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Main directions of migration

- From Rural – to Urban areas
- From Remote districts - to Central regions
- From poor regions to more wealthy regions and countries
- From South to North
- From East to West
- South Asia: South–South route = South-North
East - West / South – North routs
Main destinations CAR

- Tajikistan – Russian Federation 84.4%
- Kyrgyzstan – Russian Federation 84.1%
- Uzbekistan – Russian Federation 50.5%

- Other big recipients Kazakhstan and Ukraine
Main destinations for South Asia and Pacific Countries

- India – Saudi Arabia, UAE, USA, UK
- China - USA
- Pakistan – Saudi Arabia
- Philippines – USA
- Republic of Korea – USA
- Vietnam – USA
- Nepal – Saudi Arabia
Observation: main languages in demand

- English
- Russian
South to south corridors

- Pakistan – India – Bangladesh
- Afghanistan – Iran – Pakistan
- Malaysia – Indonesia – Singapore
- China – Hong Kong

Mostly by economic reason / conflict area
Languages are close to each other
Policies toward migration
South Asia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Bangladesh</th>
<th>India</th>
<th>Nepal</th>
<th>Pakistan</th>
<th>Sri Lanka</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Remittances</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addressing brain drain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brain circulation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diaspora</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Return programmes</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant rights</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dual citizenship</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>PIO &amp; OCI cards*</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: * PIO card – Person of Indian Origin card (since 1999); OCI – Overseas Citizen of India card (since 2005).
Policies toward migration CAR

- Kazakhstan Law on migration, 1997
- Tajikistan State program
- Kyrgyzstan State program
- No regional structures
- Some bilateral agreements
- Some dialogue structures / commissions
New trend

• Software /IT/ICT product development/service provided abroad and globally online
• Virtual migration
• Work in virtual space
• Bank account in the other country
• Global consumer
Labor demand structure in Russian Federation

(source FMS 2010)
### Labor force quality CAR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Countries</th>
<th>% of labor force with professional qualification</th>
<th>% of youth entering labor age without any professional qualification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kyrgyzstan</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tajikistan</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uzbekistan</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Supply side: migrant quality

Case of Russian Federation

- 70% of labor migrants are from rural areas or small towns
- 40% have no professional education,
- 20% do not speak and write in Russian
- Overall low awareness on legal procedures, customs and rules
- Overall low awareness on environmental issues
Major jobs
(survey with workers from Tajikistan)

- 55.8% - construction sector
- 16.5% - retail trade,
- 6.2% - household & municipal cleaning service,
- 3.6% - in agriculture
- 2.8% - in industry
- 15.1% - other sectors
## Some indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>States / Indicators 2010</th>
<th>Poverty rate %</th>
<th>New labor force % to total</th>
<th>News jobs created % of labor force</th>
<th>Migration % of labor force</th>
<th>Remittance % / GDP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kyrgyzstan</td>
<td>43.1</td>
<td>5.41</td>
<td>5.27</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tajikistan</td>
<td>53.5</td>
<td>5.86</td>
<td>5.86</td>
<td>36.9</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uzbekistan</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>8.17</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Observations

• Labor demand shift: from industry/ agriculture - to service
• Demand in low skill labor (RF) is still growing
• Greater skills – greater competition
• Low skilled migrants tend to stay and shift from construction to service
• High skilled migrants tend to return home with greater capacity
Employer / administration requests (recipient country)

- Communication/Language skills
- Professional competence
- Rules and Regulations
- Ability to learn and build on experience
- Appreciation of clean Environment
- Good health
What could be the response
Core principles

• Vocationalism
• Critical thinking
• Employability skills
• Personal responsibility
• Global citizenship and tolerance
• Awareness on environmental issues
Implications to education
(sending country/receiving country)

Core subjects
• Languages (of recipient countries)
• Basics of Math
• Basics of IT/ICT
• Geography / History / Culture / Civics
• Environmental awareness
• Physical culture, wellness and hygiene
## Capacity of formal and non-formal TVET (CAR)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Coverage of secondary schools graduates with formal TVET</th>
<th>Contribution of non-formal/adult training to the total outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kyrgyzstan</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tajikistan</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uzbekistan</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Conclusions

Need for

• improved social status of labor migration
• comprehensive state policies, international frameworks and bilateral agreements
• Labor market analysis for migrant and TVET
• TVET flexible response
• Focus on core general subjects
• Role of non-formal providers
• Coordinated education response