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Migration flows between the countries of Latin America and Caribbean (LAC) and between the European Union (EU) are not new. The first flows date from the end of the fifteenth century, primarily from north to south or from Europe to the Americas. This process continued up to the 1950s when LAC went from being a region of destination to a region of origin of international migrants. This trend continues to this day; during the first decade of the twenty-first century, high levels of extra-regional emigration from LAC, in particular to the United States of America and Spain, were also recorded. The latter was established as the second country of destination of LAC emigrants.

**People from Latin America and the Caribbean and the European Union residing in the other region**

Today, nearly 4.3 million people from LAC reside in the 27 EU countries. Conversely, nearly 1.3 million people from any of the 27 EU countries reside in LAC. This means that for every European residing in LAC, there are 3.4 Latin Americans or Caribbean persons residing in the EU. The fact that the stock of people is highly concentrated in few countries also stands out. This is notable in the case of people from LAC residing in the EU, where 9 out of 10 LAC individuals reside in one of these five countries: Spain, the United Kingdom, the Netherlands, Italy and France. Spain is the most representative case since 6 out of 10 of these individuals reside there.

For this reason, it is not surprising that half of the EU countries have a negative net migration balance in regards to LAC countries – that is, the number of emigrants is greater than the number of immigrants –. In other words, there are more people born in these countries residing in LAC than Latin Americans and Caribbean persons residing in these 13 European countries: Austria, Bulgaria, Estonia, Hungary, Ireland, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, Portugal, Czech Republic and Romania.

Migratory dynamics permit identifying postcolonial ties as an important variable to be considered. The majority of the LAC population chooses, for residence, the EU country which administrated the territory of its country of origin in the past. See, for example, the indigenous population of Andean countries in Spain or that of the Jamaicans and Trinitarians in the United Kingdom; the same occurs with the Surinamese and Dutch in the Netherlands or with the Haitians in France.

---

1 For more information on this data, see “Appendix 2. Methodological Considerations” of this document.
Migration flows between the two regions in the last decade

As regards migration flows from LAC to the EU, the fact that, virtually during the entire first decade of 2000, these flows gradually increased is striking; however, 2008 marked a turning point since the flows drastically decreased. This decrease may be explained by the area’s economic crisis and fundamentally that of the principal receiving country of this flow: Spain. In 2000, just over 200,000 LAC individuals entered the EU, a number which exceeded 400,000 in 2006 and ended up with 229,000 in 2009. After 2008 it is possible to also see a decline in the irregular flows from LAC. That year, 80,600 people were detained, while a 54 per cent decrease (52,235 people detained) was recorded in 2010.

A decrease in the number of residence permits granted to LAC individuals is also perceived. Between 2008 and 2011, 1.01 million permits were granted to people from LAC (14% of the total), showing a gradual decrease since 2008. This decrease can be observed in absolute and relative terms. In 2008, 397,000 permits were granted, which represented 16 per cent of the total for that year; in 2009, around 318,000 or 14 per cent of the total for that year, and 295,000 in 2012 or 12 per cent of the total for that year.

Individuals from Latin America and the Caribbean working in European Union countries

Nearly 327,000 residence permits with authorization to perform remunerated activities were granted in the EU between 2008 and 2010 to LAC individuals, a number which represents 15 per cent of the total of this type of permit: 2.234 million. The principal LAC country of origin of this type of flow is Brazil whose emigrants received 67,250 permits in the three-year period mentioned (21% of the total of permits for LAC citizens). The majority of the emigrants went to work in Portugal (37,767 people).

As regards the sectors of the economy in which LAC individuals residing in the EU work, the services sector stands out. The most paradigmatic example is that of Spain which continues being the principal country of destination of labour migration from LAC, despite the economic crisis. In this European country, 652,000 LAC individuals were affiliated with Social Security in 2010, a number which represents 35 per cent of the total of affiliated foreign individuals. It is noted that 78 per cent of LAC individuals worked in the services sector. The other three sectors are well below: construction (10%), industry (6%) and agriculture (6%).

The 2008 economic crisis and its impact on migration flows

Since the European crisis, three processes were generated simultaneously. On the one hand, contrary to what was thought in several countries at the beginning, a massive
return of migrants to LAC did not occur. In general, migrants decided to wait for the economic situation to improve in the countries of destination. Furthermore, several countries adopted measures for encouraging the return of migrants, particularly those who were unemployed, which did not have excellent results, as happened in the Spanish case. On the other hand, there is certain anecdotal information which permits identifying a new European emigration flow to LAC countries, specifically from Spain and Portugal. In the first case, nearly 34,000 people emigrated to Argentina and more than 6,000 emigrated to Chile and Uruguay from June 2009 to November 2010.

**Interregional migration in countries in Latin America and the Caribbean**

LAC is a region with interregional and extra-regional migration. Even though the majority go to countries outside of the region such as the United States and Europe, a significant part migrates to the countries of Central and South America: 57 per cent of the immigrants residing in LAC come from another country of the region. This is not a trivial affair since thousands of families receive monetary remittances from other LAC countries. The fact that important migration corridors between border-sharing countries have been established, of which the largest (more than 600,000 people) is the corridor between Colombia and Venezuela, stands out.

**Migration and its link to development**

It is possible to outline at least a few conclusions on this topic. First, the remittances are not sufficient for compensating the negative impacts that emigration has on human development in the societies of origin, for example, the loss of the most entrepreneurial individuals. Second, it is fundamental to include discussions on this link within the framework of human rights since, in this manner, development is analysed from a comprehensive perspective and not only with an economic focus.

On the specific topic of monetary remittances sent by workers, it is possible to identify that for every 1.55 dollars* that arrived from EU countries to LAC, 1 dollar flowed in the opposite direction from LAC countries to the EU, according to the World Bank figures for 2010 if the amounts that flow between the two regions are compared. Furthermore, it is noteworthy that 13 of the 27 EU countries (48%) receive more remittances than those sent to LAC and that in three of these countries (11%), the balance fluctuates around zero. The 13 countries with a negative net balance of remittances are (in millions of dollars) Portugal (205), France (137), Belgium (116), Poland (64), Austria (32), Hungary (24), Romania (9), Czech Republic (6), Bulgaria (3), Slovenia (2), Lithuania (2), Slovakia (1) and Latvia (1). The three countries in which the balance fluctuates around zero are Estonia, Greece and Malta. This means that in only 40 per cent of EU countries, the flow

* In the present study ‘dollars’ refers to US dollars.
of monetary remittances that goes to LAC is more than that received from countries in the Americas. Among these, Spain, the United Kingdom and Italy stand out.

Women, migration and gender

Finally, as regards women and migration, it will be indicated how migration can help to transform, on some occasions, and can help to perpetuate unequal gender relations, on others. The effort that migrant women make to send monetary remittances to their families in the country of origin is greater. Normally, women send three times more remittances than men do. On the other hand, it is striking how women manage the monetary remittances received from other countries when they are the head of the household in the country of origin. When this happens, this money is mainly used for improving the educational quality of their children, which happens less often when men manage the resources.
The project “Strengthening of dialogue and cooperation between the European Union (EU) and Latin America and the Caribbean (LAC) to establish management models on migration and development policies” is implemented by the International Organization for Migration (IOM) together with the Fundación Internacional para Iberoamérica de Administración y Políticas Públicas (International Foundation for the Public Policies and Administration of Ibero-America) (FIAPP) and is financed by the EU. Its principal objectives are to begin a process of cooperation between the EU and LAC and to create a permanent exchange of information and good practices between the interested LAC countries as well as between these countries and the EU. Some of the specific objectives are the promotion of a more comprehensive knowledge of the migration flows between the two regions through the compilation, processing and exchange of data between the countries with a notable migration flow to the EU, and the creation and strengthening of capacities in the national administrations for developing, updating and taking full advantage of the data analysis.

The study on “Migratory routes and dynamics between Latin American and Caribbean (LAC) countries and between LAC and the European Union” is part of the project and its general objective is to provide quantitative elements to fuel discussion between each regions’ governments as well as between the two regions. Its objective is to present relevant and current information, providing weight to the dialogue between the countries in the regions of LAC and the EU, for approaching the subject of migration and development. Through the access to and systematic analysis of several databases and a revision of existing literature, the principal flows from one region to another and some of their characteristics have been identified. The information presented in this study aims to serve as a primary and useful reference that facilitates understanding of the migratory dynamics between regions and contributes to dialogue between the different actors. Also, it updates the study “Migration from Latin America to Europe: Trends and Policy Challenges” developed by Adela Pellegrino and published by IOM in 2004.

The study is organized in five chapters. The first two chapters generally present information on the general dynamics of migration in LAC and from LAC. The other chapters, however, present information on the migratory dynamics between LAC and the EU, the second component of the study. The first chapter presents a historic outline of migration in LAC and the EU as well as the exchanges and migratory dynamics between the two regions up to 2000. In this section, it should be noted that the migration flows between the two regions are not new. The first flows date from the end of the fifteenth century, primarily from north to south or from Europe to the Americas. This process continued up to the 1970s when the trend started to revert itself, largely because LAC went from being a region of destination to a region of origin of international migrants.
In the second chapter, the discussion is taken up after 2000, specifically because it was during the first decade of the twenty-first century that high levels of extra-regional emigration from LAC – in particular to the United States and Spain – were recorded. The latter was established as the second country of destination of emigrants from LAC. These individuals’ motivations and intentions for emigrating to other countries are also outlined in this chapter. It is worth noting that migration is a phenomenon caused by multiple variables and processes. The decision to emigrate is influenced by structural variables such as the wage difference between countries; intermediate level variables such as social networks and the information that flows through them, and the variables that are related to the life of each one of the migrants and their families. Subsequently, information on people who have already migrated and are residing in another LAC country (stock), as well as data on the interregional migration flows, is presented.

In this chapter, discussions in regards to migration and development are also presented, emphasizing two of the biggest topics in this discussion: high-skilled emigration from LAC countries and the monetary remittances that flow to LAC, specifically from other LAC countries. In this sense, it is important to emphasize that even though interregional emigration is less compared to extra-regional migration, specifically that which has North America and EU countries as its destination, there are several countries and hundreds of thousands of families who receive monetary remittances from another LAC country.

The last topic raised in the second chapter is the relationship between women and migration in LAC. In this context, discussions on how migration can help to transform, on some occasions, and can help to perpetuate unequal gender relations, on others are presented. Also, the effort that migrant women make to send monetary remittances to their families in the country of origin on the one hand and to manage the resources received from other countries when they are the head of the household in their country on the other hand is observed. All of these processes show the relevance of making women participants in decision making at the time of promoting development projects or processes, both in the countries of origin and of destination.

The third chapter fully enters into the second component of the study: recent migratory dynamics between LAC and the EU. Within it, current information is presented both on the stock of people from LAC residing in EU countries and in regards to migration flows from the first region to the second. To construct this chapter, the different databases that permitted identifying the number of individuals who regularly entered EU countries from LAC during the first decade of the twenty-first century were analysed and used. Also, more specific information regarding irregular migration, acquisition of citizenship of LAC individuals, return migration and monetary remittances sent from EU countries to LAC is shown. Two pieces of data, among others, stand out: the first is that the percentage of LAC migrants does not exceed 17 per cent of the total in virtually any category regarding migration flows; in other words, it is observed that LAC migration to the EU is much less compared to migration from other continents such as Asia and Africa. The second is that the LAC population residing in the EU is highly concentrated in very few countries.
Virtually every 9 out of 10 LAC individuals reside in Spain, Italy, the United Kingdom, the Netherlands and France.

Chapter four goes into greater depth on the discussion of the European labour market and labour migration of LAC individuals in EU countries, particularly in Spain and to a lesser extent in the United Kingdom. At the beginning of this chapter, information is presented on the residence permits that EU countries grant to LAC individuals. This category is relevant because it is possible to identify and quantify labour migration in it. Subsequently, the labour market since the 2008 crisis and its impact on the unemployment rates of immigrants in several EU countries is analysed. Finally, the British and Spanish cases are studied. The focus is primarily on the latter for one reason: 6 out of 10 LAC individuals reside in Spain. Therefore, knowing the sociodemographic characteristics of the immigrants that function in this country’s labour market is fundamental.

With the objective of presenting a more complete panorama of the migratory dynamics between LAC and the EU, chapter five raises the subject of LAC as a region of destination of European emigrants in the last lustrum. In this chapter, information on the stocks of Europeans in LAC countries and on the new flows of European immigrants that, as a result of the European economic crisis, have arrived in the region’s principal countries of destination: Argentina and Brazil. Also, the net migration balance of EU countries is calculated and information is provided on the monetary remittances that go from LAC to European countries.

Subsequently, and to sum up, several general conclusions in which some of the most relevant topics that are specifically raised throughout the study are presented. For example, as regards the stock of people, migrant flows between the two regions and flows of monetary remittances, among others. Also, information on women and migration as well as the participation of LAC individuals in the labour market is included.

It is worth pointing out that the text of the report is accompanied by a series of tables, figures and maps which aim to present the information in such a way that reading them is more synthetic and didactic. In addition to these tools, it is possible to find detailed information on 26 LAC countries in Appendix 1. “National profiles of several LAC countries”. The decision to include national profiles as appendices in this report was taken due to the quantity of information collected from the diverse quantitative sources that were consulted and the impossibility of including it in the study. The objective that Appendix 1 tries to meet is that of presenting and showing a good part of the pertinent information contained in the accessed databases that are described in Appendix 2 in an orderly, logical and coherent manner. On one page, these national profiles present information about the population in LAC countries, the gross national income, exports and imports, and detailed information regarding migration. Also, an introductory page with sources from which the data contained therein was obtained is presented to facilitate reading and interpreting the summary pages.
The methodological conditions which include descriptions of the consulted sources and accessed databases, as well as their strengths and weaknesses for developing this study, are presented in Appendix 2. In this sense the databases produced by the World Bank and the Statistical Office of the European Communities (EUROSTAT) stand out. This is because the other databases consulted mostly include two categories which limit their use for this study: they present information up to the last census round (from 2000 to 2002) and/or it is not possible to break down the information contained therein for each LAC and EU country2.

Finally, it is important to note that up to now, dozens of relevant documents for developing the study have also been identified. They have been well organized and catalogued, and their content has been described broadly in the annotated bibliography that can be found in the website of the project www.migracion-ue-alc.eu or by contacting the Publisher. The literature has been classified in four large categories: a) literature on migration in LAC in general, b) literature on LAC as a region of origin to the EU and on the LAC population in EU countries, c) literature on interregional flows in LAC and d) literature on flows from the EU to LAC. The literature has been classified by subjects, taking into account the central ideas of the study’s framework draft. In such a way that it is possible to find literature on migration flows and circuits, labour markets, Diaspora and political participation, public policies, skilled migration, remittances, impact of the crisis on flows, return, gender and childhood, among others. All of this literature serves to qualitatively feed and strengthen the information obtained from the databases used that are presented and analysed in this document.

2 The other databases consulted are produced by the Organisation for Co-operation and Economic Development, the Organization of American States, the Latin American and Caribbean Demographic Centre and the International Labour Organization.
1.1. Migration in Latin America and the Caribbean and the European Union

Migration develops in a specific time and physical space, involves specific periods of time that can be short or long and specific geographic areas crossed by a flow of individuals that enter and leave them. Migration in LAC, as well as between it and other regions of the world, specifically countries that currently make up the European Union, is not new. Evidence of this is what was experienced during colonization and the migration processes that were created and established starting with the period known as the Era of the Great Migration from 1815 to 1914. During this period, there was a massive migration process from several European countries to the Americas, primarily from Italy and Spain.

The World Wars created a change in the migration patterns. Europe changed from an originating area of migrants to a receiving area. After the Second World War, the principal European countries began to facilitate the exchange of goods and services that later included the free movement of people. At the same time, several of these countries facilitated the entry of extra-regional migrants with the objective of satisfying the labour demands of certain sectors of the economy through the creation of temporary labour programmes. One of the most paradigmatic examples may be that of West Germany.

Since the Second World War, and in a parallel manner, the European migration flows to LAC suffered a turning point which was completely established during the oil crisis at the beginning of the 1970s. In this period, many of the flows continued to be regional but others began to globalize (King et al., 2010:39). After this decade, the majority of LAC countries became countries of origin of migrants, primarily to the United States. Many of the Central and South American countries recorded constant and large flows to this country. This is not the case of Mexico, whose migration flows to the United States date from the nineteenth century.
Simultaneously, a large part of the countries that formed the European Community became receivers of extra-continental migrants from Africa, LAC and Asia. The most substantial changes were experienced in European countries that had been countries of origin of migrants for many years. Spain, Greece, Italy and Portugal went from being countries of origin to countries of destination of individuals, basically, after their formal incorporation to the EU in the middle of the 1980s. The cases of Spain and Italy are notable, where people from nearly the entire world arrived.

This change can be identified by analysing the international migrant stocks. For example, the percentage of LAC immigrants has not recorded substantial variations since the 1960s. However, this has significantly changed in Europe and especially in southern European countries. According to the United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs (2009), the international migrant stock in 1960 was 2.6 per cent in regards to the total of the world population; in 2011, it was estimated at 3.1 per cent. In Latin America, the change was similar during this period, going from 2.8 per cent in 1960 to 3.3 per cent in 2010. In contrast, in Europe – also including countries that are not part of the EU – the rate nearly tripled, going from 3.4 per cent to 9.5 per cent in the same period. The exponential increase in Spain and Portugal where the rate multiplied by twenty (Table 1) stands out.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>1960</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>Change 1960-2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
<td>20.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
<td>16.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>8.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>21.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


It is estimated that in 2010, the total number of international migrants fluctuated around 214 million people (UN-DESA, 2009). If the number of internal migrants is added to this, around 740 million (UNDP, 2009), it can be concluded that around one billion people resided in a location different from where they were born. This represents just over one seventh of the world population. As regards international migration, the main topic of the study, analysing the figures from the World Bank (WB) (2011a), it is possible to identify that today, just over 7.18 million international migrants reside in the countries of the LAC region, a number that represents 3 per cent of the total of international migrants. On the other hand, just over 48.42 million international migrants
reside in the EU-27, a figure that represents 22 per cent of the 214 million international migrants.

Furthermore, upon analysing the WB data (2011a) on migration in LAC and the EU, it is possible to identify some similarities between the two regions. For example, just over 32.58 million people from LAC countries reside in a country different from the one in which they were born. In the case of people born in the EU, the number is around 31.72 million. These two figures represent 15 per cent of the total of international migrants. In other words, the two regions are similar as a place of origin of migrants. The main difference lies in that the majority of Europeans that reside in another country reside in another EU country: just over 16.79 million, 53 per cent of the total of European emigrants. Conversely, the majority of LAC individuals that reside in another country do so outside of the LAC region, primarily in North America and the EU. Only 4.08 million of the individuals who were born in a LAC country reside in another country of the region, representing 13 per cent of the total of international emigrants of Latin American or Caribbean origin.

1.2. Historical characteristics of migration between Latin America and the European Union up to 2000

1) Latin America and the Caribbean as a destination of migration from Europe

Migration between the two areas is not a new phenomenon. The first modern exchanges took place as of the sixteenth century. The discovery of the Americas in 1492 was the starting point for several European countries such as Spain, Portugal, the Netherlands, France and the United Kingdom to create colonies on the American continent. The flow of migration from north to south continued for three and half centuries more, converting Latin America into one of the principal destinations for Europeans. “European immigrants dominated the migration scenario in LAC but they were not the only ones since other groups from Africa – in the framework of the forced relocations which were a product of slavery (European) –, Asia and also the Middle East arrived in the region.” (Ayuso, 2009:3)

The exact number of individuals who emigrated from Europe to the Americas during this period is practically unknown. There is information on the migration flows as of the period entitled the “Era of the Great Migration”, which lasted from 1815 to 1914 (Map 1). During this century, between 22 and 26 million people migrated from European countries to the Americas (King et al., 2010). Even though the majority migrated to the United
States and Canada, a significant contingent arrived in South America. The most popular countries of destination were Argentina, to which around 5 million Europeans arrived; Brazil, to which between 2 and 5 million arrived; Cuba and Mexico to each of which a little less than one million arrived; and to a lesser extent Uruguay, Chile and Venezuela (Loc. cit.; Devoto, 2009; Yépez and Herrera, 2007). The majority of migrants came from Italy (38%), Spain (28%) and Portugal (11%) (Ayuso, 2009).

The migration flows from Europe to Latin America can be classified in two large categories: old and new. According to King et. al. (2010: 28–29), the first group is made up of people who travelled during the entire nineteenth century, generally in complete family groups and primarily from the United Kingdom, Ireland, Germany and the Scandinavian countries. The second group is made up of people who generally travelled from the end of the nineteenth century until the First World War. This flow was primarily made up of young men from Poland, Austria-Hungary, Italy and the Balkan countries. Perhaps one of the most paradigmatic cases is the Italian case, characterized by the migration of 7.1 million people in 35 years (Op. cit.: 31). Between 1880 and 1914, 4.1 million people left Italy to go to the United States, 1.8 million to go to Argentina and 1.2 million to go to Brazil (Loc. cit.).

**Map 1**

*Migration from Europe to the Americas, 1815–1914*

As is often the case in all migration processes, there were many motivations for migrating, but there is a general consensus for explaining the movement of people from Europe to Latin America. On the one hand, the Industrial Revolution that developed in Europe acted as an important push factor, and on the other hand the existence of an open migration system in many LAC countries stands out as a pull factor. The World Wars changed this pattern. Starting in 1945, European immigration to LAC has gradually and constantly decreased – even though it seems that the trend is changing in the last three years, as shall be seen further along in this report –. For example, compared to nearly 4 million Europeans registered in LAC during the 1970 census round, there were 1.9 million in 2000 (Ayuso, 2009:4) and around 1.2 million are estimated in 2010 (WB, 2011a). Some of the factors that explain this decrease are the 1970s oil crisis and the formal incorporation of the principal European countries from which migrants departed in the European Union in the 1980s.

The decrease in the migration flows from Europe to Latin America is clearly seen in the cases of Germany, Spain, Italy, Poland and Portugal as countries of origin and in the principal Latin American countries of destination (Argentina and Brazil). According to information from the World Bank (2011b), it is possible to identify that in 1960 there were over 1.87 million people born in one of the five European countries mentioned in the Argentinean case. In 2000, the figure did not reach 400,000. The rate of decline of the European population from these five European countries during this period was 475 per cent.

As can be observed in Figure 1, the most paradigmatic case in absolute terms is Italy. The population born in Italy and residing in Argentina went from 927,000 people in 1960 to 224,000 in 2010, showing a 414 per cent decrease. In terms of percentage, the most striking case is that of Poland which went from having 113,000 migrants in Argentina in 1960 to 14,000, decreasing at a rate of 786 per cent. The preliminary figures for 2010 from the WB, which will be presented in detail in the following sections of the study, permit identifying that the downward trend of immigration from these five countries continues in this South American country.

The case of Brazil is similar (Figure 2). The country went from having 949,000 migrants from Germany, Spain, Italy, Poland and Portugal in 1960 to 338,000 in 2000. The most paradigmatic case in absolute terms is that of Portugal, which went from 486,000 in 1960 to 212,000 in 2000. In relative terms, the Polish nationality was that which decreased the fastest, 417 per cent, going from 31,000 people residing in Brazil in 1960 to 7,000 in 2000. Opposite to what happened in Argentina, the WB figures permit identifying that the trend reversed in 2010. For the first time in 50 years, the migrant stock from these five European countries increased compared to the figures from 2000, even though the growth rate did not exceed 0.8 per cent in any case.
Figure 1

Individuals with any European nationality residing in Argentina, selected countries, 1960–2000

II) Europe as a destination for migration from Latin America and the Caribbean

In contrast, the emigration of people from LAC to EU countries is something relatively new, especially if compared with the flows from Europe to LAC. In the last 50 years, the majority of the continent’s countries became countries of origin of extra-continental migrants. This transition was experienced parallel to the intense process of urbanization that still continues in several countries. In such a way that the population gradually grew in big metropolises such as Mexico City, Lima, Sao Paulo and Rio de Janeiro.

Map 2 shows the principal LAC interregional and extra-regional flows in the second half of the twentieth century. On the map, it is observed that the majority of migration from Mexico, Central American countries, Caribbean countries and several South American countries is in a direction towards the United States. The role of Argentina as an inter-regional destination for migration, which primarily comes from several South American countries with which it shares a border, stands out. The majority of the flows observed in Map 2 can be classified as labour flows, primarily motivated by the desire to find a better job in the country of destination that allows the emigrants and their families to have a better quality of life. A trend that is observed from 1950 is the regionalization...
and subregionalization of the flows. The latter, in particular, when referring to temporary migration, especially in the agricultural sector (Durand, 2009).

Map 2

Principal migration flows in LAC, 1950–2000

The flows from LAC to Europe have an important nuance. While in the 1950s and 1960s, many European emigrants returned to their countries of origin at a maximum number of 50,000 people per year between 1962 and 1973, after the 1970s, a significant contingent of people from Central and South America sought political refuge in European countries, primarily in the United Kingdom, Spain, France, Switzerland and Germany (Ayuso, 2009). In addition to the strong presence of military regimes in the continent, another factor which contributed to converting LAC into a region of emigration was the

population growth: in 1960, the birth rate in LAC countries was 5.97 children per woman. Mexico (6.70) and Brazil (6.15) were the cases with the highest rate (Durand, 2009).

Starting in the 1980s, the flow was becoming more economic due to the migration of young students and workers who sought to leave a region immersed in complete economic crisis (Yépez, 2007). For some countries, the paradigmatic change in terms of

**Figure 3**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>3,294</td>
<td>43,277</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecuador</td>
<td>9,716</td>
<td>176,212</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>9,834</td>
<td>140,748</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>13,410</td>
<td>26,797</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>52,801</td>
<td>83,803</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


**Note:** The numbers in the figure only correspond to the number of people residing in Spain in 1990 and 2000.

the number of individuals from LAC residing in the EU began to be established during this decade. This is the case of Argentineans in Spain (Figure 3), Colombians and Brazilians in Italy (Figure 4) and Ecuadorians in France (Figure 5).

In the 1990s, some of the LAC to the EU migration patterns were notably accentuated and the number of LAC individuals grew exponentially in several European countries. This is the case of Ecuadorians, Colombians and Peruvians in Spain (Figure 3). In absolute and percentage terms, the Ecuadorian population was the one that grew the most during this decade: it went from 9,700 people in 1990 to 176,000 in 2000, growing at an average annual rate of 181 per cent. Following the Ecuadorians, Colombians went from 9,800 to 140,000 in the same period of time, growing at an average annual rate of 143 per cent. Finally, there is Peru which went from 3,000 people to 43,000 in 2000, growing at an average annual rate of 131 per cent. In contrast, the growth in the number of Argentineans and Brazilians was gradual from 1960 to 2000. As will be presented later in this report, it is noteworthy that this trend to increase continued during practically the entire decade of the twenty-first century.
In Spain, the percentage of women in the stock of people from LAC countries, analysed in Figure 3, never went below 47 per cent from 1960 to 2000. Of the five LAC nationalities analysed with Spain as the country of destination, only in the case of Peru in 1960, 1970 and 1980 was the percentage 47 per cent. This trend reversed in 1990 when 54 per cent of the stock was women, and continued in 2000 when the percentage of women in the stock was 59 per cent. The Brazilian and Colombian cases also stand out. In the former, the percentage of women residing in Spain up to 1980 was 51 per cent, which later grew to 56 per cent in 1990 and 64 per cent in 2000. In the Colombian case, a less marked growth in the feminization of the stock was recorded, going from 56 per cent between 1960 and 1980, to 59 per cent in 2000.

If the Spanish case is compared with the Italian case (Figure 4), it is possible to identify several similarities and some differences, specifically in the dynamics of intensification and feminization of the migration stock. For example, there is exponential growth in the case of the Ecuadorian and Peruvian population during the 1990s. The former went from 12,000 people to nearly 47,000 in 2000 while the latter went from 1,000 to nearly 22,000 in the same period of time. In the case of persons of Colombian origin, an important difference occurred, since there was exponential growth in the 1980s. The same happened with the Brazilian population. In the last two cases, the change observed in the 1990s is minimal compared to that of the 1980s. Even more important is the Argentinean case that, after growing in the 1980s, decreased in the following decade.

**Figure 4**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country of origin</th>
<th>Number of individuals residing in Italy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>118 (1960), 1,872 (2000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>256 (1960), 4,095 (2000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>603 (1960), 8,478 (2000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>458 (1960), 16,981 (2000)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Italy, the flows are still more feminized than in Spain. For example, the lowest percentage of women from 1960 to 2000 of the five mentioned LAC countries was recorded in the case of Ecuadorians and Peruvians in 1970 (48% in both cases). In 2000, the countries in which the stock was more feminized were Brazil and Colombia. In both cases, women made up 51 per cent of the total in 1960 while in 2000, they represented 77 per cent and 75 per cent respectively. In other words, in 2000 three out of four people born in Brazil and Colombia, and residing in Italy, were women. The trend in Peru and Argentina is not very far behind. In the first case, the percentage of woman was 50 per cent in 1960 and 66 per cent in 2000. In the second case, the percentage was 51 per cent in 1960 and 61 per cent in 2000.

Finally, there is the case of France as a country of destination (Figure 5). It is also possible to find interesting contrasts in the French case, specifically between some South American and Caribbean countries. For example, as regards individuals from Brazil and Colombia, the growth of emigration was gradual from 1960 to 2000, an occurrence that contrasts with the cases of Ecuador and Jamaica. The case of Jamaicans, the annual growth rate of which was 264 per cent during the 1990s, stands out. The case of Haiti

---

Figure 5

**Individuals with a LAC nationality residing in France, selected countries, 1960–2000**

![Bar chart showing individuals with a LAC nationality residing in France, 1960–2000.](chart.png)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ecuador</td>
<td>13,530</td>
<td>8,163</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,391</td>
<td>1,849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>15,717</td>
<td>17,931</td>
<td>17,761</td>
<td>14,676</td>
<td>48,902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>17,931</td>
<td>17,761</td>
<td>14,676</td>
<td>2,391</td>
<td>1,849</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


**Note:** The numbers in the figure only correspond to the number of people residing in France in 1990 and 2000.
is equally interesting because after having grown during the 1980s, it had a significant decrease in the following decade. In other words, the Haitian population decreased during the 1990s. Perhaps, the fact that many of these individuals had received French nationality could serve as an explanation. As will be seen later in the document, it is notable that in the first decade of the twenty-first century, the Haitian population grew exponentially until reaching its historical high in 2000: 42,000 people.

The case of France differs slightly from those of Spain and Italy in terms of feminization of migration. This is because none of the five selected countries show a substantial change in percentage terms in this respect in France. This means that even though there was growth in the total flow, the percentage of women remained stable for forty years. In nearly all cases (Brazil, Colombia, Ecuador, Haiti and Jamaica), the percentage went from 47–48 per cent in 1960 to 51–52 per cent in 2000. In some cases, there was an increase in 1980 but then it went back to the current percentage. For example, the stock of Colombian women went from 48 per cent in 1960 to 61 per cent in 1980, ending at 51 per cent in 2000. In Brazil, it went from 48 per cent in 1960 to 58 per cent in 1980, ending at 51 per cent in 2000.

Feminization of migration is largely related to “the entry of European women to the labour market and the makeup of family units with a double salary which created an unprecedented demand, until now, of women who worked in domestic services and in the care of the elderly and minors” (Vono de Vilhena, 2011:34). In addition to it being possible to identify the growing feminization of migration, it can also be observed that the migration flows are quite concentrated. The cases of Spain, Italy and France as countries of destination for individuals from Andean countries, primarily from Ecuador, Colombia and Peru, stand out. This trend is an important phenomenon which will be discussed more in-depth in the following sections.

Finally, the beginning of the new century brought important changes for migration from LAC to the EU, in some cases in the composition of flows and in others, their density. As is often the case in migration processes, there are several factors which made the EU a more attractive region for people during the first years of the 2000s. Within the determining factors, there is the LAC economic crisis, specifically of South American countries, high levels of inequality and the strengthening of migration control and the United States visa system as of 2001 (Pellegrino, 2004). These factors caused a certain globalization of the region’s flows. The United States stopped being the principal country of destination and the individuals from LAC migrated to Canada, Japan, Australia, European countries and also Israel (ECLAC, 2008). The following are part of the principal European countries of destination: the Netherlands, the United Kingdom and Portugal; along with Spain, Italy and France. Among the factors that made these countries become receiving countries are “the existence of historical, cultural and linguistic links, the importance of the informal labour market, primarily in Latin countries and timely regularizations” (Ayuso, 2009:5).
2. Migration in the Americas from the year 2000

During the first decade of the twenty-first century, the trend of LAC as a region with higher rates of emigration than of immigration continued. The principal country of destination since the 1950s continues to be the United States. The population of Hispanic origin, made up of people born inside and outside of the United States territory, went from 35.3 million in 2000 to 50.5 million in 2010, showing a 43.3 per cent growth rate (Pew Hispanic Center, 2011). It is estimated that around 24 million of these individuals were born in LAC. The population of Hispanic origin also represents 55 per cent of the total of foreigners residing in the U.S., a figure that fluctuates around 43 million people (OAS, 2011; IOM, 2011a).

Even though the United States continues being the principal receiving country of people from countries of the LAC region, the decade 2000 brought a substantial change: the establishment of Spain as the second country of destination. Additionally, the inter-regional migratory dynamics were established during these years. In 2009, it is calculated that 72 per cent of Latin American and Caribbean emigrants travelled to the United States, 11 per cent to another LAC country, 9 per cent to Spain, 2 per cent to Canada and 1 per cent to the United Kingdom and Japan respectively (OAS, 2011).

Both phenomena, Spain as the second receiving country and the establishment of inter-regional migration, are the result of at least a few processes that were experienced in a parallel manner in the last ten years. First, the increase of migration control measures in the United States as of 11 September 2011, particularly through the deployment of the National Guard and deportation of people with irregular status from the interior of the country to the point in which over 396,000 people were deported (historical high) in the 2011 financial year (ICE, 2011).³

³ The Obama Administration has deported over one million people in three years, the greatest number since the term of President Dwight D. Eisenhower, whose administration ended in 1961.
Second, the regional processes of economic integration which began to occur in the 1990s converted some of the LAC subregions into spaces with free movement of people during the first decade of the twenty-first century. Such is the case of the Southern Common Market (MERCOSUR), the Andean Community of Nations (CAN), the Central American Integration System (CA-4) and the Caribbean Community (CARICOM) (Durand, 2009). To a large extent, these processes facilitated the movement of people between countries of the same region in such a way that, today, Nicaraguans can travel to Honduras and Guatemala without needing a visa within the framework of CA-4, and Uruguayans can travel to Argentina or Brazil within the framework of MERCOSUR.

To a certain point, these dynamics reflect the paradigms in which migration in the Americas is understood and administered today. On the one hand, there are countries with a vision and management of the migration flows based on the prism of security, following the traditional stance of the United States (Durand, 2009). Puerto Rico, Costa Rica and Mexico may be the most relevant examples from Central America. On the other hand, there is the case of South America which has been moving towards a free, regional movement system. In this process, the case of Argentina stands out, as the principal receiving country of immigrants in LAC with 1.8 million foreigners living in its territory, according to the most recent census from 2010 (INDEC, 2011). Through regularization programmes and other similar initiatives, Argentina has been advancing towards a plan for the protection and guarantee of peoples’ rights regardless of their nationality or their migration status, starting with individuals from the countries in the expanded MERCOSUR. These programmes are an example of the approach of the countries of the Southern Cone region for gradually advancing towards a plan for the free movement of people regardless of their nationality or migration status, something that is completely new and which is carried out under the premise of not creating two classes of citizens: those who can exercise their rights since they have a regular status and those who cannot since they have an irregular status.

It is noteworthy that these new plans for movement are not exempt from difficulties at the time of implementing them into everyday reality, especially when the move involves destinations and routes from third countries that are not part of these multilateral

---

4 The regions mentioned are integrated as follows: MERCOSUR by Argentina, Brazil, Paraguay and Uruguay; CAN by Bolivia, Colombia, Ecuador and Peru; CA-4 by Guatemala, El Salvador, Honduras and Nicaragua; and CARICOM by Antigua and Barbuda, Barbados, Belize, Dominica, Grenada, Guyana, Jamaica, Montserrat, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines and Trinidad and Tobago.

5 The countries that are part of the extended MERCOSUR are the four countries previously mentioned in the previous note and Bolivia, Chile, Peru, Ecuador and Colombia.

6 To review an explanation of how multilateral progress has been made in this respect between South American countries, see Colombo S. et al., 2011, “Las migraciones internacionales en la agenda de América del Sur: derechos humanos, corresponsabilidad y multilateralismo frente a la securitización de la política migratoria en los países desarrollados”. Densidades, 7:11–30.
agreements. For example, the individuals from CA-4 countries that go towards the United States and must pass through Mexico generally face high levels of violence upon doing so, as shown by the fact that 77 migrants were killed in San Fernando, Tamaulipas Mexico in August 2010. Furthermore, there is evidence that migrants with a Honduran, Salvadoran and Nicaraguan nationality are extorted and assaulted by some authorities in the territory of the countries that form the CA-4, such as Guatemala and Honduras (Venet and Palma, 2011). On the other hand, foreigners in Argentina have certain difficulty freely exercising certain rights such as access to justice. However, it is possible to see certain advances, especially in the legal frameworks of the countries in the LAC region. The challenge lies in appropriately and efficiently carrying out the new regulations with the aim to guarantee and protect the rights of migrants which are provided by the new laws.

Related to the topic of migrant vulnerability is also that of displaced people in the interior of the region. Colombia is the most paradigmatic case. It is calculated that today there are over 4 million people who have been displaced in this country since the 1960s, a number which represents 14 per cent of the total of displaced people in the world (King et al., 2010). Another relevant case in the region is that of Mexico, where it is calculated that between 2005 and 2010, around 1.6 million people were forced to leave their homes due to the violence experienced in their localities (The Economist, 2012). Another case is that of Peru where there are still between 100,000 and 300,000 displaced people. The case of Guatemala stands out due to a lack of information that permits assessing how many people have been, and continue to be, displaced since the 1980s.

2.2. Outline of the intentions and motivations to migrate

Migration is a process with multiple causes and motivations. On the one hand, there are explanations that put more emphasis on the structural factors (macro), such as public policies and the levels of inequality between countries and/or the wage difference between neighbouring regions or countries. One of the main hypotheses is that people will leave areas where there are low wages and go to others with higher wages, and that the states may have influence on the flows through the policies that they implement. These theories tend to be complemented by explanations that analyse the migration process as if they were social in nature and that they can be catalogued into another group.

The second group contains explanations of an intermediate nature (meso) that analyse migration through the network theory, transnationalism and social capital. These theories stipulate that, once created, the circuits of migration will gradually increase due to the
communication and interaction that exists between people in the area or country of destination and those who have not yet migrated and are in the localities of origin. Finally, and in this second group, there are theories that explain migration from the micro level, in which the will of people and their families are the main factor. In general, they stipulate that human beings decide to migrate as a strategy for facing and/or overcoming difficulties in the places of residence. Here, the sociodemographic variables such as age, gender, education, job qualifications or membership in a group or minority play a significant role since they influence the way and modes that people use to move, and the level of vulnerability of migrants during their trajectory and stay in the country of destination.

In 2008, Gallup conducted a survey in 20 LAC countries with the purpose of identifying how many people would like to emigrate, their motivations for doing so and also the countries which they have in mind as a destination. Ríos and Crabtree (2008a) emphasize that the first country mentioned as a destination was the United States. However, in the cases of Argentina, Bolivia, Chile, Colombia, Peru and Uruguay, the first country mentioned was Spain. In a recent study, it was identified that 20 per cent of the people in the LAC region would like to permanently emigrate (Esipova et al., 2011). It includes the fact that in six countries (Guyana, El Salvador, Peru, Nicaragua and the Dominican Republic) at least 40 per cent of the people would like to permanently migrate to another country if they have the opportunity and the ideal conditions for doing so (Ríos and Crabtree, 2008a). In the cases of Bolivia, Chile, Colombia and Honduras, the percentage is at least 33 per cent (Loc. cit.).

This means that, in half of the countries studied, at least one out of every three people would like to permanently migrate to another country. The cases of Guyana, the Dominican Republic and El Salvador where the ratio is at least one out of two people stand out. However, there is a substantial difference between the aspiration and ability to migrate: many individuals who would like to migrate do not have the socioeconomic means to do so or cannot convert this desire into reality (Carling, 2002). For this reason, it is not surprising that in the 20 countries where the survey was conducted, only three (Belize, El Salvador and Guyana) have a percentage of the population that is abroad which is greater than 10 per cent of the entire population.

Another relevant element is that the intention to emigrate is not strongly decided due to having a job (Ríos and Crabtree, 2008b). For example, 23 per cent of the individuals who did not have a job at the time of the survey responded that, in ideal conditions, they would have the intention to permanently emigrate (Loc. cit.). On the other hand, 26 per cent of the individuals who had a job responded in the same way (Loc. cit.). Perhaps job satisfaction is the most important variable: 39 per cent of the individuals

---

7 The countries where the survey was conducted are: Argentina, Belize, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Ecuador, El Salvador, Guatemala, Guyana, Honduras, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, the Dominican Republic, Uruguay and Venezuela.
that were not satisfied with their job wished to emigrate, compared to 24 per cent who were satisfied.

Esipova et al. (2011) affirm that individuals who have a greater tendency to emigrate are between 25 and 44 years old. Another factor that is relevant to migration is the level of education: when this level is higher, there is a higher inclination to move in the near future. Social networks are also a determining factor: people who have the support of family or friends in the country of destination showed that they were more likely to migrate than those who do not have social networks; 30 per cent of the first group tend to move compared to 10 per cent of the second.

The report by Esipova et al., based on a broader survey, is a good indicator for showing that these structural factors partially influence the decision to emigrate. For example, in the case of Ecuador – the LAC country with the largest population in the EU as will be seen later in this document – the three principal elements that influence the migration processes are the labour demand in the countries of destination, the conditions of social reproduction in the country of origin and the social networks between the two countries. The combination of these three factors largely determines the flows and puts people in more or less favourable contexts (Herrera, 2007).

These explanations are also valid for understanding why people migrate in, through and to the LAC region. However, finding the specific weight of each one of these is a large task because each migrant has more than one reason which leads to his or her journey. Taking into account that migration is a process that occurs at a certain time and in a determined space, the challenge is to detect and understand what variables have more weight in that time and space.\(^8\)

2.3. Migration from and in Latin America and the Caribbean in the last lustrum

I) Migrant stock between countries in Latin America and the Caribbean

In 2010, just over 4.08 million individuals from LAC resided in another country in the same region (WB, 2011a).\(^9\) The principle countries of origin of interregional migration

\(^8\) Furthermore, the ecological fallacies must always be considered. For example, the fact that there are high rates of emigration in areas with high levels of unemployment does not necessarily mean that there is a link between unemployment and emigration or that migrants are unemployed before starting their journey.
are Colombia (21%), Nicaragua (10%), Paraguay (9%), Haiti (8%), Chile, Argentina and Bolivia (7% each)\(^9\) This means that nearly seven out of 10 interregional migrants in LAC are individuals from these seven countries. Table 2 shows that just over 80 per cent of interregional migrants are individuals from these 10 countries.

**Table 2**

**Principal countries of origin of LAC interregional migrants and percentage in regards to the total individuals residing in another country, 2010**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country of origin</th>
<th>Total number of individuals from that country residing in another LAC country</th>
<th>Percentage in regards to the total of LAC interregional emigrants</th>
<th>Percentage in regards to the total of people residing outside of that country</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>854,754</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicaragua</td>
<td>409,545</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paraguay</td>
<td>346,804</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haiti</td>
<td>307,244</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>276,167</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>274,902</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolivia</td>
<td>271,420</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>247,970</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>184,085</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uruguay</td>
<td>154,817</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other 34 countries</td>
<td>758,101</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44 countries total</td>
<td>4,085,809</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


**Note:** The countries shown in detail are those in which the percentage in regards to the total of LAC interregional emigrants is at least 4 per cent.

\(^9\) The information is available for 44 countries (named in accordance with the information presented in the headquarters of the World Bank): Antigua and Barbuda, Netherlands Antilles, Argentina, Aruba, Barbados, Belize, Bermuda, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Dominica, Ecuador, El Salvador, Grenada, Guadeloupe, Guatemala, Guyana, French Guiana, Haiti, Honduras, Cayman Islands, Turks and Caicos Islands, Jamaica, the Bahamas, Martinique, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Puerto Rico, the Dominican Republic, St. Barthelemy, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Suriname, Trinidad and Tobago, Uruguay and Venezuela.

\(^{10}\) Percentage in regards to the total of interregional migrants.
Interregional migration represents a good proportion of emigration in these countries. The cases of Paraguay, where 68 per cent of the total emigrants reside in another LAC country; Nicaragua, whose percentage is 56 per cent; Chile and Uruguay with 44 per cent respectively; and Bolivia and Colombia with 40 per cent respectively, stand out. In other words, this means that in the Paraguayan case nearly 7 out of 10 migrants that reside abroad do so in another LAC country, while in Bolivia and Colombia, 4 out of 10 emigrants reside in another LAC country. The principle countries of destination for inter-regional migrants are Argentina (23%), Venezuela (18%), Costa Rica (11%) and the Dominican Republic (9%). These four countries receive 60 per cent of the individuals from the other 40 Latin American and Caribbean countries.

Analysing the data presented by the World Bank for the countries of origin and destination in 2010, it can be observed that an important proportion of emigrants from a LAC country reside in another country in the region: 57 per cent of LAC immigrants come from another country in the area. For this reason, it is not surprising that something more than 2.15 million people (53% of the interregional flow) are concentrated in only seven migration corridors out of a total of 1,892 possible corridors (Table 3). Also note that the corridors are formed by countries that share a border, which is an indicator of subregionalization of the flows.

### Table 3

**Principal migration corridors between LAC countries, 2010**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country of origin</th>
<th>Country of destination</th>
<th>Total number of individuals from the country of origin residing in the country of destination</th>
<th>Percentage in regards to the total of LAC interregional</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>Venezuela</td>
<td>604,514</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicaragua</td>
<td>Costa Rica</td>
<td>373,548</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paraguay</td>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>307,510</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haiti</td>
<td>Dominican Rep.</td>
<td>279,216</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. P. de Bolivia</td>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>220,869</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>200,969</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>Ecuador</td>
<td>170,255</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rest of the 1,885 migration corridors</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,928,929</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44 countries total</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,085,809</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Elaboration by the author using information from the World Bank, 2011a, *Bilateral Migration Matrix.*


**Note:** The migration corridors shown in detail are those in which the stock is more than 150,000 people.
II) Recent migration flows in and from countries in Latin America and the Caribbean

Measuring the migration flows is not a simple task, especially when measuring irregular migration. This is due in part to a division of functions between the institutions for compiling information on international migration in general (Massé, 2012). First, there are government agencies responsible for compiling information through administrative records. Then, there are authorized institutions for compiling information and producing statistical results from censuses and home surveys (Loc. cit.; Calvelo, 2011).

As regards LAC as a region of origin, it can be observed that the general emigration trend has increased over the last 10 years (OAS, 2011). However, this trend has not remained constant in the countries or even regions of origin or destination. The information contained in Table 4 allows observing that the increase has mostly been in emigration to the United States, the country of destination for more than half of the emigration flow from LAC (Loc. cit.).

This increase was at the cost of emigration to countries of the European Union, specifically to Spain, up to 2007. The annual emigration averages to EU countries that are part of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) decreased from 2008 to 2009 compared to the averages from 2003 to 2007. The case of Spain stands out, in which the annual average from 2003 to 2007 indicates that one out of every three LAC people that emigrated did so to this country, while from 2008 to 2009, one out of four did so. This is largely due to the decrease in the emigration flows from the Andean region and the Southern Cone, of 8 per cent and 24 per cent, respectively (Loc. cit.). In contrast, in the Caribbean and Central America, there was an increase between these periods, of 27 per cent and 9 per cent, respectively.

---

11 In general, the administrative records are made and the figures are compiled by migration directorates or institutes that mostly depend on Ministries of the Interior. These records are used for measuring the flows starting from the entry and exit of people, even though there are very few countries that record the exits. Their strength lies in that they allow controlling short-term movements when they are well implemented. In contrast, censuses and home surveys measure and identify some of the sociodemographic characteristics of the people residing in a home, community or country for a determined amount of time. They are also good for controlling long-term movements, for example, between periods of 5 or 10 years. Up to a certain point, censuses and counts permit identifying the number of irregular migrants in countries of destination.
## Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>Spain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antigua and Barbuda</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bahamas</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbados</td>
<td>730</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuba</td>
<td>28,150</td>
<td>700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominican Republic</td>
<td>30,050</td>
<td>12,360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grenada</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guyana</td>
<td>7,550</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haiti</td>
<td>18,280</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamaica</td>
<td>18,090</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint Kitts and Nevis</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint Lucia</td>
<td>820</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint Vincent and the Grenadines</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suriname</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinidad and Tobago</td>
<td>6,350</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caribbean</td>
<td>113,710</td>
<td>19,640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belize</td>
<td>930</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costa Rica</td>
<td>2,190</td>
<td>340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Salvador</td>
<td>26,460</td>
<td>880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guatemala</td>
<td>18,440</td>
<td>680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honduras</td>
<td>6,600</td>
<td>4,170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>154,970</td>
<td>4,950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicaragua</td>
<td>3,850</td>
<td>1,650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panama</td>
<td>1,750</td>
<td>410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central America</td>
<td>215,190</td>
<td>13,060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolivia</td>
<td>2,390</td>
<td>4,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>27,150</td>
<td>26,980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecuador</td>
<td>11,410</td>
<td>31,360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>15,260</td>
<td>20,040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venezuela</td>
<td>8,380</td>
<td>11,780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andean Region</td>
<td>64,740</td>
<td>137,520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>5,600</td>
<td>23,460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>13,150</td>
<td>23,440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>2,110</td>
<td>8,110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paraguay</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>14,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uruguay</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td>8,760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Cone</td>
<td>22,420</td>
<td>77,970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total by country/region of destination</td>
<td>416,060</td>
<td>248,190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage distribution by the country/region of destination</td>
<td>53 %</td>
<td>32 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The cases of Bolivia and Ecuador are largely those that explain the general decrease of emigration to the EU: from 2003 to 2007, they were the countries of origin with the highest flows to Spain. The flow decreased from 2008 to 2009. The Bolivian case is noteworthy, in which the annual average between periods decreased 69 per cent, while the decrease was 4 per cent in the Ecuadorian case. In particular, the decrease in emigration to Spain from the two countries decreased 75 per cent and 11 per cent, respectively. Despite the general decrease, in some countries emigration to the EU-OECD increased between periods. For example, in the cases of Colombia, Ecuador and Venezuela, the annual averages between periods increased 17 per cent, 16 per cent and 3 per cent, respectively.

In the case of countries in the Southern Cone, all of the countries except for Paraguay recorded a rate of decrease between the two periods: Argentina (31%), Brazil (29%), Chile (15%) and Uruguay (40%). In the cases of Argentina, Chile and Uruguay, the rate of decrease of emigration to Spain between the two periods was more than the average, which was 17 per cent, that is 44 per cent, 32 per cent and 55 per cent respectively.

As regards immigration flows in the LAC region, Argentina and Chile are the principal countries of destination (OAS, 2011). Argentina is the country which registered more temporary and permanent entries from 2006 to 2009, with around 600,000 entries, 210,000 of which were recorded in 2009; 59 per cent of the entries were temporary and 41 per cent were permanent (Loc. cit.). In the cases of Argentina and Chile, it was noted that there was a decrease in the influx of 5 per cent and 20 per cent, respectively, in 2008.

### Table 5

**Labour and student migration in the Americas, selected countries 2006–2007 and 2008–2009, annual averages**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country of destination</th>
<th>Labour migration</th>
<th>Study/Training</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Permanent</td>
<td>Temporary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2006 2007</td>
<td>2008 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>19,100</td>
<td>31,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>32,400</td>
<td>36,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecuador</td>
<td>20,150</td>
<td>22,550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>72,100</td>
<td>70,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uruguay</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>2,150</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


*Note:* To see how each category is structured, consult the OAS report.
Table 5 shows the influxes to the countries and their principal motivation, whether movement due to labour or study and/or training. It is noted that in Chile, Colombia and Ecuador, the entries for studying or professional training from 2008 to 2009 fluctuated around 2,000 permits, double the amount in Argentina. In the five South American countries on which information is presented, all of the migration categories recorded growth from 2008–2009 in comparison with 2006–2007.

As regards irregular flows, it should be pointed out that measuring them is not an easy task, largely because there are many ways to become an irregular migrant. For example, many migrants become irregulars because they migrated without a visa or because they exceeded the period of time provided by the visa obtained in the country of destination. However, the cases of people whose residence permit was revoked, people whose request for asylum was rejected or *ex lege* changes from regular to irregular status must also be considered (Kraler and Reichel, 2011). Also, the irregular status can be, as migration can also be, a strategy for responding to or facing economic and social problems, and to a certain point, is a consequence of strict visa policies (Herrera-Lasso and Artola, 2011).

The most troubling cases of irregular migrants are those in which people leave their country without a permit or visa that permits them to freely travel. The most paradigmatic case in the region is that of migrants, primarily Central Americans, who want to go the United States. Civil organizations and the Ombudsman in Mexico calculate that since 2009, around 20,000 migrants are kidnapped every year (CNDH 2009, CNDH 2011). The condition of vulnerability increases depending on whether they are women, girls or boys.

Some of the region’s countries have reformed their legal frameworks and have implemented programmes with the objective of decreasing vulnerability. The cases of Costa Rica and Mexico, countries that published new migration laws, are in the first category and Argentina is in the second category. The latter has carried out an important regularization programme since 2007 known as *Patria Grande*. From 2007 to 2009, approximately 215,000 people were regularized, a number that represents 12 per cent of the total number of foreigners residing in that country (OAS, 2011; INEC, 2010). The main people who benefitted were from Paraguay, Bolivia and Peru (OAS, 2011). Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Ecuador, Mexico and Paraguay also have similar programmes. Of these, the Chilean case stands out, as the Chilean government received 49,000 requests from 2007 to 2008 (Loc. cit.; Texido, 2012).

---

12 This refers to changes that do not go through a legislative process but are part of the decisions exclusive to the Executive Power.

13 For more information on this and other programmes implemented in Argentina, as well as more detailed information for the Argentinean, Brazilian, Colombian and Mexican cases, see Chiarello, L., 2011, Las políticas públicas sobre migraciones y la sociedad civil en América Latina. Los casos de Argentina, Brasil, Colombia y México. Scalabrini International Migration Network, New York.
2.4. Migration and development in Latin America and the Caribbean

In the last fifteen years, a general consensus on the importance of migration and its link with development has been established, both in countries of origin and destination. In the beginning, the link between migration and development was commonly understood as regards “the three R’s”: recruitment, remittances and return (Nyberg-Sorensen et al., 2002). In ideal terms, “once recruited, migrants will save sufficient capital which they will send to their families, and they will develop certain skills abroad that may be productively used in the countries of origin once they return.” (Ibid:15) However, the evidence shows

Dialogue box 1

Possible effects of migration on development

Possible positive effects of migration on development:
• Global economic efficiency increases.
• Migration is positive for people, specifically when the countries of destination offer opportunities that do not exist in the countries of origin.
• A flow of remittances and an exchange rate that benefits the individuals and the receiving countries.
• Unemployment is reduced in some sectors of the economy in the countries of origin.
• Diasporas bring new technology and capital.
• Trade between the states of origin and destination is boosted.
• The possibility of emigrating can stimulate investment in education and human capital.
• The philanthropic activities of the diasporas contribute to community development and decrease the impact of natural disasters.

Possible negative effects of migration on development:
• Loss of skilled workers and decrease of the quality of essential services.
• Reduction of economic growth and productivity given the decrease in the number of skilled people in the labour market.
• Less returns on investment of the state in public education.
• Selective migration can cause greater disparities in the countries of origin.
• The country of origin loses tax revenues.
• Creation of an economy based on remittances and dependence of the receivers, a problem that is exacerbated when the remittances decrease over time.
• Potential inflation of the remittances, particularly in the real estate sector.

that this process is often not completed: the individuals who develop their skills abroad are a minority primarily composed of people who already have a high level of education.

Farrant et al. (2006:8) show some of the positive and negative impacts of this link (Dialogue box 1). Note that the majority of the effects are understood from an economic and market perspective. However, this perception neglects key elements for individuals, such as human rights for example. For this reason, it is important to understand the link between migration and development from a broader perspective and to include the element of human rights. One way to do so is by following the recommendations that have come from the Global Forum on Migration and Development in the last three years and/or the proposals of the IOM (2010b, 2011b) which stand out due to their comprehensiveness. Based on a framework of human rights, the latter proposes including the migration topic of migrants and their families in the countries’ development strategies, specifically, though not exclusively, in the following agendas: legal protection, employment, social protection, health services, education, tertiary education and skill building, economic growth, financial services, trade, agricultural and rural development, infrastructure and the environment.

I) Migration of individuals with high levels of education in Latin America and the Caribbean

The brain drain or brain gain, specifically from skilled migration, has been the reason for discussion in primarily European and African countries. One of the most representative cases is that of nurses and doctors born in Caribbean and African countries who work in the United States and Europe, particularly in the United Kingdom. According to Pellegrino (2008), “high-skilled” migration from LAC went from the United States to Europe after 2004. Normally migration circuits form between European countries and their ex-colonies.

One of the factors that explains “high-skilled” migration from LAC is the exponential increase in the number of students who at least earned a degree, which went from 260,000 in 1950 to around 9 million in 2000, added to the difficulty of finding a job in line with their professional characteristics (Barrere et al., 2004). The authors put particular emphasis on the unemployment rates of highly skilled people in LAC and point out that in the best of the cases, these individuals perform activities for which they are overqualified.

On the other hand, it draws attention that the population born in a Latin American country is that which records the lowest levels of education in OECD member countries. According to OECD (2008), 54 per cent of Latin American immigrants have primary education, 32 per cent have secondary education and only 14 per cent have a tertiary level of education. The highest records occur in North America, where 43 per cent of

14 The other regions are North Africa, Sub-Saharan Africa, Oceania, North America, EU-15 (prior to the 2004 expansion), EU-10 (countries that were incorporated in 2004) and other European countries.
emigrants from this region have tertiary education and 38 per cent have secondary education.

The fact that the stay of migrants from Latin American (LA) countries in OECD countries is less than the average and is only higher than those who come from sub-Saharan Africa stands out. The length of stay of individuals from LA is the following: 22 per cent of individuals from LA have a stay of 0 to 5 years, 17 per cent between 5 and 10 years, and 61 per cent of 10 years or more (Loc. cit.). The figures permit identifying that the lower the level of education, the less time the person resides in the country of destination. For example, only 58 per cent of the individuals that have primarily education stay in the country of destination for ten years or more in contrast with 68 per cent of individuals with tertiary education.

The Caribbean is the subregion where skilled emigration occurs more, as shown by the rates of emigration of people with high levels of education from this region. According to Bhargava et al. (2010), six out the 10 countries with higher rates of emigration of individuals with tertiary education are in the Caribbean and one is in South America. These countries are Guyana, where 89 per cent of the persons residing abroad have high levels of education; Granada, Jamaica and Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, where the percentage is 85 per cent each; Haiti with 84 per cent; Trinidad and Tobago with 79 per cent; Saint Kitts and Nevis with 78 per cent; and Saint Lucia with 71 per cent. There are also five Caribbean countries where at least 6 out of 10 emigrants have tertiary education: Antigua and Barbuda (67%), Belize (65%), Dominica (64%), Barbados (63%) and the Bahamas (61%).

There is the belief that “high-skilled” emigration over the long term can become an element that helps to boost the development of societies of origin through the transnationalization of social capital and economic and social remittances (Thomas-Hope, 2002). However, the evidence shows that emigrants with high levels of education make up a small portion of the Diaspora and that their skills and knowledge are not always useful for contributing to the development of their countries of origin (Orozco and Jewers, 2010). In contrast, the emigration of highly skilled people can have a negative impact on the quality of life of people residing in the countries of origin. A remarkable case is that of people who work in the health sector, for example in Jamaica and Saint Lucia (Mortley, 2009). Nevertheless, given that it is complicated to evaluate the specific impact of high-skilled migration, as explained by the IOM (2010b), it is important to perform assessments by country and at the sub-national and local levels to identify the impacts on migrants and their families.

II) Remittance flows in Latin America and the Caribbean and between countries in Latin America and the Caribbean

Monetary remittances are generally considered as one of the benefits of migration for development of the people, families and countries that receive them. However, several nuances must be noted. Today there is the generalized opinion that remittances help
families to decrease poverty (Adams and Page, 2005; Andersen and Christensen, 2009; Ratha, 2009). This flow facilitates access to some basic services such as the health and/or school system and permits responding to personal needs such as housing improvements: lavatories, roof and cement floor, among others. However, there is very little evidence that remittances, including those channelled through group initiatives, are a factor that starts or creates economic development in the countries of origin. In the few cases in which this happens, it is largely because the community is supported technically and administratively by third parties such as state agencies or civil organizations (Hudson Institute, 2011; Corvino, 2011).15

Remittances in LAC are an important source of income for hundreds of thousands of people and greatly exceed the levels of official development assistance (Ratha et al., 2011). From 2006 to 2008, the monetary flow that fell within the concept of monetary remittances in the countries of the region was more than 59,000 million dollars (CELADE, 2010). In 2006, the flow was 59,000 million; in 2007, it was 63,000 million and in 2008, it was 64,000 million (Ratha, 2011). In 2009, when the impact of the economic and financial crisis was experienced in the United States and the countries of the European Union, the flow decreased to 57,000 million, showing a decrease of 12 per cent in regards to 2008.

In comparative terms, LAC was the region in the world where the flow of remittances was most affected since the economic crisis, primarily due to the negative impact on the participation of emigrants in the labour market of the United States and Spain, and also due to the relevance of remittances in the Gross Domestic Product (GDP) of some Central American and Caribbean countries (CRNU, 2010). In 2008, 71 per cent of Hispanic migrants residing in the United States declared having sent less money to their families in the countries of origin as compared to the previous year (IOM, 2009). Also, it is calculated that between 50,000 and 100,000 homes stopped receiving income in this way and it was estimated that approximately 4 million people in LAC received less money from their relatives abroad as compared to 2008 (Orozco, 2009). In Guatemala, for example, 37 per cent of homes received less income in 2009 for this reason, as compared to 2008 (UNICEF, 2010). In Jamaica, it was estimated that the decline of remittances would impact people’s spending power in such a way that poverty levels would increase from 15 per cent to 21 per cent (Loc. cit.).

In 2010, the flow of remittances remained around 57,000 million, the same amount as for 2009. It is expected that between 2011 and 2014, the flow of remittances entering

---

15 On the topic of remittances, there are also what is known as social remittances. This concept was coined by Levitt, who defines them as “the ideas, practices, behaviour, identities and social capital that flow from the countries of destination to the countries of origin” (1998:927). All of this is strongly linked to the life or experiences that people have before emigrating and largely influences what they do in the countries of destination and what they later bring to their localities of origin (Levitt and Lamba-Nieves, 2009). Despite their relevance, the quantitative nature of this report limits going in depth on the analysis on these flows. Nonetheless, it would be worth doing so in another study.
LAC countries may grow gradually (Table 6). It is noteworthy that the percentage from 2008 and up to 2010 fluctuates between 13 per cent and 14 per cent of the total flow of remittances worldwide.

### Table 6

**Flows of remittances entering regions made up of developing countries, 2008–2014**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>East Asia and the Pacific</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia and Central Europe</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin America and the Caribbean</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle East and North Africa</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Asia</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Saharan Africa</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worldwide total</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>429</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>483</td>
<td>514</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>593</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of LAC with respect to the worldwide total</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


*Note:* The letter e stands for “estimate” and the letter f stands for “forecast”. The quantities are expressed in billions of dollars.

In 2010, according to Ratha et al. (2011), the principal receiving countries of remittances in LAC were (in billions of dollars) Mexico (22.6), Brazil (4.3), Guatemala (4.3), Colombia (3.9) and El Salvador (3.6). In other words, out of every 10 dollars that came into LAC countries, four were received by people from these five countries. However, the order changes when the numbers are analysed in relative terms (measured as a percentage of the GDP): a fact that shows the importance of remittances as a source of income in some of the region’s countries. In this way, the cases of Honduras (19%), Guyana (17%), El Salvador (16%), Haiti (15%), Jamaica (14%), Nicaragua (10%), Guatemala (10%), Granada (9%), the Dominican Republic (7%), Bolivia (6%) and Belize (6%) stand out.  

All of these countries are above the average in LAC, which fluctuates around 5.6 per cent of the GDP.

Even though the majority of these monetary resources flow from the United States, a significant portion comes from EU countries – as will be seen later – and even countries in the LAC region. In 2010, the interregional remittances flow was 4.57 million dollars, 7.8 per cent of the total flows that came into the countries of the region. Even though this figure is small in absolute and percentage terms, its importance is not, specifically

---

16 Percentage with regards to the GDP of each country.
in cases such as Colombia, Nicaragua or Paraguay, whose emigrants primarily reside in another LAC country such as Venezuela, Costa Rica and Argentina, respectively.

According to the WB (2011c), the principal LAC countries from where remittances are sent are (in millions dollars) Venezuela (1,160), Argentina (805), Costa Rica (333), Ecuador (303) and Chile (273). Sixty-three per cent of the total that is sent from one LAC country to another flows from these countries. The principal receiving countries are (in millions dollars) Colombia (1,327), Brazil (465), Peru (425), Paraguay (343) and Bolivia (301), which receive 66 per cent of the remittances sent from other countries in the region when added up. These numbers show that the monetary flows are highly concentrated (Table 7), as also occurs with the stock of people.

Comparing the countries that make up the principal migration corridors (Table 3) with the remittance flows (Table 7), many coincidences are observed. For example, the Principal corridors of remittances between countries in the LAC region, 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country of origin of the monetary remittance</th>
<th>Country of destination of the monetary remittance</th>
<th>Total quantity going from the country of origin to the country of destination</th>
<th>Percentage with regards to the total interregional remittances in LAC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Venezuela</td>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>971</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>Paraguay</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>Bolivia</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costa Rica</td>
<td>Nicaragua</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecuador</td>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paraguay</td>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominican Rep.</td>
<td>Haiti</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rest of the 1,521 corridors of remittances</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,361</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total 40 Countries</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,579</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Note: The quantities are expressed in millions of dollars.

The WB presents information on 40 LAC countries: Antigua and Barbuda, Netherlands Antilles, Argentina, Aruba, Bahamas, Barbados, Belize, Bermuda, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Dominica, Ecuador, El Salvador, Grenada, Guatemala, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Cayman Islands, Turks and Caicos, U.S. Virgin Islands, Jamaica, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Puerto Rico, the Dominican Republic, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Suriname, Trinidad and Tobago, Uruguay and Venezuela.
principal migration corridor in LAC, formed by Colombia and Venezuela, also appears in Table 7 as the region’s main corridor of monetary remittances. The same occurs in the case of Argentina as a country of destination for people from Paraguay and Bolivia, as well as the main country of origin of monetary remittances to the latter countries. The same occurs in the cases of Costa Rica and Nicaragua, Ecuador and Colombia, and the Dominican Republic and Haiti. The only case that stands out for appearing in the monetary remittances flow but not as one of the principal migration corridors is Paraguay as a country of origin of remittances to Brazil. Finally, it is worth pointing out that, as some research shows, the remittances are not sufficient for compensating the negative impacts that migration has, specifically that of people with high levels of education, on the human development of the societies of origin (Mishra, 2005; Nurse and Jones, 2009).

2.5. Women and migration in Latin America and the Caribbean

According to the United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs (UN-DESA) (2009), women represent 49 per cent of people residing in a country different from the one they were born in, a trend that has continued since 1990. The highest rate of women immigrants is in Europe (52%) and Oceania (51%) while in LAC and North America, the distribution between men and women is practically equal (50%). The lowest percentages of women are in Asia and Oceania (45%) and in Africa (47%). Figure 6 permits observing the change that has been recorded in the number of women immigrants residing in LAC countries. It is noted that the percentage of migrant women in LAC has remained stable since 1990, and the greatest number of women is observed in the South American region, specifically as of 1995. The countries where more foreign women than men reside are Barbados (58%), the Bahamas (55%) and Netherlands Antilles (55%) in the Caribbean; Guatemala (57%) and El Salvador (53%) in Central America; and Uruguay (54%), Argentina (52%) and Ecuador (51%) in South America.

18 There is information available on 46 countries: Anguilla, Antigua and Barbuda, Netherlands Antilles, Argentina, Aruba, Bahamas, Barbados, Belize, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Dominica, Ecuador, El Salvador, Grenada, Guadeloupe, Guatemala, Guyana, French Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Cayman Islands, Falkland Islands, Turks and Caicos Islands, British Virgin Islands, U.S. Virgin Islands, Jamaica, Martinique, Mexico, Montserrat, Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Puerto Rico, the Dominican Republic, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Suriname, Trinidad and Tobago, Uruguay and Venezuela.
As regards interregional flows in LAC, it was in the 1980s that a predominance of female migration began to appear (Bettin, 2011). One factor that pushes women to migrate, in addition to the economic factor, is gender inequality in the countries of origin, since some women may see migration as a way to be free from patriarchal ties, discriminatory power relationships or violence within their families (Anderson, 2007; INSTRAW, 2007; Pessar, 2005; Piscitelli, 2008). On some occasions, female migration can be seen as facilitated by the matriarchal structures in the countries of origin (Massey et al., 2006) and there is information that the networks of migrant women in the countries of destination are relevant as a factor of attraction of female migration (Richter and Taylor, 2007). However, migration does not always bring about deep transformations in the gender roles and relations since women can suffer high levels of discrimination in the countries of destination (Magliano, 2007).

The trend of feminization of the interregional flows continues in some South American countries such as Peru and Paraguay, for example. The flows from Peru are predominantly made up of women that move to Argentina, Chile and other European countries such as Spain and Italy. In Argentina, Paraguayan and Peruvian women show a certain tendency to migrate independently and receive support from the networks of women in the country of destination (Cerrutti, 2009). On the other hand, Ecuadorian women tend to migrate with their husbands or relatives (Loc. cit.).
The sector of personal and domestic services is an important source of employment for women in Argentina, Chile and Mexico, as occurs in some European countries (Pessar, 2005). This can be explained up to a certain point by the income of Argentinean, Chilean and Mexican women in productive sectors of the economy. Also, Argentina represents a popular destination due to the initiatives started for guaranteeing universal access to health and education services without taking into account the nationality of the people.

In general, women tend to be concentrated in “low-skilled” jobs characterized by precarious labour conditions, low wages and no social security (Cerrutti, 2009). On some occasions, a concentration of migrant women in certain sectors of the economy is verified, as in the case of Paraguayan women in Argentina, where a significant group of them work as seamstresses. Finally, it is important to emphasize that women can be more vulnerable to suffering labour abuses or can also be victims of the crime of human trafficking.19

The trafficking of women and even girls is a central topic, particularly in some of the countries of the region. For example, in southern Mexico, Nicaragua, Costa Rica and the area that forms the shared border between Brazil, Paraguay and Argentina. Also, it has been identified that there are networks for human trafficking for the purpose of sexual exploitation that recruit women and children to later smuggle and traffic them into Argentina, Brazil, Bolivia, Spain and Italy. Countries such as Brazil, Colombia, the Dominican Republic, Suriname and Venezuela are considered to be the principal countries of origin of victims of human trafficking in Europe (Ribando, 2005). Germany, Spain, the Netherlands and Portugal are the EU countries with the greatest number of victims from LAC (Loc. cit.).

It is calculated that 11 per cent of the sex workers residing in the EU come from LAC (TAMPEP, 2009). The same study also estimates that the principal countries of origin of sex workers from LAC are Brazil, Colombia and Ecuador. In Western Europe, the percentage of women from LAC that work in this industry is doubled, and reaches maximum levels in Portugal (65%) and Spain (49%) (Loc. cit.).

As regards the link between gender and remittances, some studies (García Domínguez, 2007; IOM, 2008a) note a general tendency of women to earn less money but to send a larger proportion of their salary as compared to men. It is estimated that women send 30 per cent of their income, compared to the 10 per cent that men send (IOM, 2008b). The remittances sent by women are primarily used for the education of their

19 Nevertheless, there are cases of men and children who are also victims of human trafficking. For example, they can suffer in terms of labour exploitation or be forced to work as beggars in the streets. See the International Organization for Migration (IOM), 2008a, Exploratory study on the trafficking of people for the purposes of sexual exploitation in Argentina, Chile and Uruguay. Serapis, Rosario.
children, for accessing health services and, on occasion, for starting productive projects (García Domínguez, 2007; IOM, 2008b). There is even information that indicates that the expense that is channelled to the education of their children is greater in families in which there are no migrant women and they are the ones who manage these resources (Pfeiffer and Taylor, 2007).

In the countries of origin, women tend to have a fundamental role in the administration of remittances. Both women and men tend to send money directly to women because they are the ones who are in charge of taking care of the family in the countries of origin (García Domínguez, 2007; IOM, 2008a). Furthermore, women can be the first beneficiaries of remittances invested in community services since they are normally the first users of these services (IOM, 2008a; Pessar, 2005). This is a fundamental topic to keep in mind when there is the intention to work with migrant associations and/or strengthen their group initiatives in order to boost social and economic development of the localities of origin of the migrants.20

---

20 To identify proposals in this respect, see Agunias, D. and K. Newland, 2012, Developing a Road Map for Engaging Diasporas in Development. A Handbook for Policymakers and Practitioners in Home and Host Countries, IOM, Migration Policy Institute, Geneva, Washington, D.C.
MIGRATORY ROUTES AND DYNAMICS BETWEEN LATIN AMERICAN AND CARIBBEAN (LAC) COUNTRIES AND BETWEEN LAC AND THE EUROPEAN UNION
3. Migrants from Latin America and the Caribbean in and to the European Union at the beginning of the twenty-first century

3.1. Individuals from Latin America and the Caribbean residing in European Union countries

In 2010, just over 4.29 million people from LAC resided in the 27 countries of the EU, a very similar number to the stock of inter-regional migrants in LAC (4.085 million) (WB, 2011a). In absolute terms, the principal countries of origin of Latin American and Caribbean migrants residing in the EU are Ecuador, Colombia, Brazil, Argentina, Peru and Bolivia (Table 8). In total, just over 2.56 million migrants come from these countries, that is, 6 out of 10 people from LAC reside in the EU.

In relative terms, the cases of Suriname and the Netherlands Antilles stand out, where 9 out of 10 of their emigrants reside in EU countries, with a specific concentration in the Netherlands. Ecuador (6 out of 10 emigrants reside in the EU); Argentina, Bolivia and Venezuela (4 out of 10 in each) and Brazil, Uruguay and Peru (3 out of 10 in each) follow them. In the list of countries that are not in Table 13 but have a percentage representative of the population residing in the EU are Barbados, Saint Kitts and Nevis and Saint Lucia, the ratio of which is also 3 out of 10. The ratio is 2 out of 10 for five countries: Antigua and Barbuda, Dominica, Grenada, Cayman Islands and the Bahamas.

The principal countries of destination of emigrants from LAC are Spain (2.616 million), the United Kingdom (424,000), Italy (358,000), the Netherlands (335,000) and France (156,000). If these numbers are added together, it can be noticed that 9 out of 10 migrants from Latin American and Caribbean countries residing in the EU are in these five European countries. This very high level of concentration is not even observed in the case of interregional migration in LAC or in that of European migrants residing in LAC. Therefore, it is not surprising that of the 15 principal circuits of migration, 10 of them are in Spain, where 6 out of 10 Latin American and Caribbean migrants that settle in Europe reside.
### Principal countries of origin of LAC individuals residing in the EU, 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country of origin</th>
<th>Total number of people from that country residing in an EU country</th>
<th>Percentage in regards to the total of LAC migrants residing in the EU</th>
<th>Percentage in regards to the total of people from that country residing abroad</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ecuador</td>
<td>632,252</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>485,859</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>443,806</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>388,947</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>317,922</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolivia</td>
<td>293,241</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venezuela</td>
<td>222,548</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suriname</td>
<td>188,945</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominican Rep.</td>
<td>173,831</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamaica</td>
<td>163,240</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>154,418</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuba</td>
<td>145,890</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uruguay</td>
<td>111,020</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands Antilles</td>
<td>92,260</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>90,917</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paraguay</td>
<td>83,457</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rest of the 28 LAC countries</td>
<td>306,526</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4,295,078</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


**Note:** Detailed information is presented for countries whose percentage in regards to the total of emigrants in EU countries is greater than 2 per cent of the total of LAC individuals residing in EU countries.
The fact that three out of four people are concentrated in 20 migration corridors is noteworthy (Figure 7). Of these, Spain appears in 12 followed by Italy, the Netherlands and the United Kingdom (2) and Portugal and France (1). The 10 principal migration corridors in absolute terms are (in thousands of people) Ecuador-Spain (519), Colombia-Spain (375), Argentina-Spain (331), Bolivia-Spain (274), Suriname-the Netherlands (187), Peru-Spain (184), Venezuela-Spain (164), Brazil-Spain (162), Jamaica-the United Kingdom (158) and the Dominican Republic-Spain (130).

The presented figures permit preliminarily outlining some conclusions. First, the fact that the total population from a LAC country residing in the EU represents 9 per cent of the total immigrant population residing in the 27 countries of the European Union stands out. The highest percentages are in Spain, where nearly 4 out of 10 immigrants come from LAC countries, the Netherlands, where the figure is 2 out of 10 and in Portugal, where it is 1 out of 10. In Italy, the United Kingdom and Sweden, the ratio of people from LAC with regards to the total of migrants is less than 1 out of 10 immigrants (0.8, 0.6 and 0.6, respectively).
The literature identifies four principal historical phases of migration to Spain from LAC: 
a) from 1960 to 1991 when the flows mostly came from Argentina, Chile and Uruguay and were generally motivated by political reasons; b) from 1992 to 1999 when the flows were mostly led by Peruvian and Dominican women; c) from 2000 to 2005 when the flows mostly left from Ecuador and Colombia and d) from 2005 to 2010 when people, largely women, mainly came from Bolivia, Brazil and Paraguay (López de Lera and Oso Casas, 2007; Martínez Pizarro, 2011). Today, the principal countries of origin of South American immigrants in Spain are Ecuador, Colombia, Argentina, Bolivia and Peru, whose migrants represent 64 per cent of the total of those from LAC in this European country.

In the case of the Netherlands, the flows date from the 1970s and mostly come from territories that were Netherland colonies centuries ago, that is, from Caribbean countries, specifically Suriname and the Netherlands Antilles. Since 2007 however, in the flows of immigration to the Netherlands there have also been individuals from South America, although recorded to a much lesser extent (OECD, 2011). In 2009, 45 per cent of immigration from LAC (17,000 people) aimed to reunite with family while only 13 per cent (5,000 people) went for work (Loc. cit.).

The case of Portugal also stands out because there is a high concentration of people with Brazilian nationality in the flow: two out of three immigrants from LAC residing in this peninsular country come from this ex-colony. Even though a large proportion of Brazilians arrived starting in the 1980s, the flow of Brazilians still continues. Evidence of this is that in 2009, 2 out of 10 visas issued by the Portuguese government were allocated for Brazilians – out of a total of 16,000 issued to students, workers and others for reuniting with family – (Loc. cit.). In the same year, the Portuguese government issued 61,400 residence permits, of which 4 out of 10 were allocated for Brazilians (Loc. cit.). Individuals from Cape Verde, Romania, Ukraine and China followed this flow with significantly lower figures, where the ratio is less than 1 out of 10 (Loc. cit.).

In the Italian case, which is important due to the absolute numbers of migrants from LAC, the presence of people from Ecuador, Peru and Brazil stands out since two out of three immigrants from LAC in Italy come from these three countries. In Italy, Latin American migration is mostly directed to metropolitan areas and is concentrated in three districts: Rome, Milan and Genoa (Palmas and Ambrosini, 2007). It is immigration focused on working in care and domestic services on the one hand, and on the other, that gets involved in activities that permit the metropolitan economy to function: construction, cleaning, small transports and bus services (Ambrosini and Abbatecola, 2005). Also, and specifically in Milan, Latin American migrants, mostly people from Peru, have started to show up in statistically significant numbers in the area of self employment (Palmas and Ambrosini, 2007).
3.2. Migration flows from Latin America and the Caribbean to the European Union

Immigration flows to the European Union from all regions of the world grew gradually from 1998 to 2007 with the exception of 2005 (Figure 8). A decrease was recorded starting in 2008, which was consolidated in 2009. The historical high in immigration flows was recorded in 2007 when 4 million people entered EU countries. From 1998 to 2007, the annual growth rate of the flow was 9 per cent, with 2002–2003 being the time period that recorded the highest growth rate (24%) followed by 2006–2007 (14%). In contrast, a decrease of 5 per cent was recorded in 2008 with regards to the flow in 2007. This decrease was established in 2009 when a decline of 34 per cent in comparison with 2008 was recorded.

Figure 8

People who arrived in the EU from 1998 to 2000, total flow and flow of LAC individuals


Note: These numbers are estimates made from the available information at EUROSTAT and are only indicative. They are not total figures because there are countries for which information is not presented in some years. To see more information on the methodology, consult the Methodological Considerations attached to this study.
A similar trend is observed in the flows from LAC, although with more extreme rates (positive and negative). In particular, a 205 per cent increase in the flows in 2000 as compared to 1999 stands out. In 2000, around 200,000 people from LAC entered the EU. Another significant increase was in 2006 when nearly 400,000 individuals arrived in the European Union. Since then, there has been an exponential decrease: from 21 per cent in 2008 and 20 per cent in 2009 (for both cases in comparison with the previous year) in such a way that for 2009, just over 229,000 entries were recorded, a similar number to that of 2000. Finally, despite the increases and decreases, it is striking that the proportion of people from LAC in the total flow of people who entered the EU has remained constant over the last ten years: between 9 per cent and 11 per cent.

For 2008 and 2009, it is possible to break down the information on flows by gender for some of the EU countries that received more people from LAC, such as Spain and Italy. For example, this permits identifying that 55 per cent of the people who arrived from LAC during both years were women (Table 9). It also permits identifying that the percentage of women from LAC is above the average composed of all nationalities: 56 per cent compared to 43 per cent, respectively. The percentage of women in flows from the three subregions of the Americas is the following: Central America (63%), Caribbean (58%) and South America (54%).

### Table 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subregion of origin</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Total flow</th>
<th>Percentage of women in regards to the total flow</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Central America</td>
<td>24,904</td>
<td>39,743</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caribbean</td>
<td>39,834</td>
<td>68,467</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South America</td>
<td>243,407</td>
<td>446,813</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total LAC</td>
<td>308,145</td>
<td>555,023</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total influx to the EU</td>
<td>2,700,803</td>
<td>6,325,505</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


*Note:* These figures are estimates made from the available information at EUROSTAT and are only indicative. They are not total figures because there are countries for which information is not presented in some years. To see more information on the methodology, consult the Methodological Considerations attached to this study.
There is a trend towards the feminization of migration from LAC to the EU, particularly of the flows motivated by economic reasons. Women are often pioneers of the migration processes and flows. First, there were women from the Dominican Republic and Peru followed by individuals from Ecuador and Colombia and in the last five years, women born in Bolivia and Paraguay (Oso Casas, 2007). A large part of the migrant women from LAC in the EU enter the labour sector of services to people, especially in Spain and Italy (Gil and Domingo, 2007; Oso Casas, 2007). Feminization of the flows and concentration in domestic labour are characteristics in the national groups of recent migration (Cerrutti, 2009; Oso Casa, 2007).

Today, the largest female flows in terms of percentage come from Central American countries. This shows that, as South American women were pioneers in the migration flows a few years ago, Central American women are now the pioneers. Despite the general decrease in the number of permits granted in 2009 compared to 2008, several Central American countries recorded an increase, largely due to permits granted to women. This increase was in people with Costa Rican, Salvadoran, Guatemalan, Honduran and Nicaraguan nationality. The same occurred with people from Haiti and Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, as well as with those from Bolivia and Paraguay in South America.

The high representation of women in the flows from LAC and in the sector of services to people leads to a series of questions and the obligation to think about public policies that are sensitive to women and gender, as well as about a greater need to have information on their migration experiences, the insecurity of women in the labour market, forms of settlement in regards to care, the changes in their processes of self identification and gender relations, among others (Yépez and Herrera, 2007).

### 3.3. Irregular migration from Latin America and the Caribbean to the European Union

During the period between 2008 and 2010, just over 1.67 million people were detained in EU countries for having irregular status (EUROSTAT, 2011b). Analysing the data, it is possible to identify a downward trend since 2008, the year in which the largest number of people were detained: 608,870. In 2009, the number went down 8 per cent upon recording 563,995 people detained and in 2010, it went down again 10 per cent when 505,140 people were detained.

In the period between 2008 and 2010, just over 198,000 people born in a LAC country were detected as having irregular status and detained. This number represents 12 per cent of the total of individuals detained during the mentioned period. The countries where more migrants from LAC were found with an irregular status were Spain (124,990),
Portugal (30,195) and the United Kingdom (15,940). The migrants in these three countries represent 85 per cent of the total of migrants detained in the three-year period. In the rest of the countries, the absolute number did not exceed 10,000 migrants detained. The majority of irregular migrants come from Brazil (65,845), Bolivia (41,170) and Paraguay (15,900) which, together, represent 60 per cent of the total. In this sense, the largest circuits of migration are: Bolivia-Spain (38,675), Brazil-Portugal (29,705) and Brazil-Spain (19,810).

As of 2008, it is also possible to identify a decrease in the flows of irregular migrants from LAC. That year, 80,600 people were detained. In 2009, there was a decrease of 19 per cent since the number of people detained was 65,200. The downward trend (of 20%) continued in 2010, when 52,235 people were detained. The decrease of irregular migration from LAC can also be analysed in terms of percentage in regards to the total numbers. In 2008, 13 per cent of the irregular migrants came from LAC while in 2010, the percentage decreased to 10 per cent.

This decrease is largely explained by a decrease in the flows from the two principal countries of origin of detained, irregular migrants: Brazil and Bolivia. In the first case, the number of detained migrants decreased 130 per cent from 2008 to 2010 while in the Bolivian case, the rate of decrease was 97 per cent. As can be seen in Figure 9, one out of two irregular Brazilian migrants detected in this three-year period were detained in 2008. In regards to Bolivians, 4 out of 10 were detained. In both cases, only 2 out of 10 migrants were detained in 2010. In contrast, the countries that recorded an increase in terms of irregular detained migrants during these three years are Honduras, the Dominican Republic, Colombia and Ecuador.
Migrants detained due to their irregular status, by country of origin, from 2008 to 2010


Note: These numbers are estimates made from the available information at EUROSTAT and are only indicative. They are not total figures because there are countries for which information is not presented in some years. To see more information on the methodology, consult the Methodological Considerations attached to this study.
3.4. Migrants from Latin America and the Caribbean who acquired citizenship from a European Union country

In the period between 1998 and 2009, just over 8.13 million people obtained citizenship from an EU country (EUROSTAT, 2011a). Out of the people mentioned above, only 575,592 were born in a LAC country, a number that represents 7 per cent of the total. Table 10 shows the variations in this time period. It can be observed that in the case of citizens from LAC, there is sustained and gradual growth year after year from 1998 to 2009, the year in which the absolute numbers decreased for the first time. The opposite happened with the total numbers of the EU where there is not a clear trend: there was an increase from 1998 to 2000 followed by a decrease from 2001 to 2003, another increase from 2004 to 2006 only to decrease again in 2007 and finally, increase from 2008 to 2009.

Table 10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>People from third countries who acquired citizenship from an EU country</th>
<th>Citizens from LAC who acquired citizenship from an EU country</th>
<th>Percentage of LAC individuals in regards to the total number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total people</td>
<td>Annual change (people)</td>
<td>Annual change (percentage)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>528,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>579,700</td>
<td>51,700</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>693,900</td>
<td>114,200</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>663,300</td>
<td>-30,600</td>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>662,500</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>651,873</td>
<td>-10,627</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>719,090</td>
<td>67,217</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>723,611</td>
<td>4,521</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>735,928</td>
<td>12,317</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>697,276</td>
<td>-38,652</td>
<td>-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>698,850</td>
<td>1,574</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>776,073</td>
<td>77,223</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8,130,101</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Note: These numbers are estimates made from the available information at EUROSTAT and are only indicative. They are not total figures because there are countries for which information is not presented in some years. To see more information on the methodology, consult the Methodological Considerations attached to this study.
The countries that granted the greatest number of citizenships to people from LAC are Spain (351,323), the United Kingdom (60,161), France (35,635), Germany (28,337), Italy (25,805) and the Netherlands (23,860). These six countries granted 9 out of 10 European passports received by LAC citizens. In percentage terms, the cases of Spain and Portugal stand out since in the former, 72 per cent of people who acquired citizenship during this period were from LAC (351,323 people) and in the latter, the percentage is 21 per cent (14,492 people).

The majority of new European citizens (three out of four) come from South American countries. Of those countries, Ecuador (123,000), Colombia (100,000), Peru (51,000), Argentina (44,000) and Brazil (42,000) stand out. Other important cases in terms of absolute numbers are the Dominican Republic (40,000), Cuba (33,000), Jamaica (28,000) and Haiti (12,000), all of which are located in the Caribbean (Figure 10). The cases of Ecuador and Colombia stand out, as they are countries that have been increasing in importance in relative terms, just as in the cases of Peru and Cuba.

The Ecuadorian case stands out above the rest: 2 out of 10 LAC individuals that received a European passport were citizens from this Andean country. Individuals from Colombia recorded a similar percentage. In the cases of Peru and Argentina, the proportion is nearly 1 out of 10. In other words, 6 out of 10 citizenships granted were granted to individuals from these four countries.

In the acquisition of citizenship, linguistic and post-colonial ties are particularly strong. At least 63 per cent of the individuals from the four countries mentioned in the previous paragraph that received a European passport received it from Spain. The highest percentage is Ecuador, where 92 per cent of the people received this citizenship. The other European countries that granted citizenship to nationals from these four South American countries were the United Kingdom and Italy. In contrast, individuals from Brazil, Jamaica and Haiti stand out for having obtained citizenship from another European country with which they share language and colonial history. In the Brazilian case, 28 per cent of the people received Portuguese nationality followed by Spanish (18%) and German (16%) nationality. On the other hand, 87 per cent of Jamaicans received British nationality and 91 per cent of Haitians received French nationality.
3.5. Return migration to Latin America and the Caribbean

The return is the last phase of the migration process even though not all individuals who emigrate return to their countries of origin. Return migration has multiple explanations, as does emigration. Some individuals return to their countries for family reasons, others because they met their goal of saving abroad and others because they did not find the economic and social opportunities for developing as desired in the country of destination, among other similar reasons. However, the positive impact of return on individuals
and communities depends on many factors among which the following are included:
a) preparation of the migrant; b) facilitation of access to information on how to organize a business by national, regional and local governments; c) the presence of economic and institutional support to increase economic capital and enhance the skills of returning migrants; d) the existence of psychological support; and e) the creation of alliances between various sectors for supporting a person from a comprehensive perspective (Bloch, 2005; Ghosh, 2000; King and Strachan, 1980; McKinley, 2008; Nair, 1999).

The European economic crisis created simultaneous processes regarding return migration to LAC. On the one hand, contrary to what came to be thought in some countries, there was not a massive return of migrants to their countries of origin. In other words, individuals generally decided to wait for the situation to improve in receiving countries. On the other hand, some countries developed initiatives to encourage migrants to return, specifically those who were unemployed. In Europe, countries such as Spain and the Czech Republic started to implement new voluntary return programmes that were complemented by the already existing ones with the support of the IOM.

One of the main objectives of these programmes is to remove pressure from the labour market, given the high levels of unemployment in the native population. In November 2008, Spain approved the Advance Payment of Benefits to Foreigners Programme (APRE). This was directed at unemployed immigrants, who would have decided to capitalize on the unemployment benefits to which they had a right and return to their countries of origin (IOM, 2012). The individuals had to have a regular status in Spain and the nationality of a country with which Spain had a social security bilateral agreement, that is, Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Ecuador, Paraguay, Peru and the Dominican Republic in LAC (IOM, 2010c). 21 Once the request is approved, the unemployment benefits would be given in two payments: 40 per cent in Spain and 60 per cent upon arriving in their country of origin. In return, the individuals benefitted by this programme should promise not to return to Spain during the three years following receipt of the first payment.

During the first year, 8,724 requested to join the programme, only 10 per cent of the potential beneficiary population (Loc. cit.). 91 per cent of the individuals that requested to join the programme had nationality from a LAC country. The following cases stand out: Ecuador with 3,839 individuals from this country (44%), Colombia with 1,570 (18%), Argentina with 846 (10%), Peru with 750 (9%), Brazil with 462 (5%), Chile with 358 (4%) and Uruguay with 314 (4%) (Loc. cit.). For July 2010, the figure had doubled and just over 16,000 people were benefitted with 4,000 indirect beneficiaries (OECD, 2011). The most representative nationalities continued being Ecuadorian, Colombian, Argentinean and Peruvian.

21 The other countries with which Spain has an agreement of this kind do not belong to LAC.
These programmes are complemented with those that the IOM implements in 166 of the world’s countries, primarily the Assisted Voluntary Return Programme (IOM, 2011a). The returns handled by IOM worldwide went from 20,000 in 2008 to just over 34,000 in 2010 (Loc. cit.). Nevertheless, EU countries such as Spain, Portugal and Ireland had recorded higher rates of unemployment. They experienced small increases from 2008 to 2009 in the number of returns and 3,297 individuals took part in this programme in Spain in 2009 (CELADE, 2010; IOM, 2010a). In this same country, the majority of individuals who took part in this programme from 2003 to 2009, a period in which nearly 10,000 people were repatriated through the programme, were from LAC, with the cases of Bolivia (22%), Argentina (15%) and Brazil (10%) (IOM, 2010c) standing out.

There are some factors that can explain the reasons why the majority of migrants decided to stay in the country of destination during the crisis. First, entering the countries regularly and irregularly is currently more complicated each time due to the measures of border security and the visa policies that are stricter each time. Both factors have contributed to breaking the traditional circularity of the circuits of migration. Another important factor is the migration status. When an individual has regularized his/her stay, it is complicated for him/her to desire to return to the country of origin, especially when there are family or emotional ties in the country of destination. Finally, there is anecdotal evidence which permits identifying that, as a consequence of the economic crisis in Spain, many migrants could be going to other European countries such as the United Kingdom, for example (McIlwaine and Cock, 2011).

3.6. Monetary remittances sent from the European Union to Latin America and the Caribbean

The economic and financial crisis that started in the United States of America in 2007 and extended to the EU one year later negatively affected levels of employment, and consequently the remittance flows that migrants sent to their countries of origin. According to EUROSTAT (2011f), the flow of monetary remittances sent from the EU to other regions of the world increased from 16,000 million euros to 23,700 million euros between 2005 and 2008. Then a drop was recorded in 2009 (21,300 million euros). However, in 2010 there was a slight increase of 1.04 per cent, reaching 22,000 million euros.
The principal country of origin of the monetary remittances sent outside of the EU countries in 2010 was Spain, from which 23 per cent of the total flowed. Italy (21%), Germany (10%), France (9%) and the Netherlands (5%) follow Spain.\textsuperscript{22} The cases of Belgium, Portugal, Italy, France and Germany stand out because the majority of the remittances go to countries outside of the European continent: 88%, 85%, 81%, 72% and 67%, respectively.\textsuperscript{23}

These figures are according to the information presented by the WB (2011c) that refers to the monetary flows to countries in LAC (Map 3). In 2010, over 7 billion dollars, of which 4.424 million came from Spain, flowed from the EU. This means that 6 of every 10 dollars received in LAC countries from the EU-27 in 2010 came from Spain.

The other two important countries of origin of remittances are Italy and the United Kingdom; 782 million dollars and 696 million dollars flowed out of these countries, respectively. This means that 1 of every 10 dollars sent to LAC from the EU came from one of these two countries. If the flows created by France (298 million dollars), Germany (292 million dollars) and Portugal (216 million dollars) are added to this data, it is possible to conclude that 9.3 of every 10 dollars sent by Latin American and Caribbean migrants from the EU countries in 2010 came from these six countries.

The six main receiving countries of remittances in LAC in 2010 were Brazil, Ecuador, Colombia, Peru, the Dominican Republic and Bolivia, which received 8 of every 10 dollars from EU countries (Table 11). In absolute terms, the first two cases are noteworthy since each received 2 of every 10 dollars from EU countries. When the data is analysed in relative terms, other countries are included in the list. For example, Suriname, where 94 per cent of the remittances that entered the country came from the EU, specifically from the Netherlands in 2010. The cases of Ecuador and Bolivia are also representative because just over half of the remittances that entered the country this year came from the EU: 54 per cent and 51 per cent, respectively. Finally, there is a group of countries whose percentage is no less than 30 per cent. In descending order, they are: Argentina (43%), Venezuela (43%), Uruguay (34%), Brazil (33%), Saint Lucia (30%) and Peru (30%).

\textsuperscript{22} Even though the United Kingdom is one of the principal countries of the EU-27 from which there is a considerable flow of monetary remittances, the specific information on this country is not presented in the note from EUROSTAT.

\textsuperscript{23} In the case of Spain, it is not possible to identify what quantities and percentages of the remittances go to countries outside of the EU-27.
Map 3

EU countries and quantities of monetary remittances to LAC, 2010


Note: The figures are expressed in millions of dollars. For the six principal countries of origin of remittances to LAC, and in addition to the quantity, the percentage is presented in regards to the total flow of remittances that went from EU countries to LAC in 2010. Please note that due to design reasons the name of the countries on the map have not been translated and have been kept in the original language, Spanish.
### Table 11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country of destination of monetary remittances</th>
<th>Amount (billions of dollars)</th>
<th>Percentage in regards to total remittances that entered LAC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>1,390</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecuador</td>
<td>1,365</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>977</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>749</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolivia</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominican Rep.</td>
<td>535</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamaica</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honduras</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paraguay</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rest of the 29 LAC countries</td>
<td>501</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>7,095</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


**Note:** Detailed information is presented for countries whose percentage in regards to the total remittances that flowed to LAC is at least 2 per cent of the total.
4. LABOUR MIGRATION FROM LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN AND THE LABOUR MARKET IN THE EUROPEAN UNION

4.1. Residence permits granted to individuals from Latin America and the Caribbean

Individuals with non-EU nationality seeking to perform remunerated activities in an EU country normally enter it, when they do so regularly, with a residence permit. This category is made up of individuals who received a residence permit for the first time, whether for reuniting with family, for studying or for working, among others. The data contained in EUROSTAT (2011g)\textsuperscript{24} for this category also permits identifying a downward trend in the immigration flows to the EU as of 2008, both in the total number of permits granted for the first time and in those granted to individuals of a LAC country. From 2008 to 2010, the 27 countries granted just over 7.33 million permits. In 2008, over 2.53 million were granted; in 2009, around 2.33 million; and in 2010, just over 2.46 million.

The first residence permits are divided into four categories: a) for family reasons, b) to undertake some form of study, c) to perform remunerated activities and d) for other reasons (EUROSTAT, 2011g).\textsuperscript{24} Of the 7.335 million, the majority of the permits were granted to individuals who carried out a remunerated activity: 2.23 million (30%). The 2.09 million permits issued for family reasons (29%) are not far behind. Permits for other reasons and for studies follow these two categories with 1.55 million (21%) and 1.46 million (20%), respectively. As can be seen, there is not a category that stands out above the others.

In the same three-year period, 1.01 million permits were granted to LAC individuals (14% of the total). In contrast to what occurred with overall figures, which mark a decrease in

\textsuperscript{24} The category “other reasons” includes: humanitarian reasons different from refugee status, unaccompanied children and adolescents that are not asylum-seekers, victims of the crime of human trafficking and other categories that cannot be included in any category in the EUROSTAT catalogue. See “Appendix 2. Methodological Considerations” for more information.
2009 compared to 2008 and a slight increase in 2010 compared to 2009, but below the levels of 2008, there has been a gradual decrease since 2008 in the case of LAC individuals. This decrease is observed in absolute and relative terms. In 2008, 397,000 permits that represent 16 per cent of the total for that year were granted; in 2009, around 318,000 or 14 per cent of the total for that year; and 295,000 in 2010 or 12 per cent of the total for that year.

The countries that granted more permits to LAC individuals between 2008 and 2010 were Spain (495,468), Italy (189,548) and the United Kingdom (103,463). These three countries granted 8 out of 10 first permits to migrants from a Latin American and Caribbean country. The ratio is as follows: Spain granted 5 out of 10, Italy 2 out of 10 and the United Kingdom 1 out of 10. In relative terms, Spain, Ireland, Italy and Portugal stand out. Of every 10 permits given to each of the two countries of the Iberian Peninsula, 5 were given to LAC individuals. Ireland, where the ratio is 2 out of 10 and Italy, where the ratio is 1 out of 10, come after these countries.

On the other hand, the five principal countries of origin of LAC individuals are Brazil with 226,551 permits (22%), Colombia with 123,038 permits (12%), Peru with 109,342 (11%) and Ecuador with 108,917 (11%). Bolivia and the Dominican Republic (9% each) and Argentina and Mexico (5% each) come after them. Individuals with nationality from one of these eight countries represent 80 per cent of the total residence permits received by citizens of LAC in the three-year period. Bolivia was the only case that recorded an increase in the aforementioned three-year period, going from 27,551 permits in 2008 to just over 32,000 in 2009 and ending with 33,000 in 2010. In the case of Mexico, the trend was similar to that of the EU: a decrease was recorded in 2009 (14,000) as compared to 2008 (16,000) and a slight increase in 2010 (15,000) but below the levels in 2008.

The other six cases recorded a decrease as of 2008. The cases of Ecuador, Colombia and the Dominican Republic stand out, where the decrease was 54 per cent, 47 per cent and 38 per cent, respectively. In the case of Ecuador, the number of permits went from 53,000 in 2008 to 25,000 in 2010. In the case of Colombia, the permits went from 56,000 to 30,000 and in the case of the Dominican Republic, from 20,000 to 13,000. The majority of the permits were granted for family reasons (44%, 40% and 54%, respectively) and primarily to women.25 Gradual decreases in the cases of Dominica and Saint Lucia in the Caribbean, and Chile and Uruguay and Venezuela in South America, were also recorded.

25 In regards to mixed marriages in Spain, it is noted that in 2009, 67 per cent of foreign wives (11,678) and 46 per cent of foreign husbands (5,503) came from the Americas. The most common nationalities of Latin American wives were: Brazilian (2,446), Colombian (1,738) and Dominican (1,098). In the same year, 1,491 foreign wives arrived from Brazil (4%), 344 from Ecuador (2%) and 286 from Peru (2%) in Italy. The marriages between Peruvians represented 5 per cent of those celebrated between non-Italian couples, while the Ecuadorians represented 4 per cent (231).
In contrast, other countries that recorded a yearly increase, opposite the general trend and that of LAC countries, were Haiti and Saint Vincent and the Grenadines in the Caribbean and Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras and Nicaragua in Central America. All of these countries only represent 14 per cent of the total of permits granted from 2008 to 2010. In the case of Haiti, the majority of the permits were for family reasons, while in the case of Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, they were for other reasons. The majority of individuals from Central American countries received a permit to carry out remunerated activities, with the exception of Costa Rica whose citizens primarily received permits for studying.

Belgium, France and Austria are the only European countries that increased the number of permits granted to LAC individuals as of 2008. In contrast, the permits granted by the principal receiving countries of migrants decreased in the three-year period: Spain went from 217,000 permits granted in 2008 to 128,000 in 2010, and Portugal from 34,000 to 17,000. In the United Kingdom, the number of permits granted went from 36,000 in 2008 to 34,000 in 2009, and finally 32,000 in 2010. In the case of Ireland, there was a decrease in 2009 as compared to 2008 and an increase in 2010 to end with 5,000 permits. The case of Italy shows a similar trend: in 2008, just over 62,000 permits were issued; in 2009, a little less than 62,000 and in 2010, a little less than 65,000.

**Figure 11**

**Unemployment rate (in percentage) according to the country of residence, place of birth and gender, 2008**

![Unemployment rate graph]

*Source: OECD, 2008, A Profile of Immigrant Populations in the 21st Century: Data from OECD Countries. OECD, Paris, p. 120.*
4.2. Labour market, unemployment and migration in the European Union

The economic and financial crisis that extended to Europe in 2008 negatively affected the labour market of the principal countries of destination of migration from LAC, namely Spain, Portugal, Italy and the United Kingdom. The case of Spain stands out, where it is estimated that there were more than 4.2 million unemployed individuals in October 2011 – of which 591,000 were foreigners –, recording the highest level in the last fifteen years (Tremlett, 2011; América al Mundo, 2011). In general, migrants are employed in the sectors of the economy that have high flexibility, that is, they obtain jobs in sectors that are strongly affected in situations of crisis.

### Table 12

**Residence permits granted to citizens of LAC for performing remunerated activities, 2008–2010**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country of origin of individuals who obtained permits for performing remunerated activities</th>
<th>Number of permits for performing remunerated activities</th>
<th>Percentage in regards to the total of permits for performing remunerated activities</th>
<th>Percentage in regards to the total of permits granted to individuals, by country of origin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paraguay</td>
<td>15,540</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolivia</td>
<td>53,042</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Salvador</td>
<td>4,220</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honduras</td>
<td>5,139</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>54,658</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicaragua</td>
<td>2,499</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>16,141</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uruguay</td>
<td>4,053</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>67,250</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecuador</td>
<td>30,806</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>31,351</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guatemala</td>
<td>823</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rest of the 21 LAC countries</td>
<td>41,271</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>326,793</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


**Note:** These numbers are estimates made from available information in EUROSTAT and are only indicative. Detailed information is presented for countries whose percentage in regards to the total of permits granted to individuals by country of origin is more than 25 per cent.
Another important characteristic is that in general, the rate of unemployment between the migrant population is higher than that recorded for individuals born in the country of destination. For example, Figure 11 shows that the rate of unemployment is higher among the migrant population than among the natives in the principal countries of the EU where migrants from LAC reside. For example, in Spain in 2008, the rate of unemployment among men born in other countries was 15.2 per cent, compared to 10.2 per cent of Spanish men. In Portugal, the rates were higher both for foreign men and women while in Italy, the rate of unemployment was higher among women immigrants (18.4%) than among Italian women (14.6%). Generally, these inequalities are heightened in periods of crisis.

**Figure 12**

Migration corridors in terms of residence permits granted to citizens of LAC to perform remunerated activities (2008–2010)

---

*Source:* Elaboration by the author using information from EUROSTAT, 2011g, *First permits by reason and citizenship – annual data.*


*Note:* These numbers are estimates made from available information in EUROSTAT and are only indicative. Detailed information is presented for migration corridors that recorded a minimum of 5,000 permits granted from 2008 to 2010.
On the other hand, a significant proportion of immigrants are employed in activities for which they are overqualified. This trend is more pronounced in southern European countries such as Spain, Italy and Greece and in the north of the continent such as Sweden and Denmark (OECD, 2008). In these countries, the percentage of migrants with a job for which they are overqualified is at least double that recorded for individuals born in these European countries (Loc. cit.).

### 4.3. Residence permits for performing remunerated activities granted to individuals from Latin America and the Caribbean

The resident permits with authorization to carry out remunerated activities granted in the EU from 2008 to 2010 to LAC individuals were just over 326,000, a number that represents 15 per cent of the total (2,234 million). It is noteworthy that more permits were granted in 2008 than in 2010: 109,376 in the former compared to 104,527 in the latter. Analysing the information presented in Table 12, it is possible to identify that the highest proportion of permits were granted to Brazilians (12%), which confirms the general trend of permits granted to LAC individuals in all categories. The nationalities that followed in absolute terms were Peruvian (17%), Bolivian (16%), Colombian (10%) and Ecuadorian (9%).

However, the panorama changes when the numbers are analysed in relative terms. Firstly, there are the individuals from Paraguay, since 59 per cent of Paraguayans that received a permit for residing in a country in the EU did so for performing remunerated activities. The countries where the proportion of individuals who received a permit for carrying out labour activities was at least one out of two, in regards to the total of permits received for those nationalities are: Bolivia (57%), El Salvador (54%), Honduras (50%) and Peru (50%). The figure for Nicaraguans is slightly lower (45%). In the cases of Argentina, Uruguay, Brazil, Ecuador, Colombia and Guatemala, the proportion is at least one out of four migrants.

The data shows that the traditional flows from Andean countries that established circuits of migration starting in the 1990s have stopped being predominantly economic: today, migration from these countries is primarily due to family reasons, with the exception of Bolivia and Peru. The figures also show that today, the economic migration flows also include Central American countries. Finally, the figures permit identifying that Paraguay and Bolivia are the principal countries of origin of migrants for economic reasons that have gone to the EU in the last three or four years, especially to Spain. Furthermore,
these nationalities appear among the three largest in terms of people with irregular status detected in the EU in the same three-year period.

The principal European countries that issued permits for performing remunerated activities to individuals that are not from EU countries in the three-year period were: Italy with 867,808 permits (39%); the United Kingdom with 377,787 (17%); Spain with 284,242 (13%); and Poland with 116,626 (5%). However, the general trend contrasts with that of permits granted to LAC individuals, where 90 per cent were granted by primarily three countries: Spain (53%), Italy (26%) and Portugal (12%). Portugal and Spain are the most important cases in relative terms since the total of permits issued, 70 per cent and 61 per cent, respectively, were for citizens of LAC. Other countries such as Italy (10%), the Netherlands (8%) and Germany (7%) are well below these figures.

Seventy per cent of labour migration from LAC to the EU is concentrated in 11 migration corridors (Figure 12). The most important corridors are Bolivia-Spain with 44,953 people, Brazil-Portugal with 37,767 people and Peru-Italy with 35,496. Notably, the three principal corridors involve three different countries of origin and three countries of destination, an occurrence that is not common in other sections such as stock or flows. Spain is the country of destination for six of the other eight most important corridors (from Colombia, Peru, Ecuador, Argentina, Brazil and the Dominican Republic), and Italy is the country of destination for the other two (from Ecuador and Brazil).

4.4. Permits for performing remunerated activities by type of employment

The figures presented by EUROSTAT (2011g) also permit identifying the skill level of the individuals. The classification is divided into four categories: highly skilled workers, researchers, seasonal workers and others. The latter category is the largest, basically because it contains all of the activities of the economy that do not fall within the three previous categories.

In general terms, the number of permits granted slightly decreased from 2008 to 2009 but then increased from 2009 to 2010, reaching higher levels in comparison with 2008 (800,000 compared to 787,000). The same trend is observed in the case of permits for LAC individuals – a decrease in 2009 and an increase in 2010 – with the difference that the 2010 levels (104,000) were less than those of 2008 (109,000). Nonetheless, there were some countries that recorded a yearly increase in this three-year period such as Dominica (the Caribbean), Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras and Nicaragua (Central America) and Bolivia (Andean). It is also noted that 94 per cent of the 326,793 labour permits granted to individuals from 2008 to 2010 were destined for another
kind of remunerated activities. Only 3 per cent were permits for seasonal workers, 2 per cent for highly skilled individuals and 1 per cent for researchers.

The majority of permits for doing other kinds of activities were granted to citizens of Brazil (21%), Peru (17%) and Bolivia (17%). The permits were primarily granted by Spain (52%), Italy (27%) and Portugal (12%). The Brazilian case stands out because its population is spread out between Portugal, France, Spain and the United Kingdom; the opposite of what occurs with migrants from Bolivia and Peru who are concentrated in Spain and Italy, respectively.

Ninety-four per cent of the 10,447 seasonal permits granted to LAC individuals during these three years was granted by Spain. It is noteworthy that the figure was decreasing substantially, going from 5,849 permits in 2008 to 1,263 in 2010, with a 463 per cent decrease. The individuals who obtained these permits were primarily migrants from Colombia (50%), Ecuador (22%) and Peru (11%). The Peruvian case stands out because it was the only one whose migrants obtained more permits in Italy (158) than in Spain (87) in 2010.

Spain is also incorporated as the principal issuing country of permits for performing high-skilled activities, with 42 per cent of the total of permits granted to LAC individuals. The Netherlands (14%), the United Kingdom (12%) and France (8%) come after Spain. The principal countries of origin of individuals receiving this kind of permit were Brazil (29%), Mexico (16%) and Colombia (11%). The Brazilian case stands out for not having a specific concentration in any country in the EU: of the 1,926 permits received, 18 per cent were granted by Spain, 16 per cent by the Netherlands, 15 per cent by Portugal, 14 per cent by France and 11 per cent by the United Kingdom.

Finally, 2,400 permits were granted for doing research in the aforementioned three-year period. 43 per cent were issued by France, 24 per cent by Spain and 16 per cent by the Netherlands. The principal nationalities of individuals that received said permits are Brazilian (37%) and Mexican (20%), followed by Colombian (11%) and Argentinean (10%).

Individuals from Mexico and Surinam stand out due to their high concentration in the category of skilled workers: in the three-year period at hand, 23 per cent of the labour permits granted to Mexicans and 36 per cent of those granted to individuals from Suriname went to researchers and highly skilled workers. The case of Brazil is also notable because, in addition to having thousands of workers in low-skilled sectors, it is the country of origin of an important flow of highly skilled individuals.

26 EUROSAT does not break down the information for the “other permits” category since it is impossible to know the kind of specific activities carried out by the individuals included in this category.
Latin American migration in the United Kingdom

The case of migration from LAC to the United Kingdom differs up to a certain point with migration that goes primarily to Spain and the rest of Europe. As of the 1980s and for many years, the Caribbean countries that are part of the Commonwealth were the principal countries of origin of migration that arrived to the United Kingdom. For this reason, it is not surprising that the majority of the population residing in this country is not from Jamaica. Nonetheless, the first decade of the twenty-first century has brought an important change: each time, there are more people from South America migrating to this country. For example, in the last three years and as a result of the crisis, Latin American migrants have arrived to England from Spain.

The population from Latin America currently records a historical high in absolute terms. According to the report published by McIlwaine and Cock (2011), it is calculated that over 113,000 Latin American individuals reside in just London and suburban areas. The authors point out that Brazilians are the largest contingent and that, together with Bolivians, they have incorporated into the circuit of migration between Latin America and the United Kingdom in recent years. Individuals from Colombia are the second national group in absolute terms and, together with Ecuadorians, the best established group.

This report also points out that more than half of the LAC individuals are employed in low-skilled sectors such as cleaning and catering services, therefore obtaining low wages. The authors of this report also point out that 11 per cent have a salary lower than the minimum wage in the trade and that 40 per cent have suffered some kind of labour abuse or exploitation. It also draws attention that 33 per cent live in cramped quarters, and the same portion does not speak English. Finally, Latin Americans residing in London show a rate of unemployment that is much higher than that of the rest of the foreigners (85% compared to 55%).


4.5. Migrant workers from Latin America and the Caribbean in Spain

The Spanish case is important for this study because 6 out of 10 people born in a LAC country reside in this country. Today, immigrants represent 14 per cent of the individuals residing in Spain (UN-DESA, 2009; Transatlantic Trends, 2011). Some of the factors
that explain the reasons for which Spain became an immigration country, in addition to economic growth, are the demand for low-skilled labour; the establishment of highly segmented labour markets; growth of the informal economy; aging of the economically active Spanish population and the limited internal mobility of said population as well as its irregular distribution throughout the country (IOM, 2010c). In spite of the crisis, this country continues being the principal destination of the majority of low-skilled labour migration coming from LAC.

Between 1994 and 2007, this European country experienced constant economic growth. Together with Ireland, the highest rate of growth in regards to employment was recorded during these years, going from 12 million to just over 20 million jobs created in 2007 (Bernardi, et al., 2011). The majority of these jobs were recorded in low productivity sectors such as construction and consumer services. In both sectors, a large portion of the workers employed were migrants.

The 2008 crisis greatly affected the country, causing a drastic decrease in immigration flows and the worsening of living conditions of many immigrants. In December 2009, the unemployment rate for migrants was 30 per cent, while it was 17 per cent for the Spanish (IOM, 2010c). It is also calculated that 340,000 migrants lost their jobs in 2009 out of a total of 1.2 million jobs lost (OECD, 2011). At the end of that same year, nearly 1.1 million foreigners did not have a job (Loc. cit.).

As it is one of the most significant population groups, it is not surprising that many individuals of Latin American origin lost their jobs, an occurrence reflected by the number of people affiliated with the Social Security system. According to the figures of the Ministry of Employment and Social Security, nearly all of the principal nationalities from LAC recorded a decrease in the number of affiliations between January 2009 and October 2011. The most representative case is that of the Ecuadorians. In January 2009, there were a little less than 213,000 Ecuadorians affiliated, while in October 2011, there were 135,000, a decrease of 37 per cent. In the case of individuals from Colombia, the number of affiliations went from 128,728 to 97,178 in the same period, a decline of 25 per cent. In the cases of Peruvians and Argentineans, the decrease was 19 per cent and 18 per cent, ending in October 2011 with 40,945 and 14,939 individuals affiliated from each nationality, respectively.

It is noteworthy that the majority of the individuals affected were men. In fact, the percentage of affiliated women in regards to the total number of affiliated individuals of Argentinean, Colombian, Ecuadorian, Peruvian and Dominican nationality gradually grew from 2005 to 2009. The case of Bolivian women was that which showed the most increase, going from 56 per cent of the total of affiliations in 2005 to 64 per cent in 2009 (Pajares, 2010). This trend continued in 2010 and 2011.

In 2012, there were just over 652,000 individuals from LAC affiliated with Social Security, a number that represents 35 per cent of the total affiliated foreigners (Table 13). It is
noteworthy that 78 per cent of the affiliated individuals from LAC worked in the services sector. The other three sectors are well below this figure: 9 per cent in construction, 6 per cent in industry and 6 per cent in agriculture.

The fact that 42 per cent of the affiliated foreigners working in the services sector are from a LAC country is also notable. The case of Ecuadoreans is that which recorded the lowest percentage of LAC individuals in the services sector: 66 per cent. It is also the Latin American country of origin with more people working in the agricultural sector (24,513). Bolivia is a similar case, as 77 per cent of Bolivians work in the services sector and 9 per cent in the agricultural sector.

Table 13

Foreign workers affiliated with Social Security with active employment, according to the sector of activity, by nationalities, annual average, 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country of origin of affiliated individuals</th>
<th>Agricultural sector</th>
<th>Industrial sector</th>
<th>Construction sector</th>
<th>Services sector</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of affiliated individuals</td>
<td>% with respect to the country of origin</td>
<td>Number of affiliated individuals</td>
<td>% with respect to the country of origin</td>
<td>Number of affiliated individuals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>500 1 3,052 7 4,062 9 38,191 83 45,884</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolivia</td>
<td>7,281 9 3,125 4 7,614 10 59,246 77 77,443</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>554 2 1,363 5 2,192 9 20,620 83 24,786</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>6 1 56 7 34 4 667 87 765</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>207 2 948 7 1,423 10 11,056 81 13,653</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>3,684 3 7,088 6 9,030 8 92,014 82 112,050</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuba</td>
<td>431 2 1,224 6 1,245 6 18,080 86 21,025</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecuador</td>
<td>24,513 14 11,611 7 21,444 13 112,805 66 170,638</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>44 1 344 6 155 3 5,571 91 6,122</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>44 1 475 6 202 3 6,757 90 7,497</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>1,824 3 3,646 5 6,730 10 57,574 82 69,838</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominican Rep.</td>
<td>486 2 1,214 4 2,314 7 27,724 87 31,773</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uruguay</td>
<td>226 1 1,291 8 1,754 10 13,558 80 16,855</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venezuela</td>
<td>181 1 880 5 847 5 16,361 89 18,299</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rest of LAC</td>
<td>1,224 3 1,344 4 2,016 6 31,611 87 36,259</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total from LAC</td>
<td>- 37,681 - 61,062 - 511,834 - 652,887</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total affiliated individuals in Spain</td>
<td>266,406 - 135,554 - 203,220 - 1,232,482 - 1,840,827</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to Pajares (2010), the majority of affiliated individuals are between 25 and 54 years old. This trend is confirmed by the figures from 2009, a year in which the percentage of affiliated individuals in this age range did not go down from 83 per cent of the total for the cases of Argentina, Bolivia, Colombia, Ecuador, Peru and the Dominican Republic (Table 14). In particular, the cases of Bolivia, Brazil, Mexico and Nicaragua stand out, in which 9 out of 10 affiliated persons are between 25 and 54 years old.

Table 14
Women from LAC with active employment in Social Security according to nationality and age group, 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country of origin of affiliated individuals</th>
<th>From 16 to 19 years</th>
<th>From 20 to 24 years</th>
<th>From 25 to 29 years</th>
<th>From 30 to 34 years</th>
<th>From 35 to 39 years</th>
<th>From 40 to 44 years</th>
<th>From 45 to 49 years</th>
<th>From 50 to 54 years</th>
<th>From 55 to 59 years</th>
<th>60 years and over</th>
<th>Total by country of origin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>1,204</td>
<td>3,491</td>
<td>5,371</td>
<td>3,788</td>
<td>2,434</td>
<td>1,805</td>
<td>1,399</td>
<td>953</td>
<td>566</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolivia</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>3,581</td>
<td>9,983</td>
<td>10,809</td>
<td>7,528</td>
<td>5,466</td>
<td>3,770</td>
<td>2,157</td>
<td>846</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>1,123</td>
<td>3,409</td>
<td>3,724</td>
<td>2,717</td>
<td>1,767</td>
<td>1,021</td>
<td>581</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>442</td>
<td>920</td>
<td>1,247</td>
<td>1,013</td>
<td>781</td>
<td>716</td>
<td>516</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>603</td>
<td>4,766</td>
<td>10,330</td>
<td>12,899</td>
<td>11,124</td>
<td>9,874</td>
<td>7,460</td>
<td>4,515</td>
<td>2,282</td>
<td>1,060</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costa Rica</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuba</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>937</td>
<td>1,586</td>
<td>1,957</td>
<td>2,152</td>
<td>1,550</td>
<td>1,016</td>
<td>487</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecuador</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>7,348</td>
<td>18,623</td>
<td>21,348</td>
<td>17,628</td>
<td>13,282</td>
<td>9,656</td>
<td>5,690</td>
<td>2,875</td>
<td>1,369</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Salvador</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guatemala</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honduras</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>848</td>
<td>926</td>
<td>655</td>
<td>467</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>855</td>
<td>1,142</td>
<td>754</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicaragua</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panama</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paraguay</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>1,345</td>
<td>3,843</td>
<td>3,001</td>
<td>1,985</td>
<td>1,599</td>
<td>1,244</td>
<td>808</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>2,675</td>
<td>6,168</td>
<td>7,329</td>
<td>6,060</td>
<td>5,004</td>
<td>3,638</td>
<td>2,452</td>
<td>1,208</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominican Rep.</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>2,256</td>
<td>3,178</td>
<td>4,006</td>
<td>3,711</td>
<td>2,828</td>
<td>1,699</td>
<td>895</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uruguay</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>515</td>
<td>1,143</td>
<td>1,636</td>
<td>1,344</td>
<td>980</td>
<td>815</td>
<td>567</td>
<td>386</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venezuela</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>531</td>
<td>1,943</td>
<td>2,410</td>
<td>1,658</td>
<td>1,203</td>
<td>862</td>
<td>670</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other LAC countries</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total affiliated women from LAC</td>
<td>2,514</td>
<td>27,533</td>
<td>67,127</td>
<td>78,780</td>
<td>62,781</td>
<td>48,112</td>
<td>34,638</td>
<td>21,301</td>
<td>10,921</td>
<td>5,264</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total affiliated individuals from LAC</td>
<td>5,415</td>
<td>49,949</td>
<td>118,793</td>
<td>144,811</td>
<td>116,631</td>
<td>86,793</td>
<td>59,775</td>
<td>35,620</td>
<td>17,988</td>
<td>9,021</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total affiliated individuals in Spain</td>
<td>23,966</td>
<td>162,597</td>
<td>318,230</td>
<td>384,387</td>
<td>322,604</td>
<td>246,596</td>
<td>167,575</td>
<td>103,492</td>
<td>53,795</td>
<td>28,565</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Note: Detailed information is presented only for affiliated women from a LAC country up to December 2011, as this is the largest gender group.

27 With the information available in the Ministry of Employment and Social Security, it is not possible to identify the gender or the age groups of the affiliated individuals in 2010. This level of differentiation is shown up to 2009 and the figures are presented below.
The majority of affiliated individuals from a LAC country were women (56%, compared to 44% of men). This proportion is inverse to the existing one for the foreign population in general, that is, when all of the nationalities are considered (57% of men compared to 43% of women). The four age groups in which the difference is greater between LAC individuals are the following: a) between 55 and 59 years, b) between 50 and 54 years, c) between 29 and 45 years and d) between 25 and 29 years. In these categories, women represent 61 per cent, 60 per cent, 58 per cent and 57 per cent, respectively.

According to the figures from the Spanish Ministry of Employment, the majority of contracts obtained by people from Latin American countries are indefinite with the exception of the case of Bolivia: in 2009, 52 per cent of the contracts signed were temporary. The individuals with the most indefinite contracts are those from Argentina (59%), Ecuador (58%), Colombia and Peru (both with 56%) and the Dominican Republic (54%). As regards age groups, it is noted that three out of four temporary contracts are for individuals between 25 and 44 years old. Gender does not seem to have an influence on the contract received although men received slightly more temporary contracts than women.

In 2009, the majority of individuals affiliated with Social Security were affiliated with the General System.28 It is noteworthy that 71 per cent of the affiliated individuals from LAC worked in the services sector. The 462,093 LAC individuals affiliated with this system represent 39 per cent of the total of affiliated individuals (Table 15). Of the affiliated individuals from LAC, more men (234,577) than women (227,514) are recorded. Nonetheless, some Latin American nationalities have more affiliated women than men. Within these nationalities, the following stand out: Colombian in which there were 3,858 more women than men, Dominican with 2,407 more women, Ecuadorian with 2,131 more women and Brazilian with 1,781 more women.

---

28 Social Security in Spain is divided into to two systems: General and Special (Agriculture, Self-Employed Workers, Domestic Workers, Coal Mining, Seafarers and Civilian Officials).
### Table 15

Foreign workers with active employment in the General Social Security System by nationality, sector and section of economic activity, 2009

| Category | Industry | A | C | Others (B, D, E) | F | G | H | I | M | N | P | Q | Total |
|----------|----------|---|---|------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-----|-------|
| Argentina |          | 70 | 2,650 | 248 | 3,216 | 7,643 | 1,430 | 7,501 | 1,972 | 3,279 | 1,055 | 2,644 | 5,028 | 36,736 |
| Bolivia |          | 254 | 2,672 | 223 | 6,559 | 5,658 | 1,124 | 6,634 | 785 | 4,636 | 336 | 3,148 | 2,607 | 34,636 |
| Brazil |          | 68 | 1,203 | 69 | 1,751 | 2,727 | 497 | 5,023 | 640 | 1,531 | 386 | 858 | 2,332 | 17,085 |
| Chile |          | 61 | 861 | 85 | 1,381 | 2,010 | 480 | 2,207 | 509 | 1,163 | 328 | 701 | 1,328 | 11,114 |
| Colombia |          | 501 | 6,488 | 624 | 8,413 | 15,130 | 3,907 | 18,896 | 2,693 | 12,967 | 1,134 | 8,134 | 8,726 |
| Costa Rica |          | 4 | 17 | 2 | 16 | 43 | 12 | 66 | 40 | 23 | 19 | 27 | 88 | 357 |
| Cuba |          | 42 | 1,089 | 107 | 1,173 | 3,251 | 558 | 4,227 | 676 | 1,943 | 441 | 1,851 | 2,056 | 17,414 |
| Ecuador |          | 968 | 10,992 | 895 | 20,860 | 22,569 | 5,821 | 21,847 | 2,387 | 22,939 | 810 | 8,831 | 7,430 | 126,349 |
| El Salvador |          | 11 | 104 | 16 | 99 | 187 | 27 | 208 | 52 | 159 | 24 | 129 | 1,197 |
| Guatemala |          | 1 | 29 | 0 | 17 | 57 | 10 | 81 | 27 | 62 | 17 | 81 | 3,907 | 503 |
| Honduras |          | 57 | 322 | 15 | 293 | 598 | 89 | 752 | 86 | 470 | 43 | 313 | 251 | 3,289 |
| Mexico |          | 9 | 435 | 12 | 180 | 835 | 100 | 895 | 782 | 455 | 488 | 560 | 1,423 | 6,174 |
| Nicaragua |          | 25 | 58 | 11 | 88 | 173 | 24 | 244 | 32 | 145 | 20 | 158 | 91 | 1,069 |
| Panama |          | 1 | 26 | 1 | 31 | 72 | 15 | 54 | 36 | 45 | 21 | 54 | 79 | 435 |
| Paraguay |          | 83 | 561 | 37 | 1,190 | 1,759 | 321 | 2,789 | 229 | 1,166 | 87 | 684 | 893 | 9,799 |
| Peru |          | 205 | 3,417 | 335 | 6,415 | 8,717 | 2,393 | 11,217 | 1,812 | 10,598 | 489 | 6,312 | 5,021 | 56,931 |
| Dominican Rep. |          | 79 | 1,076 | 112 | 2,232 | 3,114 | 437 | 8,319 | 428 | 3,040 | 184 | 1,492 | 2,084 | 22,597 |
| Uruguay |          | 38 | 1,170 | 90 | 1,506 | 2,935 | 551 | 3,421 | 381 | 1,160 | 196 | 822 | 1,372 | 13,642 |
| Venezuela |          | 23 | 776 | 90 | 764 | 2,778 | 387 | 2,853 | 1,236 | 1,566 | 385 | 1,260 | 2,373 | 14,491 |
| Other LAC countries |          | 2 | 40 | 6 | 47 | 71 | 21 | 137 | 12 | 83 | 16 | 60 | 54 | 549 |
| Total LAC |          | 2,502 | 33,986 | 2,978 | 56,231 | 80,327 | 18,204 | 97,371 | 14,815 | 67,430 | 6,479 | 43,599 | 462,093 |
| % LAC in regards to the total |          | 23 % | 29 % | 32 % | 34 % | 45 % | 31 % | 41 % | 38 % | 51 % | 20 % | 62 % | 41 % | 39 % |
| Total General System |          | 11,106 | 115,556 | 9,390 | 163,808 | 203,110 | 58,520 | 239,478 | 40,597 | 132,650 | 32,817 | 61,366 | 106,668 | 1,175,066 |

**Source:** Elaboration by the author using information from the Ministry of Employment and Social Security, Spain, 2011b, Trabajadores extranjeros en alta laboral en el Régimen General de Seguridad Social según nacionalidad, sector y sección de actividad económica.


**Notes:** A: Agriculture, livestock production, forestry and fishing; C: Manufacturing industry; B: Extractive industries; D: Supply of electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning; E: Supply of water, sewage, waste and pollution management; F: Construction; G: Trade and repair of vehicles and motors; H: Transport and storage; I: Hotel/restaurant industry; M: Professional, scientific and technical activities; N: Administrative activities and support services; P: Education; Q: Human health and social services; J: Information and communications; K: Financial and insurance activities; L: Real estate activities; O: Public administration and defense, compulsory Social Security; R: Artistic, recreational and training activities; S: Other services; T: Domestic activities; U: Activities of extra-territorial organizations and bodies.
The majority of the just over 234,000 affiliated men that are from LAC is distributed in four sections of economic activity: 23 per cent in construction; 16 per cent in trade and repair of vehicles and motors; 16 per cent in the hotel/restaurant industry; and 10 per cent in administrative activities and support services. The construction sector stands out, where men represent 94 per cent of the affiliated workers who were born in a LAC country. The level of concentration is still greater in some sectors for women since 77 per cent of them work in four sections of activity: 26 per cent in the hotel/restaurant industry; 19 per cent in administrative activities and support services; 19 per cent in the trade and repair of vehicles and motors; and 13 per cent in health activities and social services.

Finally, it is noted that LAC individuals are those that stand out the most among foreign entrepreneurs. In 2009, 17 per cent of foreign individuals that had started a business were born in Argentina, 8 per cent in Colombia, the same in Peru, 7 per cent in Ecuador and 4 per cent in Venezuela and Uruguay, respectively (Romero León, 2011). These numbers add up to nearly half of the foreigners who started a business in that year. It should be noted that from 2005 to 2008, the proportion of individuals from these countries who started a business was more than 50 per cent of the total of foreign persons who did the same. This demonstrates the entrepreneurial calling of LAC individuals residing in Spain (Oso Casas and Varela, 2008). Oso Casas and Varela (Loc. cit.) also identified gender discrimination: women have more difficulties creating a business as compared to men.
MIGRATORY ROUTES AND DYNAMICS BETWEEN LATIN AMERICAN AND CARIBBEAN (LAC) COUNTRIES AND BETWEEN LAC AND THE EUROPEAN UNION
5.1. European migrants residing in Latin America and the Caribbean

Table 16

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country of origin of European migrants residing in a LAC country</th>
<th>Number of European migrants residing in LAC (stock)</th>
<th>Percentage in regards to the total of European migrants residing in LAC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>354,941</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>354,340</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>273,467</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>75,681</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>47,724</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>45,142</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Netherlands</td>
<td>27,830</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>26,875</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>8,928</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>7,751</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>6,656</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rest of the 16 countries in the EU</td>
<td>29,148</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total 27 Countries</td>
<td>1,258,481</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Note: Detailed information is presented for countries whose percentage in regards to the total immigrant population residing in LAC is at least 1 per cent.
Today, it is possible to affirm that the migratory dynamics between LAC and the EU continue to be established in both directions. According to the figures from the World Bank (2011a), around 1.25 million people from the EU-27 reside in LAC countries. The principal countries of origin of the EU are Spain, Italy and Portugal; nearly 8 out of 10 European immigrants in the Americas have one of these nationalities (Table 16). These same countries stand out in relative terms. In the first case, one out of four Spaniards residing abroad do so in a LAC country. In the case of Portugal and Italy, the rate is 1 out of 10. In all of the other cases, the rate is less than one. The nearly 1.26 million Europeans residing in a LAC country represent 18 per cent of the total immigrants residing in this region.

Table 17

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country of destination in LAC where European migrants reside</th>
<th>Number of European migrants residing in the country (stock)</th>
<th>Percentage in regards to the total European migrants residing in LAC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>374,275</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>361,551</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venezuela</td>
<td>189,729</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>64,941</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>49,368</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominican Republic</td>
<td>39,385</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uruguay</td>
<td>34,572</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecuador</td>
<td>34,559</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>13,684</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suriname</td>
<td>13,297</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rest of the 34 countries</td>
<td>83,121</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44 countries total</td>
<td>1,258,481</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Note: Detailed information is shown on the countries whose number of European migrants residing in the country exceeds 10,000 people.

29 The information is available for 44 countries (named in accordance with the information presented in the headquarters of the World Bank): Antigua and Barbuda, Netherlands Antilles, Argentina, Aruba, Barbados, Belize, Bermuda, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Dominica, Ecuador, El Salvador, Grenada, Guadeloupe, Guatemala, Guyana, French Guiana, Haiti, Honduras, Cayman Islands, Turks and Caicos Islands, Jamaica, the Bahamas, Martinique, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Puerto Rico, the Dominican Republic, Saint Barthelemy, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Suriname, Trinidad and Tobago, Uruguay and Venezuela.
The LAC countries in which the majority of these individuals reside are Brazil, Argentina, Venezuela and Mexico, where 8 out of 10 of these European migrants reside (Table 17). The cases of Argentina and Brazil stand out where one out of three immigrants from EU countries reside in each one.

The data from the World Bank does not permit breaking the information down by gender or age group of the migrants for 2010 – this degree of distinction is shown up to 2000. However, from the data presented by the National Institute of Statistics and Census (INDEC) in Argentina, it is possible to identify a clear trend in the evolution of the demographic characteristics of Europeans residing in this country after the 1970s.\(^{30}\) For example, the migrant stock from Italy and Spain, the main European countries of origin of migrants, came to be mostly made up of women in the 1970s and 1990s, respectively.

According to INDEC, nearly 300,000 foreign individuals reside in Argentina.\(^{31}\) Of these, around 147,000 are Italians and 94,000 are Spaniards, representing 49 per cent and 31 per cent of the total foreign population, respectively. In both cases, there are more women than men, and the fact that the majority of the population is at least 65 years old stands out. In the Italian population, this occurs in 7 out of 10 cases and in the Spanish population, in 2 out of 3 cases. In the Italian case, women are the majority in all of the age groups,\(^{32}\) while in the Spanish case, men are the majority only in the age group from 0 to 14 years old, a group that represents only 6 per cent of the total Spanish population residing in Argentina. This data is an important indicator since it shows that a large portion of the European population residing in the principal receiving country of migrants in LAC is at the age of benefitting from the Social Security programme. In the same manner, this data greatly contrasts when compared to the rest of the foreign population in the country, in which 8 out of 10 migrants are between 15 and 64 years old, that is, they are at the productive age.

\(^{30}\) Argentina and Brazil conducted a national census in 2010, from which it is possible to access certain preliminary results. However, in the Brazilian case, detailed information up to September 2012 can be accessed according to the information contained in the Brazilian Institute of Geography and Statistics (IBGE). See IBGE, 2011, Publishing Calendar. [http://censo2010.ibge.gov.br/en/calendario-de-divulgacao](http://censo2010.ibge.gov.br/en/calendario-de-divulgacao) (accessed 26 December 2011).

\(^{31}\) This number is slightly different than the one estimated by the WB (361,000 people). One of the reasons why this difference may exist is related to the way that the WB constructs its data and the questions asked in the 2010 Census survey in Argentina. For more information, see the “Methodological Considerations” section attached to this document.

\(^{32}\) INDEC shows three age groups that are catalogued in the following ranges: a) from 0 to 14 years old, b) from 15 to 65 years old and c) 65 years and older.
5.2. Flows of Europeans to Latin America and the Caribbean since the 2008 crisis

The economic and financial crisis that affected the EU and especially Spain and Portugal in 2008 has led to some individuals seeing LAC as an attractive region for developing their skills and improving their quality of life, just as has occurred in the past. This phenomenon is also related to the economic growth of the two principal countries of destination in the region, Argentina and Brazil, in comparison with the situation of the European countries.

In 2008 and 2009, around 107,000 exits of European citizens to reside in a LAC country were recorded (EUROSTAT, 2011d). Of these, 73 per cent of the flows had South America as their destination; 16 per cent, the Caribbean and 11 per cent, Central America. The most significant countries of origin were Spain (47,701), Germany (20,926), the Netherlands (17,168) and Italy (15,701). In 2008, nearly two out of three migrants to LAC were born in Spain and Germany.³³

There are similarities between the Spanish and Italian cases and differences between these two cases and Germany and the Netherlands, primarily, on the destination of the flows. For example, in 2008, the majority of the flow from Spain and Italy made its way to South America: 9 out of 10 Spaniards and Italians who emigrated to LAC went the Southern Cone countries. In contrast, in the case of Germany, the flows are a little less concentrated: 7 out of 10 went to the Southern Cone, 2 out of 10 to Central America and 1 out of 10 to the Caribbean. In the case of the Netherlands, 6 out of 10 moved to the Caribbean, 3 out of 10 to South America and 1 out of 10 to Central America. In 2009, these trends continued in the cases of Spain, Italy and the Netherlands.³⁴

There is certain information that permits identifying the new migration flow to LAC, specifically in the case of Spain and Portugal. In the first case, from June 2009 to November 2010, around 33,000 people emigrated to Argentina and around 6,000 emigrated to Uruguay and Chile (Hatton, 2011). Compared to the previous period, the percentage increase was 11 per cent, 16 per cent and 24 per cent, respectively. The flow also increased for a country without a tradition of immigration, Ecuador, where the emigration of people born in Spain grew 131 per cent from 2009–2010 compared to 2006–2008, going from 2,900 to 6,700 people (INEC, 2010). It is notable that a large

³³ It may be that some of these individuals were born in LAC countries and have a European passport. However, it is not possible to identify this data in the EUROSTAT databases.

³⁴ For the case of Germany, there is only information from 2008.
portion of these emigrants have degrees in the area of Social Sciences, specifically in Sociology, Anthropology and Administration (Adecco, 2010).

It has been identified that a significant amount of the individuals who emigrated to Argentina are men between 25 and 35 years old, single and without a family who have high levels of education and whose labour priorities are professional autonomy and the prospect of pursuing a career in a multinational company (Sánchez, 2010). Some of these individuals were born in Argentina and have Spanish nationality (Argentina.ar., 2011). Argentina also receives flows from Germany, Italy, France and the United Kingdom (Goni, 2011). More important is the fact that a significant amount of young European people that are arriving in Argentina are not being appropriately registered by national authorities because they arrive in Argentina with a tourist permit.

In the case of Portugal, exits to countries that were historically Portuguese colonies in Africa, such as Angola and Mozambique, have been recorded (Hatton, 2011). Nevertheless, there is also an important contingent that has emigrated to Brazil, taking advantage of the economic growth that this country has shown in the last lustrum, in contrast to what has occurred in Portugal, where the unemployment rate has reached double digits in the last two years (Phillips, 2011). The case of emigration to Brazil of specialists in civil and architectural engineering, sectors where there is strong demand due to the preparations for the Soccer World Cup and the Olympics that will be held in 2014 and 2016, respectively, especially stands out (Loc. cit.). Also, the recruiting agency Monster estimates that 56,000 French, 33,000 Italians and 32,000 Spaniards are looking for employment in this South American country (Rodrigues, 2012). Other data that gives an example of how Brazil has once more become a receiving country of European migrants is that during the migration regularization programme that the government implemented in 2009, around 2,400 Europeans regularized their stay (Phillips, et al., 2011).

It is noteworthy that this phenomenon is not only observed in the case of Argentinean, where it is calculated that a little over 100,000 people born in Argentina have Spanish nationality, but also in other LAC countries such as Ecuador, Colombia and Venezuela (OAS, 2011). It is calculated that 97,000 people born in Ecuador, 89,000 in Venezuela and 78,000 in Colombia now have Spanish citizenship.
5.3. Net migration balance of European Union countries

When the net migration balance (NMB) of each EU country is calculated, obtained from subtracting the number of emigrants from the total number of immigrants, it is observed that 13 countries have a negative NMB in regards to LAC. In other words, there are more people born in these countries that reside in LAC than Latin Americans and Caribbean persons residing in these 13 countries. These are Austria, Bulgaria, Estonia, Hungary, Ireland, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, Portugal, Czech Republic and Romania (Map 4).

The percentage of migrants from LAC residing in EU countries (9%) contrasts with the population born in the EU member countries that represent 18 per cent of the total immigrant population in LAC. In other words, nearly 1 out of 10 migrants residing in the EU were born in LAC, while 2 out of 10 immigrants residing in LAC were born in an EU country.

According to the figures from the WB, the ratio that is established is one migrant from the EU residing in LAC for every 3.4 migrants from LAC residing in the EU. However, if the five principal countries of destination and origin of migrants in the EU (Spain, the United Kingdom, the Netherlands, Italy and France) are removed from the equation, the ratio is nearly the same: one to one. In other words, for every migrant born in LAC residing in an EU country, there would be a European migrant residing in a LAC country. For this reason, it is not surprising that half of the EU countries have a negative NMB.
5.4. Countries in Latin America and the Caribbean as origin of monetary remittances to the European Union

According to the figures from the WB (2011c), LAC and the EU are regions that send and receive remittances, in general and between them. In 2010, a little over 4.59 million...
dollars flowed from LAC countries to the EU-27 in the form of monetary remittances. Spain, France, Portugal, Italy, Germany and Belgium are the principal European receiving countries of these flows (Table 18). The remittances these six countries received in 2010 represented 9 of every 10 dollars that came into the EU-27 countries from LAC. In 3 of the 27 European countries, the money from LAC represents at least 10 per cent of the total of remittances that come into them. These countries are Spain, where 1 of every 4 dollars comes from LAC, and Portugal and Italy, where 1 of every 10 dollars comes from LAC.

Table 18

Principal EU countries of destination of monetary remittances from LAC, 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country of destination of monetary remittances</th>
<th>Amount (billions of dollars)</th>
<th>Percentage in regards to the total remittances that entered the EU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>2,588</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rest of the 19 EU countries</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4,594</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Note: Detailed information is presented for countries whose percentage in regards to the total remittances that flowed to the EU is at least 2 per cent of the total.

In 2010, the principal countries of origin of monetary remittances from LAC were Argentina, Brazil, Venezuela, Mexico and Chile. Nearly 9 of every 10 dollars received by families in the EU came from eight of the region’s countries (Table 19). However, when the figures are analysed in relative terms, the panorama changes little since the Caribbean appears as a key remittance issuing country to EU countries. Such is the case of Cuba, where 88 per cent of the remittances that leave the country go to EU countries, and the same for Bermudas with 68 per cent, Suriname with 64 per cent and Saint Lucia with 50 per cent. Countries of the Southern Cone also appear on this list, such as Uruguay where 74 per cent of the remittances that leave the country go to the EU, Brazil with 63 per cent, Argentina with 59 per cent and Peru with 50 per cent. For example, this means that nearly 9 of every 10 dollars sent from Cuba goes to countries of the EU-27, as well as 3 of every 4 dollars sent from Uruguay, and so forth.
### Principal countries of origin of monetary remittances from LAC to the EU, 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country of origin of monetary remittances</th>
<th>Amount (billions of dollars)</th>
<th>Percentage in regards to the total remittances that flowed to the EU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>1,244</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>965</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venezuela</td>
<td>744</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominican Rep.</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecuador</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uruguay</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suriname</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rest of the 30 LAC countries</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,594</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


**Note:** Detailed information is presented for countries whose percentage in regards to the total remittances that flowed to the EU is at least 2 per cent of the total.

The figures presented in the last two tables show that the remittance flows that go from LAC to the EU-27 are concentrated in a few countries. For more clarity in this regard, Table 20 presents a cross between the six principal receiving countries in the EU and the seven principal issuing countries in LAC. In this table, it can be observed that the remittances from Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Ecuador, Mexico, the Dominican Republic and Venezuela represent at least 80 per cent of the total that flows to Spain, France, Portugal, Italy, Germany and Belgium. In absolute terms, the five most representative flows are (in millions of dollars) from Argentina to Spain (927), from Venezuela to Spain (551), from Brazil to Portugal (330), from Brazil to Spain (320) and from Mexico to Spain (223).

In relative terms, the flow of remittances from Brazil to Portugal exceeds the others, as 8 of every 10 dollars that enter Portugal come from this South American country. The other corridor that stands out is the one from Argentina to Italy, as nearly 6 of every 10 dollars that enter Italy as remittances come from Argentina. As can be observed, the percentage does not exceed 50 per cent in any other corridor.

Comparing the amounts that flow between the two regions, it is possible to conclude that for every 1.55 dollars that go from EU countries to LAC, 1 dollar goes in the opposite
direction, from LAC countries to the EU. Furthermore, it is noteworthy that 13 of the 27
countries of the EU (48%) receive more remittances than those sent to LAC, and that
in three of these cases (11%) the balance fluctuates around zero. The quantities are
significant, especially in the cases of Portugal, France and Belgium.

Table 20
Principal countries of origin of monetary remittances in LAC and principal
countries of destination in the EU, 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country of origin of remittances in LAC</th>
<th>Receiving country of remittances in the EU</th>
<th>Rest of the 21 countries in the EU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>France</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>927</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecuador</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominican Rep.</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venezuela</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rest of the 33 LAC countries</td>
<td>551</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total received by countries in the EU</td>
<td>2,588</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Total amount and percentage)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Note: Detailed information is presented for the six principal countries of destination in the EU of monetary remittances. The amounts are expressed in millions of dollars.

The 13 countries with a negative net balance of remittances are (in millions of dollars) Portugal (205), France (137), Belgium (116), Poland (64), Austria (32), Hungary (24), Romania (9), Czech Republic (6), Bulgaria (3), Slovenia (2), Lithuania (2), Slovakia (1) and Latvia (1). The three countries in which the balance fluctuates around zero are Estonia, Greece and Malta. This means that in only 40 per cent of the EU countries, the flow of monetary remittances that go to LAC is more than that received from LAC countries. Among these, Spain (1,836), the United Kingdom (636) and Italy (444) stand out. This is important data to take into account since it is normally thought that remittances Mostly flow from north to south. Although significant quantities are at hand in this case, what these figures show is that there is also a considerable amount of money that goes in the opposite direction, that is, from south to north.
The migration flows and migratory dynamics in and between countries in LAC and the EU are not new. Migration is a phenomenon caused by several variables and processes. The decision to emigrate is influenced by structural variables such as the wage difference between countries, intermediate level variables such as social networks and the information that flows through them, and variables that are related to the life of each one of the migrants and their families. The challenge for all of these actors is in identifying the specific weight of each one of the variables or factors that push people to migrate at a certain time and in a determined space.

LAC is a region with internal and external migration. Even though the majority of emigration is directed to countries outside of the region such as the United States and Europe, a significant part is directed to the countries of Central and South America: 57 per cent of the immigrants residing in LAC come from another country of the region. This data does not lack importance since one of the implications is that thousands of families receive monetary remittances from other LAC countries. The fact that important migration corridors between border-sharing countries have been established stands out, of which the largest is the corridor between Colombia and Venezuela (604,514 persons) followed by the one formed by Nicaragua and Costa Rica (373,548 persons) and by Paraguay and Argentina (307,510 persons).

Furthermore, 53 per cent of the interregional flow, which is 4.03 million people, is concentrated only in seven migration corridors out of a total of 1,892 possible corridors. The countries where interregional emigration represents the majority of emigration are Paraguay, where 68 per cent of the total emigrants reside in another LAC country; Nicaragua, whose percentage is 56 per cent; Chile and Uruguay each with 44 per cent; and Bolivia and Colombia each with 40 per cent.

For many centuries, LAC countries were receivers of European migrants, permitting them to find a better quality of life in their land. The levels of emigration were so high that it is estimated that during the Era of the Great Migration, which lasted from 1815 to 1914, between 22 and 26 million people migrated from Europe to the Americas. The process of emigration from north to south continued until the 1970s, when the trend started to greatly reverse because LAC went from being a region of destination to a region of origin of international migrants. However, it was in the last decade when Spain was established as the second country of destination of migrants from LAC – the United States has occupied the first position for half of a century –.

Today, around 4.29 million people from LAC reside in the 27 EU countries, a very similar number to the stock of interregional migrants in LAC (4.08 million). Conversely,
around 1.26 million people from one of the 27 countries of the EU reside in the 44 LAC countries. This means that for every European residing in LAC, there are 3.4 Latin Americans or Caribbean persons residing in the EU. The fact that the stock of people is highly concentrated in few countries also stands out. This is notable in the case of individuals from LAC that reside in the EU where 9 out of 10 people from LAC reside in only five countries: Spain, the United Kingdom, the Netherlands, Italy and France. Spain is the most representative case since 6 out of 10 people reside in this country. This also explains why a large part of literature dedicated to the population and the flows from LAC in and to the EU is focused on this European country.

However, if the five principal countries of destination and origin of migrants in the EU (Spain, the United Kingdom, the Netherlands, Italy and France) are removed from the equation, the ratio is nearly the same: one to one. In other words, for every migrant born in LAC residing in an EU country, there would be one European migrant residing in a LAC country. Therefore, it is not surprising that half of the EU countries have a negative net migration balance, which is obtained from subtracting the number of emigrants from the number of immigrants. In other words, there are more individuals born in these countries residing in LAC than Latin Americans and Caribbean persons residing in these 13 European countries. They are Austria, Bulgaria, Estonia, Hungary, Ireland, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, Portugal, Czech Republic and Romania.

These figures permit identifying that postcolonial ties are an important variable to be considered since the majority of the population from LAC residing in an EU country chooses the country that administered its territory of origin in the past. For example: migration from Andean countries and the Southern Cone chooses Spain and Jamaicans and Trinitarians, the United Kingdom. The same occurs with the Surinamese and people born in the Netherlands Antilles in the Netherlands and with the Haitians in France.

Another piece of data that stands out is that the population from a LAC country residing in the EU represents 9 per cent of the total immigrant population residing in the 27 countries of the European Union. On the other hand, the population born in the member countries of the EU represents 18 per cent of the total immigration population in LAC. In other words, nearly 1 out of 10 migrants residing in the EU were born in LAC, while 2 out of 10 immigrants residing in LAC were born in an EU country.

The principal countries of origin of Latin American and Caribbean migrants residing in the EU are Ecuador, Colombia, Brazil, Argentina, Peru and Bolivia. In total, just over 2.56 million migrants come from these countries, that is, 6 out of 10 people from LAC reside in the EU. The 10 principal migration corridors between LAC and the EU in absolute terms are (in thousands of people) as follows: Ecuador-Spain (519), Colombia-Spain (375), Argentina-Spain (331), Bolivia-Spain (274), Suriname-the Netherlands (187),
Peru-Spain (184), Venezuela-Spain (164) Brazil-Spain (162), Jamaica-United Kingdom (158) and the Dominican Republic-Spain (130).

As regards migration flows from LAC to the EU, it is possible to conclude that during nearly the entire first decade of 2000, migration from this region gradually increased. However, 2008 marked a turning point: the flows drastically decreased. This process can be explained by the economic crisis in the area and, primarily, in the principal receiving country of this flow (Spain). In particular, a 205 per cent increase in the flows in 2000 as compared to 1999 is noteworthy. In 2000, just over 200,000 people from LAC entered the EU. In 2006, a year in which almost 400,000 people arrived in the European Union, there was another significant increase. Since then, there has been an exponential drop: of 21 per cent in 2008 and 20 per cent in 2009, in regards to the previous year in both cases. This occurred in such a way that for 2009, just over 229,000 entries were recorded, a number similar to that of 2000. Despite the increases and decreases, the proportion of people from LAC in the total flow of people who entered the EU has remained constant over the last 10 years: between 9 per cent and 11 per cent.

It is also possible to identify this decrease in the flows from LAC by analysing the numbers of people detained due to their irregular status. From 2008 to 2010, just over 1.68 million people were detained. When the figures are broken down, it is possible to identify a downward trend since 2008, a year in which the largest number of people were detained: 608,870. In 2009, the number went down 8 per cent, recording 563,995 people detained and in 2010, it went down again by 10 per cent, with the detainment of 505,140 people. Starting in 2008, it is also possible to identify a decrease in the flows of irregular migrants from LAC. That year, 80,600 people were detained. In 2009, there was a decrease of 19 per cent as the number of people detained decreased to 65,200. In 2010, the downward trend continued, showing a decrease of 20 per cent with 52,235 people detained. The decrease of irregular migration from LAC can also be observed in terms of percentage in regards to the total numbers. In 2008, 13 per cent of irregular migrants came from LAC while in 2010, the percentage decreased nearly 10 per cent.

A decrease in the number of resident permits granted to people from LAC is also observed. From 2008 to 2011, 1.01 million permits were granted to people from LAC (14% of the total), showing a gradual decrease since 2008. This decrease is observed in absolute and relative terms. In 2008, 397,000 permits that represent 16 per cent of the total for that year were granted; in 2009, around 318,000 or 14 per cent of the total for that year; and 295,000 in 2010 or 12 per cent of the total for that year.

The countries that granted more permits to individuals from LAC between 2008 and 2010 were Spain (495,468 permits), Italy (189,548 permits) and the United Kingdom
These three countries granted 8 out of 10 first permits to migrants from a Latin American or Caribbean country. The four principal countries of origin of individuals from LAC in absolute terms are: Brazil with 226,551 permits (22%), Colombia with 123,038 permits (12%), Peru with 109,342 permits (11%) and Ecuador with 108,917 permits (11%). Bolivia and the Dominican Republic (9% each) and Argentina and Mexico (5% each) come after them. Individuals that have nationality from one of these seven countries represent 80 per cent of the total residence permits received by citizens of LAC in the aforementioned three-year period.

There were some countries that registered a yearly increase in the number of residence permits in the aforementioned three-year period, opposite the general trend and that of LAC countries. These countries are Haiti and Saint Vincent and the Grenadines in the Caribbean, and Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras and Nicaragua in Central America. Even though these countries only represent 4 per cent of the total of permits granted during these three years, they are countries that have been increasing their density in the flow. In the case of Haiti, the majority of the permits were for family reasons while in the case of Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, they were for other reasons. The majority of people from Central American countries received a permit to perform remunerated activities with the exception of Costa Rica, whose citizens primarily received permits for studying.

As regards the integration of LAC immigrants in the European labour market, two pieces of data stand out. First, in the most important receiving countries, the unemployment rate of immigrants is higher than that of the native population. For example, in Spain in 2008, the rate of unemployment among men born in other countries was 15.2 per cent, compared to 10.2 per cent of Spanish men. In Portugal, the rates were higher both for foreign men and women while in Italy, the rate of unemployment was higher among female immigrants (18.4%) than among Italian women (14.6%). Second, given that the majority of immigrants work in high flexibility sectors of the economy, they are strongly affected in a time of economic crisis.

The services sector is the principal sector of the economy in which individuals from LAC work. This is clearly reflected in Spain, a relevant case due to the number of people from LAC that reside and work in this country. In 2010, there were 652,000 individuals from LAC affiliated with Social Security, a number that represented 35 per cent of the total affiliated foreigners. Seventy-eight per cent of the affiliated individuals from LAC worked in the services sector. The other three sectors are well below this figure: 9 per cent in construction, 6 per cent in industry and 6 per cent in agriculture.

The majority of the just over 234,000 affiliated men that are from LAC is distributed in four sections of economic activity: 23 per cent in construction; 16 per cent in trade and
repair of vehicles and motors; 16% in the hotel and restaurant industry; and 10% in administrative activities and support services. Something similar happens with women, albeit with higher levels of concentration. The majority of the 227,514 women from LAC affiliated with Social Security worked in four sectors of activity: 26% in the hotel and restaurant industry; 19% in administrative activities and support services; 19 per cent in the trade and repair of vehicles and motors; and 13 per cent in health activities and social services. It is also noteworthy that just over half of LAC individuals have indefinite contracts. Nonetheless, if the figures are analysed according to age groups, it can be observed that three out of four temporary contracts are for individuals between 25 and 44 years old. Gender does not seem to have an influence on the contract received although men received slightly more temporary contracts than women.

Another interesting piece of data is that LAC individuals are those that stand out more among foreign entrepreneurs in Spain. In 2009, 17 per cent of foreign individuals that had started a business were from Argentina, 8 per cent from Colombia, 8 per cent from Peru, 7 per cent from Ecuador, 4 per cent from Venezuela and 4 per cent from Uruguay. The people coming from these countries add up to nearly half of the foreigners that started a business in that year. This shows that there is the initiative and potential among the LAC population residing in Europe and that, if well accompanied, it can bring benefits both to the countries of origin and of destination as well as to migrants and their families.

It is important to point out that the European economic crisis created two simultaneous processes. On the one hand, contrary to what came to be thought in some countries, there was not a massive return of migrants. In general, individuals decided to wait for the situation to improve in receiving countries. Even the return programmes that European countries such as Spain and the Czech Republic developed had little success. In Spain, only 10 per cent of the potential beneficiaries took part in the Advance Payment of Benefits to Foreigners Programme. On the other hand, immigration flows began to be recorded from the EU to the principal countries of destination in LAC: Argentina and Brazil. In the latter country, for the first time since 1960, there was an increase in immigration from countries such as Spain, Italy and Portugal between 2000 and 2010, largely due to immigration that has been occurring in the last four years.

It is possible to outline at least a couple of conclusions in regards to the topic and the link between migration and development. First, it is essential to include the framework of human rights in discussions on the link between the two topics, which can be used for analysing the development of a comprehensive perspective and not only from an economic focus, as the Global Forum on Migration and Development did in its latest editions. Second, even though the majority of monetary remittances that flow between the two regions do so from north to south, a considerable quantity is also sent in the opposite direction.
Focusing on the topic of monetary remittances, by comparing the quantities that flow between the two regions, it is possible to identify that for every 1.55 dollars that go from EU countries to LAC, 1 dollar goes in the opposite direction, from LAC countries to the EU. Furthermore, it stands out that 13 out of the 27 countries of the EU (48%) receive more remittances than those sent to LAC and that in three cases (11%), the balance fluctuates around zero. The 13 countries with a negative net balance of remittances are (in millions of dollars) Portugal (205), France (137), Belgium (116), Poland (64), Austria (32), Hungary (24), Romania (9), Czech Republic (6), Bulgaria (3), Slovenia (2), Lithuania (2), Slovakia (1) and Latvia (1). The three countries in which the balance fluctuates around zero are Estonia, Greece and Malta. This means that only in 40 per cent of EU countries, the flow of monetary remittances that goes to LAC is more than that received from American countries. Among these, Spain, the United Kingdom and Italy stand out.

Finally, as regards women and migration, it is notable that migration can help to transform, on some occasions, and can help to perpetuate unequal gender relations, on others. On the one hand, the effort that migrant women make to send monetary remittances to their families in the country of origin also stands out. Usually, women send three times more remittances than men do. On the other hand, it draws attention how women manage the monetary remittances received from other countries when they are the head of the household in the country of origin. When women are the head of the household, the remittances are largely used for improving the children’s educational quality. However, when men receive the remittances, they channel less resources to this area.

Women have been the pioneers of migration from LAC to the EU. This has happened in most of the countries of the Southern Cone. During 2008 and 2009, 55 per cent of the individuals who arrived from LAC to the EU were women. It is noteworthy that the percentage of women from LAC is above the average made up of all nationalities: from 56 per cent compared to 43 per cent, respectively. Also, it is possible to identify the percentage of women in flows from the three subregions of the Americas: Central America (63%), Caribbean (58%) and South America (54%). Therefore, women must be participants in the decision making process at the time of pushing policies and promoting development projects or processes, both in the countries of origin and of destination.
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MIGRATORY ROUTES AND DYNAMICS BETWEEN LATIN AMERICAN AND CARIBBEAN (LAC) COUNTRIES AND BETWEEN LAC AND THE EUROPEAN UNION
The national profiles that are presented in this section seek to present and show a good part of the information contained in the accessed databases described in Appendix 2 and that is pertinent to the study in an orderly, logical and coherent manner. These national profiles present, on one page, information about the population in LAC countries, the gross national income, exports and imports, and detailed information regarding migration from the 26 countries in LAC: Argentina, Barbados, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Cuba, Dominica, Ecuador, El Salvador, Grenada, Guatemala, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Jamaica, Mexico, Nicaragua, Paraguay, Peru, the Dominican Republic, Saint Lucia, Suriname, Trinidad and Tobago, Uruguay and Venezuela. These countries were selected, firstly, because they represent around 97 per cent of the stock of people from LAC residing in EU countries according to figures from the WB (2011a). Secondly, all of them have at least 10,000 of their migrants residing in EU countries. Both conditions make them stand out in comparison with the rest of LAC countries that are not presented in this appendix.

To facilitate reading the summary pages, an introduction page with the sources from which the presented data was obtained is presented below.

**National Profiles: Sources of the Data**

1. **General data on the country, trade exchanges and remittances**


[^36]: The Inequality-Adjusted Human Development Index is the indicator of the level of human development that takes the degree of inequality existing in a society into account. In a country with absolute inequality in the distribution of health, education and income, the HDI and IHDI have the same value. The bigger the difference between the HDI and IHDI, the more inequality there is in the society.


2. Data about Latin America and the Caribbean–the European Union stock and migration flows

Migrant stocks and principal countries with a higher stock in LAC and the EU (2010): World Bank, “Bilateral Estimates of Migrant Stocks in 2010”.


---

37 The Development Assistance Committee (DAC) is the principal body of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) for topics related to cooperation and development. The EU countries that are part of the DAC are Germany, Austria, Belgium, Denmark, Spain, Finland, France, Greece, Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Portugal, Sweden and the United Kingdom.

38 The data takes 27 EU countries and 40 LAC countries into account. The LAC countries are Antigua and Barbuda, Netherlands Antilles, Argentina, Aruba, Bahamas, Barbados, Belize, Bermuda, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Grenada, Guatemala, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Cayman Islands, Turks and Caicos Islands, Virgin Islands (U.S.), Jamaica, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Puerto Rico, St. Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Suriname, Trinidad and Tobago, Uruguay and Venezuela. There is no available data on remittances received by Aruba, the Bahamas, Bermuda, Cuba, Netherlands Antilles, Cayman Islands, Turks and Caicos Islands, Virgin Islands (U.S.) and Puerto Rico.

39 The data takes into account the 27 EU countries and 44 LAC countries: Antigua and Barbuda, Netherlands Antilles, Argentina, Aruba, Bahamas, Barbados, Belize, Bermuda, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Dominica, the Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Guatemala, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Cayman Islands, Virgin Islands (U.S.), Jamaica, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Puerto Rico, St. Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Suriname, Trinidad and Tobago, Uruguay and Venezuela.

40 For 2008, the data is based on the information from 26 EU countries, all of them except for Luxembourg.

41 The term “illegal” is used in the EUROSTAT database, not by the author. For more information on why this word must be eradicated when referring to migrants, see Colorlines, Drop the I Word campaign. Available from: http://colorlines.com/drop-the-i-word/.
Individuals who acquired citizenship from a European country and country that granted the greatest number of passports (1998–2009)\(^{42}\): EUROSTAT, “Acquisition and Loss of Citizenship”.

Residence permits (from 2008 to 2010)\(^{43}\): EUROSTAT, “Residence permits”. The following sub-categories come from the following sections in the same database:
– permits issued for family reasons: “First permits issued for family reasons”;
– Permits for performing remunerated activities, permits for researchers and highly skilled workers and permits for seasonal workers: “First permits issued for remunerated activities”;  
– permits for education reasons: “First permits issued for education reasons”;  
– permits for other reasons: “First permits for other reasons”.

It is noteworthy that the data on permits to researchers, highly skilled workers and seasonal workers is based on a lower number of European Union countries\(^{44}\) compared to the permits for performing remunerated activities in general. These figures and percentages that are presented in the table are only indicative.

Finally, in the cases that do not have information, the initials “ND” are displayed which mean No Data. In the cases in which the categories do not apply, the phrase “Not applicable” is displayed.

\(^{42}\) Data based on nine EU countries: Germany, Spain, France, Ireland, Italy, the Netherlands, Portugal, Sweden and the United Kingdom. However, the information is not complete for all countries. In the cases of Haiti, Honduras and Mexico, information is missing on the following countries: France from 1998 to 2003 and in 2006; Ireland from 1998 to 2004; Italy from 1998 to 2002 and from 2004 to 2007; Portugal in 2005 and the United Kingdom in 2009. In the cases of Paraguay, Uruguay, Trinidad and Tobago and Venezuela, information is missing on Germany from 1998 to 2001; Spain from 1998 to 2004; France from 1998 to 2003 and in 2006; Ireland from 1998 to 2004; Italy from 1998 to 2002 and 2004 to 2007; Portugal in 1998 and 2007; the United Kingdom from 1998 to 2001 and in 2009; and Sweden from 1998 to 2001.

\(^{43}\) The data is based on the information on 26 countries in the EU, all of them except for Luxembourg.

\(^{44}\) The data on permits to researchers is based on the information from 22 countries of the EU-27: all except for Bulgaria, Denmark, Finland, Luxembourg, Portugal and the United Kingdom for 2008. The data on permits to highly skilled workers is based on 20 countries of the EU-27: Germany, Austria, Belgium, Cyprus, Denmark (2009 and 2010), Slovakia (2009), Slovenia (2008 and 2009), Spain, France, Greece, Ireland, Italy (2010), Latvia (2009 and 2010), Malta (2008 and 2009), the Netherlands, Poland (2010), Portugal, Sweden (2009 and 2010), the United Kingdom and the Czech Republic (2009 and 2010). The data on permits to seasonal workers is based on 13 countries of the EU-27: Germany (2008 and 2009), Belgium, Cyprus, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain (2008 and 2009), Greece, Italy, Hungary, Malta, Poland (2010), Romania (2010) and Sweden.
ARGENTINA

1. General data, trade exchanges and remittances

**Population (2011):** 40.7 million people
**Gross National Income-Purchasing Power Parity per capita (2011):** USD 14,527
**Human Development Index (2011):** 0.55 (high)
**Inequality-Adjusted Human Development Index (2011):** 0.44 (high)

**Exports to the EU (2009):** EUR 8.203 billion
**Imports from the EU (2009):** EUR 4.777 billion
**Official Development Aid received from EU countries that make up the DAC (2009 net):** USD 64.28 million

**Remittances received from the EU-27 (2010):** USD 291 million
**Remittances sent to the EU-27 (2010):** USD 1.244 billion
**Remittances received from LAC (2010):** USD 166 million
**Remittances sent to other LAC countries (2010):** USD 805 million

2. Data about Latin America and the Caribbean–the European Union stock and migration flows

**Stock of Argentineans in the 43 LAC countries (2010):** 274,902
**Stock of people from any of the 43 LAC countries in Argentina (2010):** 956,907
**Stock of Argentineans in the 27 EU countries (2010):** 388,947
**Countries with largest stock of Argentinean people in the EU (2010):** Spain (331,173), Italy (16,243) and France (11,171)
**Stock of people from the EU-27 that are residents in Argentina (2010):** 361,551
**EU countries with largest stock in Argentina (2010):** Italy (205,026), Spain (127,165) and Poland (12,964)

**Persons who acquired citizenship from an EU-27 country (1998–2009):** 43,992
**EU country that granted the greatest number of citizenships (1998–2009):** Spain (27,937 or 64% of the total of citizenships received by Argentineans)
**Total residence permits granted by EU countries (2008–2010):** 49,102 (Table 1)
**Principal countries that granted them:** Spain (31,356), the United Kingdom (6,477) and Italy (5,214)
**Table 1**

Residence permits granted to migrants from this LAC country in the EU-27, 2008–2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For family reasons</td>
<td>6,543</td>
<td>4,022</td>
<td>4,638</td>
<td>15,203</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For performing remunerated activities</td>
<td>4,615</td>
<td>6,507</td>
<td>5,019</td>
<td>16,141</td>
<td>32.9</td>
<td>944 (5.8 % of the permits for performing remunerated act.)</td>
<td>1,038 (6.4 % of the permits for performing remunerated act.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For education reasons</td>
<td>1,939</td>
<td>1,666</td>
<td>1,743</td>
<td>5,348</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other reasons</td>
<td>7,383</td>
<td>3,015</td>
<td>2,012</td>
<td>12,410</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>20,480</td>
<td>15,210</td>
<td>13,412</td>
<td>49,102</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Persons detained for their irregular status in the EU-27 (2008–2010): 5,695 (Table 2)

**Table 2**

Irregular migrants detained in the EU-27, 2008–2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>Total (2008–2010)</th>
<th>Percentage of total irregular migrants from LAC</th>
<th>Ratio between regular and irregular migrants (flows) in the EU-27</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1,995</td>
<td>1,930</td>
<td>1,770</td>
<td>5,695</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>1 irregular for every 8 regulars</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. General data, trade exchanges and remittances

**Population (2011):** 273,090 people  
**Gross National Income-Purchasing Power Parity per capita (2011):** USD 17,966  
**Human Development Index (2011):** 0.55 (high)  
**Inequality-Adjusted Human Development Index (2011):** ND

**Exports to the EU (2009):** EUR 36 million  
**Imports from the EU (2009):** EUR 109 million  
**Official Development Aid from EU countries that make up the DAC (2009, net):** ND

**Remittances received from the EU-27 (2010):** USD 44 million  
**Remittances sent to the EU-27 (2010):** USD 6 million  
**Remittances received from LAC (2010):** USD 6 million  
**Remittances sent to other LAC countries (2010):** USD 10 million

2. Data about Latin America and the Caribbean–the European Union stock and migration flows

**Stock of Barbadians in the 43 LAC countries (2010):** 3,413  
**Stock of people from any of the 43 LAC countries in Barbados (2010):** 16,901  
**Stock of Barbadians in the 27 EU countries (2010):** 29,433  
**Countries with largest stock in the EU (2010):** the United Kingdom (28,612), Germany (274) and Sweden (128)  
**Stock of people from the EU-27 that are residents in Barbados (2010):** 3,886  
**EU countries with largest stock in Barbados (2010):** the United Kingdom (3,886)

**Persons who acquired citizenship from an EU-27 country (1998–2009):** 1,681  
**EU country that granted the greatest number of citizenships (1998–2009):** the United Kingdom (1,422 or 85% of the total of citizenships received by Barbadians)  
**Total residence permits issued by EU countries (2008–2009):** 1,043 (Table 1)  
**Principal countries that granted them:** the United Kingdom (953), Italy (30) and France (20)
### Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For family reasons</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For performing remunerated activities</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>20 (10.7 % of the permits for performing remunerated act.)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For education reasons</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>39.1</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other reasons</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>422</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>1,043</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Persons detained because of their irregular status in the EU (2008–2010): 85 (Table 2)**

### Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>Total (2008–2010)</th>
<th>Percentage of total irregular migrants from LAC</th>
<th>Ratio between regular and irregular migrants (flows) in the EU-27</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 irregular for every 42 regulars</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. General data, trade exchanges and remittances

**Population (2011):** 10.1 million people

**Gross National Income-Purchasing Power Parity per capita (2011):** USD 4,054

**Human Development Index (2011):** 0.46 (medium)

**Inequality-Adjusted Human Development Index (2011):** 0.30 (low)

**Exports to the EU (2009):** EUR 238 million

**Imports from the EU (2009):** EUR 278 million

**Official Development Aid from EU countries that make up the DAC (2009, net):** USD 299 million

**Remittances received from the EU-27 (2010):** USD 545 million

**Remittances sent to the EU-27 (2010):** USD 49 million

**Remittances received from LAC (2010):** USD 301 million

**Remittances sent to other LAC countries (2010):** USD 146 million

2. Data about Latin America and the Caribbean–the European Union stock and migration flows

**Stock of Bolivians in the 43 LAC countries (2010):** 271,420

**Stock of people from any of the 43 LAC countries in Bolivia (2010):** 121,230

**Stock of Bolivians in the 27 EU countries (2010):** 293,241

**EU countries with largest stock in Bolivia (2010):** Spain (2,431), Germany (2,148) and Italy (1,231)

**Stock of people from the EU-27 that are residents in Bolivia (2010):** 8,961

**Countries with largest stock in the EU (2010):** Spain (27,460), Italy (7,858) and Sweden (3,075)

**Persons who acquired citizenship from an EU-27 country (1998–2009):** 8,311

**EU country that granted the greatest number of citizenships (1998–2009):** Spain (5,348 or 64% of the total of citizenships received by Bolivians)

**Total residence permits granted by EU countries (2008–2010):** 93,050

(Table 1)

**Principal countries that granted them:** Spain (79,370), Italy (10,137) and Sweden (1,014)
Table 1

Residence permits granted to migrants from this LAC country in the EU-27, 2008–2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For family reasons</td>
<td>3,021</td>
<td>3,078</td>
<td>4,808</td>
<td>10,907</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For performing remunerated activities</td>
<td>5,670</td>
<td>22,761</td>
<td>24,611</td>
<td>53,042</td>
<td>57.0</td>
<td>101 (0.2 % of the permits for performing remunerated activities)</td>
<td>36 (0.01 % of the permits for performing remunerated act.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For education reasons</td>
<td>780</td>
<td>711</td>
<td>607</td>
<td>2,098</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other reasons</td>
<td>18,080</td>
<td>6,024</td>
<td>2,899</td>
<td>27,003</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>27,551</td>
<td>32,574</td>
<td>32,925</td>
<td>93,050</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Persons detained because of their irregular status in the EU (2008–2010): 41,170 (Table 2)

Table 2

Irregular migrants detained in the EU-27, 2008–2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>Total (2008–2010)</th>
<th>Percentage of total irregular migrants from LAC</th>
<th>Ratio between regular and irregular migrants (flows) in the EU-27</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17,460</td>
<td>14,835</td>
<td>8,875</td>
<td>41,170</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>1 irregular for every 2 regulars</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. General data, trade exchanges and remittances

**Population (2011):** 196.6 million people  
**Gross National Income-Purchasing Power Parity per capita (2011):** USD 10,162  
**Human Development Index (2011):** 0.5 (medium)  
**Inequality-Adjusted Human Development Index (2011):** 0.36 (medium)

**Exports to the EU (2009):** EUR 25,723 million  
**Imports from the EU (2009):** EUR 21,629 million  
**Official Development Aid from EU countries that make up the DAC (2009, net):** USD 349.28 million

**Remittances received from the EU-27 (2010):** USD 1.390 billion  
**Remittances sent to the EU-27 (2010):** USD 965 million  
**Remittances received from LAC (2010):** USD 465 million  
**Remittances sent to other LAC countries (2010):** USD 110 million

2. Data about Latin America and the Caribbean–the European Union stock and migration flows

**Stock of Brazilians in the 43 LAC countries (2010):** 184,085  
**Stock of people from any of the 43 LAC countries in Brazil (2010):** 144,496  
**Stock of Brazilians in the 27 EU countries (2010):** 443,806  
**Countries with largest stock in the EU (2010):** Spain (162,205), Portugal (70,350) and the United Kingdom (57,245)  
**Stock of people from the EU-27 that are residents in Brazil (2010):** 374,275  
**EU countries with largest stock in Brazil (2010):** Portugal (214,511), Italy (55,370) and Spain (43,871)

**Persons who acquired citizenship from an EU-27 country (1998–2009):** 40,496  
**EU country that granted the greatest number of citizenships (1998–2009):** Portugal (11,425 or 28% of the total citizenships received by Brazilians)  
**Total residence permits granted by EU countries (2008–2010):** 226,551 (Table 1)

**Principal countries that granted them:** Portugal (73,723), the United Kingdom (35,790) and Italy (35,271)
Table 1

Residence permits granted to migrants from this LAC country in the EU-27, 2008–2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For family reasons</td>
<td>27,398</td>
<td>24,028</td>
<td>23,988</td>
<td>75,414</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For performing remunerated activities</td>
<td>26,737</td>
<td>22,969</td>
<td>17,544</td>
<td>67,250</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>2,823 (4.2 % of the permits for performing remunerated act.)</td>
<td>120 (0.2 % of the permits for performing remunerated act.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For education reasons</td>
<td>18,232</td>
<td>14,536</td>
<td>16,124</td>
<td>48,892</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other reasons</td>
<td>15,388</td>
<td>11,876</td>
<td>7,731</td>
<td>34,995</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>87,755</td>
<td>73,409</td>
<td>65,387</td>
<td>226,551</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Persons detained because of their irregular status in the EU (2008–2010): 65,820 (Table 2)

Table 2

Irregular migrants detained in the EU-27, 2008–2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>Total (2008–2010)</th>
<th>Percentage of total irregular migrants from LAC</th>
<th>Ratio between regular and irregular migrants (flows) in the EU-27</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>32,940</td>
<td>18,550</td>
<td>14,330</td>
<td>65,820</td>
<td>33.2</td>
<td>1 irregular for every 3 regulars</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. General data, trade exchanges and remittances

Population (2011): 17.27 million people  
Human Development Index (2011): 0.56 (high)  
Inequality-Adjusted Human Development Index (2011): 0.45 (high)

Exports to the EU (2009): EUR 7,518 billion  
Imports from the EU (2009): EUR 4,530 billion  
Official Development Aid from EU countries that make up the DAC (2009, net): USD 32.9 million

Remittances received from the EU-27 (2010): USD 1 million  
Remittances sent to the EU-27 (2010): USD 261 million  
Remittances received from LAC (2010): USD 2 million  
Remittances sent to other LAC countries (2010): USD 273 million

2. Data about Latin America and the Caribbean–the European Union stock and migration flows

Stock of Chileans in the 43 LAC countries (2010): 276,167  
Stock of people from any of the 43 LAC countries in Chile (2010): 227,212  
Stock of Chileans in the 27 EU countries (2010): 154,418  
Countries with largest stock in the EU (2010): Spain (76,268), Sweden (29,805) and France (14,615)  
Stock of people of the EU-27 residents in Chile (2010): 49,368  
EU countries with largest stock in Chile (2010): Spain (15,563), Germany (9,377) and Italy (6,731)

EU country that granted the greatest number of citizenships (1998–2009): Spain (7,344 or 37% of the total citizenships received by Chileans)

Total residence permits granted by EU countries (2008–2010): 25,734 (Table 1)  
Principal countries that granted them: Spain (13,619), the United Kingdom (3,541) and France (1,938)
Table 1

Residence permits granted to migrants from this LAC country in the EU-27, 2008–2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For family reasons</td>
<td>2,552</td>
<td>2,197</td>
<td>2,570</td>
<td>7,319</td>
<td>28.4</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For performing remunerated activities</td>
<td>1,763</td>
<td>2,361</td>
<td>1,805</td>
<td>5,929</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>397 (6.7 % of the permits for performing remunerated act.)</td>
<td>65 (1.1 % of the permits for performing remunerated act.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For education reasons</td>
<td>2,357</td>
<td>2,150</td>
<td>2,309</td>
<td>6,816</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other reasons</td>
<td>2,901</td>
<td>1,620</td>
<td>1,149</td>
<td>5,670</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9,573</td>
<td>8,328</td>
<td>7,833</td>
<td>25,734</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Persons detained because of their irregular status in the EU (2008–2010): 3,425 (Table 2)

Table 2

Irregular migrants detained in the EU-27, 2008–2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>Total (2008–2010)</th>
<th>Percentage of total irregular migrants from LAC</th>
<th>Ratio between regular and irregular migrants (flows) in the EU-27</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1,235</td>
<td>1,150</td>
<td>1,040</td>
<td>3,425</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1 irregular for every 7 regulars</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. General data, trade exchanges and remittances

Population (2011): 46.9 million people
Gross National Income-Purchasing Power Parity per capita (2011): USD 8,315
Human Development Index (2011): 0.49 (medium)
Inequality-Adjusted Human Development Index (2011): 0.33 (low)

Exports to the EU (2009): EUR 3.994 billion
Imports from the EU (2009): EUR 3.310 billion
Official Development Aid from EU countries that make up the DAC (2009, net): USD 294.53 million

Remittances received from the EU-27 (2010): USD 977 million
Remittances sent to the EU-27 (2010): USD 75 million
Remittances received from LAC (2010): USD 1.327 billion
Remittances sent to other LAC countries (2010): USD 50 million

2. Data about Latin America and the Caribbean–the European Union stock and migration flows

Stock of Colombians in the 43 LAC countries (2010): 854,754
Stock of people from any of the 43 LAC countries in Colombia (2010): 68,897
Stock of Colombians in the 27 EU countries (2010): 485,859
Countries with largest stock in the EU (2010): Spain (375,710), France (24,806) and Italy (23,262)
Stock of people from the EU-27 that are residents in Colombia (2010): 13,684
EU countries with largest stock in Colombia (2010): Spain (5,327), Italy (2,256) and Germany (1,897)

EU country that granted the greatest number of citizenships (1998–2009): Spain (76,200 or 77% of the total citizenships received by Colombians)
Total residence permits granted by EU countries (2008–2010): 123,038 (Table 1)
Principal countries that granted them: Spain (81,997), the United Kingdom (17,256) and Italy (10,126)
Cuadro 1

Residence permits granted to migrants from this LAC country in the EU-27, 2008–2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For family reasons</td>
<td>22,028</td>
<td>14,737</td>
<td>12,512</td>
<td>49,277</td>
<td>40.1</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For performing remunerated activities</td>
<td>16,384</td>
<td>8,355</td>
<td>6,612</td>
<td>31,351</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>985 (3.1 % of the permits for performing remunerated act.)</td>
<td>5,149 (16.4 % of the permits for performing remunerated act.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For education reasons</td>
<td>9,681</td>
<td>9,336</td>
<td>9,028</td>
<td>28,045</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other reasons</td>
<td>8,724</td>
<td>3,483</td>
<td>2,158</td>
<td>14,365</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>56,817</td>
<td>35,911</td>
<td>30,310</td>
<td>123,038</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Persons detained because of their irregular status in the EU (2008–2010): 12,040 (Table 2)

Table 2

Irregular migrants detained in the EU-27, 2008–2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>Total (2008–2010)</th>
<th>Percentage of total irregular migrants from LAC</th>
<th>Ratio between regular and irregular migrants (flows) in the EU-27</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3,510</td>
<td>4,275</td>
<td>4,255</td>
<td>12,040</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>1 irregular for every 10 regulars</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CUBA

1. General data, trade exchanges and remittances

Population (2011): 11.2 million people
Human Development Index (2011): 0.54 (high)
Inequality-Adjusted Human Development Index (2011): ND

Exports to the EU (2009): EUR 356 million
Imports from the EU (2009): EUR 1.066 billion
Official Development Aid from EU countries that make up the DAC (2009, net): ND

Remittances received from the EU-27 (2010): ND
Remittances sent to the EU-27 (2010): USD 38 million
Remittances received from LAC (2010): ND
Remittances sent to other LAC countries (2010): USD 2 million

2. Data about Latin America and the Caribbean–the European Union stock and migration flows

Stock of Cubans in the 43 LAC countries (2010): 48,417
Stock of people from any of the 43 LAC countries in Cuba (2010): 2,773
Stock of Cubans in the 27 EU countries (2010): 145,890
Countries with largest stock in the EU (2010): Spain (105,748), Italy (18,959) and Germany (11,726)
Stock of people from the EU-27 that are residents in Cuba (2010): 5,717
EU countries with largest stock in Cuba (2010): Spain (4,715), Germany (331) and Italy (217)

EU country that granted the greatest number of citizenships (1998–2009): Spain (23,065 or 70% of the total citizenships received by Cubans)
Total residence permits granted by EU countries (2008–2010): 35,246 (Table 1)
Principal countries that granted them: Spain (18,826), Italy (10,698) and the United Kingdom (1,646)
Table 1

Residence permits granted to migrants from this LAC country in the EU-27, 2008–2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For family reasons</td>
<td>7,373</td>
<td>4,736</td>
<td>7,061</td>
<td>19,170</td>
<td>54.4</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For performing remunerated activities</td>
<td>2,800</td>
<td>2,446</td>
<td>2,152</td>
<td>7,398</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>240 (3.2 % of the permits for performing remunerated act.)</td>
<td>33 (0.4 % of the permits for performing remunerated act.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For education reasons</td>
<td>566</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>1,257</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other reasons</td>
<td>4,582</td>
<td>2,396</td>
<td>443</td>
<td>7,421</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>15,321</strong></td>
<td><strong>9,928</strong></td>
<td><strong>9,997</strong></td>
<td><strong>35,246</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Persons detained because of their irregular status in the EU (2008–2010): 2,995 (Table 2)

Table 2

Irregular migrants detained in the EU-27, 2008–2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>Total (2008–2010)</th>
<th>Percentage of total irregular migrants from LAC</th>
<th>Ratio between regular and irregular migrants (flows) in the EU-27</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1,050</td>
<td>970</td>
<td>975</td>
<td><strong>2,995</strong></td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1 irregular for every 11 regulars</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DOMINICA

1. General data, trade exchanges and remittances

Human Development Index (2011): 0.5 (medium)
Inequality-Adjusted Human Development Index (2011): ND

Exports to the EU (2009): EUR 30 million
Imports from the EU (2009): EUR 21 million
Official Development Aid from EU countries that make up the DAC (2009, net): ND

Remittances received from the EU-27 (2010): USD 5 million
Remittances sent to the EU-27 (2010): USD 1 million
Remittances received from LAC (2010): USD 3 million
Remittances sent to other LAC countries (2010): USD 0.1 million

2. Data about Latin America and the Caribbean–the European Union stock and migration flows

Stock of Dominicans in the 43 LAC countries (2010): 10,381
Stock of people from any of the 43 LAC countries in Dominica (2010): 868
Stock of Dominicans in the 27 EU countries (2010): 12,924
Countries with largest stock in the EU (2010): the United Kingdom (8,926), Spain (1,407) and Italy (943)
Stock of people from the EU-27 that are residents in Dominica (2010): 500
EU countries with largest stock in Dominica (2010): the United Kingdom (500)

EU country that granted the greatest number of citizenships (1998–2009): the United Kingdom (562 or 43% of the total citizenships received by Dominicans)
Total residence permits issued by EU countries (2008–2009): 1,449 (Table 1)
Principal countries that granted them: Italy (589), France (329) and the United Kingdom (210)
Table 1

Residence permits granted to migrants from this LAC country in the EU-27, 2008–2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For family reasons</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>786</td>
<td>54.2</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For performing remunerated activities</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>8 (5.6 % of the permits for performing remunerated act.)</td>
<td>2 (1.4 % of the permits for performing remunerated act.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For education reasons</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other reasons</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>439</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>577</td>
<td>477</td>
<td>395</td>
<td><strong>1,449</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Persons detained because of their irregular status in the EU (2008–2010): 265 (Table 2)

Table 2

Irregular migrants detained in the EU-27, 2008–2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>Total (2008–2010)</th>
<th>Percentage of total irregular migrants from LAC</th>
<th>Ratio between regular and irregular migrants (flows) in the EU–27</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>1 irregular for every 5 regulars</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. General data, trade exchanges and remittances

Population (2011): 14.7 million people
Human Development Index (2011): 0.5 (medium)
Inequality-Adjusted Human Development Index (2011): 0.37 (medium)

Exports to the EU (2009): EUR 1.896 billion
Imports from the EU (2009): EUR 987 million
Official Development Aid from EU countries that make up the DAC (2009, net): USD 92.78 million

Remittances received from the EU-27 (2010): USD 1.365 billion
Remittances sent to the EU-27 (2010): USD 178 million
Remittances received from LAC (2010): USD 106 million
Remittances sent to other LAC countries (2010): USD 333 million

2. Data about Latin America and the Caribbean–the European Union stock and migration flows

Stock of Ecuadorians in the 43 LAC countries (2010): 66,470
Stock of people from any of the 43 LAC countries in Ecuador (2010): 245,492
Stock of Ecuadorians in the 27 EU countries (2010): 632,252
Countries with largest stock in the EU (2010): Spain (519,123), Italy (95,226) and Germany (5,908)
Stock of people from the EU-27 that are residents in Ecuador (2010): 34,559
EU countries with largest stock in Ecuador (2010): Spain (10,283), Germany (6,033) and Italy (5,267)

EU country that granted the greatest number of citizenships (1998–2009): Spain (113,205 or 93% of the total citizenships received by Ecuadorians)
Total residence permits granted by EU countries (2008–2010): 108,917 (Table 1)
Principal countries that granted them: Spain (70,237), Italy (31,259) and Belgium (1,996)
Table 1

Residence permits granted to migrants from this LAC country in the EU-27, 2008–2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For family reasons</td>
<td>23,864</td>
<td>10,921</td>
<td>13,564</td>
<td>48,349</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For performing remunerated activities</td>
<td>14,373</td>
<td>8,318</td>
<td>8,115</td>
<td>30,806</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>143 (0.5% of the permits for performing remunerated act.)</td>
<td>2,318 (7.5% of the permits for performing remunerated act.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For education reasons</td>
<td>1,214</td>
<td>1,215</td>
<td>1,297</td>
<td>3,726</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other reasons</td>
<td>14,230</td>
<td>9,793</td>
<td>2,013</td>
<td>26,036</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>53,681</td>
<td>30,247</td>
<td>24,989</td>
<td>108,917</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Persons detained because of their irregular status in the EU (2008–2010): 12,205 (Table 2)

Table 2

Irregular migrants detained in the EU-27, 2008–2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>Total (2008–2010)</th>
<th>Percentage of total irregular migrants from LAC</th>
<th>Ratio between regular and irregular migrants (flows) in the EU-27</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3,780</td>
<td>4,305</td>
<td>4,120</td>
<td>12,205</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>1 irregular for every 8 regulars</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MIGRATORY ROUTES AND DYNAMICS BETWEEN LATIN AMERICAN AND CARIBBEAN (LAC) COUNTRIES AND BETWEEN LAC AND THE EUROPEAN UNION
1. General data, trade exchanges and remittances

**Population (2011):** 6.2 million people  
**Gross National Income-Purchasing Power Parity per capita (2011):** USD 5,925  
**Human Development Index (2011):** 0.47 (medium)  
**Inequality-Adjusted Human Development Index (2011):** 0.34 (medium)

**Exports to the EU (2009):** EUR 199 million  
**Imports from the EU (2009):** EUR 312 million

**Official Development Aid from EU countries that make up the DAC (2009, net):** ND

**Remittances received from the EU-27 (2010):** USD 61 million  
**Remittances sent to the EU-27 (2010):** USD 7 million  
**Remittances received from LAC (2010):** USD 104 million  
**Remittances sent to other LAC countries (2010):** USD 59 million

2. Data about Latin America and the Caribbean–the European Union stock and migration flows

**Stock of Salvadorans in the 43 LAC countries (2010):** 60,631  
**Stock of people from any of the 43 LAC countries in El Salvador (2010):** 32,165  
**Stock of Salvadorans in the 27 EU countries (2010):** 22,663  
**Countries with largest stock in the EU (2010):** Spain (8,130), Italy (7,989) and Sweden (2,899)  
**Stock of people from the EU-27 that are residents in El Salvador (2010):** 1,205  
**EU countries with the largest stock in El Salvador (2010):** Spain (513), Italy (270) and Germany (218)

**Persons who acquired citizenship from an EU-27 country (1998–2009):** 2,257  
**EU country that granted the greatest number of citizenships (1998–2009):** Spain (771 or 34% of the total citizenships received by Salvadorans)  
**Total residence permits issued by EU countries (2008–2009):** 7,773 (Table 1)  
**Principal countries that granted them:** Italy (4,883), Spain (1,950) and France (237)
### Table 1

**Residence permits granted to migrants from this LAC country in the EU-27, 2008–2010**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For family reasons</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>705</td>
<td>1,274</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For performing remunerated activities</td>
<td>562</td>
<td>1,185</td>
<td>2,473</td>
<td>4,220</td>
<td>54.3</td>
<td>39 (0.9 % of the permits for performing remunerated act.)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For education reasons</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>1,002</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other reasons</td>
<td>511</td>
<td>590</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>1,277</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,696</td>
<td>2,348</td>
<td>3,729</td>
<td>7,773</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Persons detained because of their irregular status in the EU (2008–2010):** 1,330 (Table 2)

### Table 2

**Irregular migrants detained in the EU-27, 2008–2010**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>Total (2008–2010)</th>
<th>Percentage of total irregular migrants from LAC</th>
<th>Ratio between regular and irregular migrants (flows) in the EU-27</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>420</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>1,330</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1 irregular for every 5 regulars</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. General data, trade exchanges and remittances

**Population (2011):** 104,090 people  
**Gross National Income-Purchasing Power Parity per capita (2011):** USD 6,982  
**Human Development Index (2011):** 0.52 (high)  
**Inequality-Adjusted Human Development Index (2011):** ND

**Exports to the EU (2009):** EUR 3 million  
**Imports from the EU (2009):** EUR 17 million  
**Official Development Aid from EU countries that make up the DAC (2009, net):** ND

**Remittances received from the EU-27 (2010):** USD 11 million  
**Remittances sent to the EU-27 (2010):** USD 0 million  
**Remittances received from LAC (2010):** USD 8 million  
**Remittances sent to other LAC countries (2010):** USD 0 million

2. Data about Latin America and the Caribbean–the European Union stock and migration flows

**Stock of Grenadians in the 43 LAC countries (2010):** 11,017  
**Stock of people from any of the 43 LAC countries in Grenada (2010):** ND  
**Stock of Grenadians in the 27 EU countries (2010):** 13,290  
**Countries with largest stock in the EU (2010):** the United Kingdom (12,958), Germany (83) and France (63)  
**Stock of people of the EU-27 residents in Grenada (2010):** ND  
**EU countries with largest stock in Grenada (2010):** ND

**Persons who acquired citizenship from an EU-27 country (1998–2009):** 975  
**EU country that granted the greatest number of citizenships (1998–2009):** the United Kingdom (876 or 90% of citizenships received by Grenadians)  
**Total residence permits granted by EU countries (2008–2010):** 531 (Table 1)  
**Principal countries that granted them:** the United Kingdom (462), Germany (17) and Italy (11)
## Table 1

### Residence permits granted to migrants from this LAC country in the EU-27, 2008–2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For family reasons</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For performing remunerated activities</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>1 (2.3% of the permits for performing remunerated act.)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For education reasons</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other reasons</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>48.4</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>531</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Persons detained because of their irregular status in the EU (2008–2010):** 85 (Table 2)

## Table 2

### Irregular migrants detained in the EU-27, 2008–2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>Total (2008–2010)</th>
<th>Percentage of total irregular migrants from LAC</th>
<th>Ratio between regular and irregular migrants (flows) in the EU-27</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 irregular for every 6 regulars</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
GUATEMALA

1. General data, trade exchanges and remittances

**Population (2011):** 14.8 million people  
**Gross National Income-Purchasing Power Parity per capita (2011):** USD 4,167  
**Human Development Index (2011):** 0.4 (medium)  
**Inequality-Adjusted Human Development Index (2011):** 0.3 (medium)

**Exports to the EU (2009):** EUR 359 million  
**Imports from the EU (2009):** EUR 492 million  
**Official Development Aid from EU countries that make up the DAC (2009, net):** ND

**Remittances received from the EU-27 (2010):** USD 64 million  
**Remittances sent to the EU-27 (2010):** USD 12 million  
**Remittances received from LAC (2010):** USD 209 million  
**Remittances sent to other LAC countries (2010):** USD 68 million

2. Data about Latin America and the Caribbean–the European Union stock and migration flows

**Stock of Guatemalans in the 43 LAC countries (2010):** 75,029  
**Stock of people from any of the 43 LAC countries in Guatemala (2010):** 46,994  
**Stock of Guatemalan people in the 27 EU countries (2010):** 13,813  
**Countries with largest stock in the EU (2010):** Spain (6,699), France (1,745) and Germany (1,037)  
**Stock of people from the EU-27 that are residents in Guatemala (2010):** 2,357  
**EU countries with largest stock in Guatemala (2010):** Spain (1,028), Germany (499) and Italy (287)

**Persons who acquired citizenship from an EU-27 country (1998–2009):** 918  
**EU country that granted the greatest number of citizenships (1998–2009):** Germany (225 or 24% of the total citizenships received by Guatemalans)  
**Total residence permits granted by EU countries (2008–2010):** 3,337 (Table 1)  
**Principal countries that granted them:** Spain (1,676), Italy (489) and the United Kingdom (400)
Table 1

Residence permits granted to migrants from this LAC country in the EU-27, 2008–2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For family reasons</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>742</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For performing remunerated activities</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>823</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>94 (11.4% of the permits for performing remunerated act.)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For education reasons</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>1,122</td>
<td>33.6</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other reasons</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,055</td>
<td>1,062</td>
<td>1,220</td>
<td>3,337</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Persons detained because of their irregular status in the EU (2008–2010): 1,070 (Table 2)

Table 2

Irregular migrants detained in the EU-27, 2008–2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>Total (2008–2010)</th>
<th>Percentage of total irregular migrants from LAC</th>
<th>Ratio between regular and irregular migrants (flows) in the EU-27</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>345</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>1,070</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1 irregular for every 3 regulars</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. General data, trade exchanges and remittances

Population (2011): 756,000 people
Human Development Index (2011): 0.44 (medium)
Inequality-Adjusted Human Development Index (2011): 0.34 (medium)

Exports to the EU (2009): EUR 183 million
Imports from the EU (2009): EUR 90 million
Official Development Aid from EU countries that make up the DAC (2009, net): USD 4.21 million

Remittances received from the EU-27 (2010): USD 18 million
Remittances sent to the EU-27 (2010): USD 1 million
Remittances received from LAC (2010): USD 15 million
Remittances sent to other LAC countries (2010): USD 5 million

2. Data about Latin America and the Caribbean–the European Union stock and migration flows

Stock of Guyanese in the 43 LAC countries (2010): 36,325
Stock of people from any of the 43 LAC countries in Guyana (2010): 7,315
Stock of Guyanese in the 27 EU countries (2010): 28,298
Countries with larger stock in the EU (2010): the United Kingdom (24,979), the Netherlands (2,352) and Germany (203)
Stock of people of the EU-27 residents in Guyana (2010): 396
EU countries with largest stock in Guyana (2010): the United Kingdom (396)

EU country that granted the greatest number of citizenships (1998–2009): the United Kingdom (2,528 or 73% of the total citizenships received by Guyanese)
Total residence permits granted by EU countries (2008–2010): 1,567 (Table 1)
Principal countries that granted them: the United Kingdom (1,019), France (452) and the Netherlands (44)
### Table 1

**Residence permits granted to migrants from this LAC country in the EU-27, 2008–2010**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For family reasons</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>582</td>
<td>37.1</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For performing remunerated activities</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>7 (7.1% of the permits for performing remunerated act.)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For education reasons</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other reasons</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>488</td>
<td>747</td>
<td>47.7</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>394</strong></td>
<td><strong>370</strong></td>
<td><strong>803</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,567</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Persons detained because of their irregular status in the EU (2008–2010): 180 (Table 2)**

### Table 2

**Irregular migrants detained in the EU-27, 2008–2010**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>Total (2008–2010)</th>
<th>Percentage of total irregular migrants from LAC</th>
<th>Ratio between regular and irregular migrants (flows) in the EU-27</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>45</td>
<td><strong>180</strong></td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>1 irregular for every 8 regulars</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. General data, trade exchanges and remittances

Population (2011): 10.1 million people
Gross National Income-Purchasing Power Parity per capita (2011): USD 1,123
Human Development Index (2011): 0.31 (low)
Inequality-Adjusted Human Development Index (2011): 0.19 (low)

Exports to the EU (2009): EUR 19 million
Imports from the EU (2009): EUR 103 million
Official Development Aid from EU countries that make up the DAC (2009, net): ND

Remittances received from the EU-27 (2010): USD 87 million
Remittances sent to the EU-27 (2010): USD 0 million
Remittances received from LAC (2010): USD 207 million
Remittances sent to other LAC countries (2010): USD 22 million

2. Data about Latin America and the Caribbean–the European Union stock and migration flows

Stock of Haitians in the 43 LAC countries (2010): 307,244
Stock of people from any of the 43 LAC countries in Haiti (2010): 17,698
Stock of Haitians in the 27 EU countries (2010): 47,528
Countries with largest stock in the EU (2010): France (42,103), Belgium (1,921) and the Netherlands (1,087)
Stock of people from the EU-27 that are residents in Haiti (2010): ND
EU countries with largest stock in Haiti (2010): ND

EU country that granted the greatest number of citizenships (1998–2009): France (10,918 or 93% of the total citizenships received by Haitians)
Total residence permits granted by EU countries (2008–2010): 11,911 (Table 1)
Principal countries that granted them: France (10,533), Italy (366) and the Netherlands (286)
Table 1

Residence permits granted to migrants from this LAC country in the EU-27, 2008–2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For family reasons</td>
<td>1,680</td>
<td>1,825</td>
<td>3,810</td>
<td>7,315</td>
<td>61.4</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For performing remunerated activities</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>20 (0.01 % of the permits for performing remunerated act.)</td>
<td>37 (0.01 % of the permits for performing remunerated act.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For education reasons</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>599</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other reasons</td>
<td>803</td>
<td>908</td>
<td>1,394</td>
<td>3,105</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,815</td>
<td>3,149</td>
<td>5,947</td>
<td>11,911</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Persons detained because of their irregular status in the EU (2008–2010): 220 (Table 2)

Table 2

Irregular migrants detained in the EU-27, 2008–2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>Total (2008–2010)</th>
<th>Percentage of total irregular migrants from LAC</th>
<th>Ratio between regular and irregular migrants (flows) in the EU-27</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>1 irregular for every 54 regulars</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. General data, trade exchanges and remittances

**Population (2011):** 7.7 million people

**Gross National Income-Purchasing Power Parity per capita (2011):** USD 3,443

**Human Development Index (2011):** 0.43 (medium)

**Inequality-Adjusted Human Development Index (2011):** 0.29 (medium)

**Exports to the EU (2009):** EUR 519 million

**Imports from the EU (2009):** EUR 231 million

**Official Development Aid from EU countries that make up the DAC (2009, net):** ND

**Remittances received from the EU-27 (2010):** USD 133 million

**Remittances sent to the EU-27 (2010):** USD 5 million

**Remittances received from LAC (2010):** USD 121 million

**Remittances sent to other LAC countries (2010):** USD 24 million

2. Data about Latin America and the Caribbean–the European Union stock and migration flows

**Stock of Hondurans in the 43 LAC countries (2010):** 56,241

**Stock of people from any of the 43 LAC countries in Honduras (2010):** 17,484

**Stock of Hondurans in the 27 EU countries (2010):** 30,910

**Countries with largest stock in the EU (2010):** Spain (27,059), Germany (896) and Italy (822)

**Stock of people from the EU-27 that are residents in Honduras (2010):** 963

**EU countries with largest stock in Honduras (2010):** Spain (325), Germany (182) and Italy (162)

**Persons who acquired citizenship from an EU-27 country (1998–2009):** 2,146

**EU country that granted the greatest number of citizenships (1998–2009):** Spain (1,381 or 64% of the total citizenships received by Hondurans)

**Total residence permits granted by EU countries (2008–2010):** 10,277 (Table 1)

**Principal countries that granted them:** Spain (8,085), Italy (963) and the United Kingdom (608)
### Table 1

**Residence permits granted to migrants from this LAC country in the EU-27, 2008–2010**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For family reasons</td>
<td>483</td>
<td>699</td>
<td>874</td>
<td>2,056</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For performing remunerated activities</td>
<td>818</td>
<td>1,610</td>
<td>2,711</td>
<td>5,139</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>24 (0.01 % of the permits for performing remunerated act.)</td>
<td>59 (0.01 % of the permits for performing remunerated act.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For education reasons</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>823</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other reasons</td>
<td>995</td>
<td>696</td>
<td>568</td>
<td>2,259</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>2,539</td>
<td>3,284</td>
<td>4,454</td>
<td>10,277</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Persons detained because of their irregular status in the EU (2008–2010):** 4,370 (Table 2)

### Table 2

**Irregular migrants detained in the EU-27, 2008–2010**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>Total (2008–2010)</th>
<th>Percentage of total irregular migrants from LAC</th>
<th>Ratio between regular and irregular migrants (flows) in the EU-27</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1,395</td>
<td>1,490</td>
<td>1,485</td>
<td><strong>4,370</strong></td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1 irregular for every 2 regulars</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. General data, trade exchanges and remittances

**Population (2011):** 2.7 million people  
**Gross National Income-Purchasing Power Parity per capita (2011):** USD 6,487  
**Human Development Index (2011):** 0.5 (medium)  
**Inequality-Adjusted Human Development Index (2011):** 0.42 (high)

**Exports to the EU (2009):** EUR 210 million  
**Imports from the EU (2009):** EUR 191 million  
**Official Development Aid from EU countries that make up the DAC (2009, net):** ND

**Remittances received from the EU-27 (2010):** USD 317 million  
**Remittances sent to the EU-27 (2010):** USD 8 million  
**Remittances received from LAC (2010):** USD 37 million  
**Remittances sent to other LAC countries (2010):** ND

2. Data about Latin America and the Caribbean–the European Union stock and migration flows

**Stock of Jamaicans in the 43 LAC countries (2010):** 27,156  
**Stock of people from any of the 43 LAC countries in Jamaica (2010):** ND  
**Stock of Jamaicans in the 27 EU countries (2010):** 163,240  
**Countries with largest stock in the EU (2010):** the United Kingdom (158,203), Germany (1,929) and the Netherlands (808)  
**Stock of people from the EU-27 that are residents in Jamaica (2010):** 5,012  
**EU countries with largest stock in Jamaica (2010):** the United Kingdom (5,012)

**Persons who acquired citizenship from an EU-27 country (1998–2009):** 28,028  
**EU country that granted the greatest number of citizenships (1998–2009):** the United Kingdom (24,652 or 88% of the total citizenships received by Jamaicans)  
**Total residence permits granted by EU countries (2008–2010):** 8,242 (Table 1)  
**Principal countries that granted them:** the United Kingdom (7,491), France (176) and Germany (158)


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For family reasons</td>
<td>1,119</td>
<td>998</td>
<td>1,209</td>
<td>3,326</td>
<td>40.4</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For performing remunerated activities</td>
<td>599</td>
<td>454</td>
<td>422</td>
<td>1,475</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>81 (0.02 % of the permits for performing remunerated act.)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For education reasons</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>608</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other reasons</td>
<td>765</td>
<td>877</td>
<td>1,191</td>
<td>2,833</td>
<td>34.4</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>2,716</td>
<td>2,543</td>
<td>2,983</td>
<td>8,242</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Persons detained because of their irregular status in the EU (2008–2010):** 5,505 (Table 2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>Total (2008–2010)</th>
<th>Percentage of total irregular migrants from LAC</th>
<th>Ratio between regular and irregular migrants (flows) in the EU-27</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2,225</td>
<td>1,790</td>
<td>1,490</td>
<td>5,505</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2 irregulars for every 3 regulars</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. General data, trade exchanges and remittances

**Population (2011):** 114.8 million people  
**Gross National Income-Purchasing Power Parity per capita (2011):** USD 13,245  
**Human Development Index (2011):** 0.53 (high)  
**Inequality-Adjusted Human Development Index (2011):** 0.41 (medium)

**Exports to the EU (2009):** EUR 10.04 billion  
**Imports from the EU (2009):** EUR 16.002 billion  
**Official Development Aid from EU countries that make up the DAC (2009, net):** ND

**Remittances received from the EU-27 (2010):** USD 164 million  
**Remittances sent to the EU-27 (2010):** USD 385 million  
**Remittances received from LAC (2010):** USD 83 million  
**Remittances sent to other LAC countries (2010):** USD 200 million

2. Data about Latin America and the Caribbean–the European Union stock and migration flows

**Stock of Mexicans in the 43 LAC countries (2010):** 57,943  
**Stock of people from any of the 43 LAC countries in Mexico (2010):** 116,824  
**Stock of Mexicans in the 27 EU countries (2010):** 90,917  
**Countries with largest stock in the EU (2010):** Spain (48,483), Germany (14,208) and France (7,245)  
**Stock of people from the EU-27 that are residents in Mexico (2010):** 64,941  
**EU countries with largest stock in Mexico (2010):** Spain (30,580), France (8,378) and Germany (8,230)

**Persons who acquired citizenship from an EU-27 country (1998–2009):** 11,154  
**EU country that granted the greatest number of citizenships (1998–2009):** Spain (4,936 or 44% of the total citizenships received by Mexicans)  
**Total residence permits granted by EU countries (2008–2010):** 46,704 (Table 1)  
**Principal countries that granted them:** Spain (14,852), the United Kingdom (8,207) and France (6,261)
### Table 1

**Residence permits granted to migrants from this LAC country in the EU-27, 2008–2010**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For family reasons</td>
<td>3,080</td>
<td>3,076</td>
<td>3,453</td>
<td>9,609</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For performing remunerated activities</td>
<td>2,883</td>
<td>1,950</td>
<td>1,963</td>
<td>6,796</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>1,563 (2.2% of the permits for performing remunerated act.)</td>
<td>45 (0.01% of the permits for performing remunerated act.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For education reasons</td>
<td>8,438</td>
<td>7,819</td>
<td>8,285</td>
<td>24,542</td>
<td>52.5</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other reasons</td>
<td>1,936</td>
<td>2,127</td>
<td>1,694</td>
<td>5,757</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>16,337</strong></td>
<td><strong>14,972</strong></td>
<td><strong>15,395</strong></td>
<td><strong>46,704</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Persons detained because of their irregular status in the EU (2008–2010): 2,235 (Table 2)**

### Table 2

**Irregular migrants detained in the EU-27, 2008–2010**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>Total (2008–2010)</th>
<th>Percentage of total irregular migrants from LAC</th>
<th>Ratio between regular and irregular migrants (flows) in the EU-27</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>750</td>
<td>845</td>
<td>640</td>
<td><strong>2,235</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.1</strong></td>
<td>1 irregular por cada 21 regulares</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. General data, trade exchanges and remittances

Population (2011): 5.9 million people
Human Development Index (2011): 0.41 (medium)
Inequality-Adjusted Human Development Index (2011): 0.29 (medium)

Exports to the EU (2009): EUR 166 million
Imports from the EU (2009): EUR 105 million
Official Development Aid from EU countries that make up the DAC (2009, net): ND

Remittances received from the EU-27 (2010): USD 24 million
Remittances sent to the EU-27 (2010): USD 12 million
Remittances received from LAC (2010): USD 290 million
Remittances sent to other LAC countries (2010): USD 67 million

2. Data about Latin America and the Caribbean–the European Union stock and migration flows

Stock of Nicaraguans in the 43 LAC countries (2010): 409,545
Stock of people from any of the 43 LAC countries in Nicaragua (2010): 31,246
Stock of Nicaraguans in the 27 EU countries (2010): 15,357
Countries with largest stock in the EU (2010): Spain (11,540), Germany (937) and Sweden (564)
Stock of people from the EU-27 that are residents in Nicaragua (2010): 2,264
EU countries with largest stock in Nicaragua (2010): Spain (681), Germany (458) and Italy (230)

EU country that granted the greatest number of citizenships (1998–2009): Spain (552 or 42% of the total citizenships received by Nicaraguans)
Total residence permits granted by EU countries (2008–2010): 5,583 (Table 1)
Principal countries that granted them: Spain (3,626), the United Kingdom (856) and Italy (408)
### Table 1

**Residence permits granted to migrants from this LAC country in the EU-27, 2008–2010**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For family reasons</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>518</td>
<td>1,194</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For performing remunerated activities</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>608</td>
<td>1,471</td>
<td>2,499</td>
<td>44.8</td>
<td>31 (1.2 % of the permits for performing remunerated act.)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For education reasons</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>615</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other reasons</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>544</td>
<td>496</td>
<td>1,275</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>1,159</td>
<td>1,730</td>
<td>2,694</td>
<td>5,583</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Persons detained because of their irregular status in the EU (2008–2010):**

2,345 (Table 2)

### Table 2

**Irregular migrants detained in the EU-27, 2008–2010**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>Total (2008–2010)</th>
<th>Percentage of total irregular migrants from LAC</th>
<th>Ratio between regular and irregular migrants (flows) in the EU-27</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>730</td>
<td>855</td>
<td>760</td>
<td>2,345</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1 irregular for every 2 regulars</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. General data, trade exchanges and remittances

Population (2011): 6.6 million people
Human Development Index (2011): 0.46 (medium)
Inequality-Adjusted Human Development Index (2011): 0.35 (medium)

Exports to the EU (2009): EUR 360 million
Imports from the EU (2009): EUR 236 million
Official Development Aid from EU countries that make up the DAC (2009, net): USD 49.11 million

Remittances received from the EU-27 (2010): USD 129 million
Remittances sent to the EU-27 (2010): USD 21 million
Remittances received from LAC (2010): USD 343 million
Remittances sent to other LAC countries (2010): USD 235 million

2. Data about Latin America and the Caribbean–the European Union stock and migration flows

Stock of Paraguayans in the 43 LAC countries (2010): 346,804
Stock of people from any of the 43 LAC countries in Paraguay (2010): 145,873
Stock of Paraguayans in the 27 EU countries (2010): 83,457
Countries with largest stock in the EU (2010): Spain (78,528), Germany (1,286) and Italy (1,192)
Stock of people from the EU-27 that are residents in Paraguay (2010): 4,377
EU countries with largest stock in Paraguay (2010): Germany (1,715), Spain (918) and Italy (478)

EU country that granted the greatest number of citizenships (1998–2009): Spain (814 or 64% of the total citizenships received by Paraguayans)
Total residence permits granted by EU countries (2008–2010): 26,324 (Table 1)
Principal countries that granted them: Spain (23,727), Italy (1,441) and Germany (283)
Table 1

Residence permits granted to migrants from this LAC country in the EU-27, 2008–2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For family reasons</td>
<td>1,154</td>
<td>1,546</td>
<td>1,497</td>
<td>4,197</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>No Aplica</td>
<td>No Aplica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For performing remunerated activities</td>
<td>2,488</td>
<td>6,931</td>
<td>6,121</td>
<td>15,540</td>
<td>59.0</td>
<td>20 (0.01 % of the permits for performing remunerated act.)</td>
<td>21 (0.01 % of the permits for performing remunerated act.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For education reasons</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>929</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other reasons</td>
<td>4,223</td>
<td>797</td>
<td>638</td>
<td>5,658</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8,142</td>
<td>9,604</td>
<td>8,578</td>
<td>26,324</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Persons detained because of their irregular status in the EU (2008–2010): 15,900 (Table 2)

Table 2

Irregular migrants detained in the EU-27, 2008–2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>Total (2008–2010)</th>
<th>Percentage of total irregular migrants from LAC</th>
<th>Ratio between regular and irregular migrants (flows) in the EU-27</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5,300</td>
<td>5,840</td>
<td>4,760</td>
<td>15,900</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1 irregular for every 2 regulars</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. General data, trade exchanges and remittances

Population (2011): 29.4 million people
Human Development Index (2011): 0.5 (medium)
Inequality-Adjusted Human Development Index (2011): 0.39 (medium)

Exports to the EU (2009): EUR 3.205 billion
Imports from the EU (2009): EUR 1.488 billion
Official Development Aid from EU countries that make up the DAC (2009, net): USD 231.1 million

Remittances received from the EU-27 (2010): USD 749 million
Remittances sent to the EU-27 (2010): USD 42 million
Remittances received from LAC (2010): USD 425 million
Remittances sent to other LAC countries (2010): USD 16 million

2. Data about Latin America and the Caribbean–the European Union stock and migration flows

Stock of Peruvians in the 43 LAC countries (2010): 247,970
Stock of people from any of the 43 LAC countries in Peru (2010): 16,707
Stock of Peruvians in the 27 EU countries (2010): 317,922
Countries with largest stock in the EU (2010): Spain (184,832), Italy (92,001) and Germany (12,620).
Stock of people of the EU-27 residents in Peru (2010): 8,593
EU countries with largest stock in Peru (2010): Spain (2,547), Italy (1,903) and Germany (1,265)

EU country that granted the greatest number of citizenships (1998–2009): Spain (39,405 or 78% of the total citizenships received by Peruvians)
Total of residence permits granted by EU countries (2008–2009): 109,342 (Table 1)
Principal countries that granted them: Italy (53,201), Spain (45,801) and the United Kingdom (2,606)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For family reasons</td>
<td>14,334</td>
<td>10,258</td>
<td>11,152</td>
<td>35,744</td>
<td>32.7</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For performing remunerated activities</td>
<td>20,839</td>
<td>17,262</td>
<td>16,557</td>
<td>54,658</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>409 (0.7 % of the permits for performing remunerated act.)</td>
<td>1,187 (2.2 % of the permits for performing remunerated act.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For education reasons</td>
<td>2,092</td>
<td>2,145</td>
<td>2,004</td>
<td>6,241</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other reasons</td>
<td>5,860</td>
<td>5,635</td>
<td>1,204</td>
<td>12,699</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>43,125</td>
<td>35,300</td>
<td>30,917</td>
<td>109,342</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Persons detained because of their irregular status in the EU (2008–2010): 5,620** (Table 2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>Total (2008–2010)</th>
<th>Percentage of total irregular migrants from LAC</th>
<th>Ratio between regular and irregular migrants (flows) in the EU-27</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>1,940</td>
<td>1,880</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>5,620</td>
<td>2.8 %</td>
<td>1 irregular for every 19 regulars</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1

Table 2
1. General data, trade exchanges and remittances

Population (2011): 10.05 million people
Gross National Income-Purchasing Power Parity per capita (2011): USD 8,087
Human Development Index (2011): 0.48 (medium)
Inequality-Adjusted Human Development Index (2011): 0.35 (medium)

Exports to the EU (2009): EUR 597 million
Imports from the EU (2009): EUR 857 million
Official Development Aid from EU countries that make up the DAC (2009, net): ND

Remittances received from the EU-27 (2010): USD 535 million
Remittances sent to the EU-27 (2010): USD 185 million
Remittances received from LAC (2010): USD 125 million
Remittances sent to other LAC countries (2010): USD 227 million

2. Data about Latin America and the Caribbean–the European Union stock and migration flows

Stock of Dominicans in the 43 LAC countries (2010): 54,976
Stock of people from any of the 43 LAC countries in Dominican Republic (2010): 358,341
Stock of Dominicans in the 27 EU countries (2010): 173,831
Countries with largest stock in the EU (2010): Spain (130,832), Italy (24,174) and Germany (7,817)
Stock of people from the EU-27 that are residents in the Dominican Republic (2010): 39,385
EU countries with largest stock in the Dominican Republic (2010): Spain (10,968), Italy (10,444) and Germany (7,583)

EU country that granted the greatest number of citizenships (1998–2009): Spain (31,275 or 80% of the total citizenships received by Dominicans)
Total residence permits granted by EU countries (2008–2010): 50,102 (Table 1)
Principal countries that granted them: Spain (33,455), Italy (12,327) and France (1,225)
Table 1

Residence permits granted to migrants from this LAC country in the EU-27, 2008–2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For family reasons</td>
<td>11,164</td>
<td>8,815</td>
<td>9,495</td>
<td>29,474</td>
<td>58.8</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For performing remunerated activities</td>
<td>4,502</td>
<td>3,123</td>
<td>2,033</td>
<td>9,658</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>61 (0.6 % of the permits for performing remunerated act.)</td>
<td>140 (1.4 % of the permits for performing remunerated act.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For education reasons</td>
<td>980</td>
<td>1,260</td>
<td>1,101</td>
<td>3,341</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other reasons</td>
<td>4,219</td>
<td>3,021</td>
<td>389</td>
<td>7,629</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>20,865</td>
<td>16,219</td>
<td>13,018</td>
<td>50,102</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Persons detained because of their irregular status in the EU (2008–2010): 6,745 (Table 2)

Table 2

Irregular migrants detained in the EU-27, 2008–2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>Total (2008–2010)</th>
<th>Percentage of total irregular migrants from LAC</th>
<th>Ratio between regular and irregular migrants (flows) in the EU-27</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2,155</td>
<td>2,325</td>
<td>2,265</td>
<td>6,745</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>1 irregular for every 7 regulars</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SAINT LUCIA

1. General data, trade exchanges and remittances

Population (2011): 176,000 people
Human Development Index (2011): 0.5 (medium)
Inequality-Adjusted Human Development Index (2011): ND

Exports to the EU (2009): EUR 63 million
Imports from the EU (2009): EUR 44 million
Official Development Aid from EU countries that make up the DAC (2009, net): ND

Remittances received from the EU-27 (2010): USD 9 million
Remittances sent to the EU-27 (2010): USD 4 million
Remittances received from LAC (2010): USD 6 million
Remittances sent to other LAC countries (2010): USD 2 million

2. Data about Latin America and the Caribbean–the European Union stock and migration flows

Stock of Saint Lucians in the 43 LAC countries (2010): 10,904
Stock of people from any of the 43 LAC countries in Saint Lucia (2010): 4,007
Stock of Saint Lucians in the 27 EU countries (2010): 11,847
Countries with largest stock in the EU (2010): the United Kingdom (10,947), Spain (416) and Germany (187)
Stock of people from the EU-27 that are residents in Saint Lucia (2010): 2,267
EU countries with largest stock in Saint Lucia (2010): the United Kingdom (2,149), France (39) and Germany (39)

EU country that granted the greatest number of citizenships (1998–2009): the United Kingdom (1,086 or 69% of the total citizenships received by Saint Lucians)
Total residence permits granted by EU countries (2008–2010): 1,147 (Table 1)
Principal countries that granted them: the United Kingdom (685), France (375) and Germany (47)
### Table 1

**Residence permits granted to migrants from this LAC country in the EU-27, 2008–2010**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For family reasons</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>484</td>
<td>42.2</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For performing remunerated activities</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>6 (5.9 % of the permits for performing remunerated act.)</td>
<td>36 (35.3 % of the permits for performing remunerated act.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For education reasons</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other reasons</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>33.1</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>419</td>
<td>409</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>1,147</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Persons detained because of their irregular status in the EU (2008–2010): 180 (Table 2)**

### Table 2

**Irregular migrants detained in the EU-27, 2008–2010**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>Total (2008–2010)</th>
<th>Percentage of total irregular migrants from LAC</th>
<th>Ratio between regular and irregular migrants (flows) in the EU-27</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>1 irregular for every 6 regulars</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. General data, trade exchanges and remittances

Population (2011): 529,000 people  
Human Development Index (2011): 0.47 (medium)  
Inequality-Adjusted Human Development Index (2011): 0.36 (medium)

Exports to the EU (2009): EUR 266 million  
Imports from the EU (2009): EUR 248 million  
Official Development Aid from EU countries that make up the DAC (2009, net): USD 121.96 million

Remittances received from the EU-27 (2010): USD 2 million  
Remittances sent to the EU-27 (2010): USD 70 million  
Remittances received from LAC (2010): ND  
Remittances sent to other LAC countries (2010): USD 22 million

2. Data about Latin America and the Caribbean–the European Union stock and migration flows

Stock of Surinamese in the 43 LAC countries (2010): 6,491  
Stock of people from any of the 43 LAC countries in Suriname (2010): 18,576  
Stock of Surinamese in the 27 EU countries (2010): 188,945  
Countries with largest stock in the EU (2010): the Netherlands (187,219), Belgium (693) and the United Kingdom (350)  
Stock of people of the EU-27 residents in Suriname (2010): 13,297  
EU countries with largest stock in Suriname (2010): the Netherlands (10,154) and France (3,143)

EU country that granted the greatest number of citizenships (1998–2009): the Netherlands (11,720 or 88% of the total citizenships received by Surinamese)  
Total residence permits granted by EU countries (2008–2010): 5,762 (Table 1)  
Principal countries that granted them: the Netherlands (3,849), France (1,584) and Belgium (247)
Table 1

Residence permits granted to migrants from this LAC country in the EU-27, 2008–2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For family reasons</td>
<td>1,636</td>
<td>1,421</td>
<td>1,464</td>
<td>4,521</td>
<td>78.5</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For performing remunerated activities</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>71 (35.7 % of the permits for performing remunerated act.)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For education reasons</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>482</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other reasons</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,066</td>
<td>1,813</td>
<td>1,883</td>
<td>5,762</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Persons detained because of their irregular status in the EU (2008–2010): 745 (Table 2)

Table 2

Irregular migrants detained in the EU-27, 2008–2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>Total (2008–2010)</th>
<th>Percentage of total irregular migrants from LAC</th>
<th>Ratio between regular and irregular migrants (flows) in the EU-27</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>275</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>745</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>1 irregular for every 7 regulars</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TRINIDAD AND TOBAGO

1. General data, trade exchanges and remittances

**Population (2011):** 1.3 million people  
**Gross National Income-Purchasing Power Parity per capita (2011):** USD 23,439  
**Human Development Index (2011):** 0.53 (high)  
**Inequality-Adjusted Human Development Index (2011):** 0.45 (high)

**Exports to the EU (2009):** EUR 1.906 billion  
**Imports from the EU (2009):** EUR 499 million  
**Official Development Aid from EU countries that make up the DAC (2009, net):** ND

**Remittances received from the EU-27 (2010):** USD 9 million  
**Remittances sent to the EU-27 (2010):** USD 3 million  
**Remittances received from LAC (2010):** USD 4 million  
**Remittances sent to other LAC countries (2010):** USD 16 million

2. Data about Latin America and the Caribbean–the European Union stock and migration flows

**Stock of Trinidadians in the 43 LAC countries (2010):** 13,381  
**Stock of people from any of the 43 LAC countries in Trinidad and Tobago (2010):** 23,654  
**Stock of Trinidadians in the 27 EU countries (2010):** 29,065  
**Countries with largest stock in the EU (2010):** the United Kingdom (26,020), Germany (707) and the Netherlands (506)  
**Stock of people of the EU-27 residents in Trinidad and Tobago (2010):** 1,719  
**EU countries with largest stock in Trinidad and Tobago (2010):** the United Kingdom (1,719)

**Persons who acquired citizenship from an EU-27 country (1998–2009):** 3,487  
**EU country that granted the greatest number of citizenships (1998–2009):** the United Kingdom (3,183 or 91% of the total citizenships received by Trinidadians)  
**Total residence permits granted by EU countries (2008–2010):** 4,280 (Table 1)  
**Principal countries that granted them:** the United Kingdom (3,734), France (124) and Italy (61)
Table 1

Residence permits granted to migrants from this LAC country in the EU-27, 2008–2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For family reasons</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>747</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For performing remunerated activities</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>767</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>124 (16.2% of the permits for performing remunerated act.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For education reasons</td>
<td>457</td>
<td>436</td>
<td>436</td>
<td>1,329</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other reasons</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>704</td>
<td>1,437</td>
<td>33.6</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,380</td>
<td>1,314</td>
<td>1,586</td>
<td>4,280</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Persons detained because of their irregular status in the EU (2008–2010): 410 (Table 2)

Table 2

Irregular migrants detained in the EU-27, 2008–2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>Total (2008-2010)</th>
<th>Percentage of total irregular migrants from LAC</th>
<th>Ratio between regular and irregular migrants (flows) in the EU-27</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>140</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>1 irregular for every 10 regulars</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. General data, trade exchanges and remittances

Population (2011): 3.4 million people  
Human Development Index (2011): 0.54 (high)  
Inequality-Adjusted Human Development Index (2011): 0.45 (high)

Exports to the EU (2009): EUR 918 million  
Imports from the EU (2009): EUR 680 million  
Official Development Aid from EU countries that make up the DAC (2009, net): USD 27.24 million

Remittances received from the EU-27 (2010): USD 35 million  
Remittances sent to the EU-27 (2010): USD 173 million  
Remittances received from LAC (2010): USD 41 million  
Remittances sent to other LAC countries (2010): USD 49 million

2. Data about Latin America and the Caribbean–the European Union stock and migration flows

Stock of Uruguayans in the 43 LAC countries (2010): 154,817  
Stock of people from any of the 43 LAC countries in Uruguay (2010): 39,766  
Stock of Uruguayans in the 27 EU countries (2010): 111,020  
Countries with largest stock in the EU (2010): Spain (99,666), Sweden (2,812) and Italy (2,175)  
Stock of people from the EU-27 that are residents in Uruguay (2010): 34,572  
EU countries with largest stock in Uruguay (2010): Spain (18,705), Italy (8,830) and Germany (1,443)

EU country that granted the greatest number of citizenships (1998–2009): Spain (5,302 or 79% of the total citizenships received by Uruguayans)  
Total residence permits granted by EU countries (2008–2010): 13,037 (Table 1)  
Principal countries that granted them: Spain (10,854), Italy (792) and the United Kingdom (434)
### Table 1

**Residence permits granted to migrants from this LAC country in the EU-27, 2008–2010**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For family reasons</td>
<td>1,833</td>
<td>1,087</td>
<td>1,123</td>
<td>4,043</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For performing remunerated activities</td>
<td>827</td>
<td>1,874</td>
<td>1,352</td>
<td>4,053</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>93 (0.2 % of the permits for performing remunerated activities)</td>
<td>127 (0.2 % of the permits for performing remunerated activities)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For education reasons</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>845</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other reasons</td>
<td>2,828</td>
<td>771</td>
<td>497</td>
<td>4,096</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>5,767</td>
<td>4,045</td>
<td>3,225</td>
<td>13,037</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Persons detained because of their irregular status in the EU (2008–2010):** 1,635 (Table 2)

### Table 2

**Irregular migrants detained in the EU-27, 2008–2010**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>Total (2008–2010)</th>
<th>Percentage of total irregular migrants from LAC</th>
<th>Ratio between regular and irregular migrants (flows) in the EU-27</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>525</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>580</td>
<td><strong>1,635</strong></td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1 irregular for every 8 regulars</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. General data, trade exchanges and remittances

**Population (2011):** 29.4 million people  
**Gross National Income-Purchasing Power Parity per capita (2011):** USD 10,656  
**Human Development Index (2011):** 0.51 (medium)  
**Inequality-Adjusted Human Development Index (2011):** 0.37 (medium)

**Exports to the EU (2009):** EUR 3.904 billion  
**Imports from the EU (2009):** EUR 3.7 billion  
**Official Development Aid from EU countries that make up the DAC (2009, net):** USD 32.29 million

**Remittances received from the EU-27 (2010):** USD 55 million  
**Remittances sent to the EU-27 (2010):** USD 744 million  
**Remittances received from LAC (2010):** USD 22 million  
**Remittances sent to other LAC countries (2010):** USD 1.16 billion

2. Data about Latin America and the Caribbean–the European Union stock and migration flows

**Stock of Venezuelans in the 43 LAC countries (2010):** 98,965  
**Stock of people from any of the 43 LAC countries in Venezuela (2010):** 738,077  
**Stock of Venezuelans in the 27 EU countries (2010):** 222,548  
**Countries with largest stock in the EU (2010):** Spain (164,239), Portugal (31,519) and Italy (6,786)  
**Stock of people from the EU-27 that are residents in Venezuela (2010):** 189,729  
**EU countries with largest stock in Venezuela (2010):** Spain (75,526), Portugal (53,035) and Italy (48,920)  

**Persons who acquired citizenship from an EU-27 country (1998–2009):** 15,457  
**EU country that granted the greatest number of citizenships (1998–2009):** Spain (8,019 or 52% of the total citizenships received by Venezuelans)  
**Total residence permits granted by EU countries (2008–2010):** 32,681 (Table 1)  
**Principal countries that granted them:** Spain (20,013), the United Kingdom (3,964) and Italy (3,863)
Table 1

Residence permits granted to migrants from this LAC country in the EU-27, 2008–2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For family reasons</td>
<td>3,999</td>
<td>3,152</td>
<td>4,046</td>
<td>11,197</td>
<td>34.3</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For performing remunerated activities</td>
<td>1,822</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>2,264</td>
<td>7,086</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>693 (9.8 % of the permits for performing remunerated act.)</td>
<td>14 (0.2 % of the permits for performing remunerated act.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For education reasons</td>
<td>2,612</td>
<td>2,361</td>
<td>2,527</td>
<td>7,500</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other reasons</td>
<td>3,991</td>
<td>1,942</td>
<td>965</td>
<td>6,898</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12,424</td>
<td>10,455</td>
<td>9,802</td>
<td>32,681</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Persons detained because of their irregular status in the EU (2008–2010): 4,955 (Table 2)

Table 2

Irregular migrants detained in the EU-27, 2008–2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>Total (2008–2010)</th>
<th>Percentage of total irregular migrants from LAC</th>
<th>Ratio between regular and irregular migrants (flows) in the EU-27</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1,770</td>
<td>1,725</td>
<td>1,460</td>
<td>4,955</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1 irregular for every 6 regulars</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 2. METHODOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS

The study on the principal flows between Latin America and the Caribbean (LAC) to the European Union (EU) and from the EU to LAC, as well as the assessment of migratory dynamics in the LAC region, aims to offer relevant and current information in addition to points of common interest between the countries in the LAC and EU regions when approaching the subject on migration and development. Through the query and systematic analysis of several databases and a revision of existing literature, the principal flows from one region to another and some of their characteristics have been identified. The information presented in this study aims to serve as a primary and useful reference that facilitates understanding of the migratory dynamics between regions and contributes to dialogue between the key parties.

In spite of its added value, relevance, pertinence and use, the study does not represent a comprehensive assessment of the migratory dynamics or of the specific topics derived from them. It is also not a strategic plan that explains and details what the approaches may be that governments should take to address the subject. The document fits between these two reference frameworks since it presents information on the principal migratory dynamics between the two regions as well as some relevant topics derived from it. The last objective is to contribute to bridging the gap of systematized information and knowledge that exists on this subject.

Given the nature of the study and its proposed objectives, the analysis was primarily based on the **review of secondary sources (secondary data analysis)**. This consisted of the analysis of available information that was previously produced and some published or soon to be published research, among others. During the compilation, processing and information analysis process, it was sought to promote the advantages that this tool can provide, such as access to databases and original sources produced by individuals from academia and other civil society organizations. However, the challenges related to this tool and its biases and limitations were taken into account, adopting a careful interpretation of the reviewed studies.

The study combines qualitative and quantitative tools. On the one hand, the information available in the different databases created by international and regional institutions and agencies has been used. On the other, the study is based on reports on specific topics such as remittances, development and circular migration, for example, those that are presented in the document attached to this report in the form of an annotated bibliography.
The databases accessed can be grouped into three categories: 1) global, 2) regional and on EU countries and 3) on LAC countries. In the first category are the tools developed by the United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs (UN-DESA), those from the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), from the World Bank (WB) and from the International Labour Organization (ILO). In the second are those developed by the Statistical Office of the European Communities (EUROSTAT) and the Migrant Integration Policy Index III (MIPEX III). Finally, in the third are the databases developed by the Organization of American States (OAS) and by the Latin American and Caribbean Demographic Centre (CELADE).

The databases produced by the World Bank and the Statistical Office of the European Communities are of particular interest for the study. This is because the other databases mostly include two categories that limit their use for this study: they present data up to the last census round (from 2000 to 2002) and/or it is not possible to break down the information contained therein for each LAC and EU country. However, the information contained in these databases has not been completely discarded, but instead was used in some cases in a complementary manner. Also, the census results from Argentina, Brazil and Ecuador were consulted, primarily due to their representation in terms of migration flows regarding the EU and for the presence of recent data since these countries conducted their last national census in 2010.

The reasons why the national sources have not been reviewed and the diplomatic missions of each of the more than 70 LAC and EU countries included in the study have not been consulted – something that was thought to do at the beginning – are primarily three. The first reason is that the regional and international databases that were constructed under the same methodology were accessed in order to present the information in a comparative manner. The second reason is that, even though there was a general consensus that the censuses and instruments used in the sources to compile information are the most solid source of statistics for counting migrants, not all LAC countries conducted national censuses in the 2010–2012 round, which limited the process of locating and analysing updated relevant information for the study. Finally, there was a limitation on the time for compiling, systematizing, analysing and presenting the information. The period for undertaking these tasks and presenting the first draft of the study in January 2012 was basically five months, from August to December 2011.

Analysing the data that is presented below, it can be observed how complicated it is to access detailed information on the sociodemographic and socioeconomic characteristics of the migrants displaced in the last decade between LAC countries, from this region to the EU and from the EU to LAC. It is important to take into account that this limitation is not new or exclusive to the LAC and/or EU countries. Several studies, including some from the 1980s, put particular emphasis on the importance of advancement in devising methodologies that permit better recording and understanding the migration flows. This is a challenge that Pellegrino highlighted in the study he conducted in 2004 named...
“Migration from Latin America to Europe: Trends and Policy Challenges”, and has been one of the biggest topics raised in the last decade in different international spaces and in the academic world.\textsuperscript{45}

Despite this drawback, the information contained in the databases described in this report permits identifying the changes in the contexts, flows and stocks in the last decade. It is also useful for understanding the current state of the flows; knowing which countries are the principal countries of origin and destination in the region and from one region to another; understanding the circuits of migration and migratory dynamics; and in some cases, the gender and age group of the individuals that make them up, specifically in the last three years in the case of EU countries. For example, the data permits clearly identifying the corridors from Colombia and Ecuador on the one hand, and Spain on the other, as well as the community of Haitian refugees residing in France and the flow of highly skilled individuals from Brazil, Mexico and Venezuela that work in an EU country.

Ignoring or discarding these numbers, though they seem very general or small, would be an error especially when trying to know the general context of the flows and the challenges that migrants face, in order to design policies that attend to their needs that facilitate cooperation in regards to migration and development between countries. Since May 2004, when the IOM published the study conducted by Pellegrino, there have been many changes in migratory dynamics. The new data, as small as it may seem, can indicate new trends and facilitate understanding of the causes and determinants of migration in the countries of origin, as well as the context in the countries of destination. Furthermore, the systematic analysis of databases permits identifying gaps and areas of opportunity for conducting quantitative and qualitative research.

1. The World Bank

I) Migrant stock between countries in Latin America and the Caribbean and the European Union

The World Bank develops bilateral matrices on the migrant stock and remittances between more than 190 countries through statistical calculations from the censuses and population counts, as well as the Migration and Remittances Factbook, the last version of which was published in 2011. It is based on “Bilateral Estimates of Migrant Stocks in 2010”, which contains information on 44 LAC countries and 27 EU countries. Its principal relevance lies in that it presents information on almost all of the countries included in the study in both regions, and uses the same methodology that permits making comparisons between the countries, subregions and regions of LAC and the EU. Even though the information contained in the database is general, which does not allow identifying the sociodemographic and socioeconomic characteristics of the migrants who make up the stocks, the information from the WB permits identifying the migrant stock between countries, distinguishing by gender and in 10 year periods from 1960. In other words, it is possible to identify, for example, the number of Jamaican men and women in the United Kingdom in 1960, 1970, 1980, 1990 and 2000. The same can be done for individuals of Ecuadorian origin in Italy, Spaniards in Argentina, Germans in Chile, and so forth, with the disadvantage that this categorization is not presented for 2010.

The WB constructs its database from the one developed by the University of Sussex on the stock of people. When the methodological documents from both institutions are analysed regarding how the figures presented by the WB are drawn up, it can be identified that the numbers on immigrants in LAC countries are developed, in the majority of cases, by the country of birth of immigrants. The other cases can be classified based on two categories: a) those that are calculated only considering nationality (for example, Ecuadorians who took a European nationality), and b) those that are added to people born in another country (for example Spain) with those who have Spanish nationality (Ecuadorians with Spanish passport).

The first category is made up of seven countries: French Guyana, Suriname, Anguilla, Aruba, Cayman Islands, Guadeloupe and Martinique. Four make up the second category: Brazil, Costa Rica, Falkland Islands, and the Netherlands Antilles. The most sensitive case for this study is Brazil, which received 29 per cent of the European immigrants in the LAC region. The other countries each received between 1 and 2 per cent of the total. In the Brazilian case, it is important to point out that the conflict mentioned in the previous paragraph can exist primarily for people born in Brazil that have Portuguese nationality and who represent 56 per cent of the total of European immigrants residing in the country.
For European countries, nearly all of the data is constructed by adding the people born in another country to those that have a nationality from another country. This is something that Massey (2012) points out in his report which states that “in general, European censuses commonly include the variable nationality/citizenship and do not incorporate that corresponding to the country of birth of the individual. This results in a sub-estimate of the quantity of immigrants of Latin American origin, for example, that responds to the question that mentions the nationality of the European Community.” Nonetheless, to confirm that these figures presented by the World Bank were based on reality and that they serve as a basis for measuring the stock of people from LAC in the EU, the data from the Municipal Register of Inhabitants of Spain was carefully reviewed. It is noteworthy that the difference between the data from the WB as compared to the data from the Municipal Register of Inhabitants does not exceed 7 per cent for any of the principal nationalities of LAC individuals residing in Spain, which shows the methodological soundness of the WB database regarding stock of people.

II) Flow of monetary remittances between countries in Latin America and the Caribbean

Regarding monetary remittances, the WB develops four databases that present information between countries. These databases are drawn up considering the migrant stock between countries, and the level of income of the countries of origin and of the countries of destination. There is a database for each of the three categories and a fourth that integrates these three concepts and the data derived from it. This database entitled “Bilateral Remittance Estimates for 2010 using Migrant Stocks, Host Country Incomes, and Origin Country Incomes” presents information for nearly all of the countries included in the study. It also permits analysing the information for 2010 by regions and subregions.

The World Bank produces other statistics that permit identifying the inflows and outflows of monetary remittances of each country, in some cases from 1970, but without identifying the countries of origin and destination of these flows. In other words, the statistics present general information that permits analysing the habitual trends regarding the entry of remittances in the last 40 years in each country. Despite its relevance, this data does not greatly help to advance the detailed analysis on monetary remittance flows between LAC and the EU and the countries in the two regions.

2. United Nations

UN-DESA produces the “United Nations Global Migration Database”, which contains information on the migrant stocks in hundreds of countries, including those in the LAC and EU regions. Given that the database draws from different sources, in the majority of cases the information presented does not even permit identifying the sociodemographic characteristics of migrants or their countries of origin. In the case of LAC as a region of destination, this database includes information from the latest census round, that is, up to 2000–2002 in the best case scenario. For example, for the case of Argentina, there is information for 1980, 1991 and 2000. In the case of Brazil, information from 1980, 1991 and 2000 can be located. By contrast, in the case of Uruguay, there is information up to 1996 and in the case of Peru, up to 1993.

In the case of EU countries of destination, it is only possible to access information that distinguishes between genders for 10 countries, although the information is a bit more updated: Germany, Austria, Belgium, Denmark, Spain, Finland, France, Italy, Portugal and Sweden. In the best case scenario, it is possible to find information on migrant stocks according to the country of origin and with the distinction of gender in some countries up to 2008. The advantage of this database is that the information on some of the countries goes from 1990 to 2008 and in other cases, as in the Netherlands, information from 1980 is also shown.

Furthermore, UN-DESA created another two databases on migration, one on migration flows and the other on migrant stock in some selected countries. The first presents information on 29 developed countries – according to the indicators of the “Human Development Report” produced by the United Nations Development Programme – with figures up to 2008. 20 countries of the EU are of interest for this study: Germany, Austria, Belgium, Denmark, Spain, Finland, France, Italy, Norway, the Netherlands, Sweden, Czech Republic and the United Kingdom. The database contains information on the influxes and outflows, in some cases from 1960.

Despite its relevance, this database presents an impediment to this study: there is only information on the influx and outflow of individuals according to their nationality for five countries (Belgium, France, Hungary, Luxembourg and the Netherlands), while in the other cases, the information is based on the former country of residence. In no case is information offered on the country of birth of the individuals that enter and leave. Furthermore, the database on stocks does not permit identifying the countries of origin of migrants, but rather only shows general data by the countries of destination, which represents an important obstacle for this study.

47 Although it is only according to the traditional classification of man and woman, the same as in nearly all databases.
3. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development

The OECD, in addition to the qualitative reports done through SOPEMI (Continuous Reporting System on Migration), which contains general information on flows of emigrants according their level of education, has developed databases with information on migration flows: a) the “Database on Immigrants in OECD Countries” (DIOC) and b) the “International Migration Database”. The DIOC contains information on some demographic characteristics and characteristics of the labour market of the population from 34 OECD countries. Despite its methodological rigour and the richness of the database, the principal problem for incorporating it in this study is that it was drawn up based on information obtained from the 2000 census round.

The “International Migration Database” contains slightly more updated information, normally broken down by years from 1975 to 2009 and is categorized by gender, on the 34 OECD countries and on the following categories:

a) influx and outflows of foreigners by nationality;
b) flows of asylum-seekers by nationality;
c) stock of foreigners by nationality and country of birth;
d) acquisition of nationality by former nationality;
e) influx of foreign, seasonal and permanent workers by nationality;
f) stock of workers by nationality and country of birth.

However, when it is desired to break down the information contained in this database according to the area and/or country of origin, it is not possible to access all of the information mentioned. For example, when trying to obtain information on the Caribbean, the majority of the categories are empty. When analysing the data by each country, it is possible to find more information but it is also limited. For example, in the randomly selected case of Bolivia, it is possible to know only the information on the gender of migrants broken down by year from 2000 in four European countries (Austria, Finland, Spain and Sweden), and in the following categories: a) influx and outflows of Bolivians according to their nationality and b) stock of foreigners according to their nationality and country of birth, and c) acquisition of nationality by former nationality. As can be

48 In addition to the already mentioned countries, in this case there is information on Germany and the Netherlands (from 2000 to 2009) and Italy (from 2002 to 2009).
49 In addition to the four already mentioned countries, in this case there is information on Luxembourg (2001) and Hungary (2006–2009).
50 In addition to the four already mentioned countries, there is information on Germany and the Netherlands (from 2000 to 2009). In the case of Spain, the information covers 2003 to 2009.
inferred from this information, the data contained therein is different according to each country which makes it impossible to make comparisons between them. Furthermore, there is no information on the majority of the countries included in the study.

Finally, OECD produces a database that contains complete and coherent information and that permits breaking down the quantities that 12 LAC countries have received in official assistance for development from the DAC (Development Assistance Committee) of the OECD\textsuperscript{51} from 2002 to 2009. Even though this is not a major topic in this study, the figures can be useful at the time of analysing the specific weight of the remittances that came into the countries of the Americas compared to the international assistance that they receive.

4. International Labour Organization

The International Labour Organization has the “International Labour Migration Statistics” database, which is made up from different sources. In the case of European countries, the information is obtained from the responses of the survey used by EUROSTAT, the United Nations Statistics Division, the ILO and the Council of Europe. In 2008, this database became part of the “Labour Statistics Database”, which is under the responsibility of the ILO Department of Statistics. Even though the database presents valuable information on labour flows, the data presented regarding migration flows between LAC and the EU are dissimilar and are not comprehensive. The elements that could be recovered are those of the economic migration flows from Brazil to Portugal between 1999 and 2002 as well as from Bolivia, Colombia, Ecuador and Peru to Spain from 2003 to 2006. This shows that the information is also not updated which, represents a large obstacle for this study. If the data contained therein is compared with the data presented in EUROSTAT (that is presented below), it can be observed that these latter databases are more complete, coherent and updated.

\textsuperscript{51} The Development Assistance Committee (DAC) is the principal body of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development for issues related to cooperation and development. The EU countries that are part of the DAC are: Germany, Austria, Belgium, Denmark, Spain, Finland, France, Greece, Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Portugal, Sweden and the United Kingdom.
The databases produced by the Statistical Office of the European Communities are those that contain more broken down information on the flows from LAC countries to EU countries in the last decade and specifically, from the study developed by Pellegrino in 2004. The databases contain information on the majority of the European Union and LAC countries as countries of origin and cover at least the following categories: i) migrant stock according to citizenship the and country of birth; ii) international migration influx and outflows from EU countries; iii) acquisition of citizenship; iv) residence permits and v) irregular migration.

Until 2007, the data was supplied to the EUROSTAT central office in Luxembourg by national statistics institutes through informal agreements. This resulted in the data was compiled using different instruments in each of the 27 EU countries. Furthermore, the countries had different definitions of the term migrant and different concepts of the temporality of migration. These factors represent a disadvantage at the time of making comparisons as upon doing so, conclusions could be drawn that are not completely correct. On the other hand, the instruments use different definitions on what kind of people are considered migrants and on the temporality of migration.

In 2008, Regulation No. 862/2007 of the European Parliament and Council entered into force, establishing common definitions for all of the countries. Adopting and using these definitions was optional in 2008 and obligatory from 2009. Through this initiative, the comparative analysis of the figures between EU countries has improved substantially as of 2008. However, depending on the definitions previously used by the member countries, the change could have kept the data of a country from being compared for a long period of time.

For these reasons, the information presented in the tables, charts and figures in which the databases produced by EUROSTAT are used as a source is only indicative and is shown to give a general idea of the changes in the flows over time. For this reason, only general information is shown: in no case is detailed information shown or comparisons made between the 27 EU countries.

52 I am grateful for the collaboration of David Thorogood, Director of the EUROSTAT Migration and Asylum Section in the Population Unit, for clarifying the level of comparability of the figures that the EUROSTAT databases contain.

53 For more information on each country, see the explanatory notes available at the following link: http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/cache/ITY_SDDS/EN/migr_flow_esms.htm.
Finally, EUROSTAT also produces information on investments and trade exchanges that go from the EU to other countries, including those of LAC. Even though these topics are not part of this study, the data provides a general idea on the economic dynamics between the two regions.

The information broken down by year, as well as the number of countries for which there is information, varies depending on the database, as presented below.

1) Migrant stocks taking into account citizenship and country of birth

The “Population by Sex, Age Group and Citizenship” database contains information on the population residing in the 27 EU member countries even though it is different for various countries. In the cases of Germany, Denmark, Slovenia, Spain, Hungary, Latvia and Sweden, data from 1998 to 2010 is presented. For the other countries, the information is as follows: Italy, from 1998 to 2000 and from 2003 to 2010; Portugal, 1998, from 2000 to 2003 and from 2007 to 2010; Greece, 1998 and 2001; France, 1999, 2003 and 2005; Belgium, from 1999 to 2003 and from 2008 to 2010; the Netherlands, from 1999 to 2010; Estonia, 2000; Luxemburg and Malta, 2001; Austria, from 2001 to 2009; the Czech Republic, from 2001 to 2010; Lithuania, 2001 and from 2005 to 2008; Bulgaria, 2001 and from 2008 to 2010; Poland, 2002 and from 2007 to 2010; the United Kingdom, from 2003 to 2005; Romania, from 2004 to 2009; Slovakia, from 2004 to 2010 and Ireland, from 2009 to 2010. In addition, there is no information on Cyprus. This database includes data on 43 LAC countries:

Despite its richness, the fact that there is no annual information for all of the countries makes analysing the data difficult and impedes observing the annual changes.

Something similar happens with the “Population by Sex, Age Group and Country of Birth” database. In it, information is presented on the majority of the EU countries as follows: Slovenia, from 1998 to 2010; Spain, Finland and the Netherlands from 1999 to 2010; Denmark, 1998, from 2000 to 2001 and from 2003 to 2010; Latvia, from 2003 to 2010; Austria, from 2002 to 2009; Sweden, 1999 and from 2003 to 2010; Lithuania, 2001 and from 2004 to 2008; Romania, from 2004 to 2005 and from 2007 to 2009; Poland, 2002 and from 2009 to 2010; Slovakia, 2003, 2005 and 2009; Belgium, from 2008 to 2010; Czech Republic and Ireland, from 2009 to 2010; Hungary, from 2001 to 2002; France, 1999 and 2005; Bulgaria and Luxembourg, 2001; Estonia, 2000; Cyprus, 2003 and Portugal, 2009. The database does not contain information on

54 Antigua and Barbuda, Anguilla, Netherlands Antilles, Aruba, Bahamas, Barbados, Cuba, St. Barthelemy, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Grenada, Haiti, Jamaica, Cayman Islands, St. Maarten, Montserrat, Turks and Caicos Islands, British Virgin Islands, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Trinidad and Tobago, Belize, Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama, Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Ecuador, Guyana, Paraguay, Peru, Suriname, Uruguay, Venezuela and Falkland Islands.
Germany, Greece, Italy, Malta or the United Kingdom and includes information on 50 LAC countries. As can be observed, the data in this section is more scarce in comparison with that offered in the database on citizenship even though the information on Spain, the largest receiving country of migration flows coming from LAC, is relatively comprehensive.

Additional data can be obtained on migrant stocks by accessing the “Long-term residents by citizenship on 31 December of each year” database in the section on residence permits. This database contains data on 33 LAC nationalities in 25 EU countries (all except Luxembourg and the United Kingdom) for 2008 and 2009.

II) International Migration Influx and Outflows from European Union Countries

The “International migration flows - Immigration” section contains more information than that presented in the previous sub-section, specifically regarding the data categorized by years. The database presents information on the flows of immigrants of all nationalities from 1998 to 2009 for 19 EU countries. These countries are: Germany, Austria, Denmark, Spain, Slovenia, Slovakia, Estonia, Finland, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Hungary, the Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, Sweden and the United Kingdom. However, there are many challenges when trying to break down this information for the LAC region where there is only information presented for the same period of time in ten cases: Denmark, Spain, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Hungary, the Netherlands, Slovenia, Finland and Sweden. This, in contrast to the database on stocks, permits analysing the trends that the flows have followed year after year by the countries and subregions of origin. The other disadvantage is that this information is broken down by gender and age group only for 2008 and 2009.

This section also contains more data on migrants born in 25 EU countries (all except for Hungary and Portugal) in 49 LAC countries as of 1998, although the information presented is intermittent for many of the countries. In other words, information is not available for all of the cases for every year from 1998 to 2009. However, the most detailed information is available for 2008 and 2009.

III) Acquisition of citizenship

The information contained in the “Acquisition and loss of citizenship” section is very similar to that of the previous section, particularly that of the “Acquisition of citizenship by sex, age group and former citizenship” database. There are only seven cases on which information is presented from 1998 to 2009: Denmark, Germany, Spain, the Netherlands, Slovenia, Finland and Sweden. The main advantage is that they represent around 75 per cent of the countries that granted European citizenship to individuals whose former citizenship was from a LAC country. As in the previous case, the information is broken down by gender and age group only for 2008 and 2009.
IV) Residence permits (family reunification, labour migration in general and by skill level of migrants, student migration and other reasons)

The “Residence permits” section contains data on 26 EU countries (all except Luxembourg and the United Kingdom) for 2008 and 2009. The figures represented therein are put into the following sub-categories: family reunification, student migration, labour migration and other reasons. All of the categories contain data on 33 LAC countries. The database on “First permits issued for remunerated activities” can be broken down based on:

a) the permits issued to highly skilled workers by reason, length of validity and citizenship;
b) permits issued to researchers by reason, length of validity and citizenship;
c) permits issued to seasonal workers by reason, length of validity and citizenship; and
d) permits issued for other remunerated activities by reason, length of validity and citizenship.

The section on “First permits issued for other reasons by reason, length of validity and citizenship” contains data on: a) individuals with refugee status and subsidiary protection (asylum-seekers are not counted during the period in which their request is being reviewed), b) residence permits and c) permits for “other reasons”. This latter section includes information on:

• other humanitarian reasons
• unaccompanied boys, girls and adolescents who are not asylum-seekers
• victims of human trafficking
• other categories that cannot be included in any of the previous categories.

It is noteworthy that the difference between the 27 EU countries in this category is substantial.

V) Irregular migration

The International Organization for Migration defines detention as the “restriction on freedom of movement, usually through enforced confinement, of an individual by government authorities. There are two kinds of detention: Criminal detention, having as a purpose punishment for the committed crime; and administrative detention, guaranteeing that another administrative measure (such as deportation or expulsion) can be implemented. In the majority of the countries, irregular migrants are subject to administrative detention, as they have violated immigration laws and regulations, which is not considered to be a crime. In many States, an alien may also be detained pending a decision on refugee status or on admission to or removal from the State.” See IOM, Glossary on Migration, IOM, Geneva, 2006.

In the case of EU countries, the detentions are administrative. According to EUROSTAT, the individuals recorded as detained are those who entered in an irregular manner (for
example, evading migration controls or using false identity documents) and those who,
having entered in a regular manner, exceeded the authorized period allotted to them. For
more information, review Art. 2.1. (r) and 5.1. (b) of the Council (EC) Regulation number

The EUROSTAT section on “Third country nationals found to be illegally present” contains
information on the number of migrants coming from 33 LAC countries that have irregular
status between 2008 and 2010 in 27 EU member countries, with the exception of
Luxembourg in 2008. The 33 LAC countries organized by subregion are:
• in the Caribbean: Antigua and Barbuda, the Bahamas, Barbados, Cuba, Dominica,
Dominican Republic, Grenada, Haiti, Jamaica, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint
Vincent and the Grenadines, Trinidad and Tobago;
• in Central America: Belize, Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Mexico,
Nicaragua, Panama;
• in South America: Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Ecuador, Guyana,
Paraguay, Peru, Suriname, Uruguay and Venezuela.

6. Migrant Integration Policy Index III

The Migrant Integration Policy Index III (MIPEX III) contains information and data on
the legislation of EU member countries regarding integration policies for immigrants,
systematized and qualified based on 148 indicators. Notably, the index permits making
comparisons between the legislation of the 27 EU countries in different areas of integration
policies such as the acquisition of nationality, labour mobility and family reunification,
among others, and in different time scales. Even though it does not contain specific
information on the population from LAC, this database is useful for knowing the legal
framework of the countries of destination and the general panorama that migrants face
upon arriving to EU countries. This data can also be used for exploring to what point the
integration policies influence the migratory dynamics from LAC countries.
The Latin American and Caribbean Demographic Centre has developed an on-line databank entitled “Investigation of International Migration in Latin America (IMILA)”, which combines information on the population born outside of the countries included in the study. The information is organized according to two conditions:
1. By country of origin or birth: the number of people born in a specific country, by the selected country of residence (at the time of the census), is obtained.
2. By country of destination or residence on the census date: the country is identified directly with the census date, and the country of origin (birth) must be specified.
However, just as in some of the analysed databases, this database is constructed from the national population and housing censuses from 1990 and 2000, and presents information up to the 2000 census round, which greatly limits its use for this study.

The Organization of American States started the Continuous Reporting System on International Migration in the Americas (SICREMI) in 2009, trying to replicate the exercise that the OECD carries out with SOPEMI. To date, databases have not been produced that integrate and systematize the information with which the First Report on International Migration in the Americas and the national reports were drawn up for Argentina, Belize, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Ecuador, El Salvador, Mexico and Uruguay. These reports, clearly relevant to the study, are included in the annotated bibliography.
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