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Background
The workshop on intellectual emigration was a follow-up to the roundtable on Demographic Trends and Social and Economic Challenges in SEE, held at RACVIAC in October 2012. There are many complex consequences and implications of emigration that are manifested in a number of domains, including the security area. In terms of socioeconomic development, particularly important is their impact on demography and economy. Over time, emigration abroad has become an integral part of the population development in the SEE region. Bearing in mind the size and dynamics of emigration flows in the last decade, particularly the high rate of intellectual emigration, as well as their repercussions on the socioeconomic and demographic development of the countries of origin, it becomes evident that there a need for conceptualizing a complex policy in relation to the Diaspora, reduction of intellectual emigration (brain drain), return of highly educated persons from abroad (“brain gain”) and mitigating unfavourable implications of intellectual emigration. The growing emigration tendency among highly educated individuals, as well as among junior scientific staff caused by long-term unemployment has led to devaluing labour, underestimating expertise, brain waste, limited opportunities for career promotion, all of which resulted in changes in the workforce quality and reduced human resources levels. Given the enormous repercussions of intellectual emigration, the issue of "brain drain" should indeed be considered alarming.

Purpose and objectives
The event aimed to discuss factors, scope and dynamics of permanent intellectual emigration of highly educated young people (brain drain) from the countries of region and its implications for the socioeconomic and demographic development of the countries. The objectives were as follows:
- To get an insight into how this phenomenon is identified and treated in national policies (strategies, resolutions, action plans, etc.);
- To explore alignment of national migration policies with other national security, economic, social, demographic policies;
- To get an insight into the situation, measures and activities undertaken in the region;
- To exchange experiences with experts from the EU and international organizations.

Organizers
The event was organized by RACVIAC - Centre for Security Cooperation, Ministry of Human Rights and Refugees of Bosnia and Herzegovina, the Migration, Asylum, Refugees Regional Initiative (MARRI) and the European Commission Technical Assistance and Information Exchange (TAIEX) instrument.

Venue, duration and participation
The Workshop took place in Sarajevo, BA, on 10-11 September 2013. It gathered some 50 participants, who included representatives of the European Commission, RACVIAC MAG countries, MARRI member countries, high-ranking national representatives and experts representing institutions and organizations dealing with migration strategies and policies.
Content

The Workshop comprised five panels outlining the EU migration legislation and the experience of the SEE countries. Panel presentations were followed by Q&A sessions and discussions.

In addition to Ambassador Branimir Mandić, RACVIAC Director, opening remarks were given by Ms Ruzmira Tihić-Kadrić, Assistant Minister of Human Rights and Refugees of Bosnia and Herzegovina, Ms Natalia Dianiskova, Head of Operation, Section for Social Development, Civil Society and Cross Border Cooperation at the EU Delegation to Bosnia and Herzegovina, Sarajevo and Mr Toni Jakimovski from the MARRI Regional Centre.

In the opening part EU’s 2005 Global Approach to migration was highlighted as EU’s framework for dialogue and cooperation with non-EU countries, with the Western Balkans and Eastern Europe included in the framework. Participants were reminded that the idea for the Workshop was put forward at the roundtable on Demographic Trends and Social and Economic Challenges in SEE, held at RACVIAC in October 2012, when it was recognized that an event was needed that would address measures to reduce emigration of highly qualified young people from the countries of the region. Thus, thanks to the efforts of the organizers the idea turned into reality, resulting in a Workshop outlining EU migration legislation, situation in the region of South-Eastern Europe and effective migration policies in the region.

On the first day there were two panels held. The first panel dealt with the EU Migration Policy. It was moderated by Mr Bernhard Perchinig from Austria, Senior Researcher at the International Centre for Migration Policy Development (ICMPD), while the panellist was Mr Hans Leppers from the Legislation and Legal Affairs Directorate of the Dutch Ministry of Security and Justice. Mr Leppers outlined the EU migration policy, particularly focusing on admission policy, conditions of entry and residence, rights of third-country nationals residing legally in a Member State, visa issuance.

He gave an overview of EU regulations and policies dealing with residence and work permits, pupil exchange, and voluntary service. He highlighted the European Union Blue Card system which has been inspired by the US green card and named after the EU flag and will act as a single work permit and residence permit for highly qualified migrants. Mr Leppers pointed out that while the EU promoted and facilitated mobility and legal migration and while there were different mobility partnerships established with the third countries, it was important to think about the commitments both by the EU and the third countries. Thus, the third countries are expected to readmit their own nationals, discourage illegal migration through targeted information campaigns, improve border control/management and improve security of travel documents. On the other hand, the EU is expected to improve opportunities for legal migration for nationals of third countries, assist the third countries to develop their capacity to manage legal migration flows, undertake measures to address the risk of brain drain and to promote circular migration or return migration, improve and/or ease
procedures for issuing short term visas to nationals of third countries, which means there should be better consular services and visa facilitation agreements for specific categories. He outlined numerous benefits of legal migration, such as: more contacts among countries by persons and entities originating from different countries leading to better cooperation and mutual understanding, synergy, development and improvement of standard of living and working conditions, more and improved trade relations, combating negative effects of illegal migration by means of facilitating legal migration, facilitated access to labour markets of the member countries.

To the question on how far the migration policy was going to take us in the future, Mr Leppers answered that the focus in the future would be on particular interests of the third countries or rather that the focus would shift from internal EU measures to external approach, turning towards the third countries, learning about their particular problems and discussing them.

The fact that EU regulations and directives do not prevent, but rather facilitate, brain drain, making it easier for young people from third countries to leave and get employment in the EU was also discussed. It was pointed out that the EU had different priorities than the region – the EU needs highly qualified migrants, while brain drain in the region creates significant economic problems. It’s a challenge to make a partnership between the EU and the region work in a mutually beneficial way. However, the third countries are expected to improve standard of living in their own countries, promote productive employment and decent work and improve economic and social framework conditions to attract young qualified people to stay.

In the second panel, moderated by Mr Toni Jakimovski from the MARRI Regional Centre, development of national strategies and policies was discussed. Ms Alenka Prvinšek Persoglio from Interact4C, an international association connecting technologies for citizens, spoke about brain drain and long-term emigration as challenges for comprehensive migration management. Ms Prvinšek stressed that migration was indeed one of the most comprehensive aspects of a society as it influenced economy, culture, history, law, the media and security. She pointed out that the right to emigration was the right guaranteed under Article 2 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, which reads: Everyone has the right to leave any country, including his own, and to return to his country. However, there is no such thing as the right to immigrate. Rather, there are different rules regulating immigration such as admission policies, visa regimes, work permit policies. She stressed that the EU nowadays faced both – emigration and immigration, but the focus was on immigration alone. Ms Prvinšek said that while the damage emigration causes could be measured in terms of investment in education, the region lacked exact statistics about the number of emigrants as only some reported their departure to relevant authorities.

She also stressed that it was crucial for the region to realize that knowledge about migration should be introduced in the universities as well as at the governmental level. Thus, it is necessary to organize trainings...
on migration targeting academia and government representatives. She concluded by saying that it was necessary to take into account three Rs in order to design an effective migration policy: Recruitment (developing a profile of emigrants and keeping a record of their number), Remittances (attracting investments in certain parts of industry that would generate jobs and money) and Reintegration (of people who worked abroad and returned to the country of origin because they were retired, but also return of younger people who have their savings and want to make investments in the country of origin).

Three Rs necessary crucial for designing an effective migration policy:
- Recruitment
- Remittances
- Reintegration

Ms Alessia Pozzi from the Ministry of Science, Education and Sports of the Republic of Croatia presented a Unity through Knowledge Fund (UKF) Croatia and the project on scientific Diaspora aimed at uniting the scientific and professional potential of Croatian and Diaspora scientists in the development of knowledge-based society. The project, financed with a World Bank loan, proved successful in its intentions to include the Diaspora in the cooperation on projects that the domestic private sector would benefit from, to help national projects become competent on the international level and to contribute to the development of the scientific sector in Croatia. 161 prominent foreign institutions were included in the project, such as Yale University, Harvard Medical School, Stanford University, Max Planck Institute for Molecular Cell Biology and Genetics, Goethe University, Swiss Federal Institute of Technology Lausanne, Swedish Royal Institute of Technology, Austrian Academy of Fine Art, Norwegian University of Science and Technology, etc. Thanks to the project, absorption capacity of the Croatian scientific and technology community for EU funds increased, while the UKF projects were more successful in getting the EU 7th Framework Programme funds compared to national non-UKF projects.

Ms Nina Daskalović from the Ministry of Labour and Social Policy (MK) gave an insight into the situation in her country regarding intellectual emigration. She outlined national strategies, policies and action plans set in place by relevant institutions. She pointed out that while the legislative framework did exist, there were limited data on intellectual emigration both from domestic and foreign sources.

Ms Alenka Prvinšek Persoglio from Interact4C

The second day was opened with panel III tackling capacity building for human resources management in the institutions. Addressing the issue of human resources management, Ms Alenka Prvinšek Persoglio highlighted that there was no successful migration management without the knowledge about migrations. Thus it was necessary to develop a university course that would outline legal acts mandatory for the countries of the region and to contribute to the development of the scientific sector in Croatia. 161 prominent foreign institutions were included in the project, such as Yale University, Harvard Medical School, Stanford University, Max Planck Institute for Molecular Cell Biology and Genetics, Goethe University, Swiss Federal Institute of Technology Lausanne, Swedish Royal Institute of Technology, Austrian Academy of Fine Art, Norwegian University of Science and Technology, etc. Thanks to the project, absorption capacity of the Croatian scientific and technology community for EU funds increased, while the UKF projects were more successful in getting the EU 7th Framework Programme funds compared to national non-UKF projects.

Ms Nina Daskalović from the Ministry of Labour and Social Policy (MK) gave an insight into the situation in her country regarding intellectual emigration. She outlined national strategies, policies and action plans set in place by relevant institutions. She pointed out that while the legislative framework did exist, there were limited data on intellectual emigration both from domestic and foreign sources.
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topic of migration. Next, the number of young qualified people, mostly doctors, who left the countries after the 1990s, when these two countries opened to the world, was quantified. Finally, the project resulted in a detailed analysis of resources, which served as a tool to the governments in developing a self-sufficient national system of migration management.

In a lively discussion that followed Ms Prvinšek’s presentation, some successful regional practices of retaining young people in the countries of origin by offering better salaries, facilities or obliging them to return after financing their stay abroad were outlined. Successful projects aimed at comprehensive migration management by conducting trainings on the topic at the central, governmental and local, municipal level were presented by representatives from Serbia, Albania and Bosnia and Herzegovina. The panel was closed with a proposal to conduct regional assessment of best practices in following returnees, how well they integrated, their number, the assistance provided to them, etc.

Panel IV addressed the influence of intellectual emigration on the development of the country of origin. It was moderated by Mr Milan Janićijević, representative of RACVIAC – Centre for Security Cooperation. The first panellist to speak was Mr Bernhard Perchinig from the International Centre for Migration Policy Development (ICMPD). He said that the only available study on potential migration worldwide was the Gallup World Poll, which indicates that about one fifth of adult population in highly developed countries in America and Europe want to migrate, the same level as in Middle East and North Africa, with only Sub-Saharan Africa and Asia standing out.

After elaborating on key factors shaping interest in migration, such as age (there is significantly higher interest in migration among those below 30), employment (the underemployed are most likely to be interested in migration, attachment to workplace decreases interest in migration), education (persons with secondary education and above are most likely to be interested in migration), social networks (presence of transnational social networks increases desire to migrate, experience of family members abroad increases desire to migrate), he outlined the desired destinations migrants were interested in. He pointed out that in addition to the United States and Europe, parts of Latin America and Asia were also among the “desired areas”. He also stressed that emigration of qualified young citizens to other European countries, but also to non-European countries, has increased in those countries that were adversely hit by the crisis. However, the data indicate that the highest share of academic mobility does not necessarily correlate with the level of education in a country – there is low share of brain drain in some high-education areas such as the US, but there are also instances of high share in high education areas such as the EU, while the highest share of brain drain is noted among middle-level countries. Still, he pointed out, mobility was a necessary condition for academic careers and there were no career options without 2-5+/- years of mobility.

On the other hand, Mr Perchinig noted, academic reasons were the most important reasons given by national citizens with a doctorate for returning to the home country.
He closed his presentation by outlining suggestions given in some international studies with the aim to attract potential returnees, some of which include involvement of expatriates in concrete projects and programmes, providing strong legal status for expatriates, and support structures to connect qualified expatriates with companies and universities in the country of origin, support of temporary return, recognition of qualifications and experiences obtained abroad, offer attractive career paths for returnees, attract returnees at early stage and at early age, encouragement of virtual work and temporal mobility, support structure for integration of spouses to make use of female brain power (settlement services), provision of kindergartens and schools offering internationally accepted qualifications.

Mr Mirza Emirhafizović from the Faculty of Political Science of the University of Sarajevo elaborated on the loss of human capital through emigration in Bosnia and Herzegovina. He pointed out that Bosnia and Herzegovina was traditionally an emigration country, while it experienced great emigration during the war from 1992 to 1995. This trend continued in the post-war period as well. He outlined some of the problems contributing to brain drain, such as mismatch between supply and demand at the labour market, as well as between education and labour market needs, fragmented labour market, increasingly precarious conditions, lack of funds allocated for scientific and research activities of labour, and a permanent economic crisis. In the closing he gave an overview of the latest migration patterns in Bosnia and Herzegovina, including recruitment of medical staff in Germany based on bilateral agreements, temporary work abroad, circular migration, training programmes, etc.

In the last panel national migration management strategies and policies were presented from the standpoint of EU candidate and potential candidate countries. The panel was moderated by Ms Aïsa Telalović, Senior Expert Associate, Department for Diaspora, Ministry of Human Rights and Refugees of Bosnia and Herzegovina. The first panellist was Ms Olga Mitrović, Migration Advisor of the Commissariat for Refugees, Republic of Serbia. She gave an overview of the legal framework on migration as well as relevant institutions in charge of migration management in the Republic of Serbia. She highlighted local migration councils, comprising representatives of competent institutions dealing with migration, as a model that could serve as an example for other countries in the region. Ms Mitrović also pointed to the problem of the lack of data on the exact number of emigrants. She presented new tools and mechanisms adopted for migration management (such as immigration toolkit and a handbook on the protection of migrants’ rights) and outlined the objectives of national migration policy, including closing the refugee chapter, reintegration of returnees under the readmission agreement, prevention of jeopardizing visa liberalization process, developing the asylum system in line with the EU standards, harnessing the development potential of Diaspora.

We should worry more about those young people who stay in the country and do not produce than about those who leave the country and lead a productive life.

She closed her presentation by elaborating on the brain gain initiatives and activities aimed at utilizing the potential of intellectual Diaspora, some of which include the MIDWEB project - Migration for Development in the Western Balkans - virtual and temporary return initiatives, a handbook and DVD “Investment Opportunities in Municipalities and Cities of Serbia”, a multimedia catalogue of investments with 193 specific projects offering investment opportunities in Serbia, Business Technology Incubator of Technical Faculties of Belgrade established in partnership among four technical faculties of the University of Belgrade, and a fund for young talents established by the Ministry of Youth and Sports.

The last panellist was Mr Ali Riza Özdemir, Head of the International Cooperation Department of Turkey - Tübitak (the Scientific and Technological Research Council of Turkey). He presented Tübitak’s mobility programmes and activities related to
intellectual migration. He said that Turkey was ready to say goodbye to the middle-income trap and become an innovation-based economy like South Korea, Israel, Ireland or Japan. In an attempt to do so it has allocated more money to research and development activities, spending one percent of GDP on R&D, while it aims to reach 3 percent in the next ten years. It also gives more incentives to researchers.

Mr Ali Riza Özdemir from Tübitak, Turkey

He pointed out that there were some immediate results evident already, such as increase in the number of patents. He stressed that while internally the measures had already been taken, Turkey still needed to focus on its cooperation with other countries, particularly with European countries as the cooperation with Europe is only 5 percent compared to 50 percent cooperation with the U.S. He highlighted that we should worry more about those young people who stay in the country and do not produce than about those who leave the country and lead a productive life. Thus, he noted, it was better to send a Turkish researcher to work abroad than to give him/her more money to stay at home. He also outlined some fellowship and scholarship programmes aimed at attracting foreign researchers to come to Turkey and conduct their research there. He closed his presentation by saying that cooperation was the key to success, although it often happens that we build too many walls and not enough bridges, as one of the greatest, Sir Isaac Newton, once said.

Closing remarks

1) Whereas states usually gather a lot of knowledge about the educational and employment situation of their population through population registers and social security and employment data, there is not only a lack of knowledge of basic demographic information about emigrants, but also about their education and employment situation, and their areas of expertise. Thus a specific focus should be put on gathering more than basic demographic data, including the data on the educational levels, expertise and type of employment of emigrants. This cannot be done, as for the resident population, by a more or less automatic data collection by public services, but has to be done proactively by setting up registers for emigrants and approaching them directly. Here the potential of mobile communications and IT can make things easier.

2) It is important to focus both on return and on involvement of expatriates in projects at home - this is not only easier for individuals, but also forges links between institutions and companies abroad.

3) As the comparability and quality of data largely depends on definitions of what to collect and what methods to use, capacity building as well as a regional agreement on types of data and methods of collection should be considered of utmost importance. A mapping of existing data - definitions and collection methods could be a starting point.

4) It is necessary to assess needs and gaps regarding brain drain in the region with the aim to get an overall picture of the phenomenon with the estimation of flows and their structure.

5) Methodology for reliable statistics as a tool for policy development (possibly within a regional IPA project) has to be established.

6) It is necessary to develop a self-sustainable training system covering analytical capacities and general topics related to migration-e/i-migration and consider the possibilities under IPA regional projects.

7) Models of existing good practice in the region need to be mapped out (perhaps in the form of questionnaires).