

Distr.
GENERAL

Working paper 16
17 November 2006

ENGLISH ONLY

**UNITED NATIONS STATISTICAL COMMISSION and
ECONOMIC COMMISSION FOR EUROPE
THE
CONFERENCE OF EUROPEAN STATISTICIANS**

**EUROPEAN COMMISSION
STATISTICAL OFFICE OF
EUROPEAN COMMUNITIES
(EUROSTAT)**

Joint UNECE/Eurostat Work Session on Migration Statistics
organised in collaboration with UNFPA
Edinburgh, Scotland, 20-22 November 2006

Item 4 of the provisional agenda

**CHALLENGES TO IMPLEMENT THE MIGRATION SECTION OF THE CES
RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE 2010 ROUND OF POPULATION AND HOUSING
CENSUSES**

Main challenges to implementing the Migration section of the CES Recommendations in the
countries of Eastern Europe and Central Asia*

Submitted by International Organization for Migration

I. INTRODUCTION

1. The increasing importance of international migration in the political and social agendas in Eastern Europe and Central Asia (EECA)¹ reinforces the need to search for adequate sources of timely and reliable data on migrants stocks and flows. With population registers and designated data collection systems still under development, national censuses remain an important source of migrant stock estimation in the majority of the EECA countries.

* This paper has been prepared by Marina Manke, Technical Cooperation Centre for Europe and Central Asia. Opinions expressed in this document are entirely those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the views of IOM. Special thanks are expressed to IOM local missions in the EECA countries who assisted with the distribution of the Questionnaire, as well as to the focal points in the national statistical offices in Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Georgia, Kyrgyzstan, Moldova who kindly provided their inputs to the Questionnaire.

¹ The EECA region includes Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Georgia, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Moldova, Russia, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, Ukraine and Uzbekistan.

2. All countries of the region apart from Uzbekistan conducted their first independent national census during the 2000 round. Despite obvious differences in the adopted census methodology, a number of common approaches were employed to estimate migrant stocks and reveal core categories of migrants.

3. This paper aims at presenting the main challenges to implementing the migration section of the CES Recommendations in the EECA context. In particular, it first addresses the key peculiarities of migration processes within the region which are relevant for migration estimation, specifically what concerns migrant stocks in the countries. Further, it looks at key political and institutional factors which affect the conduction of national censuses in the region based on the experience of the round 2000 and their possible implications for the forthcoming round 2010. Based on the analysis of a specially designed questionnaire distributed among representatives of the national statistical offices (NSOs) in the region², as well as national census templates of the round 2000, the paper summarizes main commonalities in the census approaches of the 2000 round, indicates some key problematic methodological aspects and raises a number of questions which will need to be taken into account while planning national census programmes of the 2010 round in the region. Special attention is paid to the applicability of the CES Recommendations to the national reality in the region, in particular what concerns suggested core and non-core topics in the international migration section of the Recommendations.

II. MIGRATION PROCESSES IN THE EECA REGION AND THEIR IMPLICATIONS FOR MIGRATION ESTIMATIONS

4. In the last years there has been an apparent change in migration trends, patterns and characteristics within the EECA region. Thus, the dissolution of the Soviet Union resulted in large-scale relocations of population within the region and set of permanent emigration outflows, also for humanitarian and economic reasons. Nowadays the prevailing trend appears to have switched towards non-permanent type of **labour migration**, when citizens of the EECA countries go away from their homes for the purpose of getting employment abroad while leaving behind their families and intending to return home. This changed character of migration in the region produces a direct impact on the process of migration estimation, in particular creating a situation where a large proportion of the population remains de jure registered but de facto does not reside in the country for relatively long periods of time. This problem becomes especially acute in the countries with rather small population and large emigration flows (Moldova, Georgia, Armenia).

5. The common past, culture and language of communication couples together with simplified rules of movement within the region determine the prevalence of **intra-regional migration** flows in EECA. Visa-free regimes, on the one hand, and complicated procedures of registration and legal status settlement, on the other, create a situation when the biggest part of migration flows takes place outside the legal framework and, therefore, result in rather big numbers of **undocumented** migrants arriving and residing in the main countries of destination in the region.

² See Annex One.

6. Increasing gaps in the economic development across the EECA states transform some countries into main destination spots (Russia, Kazakhstan) with others distinctly becoming source countries of labour migrants (Moldova, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Uzbekistan, Georgia)³. A growing division into either **sending countries or receiving countries** produces a direct impact on the evolving priorities of migration policies in the region and, therefore, results in the evolution of concrete types of data collection systems. For instance, the migration policy of Russia and Kazakhstan is for most dominated by the need to regulate migration inflows and estimate the number of incoming and residing foreigners, while Moldova, Georgia and Tajikistan are searching for appropriate ways of registering outflows of their citizens and estimating their diasporas abroad.⁴

7. Another important trend in the region is the persistence of **forced migration** flows for ecological reasons (mainly Central Asia), and to a less degree as a result of military conflicts and human rights abuses, which leads to the appearance of considerable numbers of IDPs and forced international migrants. Asylum flows and refugee settlements are still vital on the political agendas.

8. Another political challenge to migration flows estimation is the still **continuing formation of international borders** and lack of control over some parts of national borders, which also contributes to incompleteness of flow estimations.

III. CONDUCTING CENSUSES IN THE EECA: INSTITUTIONAL AND POLITICAL CONTEXT

9. Before looking in more detail at the methodological applicability of the Migration Section of the CES Recommendations throughout the EECA region, it appears important to consider a few specific features of the institutional and political context in which national censuses are being carried out and the existing main challenges to census implementation in general. For this purpose, one should distinguish three levels of census conduction: preparatory stage, implementation stage and post-census stage.

10. During **the preparatory stage**, a main challenge for the majority countries in the region remain their national capacities of designing an appropriate methodology to best fit their national needs for population and migration data. The 2010 round will be only the second time when national censuses are conducted since the EECA countries' independence. In the times of the Soviet Union, the development of a census methodology was centrally carried out in Moscow, with the involvement of large scientific community and specially created methodological units. Around 2000, it became all the responsibility of the new

³ The division of countries into sending and receiving similar to other regions should be considered in its full dynamism, as an approximation, rather than a static fact, since most of the countries act as both sending and receiving at the same time.

⁴ Russia is in at the last stages of launching a centralised register of aliens, Georgia had a special emigration form during its national census of the 2000 round, Tajikistan's migration cards are filled in by the country's citizens at the borders while no data are collected on incoming citizens, nor any systematic data collection is carried out on foreigners crossing the borders.

independent states (NISs)' national statistical offices (NSOs) to develop the census methodology, often with limited technical and personnel resources at hand. There still remains an apparent **need** in the region to conduct capacity-building activities and provide methodological support for NSOs.

11. The main challenge during the census **implementation stage** in the majority of the EECA countries remains the availability of technical and financial resources. Support to the countries in their fund-raising activities for generating lacking funding is remains an acute need for a number of countries (i.e. in Central Asia, specifically Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan).

12. The **post-census stage** involves processing the results and their dissemination and entails additional challenges for national censuses implementation in EECA. In particular, the processing stage is complicated in some countries by the absence of modern technologies capable of efficient processing of the compiled forms. Some countries report the need to acquire scanners and other necessary technical equipment for the 2010 round, with financial issues reported as remaining a big challenge there.

Further, dissemination of results may be politically sensitive in some countries, especially when the census results in population numbers which largely diverge from the pre-census population estimations. A direct result of large unregistered flows of migrants mentioned earlier, the dissemination of census results bears direct financial implications and affect state budget allocations, both agency-wise and region-wise. In a number of countries a big divergence between the current population estimates and the census results has been considered a concrete challenge, calling for an importance of learning possible **methodological approaches** to revisiting the population estimations in the period between censuses and carrying out methodological adjustments⁵.

IV. CLASSIFICATION PRINCIPLES OF MIGRATION SUGGESTED IN THE CES RECOMMENDATIONS AND THEIR APPLICABILITY IN THE EECA REGION.

13. As mentioned earlier, the national censuses of the 2000 round became the first such exercise for the NISs after the dissolution of the Soviet Union. The introduction of 11 different census templates across the region after having a single template in the All-Union 1989 census could not but produce a significant effect on the diversity of the revealed census results and comparability of collected data.

14. Some new features of the 2000 round census methodology were nevertheless common in the region and included:

- 1) switch from the notion of a family to the notion of a household;
- 2) introduction of new parameters, i.e. citizenship, temporarily present and temporarily absent types of population;

⁵ See Annex Two for an example of Russia's census 2002 results and their impact on total population estimation in the inter-census period.

- 3) counting only “permanently residing population” in comparison to the 1989 census when both permanently residing and “present” population were counted⁶;
- 4) introduction of a number of questions aimed at establishing social-economic characteristics of the population, i.e. place of employment (allowing to estimate a “commuting” type of migration flows and reveal the number of those residing on a particular territory but employed in another territory);
- 5) introduction of special forms aimed at estimating certain types of migration (i.e. emigration form in Georgia).

15. The Statistical Committee of the CIS plays a coordinating role in the development of common approaches to census methodologies in the region. For the 2010 round Coordinating Council was established which, among others, also develops and considers common templates and provides a platform for regular discussions in the pre-census period.

“Country/Place of Birth” as a Criterion of Migrant Categorization

16. This criterion has been among the main ones in the Soviet-time censuses and was preserved in the 2000 round censuses across the region. Its implementation within the EECA context, however, does present certain challenges, in particular what concerns the qualification of population born before the Soviet Union dissolution. Following the CES recommendation for collecting information based on international boundaries existing at the time of the census, large numbers of “foreign-born” who migrated within the EECA region after the Soviet Union dissolution is revealed. The peculiar migration processes on the beginning-mid 1990s are the main cause of a big discrepancy between the numbers of foreigners and foreign-born in the region, as is, for instance, the case with the Russian Federation (RF) where the 2002 census estimated that 13,6 million RF residence were born outside of the country while only 1,5 million of foreigners and stateless resided there⁷. To avoid misinterpretation of the census results, an additional processing stage needs to be incorporated where the number of foreign-born population would be qualified as to how many of those were born on the territory of the former Soviet Union⁸.

⁶ Among positive aspects of counting only “permanent” population were quoted to be a more stable character of “permanent” residence and financial savings (no need to organize census in transport, hospitals, hotels, and to concentrate the correctness of permanent population registration (“? ?????????? ?????????? 2000 ?.” downloaded at http://www.sampo.ru/~stat/perepis/perep_nas.php3?file=osoben on 5 November 2006.)

⁷ See more on the problem of applying the country of birth criterion to the context of the EECA region in O. Chudinovskikh, 2005, “How Do the CIS Countries Estimate Migrants Stock (Do They)?”, *Invited Paper* Session 2, UNECE/Eurostat seminar on migration statistics, 21-23 March.

⁸ Consistent with the CES recommendation N. 370.

“Country of Citizenship” as a Criterion of Migrant Categorization

17. Widely used in the 2000 round censuses, this category appears at first sight to be the least controversial within the context of the EECA region. A novelty in comparison to the All-Union Census of 1989, the “citizenship” criterion in the 2000 round censuses allowed the countries to disaggregate their total population into the categories of citizens, non-citizens, stateless and non-identified. In some countries stateless were counted and reported within the category of non-citizens (or foreigners).

18. The criterion “country of citizenship” presents practically no methodological problems in terms of its applicability to the EECA region. However, the data disaggregated based on this criterion should be interpreted with caution taking into account what stands behind the notion of citizenship in each particular country.

19. In particular, the existence of different systems of citizenship acquisition (i.e. *jus soli* - if born on the territory of this State, and *jus sanguinis* - if born to (a) citizen(s) of this State) makes this category not so straightforward as it appears at first sight. Practically in all EECA states the prevailing citizenship criterion is *jus sanguinis*, which explains the reason why none of the 2000 round censuses in the region entailed a topic on ***citizenship acquisition***. However, the recent years have seen an increasing tendency to extend the *jus sanguinis* principle and introduce a number of naturalisation options in addition to the “principle of blood”, as, for instance, is the recent initiative of the Russian Federation to extend favourable conditions on citizenship acquisition to former “compatriots”.

20. An additional case potentially presenting difficulties in data estimation in accordance with this criterion is the existence of an institute of double citizenship (for instance, as was mentioned in the context of Kyrgyzstan). Special care should be taken in order to collect information on all cases of double citizenship in a country (by introducing a special line in the census questionnaire).

“Residence” as a Criterion of Migrant Categorization

21. The category of “residence” presents a considerable challenge for the implementation of the Migration Section of the CES recommendations in EECA. Two main factors are of major importance there: first, concerning nationals, is the difficulty of applying the notion of “usual residence” among the still dominant practice of using the term of “permanent residence” across the region, and, second, concerning foreigners, the big variety of different residence statuses distinguished by the states⁹.

22. The wide-spread application of the notion of “permanent” residence among the EECA states can be contributed to the legacy of the Soviet-type system of residence registration - “propiska” when each person was registered in a concrete location (with a relevant mark in his/her passport) and this was directly affecting the whole system of his/her legal rights (i.e. social benefits) and duties (i.e. conscription). Though in a number of national censuses of 2000 round an attempt was made to distinguish a relatively new notion of “usual residence” (Belarus, Russia), in addition to the remaining “permanent residence”. However, there still remains some confusion in the terminology, as, for instance, in Karelia (an administrative unit

⁹ See Annex Three for a regional overview of legislative norms and existing categories of residence.

of the RF) where “permanent” (not usual) place of residence was considered to be the one where the population had been living most part of their time, and which could be different from the place of registration¹⁰. There is an apparent need to enhance the efforts in terms of better systematization of census terminology concerning the place of residence in the forthcoming 2010 round.

Previous Place of Usual Residence and Data of Arrival in the Current Place of Residence

23. This category was applicable in the majority of the EECA censuses of the 2000 round, though in some censuses in an abridged form, in particular, it was mainly expressed through a question about the period of uninterrupted residence in the current place of residence.

“Ethnicity” as a Criterion of Migrant Categorization

24. Ethnicity was traditionally used as a main criterion categorising the population in the Soviet Union and was widely applied in the censuses of 2000 round. In the majority of the countries, national constitutions guarantee the right to ethnic self-determination, and a lot of effort was spent to ensure that the respondents were free to determine their own ethnicity. As a result, for instance, in Russia the number of declared ethnicities reached 800 and was further reorganised into around 180 ethnic groups residing on the territory of Russia. However, in some other countries of the region the principle of ethnic self-determination during the census was not strictly followed, there the interviewers were intervening in the process of ethnicity recording.

Category “Reason for Migration”

25. This category appears very useful in the context of the EECA region; has been already used in a few censuses of the 2000 round (Armenia) and is planned for introduction further in the additional countries for the 2010 round (Kyrgyzstan, Azerbaijan)¹¹. This category is recommended in the model census questionnaire developed by the Coordination Council of the CIS Statistical Committee, where the following reasons of both absence from the place of residence, as well as reasons of arrival to the current place of residence, are suggested: work, study, family circumstances, other¹².

Category “country of birth of parents”

26. This category has not been used in any of the EECA censuses of the 2000 round, nor is anticipated at the moment for the 2010 censuses. Its value is questionable for the EECA region where the majority of international migrants have similar roots and were born within a single State of Soviet Union. Further, this category raises additional questions, for instance,

¹⁰ “? ?????????? ???????? 2000 ?.” downloaded at http://www.sampo.ru/~stat/perepis/perep_nas.php3?file=osoben on 5 November 2006.

¹¹ See Annex One for details on available/proposed reasons of migration.

¹² “Enumeration of Model Census Survey Questions”, downloaded at <http://www.cisstat.com/census2010/1meeting.htm> and presented at the First Sitting of the Coordination Council on the 2010 Round Census Conduction in the CIS States, 19-21 April 2006, Moscow.

what concerns cases when parents were born in one place, but were citizens of another country, or when one of the parents was born in a home country and another in a foreign country.

V. GENERAL CONCLUSIONS

27. This paper mainly concentrated on the methodological challenges of CES Census 2010 Recommendations implementation in the EECA region. Some of these challenges are specific to the region, while the others are more general and follow from the complexity of the migration phenomenon itself.

28. In the EECA region it has been so far only possible to distinguish migrants in accordance with the criteria of citizenship and country/place of birth. No country of the region has so far applied or intends to apply in 2010 the recommended criterion of “country of birth of parents”.

29. Peculiarities of the on-going migration processes in the region and the existing legislative frameworks directly affect the quality of current migration estimations and result in the under-recording of actual flows (either inflows, as is the case of Russia, or outflows, as is the case of Moldova, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan).

30. The CES recommendations provide a number of solutions to the existing complexity of migration phenomena in the region and practically all EECA states are striving to apply them to this or that degree. However, it appears very important to bear in mind the very purpose of the recommendations which should serve the purpose of providing good practices and possible solutions, rather than taken for granted. It should be left to the countries themselves to decide which categories of migrants and topics fit their national context to the best possible degree.

31. Different countries will have different priorities in terms of revealing certain types of migrants based on whether they are mainly source or destination countries, as well as in accordance with their national migration policy priorities. A warning should be made about applying any international recommendations in a blind way as what works for one country may be irrelevant for another.

32. Nevertheless, the problem of incomparability and variety of existing data on international migration can only be solved if common approaches are pursued, which once again stresses the importance of open discussion of possible solutions and a need to search for common grounds and enhanced understanding.

Annex One: Migration Data Sources in the Region of Eastern Europe and Central Asia: National Context. Overview of the Answers to the Questionnaire.

	ARM		AZ		BEL		GE		KYRG		MOLD	
1. Census of 2000 Round	10-19 October 2001		27 Jan - 3 Feb 1999		16-23 Feb 1999		17-24 Jan 2002		24 March 1999		2004	
<i>1.1. CORE TOPICS</i>												
Country of Birth	X		X				X		X			
Country/place of Birth			X		X		X		X			X
Country of citizenship	X		X		X		X		X			X
Previous place of usual residence (PUR) and date of arrival to the current PUR	X		X		X				X			X
Ever resided abroad												
Year of arrival in the country							X					
<i>1.2. NON-CORE TOPICS</i>												
Country of previous PUR abroad			X				X					
Total duration of residence in the country			X				X					
Year and month of arrival in the current place												
PUR one year prior to the census												
PUR five years prior to the census												
Reason for migration	X ²						X					
Country of birth of parents												
Citizenship acquisition												
Other categories												
<i>1.3. CATEGORIES OF MIGRANTS</i>												
CITIZENS	Revealed	Statistics Exist	Revealed	Statistics Exist	Revealed	Statistics Exist	Revealed	Statistics Exist	Revealed	Statistics Exist	Revealed	Statistics Exist
permanently resident	X		X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X
usually resident	X		X		X	X			X	X		
temporary absent	X						X		X		X	X
reason							X				X	X
period of absence	X						X				X	X
country of residence	X						X				X	X

Annex One: Migration Data Sources in the Region of Eastern Europe and Central Asia: National Context. Overview of the Answers to the Questionnaire.

	ARM	AZ	BEL	GE	KYRG	MOLD
temporary present but permanently resident abroad	X	X		X	X	X
by reason of residence						
born in the country		X	X	X	X	X
born abroad		X		X	X	
native background						
foreign background						
FOREIGNERS	X	X	X	X		X
permanently resident		X		X	X	
usually resident			X	X	X	
temporary present but permanently resident abroad			X	X	X	X
by reason of residence			X	X		X
born in the country	X	X	X	X	X	X
born abroad	X	X	X	X	X	X
native background						
foreign background						
Refugees		X		X	X	X
Asylum seekers		X	X	X		X
IDPs	X	X		X		
Forced migrants						
Other categories						
<i>1.4. LANGUAGE/ETHNICITY</i>						
Native Language	X	X ¹	X	X	X	X
Foreigner Language	X	X ¹	X	X	X	X
Ethnicity	X	X ¹	X	X	X	X
2. Census of 2010 Round						
<i>2.1. PLANNED CORE TOPICS</i>			N/A	N/A		N/A
Country of Birth		X			X	
Country/place of Birth		X			X	
Country of citizenship	X	X			X	

Annex One: Migration Data Sources in the Region of Eastern Europe and Central Asia: National Context. Overview of the Answers to the Questionnaire.

	ARM		AZ		BEL		GE		KYRG		MOLD	
Previous PUR and data of arrival to the current PUR			X						X			
Ever resided abroad			X									
Year of arrival in the country			X									
2.2. PLANNED NON-CORE TOPICS												
Country of previous PUR abroad	X		X									
Total duration of residence in the country			X									
Year and month of arrival in the current place			X									
PUR one year prior to the census			X									
PUR five years prior to the census												
Reason for migration			X ²						X ²			
Country of birth of parents												
Citizenship acquisition												
Other categories	X ³								X ³			
3. Problematic Issues Related to Migration												
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
Definition of "usual place of residence"		X		X		X		X		X	X	
Country of birth		X		X		X		X		X		X
Counting of double citizenship		X				X		X	X			X
Category of country of parents		X						X				
Difference of census results with the current migration estimations		X			X			X	X		X	
Ethnicity		X		X		X		X		X	X	
Others				X				X			X	

Source: Questionnaire designed by IOM TCC with methodological support of O. Chudinovskikh and filled in by contact points in the National Statistical Offices, November 2006.

¹ Verified by the national census template.

² Reason for migration category: Arm : work, family, study, visit, business, tourism, other. Az: Work, study, family, other. Kg: economic, social, political, ecological, other


³ Planned non-core topics, other categories: Arm: Refugee status or an IDP.

Kg: 1. Are you a refugee or an IDP?

2. For temporarily absent: reason of absence (work, study, family, other)

3. For temporarily residing: period of absence in the place of permanent residence, reason for temporary residence (work, study, family, other)

Annex Two: Total Population Estimation in Russia at 1 January: Before and After Census 2002 (persons, thousands)



Source: Data of the Federal Statistical Service of the RF downloaded from <http://www.gks.ru> in August 2005 and November 2006

Annex Three: Types of Stay/Residence Permits for Foreigners in EECA

	Stay	Temporary Residence	Permanent Residence
Azerbaijan	If longer than 30 days	If longer than 30 days	
Armenia		Temporary (up to 1 year)	Ordinary (after 3 years or for special categories) Special (up to 10 years , Armenian origin) Particular (diplomats, IO employees)
Belarus	Up to 90 days	From 90 days to 1 year	Permanent
Georgia		Similar for foreigners and citizens, if longer than 3 months	
Kazakhstan		Longer than 6 months Permanent residence	
Kyrgyzstan	Up to 6 months	From 6 months	Immigrant's status
Moldova		From 90 days to 1 year Up to 5 years (investors) Up to 3 years (minors)	Permanent Immigration Certificate from 90 days
Russia	Up to 90 days and less than 1 year	Up to 3 years , can be extended	Up to 5 years
Tajikistan	Up to 6 months		Longer than 6 months - Immigrant's status Permanent residence - up to 5 years
Turkmenistan	Temporary stay		Permanent Residence
Ukraine	Border registration Up to 6 months, 90 days for non-visa entry		Permanent Residence
Uzbekistan	Temporary stay		Permanent Residence

Sources:

Azerbaijan	"On the Registration at the Place of Stay and the Place of Residence". Law N.? 55-I? 4 April 1996
Armenia	Regulation to ensure implementation of the law of the Republic of Armenia on "Legal Status of Foreign Citizens in the Republic of Armenia" from 24 March 1998 N. 200 decree of the Government of Armenia
Belarus	"On Immigration". Law N 224-3 from 29 December 1998; Rules of Foreign Citizens' and Stateless Person's Stay in the Republic of Belarus. Council of Minister's Regulation N. 949 from 15.07.02
Georgia	"On the Registration Rule and Personal Identification of Citizens of Georgia and Foreigners Residing in Georgia". Law N 323-11 from 27 June 1996.
Kazakhstan	On Approval of the Instruction on Rules of Entry and Stay of Foreign Citizens in the Republic of Kazakhstan, and also of Their Departure from the Republic of Kazakhstan and Organization of Field Service Activities of the Law-enforcement Agencies in the Area of Prevention and Interception of Foreign Citizens' Illegal Migration on the Territory of the Republic of Kazakhstan. Joint Order of the Ministry of Interior of the Republic of Kazakhstan (N 215 on 9.04.2004), Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Kazakhstan (N 08-1/93) and the Agency of the Republic of Kazakhstan of Migration and Demography (N 35-? on 14.04.2004)
Kyrgyzstan	"On External Migration". Law N 61, from 17 July 2000
Moldova	"On Migration". Low N 1516-XV from 6 December 2002
Russia	"On Legal Status of Foreign Citizens in the Russian Federation". Law N 115-?? from 25 July 2002
Tajikistan	"On Adoption of Rules of Foreign Citizens' Stay in the Republic of Tajikistan and Rules on Transit Crossing of Foreign Citizens through the Territory of the Republic of Tajikistan". Regulation of the Government N. 218 from 15 May 1999
Turkmenistan	"On the Order of Entry, Exit and Stay of Foreign Citizens in Turkmenistan" (with alterations and amendments from 25 September and 27 January 2004). Presidential Order N 6135 from 21 February 2003
Ukraine	"On Rules of Entry of Foreigners and Stateless Persons to Ukraine, their Exit from Ukraine and Transit Through Its Territory". Cabinet of Ministers' Regulation N 1074 from 29 December 1995 (with alterations and amendments introduced by regulations N 910 (910-2000-?) from 05 June 2000, N 1259 (1259-2001-?) from 26 September 2001, N 1161 (1161-2003-?) from 25 July 2003, N 1402 (1402-2003-?) from 04 September 2003)
Uzbekistan	"On the Order of Entry, Departure, Stay and Transit Travel of Foreign Citizens and Stateless Persons in the Republic of Uzbekistan". Resolution of the Cabinet of Ministers of the Republic of Uzbekistan No. 408 from 21 November 1996.