

**Senate Standing Committee on Economics**

**ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE**

**Treasury Portfolio**

Additional Estimates

26 February 2014

**Question: AET 3000**

**Topic: Net Overseas Migration**

**Written: Page 61, 26 February 2014**

**Senator DASTYARI asked:**

3000. Senator DASTYARI: In the report, there is also a quote which reads:

DIBP—

which I assume is the Department of Immigration and Border Protection—

is well placed to produce short term NOM assumptions, but beyond 2016-17 the ABS has placed more weight on established trends in NOM.

NOM is net overseas migration.

I am just wondering why that is the case. The reason being that, between, say, 2011 and 2013 there was an increase in NOM from 170,000 to 244,000. Again, you can take this on notice. I think the projections that you use for the next two years are quite accurate, then you go back to historical figures that someone like me would argue we are never going to return to. I don't know whether that is something you can answer now or can take on notice.

Ms van Halderen: We can certainly take that one on notice.

**Answer:**

3000. The reason the ABS NOM assumptions revert back to historical trends is that ABS is not forecasting or predicting the future but projecting forward scenarios that are based on observed trends.

The NOM assumptions in the projections have a 'phase-in' period to get to the long range NOM assumption in the year 2021. So for the years 2017-18 through to 2019-20 the NOM assumption is transitioning between the Department of Immigration and Border Protection's figures at around 251,000 to the long range assumption of 240,000.

With advice from Australian state and federal government projections experts and academia, migration trends in the most recent 5 years were considered to be more useful in framing long range NOM assumptions than the 30 year average of around 130,000.