

Analysis of existing migratory data production systems and major data sources in Serbia

Enhancing data production systems of migration and human capital in the South-East European area

Vladimir Nikitović, Goran Penev, Jelena Predojević-Despić, Mirjana Rašević
Institute of Social Sciences

**Gordana Bjelobrk, Duško Bumbić, Gordana Cvetinović, Ljiljana Đorđević,
Aleksandra Jovanović, Gordana Jordanovski, Marija Jovanovic, Snežana Lakčević,
Jelena Manojlovic, Selena Marković, Nataša Mijakovac, Jelena Milaković, Slavica
Novaković, Ljiljana Sekulić, Slavica Vukojčić Ševo**
Statistical Office of the Republic of Serbia

Timea Rafai
Kanjiza Municipality

2013

This working paper was developed in the framework of **SEEMIG – Managing Migration and its Effects in SEE – Transnational Actions towards Evidence-based Strategies**. SEEMIG is a strategic project funded by the European Union’s South-East Europe Programme.

SEEMIG - SEE/C/0006/4.1/X

The information published here reflects the authors’ views and the Managing Authority is not liable for any use that may be made of the information concerned.

Content

List of acronyms and abbreviations	4
Executive Summary.....	5
1. INTRODUCTION	7
2. DATA SOURCES AND RESPONSIBLE AUTHORITIES	8
2.1. Administrative (register-based) data sources.....	8
2.1.1. Ministry of Interior of the Republic of Serbia	8
2.1.3. Central Register Office of Compulsory Social Insurance	12
2.2. Statistical data sources, sample surveys.....	13
2.3. Census databases.....	14
2.3.1. Census of Population, Households and Dwellings - Statistical Office of the Republic of Serbia.....	14
3. CASE STUDIES ON LOCAL LEVEL ABOUT USE AND ACCESIBILITY OF MIGRATION-RELATED DATA SOURCES... 16	
3.1. KANJIŽA MUNICIPALITY	16
4. REFERENCES.....	22

List of acronyms and abbreviations

CROCSI – Central Register Office of Compulsory Social Insurance

CRMRS – Commissariat for Refugees and Migration of the Republic of Serbia

EU – European Union –

ESA95 – European system of national and regional accounts

ISS – Institute of Social Sciences

IDPs – Internally displaced persons

KM – Kosovo and Metohija -

LFS – Labour Force Survey -

MG Profile of RS – Migration profile of the Republic of Serbia -

MI –Ministry of Interior of the Republic of Serbia

SORS –Statistical Office of the Republic of Serbia

UNHCR – United Nations High Commissariat for Refugees

Executive Summary

Proceeding from the most important aims of the SEEMIG ("Managing Migration and its Effects in the SEE countries") project, and having in mind recent specific social, economic and political development of Serbia both on a national and regional level, the existence of the special goal for Serbia should be emphasized. These specificities also refer to the unsatisfying degree of development of statistics regarding international migration. Finally, the migration-related statistics in Serbia is not fully available for decision makers, expert and academic public.

This report is the result of joint work of all three partners from Serbia participating in the SEEMIG project: Institute of Social Sciences – ISS, Statistical Office of the Republic of Serbia – SORS and the Municipality of Kanjiža. The report presents an overview of the existing migration-related data sources as well as of those which could be potentially developed in the near future. The following migration-related data sources are singled out: 1) partial records of state institutions (Ministry of Interior of the Republic of Serbia, Central Registry of Compulsory Social Insurance, Commissariat for Refugees and Migration of the Republic of Serbia) available only through the Migration Profile of the Republic of Serbia – regularly published since 2010; 2) Labour Force Survey, and 3) Census of Population 2002 and 2011.

Most of the indicators of international migration flows can be obtained from the records of Ministry of Interior (MI). However, those indicators in fact represent the flows of foreign citizens. On the other hand, the national legal framework did not recognize the category of immigrants or immigration as a process (CRMRS, 2011) until the end of 2012, when the Law on Migration Management was adopted. Thus, it is possible to evaluate immigration flow indicators of foreigners only indirectly, on the basis of this source, since the definitions used were not harmonized with the international standards. Data on emigration flows of Serbian citizens do not exist, because citizens who go to work/reside abroad mainly do not unregister their place of residence. Generally, the limited accessibility of migration data from MI records does not allow an analysis of all relevant indicators. The number of Serbian citizens – returnees from work/residence abroad is even harder to estimate. It is only possible to indirectly estimate the number of pensioner returnees on the basis of total inflow of foreign exchange pensions from abroad. However, this could result just in a rough estimate due to the unknown structure of the pensioner population.

The first recommendation resulted from the report refers to the need for establishing a central population registry and introducing a uniform address system. Establishing local, municipality-level (corresponds to NUTS 4 level) registries could serve as a good starting point. Additionally, it is necessary to carry out harmonization of definitions used in migration-related statistics across the existing partial registries; introducing additional specialized registries would be beneficial. Partial (specialized) registries should be regularly updated in order to avoid the problem of incomparability both between themselves and with census data. In that sense, the Commissariat for Refugees and Migration of the Republic of Serbia (CRMRS), as the main body for coordination of actions, monitoring and managing migrations in Serbia, should provide coordination of competence among various institutions which monitor migrations and migrants. It is certainly one of the greatest challenges as to the migration issue. Thus, the integration of the relevant migration-related national databases should be the ultimate goal in achieving more efficient migration management. This goal has been recognized in the recently adopted Law on Migration Management (November 2012), which anticipates formation of a uniform system of collecting, organizing and sharing data on migration between state responsible authorities on migration management. Yet, it is necessary to define more precisely, through the sub-Acts, the competence of individual authorities in view of the type of data they collect, so as to enable mutual coordination and to improve the data quality.

The statistics on migration flows produced by state institutions (the records of MI and the partial data bases) will be internationally comparable only if it is fully harmonized with international definitions and legal norms used in the field. Uplifting the level of personnel training that participates in the process of collecting and producing this type of migration data would also improve the quality of migration statistics. While the anticipated uniform system for monitoring migration flows is established, and in the absence of a central population registry, it would be beneficial to carry out surveys, in conformity with international standards

and definitions, which would provide an updated and more reliable picture on migration flows comparing to the current one. It seems that inclusion of a migration module into the LFS is far more realistic option, which could provide more coherent information on migration flows and migrant characteristics.

The existing records on migration flows collected by the Ministry of Interior should be accessible to every institution (scientific and educational) which could improve the methodology of collecting data and thus improve the quality of the data themselves, being numerical basis for migration management.

Experience so far indicates that there is a vast interest in knowledge on population phenomena and the possibilities of resolving demographic problems in Serbia, not only by the highest state authorities, their specialized institutions, local self-governments, academic and scientific communities, but of the wider public as well. This report could take advantage of such an interest to comprehensively inform the public on the past and future results of the study, as well as of the whole SEEMIG project. The exercise gained through this analysis on availability and quality of major migration data sources proved that there is a room for improving migration-related statistics as a first step for efficient migration managing in Serbia.

1. INTRODUCTION

Proceeding from the most important aims of the SEEMIG ("Managing Migration and its Effects in the SEE countries") project, and having in mind recent specific social, economic and political development of Serbia both at state and regional aspect, the existence of the special goal for Serbia should be emphasized. These specificities also refer to the unsatisfying degree of development of statistics regarding international migration. Finally, the migration-related statistics in Serbia is not fully available for decision makers, expert and academic public.

This report is the result of joint work of all three partners from Serbia participating in the SEEMIG project: Institute of Social Sciences – ISS, Statistical Office of the Republic of Serbia – SORS and the Municipality of Kanjiža. The report presents an overview of the existing migration-related data sources as well as of those which could be potentially developed in the near future. The following migration-related data sources are singled out: 1) partial records of state institutions (Ministry of Interior of the Republic of Serbia, Central Registry of Compulsory Social Insurance, Commissariat for Refugees and Migration of the Republic of Serbia) available only through the Migration Profile of the Republic of Serbia – regularly published since 2010; 2) Labour Force Survey, and 3) Census of Population 2002 and 2011.

Given the nonexistence of a central population register, the majority of indicators on international migration flows in Serbia have to be calculated from the partial records, produced primarily by the Ministry of Interior of the Republic of Serbia (MI), and, to smaller degree, by the Commissariat for Refugees and Migration of the Republic of Serbia (CRMRS). Yet, if we put aside the clear shortcomings of those records, such as incomplete information on migration statistics and certain methodological limitations, existing partial records maintained by the state institutions could be used as a good basis for the elaboration of a unique system of collecting, processing and disseminating migration data. Labour Force Survey (LFS) may potentially represent a significant source of migration data. Yet, the LFS in Serbia had not recognized the migrant stock as a target group until now. However, it seems that inclusion of a migration module into the LFS could provide more coherent information on migration flows and migrant characteristics. The population census provides the most relevant data on the size and structure of immigrant stock, while the census coverage of emigrants is significantly lower. Serbia traditionally collects data on its emigration through population censuses (since 1971), but it is estimated that the census coverage of the population residing abroad has been continuously decreasing. This problem has especially become prominent in the last census (2011), when the data on the population residing abroad were collected solely through the information obtained from their household members who usually reside in Serbia.

In the past census rounds (1971, 1981, 1991 and 2002), enumeration of Serbian citizens residing abroad was carried out in the pre-census period and during the census. Information on the persons residing abroad was provided by their family members residing in the country. During the pre-census period, census forms were transferred to Yugoslav diplomatic and consular missions who further distributed them to clubs and other associations of our citizens and churches. However, regardless of the limitations, census still represents a very important data source on the emigration, especially on the structure of emigrants.

Apart from all the shortcomings of the stated data sources regarding their coverage, contents and incidence, there are also problems related to harmonization of the definitions and data processing across the existing partial registries (the records of MI, and the partial data bases of other state institutions).

Experience so far indicates that there is a vast interest in knowledge on population phenomena and the possibilities of resolving demographic problems in Serbia, not only by the highest state authorities, their specialized institutions, local self-governments, academic and scientific communities, but of the wider public as well. This report could take advantage of such an interest to comprehensively inform the public on the past and future results of the study, as well as of the whole SEEMIG project.

2. DATA SOURCES AND RESPONSIBLE AUTHORITIES

This chapter includes data from administrative sources, a survey with certain migration-related questions, and data from population censuses.

Serbia does not have a Population register. Migration-related data can be obtained from partial records of some state institutions. For the recent years (starting with 2010), this type of data is available in the Migration Profile of the Republic of Serbia. The accessible data concern only immigration flows of foreign citizens. Data on emigration flows are not collected.

The only migration-related official statistical research in Serbia is the Labor Force Survey. However, only very limited data about migrants are available through the LFS because interviewing migrants is not one of its basic tasks. If relatively modest changes were introduced to the way that this survey is conducted, the LFS could become a significant source of migration-related data.

The population censuses in Serbia provide the most relevant data on immigrant and emigrant stocks. In the last two censuses (2002 and 2011), a large majority of emigrants was not included in the usually resident population. Nevertheless, the population censuses are still the best source of data on the socio-economic characteristics of the emigrant population.

2.1. Administrative (register-based) data sources

2.1.1. Ministry of Interior of the Republic of Serbia

The data on international migration from the MI records are published in the Migration profile of the Republic of Serbia (MG Profile of RS). This report was produced for the first time for 2010. Since then, this report is regularly (annually) updated by CRMRS. The data include the following migrant categories:

No. of immigrants in Serbia (permanently and temporary residing foreigners)

- No. of persons temporarily residing in Serbia
- No. of permanently residing foreigners in Serbia
- No. of foreigners with approved residence permit on the basis of work
- No. of foreign students in Serbia
- No. of persons which acquired citizenship
- No. of persons who were denied entry in Serbia
- No. of persons against whom a measure of termination of residence was imposed
- No. of human trafficking victims
- No. of perpetrators of criminal offence of human trafficking
- No. of asylum seekers (expressed intention and submitted application)
- Decisions of first instance and second instance authorities on asylum application and decisions based on administrative dispute

The basis for monitoring migrant categories is found in the following laws: **Law on Foreigners** (*Official Gazette of RS, No. 97/2008*), **Law on Asylum** (*Official Gazette of RS, No. 109/2007*), **Law on Citizenship of the Republic of Serbia** (*Official Gazette of RS, No. 135/2004 and 90/2007*), **Law on Refugees** (*Official Gazette of RS, No. 18/2002 – Decision of the Fed. Constitutional Court and Official Gazette of RS, No. 30/2010*), **Law on Residence of Citizens** (*Official Gazette of RS, No. 81/2011*), **Law on Diaspora and Serbs in the Region** (*Official Gazette of RS, No. 88/2009*).

The Law on Official Statistics (*Official Gazette of RS, No. 104/2009*) defines the cooperation of SORS with MI and other institutions in RS which produce official statistics. However, SORS does not receive any data from the MI records regarding international migration.

It can be concluded on the basis of the indicators published in the MG Profile of RS that the MI records include following categories of migrants or migration-related events:

- immigration flow - for foreign citizens,
- immigrant stock - for foreign citizens,
- asylum seekers,
- acquisition of citizenship,
- irregular migration,
- return of the citizens of the Republic of Serbia – based on Readmission Agreement.

However, the MG Profile of RS contains no specific information on the definitions and methodology of monitoring of migration events that the MI records use. Published tables in the MG Profile of RS contain the following labels of migrant categories:

○ **immigration flow; immigrant stock**

Fields	Dimensions	Indicators	Classification
Temporary residence permits	Temporary residence permits granted for the first time	No. of granted permits during reference period where person was granted residence for the first time	Citizenship, reason for permit issuance (permit type), permit validity, age, gender
	Temporary residence permits valid at the end of reference period	No. of valid permits at end of reference period (no. of issued permits, permits not annulled and not expired permits)	Citizenship, reason for permit issuance, first issuance, permit validity, age, gender

○ **asylum seekers**

Fields	Dimensions	Indicators	Classification
Asylum seekers	No. of persons who expressed intention to seek asylum in reference period	No. of persons who expressed intention to seek asylum	Age, gender, citizenship
	No. of asylum seekers in reference period	No. of persons who submitted application for international protection	Age, gender, citizenship
	Processing of asylum applications during reference period	No. of persons whose application for international protection is being considered by competent authorities at the end of reference period	Age, gender, citizenship

○ **acquisition of citizenship**

Fields	Dimensions	Indicators	Classification
Acquisition of citizenship	Newly-admitted citizens	No. of persons who acquired citizenship of the Republic of Serbia and then registered their residence in Serbia, previously having citizenship of another country or were without any citizenship	According to age and gender, previous citizenship

○ **irregular migration**

Fields	Dimensions	Indicators	Classification
Prevention of illegal entry	Denied entry in country	No. of citizens of other countries and persons without citizenship who were denied entry into the territory of	Age, gender, citizenship, reason for denial of entry, entry

		Serbia in reference year	point
	Changes in no. of denied entries into country	No. of citizens of other countries and persons without citizenship who were denied entry into the territory of Serbia in relation to previous year	
Return of persons illegally residing in Serbia	Decision of competent authority for termination of residence	No. of citizens of other countries and persons without citizenship against whom the measure of termination of residence was imposed.	Citizenship, reasons for termination, age, gender
	Imposing protective measures of removal from the territory of Serbia	No. of citizens of other countries and persons without citizenships against whom protective measures of removal from the territory of Serbia were imposed	Citizenship, reason for imposing protective measure, age, gender
	Imposing security measure of banishment from the country	No. of citizens of other countries and persons without citizenship against whom security measure of banishment from the country was imposed	Citizenship, reasons for imposing security measure, age, gender
	Decisions of competent authorities on leaving the territory of Serbia to illegally residing persons	No. of citizens of other countries and persons without citizenship against whom there is a decision on leaving Serbia due to illegal stay	Age, gender, citizenship
Data on human trafficking Victims	No. of human trafficking victims	No. of persons identified as human trafficking victims in reference year	
	Criminal prosecution of human trafficking perpetrators	No. of criminal charges submitted in reference year against persons who committed human trafficking	Gender and age of perpetrator, type of criminal act

○ **return of citizens of the RS – based on Readmission Agreement**

Fields	Dimensions	Indicators
Return of citizens of the Republic of Serbia who do not qualify or do not qualify anymore for the existing terms for entry, stay or residence in another state	No. of submitted applications for returning citizens of Serbia based on Readmission Agreement	Applicant country, gender, age
	No. of approvals for return of citizens of the Republic of Serbia based on Readmission Agreement	Applicant country, gender, age
	No. of returnees registered at border crossing based on Readmission Agreement	Border crossing where gender and age were registered

The data are available for the indicators and years covered in the MG Profile of RS – 2009, 2010 and 2011. It is not known if the data are used for statistical purposes by the data owner.

CRMRS established a technical working group in February 2011 for drafting the MG Profile of RS. SORS and MI were included in the group, along with other representatives of the ministries of RS that make up the Coordination Body for Monitoring and Management of Migration. Yet, SORS was not involved in the design of the data collection nor in the modification of the MI records.

Since there is no direct access to the MI records, it is not possible to evaluate the quality of the data in terms of relevance, accuracy, comparability, timeliness. It is very important the data from MI records to be accessible to the public. As well, it is essential SORS and the scientific institutes to be included in the defining of the data collection methodology. Last, but not the least, it is important that all the relevant national institutions obey **the Law on Migration and Management** (*Official Gazette of RS, Number 107/2012*) and **the Law on Official Statistics** (*Official Gazette of RS, No. 104/2009*).

2.1.2. Commissariat for Refugees and Migration of the Republic of Serbia

CRMRS is in charge of keeping records on refugees and internally displaced persons (IDPs) from Kosovo and Metohija (KM). In regards to the refugees, the process of collecting data is based on **the Law on Refugees** (*Official Gazette of RS, No.30/2010*), while the legal background for keeping records on IDPs represent Memorandum of Agreement between United Nations High Commissariat for Refugees (UNHCR) and Commissariat for Refugees of the Republic of Serbia signed in 2000, and Conclusion of the Government of the Republic of Serbia 05 No: 06-3186/2005. The current Law on Refugees was adopted in 2010 on the basis of amendments to the Law on Refugees of 2002 with intention to improve solutions for housing problems, thus increasing the number of integrated persons.

These two databases include exclusively migrant population; the one refers to refugees, the other to IDPs. The data from the databases are transferred electronically to SORS as needed.

The status of a refugee is determined according to the provisions of the Law on Refugees. Refugees are persons who were forced to leave their places of residence in former Yugoslav republics on account of the events happened in the period 1991-1998 and sought refuge in the territory of the Republic of Serbia, for the purpose of meeting basic subsistence needs and getting assistance in the process of integration (*Official Gazette of RS, No.30/2010*, article no.1).

IDPs from KM are recognized by the criterion of place of permanent residence. These are the persons whose permanent place of residence is located in the territory of KM but who are forced to reside in Serbia outside KM. On this basis, one can get an identification card of IDP which is recorded in the CRMRS database of IDPs.

The procedure of the cessation of a refugee status may be initiated ex officio or at the justified refugee's request. The CRMRS shall adopt a decision ex officio on the cessation of refugee status: if a person has acquired the citizenship of the Republic of Serbia and initiated the procedure of residence registration; if a person has voluntarily returned to reside in the former Yugoslav republic he/she fled; if a person move to a third country; and, for beneficiaries of the housing programme in the process of integration (*Official Gazette of RS, No.30/2010*, article no.17). Since the last registration of refugees in 2004/05, the validity of a refugee ID expires after two years. If any of the conditions is met after two years, a person is removed from the database. In case of IDPs, if a person return his/her own IDP's ID to CRMRS due to return to KM, he/she is removed from the database of IDPs.

Data on refugees and IDPs are collected according to the UNHCR recommendations. The following labels of refugees are included: name and surname, sex, kinship within family, birth date, unique personal number, birth place (country, settlement, and municipality), refugee ID number and date of issue, nationality/ethnicity, date of arrival in Serbia and Montenegro, country of origin, place of residence prior to 1991, labels on returnee status in origin countries, health status, marital and economic status, level of education, employment status and income sources, detailed data on residential property in the country of origin, and current accommodation in Serbia. Data on IDPs are structured the same way excluding the labels on returnee status, but including information on temporary place of residence.

The data on refugees are available for 2001 according to the Registration of refugees in 2001 by CRMRS and UNHCR, and for the years from 2004 to 2012 based on the the last registration of refugees in 2004/05 and its regular annual updates. The data on IDPs are available for the years over the period 2000 to 2012 based on the Registration of IDPs in 2000 and its regular annual updates.

The data are used for statistical analyses by CRMRS in accordance with its main functions in providing assistance to refugees and IDPs. The statistics on these two categories of migrants are regularly published in the MG Profile of RS and the website of CRMRS.

There is no formal agreement between CRMRS and SORS. Yet, the cooperation is regularly carried out on the basis of the Law of the Public Administration (*Official Gazette of RS, No. 79/2005, 101/2007, 95/2010*). In general, data are accessible for statistical purposes in accordance with the Law on the Protection of Personal

Data. SORS took part in designing the questionnaires for the Registration of refugees in 2004/05, and afterwards was engaged in the data entry and processing. The SORS' statisticians are usually included in creating and formulating of questionnaires used for the field research by CRMRS staff.

The data produced by CRMRS can be considered relevant as far as the size and structure of the refugee population with formal recognition of refugee status (according to the Law on refugees) are concerned. As regards the IDP population, its size and structures by the CRMRS database, apart from the distant date of the Registration (2000), should be interpreted with caution since many displaced Roma, who have been unable to obtain IDP status due to their lack of documentation and inability to access registration procedure, are excluded.

Since the number of refugees in Serbia has been drastically reduced in the last decade due to their integration, one of the largest in Europe recently, a possible reform of the data registry on refugees seems to be irrelevant. The first suggestion for improving the data registry on IDPs refers to the need for a re-registration of this population, since the current estimation of the IDPs' size in Serbia is based on the first and only registration of IDPs, dating back from 2000. Probably, the best solution could be to exploit the database from the last Census of population (2011) which included the IDP category. As regards those ethnic minorities excluded from the CRMRS database on IDPs, their lack of valid personal documentation would be certainly the first thing to be solved before any sensible attempt is undertaken to record their inclusion

2.1.3. Central Register Office of Compulsory Social Insurance

The Central Register Office of Compulsory Social Insurance (CROCSI) is responsible for updating the databases in the field of social insurance. The process of collecting data is based on the **Act on the Central register office for compulsory social insurance** adopted on May 7th 2010 (Official Gazette of RS, No. 30/10).

The Republic Fund of Health Insurance (included in CROCSI as of 2013) transfer the data on employed persons electronically to SORS once a month since 2009.

All citizens of Serbia employed in the country and those Serbian nationals who work abroad but do not have compulsory social insurance in the country of destination, as well as all foreigners who study or undergo specialized training in Serbia are included in CROCSI. All migrants who meet any of the requirements for compulsory social insurance are included in CROCSI. If compared to foreigners, there are no special rules for registration of Serbian nationals in CROCSI. The condition for deregistering persons from CROCSI is the loss of right to compulsory social insurance regardless of whether a person is migrant or not.

The following data are collected for all persons registered in CROCSI: Unique Master Citizen Number, namely file number for foreigners issued by MI, surname, name, sex and date of birth, name of a parent, municipality, place of residence and address, citizenship, profession acquired by education, relationship with holder of insurance.

According to the Law on the Central Registry of Compulsory Social Insurance, CROCSI will provide information upon either personal or relevant institution's request. The data from CROCSI are used for statistical analyses with regard to the basic functions of the institutions included in the system of social insurance (contracting, control, financial planning), but statistics from the register are not published.

SORS was neither involved in the design of the data collection nor did it have any requests or suggestions. The Cooperation Agreement between SORS and the Pension and Disability Insurance Fund of the Republic of Serbia was signed on August 1, 2008, and between SORS and the Republic Fund of Health Insurance on August 6, 2009. The agreements are being carried out without difficulties and as anticipated. The cooperation is expected to continue.

The CROCSI data are relevant and reliable for requirements of compulsory social insurance, but not for an analysis of migrants and migratory events. Given the main goals and activities of CROCSI, we do not consider it necessary to alter the methods of the register data collection.

2.2. Statistical data sources, sample surveys

2.2.1 Labour Force Survey - Statistical Office of the Republic of Serbia

SORS is in charge of collecting, processing and disseminating the LFS data. LFS is a survey of households carried out in the Republic of Serbia (excluding the province of KM) twice a year in compliance with the following recommendations: Council Regulation (EC) No 577/98, Council Regulation (EC) No. 377/2008, Regulation (EC) No. 1991/2002 and No. 2257/2003 of the European Parliament and of the Council, Commission Regulation (EC) No. 1897/2000, 430/2005 and 377/2008. Data from the LFS are comparable with LFS data from other countries.

Since 2008, the LFS fieldwork is carried out in April and October of each year. The LFS questionnaire requests information about respondents' activities in a seven day period which ends on a Sunday and includes the 15th day of the month: this is called a reference week. The interviews are carried out in the two week period following the reference week. After the fieldwork, for the next two weeks, the data input is conducted at the regional offices and the central office of the SORS for the capital. Then, during the following two weeks, the logical control of the data is carried out. LFS results are published two months after the survey period.

The first LFS in Serbia was conducted in May 1994, as a test survey. LFS has been included in the regular statistical research programmes of the Statistical Office since 1996. Between 1995 and 2007 the survey was carried out annually. Since 2008, it has been conducted twice a year (April and October). In 2013, LFS will be carried out three times – the first from March 25 to April 7, the second is scheduled for the end of June and the third for October.

LFS sampling design has been founded on a two-stage sampling technique. The first stage refers to systematic sampling of primary sampling units, enumeration areas (1,074), ensuring high level of implicit geographic stratification of the sample based on the results of Census 2002. The secondary sampling units (households) are sampled with equal probabilities (simple random sample). The LFS sample size at the semi-annual level is around 9,000 households (the plan for 2013 is 10,000 households per survey).

The first part of the LFS questionnaire, the module *Demographic Characteristics*, is designed to collect demographic data on all members of the selected household, while other modules relate to the members of a household aged 15 years and above.

In accordance with the definition by the ESA95, the target population of the LFS in Serbia include:

- Persons who reside, or intend to reside, in the territory of the Republic of Serbia for a period of one year or more;
- Persons who are members of the surveyed household, but who are absent or intend to be absent from the household for less than a year.

Each member of the selected household aged 15 years and above can be data provider. In LFS, adult members of a household are supposed to answer questions on behalf of children, absent and disabled members of the household.

According to the LFS, migrants are defined as persons who have been residing in Serbia for less than a year and intend to stay in Serbia for less than a year. However, migrants who have been residing in Serbia for less than a year with the intention of staying there for at least one year, as well as migrants who have been

residing in Serbia for more than a year could be identified in the LFS database by the criteria of citizenship and country of birth.

Only the basic demographic data – year of birth, sex, marital status, citizenship and country of birth, are collected for the migrants as defined in the LFS. As regards to all other persons aged 15 years and above including migrants who have been residing in Serbia for less than a year and intend to stay for more than a year, as well as for persons who have been absent for less than a year and who do not intend to be absent for more than a year, all required data are collected. The data include common demographic characteristics (sex, year birth, country of birth, marital status, citizenship, ethnic affiliation, etc.) and those related to economic activity in the reference week, education level, household income, job application, and work history.

The data on migrants according to the definition used in the LFS are not processed. The statistics based on the data collected for all the interviewed persons excluding migrants by the LFS definition are published twice a year in the *Statistical Releases*, and once a year in the *Bulletin* by SORS. The LFS database and the publications could be accessed on the SORS website, as well.

Since SORS is the LFS data owner, the more detailed LFS statistics could be delivered to the state institutions on a request. Data on citizenship are not published but could be obtained on a request. The LFS non-response rate is about 20 per cent. The processing of data includes the logical control. The data from the LFS in Serbia are comparable with relevant LFS data from other countries. All the set deadlines related to the implementation of the survey process and the data publishing are respected.

2.3. Census databases

2.3.1. *Census of Population, Households and Dwellings - Statistical Office of the Republic of Serbia*

Since 1950, a census of population has been conducted seven times in the territory of the Republic of Serbia. All censuses were carried with traditional method, which means that all individuals were enumerated directly and their characteristics were registered through the completion of paper census forms. The information was collected in the field at the same time across the whole country, over a period of two weeks. Census forms were filled in by specially trained persons, the so-called enumerators, who acted as interviewers. So far, there has been no register-based census.

According to census 2011, all persons who are present in the country at the reference point of time (September 30, 2011 at 24:00), as well as persons who, at Census Day, have been absent from the country for a longer or a shorter period of time are included in the enumerated population. After the data processing, only the persons who meet the criteria for usual residents (a person who has been continuously residing in the territory of Serbia for at least one year or less than a year but with the intention of staying in Serbia for at least one year), regardless of whether they belong to the group of autochthon or immigrant population (including asylum seekers who meet the criteria for usual resident), are included in the total usually resident population of Serbia. As far as emigration is concerned, only persons who have been absent from Serbia for less than a year and who do not intend to stay abroad for more than a year, as well as persons who have been residing abroad for a year or more, but keep re-entering the country at least once a week, are included in the total usually resident population of Serbia. Third level students studying abroad while having their household in the country are included in the usual residents of the country in compliance with the CES Recommendations (UNECE, 2006) only if they keep re-entering to Serbia at least once a week. Foreign diplomats and members of their families are not enumerated, and consequently not included into the usually resident population of Serbia.

According to the census 2011 definition, migrants (international and internal) are all persons who have changed their usual place of residence, namely who have not been residing continuously in their place of birth since their birth (place of the mother's permanent residence at the time of the birth of the enumerated person). Only the previous place (country) of residence is registered.

There are two migration-related questions included in the census form from 2011. The first one provides information on whether a person has been residing in the same place since birth. Second question collects information on whether a person has ever resided abroad continuously for one year or more. For persons that have ever resided abroad, the country of previous usual residence, the year of arrival in Serbia, and a reason for migration (e.g. education, family reasons, forced migration, readmission, etc.) are recorded. Place of birth and country of citizenship are collected for all respondents, whether they are migrants or natives. Apart from country of previous usual residence and reason for migration, all the listed characteristics belong to the core migration-related topics from the CES Recommendations (UNECE, 2006).

The information on place of usual residence one year prior to the census is derived indirectly. The question on the parents' place (country) of birth, from the group of non-core topics regarding migration, is not included in the census form.

There are no specific questions for migrants. The questions are the same for all persons enumerated. In line with the CES recommendations (UNECE, 2006), data on economic, demographic, educational, migratory and other characteristics of the population are included in the census form. Data processing includes all the breakdowns for the census topics in compliance with the Regulation EC 1201/2009. The following characteristics of the enumerated population are available: sex, age, legal marital status, de facto marital status, total number of children born alive, current activity status, occupation, industry, status in employment, place of work, main source of livelihood, educational attainment, school attendance, literacy, and computer literacy.

In Serbia, no relation has been established between the data from the existing partial registers (e.g. the pension fund) and the census data. In order to conduct a register-based census or a combined census that would include data from the existing registries, certain preconditions have to be met. It is necessary to apply the same definitions and classifications (e.g. professions) across the registries, to establish interlinks between them, and to keep the registers updated. In addition, unique address system and some new, specialized registries should be established.

Until the beginning of July 2013, SORS published 11 books of final results from the census 2011 including two books on dwellings. The published books contain the following population characteristics: ethnicity, age and sex, educational attainment, literacy and computer literacy, religion, mother tongue, marital status, fertility of the female population, economic activity, disability, and migration. The book 9 contains the most important migratory characteristics of the population in Serbia distinguishing between autochthonous and migrant population, up to the level of municipalities/cities. In addition, the data on migrants are presented by area from which they had moved and time of arrival to current place of usual residence, and by sex, up to the level of municipalities/cities. The data on population by country of birth and citizenship are presented up to the level of areas (NUTS 3). The more detailed data on migrants from the census database, produced by additional data processing, will be available by the end of October 2013.

For SORS it is important that census data could be published as detailed as possible. At the same, it is obliged by law to protect individual data. However, some specific population characteristics, such as religion, mother tongue, ethnicity, and disability, are published in the books of the census 2011 only up to the level of municipalities/cities and by type of settlement.

The relevance of collected data in the 2011 census has been fully met through the preparatory meetings organized by SORS, including the national conference *Census 2011* on the methodological and theoretical census issues held in April 2008, and the meetings with representatives of public institutions, non-governmental sector, and international organizations (UNESCO, UNICEF, and IOM). Finally, the census form included all of the core topics as defined in the CES recommendations (UNECE, 2006).

As for the accuracy of the data, a post-census survey was carried out in 250 enumeration areas. The results will be available in August 2013. However, the comparisons of the census data with the data from the databases of the Pension and Disability Insurance Fund and the Health Insurance Fund were not helpful due to the stated limitations of these partial databases. Quite satisfactory results were obtained through the comparison between the census population and the annual population estimate based on the statistics of vital events (live births, deaths).

International comparability has been ensured by including all of the core topics and by accepting the definitions from the international classifications (ISCO, NACE Rev1, etc.). However, complete comparability of data between the census 2002 and the census 2011 is not quite possible because the former used the concept of permanent place of residence while the latter used the concept of usual residence.

Implementation of potential reforms regarding the census data collection in Serbia is limited by the lack of staff engaged in a census process and by possible lack of funds for the next census round. As for the contents of the census form, it has been concluded that it would be more appropriate to reduce the number of questions rather than to introduce new ones. In the latter case, new questions should not significantly burden respondents.

If the next census were also to be organized as a traditional one, using the face to face interview, the longer training period of enumerators and instructors comparing to the recent census (one working week instead of just three days) would certainly affect the quality of data in a positive manner.

3. CASE STUDY ON LOCAL LEVEL ABOUT USE AND ACCESIBILITY OF MIGRATION-RELATED DATA SOURCES

3.1. KANJIŽA MUNICIPALITY

Based on the 2011 census, the municipality of Kanjiža is categorized as the most ethnically homogeneous municipality in the province of Vojvodina which is the most ethnically heterogeneous area of the country. The Hungarians form 85 per cent of the total of 25,343 inhabitants. The Hungarians are not absolute majority in only one settlement out of 13 in the territory of the municipality. The average age of population of Kanjiža is 42.4 years (42.2 in Serbia as a whole), while the ageing index amounts to 1.3. The old-age dependency ratio is 28.0, which is also above the national average. The sex ratio is 95.8, while the average age of women is almost 3 years higher than that of men (43.8 in contrast to 41.0).

There were significant foreign investments in the municipality of Kanjiža between 2001 and 2011 due to the privatisation process. In that period, foreign investors privatised the most successful factories which produce construction industry material, such as Potisje roof tile factory bought by Tondach A.D., and FIM insulation material factory bought by the Italian Tegola Canadese. Foreign firms are interested in agriculture and trade. In the utilities field, refuse collection was privatised by the Austrian firm Brantner.

However, the economy of the municipality of Kanjiža during the last decade has been in a complex economic situation. A large number of young people are still unemployed because of the negative effects of the privatisation. For example, Potisje-Tondach employed around 40 per cent of the employed persons in the municipal industry sector. However, as a consequence of privatisation in 2004, the number of employees was reduced by half. Between 2001 and 2011, the average salary decreased from 330 EUR to 310 EUR. At the end of 2011, the number of unemployed persons was 2,232 (the unemployment rate is around 10 per cent), and it kept increasing with time. Informal economy creates disloyal competition, and brings the legal services sector into a difficult position.

According to census 2011, 16,270 inhabitants or 64.2 per cent of total population of the municipality have been residing continuously in their place of birth since their birth. Out of 9,073 persons who belong to the

category of people that have changed their place of residence at least once in a lifetime (migrant population) there are 4,002 persons whose previous place of residence was within the municipality. Out of the migrant population, only 728 persons have moved to the municipality from abroad, while 375 persons of that number originates from former Yugoslav republics. During the last 30 years, the highest intensity of migration in the municipality has taken place in the five-year period before the census. Finally, the 2011 census registered 832 persons from Kanjiža municipality who have been continuously residing abroad for at least one year or less than a year but with the intention of staying abroad for at least one year. These persons are considered as emigrants and therefore are not included in the total usually resident population of the municipality.

There is no insight into different types of international migration on municipal level. Indirect and incomplete sources of information are:

- Database of the Centre for Social Work on illegal migrants;
- Register of financial aid beneficiaries who came from KM;
- List of submitted Renunciations of Citizenship (there were eight of those in 2012) - these are the only complete and accurate data.

The municipality of Kanjiža delegated a Commission in charge of creation of an Action plan which would deal with refugees and migrants. The Commission did not convene so far. The municipal police has no database of illegal migrants, as there is no way of identifying them with certainty.

The conclusions based on the work experience of the employees of the Centre for Social Work of the municipality of Kanjiža, who conduct field work as well, are as follows: illegal migrants mostly have fake identification documents, the number of families from KM which live in the municipality of Kanjiža is higher than the one in the financial aid beneficiaries register, and a significant number of people and their family members who went abroad in search of employment are not registered in any kind of a database.

Continuous monitoring and collecting information on immigrants into the municipality of Kanjiža is deemed necessary, as well as reliable register of locals from the municipality who reside abroad. Institutionalization of the migration monitoring and establishment of a relevant database are needed in order to formulate successful local action plans for development, employment, protection of interest of children and youth, and population policy on a local level. Yet, the establishment of the database does not depend on the municipality itself, but rather on the Ministry of Interior and Ministry of Social Affairs. It appears that there is no cooperation between them, at least on local level. As for finances, the municipality has no sufficient funds for acting independently.

Specific problem of the municipality of Kanjiža refers to illegal immigrants. It is conditioned by the geographic position of the municipality which is located on the very border with the Republic of Hungary, that is, the EU. Namely, the issue on transit migrants who try to get to the EU illegally is pronounced. The Centre for Social Work in Kanjiža mostly deals with placement, care and transport of minors caught on the border, and is involved in the judicial process. The number of immigrant minors has grown drastically in the past five years. There were 576 legal proceedings against minors who were caught crossing the border illegally in 2012.

There are no trustworthy data on the illegal migrants on municipal level. The information given by the children migrants are the information the authorities work with, and they are usually false. In almost 100 per cent of the cases, the children, as well as the adults, do not have an ID number. If they do have identification documents, they are most commonly falsified, or they belong to another person. It is really difficult to obtain realistic information from the illegal migrants as they do not speak any foreign languages. Interpreters are rarely provided, and when they are, it is for court proceedings. There is no unified system for identification of such migrants. Not even a photograph is made of them, nor are their fingerprints taken. They mostly report that they are around 16 years of age. In many cases entire families emigrate, but usually they are not

real families. They just claim that they are, but there is again no way to verify it. After they are placed in the refugee centres, the Centre for Social Work does not receive any information about what happens to the children. Quite a few times the employees of the Centre encountered the same children again, but the identification documents of the children had names and birth dates that were different comparing to their first encounter. Those emigrants who are caught on the border with Hungary (as the EU is their target destination) are sent back to Serbia if it is concluded that Serbia is the country where they came from. Then, they are deported back to their country of origin.

There is no official cooperation of the Kanjiza municipality with the relevant Hungarian authorities concerning a common database of persons trying to get to the EU illegally. As well, the migration-related database of the Ministry of Interior is not accessible to the Kanjiza local administration and their institutions. Additionally, the local administration is not allowed to issue any official document to migrants without a valid ID.

There is a great need for an identification system which would imply taking photographs and fingerprints of immigrants, as well as unified identification cards in Serbian and foreign language (Arab, Afghan and other most frequent). This would be useful in case of recurrent immigration, when the same migrants come back again hoping to enter the EU. If a person tries to cross the border illegally and is caught, it would facilitate his/her identification. Since the EU is the target destination of the illegal immigrants, they do not want asylum in Serbia. Therefore, they do not give valid information about themselves, while their identification documents are prepared by human traffickers.

4. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Most of the indicators of international migration flows can be obtained from the records of MI. However, those indicators represent, in fact, the flows of foreign citizens. On the other hand, the national legal framework did not recognize the category of immigrants or immigration as a process (CRMRS, 2011) until the end of 2012, when the Law on Migration Management was adopted. Thus, it is possible to evaluate immigration flow indicators of foreigners only indirectly, on the basis of this source, since the definitions used were not harmonized with the international standards. Data on emigration flows of Serbian citizens do not exist, because citizens who go to work/reside abroad mainly do not unregister their place of residence. Generally, the limited accessibility of migration data from MI records does not allow an analysis of all relevant indicators. The number of Serbian citizens – returnees from work/residence abroad is even harder to estimate. It is only possible to indirectly estimate the number of pensioner returnees on the basis of total inflow of foreign exchange pensions from abroad. However, this could result just in a rough estimate due to unknown pensioner structure.

The LFS in Serbia is comparable with corresponding surveys in other countries, but its main drawback is low research incidence and a relatively small sample of respondents from the viewpoint of migration oriented research. Since interviewing migrants is not one of the basic tasks of the survey, its methodology does not contain special instructions for the proper coverage of this population category. Due to these reasons, the general coverage of migrants is poor. The cases when the whole household is abroad for work/residence also contribute to the undercoverage, as there is nobody to be interviewed. Furthermore, migrants, according to the definition in compliance with the European Council Regulation 862/2007, are not singled out in the published LFS results. Thus, additional processing of the collected data which would use the criteria of citizenship and country of birth is necessary for identifying migrants in the LFS.

The questions in the census form are the same for all enumerated persons regardless of whether they belong to migrant or autochthonous population. The census provides the most relevant data on the number and structure of immigrants. The data on the number and the structural characteristics of emigrants (persons who have been residing abroad for at least one year, or less than a year but with the intention of residing abroad for at least one year) are not included in the usually resident population of the country in conformity with international recommendations for the 2010 censuses. Although it is not expected for a census to provide a realistic size of emigrant stock, it still represents the best source of socio-economic characteristics of emigrants. International comparison has been ensured by including all of the core topics and by accepting the definitions from the international classifications. However, complete comparability of data between the census 2002 and the census 2011 is not quite possible because the former used the concept of permanent place of residence while the latter used the concept of usual residence, although the difference is not considered significant.

The first recommendation resulted from the report refers to the need for establishing a central population registry and introducing a uniform address system. Establishing local, municipality-level (corresponds to NUTS 4 level) registries could serve as a good starting point. Additionally, it is necessary to carry out harmonization of definitions used in migration-related statistics across the existing partial registries; introducing additional specialized registries would be beneficial. Partial (specialized) registries should be regularly updated in order to avoid the problem of incomparability both between themselves and with census data. In that sense, CRMRS, as the main body for coordination of actions, monitoring and managing migrations in Serbia, should provide coordination of competence among various institutions which monitor migrations and migrants. It is certainly one of the greatest challenges as to the migration issue. Thus, the integration of the relevant migration-related national databases should be the ultimate goal in achieving more efficient migration management. This goal has been recognized in the recently adopted Law on Migration Management (November 2012), which anticipates formation of a uniform system of collecting, organizing and sharing data on migration between state responsible authorities on migration management. Yet, it is necessary to define more precisely, through the sub-Acts, the competence of individual authorities in view of the type of data they collect, so as to enable mutual coordination and to improve the data quality.

The statistics on migration flows produced by state institutions (the records of MI and the partial data bases) will be internationally comparable only if it is fully harmonized with international definitions and legal norms used in the field. Uplifting the level of personnel training that participates in the process of collecting and producing this type of migration data would also improve the quality of migration statistics. While the anticipated uniform system for monitoring migration flows is established, and in the absence of a central population registry, it would be beneficial to carry out surveys, in conformity with international standards and definitions, which would provide an updated and more reliable picture on migration flows comparing to the current one. It seems that inclusion of a migration module into the LFS is far more realistic option, which could provide more coherent information on migration flows and migrant characteristics.

The existing records on migration flows collected by the Ministry of Interior should be accessible to every institution (scientific and educational) which could improve the methodology of collecting data and thus improve the quality of the data themselves, being numerical basis for migration management.

It can hardly be expected that a future census form extended by some new questions comparing to the current one could provide a better coverage and more detailed information on migrant stock, without decreasing the existing quality of census data. In that sense, census data, namely numerousness of collected characteristics on migrants, should be used as a supplementary source of data to regular (annual) reports on migration flows, taking into consideration the periodicity of censuses and their usually high undercoverage of migrant population.

Owing to the activities on the project so far, it is evident that the cooperation between the institutions which collect migration data in Serbia has intensified. In that sense, ISS and SORS are well on their way of establishing or promoting institutional connections with relevant authorities responsible for collecting, processing and publishing migration data. It will certainly have positive impact on improving the quality and accessibility of the data in the following period.

The records of MI on the number of persons who were issued temporary residence permits for the first time, based on which they will stay in Serbia for at least 12 months or have the intention of staying for at least 12 months, may serve as the most adequate substitute for the lack of internationally harmonized data (as to the EC Regulation 862/2007) on immigration flows of foreigners. However, there is no adequate substitute in the official statistics or "non-statistical" sources for the lack of data on emigration flows from Serbia.

Available data on international migration provided by the national sources do not reflect actual size and relevance of the migration processes in Serbia as far as the statistics on flows is concerned. The flows of nationals are the far most significant since Serbia is not an immigration country, but the official data collection systems are practically not able to cover them. However, the census data regarding migration stock reveal that the structure of emigrant population strongly affects the size and quality of the labour force in Serbia, particularly in the traditional emigration regions of the country, reinforcing the fast developing demographic ageing.

It does not seem realistic to expect that data collection and production systems aimed at registering emigration flows from the country could be adequately improved to provide reliable results. As regards immigration flows, the problem of definition comparability between the existing data sources could be solved most easily. The recently adopted Law on Migration Management needs to define this topic more precisely through its sub-Acts. Regular updating of the existing databases seems to be more challenging as it is probably more dependent on financial and organizational capacities. Most of the abovementioned recommendations could be accomplished only by serious financial support. It implies that international funding is of essential importance.

Finally, the disintegration of Yugoslavia had effects on collection of migration-related data, particularly in the sense of definition of migrants and citizenship. The specific problem relates to the changes of borders. With the dissolution of the former SFRY, some migration flows which had previously been internal obtained the status of international. Namely, it resulted during the 1990s in a new category of migrants, labelled as refugees, which comprised all of the forced migrants that escaped from the former republics of SFRY. However, the most recent changes of political borders (independence of Montenegro in 2006, and the

declaration of independence on the part of KM in 2008) did not reflect at the available MI records of the issued residence permits. The migration flows related to KM are considered as internal migration according to the Serbian Constitution while the flows from/to Montenegro are not reported by the MI for the reference period even they should not be negligible given the known facts on migration history between Serbia and Montenegro.

5. REFERENCES

CRMRS – Commissariat for Refugees and Migration of the Republic of Serbia (2012) Migration Profile of the Republic of Serbia for 2011. Belgrade: Commissariat for Refugees and Migration of the Republic of Serbia.

http://www.kirs.gov.rs/docs/migracije/Migracioni_profil_Republike_Srbije_za_2011.pdf. (in Serbian for now)

IOM – International Organization for Migration – Mission to Serbia (2012). Migration Profile of the Republic of Serbia for 2010. Belgrade: IOM Serbia. (in Serbian and English)

IOM – International Organization for Migration (2012). Fundamentals of Migration Management in the Republic of Serbia (second amended edition). Belgrade: IOM Serbia. (in Serbian and English)

Kupiszewski, M., D. Kupiszewska and V. Nikitović (2012). The Impact of Demographic and Migration Flows on Serbia. Belgrade: International Organization for Migration - IOM Serbia. (in Serbian and English)

Penev, G., Predojevic-Despic, J. (2012). Spatial Aspects of Emigration out of Serbia. Three "Hot" Emigration Zones. In: Stanovništvo (Population). Volume L, Number 2, p. 35-64. (in Serbian)

Predojevic-Despic, J., G. Penev (2012). Who Are They and Where Do They Go: Characteristics and Distribution of the Population of Serbia Abroad by Destination Countries and the Significance of the Migrant Networks. In: Nacionalni interes (National Interest). Volume VIII, Number 3, p. 355-388. (in Serbian)

Republic of Serbia (2005, 2007, 2010). Law on Public Administration. Official Gazette of RS, Numbers 79/2005, 101/2007, 95/2010. (in Serbian)

Republic of Serbia (2007). Law on Asylum. Official Gazette of RS, Number 109/2007. (in Serbian)

Republic of Serbia (2007). Law on Citizenship of the Republic of Serbia. Official Gazette of RS, Number 135/2004 and 90/2007. (in Serbian)

Republic of Serbia (2008). Law on Foreigners. Official Gazette of RS, Number 97/2008. (in Serbian)

Republic of Serbia (2009). Law on Diaspora and Serbs in the Region. Official Gazette of RS, Number 88/2009. (in Serbian)

Republic of Serbia (2010). Law on Refugees. Official Gazette of RS, Number 18/2002 – Decision of the Fed. Constitutional Court and Official Gazette of RS, Number 30/2010. (in Serbian)

Republic of Serbia (2010). Regulation on the Nomenclature of Statistical Territorial Units. Official Gazette of the RS, Number 109/09 and 46/10).

Republic of Serbia (2011). Law on Residence of Citizens. Official Gazette of RS, Number 81/2011. (in Serbian)

Republic of Serbia (2012). Law on Migration and Management. Official Gazette of RS, Number 107/2012. (in Serbian)

SORS – Statistical Office of the Republic of Serbia (2012). 2011 Census of Population, Households and Dwellings in the Republic of Serbia. Age and Sex. Belgrade: SORS – Statistical Office of the Republic of Serbia. (in Serbian and English)

Šuković, D. (2009). Citizens of Serbia in Focus of the Labour Market . Stanovništvo (Population). Volume 47, Number 2, p. 85-99. (in Serbian)

UNECE (2006). Conference of European Statistical Recommendations for the 2010. Census of Population and Housing. New York and Geneva: UN Economic Commission for Europe.

Vukmirović, D., R. Smith Govoni (Eds.) (2008). Living Standard Measurement Study, Serbia 2002- 2007. Belgrade: SORS – Statistical Office of the Republic of Serbia. (in Serbian)