as from China, India and Vietnam (4% to 8%). Out of 390 thousand immigrants aged 14 and over, 56 thousand persons had higher education, including 586 with a Candidate or Doctor of Sciences degree. The largest number of academic degree holders arrived from Ukraine.

**Reasons for move**

The introduction of a new methodology of emigration statistics collection made reasons for moving very difficult to interpret. For every migrant unregistered from the place of residence, a special departure registration form is filled in, stating the reason for emigration. At the same time, there is a large flow of “emigrants” with expired place-of-stay registrations, for whom the stated reason is probably copied from their arrival registration form. Tens of thousands of such migrants had their registrations processed in 2011 and expired in 2012. Therefore from 2012 on, data on emigrants distribution by reason for move is simply meaningless. This could have partly been avoided if the reason had been automatically changed to “return to place of
previous residence” for such migrants in the Rosstat database, but that is probably a future issue.

In 2012, the structure of reasons for moving manifested a growth in work-related arrivals (table 11). This value has peaked for the entire observation period, since 1997. There is a larger share of arrivals for study, and on the other hand, a decrease in migration related to personal circumstances.

Table 11. Distribution of immigrants by reasons for move, percent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age 16+</td>
<td>1,2</td>
<td>1,4</td>
<td>1,5</td>
<td>2,6</td>
<td>3,6</td>
<td>4,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 14+</td>
<td>9,1</td>
<td>9,4</td>
<td>11,2</td>
<td>13,9</td>
<td>27,2</td>
<td>33,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To the previous place of residence</td>
<td>5,6</td>
<td>4,5</td>
<td>4,1</td>
<td>3,4</td>
<td>2,3</td>
<td>1,9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Pushing” reasons *</td>
<td>2,4</td>
<td>2,1</td>
<td>1,8</td>
<td>1,7</td>
<td>1,5</td>
<td>1,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal or family reasons</td>
<td>66,4</td>
<td>67,5</td>
<td>65,5</td>
<td>61,6</td>
<td>44,3</td>
<td>39,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other reasons</td>
<td>7,4</td>
<td>8,8</td>
<td>9,6</td>
<td>10,8</td>
<td>10,5</td>
<td>9,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not stated</td>
<td>7,9</td>
<td>6,4</td>
<td>6,2</td>
<td>6,1</td>
<td>10,6</td>
<td>9,9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100,0</td>
<td>100,0</td>
<td>100,0</td>
<td>100,0</td>
<td>100,0</td>
<td>100,0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Included in this group are humanly important but minor-sized flows due to aggravation of ethnic conflicts, increase in crime, environmental problems and unsatisfactory climate.

Source: Rosstat

The “personal and family reasons” category (fig. 12) accumulates the largest percentage of stated reasons for moving, but is difficult to interpret. Since 2011, additional suggestions helped to “decode” the “personal and family reasons” formulation but only to a partial extent. Namely, family reunification-related reasons became specifiable in 2011. In 2012, 2.2 thousand persons moved due to a spouse’s place of work change, 11.2 thousand due to marrying, 8.3 thousand moved to join their children and 9 thousand - their parents. In total, migrants with these reasons for moving made up about 18% of all migrants stating family reasons in 2011, and about a fifth in 2012. It can be assumed that their actual number is much higher.

Unfortunately, Rosstat data on reasons for moving depend heavily upon counting methods, and specifically registration procedures. The number of migrants whose main reason for moving was studying is fairly small, and their share does not exceed 4–5 percent. According to Ministry of Education data, Russian higher educational institutions alone have enrolled tens of thousands of foreign students in long-term study programmes: 35 thousand in 2011, going up to 48 thousand in 2012. However, Rosstat data on international migration account for a mere 17 thousand persons, only 14 thousand among them foreigners. Therefore statistics only reflect a little over a third of the actual flow of study migrants who are foreign nationals.
Unfortunately, differences in motivation for moving between migrants from different countries are as yet impossible to ascertain. Since 2011, data has been developed not by country of previous residence, but by citizenship, and cumulatively rather than on a country-by-country basis. Therefore these distributions are of limited analytical potential, though the main differences are still traceable. As shown on fig. 13, among migrants who arrived in Russia in 2012, there is a preponderance of those who cited work as their main reason for migration, while Russian citizens, in their turn, frequently cite reasons that are hard to interpret (“family circumstances”: 56%, “other”: 14%).
Out of all immigrants who had mentioned work as their main reason for arrival, 86% were foreigners, and for those arriving to study - 82%.

**Fig. 14. Proportion of foreigners and the RF citizens in groups of immigrants by reasons for move, percent**

![Proportion of foreigners and the RF citizens in groups of immigrants by reasons for move, percent](image)

*Source: Rosstat*

For all its limitations, Rosstat data is currently the only source of information on reasons for migration. There are plans to develop this variable in the future based on permanent and temporary resident permit statistics, whereby a migrant’s purpose of long-term stay in Russia will be recorded upon issuing him or her the document.
Fig. 15. Form for statistical registration of arrival. Filled in at the moment of migrants' registration at a place of residence or place of stay for 9 months and longer. Form of departure is to be filled in only in case of emigration, it has the similar design.

Form for statistical registration of arrival (size 125 x 280 mm)

Front side:
1. Family name
2. Given name
3. Patronymic
4. Date of birth
5. Place of birth (name of a country, region, district, city, town, rural settlement)
6. Sex
7. Citizenship (in case of double citizenship, indicate the state if registration is done for the reason of citizenship change, indicate the previous citizenship)
8. New place of residence (name of a country, region, district, city, town, rural settlement)
9. Last place of residence (name of a country, region, district, city, town, rural settlement)
10. Since what year had resided in the last (previous) place of residence____
11. Main reason for move (education; job, return to the previous place of residence; ethnic conflicts aggravation; increase in crime; ecological troubles; unsuitable climatic and natural conditions; private and family reasons (out of them*): spouse's, place of work change; family formation (marriage); to children's; to parents'; other reasons (to be specified. out of them*: purchase inheritance, etc.) of a dwelling space* the detailing subcategories were introduced in 2000

Reverse side:
12. Sphere of occupation (industry) in the place of previous residence (agriculture, trade, construction, finance, education, healthcare etc., was not employed)
13. Employment status (hired work as: manager, specialist, other employee [technician, executive officer], worker, self-employed)
14. Type of social welfare (old-age pension, disability pension, long service pension, unemployment benefit, other pensions and allowances)
15. Education (higher, including PhD degree; higher vocational incomplete, secondary vocational (specialized secondary) education, primary vocational, general secondary education (full), basic general (post-primary) education, elementary general (elementary) and out of elementary education)
16. Marital status (married, never married, divorced, widowed)
17. In case of having lived together with the family before move - arrived with the whole family, with a part of the family, alone, had lived without family before move
18. Part of a family has already lived in the new place of residence (yes, no)
Administrative data on residence permits.

This paragraph is based on the data of the FMS of Russia on the issued temporary residence permits (TRPs) and permanent residence permits (PRPs), as well as on the number of foreign citizens holding these documents at the end of the calendar year.

Information note. Since 2003 two kinds of authorization documents for foreigners who reside in Russia have been in use in the Russian Federation, which entitle foreign citizens to stay in the Russian Federation for a long time. A temporary residence permit is issued once for up to three years. The total number of permits is quoted annually (but the limit is often exceeded).

A permanent residence permit is the next status that gives a person right to live in Russia almost permanently and to apply to authorities for the RF citizenship. A request to obtain a permanent residence permit is submitted by a foreign citizen to the regional office of Migration service not later than six months before the temporary residence permit expires. A foreigner must have been residing in the Russian Federation not less than one year on the basis of a temporary residence permit before obtaining a permanent residence permit. A permanent residence permit is issued for the period of the national identification document validity, but not more than for five years. When PRP expiry date comes, a foreign citizen can apply for its extension for another five years. The application is submitted to the regional office of the FMS of Russia at the place of issuance of the permanent residence permit, not later than two months before the validity term of the permit expires. The number of prolongations of the permanent residence permits is unlimited. A foreign citizen, permanently residing in the Russian Federation, must annually confirm his or her residence in the Russian Federation sending (or providing personally) a notification the nearest regional office of the FMS.

Issued residence permits

In 2012 the FMS of Russia issued 221 thousand temporary residence permits and 126 thousand permanent residence permits (fig. 16). Thus the total number of the issued documents equaled almost 350 thousand and reached historic highs. In comparison with 2011, the increase in issued TRPs equaled 26 per cent only, but the number of the issued permanent residence permits was almost 4 times as big. During the nine months of 2013 the number of the issued documents was from 3 to 4 per cent bigger than the one over the same period of 2012, and it is very likely that by the end of the year their number will be quite close to the level of 2012, i.e. the flow is gradually stabilizing. The growth in the number of the issued documents in 2012 was connected with important changes in the legislation on citizenship introduced in late 2011.

27 From 2003, when the new Law on the Legal Status of Foreigners came into effect, the biggest number of TRPs and PRPs was issued in 2009 and equaled 257 thousand
28 160 thousand TRP and 90 thousand PRP were issued from January to February 2013, whereas 167 thousand TRP and 93 thousand PRP were issued over the same period of 2012.
Fig. 16. Dynamics of the number of foreign citizens granted temporary residence permits and permanent residence permits in Russia, thousands

![Graph showing the dynamics of the number of foreign citizens granted temporary residence permits and permanent residence permits in Russia, thousands.]

Source: FMS of Russia

Till the end of 2011 the majority of the citizens of the CIS states (and nationals of other states that were born in Russia or had family ties with Russian citizens) could apply for the RF citizenship on the basis of temporary residence permits only, permanent residence permits were not required. The period of living with a TRP before citizenship acquisition lasted just several months.

Up to the end of 2011, the absolute majority of the nationals of Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan and Belarus could apply for the RF citizenship without receiving interim statuses, immediately after moving to Russia (in accordance with international agreements between these countries and Russia). In the end of 2011 a new requirement was introduced: an applicant for the RF citizenship had to be a permanent residence permit holder. This, in turn, caused dramatic growth of foreigners obtaining this document (table 12). Note that one can get a permanent residence permit after one year residence in Russia with temporary residence permit.

The greatest increase in the number of issued TRPs related to the citizens of Kazakhstan and Kyrgyzstan, who had almost never applied for the status before. Since 2011 the number of the citizens of Kazakhstan receiving a TRP has grown more than fourfold; that of Kyrgyzstan has grown more than fivefold; that of Belarus has grown by 38 per cent.

---

29 This order of citizenship acquisition was introduced in 2003 through an amendment to the Federal Law on citizenship adopted in 2002. The first version of the law appeared to be extremely strict and needed some corrections for the sake of thousands migrants arriving in Russia.
Table 12. Issued temporary and permanent residence permits in Russia in 2010-2012 by countries of migrants’ citizenship, thousand (25 top countries)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FLOWS</th>
<th>Issued Temporary residence permit</th>
<th>Issued Permanent residence permit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>181.3</td>
<td>175.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armenia</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>26.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azerbaijan</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>18.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belarus</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kazakhstan</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyrgyzstan</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moldova</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serbia</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syria</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tajikistan</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkmenistan</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukraine</td>
<td>31.7</td>
<td>29.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uzbekistan</td>
<td>33.7</td>
<td>32.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viet Nam</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: FMS of Russia

Amendments to the Law on citizenship caused serious changes not only in the number of foreigners receiving temporary residence permits and permanent residence permits, especially, but in the proportion of the citizens of several countries and other migrants receiving these statuses.

In 2012 among the foreigners getting TRP the majority were citizens of Kazakhstan (17 per cent), Uzbekistan (15 per cent), Ukraine (more than 16 per cent), Armenia (12 per cent) and Tajikistan (10 per cent). The top-10 countries comprised the countries of the former USSR and Vietnam (fig. 17).

30 To make it possible to compare this information with other data (the Rosstat data on migration flows, the FMS data on work permits etc.) we provide an extended list of the countries, though more than 90 per cent of the issued TRPs and 85 per cent PRPs fall on 10 states, namely, nine CIS states and Georgia.
Fig. 17. Percentage of citizens of selected states among the foreigners receiving a Temporary residence permit in Russia, percent

Source: FMS of Russia

The share of the citizens of Kazakhstan has grown from 5 to 16 per cent during a year, that of Kyrgyzstan has grown from 1.4 to 5 per cent.

The biggest number of permanent residence permits was obtained by the citizens of Ukraine (23 thousand or 18 per cent), Armenia (21 thousand or 15 per cent), Uzbekistan (17 thousand or 13 per cent.) and Tajikistan (15 thousand or almost 10 per cent). In comparison with the data of 2011 the most considerable increase in the number of the received permanent residence permits happened as for the citizens of Kyrgyzstan (more than three times), Belarus (2.7 times), China (twice), Azerbaijan (by 45 per cent). The number of the permanent residence permits issued to the citizens of Kazakhstan has grown by 50 per cent. Citizens of Georgia, Tajikistan and Vietnam have received almost 40 per cent more permanent residence permits than they did in 2011.

The share of the citizens of the countries receiving the main part of the permanent residence permits has changed in their general number, but not so dramatically as it was in the case with temporary residence permits (Fig.18). In general, citizens of five countries (Ukraine, Armenia, Tajikistan, Uzbekistan and Kazakhstan) in 2012 received 68 per cent of all permits for living in the Russian Federation (70 per cent of the TRPs and 63 per cent of the PRPs).
Fig. 18. Percentage of the citizens of selected states among the foreigners receiving Permanent residence permits, %

![Graph showing percentage of citizens among foreigners receiving residence permits]

Source: FMS of Russia

Stock of foreign population in Russia

After the population census in 2010, the administrative data of the FMS of Russia are the only source of information on persons holding residence permits (both temporary and permanent). However, there are thousands of foreigners residing in Russia, who do not need these documents and statuses. Among them are, for example, foreign students (stock in 2012-2013 academic year was about 164 thousand persons), and also persons having long-term extendible visas of some categories. Detailed data on these foreigners are not available so far. In 2012 FMS issued 315,7 thousand multi-entry extendible visas, including 84,5 thousand educational and 218,8 thousand job visas.

The stock of foreigners with valid Temporary and Permanent residence permits reached 653 thousand persons by the end of 2012 (fig.19) and 716 thousand by early October 2013.

In comparison with 2011 the stock of foreigners increased by more than 25% per cent. Since 2011 the TRP stock has grown insignificantly, by 12 per cent only, but as for the citizens of particular countries the increase was considerable. The stock of citizens of Kazakhstan with TRPs has grown almost three times, those of Kyrgyzstan - almost 3.4 times.

The stock of Permanent residence permit holders demonstrated a much more significant increase: by almost 60 per cent. Population of PRP holders who are the citizens of Moldova, Tajikistan, Azerbaijan and Armenia, doubled; stock of the citizens of Uzbekistan increased by 70 per cent, and of Ukraine - by 60 per cent.
Fig. 19. The dynamics of the number of foreigners with temporary and permanent residence permits in Russia at the end of the year, thousands.

Source: FMS of Russia

The time period of living with a TRP is quite short. In a year a foreigner can apply for a permanent residence permit. In most cases migrants exercise the right. Persons who received a TRP during the previous one or two years, received a permanent residence permit in 2012 and by the end of the year were already living in Russia having a new status (table 13).

Only citizens of Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan и Belarus still have some advantage due to the international agreements with Russia. They can submit an application for citizenship immediately after receiving a permanent residence permit.

As we have explained earlier the quick growth of the number of foreigners living in Russia is connected with the changes in the rules of Russian citizenship acquisition. In the chapter on naturalization it will be demonstrated that nowadays the majority of foreign citizens still obtain Russian citizenship via simplified procedure. In other words, the five-year period of living with a permanent residence permit that is necessary according to the regular procedure of citizenship acquisition is applied to a very limited number of foreign citizens. In other cases one still has to live with a permanent residence permit for some time to get the RF passport. Thus, the stock of foreigners with a permanent residence permit will be quite stable, i.e. naturalization cannot happen as fast as is used to before 2011 (when it took not much longer than a year from the moment of moving to Russia to the moment of receiving a Russian passport). During several years foreigners are expected to live in Russia keeping their citizenship and “maintain” the stock of the foreign population in the Russian Federation.
Table 13. The number of foreign citizens with temporary residence permits and permanent residence permits as of December 31, 2012, by the main countries, thousands

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STOCKS</th>
<th>Temporary residence permit holders</th>
<th>Permanent residence permit holders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>327,6</td>
<td>378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armenia</td>
<td>48,7</td>
<td>56,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azerbaijan</td>
<td>38,8</td>
<td>44,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belarus</td>
<td>2,2</td>
<td>1,9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>3,2</td>
<td>4,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td>0,5</td>
<td>0,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>6,6</td>
<td>8,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>0,3</td>
<td>0,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>0,7</td>
<td>0,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kazakhstan</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyrgyzstan</td>
<td>3,4</td>
<td>3,9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td>1,1</td>
<td>1,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>1,3</td>
<td>1,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moldova</td>
<td>18,3</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>0,4</td>
<td>0,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serbia</td>
<td>0,6</td>
<td>0,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syria</td>
<td>0,4</td>
<td>0,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tajikistan</td>
<td>45,7</td>
<td>53,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>1,6</td>
<td>1,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkmenistan</td>
<td>2,5</td>
<td>2,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukraine</td>
<td>59,4</td>
<td>66,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>0,6</td>
<td>0,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uzbekistan</td>
<td>59,7</td>
<td>69,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viet Nam</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>15,5</td>
<td>17,8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: FMS of Russia*

The distribution of the stock by countries of citizenship was more or less similar to the structure of the “flow” of foreigners that had received these documents. About 68 per cent of the whole stock of migrants (70 per cent of the TRP holders and 63 per cent of the PRP holders) are represented by citizens of five states, namely, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Tajikistan, Ukraine and Uzbekistan (fig.20).
Fig. 20. Distribution of foreign citizens with temporary residence permits and permanent residence permits, by the countries of nationality, per cent

Source: FMS of Russia

In 2012 году citizens of Kazakhstan significantly increased their share in the population with TRPs, but the share of citizens of Azerbaijan remains bigger.

**Sex and age composition**

Due to a rather short period of validity of temporary residence permits and fast transformation into the stock of permanent residence permit holders, the age-sex composition of flows and stocks varied insignificantly. The share of women in the flows of migrants that were granted TRPs and PRPs did not considerably differ both on the average for the whole flow and by specific countries. The age composition was also very similar. It means that it is possible to describe age and sex composition of the whole flow (persons granted both temporary and permanent residence permits) and the whole stock of residence permits holders.

On the average ratio of women made about 43 per cent in the flow and 46 per cent in the stock of foreigners. The percentage of women among the citizens of many states was much bigger but did not exceed (for the main countries of origin) 55-56 per cent. The biggest share of women was observed among the citizens of Kazakhstan, Ukraine, Estonia, Kyrgyzstan, Turkmenistan and Belarus.

Considerable predominance of men and a very small share of women have been observed among the citizens of Turkey, Serbia, Italy, Bulgaria and India (the share of women varied within

---

31 Among persons with permanent residence permits the number of children and teenagers was a little smaller and that of middle-aged persons (aged 40+) was a little bigger
the range from 6 to 16 per cent. Among all the citizens of Egypt having received residence permits in Russia, the share of men was 98-99 per cent (see Fig. 22 and 23).

Comparing the flows of foreigners which got residence and work permits with one can come to conclusion that citizens of such countries as Turkey, Serbia and some others are the same persons who participate in labour migration, i.e. it is “migration of individuals”, not households. As for the citizens of other countries it is only partially true. Many of them move with families and the ratio of pre- and post working ages has a smoothing influence on the sex (and age) composition of the flows of migrants granted residence permits. We plan to test this assumption in the future such on the basis of the FMS’s Central data bank of foreign citizens.

Figure 21 demonstrates the age composition of the resident population and foreigners who have received TRPs and PRPs. Data for the resident population for the ages younger than 40 years old were available by other age intervals, than for foreigners granted residence permits. Besides, the FMS often registers data for the adult family members only while issuing residence permits. That is information on minors may partly be missing from the Central data bank of foreign citizens. Thus, it is more difficult to compare the age composition of migrants and the resident population, however one can see that the resident population is much older than migrants.

**Fig. 21. Distribution of the resident population of the Russian Federation and persons who received temporary residence permits and permanent residence permits in 2012 and stock of permit holders at the end of 2012, by the major age groups,**

![Age Composition Chart](image)

**Source:** based on the FMS of Russia and Rosstat data

Distribution by age groups (for referential use) are provided on the fig. 24 and 25. The largest share of children and teenagers has been observed among the citizens of Kazakhstan and countries beyond the former USSR, namely Korea (up to 20 per cent), the USA, Vietnam, Germany (14-17 per cent while the average level was 6-7 per cent).
Ratio of persons aged 18-39 among the citizens of the main countries of origin was the lowest in case of Kazakhstan (70%), for Ukraine and Belarus it made about 80%, varied from 80% to 90% among the nationals of Kyrgyz Republic, Uzbekistan, Armenia, Georgia, Moldova and Viet Nam. This age group represented over 90% of migrants coming from Azerbaijan, Tajikistan, China and Turkey.

The share of persons in post-working ages was bigger than average among the citizens of many CIS states- Ukraine, Uzbekistan, Kazakhstan, Korea and a number of the Western countries (from 14 to 20 per cent while the average level was 9-10 per cent).
Fig. 22. Sex composition of persons granted permanent and temporary residence permits in 2012, %

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>Males</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armenia</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azerbaijan</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belarus</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belarus</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armenia</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 23. Sex composition of the stock of permanent and temporary residence permit holders, 31 Dec. 2012, %

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>Males</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armenia</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azerbaijan</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armenia</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Fig. 24. Age composition of persons granted permanent and temporary residence permits in 2012, %**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>&lt; 17</th>
<th>18-39</th>
<th>40-59</th>
<th>60+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viet Nam</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uzbekistan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukraine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkmenistan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tajikistan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serbia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moldova</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>19,2</td>
<td>17,3</td>
<td>20,0</td>
<td>5,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td>7,3</td>
<td>27,4</td>
<td>6,1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyrgyzstan</td>
<td>10,7</td>
<td>23,1</td>
<td>4,5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>6,6</td>
<td>46,9</td>
<td>14,6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kazakhstan</td>
<td>16,0</td>
<td>20,8</td>
<td>6,1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>19,2</td>
<td>24,1</td>
<td>6,1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>10,3</td>
<td>32,5</td>
<td>12,4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>10,1</td>
<td>32,5</td>
<td>12,4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>12,4</td>
<td>32,8</td>
<td>14,6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>16,5</td>
<td>36,6</td>
<td>12,4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>10,9</td>
<td>28,3</td>
<td>10,9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td>12,8</td>
<td>25,9</td>
<td>10,9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>6,0</td>
<td>28,3</td>
<td>14,6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>12,4</td>
<td>32,8</td>
<td>14,6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>17,0</td>
<td>32,8</td>
<td>14,6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belarus</td>
<td>14,8</td>
<td>36,6</td>
<td>12,4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azerbajan</td>
<td>2,0</td>
<td>24,4</td>
<td>12,4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armenia</td>
<td>9,5</td>
<td>30,3</td>
<td>12,4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>9,7</td>
<td>25,7</td>
<td>12,4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9,7</td>
<td>25,7</td>
<td>12,4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fig. 25. Age composition of stock of permanent and temporary residence permit holders in 2012, %**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>&lt; 17</th>
<th>18-39</th>
<th>40-59</th>
<th>60+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viet Nam</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uzbekistan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukraine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkmenistan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tajikistan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serbia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moldova</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>22,9</td>
<td>23,9</td>
<td>22,9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td>9,3</td>
<td>29,7</td>
<td>9,3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyrgyzstan</td>
<td>9,5</td>
<td>23,9</td>
<td>9,5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>7,6</td>
<td>50,9</td>
<td>7,6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kazakhstan</td>
<td>17,7</td>
<td>20,6</td>
<td>17,7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>19,9</td>
<td>44,4</td>
<td>19,9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>12,4</td>
<td>33,0</td>
<td>12,4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>12,1</td>
<td>33,1</td>
<td>12,1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>18,1</td>
<td>40,0</td>
<td>18,1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>12,0</td>
<td>28,9</td>
<td>12,0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>14,3</td>
<td>29,8</td>
<td>14,3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td>14,3</td>
<td>29,8</td>
<td>14,3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>10,1</td>
<td>30,0</td>
<td>10,1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>10,1</td>
<td>30,0</td>
<td>10,1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>18,4</td>
<td>46,4</td>
<td>18,4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belarus</td>
<td>13,1</td>
<td>32,1</td>
<td>13,1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azerbajan</td>
<td>2,2</td>
<td>26,9</td>
<td>2,2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armenia</td>
<td>9,0</td>
<td>30,8</td>
<td>9,0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>16,3</td>
<td>16,3</td>
<td>16,3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9,1</td>
<td>27,4</td>
<td>9,1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Labour Migration

Data sources.
This chapter has been prepared using all available data concerning temporary and long-term labour immigration: administrative records of the Federal Migration Service of Russia and the results of a selective labour force survey conducted by Rosstat.

The Federal Migration Service has two main data sources at its disposal for temporary forms of labour migration to Russia. Chief among them is the Central Data Bank of Foreigners and Stateless Persons (CDBF). We requested and have received migrant distributions by country of citizenship, gender, age, and vocational/qualification group. Besides the Central Data Bank, some data could be obtained from the standardized FMS performance report form, known as 1-RD. This is a large-format digital spreadsheet (Microsoft Excel) produced on a monthly basis by the FMS statistics department, containing several thousand indicators from all of the FMS' activities, both aggregate and for each individual region. Two sections of the 1-RD form contain working indicators related to labour migration. 1-RD does not include a distribution by country of citizenship (that information is only available for patents sold), but it is filled in a more thorough manner.

Thus in order to work out the absolute numbers of issued work permits, aggregate values from 1-RD were distributed (after consultations with FMS specialists), in accordance with the percentage-based structure obtained from CBDF data. For ordinary work permits and those issued to skilled professionals, the sum totals were closely similar, and thus the age, gender, and vocational profiles for these categories of workers are more detailed. Data on highly skilled professionals loaded from the CBDF was incomplete (6.78 thousand instead of 11.8), so the description of this flow is based on an information note provided by the FMS.

Virtually absent from FMS data on labour migration is information on persons living in Russia with a permanent and temporary residence permits, citizens of Belarus (as a member of the Union State Russia-Belarus), and since 2012, almost on all the citizens of Kazakhstan (the 2012 report has records of several hundred issued permits issued for those who work in accordance with civil contract, those having labour contract are free from work permit).

In 2012, Rosstat started to process and publish information on foreign nationals permanently residing in Russia, collected at the Labour force survey. The survey has been conducted since 1992 – previously every half a year, then quarterly and on a monthly basis since 2009. The annual number of respondents exceeds 830 thousands. The first results showing profiles of foreigners were published in 2013.

---

32 Due to Kazakhstan joining the Customs Union and the Common Economic Space of Russia and Belarus.
Temporary Labour Migration

This type of migration is seen in Russia as characteristic of the present migration situation as a whole. Its scale is determined not only by the number of foreigners obtaining work permits, but also by the hundreds of thousands of migrants without documents. Public opinion about migration as a whole is affected by an attitude towards labour migrants — the “Gastarbeiters,” whose presence is often associated with crime, displacing Russians from available vacancies, contagious diseases and a low level of everyday culture.

The economic consequences of labour migration are underestimated so far. There is a big deficit in in-depth studies in Russia devoted to assessment of the contribution of migrants, both legal and illegal, to the gross domestic or regional products. This is difficult to do due to the scale of shadow economy and the widely spread informal employment (among both foreigners and Russian citizens).

Rules of migrants access to the labour market. A law was adopted at the very end of 2012 (December 30) reinstating a right (abolished in 2007) of temporary residence permit holders, to be employed without a work permit. This step was predictable and logical. A temporary residence permit is the document (and status) preceding permanent residency and eventual Russian citizenship. Despite its name (“temporary residence”), in fact this status implies moving for permanent residence. While submitting a petition, the applicant must state his or her source of income and projected employment in Russia. The applicant’s dependants obtain the right for temporary residence simultaneously with him or her.

In other respects, there have been no changes to the schemes of foreign workers’ access to the labour market of the Russian Federation. Citizens of countries with an entry visa requirement obtain their visas based on an invitation sent by the potential employer (who is licensed by the Migration service to hire foreigners) and are from now on contractually bound to them. All of the conditions accompanying work permit issuance are to be fulfilled by the employer hiring the foreigner.

Citizens of countries with visa-free entry may apply to the migration service for a work permit, personally, (or) through an organization employing foreign nationals in the Russian Federation, or through a legal representative. The waiting period for a work permit is 10 working days for a foreigner. Besides, if the permit is issued for a period of over 90 days, the foreigner must submit a medical certificate to the FMS confirming that he or she is not addicted to drugs or infected with one of the (four) contagious diseases endangering people in his or her surroundings.

All foreign workers can only be employed in the region specified in the work permit, some exemptions are made for those whose profession is connected with frequent trips to other regions of Russia.

33 The fee to be paid per one foreign worker makes about 200 USD
A year-long work permit can be issued at once if an applicant has already a contract with an employer. If the foreigner does not have any job offer, the permit is only issued for a period of three months, but is extendable if by the end of this period the worker gets a contract. A set of documents must be submitted in order to extend it: a copy of a contract, information on the types of the worker’s economic activity, a medical certificate of the absence of drug addiction and a number of contagious diseases, and a confirmation of registration at a place of stay (i.e. an address-specific migration record).

Three main types of permission documents, corresponding to the main channels of temporary labour migration, currently exist in Russia; they differ significantly in the scale and composition of flows. A detailed description of these categories was provided in the Russian Federation report for 2011. The essential points are as follows:

5) The first type are ordinary (regular) working permits, which can be divided into three categories:
   • issued of the basis of annual quota (which was 1.7 million permits throughout 2010–2012);
   • issued without a quota to members of certain professions, a list of which is approved annually by the Ministry of Labour;
6) The second type of permit is issued on a quota-free basis to so-called highly skilled professionals (criteria are explained below);
7) The third type of documents are so-called patents (more exactly described as licenses) for employment in private households, issued to nationals of countries with no entry visa requirement for Russia. A description of quantitative and certain structural features of these flows is given below.

***

Scale of labour migration in 2012. Temporary labour migration flows to Russia continued to grow in 2012, compared to 2011. In 2012, Russian migration authorities issued about three million documents permitting citizens of 141 countries to work in Russia. Specifically, 1.4 million foreigners obtained work permits (a 15% increase from 2011), and 1.3 million citizens of countries with no entry visa requirement bought patents (almost 50% above the 2011 level). Russia exceeded the pre-crisis, 2008 level in work permits issued (1.35 million), when the value had been at its highest for the entire period of observation (beginning 1994). Table 14 gives an overview of the main indicators for 2010-2012.

---

34 Due to the temporary nature of labour migration and seasonal fluctuations, it is preferable to study flow data (the issued work permits), since stock data (number of persons with valid work permits) show little difference from the flows. The FMS is able to provide information on the number of foreigners with valid work permits by the end of a year, but this indicator does not account for the seasonal fluctuations in foreign presence on the Russian labour market.
35 All CIS countries except Turkmenistan.
Table 14. Main indicators of international labour migration in Russia, thousand

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013 January-November</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Limits (quota) for work permits</td>
<td>1944</td>
<td>1746</td>
<td>1746</td>
<td>1746</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular work permits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1170,0</td>
<td>1219,8</td>
<td>1403,6</td>
<td>1245,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizens of visa entry states</td>
<td>208,5</td>
<td>199,5</td>
<td>210,4</td>
<td>185,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizens of visa-free states</td>
<td>894,2</td>
<td>941,1</td>
<td>1121,7</td>
<td>1059,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary residence permit holders</td>
<td>67,3</td>
<td>79,2</td>
<td>71,5</td>
<td>0,086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quota-free skilled occupations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>work permits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highly qualified specialists</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(issued work permits)</td>
<td>3,1</td>
<td>11,3</td>
<td>11,8</td>
<td>23,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sold patents (to nationals of visa-free countries)</td>
<td>156,9</td>
<td>862,4</td>
<td>1283,4</td>
<td>1401,9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: FMS of Russia

Regular work permits.
The majority of labour migrants are citizens of CIS countries with no Russian entry visa requirement. In 2011–12, their share among receivers of work permits reached 83 to 84 percent. When the number of private household employment patents sold to nationals of visa-free states has been taken into account, the share for 2011–12 is about 92 percent. During eight months of 2013 the FMS has issued 944 thousand work permits (which is 7 thousand fewer than for the same period last year). The number of patents sold comprises 1.08 mln. that is almost 90 thousand more than for the same period 2012.

Citizens of 10 states made for almost 95% of the entire flow in 2012. National of Uzbekistan remain overwhelmingly in the lead, at around 42% of all issued work permits. The number of migrants from Uzbekistan which obtained work permits reached an unprecedented figure of almost 590 thousand persons. With a tremendous gap Uzbekistan is followed by Tajikistan (218 thousand), Ukraine (151 thousand) and Kyrgyzstan (about 92 thousand). Some of the countries

36 Armenia, Azerbaijan, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Moldova, Tajikistan, Ukraine and Uzbekistan. Turkmenistan maintains an observer status in the CIS a position of an observer and has a mutual travel visa regime with the RF; nationals of Belarus do not need work permits in Russia.
that are among the top ten had never been part of the USSR: China (97 thousand), North Korea (37 thousand), and Turkey (26 thousand permits) (see table 15).

Table 15. Number of foreign nationals who obtained regular work permits in the Russian Federation, thousands

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issued work permits, total</th>
<th>Thousand</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CIS countries</td>
<td>1353.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Including: Azerbaijan</td>
<td>985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armenia</td>
<td>38.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kazakhstan</td>
<td>51.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyrgyzstan</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moldova</td>
<td>105.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tajikistan</td>
<td>60.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkmenistan</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukraine</td>
<td>390.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (non CIS and Georgia)</td>
<td>369.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Including:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viet Nam</td>
<td>168.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>17.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Korea</td>
<td>67.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serbia</td>
<td>48.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>168.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: FMS of Russia

The number of migrants from Uzbekistan grew almost by 25% compared to 2011; the flows from Ukraine increased by 18%, from Tajikistan, Kyrgyzstan and Moldova by 10%. Among the top sending countries (fig. 26) outside of the former USSR, Turkey and Serbia demonstrated the largest growth from 2011, at 43 and 36 percent respectively. Notably, significant changes have
occurred in the number of migrants arriving from countries which are not among the top ten, but have been sending statistically significant flows to Russia (1000 persons and over) for several years. For instance, the number of the nationals of Thailand grew by 40%. On the other hand, there was a significant decline in the number of labour migrants from France (minus 18%), Germany (-27%), the USA (-33%) and UK (-35%).

**Fig. 26. Distribution of issued work permits by the main countries of migrants'citizenship in 2012, percent**

![Diagram showing distribution of work permits by countries]

Source: based on FMS data

One of the basic problems related to this category of migrant workers is connected with the quota system. The existing quota system has been criticized for many years as it is very inflexible and does not have objective ground. Formally quota is established on the basis of requests sent by the future employers to the Ministry of labour. The campaign takes place once a year and within a very short period of time. In many cases it is not possible to know how many foreign workers an employer or entrepreneur will need one year later.

Many employers and foreign workers are unable to interact in a legal way because regional quotas have become a business opportunity for companies acting as intermediaries. This type of business became a phenomenon of the recent years. Posing as bona fide employers, intermediary companies (that in fact do not produce anything and thus have no workers) participate in the request campaign to form quotas for the following year, only to resell the allotted quotas later to those who need them, charging up to 25 thousand roubles (around 570 Euro) per work permit. The FMS of Russia is currently developing proposal that will help to get rid of this practice and shut bad faith intermediaries out of the foreign labour force market.

---

“Skilled professionals”

This category of workers is issued work permits without quota. It worth putting its title in inverted commas because in fact it has nothing to do with the skilled of highly educated professionals of different occupational groups. This category of workers includes foreigners holding positions or representing one of a very specific list of professions approved by the Ministry of Labour. This list is partially revised every year. In 2012 it included 41 positions, while in 2013 their number reached 59 due to the addition of more positions related to theatrical and circus activities. This list is often seen as bewildering, utterly unconnected as it is to real-life demand for certain specific professions in the Russian economy. So far, Russia has not adopted the practice of compiling lists similar to those used in e.g. Australia or Canada (this question is a subject of discussion now). Out of the 59 positions listed for 2013, twenty-three are top managers of various levels (directors, deputy directors and their associates, executives, etc.); twenty are related to theatre and circus work (actors/performers, directors, sound engineers, etc. - the FMS explains that these professions were included in the list for the benefit of foreign entertainers on tours). Thirteen items on the list are allotted to engineers of various specializations, and three more to technicians and technologists.

Fig. 27. Skilled professional distribution by country of citizenship, 2012, thousands and percent.

![Skilled professional distribution by country of citizenship, 2012, thousands and percent.](image)

Source: based on FMS data

In 2012, the number of persons who obtained a work permit via this channel was 44 thousand, slightly higher than in 2011. The list of the main sending countries mostly included the same
ones that were the countries of origin for the major part of the whole inflow of migrant-workers. There was a slight altering of the rankings (citizens of Turkey came up fifth, and of Serbia - seventh). The largest numbers of skilled professionals came from Uzbekistan (almost 30%), Ukraine (16%), China and Tajikistan, the latter two almost equal (7.5 and 7.9 percent) (fig. 27).

It should be pointed out that no common practice exists dealing with highly skilled specialists recruitment. Not all of the foreigners having the abovementioned professions or positions use this channel to obtain work permits. Judging by the FMS data, the number of top-level executives who obtained work permits in 2012 was more or less evenly spread between quota-based and quota-free permission procedures.

Experts have long been of the opinion that Russia needs a radically new approach to categorizing workers who are eligible for simplified access to the Russian labour market. Steps towards it are planned on being taken in the near future.

**Highly skilled professionals (specialists) (HSPs)**

The highly skilled professionals’ category was introduced in July 2010. Until recently, its main criterion had been annual earnings of at least 2 million roubles. In 2013, the set of conditions was expanded. Under the law, a foreigner is deemed a highly skilled professional if he or she possesses work experience, skills or achievements in a specific area of activity, and if the terms of his or her employment in the Russian Federation involve a salary of: (1) at least one million roubles per annum (365 calendar days) for research workers or teachers/professors invited to work at state-accredited higher educational and research institutions, as well as for foreigners employed by residents of special economic zones of the industrial, tourism/recreation, and seaport types (not including sole-proprietor enterprises); (2) at least 750 thousand roubles per annum (365 calendar days) for foreign nationals employed by residents of the technology development special economic zone (not including sole-proprietor enterprises); (3) no mandatory minimum for foreign nationals employed at the Skolkovo Innovation Centre; (4) at least two million roubles per annum (365 calendar days) for other foreign nationals.

In 2012, the FMS of Russia issued 11,795 work permits to highly skilled professionals, which is a 9.1% increase from 2011. Of these, 10,863 were issued to citizens of countries with a visa requirement, and only 932 to those from visa-free countries.

The largest numbers of permits was issued to citizens of China (1604), Turkey (1038), France (853), Germany (822), the UK (679), the USA (648), Ukraine (622), Vietnam (518), Italy (375), Japan (319), the Republic of Korea (316), the Philippines (225), Finland (212), Poland (183), India (181), Serbia (170), the Czech Republic (169), and Canada (168) (fig. 28).

---

39 A requirement to present documents confirming said skills is as yet absent from the legislation.
Half of all HSPs are heads of companies, organizations and enterprises or their structural departments (divisions); about 10% are specialists in natural sciences and engineering, and virtually all of the rest are not assigned to occupational groups, having been categorized as “others.”

Fig 28. Highly skilled professionals distribution by country of citizenship in 2012 (thousands and percent)

![Diagram showing distribution of highly skilled professionals by country of citizenship in 2012](image)

Source: FMS of Russia reference note provided at a request for this report preparation

As data on flows was incomplete, the only possibility to describe some characteristics of HSPs was to examine available statistics on stocks of HSPs having valid work permits by the end of 2012. The total number of HSPs was 12.1 thousand persons, 11.3 thousand of them male and only 809 female (7%). By their age compositions, the HSPs were “older” than other labour migrants, the modal age being 40–49 years for men and 30–39 years for women. 48 percent of HSPs were heads of enterprises and their divisions, 10% were specialists in science and engineering, the rest included small numbers of representatives of other occupations, while almost 35% were not assigned to an occupation group, categorized as “others.”
Patents

This channel of labour migration is becoming more widespread in Russia; the number of patents sold in 2012 was 50% higher than in 2011. In the first nine months of 2013, the FMS sold over 1.099 million of these documents. This type of permit for foreign workers (from visa-free countries) was introduced in 2010 and is currently the most dynamic and expanding employment practice for this part of the labour migrants. The patent costs 1000 roubles (about 25 Euros). A monthly or annual transfer of 1000 roubles to the tax service account extends the patent; the payment receipt confirms the validity of the patent.

Fig. 29. Number of patents purchased by citizens of countries visa-free entry⁴⁰, thousand

Source: FMS of Russia

Almost half (47%) of all patents were purchased by nationals of Uzbekistan, 22% by nationals of Tajikistan and about 9% by nationals of Kyrgyz Republic (fig.30). Taking into account issued work permits (fig. 29), this translates to a total of almost 1.3 million permit documents obtained by

⁴⁰ Others include stateless persons and citizens of South Ossetia and Abkhazia.
citizens of Uzbekistan, over 500 thousand by citizens of Tajikistan, and 170 thousand by citizens of Kyrgyzstan.

**Fig. 30. Distribution of sold patents by countries of migrants’ citizenship (visa-free states), percent**

![Diagram showing distribution of sold patents](image)

* “Other” include citizens of Abkhazia, South Ossetia and Non-nationals of Latvia

*Source: based on FMS data, Form 1-RD*

Patents are still used as a simple way to obtain legal grounds for staying in Russia. Unlike foreigners obtaining their primary work permit, who are required to present a contract with an employer to the migration service within three months or leave Russia, patent holders are not required by law to confirm their employment, nor is there a limit on the duration of their stay in Russia. With a receipt confirming the payment of the monthly “fee,” a patent-holder can remain in Russia as long as his or her patent is valid. There is an opinion that many foreigners of this category do not have permanent job and just use patents as a ground to stay in Russia without losing their legal status. Another important circumstance is independence from the quota system.

Out of the whole stock of foreigners having a valid work permit about 6 per cent also had a valid patent at the end of 2012, and 3.2 per cent at the beginning of November 2013. Most

---

41 See Margarita Verkhovskaya, Anna Semyonova, Yulia Sinyaeva, “Gastarbaitery oforml’ayuts’a chastnym obrazom.” (“Migrant workers get legal status through “private” channel”) Izvestiya, 20 March 2012

frequently both documents were obtained by citizens of Armenia (14 per cent in the end of 2012 and 9.4 per cent in the beginning of November 2013). In 2012 over 9 per cent of the citizens of Uzbekistan with a work permit had a patent as well, whereas in November 2013 their number did not exceed 4 per cent. Thus, statistics show that the overwhelming majority of labor migrants from states with a visa-free entry to Russia have only one document permitting them to work in Russia. Thus, introduction of the patent system has provided a real opportunity for many people more easily to obtain a legal status to stay and work in Russia.

Among the main problems about patents, the main one is the impossibility to get information about the migrants’ labor activity after they receive a patent (any control mechanism does not exist so far). The problem (employment control) cannot be solved so far, as the patents system have been introduced to minimize the number of formal procedures and documents. Apparently, the answers to these questions can be received through special surveys. The second problem is – absence of requirement in the law to provide a health certificate stating that the migrant is not a carrier of a some infections (such a certificate is necessary to obtain a regular work permit).

This problem has been broadly discussed and is likely to be solved soon on the legislative level. A migrant’s state of health is very important as patent owners work in private households, i.e. in families. Employers should have guarantees that if they hire a babysitter, domestic servant or a worker for a flat renovation, it will not cause such a serious consequence as, for instance, tuberculosis among the family members.

Labor Migrants’ Profiles

Sex and age

Predomination of the demand for male professions determines a high percentage of men in the flow of labor migration to Russia (Fig.31). In 2012 it comprised almost 90 per cent. But the average number is mainly formed by massive flows of Uzbekistan and Tajikistan citizens, e.g. in 2012 they received almost 58% of all work permits issued by the FMS.

Differences between the countries was considerable because of the specific character of foreigners’ employment in Russia in terms of sectors of economy and occupation. Still, in a number of cases women take an active part in labor migration. It is caused by the formation of peculiar niches (professional ones and those according to the activity types), requiring female rather than male work force. Among the migrants from Thailand (tertiary sector employment, e.g. in Thai massage rooms and Eastern medicine clinics that have gained popularity in Russia) and the Philippines (employment as home helpers) women comprised 76% and 65%, respectively. Women - citizens of Kyrgyzstan (32% of migrants) work mainly in firms providing catering or cleaning services (Fig.32).

---

42 Only 3 per cent of highly qualified specialists (HQS) and 15 per cent of qualified specialists (QS) were women
Fig. 31. The ratio of men and women among foreigners (work permits issued under quotas and for “skilled professionals”), 2012, per cent

Source: based on the FMS data
The highest rate of women was among shop assistants and clothes demonstrators (56 per cent), workers suggesting individual services and services connected with property protection (40 per cent), mid-skilled staff (clerical support workers) in finance, administration and social activities (32 %) and agriculture workers (20 %).

Among managers the rate of women also generally equaled 20 per cent, but the rates were only high for citizens of a small number of countries, e.g. more than 45 per cent - for Moldova and Kyrgyzstan, 28 per cent for Uzbekistan, 26 per cent for Ukraine, 22 per cent for China. At the same time, among top-managers from Western countries men predominate. The rate of women...
in this professional group is about 10 per cent for Germany, France and the USA and 5 per cent for Italy and the United Kingdom.

According to the Labor force survey, carried out by Rosstat on a monthly basis, the average age of the working resident population of the Russian Federation was 40.8 years in 2012, which was 7 years more than the average age of temporary labor migrants. The youngest migrants came from Kyrgyzstan (30.1 yrs), Tajikistan and Vietnam (31 yrs), Afghanistan and Uzbekistan (32 yrs). Citizens of Western countries, in average, were almost 10 years older, e.g. the average age of citizens of France, the UK, Japan, Italy, the USA and Germany receiving work permits exceeded 40 years (for the US and Germany it was closer to 45).

Fig.33. Distribution of temporary labor migrants and employed resident population aged 15-72 by age groups, 2012, % *

Source: based on FMS data on issued work permits (temporary migrant workers) and Rosstat LFS data (employed resident population, 2012 average).

Temporary labor migrants are much younger than the resident working population of the Russian Federation (see fig. 33): the rate of persons under the age of 29 makes about 44% among temporary migrants and 23% among the residents. The age of the migrant workers is one of the important aspects which should be taken into account while working out migration and adaptation policies. The age factor is closely connected with the educational attainment, vocational training, family status etc.
Fig. 34. Distribution of foreigners with work permits (under the quota and as skilled professionals) by age groups, 2012, per cent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>0%</th>
<th>20%</th>
<th>40%</th>
<th>60%</th>
<th>80%</th>
<th>100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armenia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azerbaijan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bosnia and Herzegovina</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic People's Republic of Korea</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kazakhstan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korea</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyrgyzstan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moldova</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serbia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tajikistan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkmenistan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukraine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uzbekistan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viet Nam</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: calculations based on the FMS data

It should be noted that among migrants from the countries of Central Asia the youngest age group (18-29 years) was the modal one: this group comprised half among the citizens of Uzbekistan, 55 per cent – Tajikistan and almost 60 per cent - Kyrgyzstan. Information by the countries and aggregated age groups is presented in fig. 34.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>18-29</th>
<th>30-39</th>
<th>40-49</th>
<th>50-54</th>
<th>55-59</th>
<th>60+</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>51,0</td>
<td>31,4</td>
<td>13,0</td>
<td>2,3</td>
<td>1,1</td>
<td>1,0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armenia</td>
<td>35,0</td>
<td>22,8</td>
<td>21,8</td>
<td>12,0</td>
<td>6,0</td>
<td>2,3</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azerbaijan</td>
<td>41,0</td>
<td>25,2</td>
<td>22,3</td>
<td>7,6</td>
<td>3,1</td>
<td>0,8</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bosnia and Herzegovina</td>
<td>19,0</td>
<td>19,1</td>
<td>28,9</td>
<td>16,8</td>
<td>11,9</td>
<td>4,3</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>22,6</td>
<td>27,7</td>
<td>37,6</td>
<td>8,3</td>
<td>3,3</td>
<td>0,6</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic People's Republic of Korea</td>
<td>2,6</td>
<td>28,2</td>
<td>53,0</td>
<td>14,3</td>
<td>1,8</td>
<td>0,1</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>19,0</td>
<td>34,3</td>
<td>25,4</td>
<td>9,0</td>
<td>7,8</td>
<td>4,5</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>31,3</td>
<td>30,0</td>
<td>20,9</td>
<td>8,7</td>
<td>6,4</td>
<td>2,8</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>10,5</td>
<td>25,6</td>
<td>32,1</td>
<td>13,8</td>
<td>10,9</td>
<td>7,1</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>35,8</td>
<td>39,0</td>
<td>19,7</td>
<td>3,0</td>
<td>1,7</td>
<td>0,7</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>10,2</td>
<td>31,7</td>
<td>26,8</td>
<td>11,7</td>
<td>8,6</td>
<td>11,0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>15,4</td>
<td>25,8</td>
<td>31,3</td>
<td>13,8</td>
<td>7,8</td>
<td>5,8</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kazakhstan</td>
<td>44,5</td>
<td>27,5</td>
<td>17,4</td>
<td>6,2</td>
<td>3,1</td>
<td>1,3</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>14,1</td>
<td>30,9</td>
<td>35,8</td>
<td>11,9</td>
<td>5,6</td>
<td>1,7</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyrgyzstan</td>
<td>58,9</td>
<td>24,6</td>
<td>13,9</td>
<td>2,1</td>
<td>0,5</td>
<td>0,1</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td>24,6</td>
<td>35,2</td>
<td>24,4</td>
<td>9,5</td>
<td>4,1</td>
<td>2,1</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>17,7</td>
<td>28,0</td>
<td>30,2</td>
<td>13,9</td>
<td>6,8</td>
<td>3,3</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moldova</td>
<td>38,7</td>
<td>26,0</td>
<td>22,7</td>
<td>8,6</td>
<td>3,3</td>
<td>0,8</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>31,3</td>
<td>26,6</td>
<td>27,5</td>
<td>8,1</td>
<td>4,5</td>
<td>2,0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>19,0</td>
<td>45,2</td>
<td>28,7</td>
<td>5,5</td>
<td>1,2</td>
<td>0,3</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>9,4</td>
<td>33,9</td>
<td>27,4</td>
<td>11,8</td>
<td>12,6</td>
<td>4,9</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serbia</td>
<td>16,8</td>
<td>22,3</td>
<td>26,4</td>
<td>16,4</td>
<td>12,3</td>
<td>5,7</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tajikistan</td>
<td>56,4</td>
<td>24,9</td>
<td>14,9</td>
<td>2,9</td>
<td>0,8</td>
<td>0,2</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>11,0</td>
<td>41,0</td>
<td>42,2</td>
<td>4,9</td>
<td>1,0</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>30,6</td>
<td>35,6</td>
<td>24,9</td>
<td>5,8</td>
<td>2,5</td>
<td>0,6</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkmenistan</td>
<td>38,2</td>
<td>34,6</td>
<td>19,0</td>
<td>4,2</td>
<td>2,5</td>
<td>1,4</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukraine</td>
<td>29,6</td>
<td>27,1</td>
<td>25,8</td>
<td>11,1</td>
<td>4,9</td>
<td>1,5</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>17,6</td>
<td>24,6</td>
<td>30,7</td>
<td>12,0</td>
<td>7,8</td>
<td>7,2</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>17,2</td>
<td>20,2</td>
<td>23,8</td>
<td>13,2</td>
<td>12,8</td>
<td>12,8</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uzbekistan</td>
<td>51,3</td>
<td>26,8</td>
<td>17,4</td>
<td>3,5</td>
<td>0,9</td>
<td>0,2</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viet Nam</td>
<td>54,5</td>
<td>26,7</td>
<td>16,2</td>
<td>2,0</td>
<td>0,5</td>
<td>0,1</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>44,4</td>
<td>26,4</td>
<td>20,8</td>
<td>5,6</td>
<td>2,1</td>
<td>0,6</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: based on FMS data

And vice versa, more than 40 per cent of the US citizens, about one third of the citizens of Germany, Italy, the UK and the countries of the former Yugoslavia were older than 50. About 17 per cent of the US citizens, 13 per cent of citizens of Italy, 11 per cent - of Germany, 9 per cent of the UK citizens were older than 60, while the average rate is only 0.6 per cent (see table 16).
Fig. 35. Distribution of foreigners with work permits (under the quota and as skilled professionals) by professional and age groups, 2012, per cent

Source: based on FMS of Russia data

The age composition of some occupational groups also varied. The oldest were not even the managers but drivers and mobile equipment operators, half of them being older than 40 (among top-managers only 39 per cent were of this age) (fig.35).

**Occupational groups**

The “average” structure is determined by the predominance of citizens of Central Asia countries among labor migrants since the majority of them are low-skilled workers. In 2012 more than 30 per cent of all migrant workers belonged to this group, the numbers being almost
the same as in 2011. More than 20 per cent were employed as skilled workers, machine operators and equipment fitters, 25 per cent were employed in mining operations, construction and repair work. Only 4 per cent were employed as managers.

Occupational structure varied greatly from country to country. The majority of citizens of Western and some Asian countries (beyond the CIS) were employed in the sectors requiring a high level of education and qualification. About 60 percent of citizens of Germany and almost half of the citizens of France, the UK, the USA, South Korea and the Baltic states, 75 per cent of the citizens of Afghanistan were employed as managers and directors of businesses or their departments. A large percentage of migrants from India and Italy also took high-level positions.

Traditionally the construction sector suggests employment to a large number of citizens of Turkey and former Yugoslavia, so among them corresponding professions generally predominate, e.g. 66 per cent of migrants from Bosnia and Herzegovina, 42 per cent of migrants from Serbia and almost half the migrants from Turkey, almost 40 per cent of migrants from Armenia. A large percentage of migrants from North Korea employed in mining operations, construction and repair work reflects their presence in the mining industry rather than in construction.

The highest rate on unskilled workers is observed among the nationals of Uzbekistan, Tajikistan and Kyrgyzstan, namely from 40 to 46 per cent, and the situation has not changed as compared to the previous year.

The distribution of labor migrants from other main countries of origin (Azerbaijan, Moldova, Ukraine) by professional groups was more even, i.e. it did not have any considerable concentration in a definite occupational group (see table 17).
Table 17. Occupational groups of temporary migrant-workers (quota-based work permits and skilled specialists permits)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Top-30 countries (not less than 500 workers)</th>
<th>Top managers of enterprises, organizations and agencies and their departments</th>
<th>Skilled staff of commercial agriculture, forestry, hunting and fishery and fish breeding</th>
<th>Workers employed in mining, repair and construction work, and assembly operations</th>
<th>Skilled workers, drivers, engine drivers, fitters of equipment etc.</th>
<th>Low-skilled workers employed in all spheres of economy</th>
<th>Other occupational and professional groups</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>74.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armenia</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>38.4</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azerbaijan</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>33.9</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bosnia and Herzegovina</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>65.8</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dem. People's Rep. of Korea</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>79.5</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>45.3</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>53.9</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>37.2</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>60.9</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>36.3</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>59.5</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>33.5</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>58.8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>40.3</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>61.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>38.3</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kazakhstan</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>48.0</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyrgyzstan</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>45.6</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td>48.2</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moldova</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>62.0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>41.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>40.6</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serbia</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>42.3</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>33.7</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tajikistan</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>45.2</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>93.0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>49.1</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkmenistan</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>33.5</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukraine</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>33.2</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>46.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>52.2</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>53.8</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uzbekistan</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>39.5</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viet Nam</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>30.2</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>48.3</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>30.1</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: based on FMS data

43 Except temporary residence permit holders
Employment by sectors of economy (migrants from visa-free states)

Valid data on the distribution of foreign workers by sectors of economy were available only on migrants from the countries with a visa-free entry to Russia. These data were collected from notifications received by the FMS from employers. As for the citizens of other countries, data can only be received from the Central data bank on foreigners and stateless persons, but the information on the structure by sectors of employment appeared to be incomplete.

Fig.36. Distribution of citizens of the countries with a visa-free entry to Russia by sectors of economy, %

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Other Sectors</th>
<th>Agriculture and Forestry</th>
<th>Transport and Communication</th>
<th>Services</th>
<th>Processing Industries</th>
<th>Retail and Stock Trade</th>
<th>Construction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>40.6</td>
<td>15.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>41.8</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>19.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 months 2013</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>36.3</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: based on FMS data

Data available for 2009-2012 and eight months of 2013 (fig.36) show slight changes: namely, the growth of the rate of those employed in the tertiary industry (from 3.6% in 2009 to 16.8% in 2013 (January-August) and a slight reduction of the rate of those employed in other industries. The latter was especially evident in agriculture and forestry, transport/communications and, to some extent, in trade. Construction seems to restore its positions – after decline in 2010 up to 32% (from 41% in 2009), in 2013 already 36.3% of workers were reported to have been employed in this sector.

It is difficult to compare employment of temporary labor migrants and the resident population by sectors of economy due to the lack of reliable information about citizens of the countries with a visa entry to Russia. Still, one can try and compare the data received on the basis of the Labor force survey with the administrative data of the FMS on citizens of the visa-free countries. Still, a direct comparison is complicated due to the differences in the list of industries suggested
in the LFS data and FMS reports, e.g. “services” are missing from the first source. Thus, the comparison includes only those types of economic activity that could be grouped in identical or very close in meaning categories. As a result the category “other” appeared to be rather big (fig.37).

**Fig. 37. Main types of economic activities of the resident population (LFS data) and temporary labor migrants from the countries with a visa-free entry to Russia (FMS data). On average in 2010-2012, per cent**

![Bar chart showing economic activities]

*Source: based on Rosstat and FMS data*

Generally, 1.4 mln foreigners receiving work permits in 2012 made up 2 per cent against the resident working population (71.5 mln on average in 2012, LFS data). The ratio of the temporary labor migrants from the countries with a visa-free entry to Russia to the resident population employed in the relevant industries was especially evident in construction only and equaled to 5.2 per cent in average for the last three years. Together with constructors from other countries (Turkey, the countries of the former Yugoslavia) this rate is slightly higher. The same is true as for agriculture and forestry, i.e. the rate of visa-free countries equaled 1.3 per cent, and if citizens of other countries are taken into account, the number can be bigger.

---

44 This kind of activity is shown in the group titled “Financial activity, real estate operations, lease and provision of services”
It should be emphasized that for a vast territory and demand for personnel almost in all the regions of Russia, labor migrants are very selective as for the place of destination, preferring the two capitals (Moscow and St.-Petersburg) and their areas. In 2012 more that 30 per cent of the work permits were issued in Moscow and Moscow Region, 18.4 per cent were issued in St.-Petersburg and the adjacent Leningrad Region. Krasnodar Krai (preparing for the Olympic games in Sochi) issued 4.6 per cent of work permits. From 2 to 2.6 per cent of labor migrants go to the oil and gas production regions, namely Khanty-Mansiysk Autonomous Area and Yamalo-Nenets Autonomous Area. Unfortunately, the statistics data on the regional distribution of the patents sold is not available yet.

Economic activity of foreigners permanently residing in Russia (Labor force survey data)

As we have already noted in the beginning of the chapter, since 2012 the Rosstat has begun processing information about foreign citizens’ employment received through Labor force survey. We have obtained the data at a request; they are not published on the official web-site of the Rosstat so far. Now only a limited range of variables is available, but perspectives exist for access to a wider range of variables and to microdata as well.

The Rosstat metadata says that the categories of foreigners that participate in labor force survey are as follows: those arriving in Russia to a permanent place of residence or seeking asylum, including those who have not completed registration documents yet; those permanently residing in the Russian Federation; those arriving in the Russian Federation to study or work during a year and longer (irrespective of how long they have been staying here and how much is left in accordance with their permit).

The survey shows that the number of foreigners of the economically active age in Russia in the second quarter of 2013 was 320.5 persons (table 18). In comparison with 2012 this indicator grew by 61 thousand or 24 per cent. The share of foreigners was almost the same in the total population of 15-72 years of age, in the economically active, employed and economically inactive population and made up, in average, 0.3 per cent, while among the unemployed it was higher and made up 0.4 per cent.

45 The data gathered during the survey are incomplete, as the number of educational migrants – foreigners(students who study in Russia) only exceeds 160, thousand persons, and the number of foreigners permanently residing in the Russian Federation (having residence permits and temporary residence permits) of the corresponding ages almost equals 600 thousand (390 thousand have a Temporary residence permit and about 207 thousand have a residence permit). Still, this is the first attempt to receive such kind of information, so it is worth paying attention to. In particular, it is for the first time that we can compare the unemployment rate among foreign population and Russian citizens.
Table 18. The number of foreign citizens (aged 15-72), residing on the territory of the Russian Federation permanently, according to the data of Labor force survey. Thousands

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>1st quarter 2013</th>
<th>2nd quarter 2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Foreigners total</strong></td>
<td>259,5</td>
<td>239,2</td>
<td>320,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Economically active</strong></td>
<td>175,6</td>
<td>168,5</td>
<td>219,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of them: employed</td>
<td>162,5</td>
<td>156,4</td>
<td>201,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unemployed</td>
<td>13,1</td>
<td>12,1</td>
<td>17,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Economically inactive</strong></td>
<td>83,9</td>
<td>70,7</td>
<td>101,5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Rosstat*

In the second quarter of 2013 about 68% of both foreigners and citizens of Russia\(^{47}\) were economically active. Out of economically active foreigners 92 per cent were employed and about 8 per cent were unemployed (in 2012 and the first quarter of 2013 the second number was 7 per cent). In the second quarter of 2013 the average level of unemployment of citizens of Russia made about 5.4 per cent (in 2012 it was lower - 5.2 per cent), and the employment level of the economically active population was higher and equaled 94 per cent\(^{48}\).

Table 19. Distribution of foreigners by the main place of employment, thousands

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>1st quarter 2013</th>
<th>2nd quarter 2-13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total foreigners aged 15-72</strong></td>
<td>162,5</td>
<td>156,4</td>
<td>201,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>at an enterprise or organization (legal entity)</td>
<td>89,8</td>
<td>77,8</td>
<td>102,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>at an enterprise (non legal entity, including farmers and self-employed)</td>
<td>18,8</td>
<td>10,6</td>
<td>16,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>employed in private households (hired by a physical person)</td>
<td>51,8</td>
<td>65,3</td>
<td>71,9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-employed in own household producing commercial products of agriculture, forestry, hunting and fishery</td>
<td>2,1</td>
<td>2,5</td>
<td>10,2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Rosstat LFS*

In the second quarter of 2013 about half of the foreigners worked at businesses and in organizations which were legal entities (table 19). A comparison of foreigners with citizens of Russia demonstrates serious differences in the distribution of both groups by their main place

---

\(^{46}\) The number of economically active population in August 2013 equaled 76.4 mln persons , or more than 53 per cent of the total population; among them 72.4 mln people, or 94.8 per cent of the economically active population, were employed in the economy, and 4 mln persons (5.2 per cent) were unemployed but actively looking for employment (according to the methodology of the International Labor Organization they are considered unemployed). 0.9 mln persons were registered as unemployed in the public agencies of employment bureaus: [http://www.gks.ru/bgd/regl/b13_01/IssWWW.exe/Stg/d08/3-2.htm](http://www.gks.ru/bgd/regl/b13_01/IssWWW.exe/Stg/d08/3-2.htm)

\(^{47}\) Information on citizens was estimated as residual between the total population and foreigners. Data for the total resident population aged 15-72 are available on Rosstat’s website [http://www.gks.ru/bgd/regl/b13_30/Main.htm](http://www.gks.ru/bgd/regl/b13_30/Main.htm)

\(^{48}\) [http://www.gks.ru/bgd/regl/b13_01/IssWWW.exe/Stg/d08/3-2.htm](http://www.gks.ru/bgd/regl/b13_01/IssWWW.exe/Stg/d08/3-2.htm)
of employment (fig.38)\textsuperscript{49}. Foreigners are twice as often employed at small businesses without forming a legal body and on small farms producing agricultural goods, and three times as often work in private households.

Further research is necessary (by means of developing the “migration” questions module in the LFS questionnaire as well) to better understand the reasons of these differences. It is necessary to find out, whether foreigners, even those having a permanent resident status (residence or temporary residence permit), still choose places of work which are less appealing for the citizens of the RF. Or the reason lies in an error caused by the respondents’ self-identification, i.e. labor migrants who have worked in Russia for many years but have not receive a permanent status can identify themselves as the permanent population.

\textbf{Fig. 38. Composition of (permanently residing) foreigners and citizens of Russia by the main place of employment, population of 15-72 years of age, Second quarter 2013, percent}

\begin{figure}[h]
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\caption{Composition of (permanently residing) foreigners and citizens of Russia by the main place of employment, population of 15-72 years of age, Second quarter 2013, percent}
\end{figure}

\textit{Source: Rosstat LFS}

As for the status (position) of the employment the differences between the citizens of Russia and foreigners – permanent residents were inconsiderable. In the second quarter of 2013 about 93% of citizens of Russia and 86% of foreigners were employees (economically active population). Among “non-employees” almost 18% of citizens of Russia and about 14% of foreigners were employers. The share of self-employed was almost the same, 77% of the citizens of Russia and 79% of foreigners. 7.2% of foreigners who were not employees were employed as assistants in family enterprises (among the population of Russia the indicator made 4.4%).

\textsuperscript{49} We did made standardization of the employed population by age: foreigners are younger than Russian citizens, and this fact can have some connection with the type of the place of work.
The LFS gives an opportunity to study the main social characteristics of population. E.g., the data on the respondents’ educational attainment (fig.39) shows that among foreigners permanently residing in Russia the number of persons with higher education is almost twice as small as the one among the citizens of Russia (the employed population). In general, 45% of foreigners and 76% of citizens of Russia have a professional education (of all levels). In other words, 55% of foreigners do not have any vocational training at all. It should be noted that educational attainment of temporary workers could be even lower. As witnessed by officials of the migration service some workers from Central Asia are illiterate and are not able even to sign the application form for work permit issuance.

**Fig.39. The educational attainment of the employed population (citizens of Russia and foreigners), as of the LFS data of 2012, per cent.**

```
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Education</th>
<th>Foreigners</th>
<th>RF Citizens</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No secondary education</td>
<td>10,2</td>
<td>3,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower secondary education</td>
<td>13,3</td>
<td>19,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper secondary (complete) education</td>
<td>15,2</td>
<td>26,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary professional education</td>
<td>16,1</td>
<td>30,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary professional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tertiary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
```

*Source: Rosstat, LFS*  

Labor demand research is of great interest. Nowadays Russian has neither reliable research to directly determine the demand nor methodologies which would allow to adequately carry out indirect assessment. As the main source one can name the survey of medium-sized and large-scale enterprises carried out by the Rosstat every two years. Its main restriction is lack of information about small businesses and individuals who are active employers of the foreign labor force. Still even these data are enough to work out and apply, while employing foreigners, lists of professions requiring specific skills and qualifications, the deficiency of which in Russian
is especially acute and cannot be made up for by the national labor force only in the nearest future.

According to the 2012 data the demand in jobs in all the sectors of economy requiring average and extra skills was 139 thousand and 197 thousand persons, respectively. In health care and social service only the demand was 83 thousand and 89 thousand persons. Still, there is not a single profession of medical character in the list of highly-qualified specialists yet.

Migration of health workers in Russia

Issues of health workers' mobility in Russia are being mainly discussed in the context of internal migration (“gravitation” towards the big cities), place of employment changes (transfer from public sector to the private one), and also change of occupation and resignation from medicine to other professions. Matters of international migration – departure of Russian health workers abroad are taken into consideration, but not regarded to be the main problem of the Russian health-care system.

One of the quite a few researches on those topics was carried out at a request the National Medical Chamber last year in five Russian regions. 2,084 respondents participated in it: 1,488 health workers and 596 students of the core colleges and higher schools. According to the research data, international migration of the health-care personnel is a lesser threat to the Russian health-care system, than complex of inner problems connected in particular with insufficient inflow of young specialists. At the time of the survey 19% of health-care workers noted that they want to go working abroad, but only 4% really engaged themselves into the emigration process. Primary constraint is complications with qualification confirmation and further job placement. According to the research data high level of dissatisfaction with every single aspect of their labour activity is typical for health-care workers. Only 14% of the medics feel moral and material satisfaction with their work, 47% of those polled would not like their children to become doctors.

According to some of assessments not less than 20% of the medical higher schools graduates do not start working of the specialty. Every year almost 8% of the specialists leave the profession.

As for the migratory potential of Russian doctors there is also a contrary opinion that deserves some attention. In the judgment of professor Leonid Roshal, a well-known in Russia pediatrician and public figure (the President of the National Medical Chamber), if preventative and urgent measures are not taken, there soon will be no personnel for medical services in Russia. “We have been moving towards the staff catastrophe for a long time, because there's

51 http://www.orenzdrav.ru/index.php/2012-03-12-12-31-38/2012-03-12-12-35-43/2150-provedeno-issledovanie-po-izucheniju-migracionnyh-processov-v-zdravoohranenii
an outflow from the public sector to the private one... Outflow of health workers abroad is also a threat to the national security. Germany and USA suggest good conditions to engage doctors from other countries"53.

Besides independent channels of emigration, health workers in Russia can use services provided by special recruitment agencies. Jobs as a rule are offered in the countries of Africa and Asia. The most recent advertisement published by the Federal agency “Zdravexport” invites doctors to Tunisia and Yemen 54, suggested monthly salaries vary from 900 to 1000 USD, that is on average lower than doctors’ salaries in Moscow and Saint Petersburg.

In spite of the fact that today part of doctors and mid-skilled staff plan to leave the country, still the main outflow of health care workers from Russia took place in the period of the most intensive emigration – in the end of 1980-s – 1990-s. In accordance with the official data only, about 800 thousand people left for Germany since 1991, more than 200 thousand – for Israel, and 133 thousand – for USA. Real figures are much higher. Undoubtedly, there were many health-care workers among the emigrants. Considerable part of them did manage to find a professional employment in the countries of new residence, but the losses of Russia remained irreparable.

In this chapter we will review an opposite situation – immigration of health-care workers to Russia, which is being discussed in the context of labour migration in general in the media only right now55.

Factors of migration of health-care workers to Russia

It has been noted, that migration of health-care workers is just a part of qualified personnel mobility, and with the labour migration growth, number of health-care workers participating in it grows as well56. Those who move are not just specialists, but human beings with their needs that are being influenced by the factors that are significant for representatives of different professions. Notwithstanding the fact, that more than one third of temporary foreign workers are low-qualified, there is a small, but steady inflow of health-care personnel.

Russia is one of the world leading countries of in-migration, mostly from the CIS countries. One of the primary factors here is higher standard of life and wages. On the Figure 40 one could see the differences in average annual salary levels for the workers in economy in general and for the

55 See, for example, - Ukrainian doctors are emigrating to Russia [http://health.unian.net/rus/detail/210325](http://health.unian.net/rus/detail/210325); Russian backwoods “subscribe” via Internet for doctors from Tajikistan [http://rus.ozodi.org/content/article/24472506.html](http://rus.ozodi.org/content/article/24472506.html) etc.
56 As it has been noted in the OECD publication of 2010 - “In particular, countries that have more migration in general, and notably those which have more highly skilled migration, tend to have more migrant health workers”. International Migration of Health Workers IMPROVING INTERNATIONAL CO-OPERATION TO ADDRESS THE GLOBAL HEALTH WORKFORCE CRISIS. OECD Policy Brief. February 2010. [http://www.oecd.org/migration/mig/44783473.pdf](http://www.oecd.org/migration/mig/44783473.pdf)
health-care sphere in particular, in Russia and in CIS countries. Leaving the salary level of the health-care workers towards the average level for all the sectors of economy outside this chapter, let’s note the differences between CIS countries and Russia. In 2011 the salaries of the health care workers in all CIAS countries, including Kazakhstan were much lower than the wages of their colleagues working in Russia. For Tajikistan the proportion made 12% only, for Kyrgyz Republic – 27%.

Fig. 40. Average monthly wages in CIS countries in the sector of health-care and social work comparing to the economy in general, US dollars.


Attractiveness of Russia depends not only on the higher salary level. Absence of the language barrier, remaining (since USSR times) of personal ties between the people living in the countries of the region, as well as high deficiency of health-care workers in Russia are important too.

In accordance with estimation of the former Minister of the health care Tatiana Golikova, deficiency of the staff in the sector was very considerable: 153 thousand doctors and about
800 thousand paramedical personnel\(^57\). In 2013 by the data of the current Minister – Veronica Skvortsova, doctor’s deficiency is 40 thousand (only for highly scarce specialties)\(^58\) and 270 thousand nurses. (Totally there are 743 thousand doctors and 1 million 419 thousand paramedical personnel working in Russia) The highest deficiency is for anesthesiologists, resuscitation specialists, narcologists, tuberculosis specialists, pediatricians and neonatologists. Even in Moscow, where situation is deemed to be more or less good, health-care staffing with doctors is only 89,6%, with paramedical personnel – 89,7%\(^59\).

Every two years Rosstat conducts a survey of large and medium size enterprises to evaluate the need for workers. As of October 31, 2012, the need in workers for the health-care and social work sphere was 233,6 thousand persons\(^60\) (table 20).

**Table 20. Need in workers to fill the vacancies in the sphere of health-care and social services**
(by the enterprises survey data, October 31, 2012)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Full list quantity of workers, thousand of persons</th>
<th>Need in workers to fill vacant workplaces, thousands of persons</th>
<th>Proportion of the need in workers to fill vacant workplaces in the general number of workplaces, %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Totally for the surveyed sectors of economy</td>
<td>28705,1</td>
<td>835,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health-care and social services</td>
<td>4106,0</td>
<td>233,6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Russia there’s a colossal regional differentiation in the provision of the population with doctors, especially for a number of specialties. In 2011 by the Rosstat data, there were 50 doctors per 10 000 of population in Russia on the average, the highest values were in Saint-Petersburg (87) and in Moscow (78), the lowest – in Kurgan region (30), Tula region and Tambov region (34 doctors per 10 000)\(^61\). This is the evidence of the reasonability for the development of regional lists of professions in demand, among which there should be health-care workers as well.

\(^{57}\) [http://www.vestifinance.ru/articles/9776](http://www.vestifinance.ru/articles/9776) Health-care Ministry estimation

\(^{58}\) [http://ria.ru/society/20130320/928153202.html#ixzz28gI9LKhK](http://ria.ru/society/20130320/928153202.html#ixzz28gI9LKhK) From 2013 Health-care Ministry is trying to apply new methods of personnel deficiency calculation, but it provokes certain skepticism among the experts. See Tatiana Bateneva “The doctors had flown away. Doctors deficiency problem should be solved with money” Rossiyiskaya gazeta, [http://www.rg.ru/2013/04/16/vrachi.html](http://www.rg.ru/2013/04/16/vrachi.html)


\(^{60}\) The survey only includes large and medium size enterprises and organizations. Totals in tabular style and methodology are available in Russian on the Rosstat web-site: [http://www.gks.ru/free_doc/2013/potrorg/potr12.htm](http://www.gks.ru/free_doc/2013/potrorg/potr12.htm)

Regulations on the admission of migrant health-care workers to the professional activity in Russia

In the context of international migration of health-care workers, a matter of definition is of very high importance. In Russian practice (and in the CIS region) when admitting to work, the fact of citizenship is taken into consideration, as well as the country and year of higher education diploma receipt. Mutual recognition of diplomas in CIS was established with a number of legal acts. Tashkent agreement (1992)\(^\text{62}\) guarantees recognition of diplomas issued before the USSR breakdown – that is, before December 26, 1991, without additional conditions and examinations. Also, foreign citizens who obtained medical higher education in Russian educational institutions, and doctors who obtained primary education abroad, but did their internship or residency in medical and educational facilities of Russian Federation, are admitted for professional activity without additional professional certificates in the medical sphere. It should be noted that diplomas of 210 best universities located in 25 Western countries are recognized in Russia without recognition, out of them 135 universities providing training in health care\(^\text{63}\).

To work in the medical sphere persons with diplomas received after December 26, 1991 in a foreign state (except for Belarus citizens) must:

1) obtain a certificate of recognition (“nostrification”) of the diploma in a state agency for supervision in the sphere of education and science (“Rosobrnadzor”);
2) afterwards – obtain in a state agency for supervision in the health-care sphere (“Roszdravnadzor”) a certificate for the right to practice medical or pharmaceutical activity in RF. About 30 medical higher schools and educational facilities on further training are authorized to hold qualifying examinations for doctors (the same number of educational institutions and colleges (including those providing secondary education), are holding tests for paramedical personnel).
3) besides, foreigners must obtain work permits in the migration service (except for citizens of Belarus and Kazakhstan (the latest - since 2012, when Kazakhstan joined the Customs Union of Russia and Belarus).

A certificate issued by Roszdravnadzor gives a foreign citizen a right to work all over the territory of the Russian Federation. Persons who obtained higher education abroad and were admitted to professional medical or pharmaceutical activity in Russia, but had not practiced profession for more than five years, can be admitted to the practice again after undergoing of retraining in corresponding educational facilities on their own account.

Sources of information about international health-care workers in Russia

Information on the flows, stocks and composition of health-care workers who obtained education abroad or who are foreign citizens, and on the health-care workers who were born outside of Russia, can be obtained from several sources:

\(^{62}\) An Agreement on Co-Operation in the Sphere of Education, Tashkent 15 May 1992
\(^{63}\) [http://www.rg.ru/2012/05/25/obrazovanie-dok.html](http://www.rg.ru/2012/05/25/obrazovanie-dok.html)
Roszdravnadzor data on certification of specialists who received diplomas outside of Russia after December 26, 1991. Those can be RF citizens Russia and foreign citizens as well.

FMS of Russia data on work permits issued to the foreign medical specialists.

Data of the population censuses about persons who were born outside of Russia and who are employed in the health-care sphere (information on the types of economical activities in the course of census-2010 was not collected).

Rosstat data on composition of immigrant and emigrant flows by the types of economical activity (with health-care and social services highlighting) and by the level of education.

Besides, information on the types of economical activity of foreigners permanently residing in Russia potentially could be obtained from the Labour force survey data.

Let’s make some quantitative examples from the sources mentioned above.

Roszdravnadzor. According to the data that we received at a request from the Federal Agency on supervision in the health-care sphere (for 2010-2012), the number of persons who obtained education abroad and applied for a certificate for professional practice in the RF, was as follows (table 21):

Table 21. Applications for certification of practice in health care professions in 2010-2011, units

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total applied</td>
<td>2336</td>
<td>2021</td>
<td>2941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Including – for health-care practice</td>
<td>2290</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>2846</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmaceutical practice</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Including – RF citizens</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>1296</td>
<td>1710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreigners</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>725</td>
<td>1231</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Roszdravnadzor

The vast majority of applicants are professionals in medicine (97-98%) and only 2-3% have education in pharmaceutics. About 60% of applicants are citizens of Russia, and 40% - foreigners. In the future we are planning to consult the Agency for supervision in the health-care sphere about more detailed information on the applicants.

FMS of Russia runs the Central data bank of foreigners that can be used as a source of information about work permits issued to the health-care specialists. First experience of ‘extraction’ of these data from the Central data bank gave us an opportunity to see migrants’ composition by citizenship, sex and age. The extraction procedure was carried out almost manually in accordance with the list of medical and pharmaceutical specialties from the Health-care Ministry classifier. First results were as follows:

In 2010-2012 FMS annually issued about 1 thousand work permits to doctors, who came from 51 world countries, and 450 – to paramedical personnel from 22 countries (table 22).
Table 22. FMS data on issued work permits for health-care specialties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issued work permits in RF</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Doctors</td>
<td>1091</td>
<td>930</td>
<td>831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paramedical personnel</td>
<td>529</td>
<td>428</td>
<td>414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1620</td>
<td>1358</td>
<td>1245</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Distribution of migrant health-care workers by countries of citizenship was as follows (average for three years):
Doctors mainly come from Uzbekistan, Ukraine and Tajikistan, paramedical personnel are mainly citizen of Ukraine, Uzbekistan, Kyrgyzstan (fig. 41).

Fig. 41. Distribution of health-care workers who obtained work permit in RF by the countries of citizenship, average for 2010-2012, %

Source: FMS of Russia

The majority of doctors were the citizens of Uzbekistan (24%), Ukraine (21%) and Tajikistan (14%). Main part of the paramedical personnel flow was composed of the citizens of Ukraine (41%), Uzbekistan (17%) and Kyrgyzstan (11%)\(^\text{64}\).

Among all the foreign citizens who obtained work permit in 2010-2012 ('patents' are not taken into account), the proportion of medics did not exceed \(0,12\) percent. If consider employment

---

\(^{64}\) According to the FMS data, percentage of women in total number of doctors was about 30% on the average in 2010-2012, and more than 76% in total number of paramedical personnel. More than a half of all doctors and over 40% of paramedical personnel are older than 40 years. This is an indirect evidence, that most of them could have obtained education before 1992, i.e. they don’t need the recognition of their diplomas and certification.
by the types of economical activity (sectors of economy), statistics that had been gathered by FMS in 2007-2010, showed that the share of workers employed in health-care system among the flows of international migrant workers did not exceed in 2007-2010 0.3% on the average.

Under the conditions of huge health-care workers deficiency, these professions are almost absent in the employers' requests sent to the agencies of the Ministry of labour within the annual campaign on quota formation. In the list of quotas by occupations published by the Ministry of Labour and Social Development, only 168 vacancies for doctors and only 42 vacancies for paramedical personnel were offered for foreigners. In 2013 these figures were a little bit higher – 363 vacancies for doctors and 86 vacancies for paramedical personnel. Situations with medical professions confirms that the quota system is very remote from life and does not help to coordinate interests of the citizens of Russia and demand in foreign labour force.

*It should be noted, that apart from authorized employment of foreign health-care workers, professional activity without authorization documents is widespread in Russia. There are plenty of small private clinics and laboratories that create favourable conditions for recruitment of undocumented health workers. In TV programs and Internet-published materials, it is reported, that such clinics provide all kinds of services by any medical specialty personnel. The inspections show, that none of such workers could show to the authorities neither a certificate allowing medical practice in the Russian Federation, nor a diploma of a medical university graduation.*

**Rosstat data**

*Population census of 2002 showed, that foreign born health care workers made 9.1 percent of the total number of this professional group in Russia. Over 47% of foreign born health workers had tertiary education (11% of all highly-skilled health workers), and 53% had secondary vocational education (8% of all mid-skilled health workers in Russia). Main birth countries are Ukraine (33%) and Kazakhstan (23%). Judging by the age structure, one can assume that up to 30% of health-care workers who were born outside Russia, could have obtained education after the breakdown of USSR.*

*Statistics on migration flows (Rosstat data on migrants registered in a place of residence and - since 2011 in the place of stay for 9 months and longer) provides information on the types of economical activity of migrants for the period from 2004 till 2007, and stared doing it again*
since 2012 (table 23). These statistical data is very difficult to interpret, as it has multiple shortcomings typical for annual migration statistics in general (for more details see the chapter on migration flows). Moreover, information on the employment sector does not reflect migrant’s profession in full measure, and there’s also information on the citizenship absent from these tables.

### Table 23. International migrants flows (aged 14+), employed in health-care and social services, thousands

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Immigrants</th>
<th>Emigrants</th>
<th>Net migration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The share of those employed in this sector of economy was 1.2% of the total immigrants flow and 0.9% of the emigrants aged 14 years and older in 2012. Approximately 43% of the newcomers had higher – and the same percentage - secondary professional education (the others’ educational attainment was not professional), and among those who left 47% had higher education and 37% had secondary professional education.

Probably the most promising (unfortunately, potentially so far) of the sources is the **Federal Register of medical and pharmaceutical personnel**. This electronic resource was introduced in 2008 and is being used by all the health-care institutions – clinics, ambulances, medical laboratories, pharmacies etc. When an employee is hired, a record (new file) should be added to the Register. Besides all the other characteristics the record contains information on each type of professional education obtained by the employee, as well as the complete title of the educational institution. In theory, on the basis of these data it is possible to study the “geography” of the staff training and retraining. The main drawback of the Register (that could be overcame) double count caused by double (or even more than double) records. There are no personal identification numbers in the Register (as well as in the health-care personnel system in general), database is not centralized. Regional health-care ministries and the Ministry of Health-care of Russia receive reports with aggregate data. Under conditions of the widespread practice of working for more than one employer, when a doctor or a nurse can be employed in two or three different clinics, information on the place of professional training cannot be correct. Moreover, for the time being information about the educational facility title is being introduced to the single cell, which makes sorting of diplomas by countries very inconvenient. According to the information received from the Moscow region Health-care Ministry specialists, these problems are well known and now the work is being carried out to

---

68 The figures mean: for immigrants employment sector in the country of previous residence, for emigrants – in Russia,
eliminate multiplication of records. One can hope, that with time other technical drawbacks of the Register would be overcame as well, and it will become a real source of information on the health-care workers, who were trained outside of Russia.

Summing up, we can note, that migration is not a main problem that stands before the personnel policy of the health-care system. Ideas of retention of health care workers deal not only with potential emigration of workers, but mainly with internal problems. Many health-care workers leave the profession, some of the graduates even do not start to work in health care. By virtue of the specific character of the professions, a matter of special programs for medical personnel inflow stimulation and sustaining of those who remain can be discussed. At that, there are objective restrictions – migration policy concerns people, not just representatives of selected professions.

Policy of the domestic health-care personnel outflow decline is connected with the general situation in the country. Only a part of potential emigrants can be influenced upon – those for whom working conditions, technologies, professional growth etc. are of higher priority. Part of the health-care workers will go abroad in any case. On the one hand, matters of the Russian doctors emigration should be considered from two positions – as an investment to the human capital and as a method of qualification improvement, on the other hand – creating conditions for personnel consolidation in Russia.

Stimulation of immigration of the staff from abroad is possible upon the establishment of some preferences, but with observance of the requirements for the quality of education. In the context of international migration, Russia should pursue a purposeful policy of students of medical higher schools involvement, showing clear perspective of staying in RF after the graduation, and the same could be said about paramedical personnel.

A considerable part of foreign students in Russia are trained in medicine and pharmacy at 52 medical universities and faculties. In 2011/2012 academic year the stock of future doctors and pharmacologists amounted to 21 thousand. Ten medical universities are in the list of top-50 universities training foreign students in Russia. About 42% of the students trained in medicine and pharmacy come from the countries of Asia, 26% - from the CIS countries, 17% - from the Middle East and Maghreb area, 11% - from the African countries (except Maghreb), 2% - from the Latin America.

---

International students

The number of foreign students in the tertiary education institutions in Russia is growing constantly. For the period between the academic years 1999/2000 and 2012/2013, their total number more than tripled (together with stateless persons it reached 305 percent compared with the level of 1999-2000) (fig.42).

Fig. 42. International students in Russia in 2007-2012, thousands

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Stock</th>
<th>Enrolled</th>
<th>Graduates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>129,6</td>
<td>34,116</td>
<td>21,638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>122,0</td>
<td>33,662</td>
<td>17,462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>145,9</td>
<td>36,427</td>
<td>21,213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>160,9</td>
<td>39,08</td>
<td>25,348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>159,5</td>
<td>35,056</td>
<td>26,478</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>171,6</td>
<td>48,527</td>
<td>28,333</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Rosstat,
*2010-2012 – stateless persons are included

At the beginning of the academic year 2012/2013, students from 160 countries studied in Russia, over 74 percent of the coming from ex-USSR countries (fig.43). While the number of students from ex-USSR countries increased by 12 thousand in 2012 comparing with the year of 2011, their share in the total number decreased by 2 percent. About 34 thousand, or 20% of the total, were the citizens of Kazakhstan, and about 25,8 thousand or 15% - of Belarus. China was leading among the non-former-USSR countries (at about 9,2 thousand students in 2012) and leaves behind 9 of 14 ex-USSR countries. Since 2009-2010 the total number of students from the Baltic states gradually decreased while the corresponding number of students from some non-former-USSR countries – Angola, Turkey, Viet Nam, Mongolia and some others-increased.

---

70 Data are collected by administrations of educational institutions and in October forwarded to the regional statistical agencies.
Fig. 43. Stock of international students by nationality, main countries. 2012/2013 academic year, thousands

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Stock (thousands)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zambia</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angola</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Ossetia</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myanmar</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syria</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morocco</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abkhazia</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mongolia</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viet Nam</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyrgyzstan</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armenia</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moldova</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tajikistan</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukraine</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azerbaijan</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uzbekistan</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkmenistan</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belarus</td>
<td>25.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kazakhstan</td>
<td>34.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Rosstat

Data on stateless persons became available only since 2010: in 2012 1,7 thousand students were enrolled, 1.8 thousand graduated and the stock amounted to about 6.7 thousand persons. Thus total stock of international students exceeded 171 thousand, that was about 2.8% of all students of tertiary educational institutions in the RF.

Before 2007 Rosstat collected information only on Federal and Municipal state-funded educational institutions, although private institutions existed in Russia since the beginning of 1990-ies. It means that in fact total numbers of foreign students in Russia before 2007 were greater, than it is demonstrated by official statistics.

Rosstat does not collect information on institutions of military type.
Fig. 44. Stock of international students in private and state institutions of tertiary education, thousands

![Chart showing stock of international students in private and state institutions from 2007 to 2012.]

Source: Rosstat (based on data of the Ministry of Education and Science)

*2010-2012 – stateless persons are included*

The proportion of international students in private institutions of tertiary education is about 19% (32,2 thousand) of their total stock in 2012 (fig.44). As it is much easier to study at private universities, further redistribution of enrollement in favour of private educational institutions takes place (fig.45). In 2012 the share of international students enrolled in private institutions reached 22.8%.

Fig. 45. International students enrolled in private and state institutions of tertiary education, thousands

![Chart showing number of international students enrolled in private and state institutions from 2007 to 2012.]

Source: Ministry of Education and Science
Most often students are expelled from institutions of federal and municipal property. It explains the reason why among foreign graduates in 2012 nearly 25% (7 thousand) studied in private institutions (fig 46). It could be treated as an indirect characteristic of migrants’ adaptation: many foreign students do not complete tertiary education in Russia.

**Fig. 46. International students graduated from private and state institutions of tertiary education, thousand persons**

![Graph showing international students graduated from private and state institutions of tertiary education, 2007-2012](image)

*Source: Ministry of Education and Science*

Due to the absence of data it is not possible to get information on students’ status change. In accordance with the law, if the purpose of stay changes the foreigner has to leave the country and enter it again. If a foreigner comes from visa-regime country he/she has to apply to the RF consulate for another type of visa. Migrants from visa-free states also have to leave the RF and then enter it again declaring a new purpose of entry in migration card (a document to be filled in at the border-crossing points). Theoretically, the Central Data bank of foreigners and stateless persons run by Federal migration service should accumulate information on every foreigner that has ever been to Russia, all entries and information on the purpose of stay including. It might be possible to extract “personal histories” of the former students - graduates from the Russian universities (or possibly those expelled before getting diploma) that entered the Russian labour market. However it is a laborious work and FMS specialists could not provide this data so far. Only recently the policy-makers started to discuss the possibilities to let migrants change their purpose of stay without compulsory exit from the RF. When these amendments to the law are adopted it should be possible to observe the sequence of student’s status change. However the decision has not been made yet.
Naturalization

About 95 thousand persons were naturalized in Russia in 2012, that showed a 30% decrease since 2011. In the middle of 2009 and especially in the end of 2011, the rules of naturalization in Russia were revised and became more strict. Main categories of simplified procedures were revoked. Restrictive changes in legislation not only led to decrease in the total numbers of citizenship acquisitions but changed the proportions between groups of applicants (table 24). One can notice that the values for the category “regular procedure” are still very small, because majority of foreigners that would like to submit their petitions for citizenship acquisition through regular procedure still have to wait for some years to become eligible for submission.

Table 24. Citizenship acquisition in Russia by type of procedure, persons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>359 196</td>
<td>362 509</td>
<td>394 184</td>
<td>111 366</td>
<td>134 983</td>
<td>95 737</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular procedure (not less than 6 years of waiting)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former USSR citizens - holders of temporary residence permit or those who arrived before July 2002 and were registered as residents of the RF (the rule had been applied since 2003 and till 1 July 2009)</td>
<td>186 573</td>
<td>225 615</td>
<td>266 815</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adults whose parents (at least one) have citizenship of the RF and is its resident</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former USSR citizens - graduates from Russian colleges and universities (after 1 July 2002)</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>953</td>
<td>2 188</td>
<td>5 662</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons that were born on the territory of Russia and formerly had the citizenship of the USSR</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>418</td>
<td>1 686</td>
<td>3 985</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons that have been married to the RF citizen at least for 3 years</td>
<td>683</td>
<td>1 807</td>
<td>4 119</td>
<td>12 123</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants of the Program for repatriation of compatriots with family members</td>
<td>3 642</td>
<td>5 248</td>
<td>17 286</td>
<td>31 326</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simplified procedure other categories</td>
<td>66 523</td>
<td>38 654</td>
<td>37 459</td>
<td>42 157</td>
<td>33 366</td>
<td>36 006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International agreements total</td>
<td>104 321</td>
<td>98 097</td>
<td>85 184</td>
<td>60 567</td>
<td>75 909</td>
<td>54 111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belarus</td>
<td>4 964</td>
<td>5 131</td>
<td>4 942</td>
<td>3 359</td>
<td>3 434</td>
<td>669</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyrgyzstan</td>
<td>42 970</td>
<td>45 291</td>
<td>35 493</td>
<td>22 347</td>
<td>23 329</td>
<td>1792</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kazakstan</td>
<td>56 387</td>
<td>47 675</td>
<td>44 749</td>
<td>34 861</td>
<td>49 146</td>
<td>2950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizenship restored</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1 540</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Federal migration service of Russia

72 Only applications processed by the FMS of Russia
Part 4 chapter 14 article applied to 1) foreigners and stateless persons formerly having citizenship of the USSR, that arrived in Russia and were registered in a place of residence before July 1 2002; 2) holders or temporary and permanent residence permits if before 1 July 2009 they would have announced a desire to obtain the RF citizenship.

Table 25. Top-10 countries of previous citizenship of foreigners granted the RF citizenship, 2013, thousands

<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>Total</td>
<td>31,5</td>
<td>330,4</td>
<td>504,5</td>
<td>366,5</td>
<td>367,7</td>
<td>361,4</td>
<td>394,1</td>
<td>111,3</td>
<td>135,0</td>
<td>95,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armenia</td>
<td>1,7</td>
<td>23,1</td>
<td>39,3</td>
<td>34,9</td>
<td>39,3</td>
<td>45,3</td>
<td>54,8</td>
<td>6,3</td>
<td>7,8</td>
<td>13,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azerbaijan</td>
<td>2,0</td>
<td>24,6</td>
<td>35,7</td>
<td>22,0</td>
<td>24,9</td>
<td>29,6</td>
<td>34,6</td>
<td>5,3</td>
<td>5,6</td>
<td>6,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belarus</td>
<td>0,6</td>
<td>10,2</td>
<td>12,9</td>
<td>7,9</td>
<td>6,7</td>
<td>7,1</td>
<td>6,1</td>
<td>3,9</td>
<td>4,0</td>
<td>1,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>1,5</td>
<td>20,7</td>
<td>25,2</td>
<td>14,0</td>
<td>12,2</td>
<td>11,1</td>
<td>9,9</td>
<td>2,5</td>
<td>2,4</td>
<td>3,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kazakhstan</td>
<td>8,7</td>
<td>106,6</td>
<td>123,3</td>
<td>68,1</td>
<td>64,8</td>
<td>58,7</td>
<td>50,6</td>
<td>27,1</td>
<td>30,0</td>
<td>14,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyrgyzstan</td>
<td>1,7</td>
<td>27,4</td>
<td>38,4</td>
<td>33,2</td>
<td>61,2</td>
<td>51,2</td>
<td>48,7</td>
<td>37,3</td>
<td>52,4</td>
<td>8,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moldova</td>
<td>0,4</td>
<td>7,3</td>
<td>13,7</td>
<td>12,8</td>
<td>13,9</td>
<td>15,8</td>
<td>20,4</td>
<td>2,0</td>
<td>2,8</td>
<td>5,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tajikistan</td>
<td>0,9</td>
<td>10,7</td>
<td>16,1</td>
<td>12,2</td>
<td>16,4</td>
<td>21,9</td>
<td>39,2</td>
<td>4,4</td>
<td>6,2</td>
<td>9,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukraine</td>
<td>7,6</td>
<td>50,6</td>
<td>94,1</td>
<td>66,5</td>
<td>55,4</td>
<td>58,5</td>
<td>62,0</td>
<td>5,7</td>
<td>7,8</td>
<td>12,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uzbekistan</td>
<td>2,3</td>
<td>29,7</td>
<td>73,3</td>
<td>67,0</td>
<td>53,1</td>
<td>44,0</td>
<td>49,8</td>
<td>4,8</td>
<td>7,9</td>
<td>13,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4,3</td>
<td>19,5</td>
<td>32,3</td>
<td>27,9</td>
<td>19,8</td>
<td>18,2</td>
<td>17,9</td>
<td>12,0</td>
<td>8,1</td>
<td>7,3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: FMS of Russia

For several years (since 2003 and till 2011) international agreements of Russia with four CIS states had helped many foreigners to get the RF citizenship. However some of applicants, especially from Kyrgyz Republic, started to misuse this way of citizenship acquisition. Many of them managed to keep their former nationality and did not change the country of residence coming to Russia to work like circular or even seasonal migrants. Russian citizenship allowed them to get free access to the Russian labour market. On 9 November 2012 Russia denounced the agreement with Kyrgyz Republic (signed in 1996) and de-facto in 2012 it almost had not been implemented. Now the citizens of KR may apply for the RF citizenship in accordance with regular procedure. Some of them can submit application within the framework of the Quadripartite agreement, but still the rules will be more complicated. In 2012 only 5.4 thousand persons obtained the RF nationality - that made only 7% of 75 thousand in 2011. More than a half of this category was presented by the former nationals of Kazakhstan, one third – Kyrgyzstan and only 12% - Belarus.

When the main channels of simplified naturalization narrowed dramatically; foreigners started to explore other variants and exercise their rights for simplified citizenship acquisition through other basis. Since 2009 to 2012 number of foreigners that obtained the RF citizenship in a simplified way because they were graduates of Russian colleges and universities increased dramatically - from 12 to 1.037 persons; spouses of the RF citizens that have been married for

73 Russia has two main agreements on citizenship acquisition: 1) Quadripartite agreement with Belarus, Kazakhstan and Kyrgyz Republic (1999) and 2) Bilateral agreement with Kyrgyz Republic (1996)

At least 3 years - 18 times (from 700 in 2009 to 12,000 persons in 2012), participants of the Program of repatriation - almost 9 times (from 3.6 thousand in 2009 to 31.3 thousand) (table 25). In 2012 the participants of the repatriation program became the leading group of applicants granted the RF citizenship, their ratio increased from 13% in 2011 up to 33% in 2012. Simultaneously – percentage of foreigners that acquired citizenship on the basis on international agreements dropped from 56% in 2011 to less than 6% in 2012 (fig. 47).

**Fig. 47. The main groups of naturalized persons by categories in 2011-2012, %**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>International agreements</td>
<td>56.2</td>
<td>56.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disabled persons whose children are the citizens of the RF</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children having a guardian who is the RF citizen</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons born in the Russian Soviet Federative Socialist Republic which had the USSR citizenship</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adults, having a parent who is the RF citizen</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stateless persons residing in CIS</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spouses of the RF citizens that have been married for 3 years and over</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children born at the parents one of whom is a foreigner and the second - the RF citizen</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>25.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants of the program of repatriation</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>32.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source: FMS data**

Changes in legislation also caused the shifts in composition of naturalized foreigners by the countries of previous nationality (or countries of residence in case of statelessness) – both in terms of absolute numbers (table 25) and percentage (fig. 48).
Comparing to 2011, in 2012 number of naturalized persons increased for the former nationals of Armenia (+70%), Moldova (+almost 90%), Tajikistan and Ukraine (+60-64%). In 2012 the recently privileged category of applicants - citizens of Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan and partly - Belarus – demonstrated dramatic decline in terms of the numbers of naturalized persons; the decrease made (comparing to 2011) minus 61%, - 51% and -82% respectively.
Most of all the new restrictions affected the citizens of Kyrgyz Republic: number of persons granted the RF citizenship and their percent – reduced from 52 thousand and almost 40% in 2011 to 8 thousand and 9% in 2012 (table 25, figure 48).

**Fig. 48. Percentage of nationals of selected countries among naturalized foreigners in Russia (by year of citizenship acquisition), %**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kazakhstan</td>
<td>16,25</td>
<td>12,85</td>
<td>24,38</td>
<td>22,22</td>
<td>15,23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uzbekistan</td>
<td>12,17</td>
<td>12,63</td>
<td>4,30</td>
<td>5,86</td>
<td>14,01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armenia</td>
<td>12,52</td>
<td>13,91</td>
<td>5,63</td>
<td>5,81</td>
<td>13,76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukraine</td>
<td>16,19</td>
<td>15,74</td>
<td>5,13</td>
<td>5,77</td>
<td>13,37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tajikistan</td>
<td>6,06</td>
<td>9,95</td>
<td>3,95</td>
<td>4,56</td>
<td>10,21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyrgyzstan</td>
<td>14,17</td>
<td>12,36</td>
<td>33,56</td>
<td>38,79</td>
<td>8,79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azerbaijan</td>
<td>8,20</td>
<td>8,79</td>
<td>4,73</td>
<td>4,17</td>
<td>6,73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moldova</td>
<td>4,37</td>
<td>5,18</td>
<td>1,79</td>
<td>2,08</td>
<td>5,49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: FMS data

In the future the authorities plan to make more amendments to the Law to facilitate citizenship acquisition procedures for the participants of the repatriation Program. This step may increase foreigner’s interest towards it. Planned extension of criteria implemented to the participants of the Program one can expect further growth of these flows and prevalence of this group of applicants among naturalized immigrants.