

## Netherlands

In spite of the economic downturn, immigration rose slightly in 2009 to 146 400, the highest figure in a decade. 30% of these immigrants were Dutch nationals. At the same time, outflows decreased slightly for the second year in a row, reaching 85 400. Out of the emigrants, 60% were Dutch nationals. Overall net migration reached the highest figure since 2001, with a surplus of 34 500 after correction for unreported emigration.

In 2009, the main origin countries of new immigrants remained Poland (12 700) and Germany (8 700). The United Kingdom (4 400) replaced Bulgaria as the third most important sending country. Immigrants from the new EU-member countries which had joined the EU in 2004 and 2007 accounted for almost one quarter of the inflows (24 200). Altogether, EU-27 countries made up for more than half of the total inflows of foreign nationals (55 500).

Since 2007, Dutch migration statistics distinguish only for so-called “non-Western countries” (these are African, Asian and South American countries, including Turkey but excluding Indonesia and Japan) among migration motives. Among the roughly 37 800 immigrants from these countries in 2009, family migrants accounted for 17 700, a slight increase over 2008. In contrast, the number of labour migrants from these countries dropped from 7 000 to 5 000. Turkey and India were the two main origin countries of labour migrants, accounting each for 30% of that figure.

The Netherlands received 14 900 requests for asylum in 2009, a slight increase over 2008. In 2009, applicants mainly came from Iraq, Somalia, Afghanistan and China. Preliminary data for 2010 show a 12% decrease of asylum requests for the period of January to October, compared with the same period in 2009.

From 2008 to 2009, the number of foreigners who took up Dutch citizenship declined from 28 300 to about 23 000. In May 2009, the naturalisation law was amended with the introduction of three major changes. First, it is now possible to withdraw citizenship as a sanction to immigrants who have severely harmed Dutch interests. Second, the practice to immediately grant citizenship to children aged under seven who are recognised by a Dutch citizen was restored after it had been abandoned in 2003. Finally, the naturalisation ceremony now concludes with a “statement of allegiance” whereby the future citizen swears an oath to respect the values and rights implied by Dutch

citizenship. In October 2010, a law came into effect that enables “latent Dutch” to acquire Dutch citizenship by option. This applies to children of Dutch mothers and non-Dutch fathers born before 1985, since they were not granted Dutch citizenship at birth.

Over the last two years, the regulation of family migration underwent several changes. As of 2011, a higher level of spoken Dutch and a written test is required for passing the Civic Integration Examination Abroad which prospective family migrants have to take in their home countries. Moreover, the possibility to oblige family migrants to participate in further education measures after their arrival in the Netherlands is currently taken into consideration. In order to harmonise the Dutch regulation of family migration with EU legislation, the Immigration and Naturalisation Department abandoned the legal differentiation between family reunification and family formation in July 2010. As a consequence, a common income requirement of 100% of the legal minimum wage was fixed for both categories. In addition, the minimum age for family migration was raised from 18 to 21.

The Dutch government is in the process of introducing a “Modern Migration Policy” that aims at simplifying the general permit system and at accelerating the admission procedure. Thus far, applicants have to follow a two-fold application process by submitting documents for an entry visa and for a residence permit. Under the new system, both procedures will be combined into one. In addition to that, the persons or institutions who recruit a foreign national will be given the status of independent sponsors who may request a residence permit on behalf of the actual applicant. Businesses and institutions can, upon passing a reliability test, become authorised sponsors and benefit from several privileges such as an exemption from the need to submit documents with the application. Possibilities to intervene against sponsors who do not fulfill their obligations will be enlarged. The coming into effect of the Modern Migration Policy was planned for January 2011, but was postponed until further notice in November 2010, due to a delay in the establishment of the computer system.

### **For further information:**

[www.ind.nl/EN/](http://www.ind.nl/EN/)

[www.cbs.nl/en-GB/default.htm](http://www.cbs.nl/en-GB/default.htm)

## Recent trends in migrants' flows and stocks

## NETHERLANDS

Migration flows (foreigners) National definition	2000	2005	2008	2009	Average		Level ('000)			
					2000-04	2005-09	2009			
<i>Per 1 000 inhabitants</i>										
Inflows	5.7	3.9	6.3	6.3	5.1	5.1	104.4			
Outflows	1.3	1.5	1.9	2.1	1.3	1.8	35.5			
<b>Migration inflows (foreigners) by type</b>	<b>Thousands</b>		<b>% distribution</b>		<b>Inflows of top 10 nationalities as a % of total inflows of foreigners</b>					
<i>Permit based statistics (standardised)</i>	<b>2008</b>	<b>2009</b>	<b>2008</b>	<b>2009</b>						
Work	11.2	8.2	11.9	8.9						
Family (incl. accompanying family)	20.5	20.4	21.8	22.2						
Humanitarian	5.7	7.9	6.1	8.6						
Free movements	56.4	55.5	60.2	60.3						
Others	..	..	..	..						
Total	93.7	92.0	100.0	100.0						
<b>Temporary migration</b>	<b>2005</b>	<b>2008</b>	<b>2009</b>	<b>Average</b>						
								<b>2005-09</b>		
<i>Thousands</i>										
International students	10.9	9.0	10.0	10.2						
Trainees	1.1	1.5	4.5	2.0						
Working holiday makers	..	..	..	..						
Seasonal workers	..	..	..	..						
Intra-company transfers	..	..	..	..						
Other temporary workers	46.1	15.6	13.7	39.9						
<b>Inflows of asylum seekers</b>	<b>2000</b>	<b>2005</b>	<b>2008</b>	<b>2009</b>	Average		Level			
					<b>2000-04</b>	<b>2005-09</b>	<b>2009</b>			
<i>Per 1 000 inhabitants</i>										
	2.8	0.8	0.8	0.9	1.5	0.8	14 905			
<b>Components of population growth</b>	<b>2000</b>	<b>2005</b>	<b>2008</b>	<b>2009</b>	Average		Level ('000)			
					<b>2000-04</b>	<b>2005-09</b>	<b>2009</b>			
<i>Per 1 000 inhabitants</i>										
Total	7.7	1.8	4.9	5.4	5.5	3.3	89			
Natural increase	4.2	3.2	3.0	3.1	3.8	3.0	51			
Net migration	3.4	-1.7	1.6	2.1	1.4	-0.1	34			
<b>Stocks of immigrants</b>	<b>2000</b>	<b>2005</b>	<b>2008</b>	<b>2009</b>	Average		Level ('000)			
					<b>2000-04</b>	<b>2005-09</b>	<b>2009</b>			
<i>Percentage of the total population</i>										
Foreign-born population	10.1	10.6	10.9	11.1	10.5	10.8	1 833			
Foreign population	4.2	4.2	4.4	4.4	4.3	4.3	735			
<b>Naturalisations</b>	<b>2000</b>	<b>2005</b>	<b>2008</b>	<b>2009</b>	Average		Level			
					<b>2000-04</b>	<b>2005-09</b>	<b>2009</b>			
<i>Percentage of the foreign population</i>										
	7.5	4.1	3.9	4.0	5.7	4.2	29 754			
<b>Labour market outcomes</b>	<b>2000</b>	<b>2005</b>	<b>2008</b>	<b>2009</b>	Average					
					<b>2000-04</b>	<b>2005-09</b>				
<i>Employment/population ratio</i>										
Native-born men	84.0	81.5	83.8	82.9	83.6	82.7				
Foreign-born men	69.9	69.5	74.9	72.8	70.2	71.3				
Native-born women	65.6	68.6	72.6	73.0	67.3	70.9				
Foreign-born women	48.8	52.4	57.3	57.1	51.5	54.5				
<i>Unemployment rate</i>										
Native-born men	1.8	3.6	2.4	3.2	2.3	3.0				
Foreign-born men	5.4	10.8	6.4	8.8	6.8	8.8				
Native-born women	3.0	4.4	2.7	3.4	3.1	3.7				
Foreign-born women	7.6	10.0	6.7	7.4	7.4	8.6				
<b>Macroeconomic indicators</b>	<b>2000</b>	<b>2005</b>	<b>2008</b>	<b>2009</b>	Average		Level			
					<b>2000-04</b>	<b>2005-09</b>	<b>2009</b>			
<i>Annual growth in %</i>										
Real GDP	3.9	2.0	1.9	-3.9	1.7	1.5				
GDP/capita (level in USD)	3.2	1.8	1.5	-4.4	1.1	1.2	31 817			
Employment (level in thousands)	2.2	0.5	1.5	-1.1	0.7	1.0	8 621			
<i>Percentage of the labour force</i>										
Unemployment	2.8	4.7	2.7	3.4	3.2	3.5				

Notes and sources are at the end of the chapter.

StatLink <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888932441515>