



**11TH ASEM CONFERENCE OF THE DIRECTORS-GENERAL OF IMMIGRATION
AND MANAGEMENT OF MIGRATORY FLOWS**

**30 – 31 October 2012
“Filoxenia” Conference Centre, Nicosia, Cyprus**

**SESSION II: POLICIES RELATED TO THE MIGRATION OF HIGHLY SKILLED PERSONS AND TERTIARY
EDUCATION STUDENTS IN EUROPE AND ASIA**

BACKGROUND NOTE

Summary

Migration is one among many options to address the imbalances generated either by structural labour and skills shortages or by technological and occupational changes. While policies may influence migration, the decisions of highly skilled persons and tertiary education students are affected by an array of variables that could be loosely classified into two broad issues: security, in terms of the actual benefits that skilled persons and the members of their families can yield out of mobility, and attractiveness, or the perceived opportunities that legislative frameworks and the socioeconomic environment in receiving contexts can guarantee to skilled persons. Individual motivations, opportunities for social integration, as well as the access to and the portability of social benefits constitute examples of the factors that are believed to affect mobility decisions.

Migration policies addressing the recruitment of skilled persons and international students may be demand- or supply-driven. Both kinds of schemes pose advantages and disadvantages. Many European and Asian countries have introduced measures to identify and facilitate the mobility of skilled persons and international students. While these measures have simplified the admission and the incorporation of skilled persons and international students into the labour market, they do not necessarily offer them different kinds of “security” (e.g. contractual security, the ability to face risks, the protection of their labour rights, or the effective utilization of their human capital), or render any given destination more “attractive” (e.g. by ensuring access to long-term resident status, the recognition of skills or the portability of social benefits).

Introduction

This paper provides an overview of policies addressing the mobility of highly skilled persons and tertiary education students. It starts by outlining some of the factors affecting the migration decisions of highly skilled persons and tertiary education students. The paper then provides some examples of highly skilled migration policies in Europe and Asia. The conclusion underlines the importance of transparency, coordination and policy coherence dealing with the admission and recruitment of highly skilled migrants.



Labour shortages in highly skilled sectors can be supply-induced (structural shortages) or demand-induced, for instance, by technological and occupational change that require a skill base not yet available. Many countries have developed specific mechanisms to increase their domestic human capital and attract highly skilled professionals in order to overcome such actual or projected shortages.

Overall, policies aimed at facilitating the mobility of highly skilled workers usually aim at addressing labour market imbalances and ensuring greater access to human capital necessary to maintain or achieve productivity and innovation goals. Lately, the idea that the potential benefits and costs of skilled migration are shared by sending and receiving countries (and migrants themselves) has gained prominence (Wickramasekara 2002). As a consequence, ethical considerations have been introduced in highly skilled migration policy, especially in some sectors such as health care and education (Adepoju, van Noorloos and Zoomers 2009). Migration policies may hinder or facilitate the mobility of highly skilled persons. However, the migration decisions of highly skilled persons and students are shaped by many other factors, as discussed below.

Factors shaping the migration of highly skilled persons

The factors that shape migration decisions and the choice of destination relate to the opportunities for highly skilled workers themselves, as much as for the members of their families. Some of these factors are employment-related (for example, career opportunities for highly skilled workers and their family members, income differentials, contractual security, the availability and quality of financing and research facilities). Others relate to the specific field of specialisation and career path, autonomy in research work, and so on. Integration prospects are also important. These include access to social benefits¹, access to the labour market for family members, and language training, among others (Ackers 2005; Khoo, Hugo and McDonald 2011).

Beyond access, one important aspect of social security refers to the “portability” of benefits when moving from one country to another. The portability of social benefits not only affects labour market decisions, but most importantly, the capacity to face social risks (Holzmann and Koettl 2011). As an example, the achievement of retirement income security for migrant workers may be hindered by nationality-based restrictions to participation in social security schemes, minimum residence requirements, minimum required periods of contributions (affecting temporary workers), restrictions to export benefits, deductions on exportable amounts, reductions to pensions paid abroad, or the design of retirement plans (i.e. the calculation of benefits and adjustments) (see Pasadilla 2011)². The coordination of these issues has faced difficulties, even in the context of economic integration (i.e. the EU, the Caribbean Community (CARICOM), and in the future AEC).

The portability of social benefits entails defining at least: a) to which social risk management instruments portability should apply; b) how to calculate and finance acquired social security rights if transferred; c) how to address the diversity of occupational plans, risk profiles, income profiles and family profiles of the migrant population. These questions have been tackled in bilateral, multilateral and regional agreements (Forteza 2008, Pasadilla 2011), but comprehensive empirical evidence on how the agreements actually work, and evaluations of their effectiveness are not yet available (Holzmann and Koettl 2011).

Moreover, social factors (status, prestige, scientific excellence, the existence of networks, xenophobia, the quality of life, and the like) and personal motivations (for instance, the experience of living abroad) are likely to influence skilled persons’ decisions. It is therefore essential to understand these factors, beyond the simple assumption that income differentials are enough incentive to move, return, or



otherwise, stay. These factors could be analysed in terms of the degree of “security” and benefits that nations willing to attract highly skilled professionals and international students can offer them.

Policies related to the migration of highly skilled persons

Most policies on highly skilled migration in receiving countries combine measures to recruit foreign professionals and international students and promote their socioeconomic integration in the receiving society. In sending countries, highly skilled migration policies often focus on harnessing highly skilled persons’ human, intellectual and financial capital. For example, policies may promote the transfer of skills and knowledge, investment and remittances, or the compensation for the loss of skills, as well as the retention and improvement of the countries’ skills base. The design of specialised schemes for the highly skilled, however, is one among many other options to address skills shortages. Flexible employer-driven systems and the improvement of domestic conditions for the highly skilled may constitute more straightforward solutions to address skills shortages.

Regarding the recruitment of highly skilled migrants some experts have categorised migration policies in demand and supply terms: a) in *demand-driven* systems the existence of a job offer is essential, as these schemes are designed to respond to identified labour market needs (i.e. revealed by shortage lists and labour market tests); b) in *supply-driven* systems workers are invited to apply for admission in a host country, and are selected according to specific criteria, regardless of the existence of a job offer. Supply-driven systems also include *free movement* regimes, which facilitate the direct encounter between workers and employers (Chaloff and Lemaître 2009). It is useful to distinguish between systems that favour permanent settlement (for instance, those in place in Canada, Australia, and New Zealand) and those that encourage temporary migration (for example, those adopted in some European countries, Japan and Korea). The mechanisms for the selection of highly skilled workers include “points-based” systems³, quotas, labour market tests and shortage occupation lists, and even the creation of special visas.

Demand-driven systems are popular in Europe, Japan and Korea and it seems that most policies tend to focus on reducing the obstacles for the admission of highly skilled persons, but fail to “attract” them through incentives (e.g. subsidies, skills recognition) (Chaloff and Lemaître 2009: 19, 30). Supply-driven systems (i.e. points systems) demand significant material and human resources needed to assess applications. Moreover, the labour market outcomes of workers selected under these schemes are not always those expected. This is partly explained by the difficulties that highly skilled migrants face to have their qualifications recognised across borders (see Background Paper for Session III), but could also stem from discriminatory practices in recruitment and employment and the segmented nature of the labour markets in some countries of destination. Indeed, certain adaptability criteria have recently deserved greater consideration in supply-driven systems (such as language proficiency, the existence of a job offer, or preferential treatment to foreign graduates) (Ibid. pp. 33-36).

Generally speaking, provisions to facilitate the recruitment of highly skilled labour include facilitating the issuing of work permits including fast track admission procedures, relaxing immigration quotas and allowing international students to remain in the receiving country and work before or upon graduation. In addition, some measures designed to “attract” qualified foreigners or potential qualified returnees include financial and social incentives (such as tax incentives, dual citizenship, access to and portability of social benefits, language training opportunities, integration provisions for workers and their families including access to the labour market for spouses and integration of children). Retention and circulation strategies usually aim to improve the infrastructure for innovation, facilitate high-tech entrepreneurship,



and achieve greater coherence between labour and education policy encouraging the participation of the private sector (OECD 2002). In what follows, some examples of these measures are briefly presented.

- ***Examples of highly skilled migration policies in Europe***

The drive for productivity, and the changing demographics and labour market dynamics have encouraged some European countries to develop specific schemes to attract highly skilled labour. These schemes include the adoption of points-systems (for example, in the United Kingdom, Denmark, Netherlands, Austria) and the combination of several measures from simplifying the procedures for the admission, recruitment and issuing of work permits to highly skilled workers through the amendment of existing regulations (for instance in France, Germany, the Netherlands, Sweden), to creating special visas (such as Germany's now phased out "Green Card" for IT professionals; and the "Green Cards" in the Czech Republic, Denmark, and Ireland; France's *Carte Compétences et Talents*), to allowing international students to stay after graduation to search for jobs.

Similarly, the European integration process has led to the adoption of a common approach to facilitate the admission of highly qualified workers and their families. The Council of the European Union adopted the *Directive on the conditions of entry and residence of third-country nationals for the purposes of highly qualified employment* (Blue Card Directive) on 25 May 2009 to introduce a common framework on recruitment of highly skilled workers from outside the EU. Yet, in 2011 the full transposition of the Directive into the national law was still not accomplished, and certain Member States received warnings concerning delays and obstacles to the admission of highly qualified migrants in their territories.⁴ The decisions on the volumes of admission of highly qualified workers and students that are nationals of the countries outside the EU remain under the national competence. This demand-driven system targets non-EU nationals with higher education qualifications or five years of professional experience, who hold a job offer in a Member State. The Blue Card combines residence and work permits, it allows for family reunification and grants spouses and partners access to the labour market. It sets a minimum salary threshold for eligibility⁵ and includes considerations on ethical recruitment. Applications are processed through a fast-track admission procedure (90 days). The Directive further states that EU Blue Card holders should enjoy equal treatment with regards to social security. Intra-EU movement is allowed after 18 months of legal residence in the first Member State, as well as the accumulation of periods of residence in different Member States. The validity of the Blue Card is from one to four years provided that the original criteria for admission and residence are met. In case of unemployment Blue Card holders benefit from a three-month job searching period.

Existing conditions for the admission of highly skilled migrants in some EU countries are equally favourable or can be more favourable than those stipulated in the Directive (OJ L 155), which raises the question of how the alignment of the national and regional frameworks will affect the highly skilled in these countries. However, the Directive states that it should not affect the possibility for an EU Blue Card holder to enjoy more favourable provisions of Community law, bilateral or multilateral agreements, and national law. The fast track admission procedure does not include the time required for the recognition of qualifications or for issuing a visa, which raises the question of the coordination of skills recognition. However, the Directive states the possibility of replacing a higher education qualification with professional experience. Moreover, the fact that applicants are required to provide an address in the Member State concerned may hinder eligibility of migrants residing abroad and those lacking strong social networks. The validity period of the Blue Card has also raised questions regarding access to long-term resident status, for which five years of legal and continuous residence as a Blue Card holder are required. Skills recognition and the transfer of social-security benefits and health insurance remain important challenges for both EU and non-EU nationals residing and working in Europe. Some authors



argue that the temporary nature of most permits and the discretion involved in their renewal creates a certain degree of uncertainty concerning immigrants' future ability to stay and work in the host country (Kahanec and Zimmermann 2011: 20). Along these lines, the high level of flexibility of the Blue Card scheme may be both an advantage to adapt to rapid changing labour market dynamics, and a potential disadvantage in terms of "security" to attract highly skilled workers.

Further relevant legislative initiatives on the EU level include the adoption of the *Directive on a specific procedure for admitting third-country nationals for the purposes of scientific research* (Council Directive 2005/71/EC of 12 October 2005). This Directive aims at making scientific careers more attractive to young people; promoting women's involvement in scientific research; extending the opportunities for training and mobility in research; as well as improving career prospects for researchers in Europe and open more avenues for the admission of third-country nationals for the purposes of research (OJ L 289: 15).

Also, in an effort to develop a more comprehensive immigration policy, the European Commission has recently launched a Proposal for a *Directive on conditions of entry and residence of third-country nationals in the framework of an intra-corporate transfer* (COM(2010) 378 final). This Proposal seeks to facilitate intra-corporate transfers of skills both to the EU and within the EU that contribute to enhance the competitiveness of the European economy, namely by: a) responding to the demand for managerial and qualified employees of multinational companies; b) by rendering transparent the conditions of admission and temporary stay of the intra-corporate transferees and the members of their family, and c) by promoting the efficient allocation and re-allocation of transferees between EU entities.

Finally, in 2011 the European Union adopted the *Directive on a single application procedure for a single permit for third-country nationals to reside and work in the territory of a Member State and on a common set of rights for third-country workers legally residing in a Member State* (Directive 2011/98/EU of 13 December 2011). This Directive aims at simplifying application procedures leading to a combined permit that encompasses both residence and work permits (OJ L 343). This is an important step towards simplifying overall admission procedures that may favour migrants possessing different skill levels.

- **Examples of highly skilled migration policies in Asia**

Migration policies concerning highly skilled professionals vary according to the specific interests of countries in terms of the recruitment of foreign talent (some countries receiving large numbers of skilled migrants have developed *ad hoc* schemes), opening up international opportunities for their own qualified nationals, and for that purpose improving their training, or promoting the return of qualified nationals and their involvement in development initiatives in their countries of origin.

Concerning the recruitment of skilled migrants, some countries have introduced measures to: a) facilitate the entry and recruitment of skilled migrants; b) simplify their access to permanent or long-term residence; c) encourage the return of skilled nationals; and d) utilize the human capital of foreign graduates. Bilateral agreements have also been concluded to facilitate the recognition of qualifications.

China, Hong Kong, China, India, Japan, Malaysia, Korea, and Singapore have sought to attract skilled workers from within and outside Asia. Points systems have been adopted in certain countries. Hong Kong, China, introduced a points system ("Quality Migrant Admission Scheme") in 2006. Japan and Korea have allowed for faster access to permanent residence and adopted points systems primarily directed to skilled workers who are already living or working in these countries (OECD 2012). Trainee programmes have further supplied medium-skilled workers in Japan and Korea, but they have sometimes been



associated with low-income jobs, and the protection of “trainees” has been scrutinised (Lee and Kim 2011).

Singapore, Brunei Darussalam, Malaysia⁶ and Thailand have relatively open immigration systems for professionals. At the same time, they supply health-related services, and have put in place strategies to become exporters of IT services. The Philippines, Indonesia and Vietnam favour the temporary immigration of professionals and export care services. Countries such as Cambodia, Lao PDR and Myanmar receive small numbers of foreign professionals but generally seek to ensure that some capacity-building activities are conducted in order to upgrade the skills of local workers (Manning and Sidorenko 2007: 1089; 1099-1100).

China and Taiwan Province of China established linkages with their professionals abroad to eventually draw on these pools of talent. China has sought to attract qualified returnees by offering them incentives related to housing and employment. It has also established Chinese Scholars Pioneer Parks where returnees enjoy special conditions to start-up businesses (Adepoju, van Noorloos and Zoomers 2009: 58).

Concerning free trade agreements, India seeks to open opportunities for service providers through Free Trade Agreements. The Asia Pacific Economic Co-operation (APEC) countries introduced a “Business card” in 1999 that facilitates the short-term mobility of high-level executives and business visitors (excluding the U.S. and Canada; OECD 2012: 177-178).

Overall, the scope and transparency of procedures for the recruitment of highly skilled migrants have an impact on the degree of “attractiveness” of the destination countries. Skills recognition remains a challenge, although bilateral agreements constitute a promising first step to address this issue. The implementation of such agreements and the realization of economic integration processes will require further coordination (see Background Note for Session III). Some authors have argued that countries would also benefit from fostering the active involvement of the private sector (e.g. multinational companies) in the establishment of centres of excellence and research and development centres that tap on the potential of both native and resident highly skilled professionals. Likewise, provisions that ensure equal treatment could be introduced in bilateral agreements, as steps towards facilitating the integration of foreign professionals. The use of a common language in the workplace or language training opportunities may further facilitate integration.

Strategies targeting international students

Many countries have simplified the conditions for international students to participate in their labour market. Debate is ongoing on whether international students contribute to the “brain drain”, constitute a source of cheap labour, or enhance the circulation and transfer of skills, technology, and knowledge. Some authors suggest it is important to “take into account the diversity of international students and their labour market participation at different stages of the migration process” (Liu-Farrer 2009: 181) in order to better understand the specificities of international students’ mobility and their labour market outcomes.

In receiving countries, participation of international students in the labour market has been facilitated through two main strategies: a) allowing students to *work during their studies*; and b) allowing students to seek employment and *change status* upon graduation. For example, Japan requires students to apply for a specific authorisation to work during their studies; Denmark allows full-time employment during the summer; Norway and France have simplified the access of international students to part-time



employment during their studies. Regarding change of status, in the past seven years, some European countries (Austria, the Czech Republic, Finland, France, Germany, Ireland, the Netherlands, the Slovak Republic, and the United Kingdom) have taken steps to facilitate international students' participation in their labour markets, especially if they are graduates from their universities. Lithuania, Spain, Sweden adopted also new legislation (2010-2012) on this regard (OECD 2012). As mentioned above, the Council of the European Union has adopted a specific Directive facilitating the admission of third country nationals for the purposes of scientific research. Also, since 2004, the mobility of non-EU doctoral students has been addressed by the *Directive on the conditions of admission of third-country nationals for the purposes of studies, pupil exchange, unremunerated training or voluntary service* (Council Directive 2004/114/EC of 13 December 2004).

In Asia, since 2005 foreign graduates from Korean universities are allowed to stay to find a job upon graduation. Moreover the Korean government recently announced its plan to grant official recognition to some "international schools" (Lee and Kim 2011: 442-444). Similarly, in 2004 the Japanese government granted international students graduating from Japanese universities the right to stay and work in Japan and in 2008, the government announced its plans to increase the number of foreign students by 300,000 until 2020 (Ibid. 448-449). One important aspect of the facilitation of student mobility for receiving countries is avoiding fraud. New Zealand, Australia, and the UK have introduced measures to ensure compliance by sponsors and students of the conditions of admission (e.g. attendance, course completion, proof of means of financing education and stay, restrictions to bring dependants) (OECD 2012: 107)

In addition, universities and quasi-state agencies have played a more important role in marketing study programmes and financing opportunities, as well as recruiting international students in their countries of origin. These marketing activities include the organization of information fairs, recruitment events, exchange programmes and even one-to-one orientation sessions. Some universities have established campuses abroad, or introduced English-language programmes and language training courses to attract international students when the teaching language is not widely spoken. Indeed, as Findlay argues, the mobility of international students is "strongly shaped by the financial interests of those who organize, supply and market elite higher education opportunities within the global economy" (2011: 163). Tuition fees paid to host universities and students' living expenses are examples of such economic gains.

Conclusions

The mobility of highly skilled workers and students is shaped by many factors as discussed above. Greater attention should be paid to the scope and transparency of existing regulations for the admission and recruitment of highly skilled migrants, the harmonisation of national and regional frameworks when the latter exist, and the need to facilitate the recognition of professional qualifications, skills or professional experience. The portability of social benefits (at least some of them such as pension and health care) is increasingly seen as a central aspect of migration management (Holzmann and Koettl 2011). Social security agreements (bilateral, regional, multilateral), especially for the transfer of pension rights, have been explored as potential options to ensure equality of treatment.

Pre-departure and post arrival orientation programmes are important in order to facilitate migrants' and relatives' familiarisation with the host country labour market, economic, cultural, and social conditions. Language training courses for migrant workers and international students facilitate integration. Retraining and opportunities for skills upgrading could also help skilled migrants maintain a level of skills relevant for jobs commensurate with their qualifications and expectations.



Achieving greater coordination is central to the development of migration policy in general and highly skilled migration in particular. The notion of coordination, as suggested by Reiner (2010) refers to: *vertical coordination* at different governance levels (i.e. regional, national, supranational, global); *horizontal coordination* between different policy fields (or the mandates of different ministries – i.e. higher education, labour, migration, social protection), and *lateral coordination* to tackle both structural issues (shaped by tradition and culture – i.e. public opinion) and technical issues (i.e. taxation, use of different working and teaching languages, etc.).

Similarly, countries need to prioritise their internal and external objectives. For instance, enhance the education and employment opportunities of internal human resources including resident foreign talent; and/or, if deemed appropriate, attract external human resources or qualified nationals abroad, or open up opportunities for local workers to participate in international labour markets. Taking into account the interests of sending and receiving countries, but also employers, professional associations and accreditation bodies (which play an important role in the regulation and the determination of certification and practice) is essential to achieve policy coherence.

In this context, it would be worth considering the following issues:

- What would be the mutual priorities in advancing regulation on the admission and recruitment procedures targeting highly skilled individuals in ASEM countries and regions?
- What multilateral and bilateral mechanisms could be envisaged in order to address issues related to the “security” and “attractiveness” of the environments where highly skilled persons and international students live and work?
- How can greater vertical, horizontal and lateral coordination be ensured in order to improve the process and outcomes of policymaking in the field of highly skilled migration and international students’ mobility?
- How to ensure the effective socioeconomic integration of highly skilled workers and students?

References

Ackers, Louise. 2005. “Moving People and Knowledge: Scientific Mobility in the European Union,” *International Migration*, Vol. 43 (5), pp. 99-129.

Adepoju, A., F. van Noorloos and A. Zoomers. 2009. “Europe’s Migration Agreements with Migrant-Sending Countries in the Global South: A Critical Review,” *International Migration*, Vol. 48 (3) [2010], pp. 42-75.

Chaloff, J. and G. Lemaître. 2009. “Managing Highly-Skilled Labour Migration: A Comparative Analysis of Migration Policies and Challenges in OECD Countries”, *OECD Social, Employment and Migration Working Papers No. 79*, OECD Publishing. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/225505346577>

Council Directive 2009/50/EC of 25 May 2009 on the conditions of entry and residence of third-country nationals for the purposes of highly qualified employment (Official Journal of the European Union, L 155, 18.6.2009, pp. 17-29)



Council Directive 2005/71/EC of 12 October 2005 on a specific procedure for admitting third-country nationals for the purposes of scientific research (Official Journal of the European Union L 289, 3.11.2005, pp. 15-21).

Council Directive 2004/114/EC of 13 December 2004 on the conditions of admission of third-country nationals for the purposes of studies, pupil exchange, unremunerated training or voluntary service (Official Journal of the European Union L 375, 23.12.2004, pp. 12-18).

Directive 2011/98/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 13 December 2011 on a single application procedure for a single permit for third-country nationals to reside and work in the territory of a Member State and on a common set of rights for third-country workers legally residing in a Member State (Official Journal of the European Union, L 343, 23.12.2011, pp. 1-9).

Doomernik, J., R. Koslowski, and D. Thränhardt. 2009. The Battle for the Brains. Why Immigration Policy is Not Enough to Attract the Highly Skilled. *Brussels Forum Paper Series*, March: The German Marshall Fund of the United States.

Findlay, A. M. 2011. "An Assessment of Supply and Demand-side Theorizations of International Student Mobility" *International Migration* Vol. 49 (2), pp. 162-190.

Forteza, A. 2008. The Portability of Pension rights: General Principles and the Caribbean Case. *Social Protection Discussion Paper No. 0825*, Washington: The World Bank.

Holzmann, R. And J. Koettl. 2011. Portability of Pension, Health, and other Social Benefits: Facts, Concepts, Issues. *Social Protection Discussion Paper No. 1110*, Washington: Social Protection and Labor, The World Bank.

Iredale, R. 2009. *The Recognition of Skills in the Asia Pacific Region*. ILO Regional Skills and Employability Program.

Kahanec, Martin and Klaus F. Zimmermann. 2011. High-Skilled Immigration Policy in Europe, Discussion Papers 1096, Berlin: German Institute for Economic Research (Deutsches Institut für Wirtschaftsforschung, DIW) January.

Khoo, S.-E., G. Hugo and P. McDonald. 2011. "Skilled Migration from Europe to Australia," *Population, Space and Place* 17, pp. 550–566.

Lee, Byoung-ha and Sungmoon Kim. 2011. "South Korea's Developmental Democracy and Migrant Workers Policy," *Pacific Focus*, Vol. XXVI, No. 3 (December), pp. 428–455.

Liu-Farrer, G. 2009. "Educationally Channeled International Labor Mobility: Contemporary Student Migration from China to Japan," *International Migration Review*, Volume 43 Number 1 (Spring), pp. 178–204.

Manning, C. and A. Sidorenko. 2007. "The Regulation of Professional Migration: Insights from the Health and IT Sectors in ASEAN," *The World Economy*, pp. 1084-1113.

OECD. 2012. *International Migration Outlook 2012*, Paris: OECD Publishing http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/migr_outlook-2012-en

OECD. 2002. *International Mobility of the Highly Skilled*, Policy Brief, July, www.oecd.org/publications/Policybriefs

Pasadilla, G. O. 2011. "Social Security and Labor Migration in ASEAN", *Research Policy Brief 34*, Tokyo: Asian Development Bank Institute.



Proposal for a Directive of the European Parliament and of the Council on conditions of entry and residence of third-country nationals in the framework of an intra-corporate transfer (COM(2010) 378 final) of 13 July 2010.

Reiner, Christian. 2010. "Brain competition policy as a new paradigm of regional policy: A European perspective", *Papers in Regional Science*, Volume 89 Number 2, June, pp. 449-461.

Skeldon, Ronald. 2009. "Of Skilled Migration, Brain Drains and Policy Responses," *International Migration* Vol. 47 (4), pp. 3-29.

Wickramasekara, P. 2002. "Policy Responses to Skilled Migration: Retention, Return and Circulation", *Perspectives on Labour Migration 5E*, Geneva: Social Protection Sector, International Migration Programme, International Labour Office.

Endnotes

¹ Health care, old age, survivors, disability, invalidity, unemployment, maternity and family benefits, sick and severance pay are some examples.

² For a detailed discussion on issues related to the portability of social benefits see Holzmann and Koettl (2011)

³ The points-based systems criteria normally include age, language proficiency, educational attainment, profession or occupation and work experience.

⁴ European Commission Press Release, 'Blue Card': Commission warns Member States over red tape facing highly qualified migrants IP/12/167, 27 February 2012, consulted on 27 September 2012, <http://europa.eu/rapid/pressReleasesAction.do?reference=IP/12/167&type=HTML>

⁵ The applicant's gross annual salary must be at least 1.5 times the average gross salary in the Member State concerned, and at least 1.2 times the average gross salary in certain professions which are in particular need of TCN workers such as mathematics, engineering, life science and health care (OJ L155: 23)

⁶ Malaysia also reduced the number of occupations where foreigners were prohibited in 2006 (Iredale 2009).

