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## Explanatory notes

Symbols of United Nations documents are composed of capital letters combined with figures.
Various symbols have been used in the tables throughout this report, as follows:
Two dots (..) indicate that data are not available or are not separately reported.
An em dash (-) indicates that the population is less than 500 persons.
A hyphen (-) indicates that the item is not applicable.
A minus sign (-) before a figure indicates a decrease.
A full stop (.) is used to indicate decimals.
Years given refer to 1 July.
Use of a hyphen (-) between years, for example, 1995-2000, signifies the full period involved, from 1 July of the beginning year to 1 July of the end year.

The following abbreviations are used in the present report:

| ASR | active support ratio |
| :--- | :--- |
| EC | European Community |
| EU | European Union |
| PSR | potential support ratio |
| TFR | total fertility rate |

Details and percentages in tables do not necessarily add to totals because of rounding.
Countries and areas are grouped geographically into six major areas: Africa, Asia, Europe, Latin America and the Caribbean, Northern America and Oceania. Those major areas are further divided geographically into 21 regions. In addition, the regions are classified as belonging, for statistical convenience, to either of two general groups: more developed and less developed regions. The less developed regions include all regions of Africa, Asia (excluding Japan), Latin America and the Caribbean, Melanesia, Micronesia and Polynesia. The more developed regions comprise Northern America, Japan, Europe and Australia/New Zealand.

The European Union comprises 15 countries: Austria, Belgium, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Portugal, Spain, Sweden and United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

Europe comprises 47 countries and areas: Albania, Andorra, Austria, Belarus, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Channel Islands, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Faeroe Islands, Finland, France, Germany, Gibraltar, Greece, Holy See, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Isle of Man, Italy, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Monaco, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, San Marino, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and Yugoslavia.

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The United Nations Population Division monitors fertility, mortality and migration trends for all countries of the world, as a basis for producing the official United Nations population estimates and projections. Among the demographic trends revealed by those figures, two are particularly salient: population decline and population ageing.

Focusing on these two striking and critical trends, the present study addresses the question of whether replacement migration is a solution to declining and ageing populations. Replacement migration refers to the international migration that would be needed to offset declines in the size of population and declines in the population of working age, as well as to offset the overall ageing of a population.

The study computes the size of replacement migration and investigates the possible effects of replacement migration on the population size and age structure for a range of countries that have in common a fertility pattern below the replacement level. Eight countries are examined: France, Germany, Italy, Japan, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America. Two regions are also included: Europe and the European Union. The time period covered is roughly half a century, from 1995 to 2050.

According to the United Nations population projections (medium variant), Japan and virtually all the countries of Europe are expected to decrease in population size over the next 50 years. For example, the population of Italy, currently 57 million, is projected to decline to 41 million by 2050. The population of the Russian Federation is expected to decrease from 147 million to 121 million between 2000 and 2050. Similarly, the population of Japan, currently 127 million, is projected to decline to 105 million by 2050.

In addition to the decrease in population size, Japan and the countries of Europe are undergoing a relatively rapid ageing process. In Japan, for example, over the next half century the median age of the population is expected to increase by about eight years, from 41 to 49 years. In addition, the proportion of the Japanese population 65 years or older is expected to increase from its current 17 per cent to 32 per cent. Similarly, in Italy the median age of the population is expected to increase from 41 years to 53 years, and the proportion of the population 65 years or older is projected to rise from 18 per cent to 35 per cent.

Building upon these estimates and projections, the present study considers six different scenarios with regard to the international migration streams needed to achieve specific population objectives or outcomes for the eight countries and two regions mentioned above. These are not meant to be recommendations in any way, but illustrations of hypothetical scenarios. The six scenarios are described below:

Scenario I. This scenario is based on the medium variant of the projections from the United Nations World Population Prospects: 1998 Revision (henceforth referred to as the 1998 Revision).

Scenario II. This scenario is based on the medium variant of the 1998 Revision, amended by assuming zero migration after 1995.

Scenario III. This scenario computes and assumes the migration required to maintain the size of the total population at the highest level it would reach in the absence of migration after 1995.

Scenario IV. This scenario computes and assumes the migration required to maintain the size of the working-age population ( 15 to 64 years) at the highest level it would reach in the absence of migration after 1995.

Scenario V. This scenario computes and assumes the migration required to prevent the ratio of the size of the population aged 15-64 to the size of the population aged 65 or over, called the potential support ratio (PSR), from declining below the value of 3.0.

Scenario VI. This scenario computes and assumes the migration required to maintain the potential support ratio (PSR), at the highest level it would reach in the absence of migration after 1995.

The total and average annual numbers of migrants for the period 2000-2050 for each scenario are presented in table 1. Scenario I shows the numbers of migrants assumed for the eight countries and two regions in the medium variant of the United Nations projections. For example, the total number of migrants for the United States for the fifty-year period is 38 million; and the average annual number is 760,000 . Scenario II assumes zero migration for the entire period; the resulting populations and age structures are given in the text of this report.

Table 1. Net number of migrants by country or region and scenario, 2000-2050

|  | Scenario | I | II | III | IV | V | VI |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Country or region |  | Medium variant | Medium variant with zero migration | Constant total population | $\begin{gathered} \text { Constant } \\ \text { age group } \\ 15-64 \end{gathered}$ | Ratio 15-64/65+ not less than 3.0 | Constant ratio 15-64/65 years or older |
| A. Total number |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| France |  | 325 | 0 | 1473 | 5459 | 16037 | 89584 |
| Germany |  | 10200 | 0 | 17187 | 24330 | 40481 | 181508 |
| Italy |  | 310 | 0 | 12569 | 18596 | 35088 | 113381 |
| Japan |  | 0 | 0 | 17141 | 32332 | 94837 | 523543 |
| Republic of Korea |  | -350 | 0 | 1509 | 6426 | 11595 | 5128147 |
| Russian Federation |  | 5448 | 0 | 24896 | 35756 | 26604 | 253379 |
| United Kingdom |  | 1000 | 0 | 2634 | 6247 | 13674 | 59722 |
| United States |  | 38000 | 0 | 6384 | 17967 | 44892 | 592572 |
| Europe |  | 18779 | 0 | 95869 | 161346 | 235044 | 1356932 |
| European Union |  | 13489 | 0 | 47456 | 79375 | 153646 | 673999 |
| B. Average annual number |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| France |  | 7 | 0 | 29 | 109 | 321 | 1792 |
| Germany |  | 204 | 0 | 344 | 487 | 810 | 3630 |
| Italy |  | 6 | 0 | 251 | 372 | 702 | 2268 |
| Japan |  | 0 | 0 | 343 | 647 | 1897 | 10471 |
| Republic of Korea |  | -7 | 0 | 30 | 129 | 232 | 102563 |
| Russian Federation |  | 109 | 0 | 498 | 715 | 532 | 5068 |
| United Kingdom |  | 20 | 0 | 53 | 125 | 273 | 1194 |
| United States |  | 760 | 0 | 128 | 359 | 898 | 11851 |
| Europe |  | 376 | 0 | 1917 | 3227 | 4701 | 27139 |
| European Union |  | 270 | 0 | 949 | 1588 | 3073 | 13480 |

Except for the United States, the numbers of migrants needed to maintain the size of the total population (scenario III) are considerably larger than those assumed in the medium variant of the United Nations projections (scenario I). In Italy, for example, the total number of migrants is 12.6 million (or 251 thousand per year) in scenario III versus 0.3 million (or 6 thousand per year) in scenario I. For the European Union, the respective numbers are 47 million versus 13 million (or 949 thousand per year versus 270 thousand per year).

In scenario IV, in order to keep constant the size of the working-age population ( 15 to 64 years), the numbers of migrants are even larger than those in scenario III. In Germany, for instance, the total number of migrants is 24 million (or 487 thousand per year) in scenario IV versus 17 million (or 344 thousand per year) in scenario III.

Figure 1 provides a standardized comparison by presenting the migration flows expressed in per million inhabitants in 2000. This comparison shows that relative to country size the number of migrants needed between 2000-2050 to maintain the size of the working-age population (scenario IV) is the highest for Italy, with 6,500 annual immigrants per million inhabitants, followed by Germany, with 6,000 annual immigrants per million inhabitants. Among the countries and regions studied in this report, the United States would require the smallest number of immigrants, approximately 1,300 per million inhabitants, to prevent the decline of its working-age population.

In scenario V , to prevent the potential support ratio from reaching below 3.0, the dates when migrants would be needed would occur later than in scenario IV, but the numbers of migrants that would be needed are much larger than that in scenario IV. In France, for instance, the total number of migrants is 16 million in scenario V versus 5 million in scenario IV, and in Japan it is 95 million versus 32 million.

The numbers in scenario VI, which keeps the potential support ratio constant, are extraordinarily large. In Japan, for example, the total number of migrants in scenario VI is 524 million (or 10.5 million per year). For the European Union, the total number of migrants in this scenario is 674 million (or 13 million per year).

Readers should keep in mind that the results of scenario VI are for illustrative purposes only. Given the assumption that the current age structure of the population would remain unchanged in the future, the resulting large number of migrants needed should be considered totally unrealistic.

Major findings of this study include the following:

1. During the first half of the twenty-first century, the populations of most developed countries are projected to become smaller and older as a result of below-replacement fertility and increased longevity.
2. In the absence of migration, the declines in population size will be even greater than those projected, and population ageing will be more rapid.
3. Although fertility may rebound in the coming decades, few believe that fertility in most developed countries will recover sufficiently to reach replacement level in the foreseeable future, thus making population decline inevitable in the absence of replacement migration.
4. The projected population decline and population ageing will have profound and far-reaching consequences, forcing Governments to reassess many established economic, social and political policies and programmes, including those relating to international migration.

Figure 1. Average annual net number of migrants between 2000 and 2050 to maintain size of working-age population, per million inhabitants in 2000

5. For France, the United Kingdom, the United States and the European Union, the numbers of migrants needed to offset population decline are less than or comparable to recent past experience. While this is also the case for Germany and the Russian Federation, the migration flows in the 1990s were relatively large due to reunification and dissolution, respectively.
6. For Italy, Japan, the Republic of Korea and Europe, a level of immigration much higher than that experienced in the recent past would be needed to offset population decline.
7. The numbers of migrants needed to offset declines in the working-age population are significantly larger than those needed to offset total population decline. Whether those larger numbers of migrants are within the realm of options open to Governments depends to a great extent on the social, economic and political circumstances of the particular country or region.
8. If retirement ages remain essentially where they are today, increasing the size of the working-age population through international migration is the only option in the short to medium term to reduce declines in the potential support ratio.
9. The levels of migration needed to offset population ageing (i.e., maintain potential support ratios) are extremely high, and in all cases entail vastly more immigration than has occurred in the past.
10. Maintaining potential support ratios at current levels through replacement migration alone seems out of reach, because of the extraordinarily large numbers of migrants that would be required.
11. Possible future increases in economic activity rates for people aged less than 65 years cannot, on their own, be a solution to the decline in the active support ratios caused by population ageing.
12. In most cases, the potential support ratios could be maintained at current levels by increasing the upper limit of the working-age population to roughly 75 years of age.
13. The new challenges being brought about by declining and ageing populations will require objective, thorough and comprehensive reassessments of many established economic, social and political policies and programmes. Such reassessments will need to incorporate a long-term perspective. Critical issues to be addressed in those reassessments include (a) appropriate ages for retirement; (b) levels, types and nature of retirement and health-care benefits for the elderly; (c) labour-force participation; (d) assessed amounts of contributions from workers and employers to support retirement and health-care benefits for the increasing elderly population; and (e) policies and programmes relating to international migration, in particular replacement migration, and the integration of large numbers of recent migrants and their descendants.

## I. OVERVIEW OF THE ISSUES

As part of its regular work programme, the United Nations Population Division continuously monitors fertility, mortality and migration trends for all countries of the world, as a basis for producing the official United Nations population estimates and projections. Among the demographic trends revealed by those figures, two are particularly salient: population decline and population ageing.

Focusing on these two striking and critical trends, the present study addresses the question of whether replacement migration is a solution to population decline and population ageing. Replacement migration refers to the international migration that would be needed to offset declines in the size of population and declines in the population of working age, as well as to offset the overall ageing of a population.

Eight countries and two regions that are treated as individual countries have been selected for this study. All of them are relatively large countries that have below-replacement fertility. The countries and regions are France, Germany, Italy, Japan, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United States of America, Europe and the European Union. Through the technique of population projection, calculations are made of the amount of replacement migration that would be necessary for each of the eight countries and two regions to offset the expected declines in the size of the total population and working-age population, as well as to offset the overall ageing of the population.

The process of population ageing, which is the transformation of the age structure to relatively greater proportions in the older age groups, is being brought about by declining fertility and increased longevity. Since fertility and mortality levels have to some extent declined in most populations, population ageing is a nearly universal process. Where fertility has dropped to particularly low levels, such as in Europe and Japan, the ageing of populations is reaching unprecedented proportions.

In a smaller, yet significant number of countries, fertility has dropped so much that deaths exceed births, resulting in declining populations. Table 2 shows the list of countries that are projected to have smaller populations in 2050 compared to 2000 and the extent to which they will be experiencing population decline and ageing. In most cases, populations that are simultaneously ageing and declining will experience severe reductions in the ratio of persons of working age ( 15 to 64 years) to older persons (65 years or older).

These observations evoke an important set of issues and related questions. The first concerns the robustness of the projection figures. The second issue relates to the social and economic consequences of such unprecedented demographic trends and population changes. The third centres on the extent to which replacement migration is a solution to these expected trends and changes. Finally, the fourth issue relates to the policy and programmatic implications of the results from this study.

With regard to the figures themselves, it should be noted that most of the countries where population is projected to decline have well-developed statistical systems and considerable amounts of data and analytical insight on their demographic situation and trends. Having such a sound basis is of great help in suggesting what the most likely course of events in the future would be and how various alternative scenarios would diverge from or fall in line with present population trends.

From the demographic point of view, there is little doubt that the most likely course of events for those countries will result in smaller and older populations. To the extent that persons of working age ( 15 to 64 years) can be seen as supporting the older population ( 65 years or older), the ratio between the two (i.e., the "potential support ratio" or PSR) will decline dramatically. However, it is useful to ask a number
of "what if" questions. What would happen, for example, if fertility, mortality and migration changed course? More specifically, how much would they have to change course in order to reverse the most likely demographic outcomes?

Fertility is presently at record low levels in many countries where total fertility rates (TFR) as low as 1.2 children per woman have been recorded in recent years-well below the level of 2.1 children per woman that would ensure the replacement of the parents' generation. Although fertility may rebound in the coming decades, few believe that fertility in most countries will recover sufficiently to reach replacement level in the foreseeable future.

TABLE 2. COUNTRIES WHOSE POPULATION IS EXPECTED TO DECLINE BETWEEN 2000 AND 2050: CHANGES IN THE TOTAL POPULATION AND IN THE PROPORTION AGED 65 YEARS OR OLDER

| Country or area ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | Population (thousands) |  | Population Change |  | Per cent 65 years or older |  | Change in proportion 65 years or older (per cent) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2000 | 2050 | (thousands) | (per cent) | 2000 | 2050 |  |
| Austria | 8211 | 7094 | -1 117 | -14 | 15 | 30 | 106 |
| Belarus | 10236 | 8330 | -1907 | -19 | 14 | 25 | 86 |
| Belgium | 10161 | 8918 | -1 243 | -12 | 17 | 28 | 65 |
| Bosnia and Herzegovina | 3972 | 3767 | -205 | -5 | 10 | 27 | 171 |
| Bulgaria | 8225 | 5673 | -2 552 | -31 | 16 | 30 | 88 |
| China, Hong Kong SAR ${ }^{\text {b }}$ | 6927 | 6664 | -263 | -4 | 11 | 33 | 217 |
| Croatia | 4473 | 3673 | -800 | -18 | 15 | 26 | 77 |
| Cuba | 11201 | 11095 | -105 | -1 | 10 | 27 | 176 |
| Czech Republic | 10244 | 7829 | -2 415 | -24 | 14 | 33 | 144 |
| Denmark | 5293 | 4793 | -500 | -9 | 15 | 24 | 59 |
| Estonia | 1396 | 927 | -469 | -34 | 14 | 29 | 107 |
| Finland | 5176 | 4898 | -278 | -5 | 15 | 26 | 72 |
| Germany | 82220 | 73303 | -8917 | -11 | 16 | 28 | 73 |
| Greece | 10645 | 8233 | -2 412 | -23 | 18 | 34 | 92 |
| Hungary | 10036 | 7488 | -2 548 | -25 | 15 | 28 | 92 |
| Italy | 57298 | 41197 | -16101 | -28 | 18 | 35 | 92 |
| Japan | 126714 | 104921 | -21793 | -17 | 17 | 32 | 86 |
| Latvia | 2357 | 1628 | -728 | -31 | 14 | 27 | 86 |
| Lithuania | 3670 | 2967 | -704 | -19 | 13 | 27 | 102 |
| Luxembourg | 431 | 430 | -1 | 0 | 14 | 27 | 84 |
| Netherlands | 15786 | 14156 | -1 629 | -10 | 14 | 28 | 104 |
| Poland | 38765 | 36256 | -2 509 | -6 | 12 | 26 | 118 |
| Portugal | 9875 | 8137 | -1 738 | -18 | 16 | 31 | 99 |
| Romania | 22327 | 16419 | -5 908 | -26 | 13 | 31 | 131 |
| Russian Federation | 146934 | 121256 | -25 678 | -17 | 13 | 25 | 100 |
| Slovakia | 5387 | 4836 | -551 | -10 | 11 | 27 | 139 |
| Slovenia | 1986 | 1487 | -499 | -25 | 14 | 32 | 131 |
| Spain | 39630 | 30226 | -9 404 | -24 | 17 | 37 | 117 |
| Sweden | 8910 | 8661 | -249 | -3 | 17 | 27 | 53 |
| Switzerland | 7386 | 6745 | -641 | -9 | 15 | 30 | 104 |
| Ukraine | 50456 | 39302 | -11 154 | -22 | 14 | 27 | 91 |
| United Kingdom | 58830 | 56667 | -2 163 | -4 | 16 | 25 | 56 |
| Yugoslavia | 10640 | 10548 | -92 | -1 | 13 | 23 | 73 |

[^0]Table 3 below shows the range of values that the potential support ratio might reach in 2050 for the eight selected countries and two selected regions, according to the three variants (low, medium and high) of the standard population projections prepared by the United Nations Population Division. These variants correspond essentially to alternative assumptions about the course of fertility. For ease of comparison, the values of the PSR in 1995 are also shown. In France, for instance, the most likely course of events (medium variant) leads to a decline of the PSR from 4.36 to 2.26: in other words, a halving of the number of working-age persons per older person. In case fertility rises to what appears at this point to be the highest plausible level in the context of France (a TFR of 2.36 children per woman in 2040-2050), the PSR would somewhat improve in relation to the medium variant, but it would still be nearly halved. If, on the other hand, fertility stabilizes at a TFR of 1.58 after 2005-which at this point appears to be the lowest plausible level-the PSR would decline even more drastically, to less than two persons in the working-age group per older person.

Thus, while the range of outcomes of alternative fertility levels in terms of the PSR by 2050 would be significant ( 1.95 against 2.52 ) the difference is relatively small in relation to the level from which the PSR will be dropping (4.36). Moreover, the impact of alternative fertility levels would not be felt until the later part of the period. While in the long run fertility levels will be the determinant factor in shaping the age structure of the population, plausible ranges of increases in fertility rates in the next decades would contribute at best marginally to slowing the process of population aging by 2050. In the short to medium term-say over the next 20 years or so - measures to shore up fertility levels would not have any impact on the PSR.

With regard to mortality, its reduction will continue to be an overriding policy goal, so action in this area would by design further the population ageing process. Longevity is in any case projected to increase, even in the absence of possible new medical breakthroughs.

Therefore, among the demographic variables, only international migration could be instrumental in addressing population decline and population ageing in the short to medium term. As noted above, the most likely changes in fertility and mortality rates for Europe and Japan are unlikely to counter population decline and population ageing over the next half century.

Table 3. Values of the potential support ratio (PSR) by projection variant

|  |  | PSR in 2050 by projection variant |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Country or region | PSR in 1995 | Low | Medium | High |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| France | 4.36 | 1.95 | 2.26 | 2.52 |
| Germany | 4.41 | 1.81 | 2.05 | 2.35 |
| Italy | 4.08 | 1.35 | 1.52 | 1.75 |
| Japan | 4.77 | 1.47 | 1.71 | 1.91 |
| Republic of Korea | 12.62 | 2.04 | 2.40 | 2.70 |
| Russian Federation | 5.62 | 2.05 | 2.43 | 3.04 |
| United Kingdom | 4.09 | 2.02 | 2.37 | 2.75 |
| United States | 5.21 | 2.43 | 2.82 | 3.26 |
| Europe | 4.81 | 1.84 | 2.10 | 2.51 |
| European Union | 4.31 | 1.72 | 1.96 | 2.26 |

Source: United Nations Population Division, World Population Prospects: The 1998 Revision.

The prospects of population decline and population ageing during the coming decades, and particularly the rapid and extensive reduction of the potential support ratio in many countries, raise a number of crucial issues in the areas of employment, economic growth, health care services, pensions and social support services.

Moreover, while most developed countries will experience population decline, a few will not. Differentials in population growth, as illustrated in figure 2, will in some cases result in dramatic repositioning of countries and regions according to their relative population size. While these issues fall outside the scope of the present study, it is clear, however, that current demographic realities and expected future population changes, and their likely far-reaching consequences will force reassessments of many established economic, social and political policies and programmes, including those relating to international migration.

Following the publication of the draft of this study, the Population Division of the United Nations organized an Expert Group Meeting on "Policy Responses to Population Ageing and Population Decline" from 16 to18 October 2000, at United Nations Headquarters in New York. The Meeting focused on the eight countries considered in this report and brought together national experts from these countries and regions, as well as representatives from selected regional and international organisations. Replacement migration was one among a number of possible policy responses that were considered.

Figure 2. Per cent change in total population for selected countries and regions, 2000-2050


Source: United Nations Population Division, World Population Prospects: The 1998 Revision.

## II. LITERATURE REVIEW

Population ageing is an inevitable outcome of the demographic transition. Primarily, as a result of declines in fertility and, secondarily, mortality declines, the age structure of a population becomes older, with a growing number and proportion of elderly persons. In recent years, the issue of population ageing has received renewed attention in many countries, especially those in the more developed regions, owing to the continuance of fertility below the replacement level and on-going trends towards lower mortality. While there is great variation among them in terms of the level and pace of population ageing, this demographic process is expected to increase further in these countries, and eventually their populations are projected to level off and decline in the foreseeable future. These changes have profound consequences and far-reaching implications, especially for pension schemes, heath-care systems, education programmes and housing plans, as well as for the economic vitality and growth of a country. This chapter reviews selected literature that concerns the impacts of migration on the size and age structure of population. Whereas existing studies have paid a great deal of attention to population ageing and its social and economic implications (see, for instance, United Nations, 2000b; Korea Institute for Health and Social Affairs, 2000; Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development, 1997), the review that follows primarily gathers the literature that investigates the impact of international migration on population dynamics in a low-fertility setting.

The future population size and age-sex structure of any country depend basically on three demographic components: fertility, mortality and net international migration. As no policies to increase the mortality of a population are socially desirable, there are, in theory, two possible ways of retarding or reversing demographic ageing. First, a reversal of declines of fertility would lead the age structure of the population back towards a younger one, thus slowing down the ageing process. However, the recent experience of low-fertility countries suggests that there is no reason to assume that their fertility will return anytime soon to the above-replacement level (United Nations, 2000c; Lutz, 2000). Although Governments in those countries have introduced, instead of explicit pronatalist policies, a variety of social welfare measures favourable for higher fertility (Demeny, 2000), the long-term effectiveness of such measures is often called into question.

Hence, as a second option, the potential role that international migration could play in offsetting population decline and population ageing has been considered. International migration has become a salient global phenomena in recent years, with a growing number of countries being involved as sending or receiving countries, or both. Given the possibility of attracting larger numbers of immigrants into affluent developed economies, virtually all of which are experiencing low fertility, it appears appropriate to consider the impact that international migration may have on the demographic challenges of ageing. In formulating migration policy, it is also likely that the demand for demographic considerations will increase, as the rapid ageing process in those countries can give rise to rigidities in the labour market and social security (Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development, 1991).

A number of previous studies have examined the demographic impact of a constant influx of migrants on the growth of a population with below-replacement fertility. For example, taking the twelve countries in Europe or members of the then European Community (EC) together, Lesthaeghe and others (1988) carried out population projections. With the present below-replacement fertility and with no further immigration, the total population of these European countries would be reduced by approximately 20 to 25 per cent by the year 2050. The calculations showed that an overall population decline during the first half of the twenty-first century can be avoided if about one million immigrants move into the area every year. Assuming the same annual migration gain of one million, Lutz (2000) recently showed that the total population of Western Europe would grow by 13 per cent (to 505 million in 2050), as opposed to declining by three percent (to 422 million) in the case of no migration.

Similar studies have been carried out more frequently at a national level. Ulrich (1998), however, argued that immigration can only slow an inevitable decline of the population of Germany. He applied different fertility assumptions for natives and foreigners and different immigration levels by group of immigrants, and estimated the population size of Germany and its structure in 2030. His projections showed that, even with a relatively high level of immigration, the population of the country would start falling in the near future. Wanner (2000), in his study of Switzerland, also showed that in the absence of future migration the total population of the country would start declining much earlier and would be 5.6 million in 2050, about 1.5 million less than what is currently projected.

The importance of immigration for the growth of population in traditional countries of immigration is relatively well recognized (Appleyard, 1991; Foot, 1991; United Nations, 1998). Nevertheless, even in these countries where relatively large numbers of migrants are systematically admitted, the current level of immigration may not be sufficient to prevent their population size from declining in the future. Espenshade (1986) projected the changes in the population of the United States, assuming that both the fertility and mortality rates remained constant at their 1980 level and that the number of immigrants remained at the level in 1983, with the same age and sex structure. According to these assumptions, the population in the United States would grow until 2025, but decline thereafter. In a similar exercise for Canada it was found that in order to avoid population decline, a volume of immigration exceeding the current annual quota would be necessary after 2050, under the assumption that the current fertility level would be maintained (Wattelar and Roumans, 1991).

Some of these studies demonstrate that long-lasting below-replacement fertility and immigration streams offsetting the negative natural growth of the national population would eventually lead to a significant increase in the foreign population and therefore a marked change in the composition of a host country (Espenshade 1986; Feichtinger and Steinman, 1992; Gesano, 1994; Ulrich, 1998). For example, in Germany, should the high rate of immigration continue at the levels of the 1990s, the foreign population in the country is projected to reach 17 million by 2030 , comprising 21 per cent of the total population (Ulrich, 1998). This can be compared with the low variant figure of 8.7 million foreigners, or 12.5 per cent of the total population, assuming a moderate assumption of net annual immigration of 80,000 persons. The demographic consequences of constant immigration flows were also examined using the case of Italy (Gesano, 1994). Accordingly, if the country desires to achieve a stationary population of the same size as the population of 57.7 million in 1991, a constant annual inflow of about 389,000 immigrants would be needed. The population would increase to a maximum of 69.2 million in 2036, when the foreign-born population would increase to 22 per cent. The eventual stationary population would include 31 per cent of foreign population.

From the viewpoint of the economic sustainability of a country, what is probably more crucial is the future changes in the size of working-age population, rather than the total population size. In Western Europe, for example, with the baby-boom cohorts now fully absorbed in the labour force, and the smaller cohorts that follow, the declines in the working-age population can be foreseen. However, some researchers (Coleman, 1992; Feld, 2000) caution against the casual resumption of mass immigration to meet the volatile demands of labour market. In fact, the results obtained in the empirical research demonstrated that the working-age population in Western Europe would continue to increase in the medium term, under the current combined effect of natural increase and international migration (Feld, 2000). Furthermore, recognizing the limited power of international migration to influence the growth and age structure of population under imaginable circumstances, Coleman (1992) asserted that priority should be given to seeking reserves of domestic manpower that have not yet been mobilized, rather than resorting to immigration.

As the age structure of immigrants is often younger than that of the host population, there is a popular belief that a large influx of immigrants makes the population of the host country significantly
younger. Accordingly, it is commonly believed that a more generous immigration policy can immediately increase the size of the working-age population and help reduce markedly the dependency costs of the elderly. However, analyses of the migration flows of recent decades in the developed countries have provided scant evidence to support these conclusions. In the United Kingdom after the Second World War, immigration neutralized the previously dominant pattern of emigration. Thus, without new Commonwealth immigration and the contribution of births from immigrants, the population of the country would have been smaller by 3 million than it was in the early 1990s (Coleman, 1995). Coleman (1995) asserts, however, that the cumulative effects of migration alone on the age structure of the country have been limited, because the age structures of immigrant and emigrant flows are similar and the level of migration is relatively small in relation to natural change. Similarly, Le Bras (1991) explored the demographic consequences of the migration flows since the end of the Second World War in seven developed countries: Australia, Belgium, Canada, France, Germany, Italy and Sweden. He also concluded that the "rejuvenating" effect of migration on the host populations in the recent past had been fairly modest. Immigration had lowered the average age of the population in these seven countries by merely 0.4 to 1.4 years.

A number of other studies have analysed the effects of the steady influx of migration on the future age structure of a host population. They equally point out that the overall ageing trend can be attenuated through immigration, but it cannot be prevented. For instance, Lesthaeghe and others (1988) projected the age structure of the total population of the twelve European countries with and without migration up to the year 2060. Assuming that the total fertility of nationals remained constant at 1.6 and that of nonnationals fell to the replacement level by 2010, the proportion aged 65 years or older among females would rise from 16.3 per cent in 1985 to 25.8 per cent in 2060 in the absence of migration. The proportion was projected to be 21.3 per cent in 2060 if an additional 400,000 female immigrants arrived every year, other things being equal. In Western Europe, almost independent of future fertility and mortality, significant population ageing is virtually certain, as much of the future change is already pre-programmed in the current age structure of the population (Lutz, 2000). Even massive immigration cannot be a remedy for population ageing, unless migrants leave the receiving countries before they reach retirement age, because they also get older and eventually comprise part of the aged population.

Research for the United States also indicates that immigration has relatively little effect on overall age composition of the population and therefore will not be a realistic solution to demographic ageing (Coale, 1986; Espenshade, 1994; Day, 1996). Assuming that immigrants adopt the low fertility of a host population, Coale (1986) compared the age structure of the United States population in 2100 with and without a net immigration of 700,000 per year. He showed that the difference in the projected age distributions of the two populations is fairly modest, regardless of the four different below-replacement fertility scenarios. Similar results were presented a decade later by Day (1996). According to her projections, should fertility and mortality follow the middle-series assumption and net migration be held at 820,000 per year or near the current level, the proportion aged 65 years or older in the United States would increase from 12.8 per cent in 1990 to 20.0 per cent in 2050 . Even if a fairly larger level of immigration ( 1.4 million per year) occurred, it would reduce the future percentage of elderly in the population only slightly (to 19.4 per cent).

Concerns about an ageing society often arise not only from the growing number and proportion of elderly, but also from the rapidly changing ratio of the working-age population to the retired population. In particular, the sharp drop of the ratio may directly affect the viability of social security systems. In the study cited earlier, Lesthaeghe and others (1988) computed the ratio of adult women (20-59 years) to elderly women ( 60 years or older) for the total population of the twelve European countries under five different scenarios. If the countries kept their current below-replacement fertility, the ratio would decline from 2.4 in 1985 to 1.5 in 2060. Immigration of 400,000 women per year from 1985 onwards would be of some help to alleviate the decline, but would still yield a ratio of 1.8 in 2060. In his study cited earlier, Wanner (2000) showed that in Switzerland, the ratio of the population aged 20 to 64 years to the
population aged 65 years or older would be 1.5 in 2050 in the absence of migration, as compared to 2.1 , which is currently projected.

While the foregoing studies unanimously point out the limited effects of international migration on population ageing, Ryder (1997) noted that the outcomes of these population projections could be sensitive to the assumed age distribution of net international migrants. As the age at entry of migrants increases, the expectation of life after migration declines, and so does the reproductive value of a migrant. Using the data for Canada, Ryder demonstrated that the increase in mean age of migrants at entry resulted in an increase in the dependency ratio by about 0.6 per cent per year of age, given a projection period of a century.

Instead of assuming migration to occur with a fixed number or at a constant rate and examining the consequences of this immigration on the age structure of a population, some researchers estimated the level of migration necessary to maintain the age structure of population. A study by Blanchet (1988) on France as well as one by Wattelar and Roumans (1991) on Austria, Belgium, Canada and Spain questioned whether immigration can be an instrument to maintain the equilibrium between the working and the dependent populations under the regime of low fertility. Eventually, these studies demonstrated the inadequacy of regulating age structure through migration in the long run. Migration can help to maintain the equilibrium of age structure in the short run, but migration cycles of a large amplitude may be inevitable in the long run (Blanchet, 1988). These authors' simulations illustrated clearly that initial structural irregularities in the population would cause sudden changes in future age pyramids. For this reason, the scenario that aims to keep constant the ratio of adults to elderly may lead to enormous immigration peaks to make up for the shortfalls of population. Furthermore, such massive inflows of migrants would be likely to bring about a phenomenal increase in the population of a country, as the immigrants themselves would become older and call for further immigration of younger population. Wattelar and Roumans (1991) argued that the desired dependency ratio could be better maintained by delaying retirement rather than resorting to migration from abroad.

In sum, although considerable variation exists in terms of the choice of the base year, the period of projection, the migration assumptions and the fertility scenarios adopted for nationals and non-nationals, the available research studies reach several conclusions. First, inflows of migrants will not be able to prevent population declines in the future, unless the migration streams reach comparatively high levels. Second, international migration can act as only a partial means to offset the effects of population ageing arising from below-replacement fertility. This recognition of the inadequacy of migration to counter population ageing, and in most cases population decline, has been further consolidated by questions regarding the feasibility of formulating and adopting suitable migration policies (Watteler and Roumans, 1991; Espenshade, 1994; McDonald and Kippen, 1999). The flows to meet such demographic objectives are often unrealistically large and would require strict control of both inflows and outflows of migrants. Furthermore, in many countries, additional large volumes of immigrants are likely to be socially and politically unjustifiable, even as a means of ensuring population stabilization. Therefore, for Governments that may wish to do so, regulation of the level and composition of replacement migration streams to reach a desired population size or population age structure poses enormous challenges.

## III. THE APPROACH: METHODOLOGY AND ASSUMPTIONS

## A. THE SIX SCENARIOS

As part of its regular work programme, the Population Division prepares population estimates and projections biennially for all countries of the world, with estimates for the period from 1950 to 1995, and with four projection variants for the period 1995 to 2050. The last such revision can be found in World Population Prospects: The 1998 Revision (United Nations, 1999a, 1999b and 1999c).

The four projection variants in the 1998 Revision (high, medium, low and constant) are prepared for countries and areas using the cohort-component method. The different variants are based on different assumptions about the future course of fertility. All variants incorporate the same assumptions about the future course of mortality, and for most countries the assumptions about future international migration trends are also the same for all four variants.

The high, medium and low variants constitute the core of the official estimates and projections of the United Nations. They are meant to create a range that encompasses the likely future path of population growth for each country and area of the world. The high and low variants provide upper and lower bounds for that growth. The medium variant is a useful central reference for trends over the longer-term future. The constant variant projects the population of each country by maintaining fertility constant at the level estimated for 1990-1995. The results of this variant are meant to be used for illustrative purposes and are not considered to represent a likely future path for any country or area.

Building upon the medium variant of the 1998 Revision, the present replacement migration study considers six different scenarios with regard to the migration streams needed to achieve particular population objectives or outcomes. The six scenarios are described below:

Scenario I. This scenario is based on the medium variant of the 1998 Revision.
Scenario II. This scenario is based on the medium variant of the 1998 Revision, amended by assuming zero migration after 1995.

Scenario III. This scenario computes and assumes the migration required to maintain the size of the total population at the highest level it would reach in the absence of migration after 1995.

Scenario IV. This scenario computes and assumes the migration required to maintain the size of the working-age population ( 15 to 64 years) at the highest level it would reach in the absence of migration after 1995.

Scenario V. This scenario computes and assumes the migration required to prevent the ratio of the size of the population aged 15-64 to the size of the population aged 65 or over, called the potential support ratio (PSR), from declining below the value of 3.0.

Scenario VI. This scenario computes and assumes the migration required to maintain the potential support ratio (PSR) at the highest level it would reach in the absence of migration after 1995.

The study examines the situation for eight countries: France, Germany, Italy, Japan, Republic of Korea, the Russian Federation, the United Kingdom and the United States. In addition, from 1995 on computations are also made for Europe and for the European Union, treating each as if it was a single country. The time period covered is roughly a half a century, from 1995 to 2050.

All the data pertaining to the eight countries and two regions mentioned above for the period 1950 to 1995 come from the estimates in the 1998 Revision. For the period 1995 to 2050, projections are carried out using the cohort-component method, taking as a base the 1995 population by sex and five-year age groups and applying the age-specific fertility and mortality rates assumed in the medium variant of the 1998 Revision.

More specifically, the number of survivors in each age and sex category at the end of each five-year period is calculated by applying to the base-year population age- and sex-specific survival rates that are derived from an observed or estimated national life-table, using the United Nations model for future mortality improvement. The number of births expected to take place during each five-year period is derived by applying the estimated age-specific fertility rate, which is obtained from the national fertility pattern and assumed future fertility trend, to the average number of women in the age group. The births are distributed by sex on the basis of the estimated sex ratio at birth. The assumed net number of international migrants, classified by age and sex, is incorporated into the calculations.

The detailed past results and future assumptions of the 1998 Revision for each of the countries and regions examined in this study are presented in the annex tables. A detailed description of the methodology used for the estimates and projections may be found in World Population Prospects: The 1998 Revision, volume III (United Nations, 1999c).

The future population trends according to the medium variant are mainly determined by the assumed future course of fertility. For each of the countries and regions considered in this study, the total fertility rate is below the replacement level of 2.1 children per woman. For those countries whose latest estimated total fertility rate was between 1.5 and 2.1 children per woman (France, Republic of Korea, the United Kingdom and the United States), it is assumed that the fertility rate will move towards a target level of 1.9 children per woman and will remain constant to the end of the projection period, 2050. For those countries and regions whose latest estimated total fertility rate was less than 1.5 children per woman (Germany, Italy, Japan, the Russian Federation, Europe and the European Union), the fertility rate is expected to rise to a target level of 1.7 children per woman and remain constant thereafter. It should also be noted that the target total fertility rate was modified when information was available on the completed fertility of the cohort of women born in 1962. In those cases (France, Germany, Italy, Japan, Europe and the European Union), the target level was set as the average of either 1.9 or 1.7 and the estimated completed fertility of the 1962 cohort. In general, recorded post-1995 trends in fertility were assumed to continue until the year 2000, and then stabilize at the 2000 level until 2005. After 2005, fertility was assumed to move towards the target level at a pace of 0.07 children per woman per quinquennium.

Scenario I, which is the medium variant of the 1998 Revision, already has migration assumptions for the period 1995-2050. In each of the other five scenarios the net total number of migrants during each five-year period is computed so that the projected results meet the particular requirements of the scenario.

Scenario II assumes that the total net number of migrants is zero for each five-year period. Scenario III involves computing the total net number of migrants for each five-year period needed to maintain the size of the total at the highest level it would reach in the absence of migration after 1995. Scenario IV determines the total net number of migrants for each five-year period required to maintain the size of the working age population (15-64 years) at the highest level it would reach in the absence of migration after 1995. Scenario V computes the total net number of migrants required to prevent the ratio of the population aged 15-64 to the population aged 65 or over from declining below 3.0. Finally, scenario VI
computes the total net number of migrants required to maintain the potential support ratio at the highest level it would reach in the absence of migration after 1995.

Another critical assumption concerns the age and sex distribution of the total net number of migrants. The age and sex structure of the migrants is assumed to be the same for all countries. This assumption, while unlikely, permits comparisons among the countries and regions. It is assumed that the structure of the migration streams is the average age and sex structure of migrants into Australia, Canada and the United States. These three countries were selected because they are the three major traditional countries of immigration.

The age structures of the three countries and their average, or model pattern for this study, are shown for males and females in figures 3 and 4 respectively. The per cent distribution by age and sex of the immigrants in the model pattern, which is used in the scenarios, is shown in table 4 and illustrated as an age-sex pyramid in figure 5 .

The projection methodology also assumes that, after the immigrants arrive in a country, they experience the average fertility and mortality conditions of that country. While this is typically not the case, especially when immigrants come from a country that differs greatly demographically from the receiving country, this assumption permits computations to be more straightforward and also facilitates comparisons between countries and regions.

Figure 3. Per cent distribution of male immigrants by age in Australia, Canada, United States of America and model pattern


Figure 4. Per cent distribution of female immigrants by age in Australia, Canada, United States of America and model pattern


Note: The model pattern is the average of the three countries.

Table 4. PER CENT DISTRIBUTION OF NET NUMBER OF MIGRANTS BY AGE AND SEX, MODEL PATTERN

| Age groups | Males | Females | Both sexes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $0-4$ | 4.33 |  |  |
| $5-9$ | 4.69 | 4.29 | 8.63 |
| $10-14$ | 4.24 | 4.58 | 9.26 |
| $15-19$ | 3.94 | 4.37 | 8.30 |
| $20-24$ | 5.13 | 7.12 | 8.31 |
| $25-29$ | 7.79 | 8.86 | 12.25 |
| $30-34$ | 6.01 | 6.05 | 16.65 |
| $35-39$ | 3.95 | 3.73 | 7.06 |
| $40-44$ | 2.27 | 2.24 | 4.51 |
| $45-49$ | 1.28 | 1.47 | 2.76 |
| $50-54$ | 0.91 | 1.48 | 2.40 |
| $55-59$ | 0.88 | 1.37 | 2.25 |
| $60-64$ | 0.83 | 1.22 | 2.05 |
| $65-69$ | 0.60 | 0.95 | 1.55 |
| $70-74$ | 0.30 | 0.47 | 0.77 |
| $75-79$ | 0.21 | 0.34 | 0.56 |
| $80+$ | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.02 |
| Total | 47.40 | 52.60 | 100.00 |

Figure 5. Age-sex pyramid of immigrants, model pattern


## B. THE IMPACT OF ECONOMIC ACTIVITY RATES ON SUPPORT RATIOS

In recent discussions about the impact of population ageing on the economically active, it has been mentioned that increasing economic activity rates could to a large extent counterbalance the effects of the transformation of the age structure. A special simulation was carried out to analyse the possible impact of changing economic activity rates on support ratios.

The potential support ratio (PSR) measures the potential numbers of active persons per each retired person, assuming that everybody aged 15-64 is economically active and that everybody aged 65 or over is no longer active. The ratio provides an indication, across country and time, everything else being assumed equal, of the impact of an age structure on old-age dependency.

Economic activity rates, however, are not uniform and vary by age and across countries. The active support ratio (ASR) measures the number of active persons aged 15 or over for each non-active person aged 65 or over, taking into account observed age-specific activity rates. In contrast to the PSR, the ASR more closely reflects in relative terms the number of active persons per each inactive elderly person.

In order to measure the maximum theoretical gain that could be obtained by increasing activity rates between age 25 and 64, the ASR resulting from the assumption that the entire population aged 25 to 64 is active economically has been computed and is named ASR1. ASR1 therefore represents 100 per cent economic activity rates for men and women in the age groups 25 to 64 . The starting points were the agespecific activity rates reported for the year 1998 in the eight countries of this study.

## IV. RESULTS

## A. Overview

## Past trends

At the middle of the twentieth century, the average fertility level stood at 2.6 children per woman in Europe and 2.4 children for the countries of the European Union (see table 5). For the countries in this study the range was from 2.2 children per woman in Germany and the United Kingdom to 2.7 children in France and in Japan. Fertility was markedly higher in the United States of America, 3.4 children, and even higher in the Republic of Korea, 5.4 children per woman. By 1965-1970, fertility had increased a little on average for the countries of the European Union, to 2.5 children per woman, but had fallen below replacement level in Japan and the Russian Federation at 2.0 children. Fertility had also decreased to 2.5 children in the United States and more slowly in the Republic of Korea, to 4.7 children. By 1995-2000, fertility was below replacement level in all countries and regions of the present study, with a relatively wide range of levels, from a high of 2.0 children in the United States to 1.2 children in Italy. The average for Europe and for the European Union was 1.4 children per woman.

As a consequence of this low, and decreasing, fertility history, coupled with a continuous decline in mortality, all populations aged rapidly. In 1950, the potential support ratio, which is defined as the ratio of the population aged 15-64 years to the population aged 65 years or older, ranged between 6 and 8 for the United States, the European Union countries, and Europe, and was 10 in the Russian Federation, 12 in Japan and 18 in the Republic of Korea. By 2000, the PSR had decreased by about 40 per cent, to 4 in the countries of the European Union and in Japan, 5 in the United States, the Russian Federation and Europe, and 11 in the Republic of Korea.

## Scenario I

According to scenario I, the medium variant of the 1998 Revision, the eight countries and two regions considered in this study would have below-replacement fertility levels until 2050 (see table 5). As a result, in all of these countries, with the exception of the United States, the total population would start declining before 2050. The population of Europe, for example, would be 101 million less ( 14 per cent) in 2050 than in 2000. The population of the European Union would be 44 million less in 2050 than in 2000, a 12 per cent reduction. Italy would see the largest relative loss, 28 per cent, followed by Japan at 17 per cent. The population of the United States would keep increasing significantly because its fertility does not fall far below replacement and substantial immigration is assumed to continue into the future. (The results of the 1998 Revision are shown in the annex tables.)

All populations would continue to age rapidly. The PSR of the European Union and that of Europe would decrease by more than half between 2000 and 2050, from 4.1 to 2.0 and from 4.6 to 2.1 , respectively. The largest decline, however, would be in the Republic of Korea, where the PSR would fall from 10.7 persons in the age group 15-64 years per one person aged 65 or older, to 2.4.

## Scenario II

Scenario II is the medium variant of the 1998 Revision with no migration assumed after 1995. It serves mostly as a backdrop, in order to measure by comparison the effects of the migrations assumed in the other scenarios. The European Union would lose 62 million people ( 17 per cent) between 2000 and 2050, and Europe would lose 123 million people (17 per cent) (see table 6). Since the migration streams assumed in scenario I are not very large, the results of scenario II are not substantially different from those of scenario I. The exception is the United States, where large flows of migration were assumed in scenario I. In scenario II the population of the United States would also start decreasing before 2050, and the increase between 2000 and 2050 would be 16 million ( 6 per cent), instead of 71 million as in scenario
I. In the group being studied, the only other countries where the population would be higher in 2050 than in 2000 are the Republic of Korea ( 10 per cent higher) and France ( 1 per cent higher).

In all countries and regions, the population aged 15-64 years would decline earlier and faster than the total population. For example, while the European Union would see its total population decline by 17 per cent between 2000 and 2050, the population aged 15-64 would decline by 30 per cent.

The proportion of the population aged 65 years or older would continue to increase rapidly, and in 2050 would reach 30 per cent for the European Union and 28 per cent for Europe. The highest proportion aged 65 years or older in 2050 would be in Italy ( 35 per cent) and in Germany and Japan ( 32 per cent). The lowest would be in the United States ( 23 per cent), with the Republic of Korea, the Russian Federation and the United Kingdom at 25 per cent, and France at 26 per cent. The potential support ratio would decrease rapidly for all countries and regions, reaching 1.9 for the European Union and 2.0 for Europe in 2050 (see table 7). The lowest level for the PSR in 2050, 1.5, would be in Italy, and the highest, 2.6, would be in the United States.

## Scenario III

In the absence of migration after 1995, populations in all countries in the study and in the two regions would start declining before 2050. Scenario III keeps the size of the total population at the maximum level it would reach in the absence of migration. The dates at which this maximum would be reached differ by country. The earliest is 1995 for Germany, Italy, the Russian Federation and Europe, followed by 2000 for the European Union. The latest are 2035 for the Republic of Korea and 2030 for the United States. The total number of migrants needed to keep the total population constant at its maximum size until 2050 would be 47 million for the European Union and 100 million for Europe (see table 8). It would be 28 million in the Russian Federation, 18 million in Germany and 17 million in Japan, but only 1.5 million in France and in the Republic of Korea. In 2050 the proportion of the total population which would be made up of post-1995 immigrants and their descendants would range from 2 per cent in the United States and 3 per cent in France and the Republic of Korea, to 28 per cent in Germany and 29 per cent in Italy. The potential support ratios in 2050 would be a little higher than in scenario II, and range from 2.0 in Italy to 2.1 in Japan, 2.6 in the United States and 2.9 in the Russian Federation (see table 9).

## Scenario IV

Scenario IV keeps the size of the population aged 15-64 years at the maximum level it would reach in the absence of migration. The dates at which this maximum would be reached differ by country. They range from 1995 for the European Union, Germany, Italy and Japan to 2000 for the Russian Federation and 2005 for Europe; 2010 for France and the United Kingdom; 2015 for the United States; and 2020 for the Republic of Korea. The total number of migrants needed to keep the population aged 15-64 constant until 2050 would be larger than in scenario III. The number that would be needed under scenario IV is 80 million for the European Union and 161 million for Europe (see table 8). The numbers range from 5 million in France and 6 million in the Republic of Korea and the United Kingdom to 25 million in Germany and 33 million in Japan. However, when the number of migrants is related to population size in the year 2000, it is Italy and Germany that would need the largest number of migrants over the period to 2050, respectively 6,500 and 6,000 annually per million inhabitants (see table 10 and figure 6 ). Among the countries studied, the United States would need the smallest number, approximately 1,300 per million inhabitants. In 2050 the proportion of the total population that would be made up of post-1995 immigrants and their descendants would range from 8 per cent in the United States to 12 per cent in France, 36 per cent in Germany and 39 per cent in Italy (see table 11). The potential support ratios would range from 2.2 in Italy and in Japan, to 2.8 in the Republic of Korea and 3.1 in the Russian Federation.

Scenario V prevents the potential support ratio from declining below the value of 3.0 by assuming net immigration once the PSR reaches the value of 3.0. The dates at which this occurs differ by country. The PSR reaches 3.0 in 2005 for Japan; in 2010 for Italy; in 2015 for Germany and the European Union; in 2020 for France and the United Kingdom; in 2025 for the United States and Europe; and in 2035 for the Russian Federation and the Republic of Korea. The total number of migrants that would be needed under scenario V is 154 million for the European Union and 235 million for Europe (see table 8). The numbers range from 12 million for the Republic of Korea, 14 million for the United Kingdom and 16 million for France, to 40 million for Germany, 45 million for the United States and 95 million for Japan. In 2050, the proportion of the population that would be post-1995 immigrants or their descendants would range from 17 per cent in the United States to 20 per cent in the Russian Federation, 53 per cent in Italy and 54 per cent in Japan (see table 11).

## Scenario VI

Scenario VI keeps the potential support ratio at its 1995 level, which was 4.3 for the European Union, 4.8 for Europe, 4.1 in Italy and the United Kingdom, 5.6 in the Russian Federation and 12.6 in the Republic of Korea. The total number of migrants needed to keep the potential support ratio constant until 2050 is extremely large in all countries (see table 8). It is 700 million for the European Union and nearly 1.4 billion for Europe. It ranges from 60 million in the United Kingdom to 94 million in France, more than half a billion in Japan and the United States, and 5 billion in the Republic of Korea. In 2050, the proportion of the population that would be post-1995 migrants or their descendants would range from 59 per cent in the United Kingdom to 99 per cent in the Republic of Korea.

## Discussion

In the absence of migration, all eight countries and the two regions with fertility below replacement will see their total population start declining before 2050, and their populations in the working-age group 15-64 years will decline even faster. Their populations will also age very rapidly. However many, if not most of them, have had immigrants in the recent past and can be expected to have immigrants in the future as well. Table 12 shows the annual net numbers of migrants for the period 1990 to 1998.

During the period 1990 to 1994, for example, the European Union received an average of a little over a million net immigrants per year and, during 1995 to 1998, a little over 600,000 per year. These numbers are quite close to the numbers of migrants that the European Union would need to receive to prevent its total population from declining: 612,000 per year between 2000 and 2025 and 1.3 million per year between 2025 and 2050. However, the annual numbers of immigrants who would be needed to prevent the population of working-age from declining are about double the numbers received in the last decade.

While the situation varies from country to country, it is somewhat similar in many of the countries with past experience with immigration. In France, Germany and the United Kingdom, the number of immigrants needed to keep constant either the total population or the working-age population varies irregularly through time because of specific age structures. These numbers are comparable to, or at most double, the number of immigrants received during the past decade. In the United States, the annual number of immigrants needed for both purposes is smaller than past immigration. In addition, the proportion in 2050 of the post-1995 migrants and their descendants in the total population (see table 11), in scenarios III and IV, is less than or equal to the proportion of migrants in the total population in 1990 in France ( 10.4 per cent) and in the United States ( 7.9 per cent). In Germany and in Italy, however, scenario III would result in about 30 per cent, and scenario IV about 40 per cent, of post-1995 migrants and their descendants in the 2050 population, which is much higher than at present (see table 13).

In scenarios III and IV, in all countries and regions, the potential support ratio would be much lower in 2050 than its 1995 level, and in some cases the decline in the PSR is substantial.

In scenario V all countries reach but do not go below the same level of PSR, 3.0 persons of active age for each older person. The number of migrants that would be needed is much larger than in the previous scenarios. These numbers are clearly politically unacceptable in all countries in the present study, except for the United States, where they correspond to the present and projected level of immigration.

The annual number of immigrants needed to keep the potential support ratios constant at their 1995 levels (scenario VI) is vastly larger, in every country, than any past experience (see figure 7). Scenario VI would furthermore result in having between 59 per cent and 99 per cent of the population of all countries in 2050 composed of post-1995 migrants and their descendants. This scenario is clearly not realistic; therefore, immigration cannot prevent ageing of the population.

In the absence of migration (scenario II), the figures show that in 2050 the ratios between the population in working-age and the population past working-age would remain at their 1995 levels if by that date, the upper limits of the working-age span should be increased from 65 years to about 72 years in the United Kingdom, 73 years in the Russian Federation, 74 years in France and the United States, 77 years in Germany, Italy and Japan, and 82 years in the Republic of Korea (see table 14).

## Impact of Economic Activity Rates on Support Ratios

Except for Japan, the active support ratios for 1998 are lower than the PSRs in all countries (see table 16). For example, in France the PSR is 4.2 and the ASR is 2.9. This is the case because activity rates are lower than 100 per cent before age 65 and are very low after 65 . The reductions from the PSR to the ASR range from 8 per cent in the Republic of Korea and 10 per cent in the United States, to 32 per cent in the Russian Federation and 39 per cent in Italy (see table 17). The resulting ASRs range from 2.7 in Italy, to 2.9 in France, 3.0 in Germany, 4.4 in Japan, 4.9 in the United States and 9.3 in the Republic of Korea (see table 16). In Japan, in contrast, economic activity rates are very high before age 65 and remain relatively high after 65 : as a consequence, the ASR is 3 per cent higher than the PSR.

As noted, when economic activity rates between ages 25 and 64 are assumed to be 100 per cent, maximum possible gains in active support ratios are achieved. For 1998, ASR1 becomes higher than ASR by 22 per cent in Japan and by 50 per cent in Italy. The resulting ASR1s range from 3.7 in France, and 4.0 in Italy and the United Kingdom to 5.3 in Japan and 5.8 in the United States (and 12.2 in the Republic of Korea).

The support ratios (PSRs and ASRs) for the year 2050 are computed for scenario II, which assumes there is no migration after 1995, utilizing the 1998 age-specific economic activity rates. The ageing of the population between 1998 and 2050 will result in large declines of both the PSRs and ASRs, with the proportional declines in both indicators being very similar. The declines in ASRs will range from 44 per cent in the United Kingdom to 48 per cent in France, 59 per cent in the Russian Federation and Germany, 60 per cent in Japan and 81 per cent in the Republic of Korea. The ASRs in the year 2050 will range from 0.9 in Italy and 1.2 in Germany, to 1.8 in Japan and the United Kingdom, and 2.3 in the United States.

The computation of ASR1s for the year 2050 indicates that increasing activity rates to 100 per cent by 2050 for all men and women in the ages 25 to 64 would offset a relatively small part of the decline in the ASR, representing 8 per cent of the decline in the Republic of Korea, 15 per cent in Japan and 21 per cent in the United States, upto a maximum of 35 per cent in France and in the United Kingdom.

Thus, the conclusion from this brief analysis is relatively clear. Possible future increases in economic activity rates in the ages 25-64 cannot, on their own, be a solution to the decline in the active support ratios caused by ageing. If one wishes to keep active support ratios at levels closer to what they are currently, without large numbers of immigrants, serious consideration would have to be given to increasing active participation in the labour force beyond the age of 65 years.

The European Union and the United States-the world's two largest economic blocks, which are often in competition with each other-are projected to follow starkly contrasting demographic paths in the coming decades: while the population of the United States would increase by 82 million between 1995 and 2050, that of the European Union would decline by 41 million (see table 15). As a result, the population of the United States, which in 1995 was 105 million smaller than that of the European Union, would be larger by 18 million in 2050 . The same trends would characterize their working-age populations: while the number of people aged $15-65$ years would decline by 61 million in the European Union, in the United States this number would increase by 39 million. By 2050, the working-age population of the United States would outnumber that of the European Union by 26 million, while in 1995 the working-age population of the European Union outnumbered that of the United States by 75 million. Therefore, although the elderly population would increase more and at a faster rate in the United States than in the European Union, the potential support ratio would continue to be less favourable in the European Union compared to the United States. In 2050 the PSR would stand at 2.0 persons of workingage per elderly person in the European Union, in contrast with a PSR of 2.8 in the United States.

## TABLE 5. TOTAL FERTILITY RATES, 1950 TO 2050, BY COUNTRY OR REGION <br> (Number of children per woman)

|  | Period |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Country or region | $1950-1955$ | $1965-1970$ | $1995-2000$ | $2020-2025$ | $2045-2050$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| France | 2.73 | 2.61 | 1.71 | 1.96 | 1.96 |
| Germany | 2.16 | 2.32 | 1.30 | 1.58 | 1.64 |
| Italy | 2.32 | 2.49 | 1.20 | 1.47 | 1.66 |
| Japan | 2.75 | 2.00 | 1.43 | 1.73 | 1.75 |
| Republic of Korea | 5.40 | 4.71 | 1.65 | 1.90 | 1.90 |
| Russian Federation | 2.51 | 2.02 | 1.35 | 1.70 | 1.70 |
| United Kingdom | 2.18 | 2.52 | 1.72 | 1.90 | 1.90 |
| United States | 3.45 | 2.55 | 1.99 | 1.90 | 1.90 |
| Europe | 2.56 | 2.35 | 1.42 | 1.67 | 1.78 |
| European Union | 2.39 | 2.52 | 1.44 | 1.45 | 1.80 |

Source: United Nations Population Division, World Population Prospects: The 1998 Revision.

TABLE 6. Total population (ZERO migration after 1995), 1950 to 2050, by country or region (Thousands)

|  | Year |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Country or region | 1950 | 1975 | 2000 | 2025 | 2050 |
| France | 41289 | 52699 | 58879 | 61121 | 59357 |
| Germany | 68376 | 78679 | 80985 | 72643 | 58812 |
| Italy | 47104 | 55441 | 56950 | 50679 | 40722 |
| Japan | 83625 | 111524 | 126714 | 121150 | 104921 |
| Republic of Korea | 20357 | 35281 | 46946 | 53020 | 51751 |
| Russian Federation | 102192 | 134233 | 144960 | 131824 | 114248 |
| United Kingdom | 50616 | 56226 | 58600 | 58768 | 55594 |
| United States | 157813 | 220165 | 274335 | 296616 | 290643 |
| Europe | 547318 | 676390 | 723482 | 684055 | 600464 |
| European Union | 296151 | 349313 | 372440 | 354500 | 310839 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table 7. Potential support ratio (Zero migration after 1995), 1950 to 2050, by country or region (Number of persons aged 15-64 per person aged 65 or older)

|  | Year |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Country or region | 1950 | 1975 | 2000 | 2025 | 2050 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| France | 5.79 | 4.65 | 4.10 | 2.82 | 2.26 |
| Germany | 6.90 | 4.29 | 4.11 | 2.45 | 1.75 |
| Italy | 7.92 | 5.29 | 3.72 | 2.40 | 1.52 |
| Japan | 12.06 | 8.60 | 3.99 | 2.24 | 1.71 |
| Republic of Korea | 18.16 | 16.25 | 10.67 | 4.43 | 2.40 |
| Russian Federation | 10.49 | 7.66 | 5.51 | 3.63 | 2.41 |
| United Kingdom | 6.24 | 4.50 | 4.08 | 2.93 | 2.36 |
| United States | 7.83 | 6.15 | 5.21 | 3.09 | 2.57 |
| Europe | 7.99 | 5.67 | 4.65 | 3.03 | 2.04 |
| European Union | 6.97 | 4.84 | 4.06 | 2.66 | 1.89 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

TABLE 8. Net number of migrants, 1995-2050, by Scenario and country or region
(Thousands)

|  | Scenario | $I$ | $I I$ | III | $I V$ | $V$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Medium | Constant | Constant |  | VI * |
|  | Medium | variant with | total | age group | Ratio 15-64/65+ | ratio 15-64/65 |
| Country or region | Variant | zero migration | population | 15-64 | not less than 3.0 | years or older |


|  | A. Total number |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| France | 525 | 0 | 1473 | 5459 | 16037 | 93794 |
| Germany | 11400 | 0 | 17838 | 25209 | 40481 | 188497 |
| Italy | 660 | 0 | 12944 | 19610 | 35088 | 119684 |
| Japan | 0 | 0 | 17141 | 33487 | 94837 | 553495 |
| Republic of Korea | -450 | 0 | 1509 | 6426 | 11595 | 5148928 |
| Russian Federation | 7417 | 0 | 27952 | 35756 | 26604 | 257110 |
| United Kingdom | 1200 | 0 | 2634 | 6247 | 13674 | 59775 |
| United States | 41800 | 0 | 6384 | 17967 | 44892 | 592757 |
| Europe | 23530 | 0 | 100137 | 161346 | 235044 | 1386151 |
| European Union | 16361 | 0 | 47456 | 79605 | 153646 | 700506 |
|  |  | B. Average annual number |  |  |  |  |
| France | 10 | 0 | 27 | 99 | 292 | 1705 |
| Germany | 207 | 0 | 324 | 458 | 736 | 3427 |
| Italy | 12 | 0 | 235 | 357 | 638 | 2176 |
| Japan | 0 | 0 | 312 | 609 | 1724 | 10064 |
| Republic of Korea | -8 | 0 | 27 | 117 | 211 | 93617 |
| Russian Federation | 135 | 0 | 508 | 650 | 484 | 4675 |
| United Kingdom | 22 | 0 | 48 | 114 | 249 | 1087 |
| United States | 760 | 0 | 116 | 327 | 816 | 10777 |
| Europe | 428 | 0 | 1821 | 2934 | 4274 | 25203 |
| European Union | 297 | 0 | 863 | 1447 | 2794 | 12736 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

* Scenario VI is considered to be unrealistic.

Table 9. Potential support ratio in 1995, and in 2050 by scenario and country or region (Number of persons aged 15-64 per person aged 65 or older)

| Country or region | 1995 | 2050 |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | I | II | III | IV | V | VI * |
|  |  | Medium variant | $\begin{gathered} \text { Medium } \\ \text { variant with } \\ \text { zero migration } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Constant } \\ \text { total } \\ \text { population } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Constant age group 15-64 | Ratio 15-64/65+ not less than 3.0 | Constant ratio 15-64/65 years or older |
| France | 4.36 | 2.26 | 2.26 | 2.33 | 2.49 | 3.00 | 4.36 |
| Germany | 4.41 | 2.05 | 1.75 | 2.26 | 2.44 | 3.13 | 4.41 |
| Italy | 4.08 | 1.52 | 1.52 | 2.03 | 2.25 | 3.00 | 4.08 |
| Japan | 4.77 | 1.71 | 1.71 | 2.07 | 2.19 | 3.00 | 4.77 |
| Republic of Korea | 12.62 | 2.40 | 2.40 | 2.49 | 2.76 | 3.00 | 12.62 |
| Russian Federation | 5.62 | 2.43 | 2.44 | 2.86 | 3.12 | 3.00 | 5.62 |
| United Kingdom | 4.09 | 2.37 | 2.36 | 2.49 | 2.64 | 3.06 | 4.09 |
| United States | 5.21 | 2.82 | 2.57 | 2.63 | 2.74 | 3.04 | 5.21 |
| Europe | 4.81 | 2.11 | 2.04 | 2.38 | 2.62 | 3.00 | 4.81 |
| European Union | 4.31 | 1.97 | 1.89 | 2.21 | 2.42 | 3.03 | 4.31 |

* Scenario VI is considered to be unrealistic.

Table 10. Average annual net number of migrants between 2000 And 2050, PER MILLION INHABITANTS IN 2000, BY SCENARIO AND COUNTRY OR REGION

| Scenario | I | II | III | IV | $V$ | VI * |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Country or region | Medium Variant | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Medium } \\ \text { variant with } \\ \text { zero migration } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Constant } \\ \text { total } \\ \text { population } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Constant age group 15-64 | Ratio 15-64/65+ not less than 3.0 | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Constant ratio } \\ \text { 15-64/65 years } \\ \text { or older } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| France | 110 | 0 | 500 | 1854 | 5423 | 30430 |
| Germany | 2519 | 0 | 4244 | 6009 | 9842 | 44825 |
| Italy | 109 | 0 | 4414 | 6531 | 12248 | 39818 |
| Japan | 0 | 0 | 2705 | 5103 | 14969 | 82634 |
| Republic of Korea | 138 | 0 | 643 | 2738 | 4950 | 2184700 |
| Russian Federation | 752 | 0 | 3435 | 4933 | 3621 | 34958 |
| United Kingdom | 341 | 0 | 899 | 2132 | 4643 | 20383 |
| United States | 2770 | 0 | 465 | 1310 | 3226 | 43201 |
| Europe | 519 | 0 | 2650 | 4460 | 6450 | 37511 |
| European Union | 724 | 0 | 2548 | 4262 | 8188 | 36194 |

* Scenario VI is considered to be unrealistic.

Table 11. Per cent of post-1995 migrants and their descendants in total population in 2050, by Scenario and country or region

| Scenario | $I$ | $C I I$ | III | IV | V | VI * |
| :--- | ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Medium <br> variant | Medium <br> variant with <br> zero migration | Constant <br> total <br> population | Constant <br> age group <br> 15-64 | Ratio 15-64/65+ <br> not less than 3.0 | Constant ratio <br> 15-64/65 years <br> or older |
| Country or region |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| France | 0.9 | 0.0 | 2.9 | 11.6 | 27.4 | 68.3 |
| Germany | 19.8 | 0.0 | 28.0 | 36.1 | 48.1 | 80.3 |
| Italy | 1.2 | 0.0 | 29.0 | 38.7 | 53.4 | 79.0 |
| Japan | 0.0 | 0.0 | 17.7 | 30.4 | 54.2 | 87.2 |
| Republic of Korea | -0.9 | 0.0 | 3.2 | 13.9 | 21.3 | 99.2 |
| Russian Federation | 5.8 | 0.0 | 22.9 | 27.6 | 20.2 | 71.9 |
| United Kingdom | 1.9 | 0.0 | 5.5 | 13.6 | 25.3 | 59.2 |
| United States | 16.8 | 0.0 | 2.5 | 7.9 | 17.4 | 72.7 |
| Europe | 4.3 | 0.0 | 17.5 | 25.8 | 32.8 | 74.4 |
| European Union | 6.2 | 0.0 | 16.5 | 25.7 | 40.2 | 74.7 |

[^1]Table 12. Net annual migration flows, 1990 to 1998

| Country or region/Year | 1990 | 1991 | 1992 | 1993 | 1994 | 1995 | 1996 | 1997 | 1998 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| France | 80000 | 90000 | 90000 | 70000 | 50000 | 40000 | 35000 | 40000 | 40000 |
| Germany | 656166 | 602563 | 776397 | 462284 | 315568 | 398263 | 281493 | 93433 | 50821 |
| Italy | 24212 | 4163 | 181913 | 181070 | 153364 | 95499 | 149745 | 126554 | 113804 |
| Japan | 2000 | 38000 | 34000 | -10 000 | -82000 | -50 000 | -13000 | 14000 | 38000 |
| Republic of Korea ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | - | - | -10 000 | - | - | - | - | -20 000 | - |
| Russian Federation | 164000 | 51600 | 176100 | 430100 | 810000 | 502200 | 343600 | 352600 | 285200 |
| United Kingdom | 68384 | 76416 | 44887 | 90141 | 84242 | 116869 | 104075 | 88476 | 178000 |
| United States | 1536483 | 1827167 | 973977 | 904292 | 804416 | 720461 | 915900 | 798378 | 660477 |
| Europe ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | - | - | 1047000 | - | - | - | - | 950000 | - |
| European Union | 1008251 | 1078441 | 1350132 | 1062116 | 782855 | 805363 | 734596 | 512208 | 569000 |

Sources: European Union, France, Germany, Italy and the United Kingdom: European Commission, Eurostat, Demographic Statistics: Data 1960-99 (Luxembourg, 1999); Japan: Management and Coordination Agency, Statistics Bureau, Japan Statistical Yearbook 2000 (Tokyo, 1999); Russian Federation: State Committee of Russia for Statistics, Russian Statistical Yearbook 1999 (Moscow, 1999); United States: Immigration and Naturalization Service, 1997 Statistical Yearbook of the Immigration and Naturalization Service (Washington, D.C., Government Printing Office, 1999); Legal Immigration, Fiscal Year 1998, Annual report No. 2 (Washington, D.C., Department of Justice, 1999).
${ }^{a}$ Europe and the Republic of Korea: Averages for 1990-1995 and 1995-2000 from World Population Prospects: The 1998 Revision, vol. 1 (United Nations publication, Sales No. E.99.XIII.9)

Note: Data for the United States of America contains only immigration; data for all other countries is net migration

TABLE 13. Migrant stock (Foreign-born population), 1990

| Country or region | Number of migrants (thousands) | Per cent of total population |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| France | 5897 | 10.4 |
| Germany ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 5037 | 6.4 |
| Italy | 1549 | 2.7 |
| Japan ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 868 | 0.7 |
| Russian Federation ${ }^{\text {b }}$ | .. | .. |
| Republic of South Korea | 900 | 2.1 |
| United Kingdom | 3718 | 6.5 |
| United States | 19603 | 7.9 |
| Europe ${ }^{\text {c }}$ | 24703 | 5.2 |
| European Union | 21378 | 5.8 |

Source: Trends in total migration stock, Revision 4 (POP/IB/DB/96/1/Rev.4), database maintained by the Population Division, Department of Economic and Social Affairs of the United Nations Secretariat.
${ }^{a}$ Data refer to foreign citizens.
${ }^{\mathrm{b}}$ Data are not readily available.
${ }^{\text {c }}$ Data includes all European countries except those of the former Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the former Yugoslavia.

Table 14. Upper limit of working-age needed to obtain in 2050 the Potential support ratio observed in 1995, scenarios II and V, BY COUNTRY OR REGION

| Country or region | Age |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
|  | Scenario II | Scenario $V$ |
| France | 73.9 | 69.0 |
| Germany | 77.2 | 72.4 |
| Italy | 77.3 | 74.7 |
| Japan | 77.0 | 72.4 |
| Republic of Korea | 82.2 | 67.6 |
| Russian Federation | 72.7 | 66.8 |
| United Kingdom | 72.3 | 68.2 |
| United States | 74.3 | 66.9 |
| Europe | 75.1 | 69.8 |
| European Union | 75.7 | 71.3 |
|  |  |  |

Table 15. Total population in 1995 and in 2050, and growth rates by scenario, BY COUNTRY OR REGION

| Country or region | 1995 | 2050 |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | I | II | III | IV | V | VI * |
|  |  | Medium variant | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Medium } \\ & \text { variant with } \\ & \text { zero migration } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Constant } \\ \text { total } \\ \text { population } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Constant age group 15-64 | Ratio 15-64/65+ not less than 3.0 | Constant ratio 15-64/65 years or older |
|  | A. Total population (thousands) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| France | 58020 | 59883 | 59357 | 61121 | 67130 | 81719 | 187193 |
| Germany | 81661 | 73303 | 58812 | 81661 | 92022 | 113181 | 299272 |
| Italy | 57338 | 41197 | 40722 | 57338 | 66395 | 87345 | 193518 |
| Japan | 125472 | 104921 | 104921 | 127457 | 150697 | 229021 | 817965 |
| Republic of Korea | 44949 | 51275 | 51751 | 53470 | 60125 | 65736 | 6233275 |
| Russian Federation | 148097 | 121256 | 114178 | 148097 | 157658 | 143093 | 406551 |
| United Kingdom | 58308 | 56667 | 55594 | 58833 | 64354 | 74398 | 136138 |
| United States | 267020 | 349318 | 290643 | 297970 | 315644 | 351788 | 1065174 |
| Europe | 727912 | 627691 | 600464 | 727912 | 809399 | 894776 | 2346459 |
| European Union | 371937 | 331307 | 310839 | 372440 | 418509 | 519965 | 1228341 | B. Average annual growth rate 1995-2050 (per cent)


| France | 0.06 | 0.04 | 0.09 | 0.27 | 0.62 | 2.13 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Germany | -0.20 | -0.60 | 0.00 | 0.22 | 0.60 | 2.36 |
| Italy | -0.60 | -0.62 | 0.00 | 0.27 | 0.77 | 2.21 |
| Japan | -0.33 | -0.33 | 0.03 | 0.33 | 1.10 | 3.41 |
| Republic of Korea | 0.24 | 0.26 | 0.32 | 0.53 | 0.69 | 8.97 |
| Russian Federation | -0.36 | -0.47 | 0.00 | 0.11 | -0.06 | 1.84 |
| United Kingdom | -0.05 | -0.09 | 0.02 | 0.18 | 0.44 | 1.54 |
| United States | 0.49 | 0.15 | 0.20 | 0.30 | 0.50 | 2.52 |
| Europe | -0.27 | -0.35 | 0.00 | 0.19 | 0.38 | 2.13 |
| European Union | -0.21 | -0.33 | 0.00 | 0.21 | 0.61 | 2.17 |

[^2]Table 16. Potential support ratios and active support ratios, 1998 and 2050

| Country | Measure | 1998 | 2050 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| France | PSR | 4.19 | 2.26 |
|  | ASR | 2.88 | 1.50 |
|  | ASR1 | 3.65 | 1.99 |
| Germany | PSR | 4.08 | 1.75 |
|  | ASR | 2.99 | 1.24 |
|  | ASR1 | 3.89 | 1.67 |
| Italy | PSR | 4.42 | 1.52 |
|  | ASR | 2.68 | 0.90 |
|  | ASR1 | 4.02 | 1.43 |
| Japan | PSR | 4.26 | 1.71 |
|  | ASR | 4.37 | 1.76 |
|  | ASR1 | 5.34 | 2.14 |
| Republic of Korea |  | 10.03 | 2.40 |
|  | ASR | 9.25 | 1.74 |
|  | ASR1 | 12.21 | 2.33 |
| Russian Federation | PSR | 5.57 | 2.41 |
|  | ASR | $3.79$ | 1.56 |
|  | ASR1 | 4.98 | 2.23 |
| United Kingdom | PSR | 4.07 | 2.36 |
|  | ASR | 3.24 | 1.82 |
|  | ASR1 | 4.00 | 2.32 |
| United States |  |  | 2.57 |
|  | ASR | 4.85 | 2.27 |
|  | ASR1 | 5.83 | 2.80 |

Notes:
PSR = population (aged 15-64)/population (aged 65 or older)
ASR = active population (aged 15 or older)/non-active population (aged 65 or older)
ASR1 = active population (aged 15 or older)/non-active population (aged 65 or older), assuming that everybody aged 25 to 64 is economically active.

Table 17. Changes in support ratios (Percentage)

|  | France | Germany | Italy | Japan | Republic <br> of Korea | Russian <br> Federation | United <br> Kingdom | United <br> States |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Changes from PSR to <br> ASR, 1998 | -31 | -27 | -39 | 3 | -8 | -32 | -20 | -10 |
| Changes from ASR to <br> ASR1, 1998 | 27 | 30 | 50 | 22 | 32 | 31 | 24 | 20 |
| Changes in ASR, 1998 to <br> 2050 | -48 | -59 | -66 | -60 | -81 | -59 | -44 | -53 |
| Changes in 2050 from <br> ASR to ASR1, as a <br> percentage of the changes <br> in ASR between 1998 <br> and 2050 | 35 | 24 | 30 | 15 | 8 | 30 | 35 | 21 |

Figure 6. Average annual net number of migrants between 2000 and 2050 to maintain size of working-age population, per million inhabitants in 2000


Figure 7. Average annual net number of migrants between 2000 and 2050 by scenario for the European Union


## B. Country results

## 1. France

## (a) Past trends

Between 1950 and 1965, the total fertility rate in France remained above 2.7 children per woman, but later dropped by 40 per cent, from 2.85 in 1960-1965 to 1.72 in 1990-1995. During that period the life expectancy at birth, for both sexes combined, increased from 66.5 years in 1950-1955 to 77.1 years in 1990-1995. One of the consequences of these changes was that the proportion of the population aged 65 or older increased from 11.4 per cent in 1950 to 15.0 per cent in 1995 , while the proportion of the population aged 15-64 remained nearly constant at nearly 66 per cent. France was the country with the oldest population at the beginning of the twentieth century. In 1901 the potential support ratio was 7.8 persons aged 15-64 for each person aged 65 or older. It declined further to 5.8 in 1950 and to 4.4 in 1995.
(b) Scenario I

Scenario I, the medium variant of the 1998 United Nations projections, assumes a total of 525,000 net immigrants from 1995 to 2020 and none after 2020 . It projects that the total population of France would increase from 58.0 million in 1995 to 61.7 million in 2025 , and decline to 59.9 million in 2050 (the results of the 1998 United Nations projections are shown in the annex tables). At that date 525,000 persons ( 0.9 per cent of the total population) would be post- 1995 migrants or their descendants. The population aged 15-64 would increase from 38.0 million in 1995 to 39.9 million in 2010 and then decrease to 34.6 million in 2050 . The population aged 65 or older would keep increasing, from 8.7 million in 1995 to 15.4 million in 2040 , before declining slightly to 15.3 million in 2050 . As a result, the potential support ratio would decrease by nearly half, from 4.4 in 1995 to 2.3 in 2050.

## (c) Scenario II

Scenario II, which is the medium variant with zero migration, uses the fertility and mortality assumptions of the medium variant of the 1998 United Nations projections, but without any migration to France after 1995. The results are very similar to those of scenario I. The total population of France would increase from 58.0 million in 1995 to 61.1 million in 2025 and then start decreasing, to 59.4 million in 2050. The population aged 15-64 would increase from 38.0 million in 1995 to 39.6 million in 2010 , and then decrease to 34.3 million in 2050 . The population aged 65 or older would keep increasing, from 8.7 million in 1995 to 15.3 million in 2040 , before declining slightly to 15.2 million in 2050 . As a result, the potential support ratio would decrease by nearly half, from 4.4 in 1995 to 2.3 in 2050.

## (d) Scenario III

Scenario III keeps the size of the total population constant at its maximum of 61.1 million in 2025. In order to achieve this, it would be necessary to have 1.5 million immigrants between 2025 and 2050, an average of 60,000 per year. By 2050 , out of a total population of 61.1 million, 1.8 million, or 2.9 per cent, would be post-1995 immigrants or their descendants.

## (e) Scenario IV

Scenario IV keeps the size of the population aged 15-64 constant at its maximum of 39.6 million in 2010. For this to happen, 5.5 million immigrants would be needed between 2010 and 2050, an average of 136,000 per year. By 2050, out of a total population of 67.1 million, 7.8 million, or 11.6 per cent, would be post-1995 immigrants or their descendants.

## (f) Scenario V

Scenario V does not allow the potential support ratio to decrease below the value of 3.0. In order to do this, no immigrants would be needed until 2020 , and 16.0 million immigrants would be needed between 2020 and 2040, an average of 0.8 million per year during that period. By 2050, out of a total population of 81.7 million, 22.4 million, or 27 percent, would be post-1995 immigrants or their descendants.

## (g) Scenario VI

Scenario VI keeps the potential support ratio at its 1995 value of 4.4. In order to achieve this, 32.1 million immigrants would be needed from 2000 to 2025 , an average of 1.3 million per year, and 60.9 million immigrants from 2025 to 2050, an average of 2.4 million per year. By 2050, out of a total population of 187 million, 128 million, or 68.3 per cent, would be post- 1995 immigrants or their descendants.

## (h) Additional considerations

As a point of comparison, the official net immigration recorded in France was an average of 76,000 per year for 1990-1994 and an average of 39,000 per year for 1995-1998. Thus, the number of migrants needed to prevent a decline in the total size of the population (scenario III) would be comparable to the past experience of immigration to France. Furthermore, the number of migrants that would be needed to keep constant the size of the population of labour-force age (scenario IV) is about double the level experienced in the early 1990s. In addition, under scenario IV, in 2050 the proportion of post-1995 immigrants and their descendants within the total population ( 11.6 per cent) would be comparable to the proportion of foreign-born that exists currently ( 10.4 per cent in 1990). Figure 9 shows, for scenarios I, II, III and IV, the population of France in 2050, indicating the share that consists of post-1995 migrants and their descendants.

However, the number of immigrants needed to keep the potential support ratio at its 1995 level would be vastly larger than any previously experienced migration flow, 20 to 40 times the annual numbers of the last 10 years. Furthermore, more than two thirds of the resulting population in 2050 would be composed of post-1995 immigrants and their descendants.

In the absence of migration, the figures show that it would be necessary to raise the upper limit of the working-age to 69 years to obtain in 2050 a potential support ratio of 3.0 in 2050 and to about 74 years in order to obtain in 2050 the same potential support ratio observed in France in 1995, which was 4.4 persons of working-age per each older person past working-age. Increasing the activity rates of the population, if it were possible, would only be a partial palliative to the decline in support ratio due to ageing. If the activity rates of all men and women aged 25 to 64 should increase to 100 per cent by 2050, this would make up for only 35 per cent of the loss in the active support ratio resulting from the ageing of the population.

Table 18. Population indicators for France by period for each scenario

| Scenario | I | II | III | IV | V | VI * |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Period | Medium variant | Medium variant with zero migration | $\begin{gathered} \text { Constant } \\ \text { total } \\ \text { population } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Constant } \\ \text { age group } \\ 15-64 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Ratio 15-64/65+ not less than 3.0 | Constant ratio 15-64/65 years or older |
| A. Average annual number of migrants (thousands) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1995-2000 | 40 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 842 |
| 2000-2025 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 114 | 157 | 1282 |
| 2025-2050 | 0 | 0 | 59 | 105 | 485 | 2301 |
| 2000-2050 | 7 | 0 | 29 | 109 | 321 | 1792 |
| 1995-2050 | 10 | 0 | 27 | 99 | 292 | 1705 |
| B. Total number of migrants (thousands) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1995-2000 | 200 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4210 |
| 2000-2025 | 325 | 0 | 0 | 2838 | 3917 | 32054 |
| 2025-2050 | 0 | 0 | 1473 | 2621 | 12120 | 57530 |
| 2000-2050 | 325 | 0 | 1473 | 5459 | 16037 | 89584 |
| 1995-2050 | 525 | 0 | 1473 | 5459 | 16037 | 93794 |
| C. Total population (thousands) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1950 | 41829 | - | - | - | - | - |
| 1975 | 52699 | - | - | - | - | - |
| 1995 | 58020 | - | - | - | - | - |
| 2000 | 59080 | 58879 | 58879 | 58879 | 58879 | 63310 |
| 2025 | 61662 | 61121 | 61121 | 64442 | 65283 | 105188 |
| 2050 | 59883 | 59357 | 61121 | 67130 | 81719 | 187193 |
| D. Age group 0-14 (thousands) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1950 | 9498 | - | - | - | - | - |
| 1975 | 12594 | - | - | - | - | - |
| 1995 | 11326 | - | - | - | - | - |
| 2000 | 11047 | 11009 | 11009 | 11009 | 11009 | 12182 |
| 2025 | 10588 | 10495 | 10495 | 11399 | 11620 | 21788 |
| 2050 | 10012 | 9924 | 10393 | 11572 | 14850 | 38396 |
| E. Age group 15-64 (thousands) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1950 | 27569 | - | - | - | - | - |
| 1975 | 33004 | - | - | - | - | - |
| 1995 | 37986 | - | - | - | - | - |
| 2000 | 38620 | 38488 | 38488 | 38488 | 38488 | 41593 |
| 2025 | 37686 | 37355 | 37355 | 39625 | 40247 | 67847 |
| 2050 | 34586 | 34282 | 35493 | 39625 | 50152 | 121047 |
| F. Age group 65+ (thousands) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1950 | 4762 | - | - | - | - | - |
| 1975 | 7101 | - | - | - | - | - |
| 1995 | 8708 | - | - | - | - | - |
| 2000 | 9413 | 9381 | 9381 | 9381 | 9381 | 9535 |
| 2025 | 13388 | 13271 | 13271 | 13417 | 13416 | 15554 |
| 2050 | 15285 | 15151 | 15234 | 15932 | 16717 | 27750 |
| G. Potential support ratio 15-64/65+ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1950 | 5.79 | - | - | - | - | - |
| 1975 | 4.65 | - | - | - | - | - |
| 1995 | 4.36 | - | - | - | - | - |
| 2000 | 4.10 | 4.10 | 4.10 | 4.10 | 4.10 | 4.36 |
| 2025 | 2.81 | 2.81 | 2.81 | 2.95 | 3.00 | 4.36 |
| 2050 | 2.26 | 2.26 | 2.33 | 2.49 | 3.00 | 4.36 |
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Figure 8. Age-sex structures by scenario for 2000, 2025 and 2050
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Figure 9. Population of France in 2050, indicating those who are post-1995 migrants and their descendants, by scenario


## 2. Germany

## (a) Past trends

While the total fertility rate increased steadily from 2.16 to 2.49 children per woman between 19501955 and 1960-1965, Germany experienced a continuous decline afterwards, to 1.30 children per woman in 1990-1995. As in other countries in Western Europe, life expectancy increased during the entire period between 1950 and 1995. It reached 76 years for both sexes during the interval of 1990-1995, up from 67.5 years for $1950-1955$. One of the results of increased life expectancy and low fertility rates is the process of population ageing. The proportion of the population aged 65 years or older increased from 9.7 per cent in 1950 to 15.5 per cent in 1995. The potential support ratio declined from 6.9 persons aged 1564 years for one person aged 65 years or over in 1950 to 4.4 persons in 1995.

## (b) Scenario I

Scenario I, the medium variant of the United Nations 1998 Revision, assumes a net total of 11.4 million migrants between 1995 and 2050. For the years 1995-2005 it estimates 240,000 migrants per year and for the period between 2005 and 2050 a net migration of 200,000 persons per annum. For the overall population of Germany the medium variant projects an increase from 81.7 million in 1995 to 82.4 million in 2005. Thereafter, the population would continuously decline to 73.3 million in 2050 (the results of the 1998 United Nations projections are shown in the annex tables). The population aged 15-64 years would increase slightly from 55.8 million in 1995 to 56.0 million in 2000; between 2000 and 2050 it would decrease continuously to 42.7 million. The share of the elderly ( 65 years and above) would increase from 12.6 million in 1995 ( 15.5 per cent) to 20.8 million in 2050 ( 28.4 per cent). Consequently, the potential support ratio would be halved, decreasing from 4.4 in 1995 to 2.1 in 2050.

## (c) Scenario II

Scenario II is based on the fertility and mortality assumptions of the medium variant of the 1998 Revision of the United Nations, but without any migration to Germany after 1995. Compared to scenario I, the total population would decrease much faster, from 81.7 million in 1995 to 58.8 million in 2050, a 28 per cent decrease for the total population. The population aged 15-64 years would decrease even faster: from 55.8 million to 32.7 million, a 41 per cent loss. In the absence of any migration, the population aged 65 or older would increase to 18.7 million by the year 2050. As a result, the potential support ratio in scenario II would decrease from 4.4 in 1995 to 1.8 in 2050.

## (d) Scenario III

Scenario III assumes a constant total population between 1995 and 2050 ( 81.7 million). Keeping the population at such a level would require substantially higher immigration to Germany than anticipated by the United Nations 1998 Revision. Between 1995-2050, a total of 17.8 million net migrants would be needed, an average of 324,000 per year. Such a migration flow would result in a population 15-64 of 48.4 million, and the group of 65 years or older would increase to 21.4 million in 2050. The potential support ratio would decline from 4.4 to 2.3 in 2050. In 2050, out of a population of 82 million people, 23 million ( 28 per cent) would be post-1995 migrants or their descendants.

## (e) Scenario IV

Scenario IV keeps the size of the population aged 15-64 years constant at the 1995 level of 55.8 million until the year 2050. This would require a total of 25.2 million migrants between 1995 and 2050, an average of 458,000 per year. The total population of Germany would increase to 92 million in 2050, of which 33 million ( 36 per cent) would be post-1995 migrants and their descendants. The potential support ratio would be 2.4 in 2050 .

## (f) Scenario $V$

Scenario V does not allow the potential support ratio to decrease below the value of 3.0. In order to achieve this, no immigrants would be needed until 2015 , and 40.5 million immigrants would be needed between 2015 and 2035, an average of 2.0 million per year during that period. By 2050, out of a total population of 113.2 million, 54.4 million, or 48 percent, would be post-1995 immigrants or their descendants.

## (g) Scenario VI

Scenario VI keeps the potential support ratio constant at its 1995 level of 4.4 until 2050. The total of immigrants needed between 1995 and 2050 to keep this ratio constant would be 188.5 million, which is an average of 3.4 million migrants per year. In 2050 the total population would be 299 million, of which 80 per cent would be post-1995 migrants and their descendants.

## (h) Additional considerations

Net migration in the years 1990-1992 was close to 680,000 individuals per annum. That number decreased between 1993-1998 to about 270,000 persons per year. The net number of migrants needed to keep the total population constant ( 324,000 per year), or to keep the age group 15-64 year constant ( 458,000 per year), is within the range of the experience of the past decade. However, to maintain the current potential support ratio of 4.4 would require an influx of 3.4 million migrants per year. This number would be more than ten times the yearly amount of migrants entering Germany during 19931998.

Figure 11 shows, for scenarios I, II, III and IV, the population of Germany in 2050, indicating the share that is made up of post-1995 migrants and their descendants. By the end of 1997, foreigners accounted for almost 9 per cent of the total population in Germany. This should be compared to the proportion of post-1995 migrants and their descendants by the year 2050: 20 per cent in scenario I; 28 per cent in scenario III; 36 per cent in scenario IV; and 80 per cent in scenario VI.

In the absence of migration, the figures show that it would be necessary to raise the upper limit of the working-age to 72.4 years to obtain a potential support ratio of 3.0 in 2050, and to about 77 years in order to obtain in 2050 the same potential support ratio observed in Germany in 1995, which was 4.4 persons of working-age per each older person past working age. Increasing the activity rates of the population, if it were possible, would only be a partial palliative to the decline in support ratio due do ageing. If the activity rates of all men and women aged 25 to 64 were to increase to 100 per cent by 2050 , this would make up for only 24 per cent of the loss in the active support ratio resulting from the ageing of the population.

Table 19. Population indicators for Germany by period for each scenario

| Scenario | I | II | III | IV | V | VI * |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Period | Medium variant | Medium variant with zero migration | Constant total population | Constant age group 15-64 | Ratio 15-64/65 + not less than 3.0 | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Constant ratio } \\ \text { 15-64/65 years } \\ \text { or older } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| A. Average annual number of migrants (thousands) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1995-2000 | 240 | 0 | 130 | 176 | 0 | 1398 |
| 2000-2025 | 208 | 0 | 279 | 473 | 631 | 2273 |
| 2025-2050 | 200 | 0 | 408 | 501 | 988 | 4988 |
| 2000-2050 | 204 | 0 | 344 | 487 | 810 | 3630 |
| 1995-2050 | 207 | 0 | 324 | 458 | 736 | 3427 |
| B. Total number of migrants (thousands) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1995-2000 | 1200 | 0 | 650 | 880 | 0 | 6990 |
| 2000-2025 | 5200 | 0 | 6978 | 11816 | 15781 | 56816 |
| 2025-2050 | 5000 | 0 | 10209 | 12514 | 24701 | 124692 |
| 2000-2050 | 10200 | 0 | 17187 | 24330 | 40481 | 181508 |
| 1995-2050 | 11400 | 0 | 17838 | 25209 | 40481 | 188497 |
| C. Total population (thousands) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1950 | 68376 | - | - | - | - | - |
| 1975 | 78679 | - | - | - | - | - |
| 1995 | 81661 | - | - | - | - | - |
| 2000 | 82220 | 80985 | 81661 | 81898 | 80985 | 88241 |
| 2025 | 80238 | 72643 | 81661 | 87451 | 89661 | 148307 |
| 2050 | 73303 | 58812 | 81661 | 92022 | 113181 | 299272 |
| D. Age group 0-14 (thousands) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1950 | 15854 | - | - | - | - | - |
| 1975 | 16932 | - | - | - | - | - |
| 1995 | 13264 | - | - | - | - | - |
| 2000 | 12751 | 12468 | 12640 | 12700 | 12468 | 14315 |
| 2025 | 10704 | 9248 | 11219 | 12543 | 13623 | 25244 |
| 2050 | 9803 | 7379 | 11807 | 13398 | 17264 | 54694 |
| E. Age group 15-64 (thousands) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1950 | 45877 | - | - | - | - | - |
| 1975 | 50073 | - | - | - | - | - |
| 1995 | 55763 | - | - | - | - | - |
| 2000 | 56025 | 55114 | 55595 | 55763 | 55114 | 60271 |
| 2025 | 50773 | 45042 | 51588 | 55763 | 57029 | 100331 |
| 2050 | 42706 | 32744 | 48426 | 55763 | 72667 | 199400 |
| F. Age group 65+ (thousands) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1950 | 6645 | - | - | - | - | - |
| 1975 | 11674 | - | - | - | - | - |
| 1995 | 12634 | - | - | - | - | - |
| 2000 | 13444 | 13403 | 13427 | 13435 | 13403 | 13656 |
| 2025 | 18762 | 18354 | 18854 | 19144 | 19010 | 22732 |
| 2050 | 20794 | 18689 | 21428 | 22861 | 23250 | 45178 |
| G. Potential support ratio 15-64/65+ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1950 | 6.90 | - | - | - | - | - |
| 1975 | 4.29 | - | - | - | - | - |
| 1995 | 4.41 | - | - | - | - | - |
| 2000 | 4.17 | 4.11 | 4.14 | 4.15 | 4.11 | 4.41 |
| 2025 | 2.71 | 2.45 | 2.74 | 2.91 | 3.00 | 4.41 |
| 2050 | 2.05 | 1.75 | 2.26 | 2.44 | 3.13 | 4.41 |

* Scenario VI is considered to be demographically unrealistic.
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Figure 11. Population of Germany in 2050, indicating those who are post-1995 migrants and their descendants, by scenario


## 3. Italy

## (a) Past trends

The total fertility rate in Italy increased from 2.3 in 1950-1960 to 2.5 in 1960-1970 and has been declining ever since. It has been below replacement level since 1975, and in 1995-2000 it was estimated at 1.20 children per woman, one of the lowest in the world. Since 1950, mortality has declined consistently, resulting in an increase in life expectancy for both sexes from 66.0 years in 1950-1955 to 77.2 years in 1990-1995. Despite an estimated net annual immigration of 70,000 in 1995-2000, the population of Italy declined during 1995-2000. Among the consequences of these demographic changes was the more than doubling of the proportion of the population aged 65 or older, from 8.3 per cent of the population in 1950 to 16.8 per cent in 1995.

As a result of these changes, the potential support ratio for Italy declined from 7.9 persons aged 1564 for each person aged 65 or older in 1950 to 4.1 in 1995.

## (b) Scenario I

This scenario, which is the medium variant of the United Nations 1998 Revision, assumes that there will be 660,000 net immigrants between 1995 and 2020, after which there will be no more migration to Italy. Under this scenario, the population of Italy would decline by 28 per cent, from 57.3 million in 1995 to 41.2 million in 2050 (The results of the 1998 United Nations projections are shown in the annex tables). The population aged $15-64$ would decline by 44 per cent over the same period, while the population over 65 years old would increase by 49 per cent, from 9.6 million to 14.4 million. Persons aged 65 or older would constitute more than one third of the population of Italy by 2050. As a result, the potential support ratio would decrease by 63 per cent, from 4.1 in 1995 to 1.5 in 2050.

## (c) Scenario II

Scenario II, which is the medium variant with zero migration, assumes that fertility and mortality will change according to the medium variant projections of the United Nations 1998 Revision, but that there will be no migration into Italy will occur after 1995. The results are very similar to those in Scenario I. Italy's population in 2050 would be 40.7 million, only 475,000 persons less than under Scenario I. There would be 21.6 million and 14.2 million persons aged $15-64$ and 65 or older, respectively, in 2050. As in Scenario I, the potential support ratio would decrease by 63 per cent from 4.1 in 1995 to 1.5 in 2050.

## (d) Scenario III

It is assumed, for Scenario III, that between 1995 and 2050 the total population of Italy will remain constant at its 1995 size of 57.3 million persons. A total of 12.9 million net migrants between 1995 and 2050 would be required to attain this goal. The annual net immigration would increase steadily from 75,000 in 1995-2000 to 318,000 in 2045-2050. Under this scenario, by 2050 a total of 16.6 million persons, or about 29 per cent of the population, would be post-1995 immigrants or their descendants.

## (e) Scenario IV

This scenario assumes that Italy's population aged 15-64 would remain constant at its 1995 level of 39.2 million, stopping the decline in the size of this age group. To achieve this objective, 19.6 million immigrants would be needed between 1995 and 2050. The average annual number of migrants would
vary, reaching a peak of 613,000 persons per year between 2025 and 2030 and then declining to 173,000 per year in 2045-2050. Under this scenario, the population of Italy would grow by 16 per cent from 57.3 million in 1995 to 66.4 million in 2050 . By the year 2050,39 per cent of the population would be post1995 migrants or their descendants. The potential support ratio would decrease from 4.1 in 1995 to 2.2 in 2050.

## (f) Scenario $V$

Scenario V does not allow the potential support ratio to decrease below the value of 3.0. In order to achieve this, no immigrants would be needed until 2010 , and 34.9 million immigrants would be needed between 2010 and 2040, an average of 1.2 million per year during that period. By 2050, out of a total population of 87.3 million, 46.6 million, or 53 percent, would be post- 1995 immigrants or their descendants.

## (g) Scenario VI

Scenario VI keeps the potential support ratio at its 1995 level of 4.08 . A total of 120 million immigrants between 1995 and 2050 would be required to maintain this constant ratio, yielding an overall average of 2.2 million immigrants per year. The resultant population of Italy in 2050 under this scenario would be 194 million, more than three times the size of the Italian population in 1995 . Of this population, 153 million, or 79 per cent, would be post-1995 immigrants or their descendants.

## (h) Additional considerations

In 1995-2000, Italy's population growth rate was estimated at -0.01 per cent. This decline in population was expected despite a net immigration of 70,000 persons per year. The number of foreignborn in Italy has almost doubled, from 821,000 in 1965 ( 1.6 per cent of the total population) to 1.5 million in 1995 ( 2.7 per cent of the population). According to Scenario III, to keep Italy's population from declining from its 1995 size, annual migration flows would have to be, on average, more than three times as large between 1995 and 2050 as they were between 1990 and 1995. To keep the population of working-age from declining would require more than five times the 1990-1995 annual level of migration. In addition, for scenarios III and IV, the proportion of Italy's population in 2050 that would be made up of post-1995 immigrants or their descendants, 29 per cent and 39 per cent respectively, is more than 10 times the proportion of the foreign-born population in 1995. Figure 13 shows, for scenarios I, II, III and IV, the population of Italy in 2050 , indicating the share that comprises post-1995 migrants and their descendants.

The demographic changes are even greater in scenario VI. This scenario requires more than twice as many immigrants between 1995 and 2050 as the total 1995 population of the country. Moreover, nearly four fifths of the resulting 2050 population of 194 million would be made up of post-1995 immigrants or their descendants.

In the absence of migration, the figures show that it would be necessary to increase working age to 74.7 years to obtain a potential support ratio of 3.0 in 2050 . To maintain in 2050 the 1995 ratio of 4.1 persons in working-age for each older person past working-age would require increasing the upper limit of the working-age span to 77 years by 2050 . Increasing the activity rates of the population, if it were possible, would only be a partial palliative to the decline in support ratio due to ageing. If the activity rates of all men and women aged 25 to 64 were to increase to 100 per cent by 2050 , this would make up for only 30 per cent of the loss in the active support ratio resulting from the ageing of the population.

Table 20. Population indicators for Italy by period for each scenario

| Scenario | I | II | III | IV | $V$ | VI * |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Period | Medium variant | Medium variant with zero migration | Constant total population | Constant age group 15-64 | Ratio 15-64/65+ not less than 3.0 | Constant ratio 15-64/65 years or older |
| A. Average annual number of migrants (thousands) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1995-2000 | 70 | 0 | 75 | 203 | 0 | 1261 |
| 2000-2025 | 12 | 0 | 214 | 315 | 499 | 1310 |
| 2025-2050 | 0 | 0 | 289 | 428 | 905 | 3225 |
| 2000-2050 | 6 | 0 | 251 | 372 | 702 | 2268 |
| 1995-2050 | 12 | 0 | 235 | 357 | 638 | 2176 |
| B. Total number of migrants (thousands) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1995-2000 | 350 | 0 | 375 | 1015 | 0 | 6305 |
| 2000-2025 | 310 | 0 | 5340 | 7887 | 12465 | 32759 |
| 2025-2050 | 0 | 0 | 7229 | 10709 | 22623 | 80622 |
| 2000-2050 | 310 | 0 | 12569 | 18596 | 35088 | 113381 |
| 1995-2050 | 660 | 0 | 12944 | 19610 | 35088 | 119684 |
| C. Total population (thousands) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1950 | 47104 | - | - | - | - | - |
| 1975 | 55441 | - | - | - | - | - |
| 1995 | 57338 | - | - | - | - | - |
| 2000 | 57298 | 56950 | 57338 | 58000 | 56950 | 63477 |
| 2025 | 51270 | 50679 | 57338 | 61064 | 64383 | 96664 |
| 2050 | 41197 | 40722 | 57338 | 66395 | 87345 | 193518 |
| D. Age group 0-14 (thousands) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1950 | 12397 | - | - | - | - | - |
| 1975 | 13436 | - | - | - | - | - |
| 1995 | 8483 | - | - | - | - | - |
| 2000 | 8165 | 8116 | 8214 | 8380 | 8116 | 9760 |
| 2025 | 5871 | 5802 | 7246 | 8013 | 9181 | 15280 |
| 2050 | 4945 | 4888 | 8124 | 9717 | 13913 | 35615 |
| E. Age group 15-64 (thousands) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1950 | 30817 | - | - | - | - | - |
| 1975 | 35326 | - | - | - | - | - |
| 1995 | 39234 | - | - | - | - | - |
| 2000 | 38721 | 38486 | 38762 | 39234 | 38486 | 43139 |
| 2025 | 32026 | 31659 | 36506 | 39234 | 41401 | 65358 |
| 2050 | 21875 | 21623 | 32985 | 39234 | 55074 | 126808 |
| F. Age group 65+ (thousands) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1950 | 3890 | - | - | - | - | - |
| 1975 | 6678 | - | - | - | - | - |
| 1995 | 9621 | - | - | - | - | - |
| 2000 | 10412 | 10349 | 10362 | 10386 | 10349 | 10578 |
| 2025 | 13373 | 13218 | 13586 | 13817 | 13800 | 16026 |
| 2050 | 14377 | 14211 | 16230 | 17444 | 18358 | 31094 |
| G. Potential support ratio 15-65/65+ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1950 | 7.92 | - | - | - | - | - |
| 1975 | 5.29 | - | - | - | - | - |
| 1995 | 4.08 | - | - | - | - | - |
| 2000 | 3.72 | 3.72 | 3.74 | 3.78 | 3.72 | 4.08 |
| 2025 | 2.39 | 2.40 | 2.69 | 2.84 | 3.00 | 4.08 |
| 2050 | 1.52 | 1.52 | 2.03 | 2.25 | 3.00 | 4.08 |
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## ITALY

Figure 12. Age-sex structures by scenario for 2000, 2025 and 2050
(Population in millions)


Figure 12 (continued)
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Figure 13. Population of Italy in 2050, indicating those who are post-1995 migrants and their descendants, by scenario


## 4. Japan

## (a) Past trends

The total fertility rate in Japan fell from 2.75 births per woman in 1950-1955 to 2.08 births in 19551960. Total fertility remained at the near-replacement level between 1960 and 1975, and it resumed falling slowly, reaching 1.49 births in 1990-1995. During the same period, the life expectancy at birth for both sexes combined increased markedly, from 63.9 years in 1950-1955 to 79.5 years in 1990-1995. The fertility decline and the increase in life expectancy in Japan brought about an increase in the proportion of the elderly. In 1995, the retired-age population ( 65 years old and over) represented 14.6 per cent of the total population, as compared to only 4.9 per cent in 1950. The ratio of the working-age population (15-64 years old) to the retired-age population increased from 11.0 in 1920 to 12.2 in 1950. It later decreased rapidly, to 4.8 in 1995. The notable increase in the median age of the population, from 22.3 years old in 1950 to 39.7 years old in 1995, is also indicative of the rapid demographic ageing that has taken place in Japan.

## (b) Scenario I

The 1998 United Nations population projection assumes no net immigration to Japan from 1995 through 2050. According to the medium variant projection, the population of Japan would increase from 125.5 million in 1995 and reach its peak in 2005 at 127.5 million. Then the population would decline to 104.9 million by 2050 (the results of the 1998 United Nations projections are shown in the annex tables). The working age population (15-64 years old) of Japan is projected to decline continuously, from 87.2 million in 1995 to 57.1 million in 2050. The population aged 65 or older would increase from 18.3 million in 1995 to 34.0 million in 2045 and then decrease slightly to 33.3 million in 2050. As a result, the percentage of population aged 65 or older in the total population would more than double, from 14.6 per cent in 1995 to 31.8 per cent in 2050. The ratio of the working-age population to the retired-age population would continue declining, from 4.8 in 1995 to 2.2 in 2025 and 1.7 in 2050.
(c) Scenario II

As the United Nations 1998 Revision assumes zero net migration in carrying out the population projections for Japan, scenarios I and II yield the same results.
(d) Scenario III

According to the medium variant projection of the United Nations 1998 Revision, the population of Japan would reach a maximum of 127.5 million in 2005. If Japan wishes to keep the size of its population at the level attained in the year 2005, the country would need 17 million net immigrants up to the year 2050, or an average of 381,000 immigrants per year between 2005 and 2050. By 2050, the immigrants and their descendants would total 22.5 million and comprise 17.7 per cent of the total population of the country.

## (e) Scenario IV

In order to keep the size of the working-age population constant at the 1995 level of 87.2 million, Japan would need 33.5 million immigrants from 1995 through 2050. This means an average of 609,000 immigrants are needed per year during this period. Under this scenario, the population of the country is projected to be 150.7 million by 2050 . The number of post-1995 immigrants and their descendants would be 46 million, accounting for 30 per cent of the total population in 2050.

## (f) Scenario $V$

Scenario V does not allow the potential support ratio to decrease below the value of 3.0. In order to achieve this, no immigrants would be needed until 2005 , and 94.8 million immigrants would be needed between 2005 and 2050, an average of 2.1 million per year during that period. By 2050, out of a total population of 229 million, 124 million, or 54 per cent, would be post-1995 immigrants or their descendants.

## (g) Scenario VI

This scenario keeps the ratio of the working-age population to the retired-age population at its 1995 level of 4.8. In order to keep this level of potential support ratio, the country would need 553 million immigrants during 1995 through 2050, or an average of 10 million immigrants per year. Under this scenario, the population of Japan is projected to be 818 million in 2050, and 87 per cent of them would be the post-1995 immigrants and their descendants.

## (h) Additional considerations

The population of Japan aged faster between 1950 and 2000 than the populations of other developed countries owing to a rapid process of demographic change that consisted of declines in fertility and increases in survivorship. Under the assumption of zero immigration in the future, the total population as well as the working-age population of Japan is projected to decline continuously during most of the first half of the twenty-first century. Scenario III examined above suggests that, if the loss of population were to be prevented through immigration, 17.7 per cent of the population would be composed of immigrants and their descendants by 2050. Similarly, 30.4 per cent of the population would be made up of immigrants and their descendants by 2050 if the country wished to maintain the size of working-age population constant. In comparison, the proportion of foreigners among the total population is barely one per cent today. Figure 15 shows, for scenarios I, II, III and IV, the population of Japan in 2050, indicating the share that would be post-1995 migrants and their descendants.

Furthermore, if the potential support ratio were kept constant at the 1995 level, 553 million immigrants, or a number more than four times as large as the current population of the country, would be needed from 1995 through 2050. In addition, 87 per cent of the resulting population in 2050 would be immigrants and their descendants. These unlikely results suggest that substantial ageing of the population, in terms of a decline in the potential support ratio, is inevitable even if Japan increases immigration greatly.

In the absence of migration, the figures show that it would be necessary to raise the upper limit of the working age in Japan to 72.4 years to obtain a potential support ratio of 3.0 in 2050. This limit would need to increase to about 77 years in order to obtain in 2050 the same potential support ratio observed in 1995, which was 4.8 persons of working age per each older person past working age. Increasing the activity rates of the population, should it be possible, would only be a partial palliative to the decline in support ratio due to ageing. If the activity rates of all men and women aged 25 to 64 increased to 100 per cent by 2050 , this would make up for only 15 per cent of the loss in the active support ratio resulting from the ageing of the population.

Table 21. Population indicators for Japan by period for each scenario

| Scenario | $I$ | II | III | IV | $V$ | VI * |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Period | Medium variant | Medium variant with zero migration | $\begin{gathered} \text { Constant } \\ \text { total } \\ \text { population } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Constant } \\ \text { age group } \\ 15-64 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Ratio 15-64/65+ not less than 3.0 | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Constant ratio } \\ \text { 15-64/65 years } \\ \text { or older } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| A. Average annual number of migrants (thousands) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1995-2000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 231 | 0 | 5990 |
| 2000-2025 | 0 | 0 | 221 | 615 | 1502 | 5183 |
| 2025-2050 | 0 | 0 | 464 | 679 | 2292 | 15758 |
| 2000-2050 | 0 | 0 | 343 | 647 | 1897 | 10471 |
| 1995-2050 | 0 | 0 | 312 | 609 | 1724 | 10064 |
| B. Total number of migrants (thousands) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1995-2000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1155 | 0 | 29950 |
| 2000-2025 | 0 | 0 | 5535 | 15366 | 37548 | 129587 |
| 2025-2050 | 0 | 0 | 11606 | 16965 | 57288 | 393957 |
| 2000-2050 | 0 | 0 | 17141 | 32332 | 94837 | 523543 |
| 1995-2050 | 0 | 0 | 17141 | 33487 | 94837 | 553495 |
| C. Total population (thousands) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1950 | 83625 | - | - | - | - | - |
| 1975 | 111524 | - | - | - | - | - |
| 1995 | 125472 | - | - | - | - | - |
| 2000 | 126714 | 126714 | 126714 | 127923 | 126714 | 158061 |
| 2025 | 121150 | 121150 | 127457 | 141877 | 166849 | 323376 |
| 2050 | 104921 | 104921 | 127457 | 150697 | 229021 | 817965 |
| D. Age group 0-14 (thousands) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1950 | 29643 | - | - | - | - | - |
| 1975 | 27109 | - | - | - | - | - |
| 1995 | 20019 | - | - | - | - | - |
| 2000 | 18765 | 18765 | 18765 | 19078 | 18765 | 26888 |
| 2025 | 16349 | 16349 | 17994 | 21065 | 27897 | 60256 |
| 2050 | 14511 | 14511 | 19297 | 23619 | 41266 | 170785 |
| E. Age group 15-64 (thousands) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1950 | 49847 | - | - | - | - | - |
| 1975 | 75625 | - | - | - | - | - |
| 1995 | 87188 | - | - | - | - | - |
| 2000 | 86335 | 86335 | 86335 | 87188 | 86335 | 108454 |
| 2025 | 72418 | 72418 | 76803 | 87188 | 104213 | 217547 |
| 2050 | 57087 | 57087 | 72908 | 87188 | 140816 | 535088 |
| F. Age group 65+ (thousands) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1950 | 4135 | - | - | - | - | - |
| 1975 | 8790 | - | - | - | - | - |
| 1995 | 18264 | - | - | - | - | - |
| 2000 | 21614 | 21614 | 21614 | 21657 | 21614 | 22719 |
| 2025 | 32383 | 32383 | 32660 | 33624 | 34738 | 45572 |
| 2050 | 33323 | 33323 | 35253 | 39890 | 46939 | 112092 |
| G. Potential support ratio 15-4/65+ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1950 | 12.05 | - | - | - | - | - |
| 1975 | 8.60 | - | - | - | - | - |
| 1995 | 4.77 | - | - | - | - | - |
| 2000 | 3.99 | 3.99 | 3.99 | 4.03 | 3.99 | 4.77 |
| 2025 | 2.24 | 2.24 | 2.35 | 2.59 | 3.00 | 4.77 |
| 2050 | 1.71 | 1.71 | 2.07 | 2.19 | 3.00 | 4.77 |
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## JAPAN

Figure 14. Age-sex structures by scenario for 2000, 2025 and 2050
(Population in millions)


Figure 14 (continued)


Figure 15. Population of Japan in 2050, indicating those who are post-1995 migrants and their descendants, by scenario


## 5. Republic of Korea

## (a) Past trends

The total fertility rate in the Republic of Korea increased from 5.40 births per woman in 1950-1955 to 6.33 births in 1955-1960 as a result of the baby boom that followed immediately after the Korean War. However, the total fertility of the country showed a sharp decline thereafter, down to 4.28 births in 19701975, to 2.50 births in 1980-1985 and to 1.70 births in 1990-1995. Owing to significant declines in mortality over time, life expectancy at birth for both sexes combined increased from 47.5 years in 19501955 to 70.9 years in 1990-1995. The proportion of the elderly (aged 65 or older) in the total population remained between 3.0 and 4.0 per cent between 1950 and 1980 and started increasing slowly thereafter, reaching 5.6 per cent by 1995. The potential support ratio of the country dropped from 18.4 to 12.6 between 1950 and 1995.
(b) Scenario I

The Republic of Korea has been until recently a country of emigration. The medium variant of the United Nations 1998 Revision assumes a net total of 450,000 emigrants from the country between 1995 and 2020 and none thereafter. Thus, it was projected that the population of the country would increase from 44.9 million in 1995 to 53.0 million in 2035, and then decline to 51.3 million in 2050 (the results of the 1998 United Nations projections are shown in the annex tables.) The working-age population of the country is projected to increase from 31.9 million in 1995 to 36.3 million in 2020, and then decrease to 30.4 million by 2050 . The population aged 65 or older would continue to increase rapidly between 1995 and 2050, from 2.5 million to 12.7 million. As a result of these changes, the potential support ratio in the country would drop extremely rapidly, passing from 12.6 in 1995 to 5.7 in 2020 and to 2.4 in 2050.
(c) Scenario II

Scenario II assumes that the population in the Republic of Korea would change according to the fertility and mortality assumptions of the medium variant of the United Nations 1998 Revision, but with net zero migration from 1995 through 2050. This scenario yields results very similar to those of scenario I. The total population of the country would keep growing from 44.9 million in 1995 to 53.5 million in 2035, and then decrease to 51.8 million in 2050. The size of the population aged $15-64$ would peak at 36.6 million in 2020, rising from 31.9 million in 1995. Then, it would decline to 30.7 million in 2050. The population aged 65 years or older is projected to grow five-fold, from 2.5 million in 1995 to 12.8 million in 2050. As in scenario I, the potential support ratio of the country would drop extremely rapidly from 12.6 in 1995 to 2.4 in 2050.

## (d) Scenario III

If no migration occurred after 1995, the population of the Republic of Korea would reach a maximum in 2035 at 53.5 million. In order to keep the size of the total population constant at that level thereafter, it would be necessary to have 1.5 million net immigrants between 2035 and 2050, or an average of 100,000 per year during that period. By 2050, out of a total population of 53.5 million, 1.7 million or 3.2 per cent, would be immigrants and their descendants.

## (e) Scenario IV

In order to keep the size of the working age population (15-64 years old) constant at its maximum of 36.6 million in 2020, the Republic of Korea would need a total of 6.4 million immigrants between 2020
and 2050 , or an average of 213,000 per year. By 2050 , out of a total population of 60.1 million, 8.4 million, or 13.9 per cent, would be post-1995 immigrants and their descendants.

## (f) Scenario V

Scenario V does not allow the potential support ratio to decrease below the value of 3.0. In order to do so, no immigrants would be needed until 2035, and 11.6 million immigrants would be needed between 2035 and 2050, an average of 0.8 million per year during that period. By 2050, out of a total population of 65.7 million, 14.0 million, or 21 per cent, would be post-1995 immigrants or their descendants.

## (g) Scenario VI

In order to keep the ratio of the working-age population to the population aged 65 years or older at its 1995 level of 12.6, it would be necessary to have a total of 5.1 billion immigrants from 1995 through 2050, or an average of 94 million per year. This number is enormous because the initial level of the potential support ratio, 12.6, is relatively high. Under this scenario, the total population of the country is projected to be 6.2 billion in 2050, of which over 99 per cent would be post-1995 immigrants and their descendants.

## (h) Additional considerations

The pace of population ageing in the Republic of Korea is projected to be one of the fastest in the world. With zero immigration in the future, the proportion aged 65 or older in the total population would increase from 5.6 per cent to 24.7 per cent between 1995 and 2050. The proportion of elderly would be 24.0 per cent in 2050 , only slightly smaller, if immigration kept the size of the total population constant at its maximum in 2035. Similarly, the proportion of elderly would be 22.1 per cent if the size of the working-age population remained at its maximum in 2020 . Thus, under these scenarios, the impact of immigration on population ageing in the country would be minimal. Figure 17 shows, for scenarios I, II, III and IV, the population of the Republic of Korea in 2050, indicating the share that comprises post-1995 migrants and their descendants.

The number of immigrants needed to maintain the potential support ratio at its 1995 level (scenario VI) is 110 times the size of the current national population and approximately equal to the current total population of the world. This extreme result indicates that the 1995 level of the potential support ratio is transitional and will be considerably lower in the future, irrespective of migration flows.

In the absence of migration, the figures show that it would be necessary to raise the upper limit of the working-age to 67.6 years to obtain a potential support ratio of 3.0 in 2050, and to about 82 years in order to obtain in 2050 the same potential support ratio observed in 1995 in the Republic of Korea, which was 12.6 persons of working-age per each person aged 65 years or older. Increasing the activity rates of the population, if it were possible, would only be a partial palliative to the decline in the support ratio due do ageing. If the activity rates of all men and women aged 25 to 64 increased to 100 per cent by 2050 , this would make up for only 8 per cent of the loss in the active support ratio resulting from the ageing of the population.

Table 22. Population indicators for Republic of Korea by period for each scenario

| Scenario | $I$ | II | III | IV | $V$ | VI * |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Period | Medium Variant | Medium variant with zero migration | $\begin{gathered} \text { Constant } \\ \text { total } \\ \text { population } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Constant } \\ \text { age group } \\ 15-64 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Ratio 15-64/65+ not less than 3.0 | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Constant ratio } \\ \text { 15-64/65 years } \\ \text { or older } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| A. Average annual number of migrants (thousands) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1995-2000 | -20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4156 |
| 2000-2025 | -14 | 0 | 0 | 41 | 0 | 15151 |
| 2025-2050 | 0 | 0 | 60 | 216 | 464 | 189975 |
| 2000-2050 | -7 | 0 | 30 | 129 | 232 | 102563 |
| 1995-2050 | -8 | 0 | 27 | 117 | 211 | 93617 |
| B. Total number of migrants (thousands) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1995-2000 | -100 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20780 |
| 2000-2025 | -350 | 0 | 0 | 1034 | 0 | 378765 |
| 2025-2050 | 0 | 0 | 1509 | 5392 | 11595 | 4749382 |
| 2000-2050 | -350 | 0 | 1509 | 6426 | 11595 | 5128147 |
| 1995-2050 | -450 | 0 | 1509 | 6426 | 11595 | 5148928 |
| C. Total population (thousands) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1950 | 20357 | - | - | - | - | - |
| 1975 | 35281 | - | - | - | - | - |
| 1995 | 44949 | - | - | - | - | - |
| 2000 | 46844 | 46946 | 46946 | 46946 | 46946 | 68768 |
| 2025 | 52533 | 53020 | 53020 | 54119 | 53020 | 522908 |
| 2050 | 51275 | 51751 | 53470 | 60125 | 65736 | 6233275 |
| D. Age group 0-14 (thousands) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1950 | 8479 | - | - | - | - | - |
| 1975 | 13318 | - | - | - | - | - |
| 1995 | 10540 | - | - | - | - | - |
| 2000 | 10068 | 10091 | 10091 | 10091 | 10091 | 15886 |
| 2025 | 8956 | 9040 | 9040 | 9338 | 9040 | 128197 |
| 2050 | 8209 | 8285 | 8752 | 10205 | 12043 | 1571113 |
| E. Age group 15-64 (thousands) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1950 | 11257 | - | - | - | - | - |
| 1975 | 20690 | - | - | - | - | - |
| 1995 | 31882 | - | - | - | - | - |
| 2000 | 33623 | 33696 | 33696 | 33696 | 33696 | 48998 |
| 2025 | 35557 | 35886 | 35886 | 36649 | 35886 | 365720 |
| 2050 | 30401 | 30685 | 31867 | 36649 | 40270 | 4319740 |
| F. Age group 65+ (thousands) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1950 | 620 | - | - | - | - | - |
| 1975 | 1273 | - | - | - | - | - |
| 1995 | 2527 | - | - | - | - | - |
| 2000 | 3152 | 3159 | 3159 | 3159 | 3159 | 3884 |
| 2025 | 8020 | 8094 | 8094 | 8131 | 8094 | 28990 |
| 2050 | 12665 | 12781 | 12851 | 13270 | 13423 | 342421 |
| G. Potential support ratio 15-64/65+ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1950 | 18.16 | - | - | - | - | - |
| 1975 | 16.25 | - | - | - | - | - |
| 1995 | 12.62 | - | - | - | - | - |
| 2000 | 10.67 | 10.67 | 10.67 | 10.67 | 10.67 | 12.62 |
| 2025 | 4.43 | 4.43 | 4.43 | 4.51 | 4.34 | 12.62 |
| 2050 | 2.40 | 2.40 | 2.48 | 2.76 | 3.00 | 12.62 |
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Figure 16. Age-sex structures by scenario for 2000, 2025 and 2050
(Population in millions)


Figure 16 (continued)


NOTE: For the constant ratio scenario, the age-sex structures in 2025 and 2050 have different scales from the other scenarios.

Figure 17. Population of the Republic of Korea in 2050, indicating those who are post-1995 migrants and their descendants, by scenario
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## 6. Russian Federation

## (a) Past trends

At a total fertility rate of 2.51 children per woman, fertility in the Russian Soviet Federal Socialist Republic in 1950-1955 was only slightly higher than the average fertility in Western Europe and Northern Europe. Its life expectancy at birth of 67.3 years in 1950-1955 was similar to the average for Western Europe. Fertility stayed above replacement levels until 1965, but dropped to 1.50 children per woman in the Russian Federation in 1990-1995 and to 1.35 in 1995-2000. Mortality levels have stagnated, or increased over much of the period since 1965, especially among adult males. As a result, the 1995-2000 life expectancy at birth of 66.6 years was lower than the 1950-1955 level. Nevertheless, the proportion of the population aged 65 years or older increased from 6 per cent in 1950 to 12 per cent in 1995. The share of the population aged 15 to 64 years also increased slightly, from 65 per cent in 1950 to 67 per cent in 1995. The potential support ratio, which was 10 persons aged $15-64$ years for each person aged 65 or older in 1950, declined to 6 in 1995.

## (b) Scenario I

This scenario, which is the medium variant of the United Nations 1998 Revision, assumes that 7.4 million net migrants would enter the Russian Federation between 1995 and 2050: 2.0 million from 1995 to 2000 , 4.1 million from 2000 to 2025 and 1.4 million from 2025 to 2050 . As a result of low fertility, the population of the Russian Federation is projected to decline from 148.1 million in 1995 to 121.3 million in 2050. By 2050, 6 per cent of the total population would be post- 1995 migrants or their descendants (the results of the 1998 United Nations projections are shown in the annex tables). The population aged 15-64 would increase slightly, from 99.2 million in 1995 to 103.0 million in 2010, and then decline to 73.6 million by 2050 . One quarter of the population of the Russian Federation in 2050 would be aged 65 years or older. Owing to the unevenness of the age structure, the potential support ratio would decrease from its level of 6 in 1995 to 5.0 in 2005 and increase again after 2005 to 6 in 2010. After 2010, the potential support ratio would decline by more than half, to 2 by 2050.

## (c) Scenario II

Scenario II uses the fertility and mortality assumptions of the medium variant of the United Nations 1998 Revision, but assumes zero migration after 1995. Under these conditions, the population of the Russian Federation would decline faster than in Scenario I. There will be 114.2 million people in 2050, 7.1 million fewer than in Scenario I. The number of persons aged 15-64 is also projected to start declining 5 years earlier than under Scenario I, from 100.5 million in 2000 to 69.2 million in 2050. However, the share of the total population above age 65 would still be about 25 per cent in 2050 , and the potential support ratio would be 2 in that year.

## (d) Scenario III

Scenario III holds the population of Russia constant at its 1995 size of 148.1 million, preventing it from declining further. In order to do so, 25 million net migrants would be needed between 2000 and 2050, an average of 500,000 immigrants per year. By 2050 , out of a total population of 148.1 million, 33.9 million, or 23 per cent, would be post-1995 immigrants or their descendants. By 2050 the potential support ratio would be 3 .

## (e) Scenario IV

Scenario IV keeps the size of the population aged 15-64 constant at its maximum of 100.5 million, reached in 2000. To attain this, a total of 36 million net migrants would be needed from 2000 to 2050. The average net migration would need to be 91,000 per year between 2000 and 2010 , and 871,000 per year between 2010 and 2050. This scenario would result in a total population of 158 million in 2050, of which 43.8 million, or 28 per cent, would consist of post-1995 immigrants or their descendants. The potential support ratio in 2050 would be 3 .

## (f) Scenario V

Scenario V does not allow the potential support ratio to decrease below the value of 3.0. In order to achieve this, no immigrants would be needed until 2035 , and 26.6 million immigrants would be needed between 2035 and 2050, an average of 1.8 million per year during that period. By 2050, out of a total population of 143 million, 29 million, or 20 per cent, would be post- 1995 immigrants or their descendants.

## (g) Scenario VI

This scenario keeps the potential support ratio at its 1995 value of 5.62. A total of 253 million net immigrants would be needed between 2000 and 2050, an overall average of 5.1 million per year. However, the average annual net migration required to maintain this ratio varies considerably over time, as two relatively small cohorts-those born between 1940 and 1945 and those born between 1965 and 1970 -pass through their economically active years and into the 65 years or older group. In the period 2005-2010, the sharp decline in the number of persons aged 65 or older would require the emigration of some 3.6 million persons per year to keep the potential support ratio constant. Immigration would then resume after 2010. Under this scenario, by 2050, a total of 308 million persons, or 73 per cent of Russia's projected population of 422 million, would be post-1995 immigrants or their descendants.

## (h) Additional considerations

Between 1990 and 1995 international migration had a major impact on population growth in the Russian Federation. An estimated 1.8 million persons migrated into Russia in this period, an average of 360,000 per year. While this volume of migration is comparable to the average levels required under scenarios I and III, it is much lower than the 871,000 persons that would be needed annually between 2010 and 2050 under scenario IV. It is also important to note that a large proportion of recent immigration into the Russian Federation has been the result of the resettling of ethnic Russians who came from the other republics of the former Soviet Union. Figure 19 shows, for scenarios I, II, III and IV, the population of the Russian Federation in 2050, indicating the share that is made up of post-1995 migrants and their descendants.

The number of immigrants required in scenario VI is immensely larger than past experience, more than 13 times the level recorded in 1990-1995.

In the absence of migration, the figures show that it would be necessary to raise the upper limit of the working-age in the Russian Federation to 66.8 years to obtain a potential support ratio of 3.0 in 2050 . This would have to increase to about 73 years in order to obtain in 2050 the same potential support ratio observed in 1995, which was 5.6 persons of working-age per each older person past working-age. Increasing the activity rates of the population, if it were possible, would only be a partial palliative to the decline in the support ratio due to ageing. If the activity rates of all men and women aged 25 to 64 increased to 100 per cent by 2050 , this would make up for only 30 per cent of the loss in the active support ratio resulting from the ageing of the population.

Table 23. Population indicators for the Russian Federation by period for each scenario

| Scenario | I | II | III | IV | V | VI* |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Period | Medium variant | Medium variant with zero migration | Constant total population | Constant age group 15-64 | Ratio 15-64/65+ not less than 3.0 | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Constant ratio } \\ \text { 15-64/65 years } \\ \text { or older } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| A. Average annual number of migrants (thousands) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1995-2000 | 394 | 0 | 611 | 0 | 0 | 746 |
| 2000-2025 | 163 | 0 | 445 | 638 | 0 | 3481 |
| 2025-2050 | 55 | 0 | 551 | 792 | 1064 | 6654 |
| 2000-2050 | 109 | 0 | 498 | 715 | 532 | 5068 |
| 1995-2050 | 135 | 0 | 508 | 650 | 484 | 4675 |
| B. Total number of migrants (thousands) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1995-2000 | 1970 | 0 | 3056 | 0 | 0 | 3731 |
| 2000-2025 | 4084 | 0 | 11120 | 15951 | 0 | 87021 |
| 2025-2050 | 1364 | 0 | 13776 | 19805 | 26604 | 166358 |
| 2000-2050 | 5448 | 0 | 24896 | 35756 | 26604 | 253379 |
| 1995-2050 | 7417 | 0 | 27952 | 35756 | 26604 | 257110 |
| C. Total population (thousands) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1950 | 102192 | - | - | - | - | - |
| 1975 | 134233 | - | - | - | - | - |
| 1995 | 148097 | - | - | - | - | - |
| 2000 | 146934 | 144960 | 148097 | 144960 | 144960 | 148790 |
| 2025 | 137933 | 131824 | 148097 | 149479 | 131824 | 231075 |
| 2050 | 121256 | 114248 | 148097 | 158049 | 143093 | 422094 |
| D. Age group 0-14 (thousands) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1950 | 29542 | - | - | - | - | - |
| 1975 | 31280 | - | - | - | - | - |
| 1995 | 31232 | - | - | - | - | - |
| 2000 | 26679 | 26244 | 27040 | 26244 | 26244 | 27216 |
| 2025 | 20923 | 19905 | 23285 | 24131 | 19905 | 43641 |
| 2050 | 17372 | 16298 | 22719 | 25011 | 23613 | 80051 |
| E. Age group 15-64 (thousands) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1950 | 66328 | - | - | - | - | - |
| 1975 | 91069 | - | - | - | - | - |
| 1995 | 99200 | - | - | - | - | - |
| 2000 | 101862 | 100467 | 102703 | 100467 | 100467 | 103197 |
| 2025 | 92021 | 87764 | 99805 | 100467 | 87764 | 159103 |
| 2050 | 73569 | 69199 | 92540 | 100467 | 89610 | 290343 |
| F. Age group 65+ (thousands) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1950 | 6322 | - | - | - | - | - |
| 1975 | 11883 | - | - | - | - | - |
| 1995 | 17664 | - | - | - | - | - |
| 2000 | 18393 | 18249 | 18353 | 18249 | 18249 | 18376 |
| 2025 | 24989 | 24156 | 25006 | 24881 | 24156 | 28331 |
| 2050 | 30315 | 28750 | 32837 | 32571 | 29870 | 51701 |
| G. Potential support ratio 15-64/65+ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1950 | 10.49 | - | - | - | - | - |
| 1975 | 7.66 | - | - | - | - | - |
| 1995 | 5.62 | - | - | - | - | - |
| 2000 | 5.54 | 5.51 | 5.60 | 5.51 | 5.51 | 5.62 |
| 2025 | 3.68 | 3.63 | 3.99 | 4.04 | 3.63 | 5.62 |
| 2050 | 2.43 | 2.41 | 2.82 | 3.08 | 3.00 | 5.62 |
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Figure 18. Age-sex structures by scenario for 2000, 2025 and 2050
(Population in millions)
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Figure 18 (continued)


Figure 19. Population of the Russian Federation in 2050, indicating those who are post-1995 migrants and their descendants, by scenario


Scenario

## 7. United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

## (a) Past trends

Whereas the total fertility rate increased steadily from the 1950s level of 2.18 children per woman to 2.81 in 1960-1965, this trend reversed itself in the decades afterwards, and fertility fell continuously to 1.78 in 1990-1995. At the same time, life expectancy increased during the entire period from 1950-1995, from 69.2 to 76.2 years for both sexes. Hence, the proportion of the population aged 65 years or older increased over the same period of time from 10.7 per cent to 15.9 per cent.

At the beginning of the twentieth century, at a time when both fertility and mortality were higher, the potential support ratio was 13.3 persons aged 15-64 for each person aged 65 or older. The ratio declined to 6.2 in 1950 and declined further to 4.1 in 1995.

## (b) Scenario I

Scenario I, which is the medium variant of the 1998 United Nations projections, assumes a total of 1.2 million net migrants between 1995 and 2050. From 1995 to 2025, 40,000 persons would enter Britain annually and none after 2025. The overall population of the United Kingdom would increase from 58.3 million in 1995 to 59.9 million in 2025 and thereafter decline to 56.6 million in 2050 (the results of the 1998 United Nations projections are shown in the annex tables). The population of working-age, aged 1564 years, would increase from 37.8 million in 1995 to 39.2 million in 2010; afterwards there would be a continuous decline to 33.4 million in 2050. By that date 1.9 per cent of the total population would be post-1995 migrants or their descendants. The population aged 65 or over, on the other hand, would increase from 9.2 million ( 15.9 per cent) in 1995 to 14.1 million in 2050 ( 24.9 per cent) in 2050. As a result, the potential support ratio would drop from 4.09 in 1995 to 2.37 in 2050.

## (c) Scenario II

Scenario II, which is the medium variant with zero migration, is based on the fertility and mortality assumptions of the medium variant of the 1998 United Nations projections, but without any migration to the United Kingdom after 1995. The overall population would decrease to 55.6 million in 2050, one million less than in scenario I; the population aged 15-64 years would decrease to 32.7 million, 700,000 less than in scenario I. The elderly population (aged 65 or older) would increase to 13.9 million in 2050, and the potential support ratio would be at 2.36 . In general, only slight differences exist between scenarios I and II regarding the population trends of the country.

## (d) Scenario III

Scenario III keeps the population in the United Kingdom constant at its maximum of 58.8 million people in 2020. In order to do so, the United Kingdom would have to receive 2.6 million migrants between 2020 and 2050. In 2050, 5.5 per cent of the total population would be post-1995 migrants or their descendants. This influx would result in a population of labour-force age of 35 million in 2050, and the population aged 65 or older would reach 14 million in 2050, 24 per cent of the total population. The potential support ratio would be 2.5 .

## (e) Scenario IV

Scenario IV keeps the age group between 15-64 years constant at its maximum of 38.9 million from 2010 on. For this to happen, a total of 6.2 million immigrants would be needed between 2010 and 2050,
which would increase the overall population to 64.3 million in 2050 . By that date 13.6 per cent of the total population would be post-1995 migrants or their descendants. In 2050, the proportion of the elderly would be 22.9 per cent and the potential support ratio 2.6.

## (f) Scenario V

Scenario V does not allow the potential support ratio to decrease below the value of 3.0. In order to achieve this, no immigrants would be needed until 2020 , and 13.7 million immigrants would be needed between 2020 and 2040, an average of 0.7 million per year during that period. By 2050, out of a total population of 74.4 million, 18.8 million, or 25 percent, would be post-1995 immigrants or their descendants.
(g) Scenario VI

Scenario VI keeps the potential support ratio at its 1995 level of 4.09. Keeping this ratio would require 59.8 million migrants between 1995 and 2050, slightly more than one million migrants a year on average. The overall population would reach 136 million in 2050, of which 80 million ( 59 per cent) would be post-1995 migrants or their descendants.

## (h) Additional considerations

Net migration in the United Kingdom amounted to 660,000 persons between 1990 and 1998, an average of 73,000 persons per year. In 1990, the proportion of the total population that was foreign-born was 6.5 per cent. This is comparable to the numbers needed to keep the total population constant, 88,000 migrants per year, and to the proportion of the total population in 2050 who would be post-1995 migrants or their descendants, 5.5 per cent. However, the number of migrants needed to keep the population of working-age constant is about twice the level of the past decade. Figure 21 shows, for scenarios I, II, III and IV, the population of the United Kingdom in 2050, indicating the share that is made up of post-1995 migrants and their descendants. Scenario VI, keeping the potential support ratio constant, would demand more than one million immigrants annually. This would greatly exceed the immigration rates that the country experienced in the past.

In the absence of migration, the figures show that it would be necessary to raise the upper limit of the working-age to 68.2 years to obtain a potential support ratio of 3.0 in 2050, and to about 72 years in order to obtain in 2050 the same potential support ratio observed in 1995 in the United Kingdom, which was 4.1 persons of working age per each older person past working age. Increasing the activity rates of the population, if it were possible, would only be a partial palliative to the decline in the support ratio due to ageing. If the activity rates of all men and women aged 25 to 64 increased to 100 per cent by 2050 , this would make up for only 35 per cent of the loss in the active support ratio resulting from the ageing of the population.

Table 24. Population indicators for United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland by period for each scenario

| Scenario | I | II | III | IV | V | VI * |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Period | Medium variant | Medium variant with zero migration | Constant total population | Constant age group 15-64 | Ratio 15-64/65+ not less than 3.0 | Constant ratio 15-64/65 years or older |


| 1995-2000 | 40 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2000-2025 | 40 | 0 | 2 | 121 | 53 | 947 |
| 2025-2050 | 0 | 0 | 103 | 129 | 494 | 1441 |
| 2000-2050 | 20 | 0 | 53 | 125 | 273 | 1194 |
| 1995-2050 | 22 | 0 | 48 | 114 | 249 | 1087 |
| B. Total number of migrants (thousands) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1995-2000 | 200 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 55 |
| 2000-2025 | 1000 | 0 | 61 | 3025 | 1315 | 23687 |
| 2025-2050 | 0 | 0 | 2572 | 3222 | 12358 | 36035 |
| 2000-2050 | 1000 | 0 | 2634 | 6247 | 13674 | 59722 |
| 1995-2050 | 1200 | 0 | 2634 | 6247 | 13674 | 59775 |
| C. Total population (thousands) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1950 | 50616 | - | - | - | - | - |
| 1975 | 56226 | - | - | - | - | - |
| 1995 | 58308 | - | - | - | - | - |
| 2000 | 58830 | 58600 | 58600 | 58600 | 58600 | 58655 |
| 2025 | 59961 | 58768 | 58833 | 62248 | 60160 | 86856 |
| 2050 | 56667 | 55594 | 58833 | 64354 | 74398 | 136138 |
| D. Age group 0-14 (thousands) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1950 | 11306 | - | - | - | - | - |
| 1975 | 13121 | - | - | - | - | - |
| 1995 | 11241 | - | - | - | - | - |
| 2000 | 11069 | 11033 | 11033 | 11033 | 11033 | 11048 |
| 2025 | 10071 | 9872 | 9890 | 10796 | 10245 | 17174 |
| 2050 | 9153 | 8968 | 9775 | 10759 | 13010 | 26299 |
| E. Age group 15-64 (thousands) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1950 | 33881 | - | - | - | - | - |
| 1975 | 35261 | - | - | - | - | - |
| 1995 | 37811 | - | - | - | - | - |
| 2000 | 38328 | 38207 | 38207 | 38207 | 38207 | 38246 |
| 2025 | 37166 | 36465 | 36510 | 38873 | 37437 | 55979 |
| 2050 | 33406 | 32745 | 35009 | 38873 | 46266 | 88239 |
| F. Age group 65+ (thousands) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1950 | 5429 | - | - | - | - | - |
| 1975 | 7844 | - | - | - | - | - |
| 1995 | 9256 | - | - | - | - | - |
| 2000 | 9433 | 9360 | 9360 | 9360 | 9360 | 9362 |
| 2025 | 12724 | 12431 | 12433 | 12578 | 12479 | 13703 |
| 2050 | 14107 | 13881 | 14048 | 14722 | 15122 | 21600 |
| G. Potential support ratio 15-64/65+ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1950 | 6.24 | - | - | - | - | - |
| 1975 | 4.50 | - | - | - | - | - |
| 1995 | 4.09 | - | - | - | - | - |
| 2000 | 4.06 | 4.08 | 4.08 | 4.08 | 4.08 | 4.09 |
| 2025 | 2.92 | 2.93 | 2.94 | 3.09 | 3.00 | 4.09 |
| 2050 | 2.37 | 2.36 | 2.49 | 2.64 | 3.06 | 4.09 |
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Figure 20. Age-sex structures by scenario for 2000, 2025 and 2050
(Population in millions)


Figure 20 (continued)


Figure 21. Population of the United Kingdom in 2050, indicating those who are post-1995 migrants and their descendants, by scenario


## 8. United States of America

## (a) Past trends

The total fertility rate in the United States dropped from 3.45 births per woman in 1950-1955 to 2.02 in 1970-1975. Except for a temporary period during the late 1970s and early 1980s, when it hovered around 1.8 , the total fertility rate has continued to be around two children per woman. Life expectancy at birth, meanwhile, has risen from 69.0 years in 1950-1955 to 75.7 years in 1990-1995. As a consequence of these changes, the proportion of the population aged 65 or older rose from 8.3 per cent in 1950 to 12.5 per cent in 1995, and the potential support ratio declined from 7.8 in 1950 to 5.2 in 1995. As a point of comparison, the potential support ratio was 15 in 1900, when 4 per cent of the population was aged 65 years or older.

## (b) Scenario I

Scenario I, the medium variant of the United Nations 1998 Revision, assumes an annual net intake of 760,000 migrants per year between 1995-2050, for a total of $41,800,000$ net migrants during the period. Accordingly, the total population of the United States is projected to increase continuously from 267 million in 1995 to 349 million in 2050 (the results of the 1998 United Nations projections are shown in the annex tables). By 2050, out of this total population of 349 million, 59 million, or 16.8 per cent, would be post-1995 immigrants or their descendants. The population aged 15-64 would increase slowly from 174 million in 1995 to 214 million in 2050, although not in a monotonic fashion. The population aged 65 or older would rise rapidly, from 33 million in 1995 to nearly 76 million in 2050. As a result, the potential support ratio would decrease from 5.2 in 1995 to 2.8 in 2050.
(c) Scenario II

Scenario II, which is the medium variant with zero migration, uses the fertility and mortality assumptions of the medium variant of the 1998 Revision, but without any migration to the United States after 1995. The results in this scenario are quite different from those of scenario I. The total population would increase to 290 million in 2050, which is 50 million less than in scenario I. The population aged 15-64 would rise from 174 million in 1995 to 192 million in 2010 and 2015 and then decline, returning to 174 million in 2050. The population aged 65 or older would double, from 33 million in 1950 to 68 million in 2050. As a result, the potential support ratio would decline to 2.6 in 2050, which is slightly below that presented in scenario I.

## (d) Scenario III

Scenario III keeps the size of the total United States population constant at its maximum of 298 million, which it would reach in 2030 (assuming no in-migration after 1995). In order to keep the total population constant at that level, it would be necessary to have 6.4 million migrants between 2030 and 2050, which is an average of 319,000 migrants per year. By 2050, out of a total population of 298 million, 7.3 million, or 2.5 per cent, would be post-1995 immigrants or their descendants.

## (e) Scenario IV

Scenario IV keeps the size of the population aged 15 to 64 constant at its maximum of 192.5 million, which it would reach in 2015 (assuming no in-migration after 1995). In order to keep the working-age population constant at that level, 18.0 million migrants would be needed between 2015 and 2050, which is an average of 513 thousand migrants per year. By 2050, out of a total population of 316 million, 25.0 million, or 7.9 per cent, would be post-1995 immigrants or their descendants.

## (f) Scenario $V$

Scenario V does not allow the potential support ratio to decrease below the value of 3.0. In order to achieve this, no immigrants would be needed until 2025 , and 44.9 million immigrants would be needed between 2025 and 2035, an average of 4.5 million per year during that period. By 2050, out of a total population of 352 million, 61 million, or 17 per cent, would be post-1995 immigrants or their descendants.
(g) Scenario VI

Scenario VI keeps the potential support ratio at its 1995 value of 5.2 persons aged $15-64$ for each person aged 65 or older. In order to keep the potential support ratio constant at that level, it would be necessary to have 593 million immigrants from 1995 to 2050, an average of 10.8 million per year. By 2050, out of a United States total population of 1.1 billion, 775 million, or 73 per cent, would be post1995 immigrants or their descendants.

## (h) Additional considerations

The official United States estimate of (documented) migrants into the United States from 1990 to 1996 is about 1.1 million per year. Thus, the past regular inflow into the United States is well above the number of migrants needed to prevent a decline in the total population or in the working-age population. Also under both scenarios III and IV, the percentage of post-1995 immigrants and their descendants in the total population of 2050 ( 2.5 per cent for scenario III and 7.9 per cent for scenario IV) would be below the percentage of foreign-born that exists currently ( 9.6 per cent). Figure 23 shows, for scenarios I, II, III and IV, the population of the United States in 2050, indicating the share that consists of post-1995 migrants and their descendants.

In the absence of migration, the figures show that it would be necessary to raise the upper limit of the working-age to 66.9 years to obtain a potential support ratio of 3.0 in 2050 , and to about 74 years in order to obtain in 2050 the same potential support ratio observed in 1995 in the United States, which was 5.2 persons of working age per each older person past working age. Increasing the activity rates of the population, if it were possible, would only be a partial palliative to the decline in the support ratio due to ageing. If the activity rates of all men and women aged 25 to 64 were to increase to 100 per cent by 2050, this would make up for only 21 per cent of the loss in the active support ratio resulting from the ageing of the population.

Table 25. Population indicators for the United States of America by period for each scenario

| Scenario | I | II | III | IV | V | VI * |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Period | Medium variant | Medium variant with zero migration | Constant total population | Constant age group 15-64 | Ratio 15-64/6+ not less than 3.0 | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Constant ratio } \\ \text { 15-64/65 years } \\ \text { or older } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| A. Average annual number of migrants (thousands) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1995-2000 | 760 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 37 |
| 2000-2025 | 760 | 0 | 0 | 431 | 0 | 9394 |
| 2025-2050 | 760 | 0 | 255 | 288 | 1796 | 14309 |
| 2000-2050 | 760 | 0 | 128 | 359 | 898 | 11851 |
| 1995-2050 | 760 | 0 | 116 | 327 | 816 | 10777 |
| B. Total number of migrants (thousands) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1995-2000 | 3800 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 185 |
| 2000-2025 | 19000 | 0 | 0 | 10771 | 0 | 234843 |
| 2025-2050 | 19000 | 0 | 6384 | 7196 | 44892 | 357729 |
| 2000-2050 | 38000 | 0 | 6384 | 17967 | 44892 | 592572 |
| 1995-2050 | 41800 | 0 | 6384 | 17967 | 44892 | 592757 |
| C. Total population (thousands) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1950 | 157813 | - | - | - | - | - |
| 1975 | 220165 | - | - | - | - | - |
| 1995 | 267020 | - | - | - | - | - |
| 2000 | 278357 | 274335 | 274335 | 274335 | 274335 | 274531 |
| 2025 | 325573 | 296616 | 296616 | 308408 | 296616 | 566888 |
| 2050 | 349318 | 290643 | 297970 | 315644 | 351788 | 1065174 |
| D. Age group 0-14 (thousands) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1950 | 42596 | - | - | - | - | - |
| 1975 | 55424 | - | - | - | - | - |
| 1995 | 59161 | - | - | - | - | - |
| 2000 | 59771 | 58756 | 58756 | 58756 | 58756 | 58808 |
| 2025 | 59241 | 52662 | 52662 | 55789 | 52662 | 122849 |
| 2050 | 59724 | 48075 | 49984 | 52984 | 60967 | 216127 |
| E. Age group 15-64 (thousands) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1950 | 102175 | - | - | - | - | - |
| 1975 | 141706 | - | - | - | - | - |
| 1995 | 174382 | - | - | - | - | - |
| 2000 | 183752 | 180843 | 180843 | 180843 | 180843 | 180979 |
| 2025 | 204985 | 184267 | 184267 | 192476 | 184267 | 372525 |
| 2050 | 213695 | 174607 | 179699 | 192476 | 218824 | 712305 |
| F. Age group 65+ (thousands) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1950 | 13043 | - | - | - | - | - |
| 1975 | 23035 | - | - | - | - | - |
| 1995 | 33477 | - | - | - | - | - |
| 2000 | 34833 | 34736 | 34736 | 34736 | 34736 | 34743 |
| 2025 | 61347 | 59687 | 59687 | 60143 | 59687 | 71515 |
| 2050 | 75899 | 67961 | 68287 | 70184 | 71997 | 136743 |
| G. Potential support ratio 15-64/65+ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1950 | 7.83 | - | - | - | - | - |
| 1975 | 6.15 | - | - | - | - | - |
| 1995 | 5.21 | - | - | - | - | - |
| 2000 | 5.28 | 5.21 | 5.21 | 5.21 | 5.21 | 5.21 |
| 2025 | 3.34 | 3.09 | 3.09 | 3.20 | 3.09 | 5.21 |
| 2050 | 2.82 | 2.57 | 2.63 | 2.74 | 3.04 | 5.21 |
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Figure 22. Age-sex structures by scenario for 2000, 2025 and 2050
(Population in millions)







Population without migration after 1995


Figure 23. Population of the United States in 2050, indicating those who are post-1995 migrants and their descendants, by scenario


Scenario

## 9. Europe

## (a) Past trends

Europe today consists of the 47 countries and areas that are listed on page viii. The combined population of these 47 countries was 728 million in 1995. The total fertility rate in Europe fluctuated at levels slightly below 2.6 births per woman in the 1950s and early 1960s, but subsequently took a steady downward course that reduced it to 1.57 births per woman by 1990-1995. Life expectancy at birth progressed at an uneven pace until recently, rising from 66.2 years in 1950-1955 to 73.0 years in 19851995. Subsequently, the expectation of life declined to 72.6 years in 1990-1995, a trend reflecting the sharp deterioration of mortality conditions observed in Eastern Europe, particularly in the Russian Federation and Ukraine. The proportion of the population aged 65 or older rose from 8.2 per cent in 1950 to 13.9 per cent in 1995. The potential support ratio declined from 8.0 in 1950 to 4.8 in 1995.

## (b) Scenario I

Scenario I, the medium variant of the United Nations population projections in the 1998 Revision, assumes an average net intake of 428,000 migrants per year between 1995-2050, for a net total of $23,530,000$ migrants during the period. After a slight increase between 1995 and 2000, when the total population of Europe would reach its top level at 729 million, continuous decline is projected to set in immediately after 2000. By 2050, Europe would have lost some 100 million inhabitants and would therefore have a population of only about 628 million, or 14 per cent less than in 1995. (The results of the 1998 Revision are shown in the annex tables.) By 2050, out of this total population of 628 million, 27 million, or 4.3 per cent, would be post-1995 immigrants or their descendants. Up to 2010, the population aged 15-64 would register diminishing increases; having topped at some 497 million in 2010, it would thereafter decline rapidly. By 2050, the working-age population of Europe would be down to 364 million, a 25 per cent reduction in relation to the 1995 level. On the other hand, the population aged 65 or older would rise steadily, from 101 million in 1995 to nearly 173 million in 2050. As a result, the potential support ratio would be severely reduced, from 4.8 in 1995 to 2.1 in 2050.

## (c) Scenario II

Scenario II, which is the medium variant with zero migration, uses the fertility and mortality assumptions of the medium variant of the 1998 Revision, but without any migration to Europe after 1995. The results in this scenario show that in the absence of migration, the total population would start decreasing immediately after 1995, and by 2050 it would be down to 600 million, approximately 27 million less than in scenario I and some 127 million (or 18 per cent) down from the 1995 level. The population aged 15-64 would initially continue to rise, going from 487 million in 1995 to 493 million in 2005; thereafter it would drop steadily to reach 345 million in 2050, a decline of almost 30 per cent in relation to 1995. The population aged 65 or older would increase from 101 million in 1995 to 169 million in 2050. While the absence of migration means considerably smaller population numbers, it would impact less on the population aging process: the potential support ratio would decline to 2.0 in 2050, which is only marginally lower than the figure (2.1) in scenario I.
(d) Scenario III

Scenario III keeps the size of the total population of Europe constant at its maximum of 728 million and calculates the number of migrants that would be required in order to prevent the decline of the population in the face of an increasing excess of deaths over births. The calculations show that a net total of 100 million migrants would be required during the period 1995-2050 just to maintain the total
population of Europe at its 1995 level. This corresponds to an average of approximately 1.8 million net migrants per year. By 2050, out of a total population of 728 million, 127 million, or close to 18 per cent, would be post-1995 immigrants or their descendants.

## (e) Scenario IV

Scenario IV keeps the size of the population aged 15 to 64 constant at 492.6 million, which is the maximum level that it would reach (in 2005) in absence of migration after 1995. The calculations show that the number of migrants that would be required to prevent the decline of the working age population after that point would total 161 million over the period 2005-2050, or a net average of approximately 3.6 million migrants per year during those 45 years. This would cause the total population to grow from 728 million in 1995 to 809 million in 2050; out of these 809 million people, some 209 million, or 26 per cent, would be post-2005 immigrants or their descendants.

## (f) Scenario V

Scenario V does not allow the potential support ratio to decrease below the value of 3.0. For this to happen, no immigrants would be needed until 2025 , and 235 million immigrants would be needed between 2025 and 2050, an average of 9.4 million per year during that period. By 2050, out of a total population of 895 million, 294 million, or 33 per cent, would be post-1995 immigrants or their descendants.

## (g) Scenario VI

Scenario VI keeps the potential support ratio at its 1995 value of 4.8 persons aged 15-64 years for each person aged 65 years or older. In order to keep the potential support ratio constant at that level, it would be necessary to have almost 1.4 billion immigrants from 1995 to 2050, an average of 25.2 million a year. By 2050, the population of Europe would have grown to 2.3 billion out of which 1.7 billion, or almost three quarters, would be post-1995 immigrants or their descendants.

## (h) Additional considerations

The United Nations estimate of the average net total number of migrants in Europe around 1997 is 950,000 per year. This level would be about half the long-term average net number of migrants required to prevent the total population from declining; one third of the number required to prevent the workingage population from declining; and about 4 per cent of the number required to maintain the potential support ratio at its 1995 level. Figure 25 shows, for scenarios I, II, III and IV, the population of Europe in 2050, indicating the share that is made up of post-1995 migrants and their descendants.

In the absence of migration, the calculations in this report indicate that the upper limit of the working age would need to be raised to 69.8 years in order to obtain in 2050 a potential support ratio of 3.0, and to about 75 years in order to obtain in 2050 the same potential support ratio observed in Europe in 1995, which was 4.8 persons of working age per older person.

Table 26. Population indicators for Europe by period for each scenario

| Scenario | I | II | III | IV | V | VI * |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Period | Medium variant | Medium variant with zero migration | Constant total population | Constant age group 15-64 | $\begin{gathered} \text { Ratio 15- } \\ 64 / 65 \text { not less } \\ \text { than } 3.0 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Constant ratio } \\ \text { 15-64/65 years or } \\ \text { older } \end{gathered}$ |
| A. Average annual number of migrants (thousands) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1995-2000 | 950 | 0 | 854 | 0 | 0 | 5844 |
| 2000-2025 | 486 | 0 | 1323 | 2696 | 0 | 17246 |
| 2025-2050 | 265 | 0 | 2511 | 3758 | 9402 | 37031 |
| 2000-2050 | 376 | 0 | 1917 | 3227 | 4701 | 27139 |
| 1995-2050 | 428 | 0 | 1821 | 2934 | 4274 | 25203 |
| B. Total number of migrants (thousands) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1995-2000 | 4750 | 0 | 4270 | 0 | 0 | 29220 |
| 2000-2025 | 12162 | 0 | 33081 | 67393 | 0 | 431153 |
| 2025-2050 | 6617 | 0 | 62787 | 93953 | 235044 | 925779 |
| 2000-2050 | 18779 | 0 | 95869 | 161346 | 235044 | 1356932 |
| 1995-2050 | 23530 | 0 | 100137 | 161346 | 235044 | 1386151 |
| C. Total population (thousands) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1950 | 547318 | - | - | - | - | - |
| 1975 | 676390 | - | - | - | - | - |
| 1995 | 727912 | - | - | - | - | - |
| 2000 | 728887 | 723482 | 727912 | 723482 | 723434 | 753810 |
| 2025 | 702335 | 684055 | 727912 | 759766 | 684189 | 1212912 |
| 2050 | 627691 | 600464 | 727912 | 809399 | 894776 | 2346459 |
| D. Age group 0-14 (thousands) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1950 | 143174 | - | - | - | - | - |
| 1975 | 160557 | - | - | - | - | - |
| 1995 | 139464 | - | - | - | - | - |
| 2000 | 127346 | 125509 | 126643 | 125509 | 125500 | 133272 |
| 2025 | 103212 | 100408 | 110158 | 119218 | 100400 | 223700 |
| 2050 | 90430 | 86378 | 112731 | 129140 | 152282 | 456670 |
| E. Age group 15-64 (thousands) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1950 | 359162 | - | - | - | - | - |
| 1975 | 438455 | - | - | - | - | - |
| 1995 | 487110 | - | - | - | - | - |
| 2000 | 494102 | 492142 | 495287 | 492142 | 492222 | 513673 |
| 2025 | 451599 | 438874 | 470673 | 492555 | 438988 | 818857 |
| 2050 | 364277 | 345100 | 432959 | 492555 | 556871 | 1564343 |
| F. Age group 65+ (thousands) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1950 | 44981 | - | - | - | - | - |
| 1975 | 77377 | - | - | - | - | - |
| 1995 | 101338 | - | - | - | - | - |
| 2000 | 107439 | 105831 | 105982 | 105831 | 105712 | 106865 |
| 2025 | 147524 | 144774 | 147081 | 147993 | 144801 | 170355 |
| 2050 | 172985 | 168986 | 182222 | 187704 | 185624 | 325446 |
| G. Potential support ratio 15-64/65+ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1950 | 7.98 | - | - | - | - | - |
| 1975 | 5.67 | - | - | - | - | - |
| 1995 | 4.80 | - | - | - | - | - |
| 2000 | 4.60 | 4.65 | 4.67 | 4.65 | 4.66 | 4.81 |
| 2025 | 3.06 | 3.03 | 3.20 | 3.33 | 3.03 | 4.81 |
| 2050 | 2.11 | 2.04 | 2.38 | 2.62 | 3.00 | 4.81 |
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Figure 24. Age-sex structures by scenario for 2000, 2025 and 2050
(Population in millions)
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Figure 25. Population of Europe in 2050, indicating those who are post-1995 migrants and their descendants, by scenario


Scenario

## 10. European Union

## (a) Past trends

The total fertility rate in the 15 countries that presently constitute the European Union was on a rising curve until 1960-65, when it attained 2.69 births per woman. Since 1995, fertility has constantly decreased, falling below the replacement level of two children per woman around 1975. By 1990-95, fertility stood at 1.5 births per woman. Life expectancy at birth, meanwhile, rose from 67.0 years in 1950-1955 to 76.5 years in 1990-1995. As a consequence of these trends, the proportion of the population aged 65 or older rose from 9.5 per cent in 1950 to 15.5 per cent in 1995, and the potential support ratio (the number of persons aged 15-64 for each person aged 65 or older) fell in the same period, from 7.0 to 4.3 .

## (b) Scenario I

Scenario I, the medium variant of the United Nations population projections in the 1998 Revision, assumes an average net intake very close to 300,000 migrants per year between 1995-2050, for a total of almost 16.4 migrants during the period. The medium variant projects that the total population of the 15 countries would briefly continue to grow until around 2005, by which time it would attain 376.5 million; from that point, it would start to decline at increasing speed, so that by 2050 some 331.3 million people would remain a loss of 40.6 million persons in relation to 1995 and 45.2 million persons in relation to the projected peak level in 2005 (the results of the 1998 United Nations projections are shown in the annex tables). This loss would be equivalent to the combined present population of the seven smallest members of the European Union: Austria, Denmark, Finland, Ireland, Luxembourg, Portugal and Sweden (see table 27). By 2050, the population of the European Union, which in 1995 was some 100 million larger than that of the United States, would be smaller than that of the United States by about 20 million.

The population aged 15-64 would first register a slight increase from 249 million in 1995 to less than 252 million in 2005, but it would be followed by an accelerating decline that would bring it down to slightly under 188 million by 2050. The projected decline ( 61.5 million between 1995 and 2050) would thus reduce the working-age population by one quarter in relation to 1995 levels. On the other hand, the population aged 65 or older would register steady growth, rising from 58 million in 1995 to 96 million in 2050, an increase of approximately 65 per cent. As a result, the potential support ratio would decrease from 4.3 in 1995 to slightly less than 2.0 in 2050.
(c) Scenario II

Scenario II, which is the medium variant with zero migration, uses the fertility and mortality assumptions of the medium variant of the 1998 Revision, but without any migration to the 15 countries of the European Union after 1995. In this scenario, the total population would start declining after 2000 rather than five years later, and by 2050 it would be down to approximately 311 million, which is 20 million less than in scenario I. The population aged 15-64 would immediately start declining, dropping from 249 million in 1995 to 174 million in 2050. Thus, without migration, the working age population would be cut by 30 per cent rather then by 25 per cent as in scenario I. The population aged 65 or older would increase from 58 million in 1995 to 92 million in 2050, entailing a decline of the potential support ratio to 1.9 in 2050, 0.1 less than that projected in scenario I.

Table 27. Population of the member countries of the European Union, 1995 and 2050, scenario I

| Member countries as of 2000 | Population (thousands) |  | Projected change 1995-2050 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1995 | 2050 (Scenario I) | (Thousands) | (Percentage) |
| Austria | 8001 | 7094 | -907 | - 11.3 |
| Belgium | 10088 | 8918 | -1170 | - 11.6 |
| Denmark | 5225 | 4793 | - 567 | - 10.9 |
| Finland | 5108 | 4898 | -210 | -4.1 |
| France | 58020 | 59883 | 1863 | +3.2 |
| Germany | 81661 | 73303 | - 8358 | - 10.2 |
| Greece | 10489 | 8233 | - 2256 | - 21.5 |
| Ireland | 3609 | 4710 | 1101 | +30.5 |
| Italy | 57338 | 41197 | -16141 | -28.2 |
| Luxembourg | 407 | 430 | 23 | + 5.7 |
| Netherlands | 15459 | 14156 | -1303 | - 8.4 |
| Portugal | 9856 | 8137 | -1719 | - 17.4 |
| Spain | 39568 | 30226 | 9342 | -23.6 |
| Sweden | 8800 | 8661 | -139 | -1.6 |
| United Kingdom | 58308 | 56667 | -1641 | -2.8 |
| European Union | 371937 | 331307 | -40630 | -10.9 |

## (d) Scenario III

Scenario III keeps the size of the total population constant at its projected peak level of 372 million in 2000 (assuming no in-migration in the period 1995-2000). In order to keep the total population constant at that level, 47.4 million migrants would be necessary between 2000 and 2050, an average of 949,000 migrants per year. By 2050 , out of a total population of 372 million, 61.6 million, or 16.5 per cent, would be post-2000 immigrants or their descendants. The potential support ratio in 2050 would be 2.2 , which is only 0.2 point higher than in scenario I.

## (e) Scenario IV

Scenario IV keeps the size of the population aged 15-64 constant at its 1995 level of 249 million, which would be the maximum level that it would ever reach in the absence of post-1995 migration. In order to keep the working-age population constant at that level, it would in fact be necessary to have 79.6 million migrants between 1995 and 2050, an average of 1.4 million migrants per year. Owing to irregularities in the age structure of the population, the annual number of migrants required to keep the working-age population constant would first increase rapidly and then decline. It would peak in 20252030 , with an annual number of net migrants in excess of 2.8 million. By 2050, out of a total population of 418.5 million, post-1995 immigrants and their descendants would be 107.7 million, or 25.7 per cent. The potential support ratio in 2050 according to this scenario would be significantly higher than in scenario I, (2.4 as opposed to 2.0 ), but the difference is modest compared to the magnitude of the drop from the level of 4.3 in 1995.

## (f) Scenario V

Scenario V does not allow the potential support ratio to decrease below the value of 3.0. In order to achieve this, no immigrants would be needed until 2015 , and 153.6 million immigrants would be needed between 2015 and 2040, an average of 6.1 million per year during that period. By 2050, out of a total population of 520 million, 209 million, or 40 per cent, would be post-1995 immigrants or their descendants.

## (g) Scenario VI

Scenario VI keeps the potential support ratio at its 1995 value of 4.3 persons aged 15-64 for each person aged 65 or older. In order to keep the potential support ratio constant at that level, the European Union would need 701 million immigrants from 1995 to 2050, an average of 12.7 million per year. Also, as under scenario IV, the irregularities in the age structure of the population would cause fluctuations in the annual number of migrants required to keep the potential support ratio constant. The peak levels would be attained in 2030-2035, with 20.3 million net immigrants per year. By 2050, out of a total population of 1.2 billion, 918 million, or about 75 per cent, would be post-1995 immigrants or their descendants.

## (h) Additional considerations

According to recent national estimates, the European Union had an average annual net migration of 857,000 persons from 1990 to 1998 . Thus, the number of migrants needed to prevent a decline in the total population is roughly comparable to the level of migration in the 1990s. However, in order to prevent a decline in the working-age population, the annual number of migrants would need to nearly double in relation to recent experience. Figure 26 shows, for scenarios I, II, III and IV, the population of the European Union in 2050, indicating the share that is made up of post-1995 migrants and their descendants.

The annual number of migrants necessary to keep the potential support ratio constant at its 1995 level would be 15 times greater than the net migration level in the 1990s. Towards the end of the period, i.e. by 2040-2050, the net annual number of migrants required by the European Union would be equivalent to half the world's annual population growth.

Thus, if replacement migration were to be used as the mechanism for shoring up the potential support ratio in the European Union at its present level, by 2050 the total population of the European Union would have grown to more than three times its present level. In this process, the European Union's share of world population would have more than doubled, from 6.6 per cent in 1995 to 13.8 per cent 2050. In addition, three quarters of the total population in 2050 would consist of post-1995 migrants from outside the present boundaries of the Union and their descendants.

In the absence of migration, the calculations in this report indicate that the upper limit of the working age would need to be raised to 71.3 years to obtain a potential support ratio of 3.0 in 2050, and to about 76 years in order to obtain in 2050 the same potential support ratio observed in 1995 in the European Union, which was 4.3 persons of working age per older person.

Table 28. Population indicators for the European Union by period for each scenario

| Scenario | I | II | III | IV | $V$ | VI* |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Period | Medium variant | Medium variant with zero migration | Constant total population | Constant age group 15-64 | Ratio 15-64/65+ not less than 3.0 | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Constant ratio } \\ \text { 15-64/65 years } \\ \text { or older } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| A. Average annual number of migrants (thousands) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1995-2000 | 574 | 0 | 0 | 46 | 0 | 5302 |
| 2000-2025 | 330 | 0 | 612 | 1380 | 1793 | 8556 |
| 2025-2050 | 210 | 0 | 1287 | 1795 | 4352 | 18404 |
| 2000-2050 | 270 | 0 | 949 | 1588 | 3073 | 13480 |
| 1995-2050 | 297 | 0 | 863 | 1447 | 2794 | 12736 |
| B. Total number of migrants (thousands) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1995-2000 | 2870 | 0 | 0 | 230 | 0 | 26510 |
| 2000-2025 | 8239 | 0 | 15290 | 34502 | 44837 | 213911 |
| 2025-2050 | 5250 | 0 | 32166 | 44874 | 108808 | 460088 |
| 2000-2050 | 13489 | 0 | 47456 | 79375 | 153646 | 673999 |
| 1995-2050 | 16361 | 0 | 47456 | 79605 | 153646 | 700506 |
| C. Total population (thousands) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1950 | 296151 | - | - | - | - | - |
| 1975 | 349313 | - | - | - | - | - |
| 1995 | 371937 | - | - | - | - | - |
| 2000 | 375276 | 372440 | 372440 | 372680 | 372440 | 400089 |
| 2025 | 367342 | 354500 | 372440 | 394551 | 401916 | 641056 |
| 2050 | 331307 | 310839 | 372440 | 418509 | 519965 | 1228341 |
| D. Age group 0-14 (thousands) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1950 | 72524 | - | - | - | - | - |
| 1975 | 82958 | - | - | - | - | - |
| 1995 | 64740 | - | - | - | - | - |
| 2000 | 62380 | 61879 | 61879 | 61941 | 61879 | 69006 |
| 2025 | 52926 | 50320 | 54641 | 60204 | 62805 | 116157 |
| 2050 | 47856 | 44130 | 57445 | 65846 | 86786 | 237981 |
| E. Age group 15-64 (thousands) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1950 | 195578 | - | - | - | - | - |
| 1975 | 220708 | - | - | - | - | - |
| 1995 | 249382 | - | - | - | - | - |
| 2000 | 251299 | 249213 | 249213 | 249382 | 249213 | 268773 |
| 2025 | 230090 | 221083 | 233826 | 249382 | 254334 | 426112 |
| 2050 | 187851 | 174470 | 216929 | 249382 | 325575 | 803974 |
| F. Age group $65+$ (thousands) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1950 | 28049 | - | - | - | - | - |
| 1975 | 45647 | - | - | - | - | - |
| 1995 | 57815 | - | - | - | - | - |
| 2000 | 61596 | 61349 | 61349 | 61357 | 61349 | 62310 |
| 2025 | 84326 | 83096 | 83973 | 84964 | 84778 | 98786 |
| 2050 | 95600 | 92240 | 98067 | 103280 | 107603 | 186386 |
| G. Potential support ratio 15-64/65+ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1950 | 6.97 | - | - | - | - | - |
| 1975 | 4.84 | - | - | - | - | - |
| 1995 | 4.31 | - | - | - |  | - |
| 2000 | 4.08 | 4.06 | 4.06 | 4.06 | 4.06 | 4.31 |
| 2025 | 2.73 | 2.66 | 2.78 | 2.94 | 3.00 | 4.31 |
| 2050 | 1.96 | 1.89 | 2.21 | 2.41 | 3.03 | 4.31 |

[^11]Figure 26. Population of the European Union in 2050, indicating those who are post-1995 migrants and their descendants, by scenario
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Figure 27. Age-sex structures by scenario for 2000, 2025 and 2050
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## V. CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

The present study focuses on the question of whether replacement migration is a solution to population decline and population ageing. Replacement migration refers to the international migration that would be needed to offset declines in the size of a population, and declines in the population of working age, as well as to offset the overall ageing of a population.

The present study investigates the possible effects of international migration on the population size and age structure of a range of countries that have in common a fertility pattern below the replacement level. In the absence of migration, all countries with fertility below replacement level will see their population size start declining at some point of time in the near future, if this is not already the case today. In some countries, the projected declines in population size during the first half of the twenty-first century are as high as one quarter or one third of the entire population of the country.

In addition, the lower the levels of fertility decline, the more pronounced will be the ageing of the population of the country. One of the major consequences of population ageing is the reduction in the ratio between the population in working-age group 15-64 years and the population 65 years or older, or the potential support ratio (PSR). Everything else being equal, a lower potential support ratio means that it is much more onerous for the working-age population to support the needs of the older retired population.

While to some extent an increase in the proportion of elderly persons aged 65 years or older is accompanied by a decrease in the proportion of children under 15 years of age, the two age groups are not directly comparable. Some studies have estimated that for an industrialized country, on average, the cost of supporting a person aged 65 years and over is substantially greater than the cost of supporting a young person less than 20 years old. A number of researchers, including Foot (1989), Cutler, Poterba, Sheiner, and Summers (1990), and Ahlburg and Vaupel (1993), report that when considering the public provision of programme or taking into account private non-medical expenses, public education expenses and medical care, the costs are roughly two and a half times greater to support an older person (aged 65 or older) than to support a young person (under 20 years of age).

While below-replacement fertility is the major cause of population decline and population ageing, even a sudden sharp increase in fertility in the short to medium term would not substantially alter the situation regarding the potential support ratios. Of course, as was shown earlier in this report, the potential support ratios could be maintained at current levels by increasing the upper limit to the workingage population. In most cases, the upper limit would need to be raised to roughly 75 years. However, if retirement ages remain essentially where they are today, increasing the size of the working-age population through international migration is the only option in the short to medium term to reduce the declines in the potential support ratio.

The present study considers countries in which current fertility ranges from 1.2 to 2.0 children per woman. For France, the United Kingdom, the United States and the European Union, the number of migrants needed to offset population decline is less than or comparable to recent past experience. While this is also the case for Germany and the Russian Federation, their migration flows in the 1990s were relatively large due to reunification and dissolution respectively. In contrast, for Italy, Japan, the Republic of Korea and Europe, a level of immigration much higher than that experienced in the recent past would be needed to offset population decline. As a result of this higher level of immigration for Italy, Japan and Europe, 18 to 29 per cent of the 2050 population would be post-1995 immigrants and their descendants; for the Republic of Korea, the comparable figure is 3 per cent.

In the absence of migration, the size of the working-age population declines faster than the overall population. As a result of this faster rate of decline, the amount of migration needed to prevent a decline in the working-age population is larger than that for the overall population. In the four countries where fertility levels are close to the replacement level, the resultant population in 2050 would include 8 to 14 per cent post-1995 migrants and their descendants. In the other six countries and regions, the post-1995 migrants and their descendants would represent between 26 and 39 per cent of the 2050 population. While some of these numbers may appear to be high, they remain within the range of migration experienced in the recent past in some industrialized countries. For example, in 1990, 16 per cent of the population of Canada and Switzerland and 23 per cent of the population of Australia were foreign-born.

In contrast to the migration streams needed to offset total or working-age population decline, the levels of migration that would be needed to prevent the countries from ageing are of substantially larger magnitudes. By 2050, these larger migration flows would result in populations where the proportion of post-1995 migrants and their descendants would range between 59 per cent and 99 per cent.* Such high levels of migration have not been observed in the past for any of these countries or regions. Moreover, it seems extremely unlikely that such flows could happen in these countries in the foreseeable future. Therefore, it appears inevitable that the populations of the low-fertility countries will age rapidly in the twenty-first century.

The consequences of a much older population age-structure than in the past are numerous and farreaching. One important consideration that has been examined in this study is the potential support ratio. The current system of providing income and health services for older persons who are no longer working has been based, by and large, on an age structure with a potential support ratio of 4 to 5 persons in working-age for each older person aged 65 years or older. If the current age at retirement does not change, the PSR is projected to decline to about 2 .

A decline of the PSR from 4 or 5 to 2 , or even to 3 , would certainly create the need to reconsider seriously the modalities of the present system of pensions and health care for the elderly. Theoretically, as noted above, a possible option would be to increase the upper limit of the working age sufficiently to attain a sustainable PSR. Such an option would simultaneously increase the number of working-age persons and reduce the number of non-working older persons. Other possible options that may need to be examined thoroughly include the adjustment of economic measures, such as increased labour-force participation, higher contributions from workers and employers, and lower benefits provided to retirees. Certainly, increased productivity in the future may increase the available resources from the working-age population. However, it is also possible that increased productivity may lead to increased aspirations and demands from both the working-age and the retired populations.

During the second half of the twentieth century, the industrialized countries have benefited from population sizes and population age-structures that were the result of a history of moderate levels of fertility and low mortality. These favourable demographic circumstances made possible, to a large extent, the provision of relatively generous benefits to retirees at comparatively low costs to workers and employers. However, these age-structures were not permanent, but merely transitional.

During the first half of the twenty-first century, the populations of most industrialized countries are projected to become smaller and older in response to below-replacement fertility as well as increased longevity. The consequences of significant population decline and population ageing are not well under-

[^12]stood as they are new demographic experiences for countries. Keeping retirement and health-care systems for older persons solvent in the face of declining and ageing populations, for example, constitutes a new situation that poses serious challenges for Governments and civil society.

Finally, the new challenges being brought about by declining and ageing populations will require objective, thorough and comprehensive reassessments of many established economic, social and political policies and programmes. Such reassessments will need to incorporate a long-term perspective. Critical issues to be addressed in those reassessments would include (a) appropriate ages for retirement; (b) levels, types and nature of retirement and health-care benefits for the elderly; (c) labour-force participation; (d) assessed amounts of contributions from workers and employers needed to support retirement and healthcare benefits for the increasing elderly population; and (e) policies and programmes relating to international migration, in particular replacement migration, and the integration of large numbers of recent migrants and their descendants. In this context, it should be noted that immigrants to one country are emigrants from another country. As such, international migration must be seen as part of the larger globalization process taking place throughout the world, influencing the economic, political and cultural character of both sending and receiving countries. While orderly international migration can provide countries of origin with remittances and facilitate the transfer of skills and technology, it also may entail the loss of needed human resources. Similarly, international migration can provide countries of destination with needed human resources and talent, but may also give rise to social tensions. Effective international migration policies must therefore take into account the impact on both the host society and countries of origin.

## ANNEX TABLES

Table A.1. France, 1998 Revision

## FRANCE

| Indicator | A. ESTIMATES |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1950 | 1955 | 1960 | 1965 | 1970 | 1975 | 1980 | 1985 | 1990 | 1995 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Population (thousands) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total.. | 41829 | 43428 | 45684 | 48758 | 50772 | 52699 | 53880 | 55170 | 56718 | 58020 |
| Males. | 20105 | 20971 | 22162 | 23737 | 24792 | 25807 | 26312 | 26900 | 27613 | 28279 |
| Females.............................................. | 21723 | 22457 | 23522 | 25021 | 25980 | 26892 | 27568 | 28270 | 29104 | 29741 |
| Sex ratio (per 100 females)............................ | 92.6 | 93.4 | 94.2 | 94.9 | 95.4 | 96.0 | 95.4 | 95.2 | 94.9 | 95.1 |
| Age distribution: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percentage aged 0-4. | 9.5 | 9.0 | 8.8 | 8.7 | 8.3 | 7.8 | 6.9 | 6.9 | 6.7 | 6.3 |
| Percentage aged 5-14. | 13.2 | 15.4 | 17.6 | 16.9 | 16.5 | 16.1 | 15.4 | 14.3 | 13.6 | 13.2 |
| Percentage aged 15-24. | 15.2 | 13.7 | 12.4 | 14.5 | 16.4 | 16.1 | 15.8 | 15.5 | 15.0 | 14.0 |
| Percentage aged 60 or over......................... | 16.2 | 16.3 | 16.8 | 17.5 | 18.1 | 18.3 | 17.2 | 18.2 | 19.1 | 20.0 |
| Percentage aged 65 or over.. | 11.4 | 11.6 | 11.6 | 12.1 | 12.9 | 13.5 | 14.0 | 13.0 | 14.0 | 15.0 |
| Percentage of women aged 15-49............... | 47.3 | 44.9 | 42.6 | 43.4 | 46.1 | 46.2 | 46.9 | 47.6 | 48.6 | 49.1 |
| Median age (years)... | 34.5 | 32.9 | 33.0 | 32.7 | 32.3 | 31.6 | 32.5 | 33.7 | 34.7 | 36.1 |
| Population density (per sq km) ....................... | 76 | 79 | 83 | 88 | 92 | 96 | 98 | 100 | 103 | 105 |
|  | 1950-1955 | 1955-1960 | 1960-1965 | 1965-1970 | 1970-1975 | 1975-1980 | 1980-1985 | 1985-1990 | 1990-1995 |  |
| Population change per year (thousands)............ | 320 | 451 | 615 | 403 | 385 | 236 | 258 | 309 | 260 |  |
| Births per year (thousands)............................ | 830 | 818 | 852 | 853 | 841 | 746 | 792 | 772 | 734 |  |
| Deaths per year (thousands)........................... | 544 | 525 | 531 | 551 | 551 | 547 | 555 | 531 | 546 |  |
| Population growth rate (percentage)................. | 0.75 | 1.01 | 1.30 | 0.81 | 0.75 | 0.44 | 0.47 | 0.55 | 0.45 |  |
| Crude birth rate (per 1,000 population)............. | 19.5 | 18.4 | 18.0 | 17.2 | 16.3 | 14.0 | 14.5 | 13.8 | 12.8 |  |
| Crude death rate (per 1,000 population)............ | 12.8 | 11.8 | 11.2 | 11.1 | 10.7 | 10.3 | 10.2 | 9.5 | 9.5 |  |
| Total fertility rate (per woman)....................... | 2.73 | 2.71 | 2.85 | 2.61 | 2.31 | 1.86 | 1.87 | 1.81 | 1.72 |  |
| Gross reproduction rate (per woman)................ | 1.33 | 1.32 | 1.39 | 1.27 | 1.13 | 0.91 | 0.91 | 0.88 | 0.84 |  |
| Net reproduction rate (per woman).................. | 1.26 | 1.27 | 1.34 | 1.23 | 1.10 | 0.89 | 0.90 | 0.87 | 0.83 |  |
| Infant mortality rate (per 1,000 births)............... | 45 | 33 | 25 | 21 | 16 | 11 | 9 | 8 | 7 |  |
| Life expectancy at birth (years) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Males. | 63.7 | 66.5 | 67.6 | 67.9 | 68.6 | 69.7 | 70.8 | 72.0 | 73.4 |  |
| Females ............................................. | 69.5 | 72.9 | 74.5 | 75.4 | 76.3 | 77.8 | 78.9 | 80.3 | 81.5 |  |
| Both sexes combined................................ | 66.5 | 69.6 | 71.0 | 71.5 | 72.4 | 73.7 | 74.7 | 76.0 | 77.1 |  |

B. MEDIUN:-VARIANT PROJECTIONS

|  | 1995 | 2000 | 2005 | 2010 | 2015 | 2020 | 2025 | 2030 | 2040 | 2050 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Population (thousands) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 58020 | 59080 | 59925 | 60597 | 61108 | 61500 | 61662 | 61632 | 60998 | 59883 |
| Males........................................................ | 28279 | 28798 | 29208 | 29519 | 29759 | 29948 | 30019 | 29984 | 29623 | 29117 |
| Females............................................... | 29741 | 30281 | 30718 | 31078 | 31349 | 31553 | 31643 | 31648 | 31375 | 30766 |
| Sex ratio (per 100 females)........................... | 95.1 | 95.1 | 95.1 | 95.0 | 94.9 | 94.9 | 94.9 | 94.7 | 94. | 94.6 |
| Age distribution: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percentage aged 0-4... | 6.3 | 6.0 | 5.9 | 5.8 | 5.8 | 5.8 | 5.6 | 5.5 | 5.5 | 5.6 |
| Percentage aged 5-14 | 13.2 | 12.7 | 12.1 | 11.7 | 11.5 | 11.5 | 11.5 | 11.4 | 11.0 | 11.2 |
| Percentage aged 15-24. | 14.0 | 13.1 | 12.8 | 12.4 | +1.8 | 11.5 | 11.4 | 11.4 | 11.5 | 11.2 |
| Percentage aged 60 or over........................ | 20.0 | 20.5 | 20.9 | 22.9 | 24.8 | 26.5 | 28.1 | 29.5 | 31.1 | 31.4 |
| Percentage aged 65 or over....................... | 15.0 | 15.9 | 16.4 | 16.6 | 18.4 | 20.1 | 21.7 | 23.2 | 25.3 | 25.5 |
| Percentage in school ages 6-11. | 7.9 | 7.6 | 7.2 | 7.0 | 6.9 | 6.9 | 6.9 | 6.8 | 6.6 | 6.7 |
| Percentage in school ages 12-14. | 4.0 | 3.9 | 3.7 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.4 | 3.4 | 3.5 | 3.3 | 3.3 |
| Percentage in school ages 15-17................. | 4.0 | 3.9 | 3.8 | 3.6 | 3.5 | 3.4 | 3.4 | 3.5 | 3.4 | 3.3 |
| Percentage in school ages 18-23................ | 8.6 | 7.8 | 7.7 | 7.5 | 7.1 | 6.9 | 6.8 | 6.8 | 7.0 | 6.8 |
| Percentage of women aged 15-49............... | 49.1 | 47.7 | 46.1 | 44.4 | 42.6 | 41.0 | 39.7 | 39.1 | 38.4 | 38.4 |
| Median age (years)...................................... | 36.1 | 37.6 | 39.0 | 40.3 | 41.5 | 42.3 | 43.0 | 43.6 | 44.1 | 43.9 |
| Population density (per sq km)......................... | 105 | 107 | 109 | 110 | 111 | 112 | 112 | 112 | 111 | 109 |
|  | 1995-2000 | 2000-2005 | 2005-2010 | 2010-2015 | 2015-2020 | 2020-2025 | 2025-2030 | 2030-2040 | 2040-2050 |  |


| Population change per year (thousands)............ | 212 | 169 | 134 | 102 | 78 | 32 | -6 | -63 | -112 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Births per year (thousands).............................. | 715 | 705 | 706 | 712 | 719 | 699 | 682 | 673 | 670 |
| Deaths per year (thousands). | 543 | 566 | 591 | 620 | 646 | 667 | 688 | 737 | 782 |
| Net migration per year (thousands). | 40 | 30 | 20 | 10 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Population growth rate (percentage). | 0.36 | 0.28 | 0.22 | 0.17 | 0.13 | 0.05 | -0.01 | -0.10 | -0.18 |
| Crude birth rate (per 1,000 population) | 12.2 | 11.8 | 11.7 | 11.7 | 11.7 | 11.3 | 11.1 | 11.0 | 11.1 |
| Crude death rate (per 1,000 population). | 9.3 | 9.5 | 9.8 | 10.2 | 10.5 | 10.8 | 11.2 | 12.0 | 12.9 |
| Net migration rate (per 1,000 population).......... | 0.7 | 0.5 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total fertility rate (per woman)........................... | 1.71 | 1.75 | 1.82 | 1.89 | 1.96 | 1.96 | 1.96 | 1.96 | 1.96 |
| Gross reproduction rate (per woman). | 0.83 | 0.85 | 0.89 | 0.92 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 |
| Net reproduction rate (per woman).. | 0.82 | 0.84 | 0.88 | 0.91 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 |
| Infant mortality rate (per 1,000 births)................ | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| Mortality under age 5 (per 1,000 births)............. | 8 | 7 | 7 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 5 |
| Life expectancy at birth (years) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Males... | 74.2 | 75.0 | 75.5 | 76.0 | 76.5 | 77.0 | 77.5 | 78.1 | 78.9 |
| Females. | 82.0 | 82.5 | 83.0 | 83.4 | 83.8 | 84.2 | 84.6 | 85.2 | 86.0 |
| Both sexes combined................................. | 78.1 | 78.8 | 79.2 | 79.7 | 80.1 | 80.6 | 81.1 | 81.6 | 82.4 |

Source: United Nations Population Division, World Population Prospects: The 1998 Revision.

Table A. 1 (continued)
FRANCE
C. HIGH-VARIANT PROJECTIONS

|  | 1995 | 2000 | 2005 | 2010 | 2015 | 2020 | 2025 | 2030 | 2040 | 2050 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Population (thousands) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total........................ | 58020 | 59163 | 60308 | 61327 | 62232 | 63075 | 63909 | 64646 | 66072 | 67413 |
| Males. | 28279 | 28841 | 29404 | 29893 | 30335 | 30755 | 31171 | 31528 | 32222 | 32972 |
| Females. | 29741 | 30322 | 30904 | 31433 | 31897 | 32320 | 32739 | 33118 | 33850 | 34441 |
| Age distribution: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percentage aged 0-4. | 6.3 | 6.2 | 6.3 | 6.3 | 6.3 | 6.4 | 6.5 | 6.4 | 6.7 | 6.9 |
| Percentage aged 5-14. | 132 | 12.7 | 12.1 | 12.2 | 12.3 | 12.4 | 12.5 | 12.6 | 12.9 | 13.3 |
| Percentage aged 15-24............................... | 14.0 | 13.1 | 12.8 | 12.2 | 11.8 | 11.8 | 12.0 | 12.0 | 12.3 | 12.6 |
| Percentage aged 60 or over........................ | 20.0 | 20.5 | 20.8 | 22.6 | 24.4 | 25.9 | 27.1 | 28.2 | 28.7 | 27.9 |
| Percentage aged 65 or over......................... | 15.0 | 15.9 | 16.3 | 16.4 | 18.1 | 19.6 | 20.9 | 22.1 | 23.3 | 22.7 |
| Percentage of women aged 15-49................ | 49.1 | 47.6 | 45.8 | 43.9 | 42.0 | 40.6 | 39.4 | 39.0 | 38.8 | 39.8 |
| Median age (years)......................................... | 36.1 | 37.6 | 38.8 | 39.9 | 40.8 | 41.3 | 41.5 | 41.6 | 40.6 | 39.5 |

D. LOW-VARIANT PROJECTIONS

|  | 1995 | 2000 | 2005 | 2010 | 2015 | 2020 | 2025 | 2030 | 2040 | 2050 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Population (thousands) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total. | 58020 | 59017 | 59523 | 59694 | 59587 | 59242 | 58647 | 57786 | 55150 | 51680 |
| Males. | 28279 | 28766 | 29001 | 29056 | 28979 | 28790 | 28474 | 28013 | 26628 | 24919 |
| Females. | 29741 | 30251 | 30521 | 30638 | 30608 | 30452 | 30173 | 29773 | 28522 | 26760 |
| Age distribution: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percentage aged 0-4. | 6.3 | 5.9 | 5.3 | 5.0 | 4.9 | 4.8 | 4.6 | 4.4 | 4.1 | 4.1 |
| Percentage aged 5-14. | 13.2 | 12.7 | 12.0 | 11.2 | 10.4 | 10.0 | 9.8 | 9.6 | 9.0 | 8.6 |
| Percentage aged 15-24. | 14.0 | 13.1 | 12.9 | 12.6 | 12.0 | 11.3 | 10.5 | 10.2 | 10.0 | 9.6 |
| Percentage aged 60 or over. | 20.0 | 20.5 | 21.0 | 23.2 | 25.5 | 27.5 | 29.6 | 31.5 | 34.4 | 36.4 |
| Percentage aged 65 or over......................... | 15.0 | 15.9 | 16.5 | 16.9 | 18.9 | 20.9 | 22.8 | 24.7 | 27.9 | 29.6 |
| Percentage of women aged 15-49................ | 49.1 | 47.7 | 46.4 | 45.0 | 43.5 | 41.8 | 40.1 | 39.1 | 37.1 | 35.5 |
| Median age (years). | 36.1 | 37.6 | 39.3 | 40.9 | 42.4 | 43.8 | 44.9 | 46.1 | 48.2 | 49.8 |
|  | 1995-2000 | 2000-2005 | 2005-2010 | 2010-2015 | 2015-2020 | 2020-2025 | 2025-2030 | 2030-2040 | 2040-2050 |  |
| Population change per year (thousands)............ | 199 | 101 | 34 | -21 | -69 | -119 | -172 | -264 | -347 |  |
| Population growth rate (percentage)................... | 0.34 | 0.17 | 0.06 | -0.04 | -0.12 | -0.20 | -0.30 | -0.47 | -0.65 |  |
| Crude birth rate (per 1,000 population)............... | 12.0 | 10.7 | 10.1 | 9.9 | 9.6 | 9.3 | 8.8 | 8.3 | 8.1 |  |
| Crude death rate (per 1,000 population)............. | 9.3 | 9.5 | 9.9 | 10.4 | 10.9 | 11.3 | 11.8 | 13.0 | 14.6 |  |
| Net migration rate (per 1,000 ponulation)........... | 0.7 | 0.5 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Total fertility rate (per woma. ; ........................... | 1.68 | 1.58 | 1.56 | 1.56 | 1.56 | 1.56 | 1.56 | 1.56 | 1.56 |  |
| Gross reproduction rate (per woman)................. | 0.82 | 0.77 | 0.76 | 0.76 | 0.76 | 0.76 | 0.76 | 0.76 | 0.76 |  |
| Net reproduction rate (per woman).................... | 0.81 | 0.76 | 0.75 | 0.75 | 0.75 | 0.75 | 0.75 | 0.75 | 0.75 |  |

E. CONSTANT-VARIANT PROJECTIONS

|  | 1995 | 2000 | 2005 | 2010 | 2015 | 2020 | 2025 | 2030 | 2040 | 2050 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Population (thousands) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total... | 58020 | 59107 | 59898 | 60383 | 60582 | 60544 | 60285 | 59819 | 58106 | 55602 |



Source: United Nations Population Division, World Population Prospects: The 1998 Revision.

Table A.2. France, replacement migration scenarios
FRANCE

|  | Scenario | I | II | III | IV | V |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Medium | Medium | Constant | Constant | VI |
| Period |  | variant | zero migration | total | age group | Ratio 15-64/65+ |
|  |  |  | population | 15-64 | not less than 3.0 | or older |


| 1995-2000 | 40 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 842 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2000-2005 | 30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 333 |
| 2005-2010 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 219 |
| 2010-2015 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 179 | 0 | 1934 |
| 2015-2020 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 207 | 0 | 1988 |
| 2020-2025 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 182 | 783 | 1937 |
| 2025-2030 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 155 | 1064 | 2002 |
| 2030-2035 | 0 | 0 | 42 | 113 | 811 | 2046 |
| 2035-2040 | 0 | 0 | 70 | 117 | 546 | 2204 |
| 2040-2045 | 0 | 0 | 86 | 54 | 0 | 2057 |
| 2045-2050 | 0 | 0 | 91 | 86 | 3 | 3196 |
| Grand total 1995-2050 | 525 | 0 | 1473 | 5459 | 16037 | 93794 |
| B. Total population (thousands) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1995 | 58020 | 58020 | 58020 | 58020 | 58020 | 58020 |
| 2000 | 59080 | 58879 | 58879 | 58879 | 58879 | 63310 |
| 2005 | 59925 | 59571 | 59571 | 59571 | 59571 | 66179 |
| 2010 | 60597 | 60139 | 60139 | 60139 | 60139 | 68436 |
| 2015 | 61108 | 60597 | 60597 | 61545 | 60597 | 79702 |
| 2020 | 61500 | 60960 | 60960 | 63112 | 60960 | 92232 |
| 2025 | 61662 | 61121 | 61121 | 64442 | 65283 | 105188 |
| 2030 | 61632 | 61091 | 61121 | 65505 | 71365 | 119014 |
| 2035 | 61401 | 60862 | 61121 | 66192 | 76441 | 133522 |
| 2040 | 60998 | 60462 | 61121 | 66750 | 80228 | 149345 |
| 2045 | 60474 | 59943 | 61121 | 66890 | 81089 | 164994 |
| 2050 | 59883 | 59357 | 61121 | 67130 | 81719 | 187193 |
| C. Age group 15-64 (thousands) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1995 | 37986 | 37986 | 37986 | 37986 | 37986 | 37986 |
| 2000 | 38620 | 38488 | 38488 | 38488 | 38488 | 41593 |
| 2005 | 39378 | 39145 | 39145 | 39145 | 39145 | 43734 |
| 2010 | 39925 | 39625 | 39625 | 39625 | 39625 | 45381 |
| 2015 | 39294 | 38965 | 38965 | 39625 | 38965 | 52319 |
| 2020 | 38483 | 38145 | 38145 | 39625 | 38145 | 59918 |
| 2025 | 37686 | 37355 | 37355 | 39625 | 40247 | 67847 |
| 2030 | 36919 | 36594 | 36615 | 39625 | 43661 | 76551 |
| 2035 | 36231 | 35913 | 36092 | 39625 | 46552 | 86078 |
| 2040 | 35512 | 35199 | 35652 | 39625 | 48753 | 96507 |
| 2045 | 35058 | 34750 | 35557 | 39625 | 49488 | 106826 |
| 2050 | 34586 | 34282 | 35493 | 39625 | 50152 | 121047 |
| D. Potential support ratio 15-64/65 or older |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1995 | 4.36 | 4.36 | 4.36 | 4.36 | 4.36 | 4.36 |
| 2000 | 4.10 | 4.10 | 4.10 | 4.10 | 4.10 | 4.36 |
| 2005 | 4.02 | 4.02 | 4.02 | 4.02 | 4.02 | 4.36 |
| 2010 | 3.96 | 3.96 | 3.96 | 3.96 | 3.96 | 4.36 |
| 2015 | 3.49 | 3.49 | 3.49 | 3.54 | 3.49 | 4.36 |
| 2020 | 3.11 | 3.11 | 3.11 | 3.20 | 3.11 | 4.36 |
| 2025 | 2.81 | 2.81 | 2.81 | 2.95 | 3.00 | 4.36 |
| 2030 | 2.59 | 2.59 | 2.59 | 2.76 | 3.00 | 4.36 |
| 2035 | 2.42 | 2.42 | 2.43 | 2.62 | 3.00 | 4.36 |
| 2040 | 2.31 | 2.31 | 2.33 | 2.53 | 3.00 | 4.36 |
| 2045 | 2.28 | 2.28 | 2.32 | 2.51 | 3.00 | 4.36 |
| 2050 | 2.26 | 2.26 | 2.33 | 2.49 | 3.00 | 4.36 |

Table A. 2 (continued)
FRANCE

| Scenario | 1 | 11 | III | IV | V | VI |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Period | Medium variant | Medium variant with zero migration | $\begin{gathered} \text { Constant } \\ \text { total } \\ \text { population } \end{gathered}$ | Constant age group 15-64 | Ratio 15-64/65+ not less than 3.0 | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Constant ratio } \\ 15-64 / 65 \text { years } \\ \text { or older } \end{gathered}$ |
| E. Age group 65 or older (thousands) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1995 | 8708 | 8708 | 8708 | 8708 | 8708 | 8708 |
| 2000 | 9413 | 9381 | 9381 | 9381 | 9381 | 9535 |
| 2005 | 9807 | 9749 | 9749 | 9749 | 9749 | 10026 |
| 2010 | 10087 | 10009 | 10009 | 10009 | 10009 | 10403 |
| 2015 | 11252 | 11158 | 11158 | 11191 | 11158 | 11994 |
| 2020 | 12389 | 12281 | 12281 | 12366 | 12281 | 13736 |
| 2025 | 13388 | 13271 | 13271 | 13417 | 13416 | 15554 |
| 2030 | 14275 | 14150 | 14151 | 14364 | 14554 | 17549 |
| 2035 | 14956 | 14825 | 14834 | 15114 | 15517 | 19733 |
| 2040 | 15402 | 15268 | 15294 | 15661 | 16251 | 22124 |
| 2045 | 15378 | 15243 | 15294 | 15786 | 16471 | 24490 |
| 2050 | 15285 | 15151 | 15234 | 15932 | 16717 | 27750 |
| F. Percentage in age group 65 or older |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1995 | 15.0 | 15.0 | 15.0 | 15.0 | 15.0 | 15.0 |
| 2000 | 15.9 | 15.9 | 15.9 | 15.9 | 15.9 | 15.1 |
| 2005 | 16.4 | 16.4 | 16.4 | 16.4 | 16.4 | 15.1 |
| 2010 | 16.6 | 16.6 | 16.6 | 16.6 | 16.6 | 15.2 |
| 2015 | 18.4 | 18.4 | 18.4 | 18.2 | 18.4 | 15.0 |
| 2020 | 20.1 | 20.1 | 20.1 | 19.6 | 20.1 | 14.9 |
| 2025 | 21.7 | 21.7 | 21.7 | 20.8 | 20.6 | 14.8 |
| 2030 | 23.2 | 23.2 | 23.2 | 21.9 | 20.4 | 14.7 |
| 2035 | 24.4 | 24.4 | 24.3 | 22.8 | 20.3 | 14.8 |
| 2040 | 25.2 | 25.3 | 25.0 | 23.5 | 20.3 | 14.8 |
| 2045 | 25.4 | 25.4 | 25.0 | 23.6 | 20.3 | 14.8 |
| 2050 | 25.5 | 25.5 | 24.9 | 23.7 | 20.5 | 14.8 |
| G. Age group 0-14 (thousands) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1995 | 11326 | 11326 | 11326 | 11326 | 11326 | 11326 |
| 2000 | 11047 | 11009 | 11009 | 11009 | 11009 | 12182 |
| 2005 | 10740 | 10677 | 10677 | 10677 | 10677 | 12419 |
| 2010 | 10585 | 10505 | 10505 | 10505 | 10505 | 12652 |
| 2015 | 10563 | 10475 | 10475 | 10729 | 10475 | 15390 |
| 2020 | 10627 | 10534 | 10534 | 11120 | 10534 | 18578 |
| 2025 | 10588 | 10495 | 10495 | 11399 | 11620 | 21788 |
| 2030 | 10438 | 10347 | 10355 | 11515 | 13150 | 24914 |
| 2035 | 10214 | 10124 | 10194 | 11453 | 14372 | 27711 |
| 2040 | 10084 | 9996 | 10175 | 11464 | 15223 | 30714 |
| 2045 | 10038 | 9950 | 10269 | 11478 | 15131 | 33677 |
| 2050 | 10012 | 9924 | 10393 | 11572 | 14850 | 38396 |
| H. Potential support ratio in 2050, by age at entry into non-working-age population |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Age |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 65 | 2.26 | 2.26 | 2.33 | 2.49 | 3.00 | 4.36 |
| 70 | 3.19 | 3.19 | 3.28 | 3.53 | 4.22 | 6.49 |
| 75 | 4.71 | 4.71 | 4.84 | 5.22 | 6.17 | 10.00 |
| 80 | 7.75 | 7.75 | 7.96 | 8.60 | 10.10 | 17.09 |

Note: The six scenarios can be described briefly as follows:
I - Corresponds to the medium variant of the official United Nations population projections (World Population Prospects, 1998 Revision).
II - This scenario amends the medium variant by assuming no migration after 1995.
III - This scenario keeps the total population figure constant at the highest level that it would reach in the absence of migration after 1995.
IV - This scenario keeps the number of persons aged 15-64 constant at the highest level that it would reach in the absence of migration after 1995.
V - This scenario prevents the ratio of persons aged 15-64 to persons aged 65 and above from falling below 3.0.
VI - This scenario keeps the ratio of persons aged 15-64 and above at the highest level that it would reach in the absence of migration after 1995. This scenario is considered to be demographically unrealistic.

Table A.3. Germany, 1998 REVISION

## GERMANY

| Indicator | A. ESTIMATES |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1950 | 1955 | 1960 | 1965 | 1970 | 1975 | 1980 | 1985 | 1990 | 1995 |
| Population (thousands) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total. | 68376 | 70326 | 72673 | 76031 | 77709 | 78679 | 78304 | 77668 | 79365 | 81661 |
| Males. | 31493 | 32573 | 33800 | 35795 | 36718 | 37322 | 37264 | 37051 | 38276 | 39731 |
| Females. | 36883 | 37753 | 38873 | 40236 | 40991 | 41357 | 41040 | 40617 | 41088 | 41930 |
| Sex ratio (per 100 females) | 85.4 | 86.3 | 87.0 | 89.0 | 89.6 | 90.2 | 90.8 | 91.2 | 93.2 | 94.8 |
| Age distribution: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percentage aged 0-4.................................. | 6.6 | 7.4 | 7.8 | 8.5 | 7.7 | 5.6 | 5.1 | 5.3 | 5.6 | 5.0 |
| Percentage aged 5-14.. | 16.6 | 13.8 | 13.4 | 14.4 | 15.6 | 16.0 | 13.4 | 10.7 | 10.5 | 11.2 |
| Percentage aged 15-24. | 14.3 | 15.8 | 15.8 | 13.1 | 12.8 | 14.5 | 16.1 | 16.5 | 13.7 | 11.3 |
| Percentage aged 60 or over. | 14.6 | 15.8 | 17.3 | 18.8 | 19.9 | 20.4 | 19.3 | 19.9 | 20.4 | 20.9 |
| Percentage aged 65 or over........................ | 9.7 | 10.7 | 11.5 | 12.5 | 13.7 | 14.8 | 15.6 | 14.6 | 15.0 | 15.5 |
| Percentage of women aged 15-49. | 50.6 | 49.6 | 46.6 | 43.5 | 44.4 | 45.0 | 47.0 | 48.8 | 47.2 | 46.6 |
| Median age (years). | 35.4 | 34.5 | 34.7 | 34.4 | 34.3 | 35.4 | 36.4 | 37.1 | 37.7 | 38.4 |
| Population density (per sq km). | 192 | 197 | 204 | 213 | 218 | 221 | 220 | 218 | 222 | 229 |
|  | 1950-1955 | 1955-1960 | 1960-1965 | 1965-1970 | 1970-1975 | 1975-1980 | 1980-1985 | 1985-1990 | 1990-1995 |  |
| Population change per year (thousands)........... | 390 | 469 | 672 | 336 | 194 | - 75 | - 127 | 339 | 459 |  |
| Births per year (thousands).. | 1106 | 1183 | 1330 | 1232 | 886 | 813 | 839 | 874 | 807 |  |
| Deaths per year (thousands)............................. | 771 | 829 | 880 | 950 | 961 | 957 | 938 | 916 | 894 |  |
| Population growth rate (percentage).................. | 0.56 | 0.66 | 0.90 | 0.44 | 0.25 | -0.10 | -0.16 | 0.43 | 0.57 |  |
| Crude birth rate (per 1,000 population)............... | 16.0 | 16.5 | 17.9 | 16.0 | 11.3 | 10.4 | 10.8 | 11.1 | 10.0 |  |
| Crude death rate (per 1,000 population)............. | 11.1 | 11.6 | 11.8 | 12.4 | 12.3 | 12.2 | 12.0 | 11.7 | 11.1 |  |
| Total fertility rate (per woman)........................... | 2.16 | 2.30 | 2.49 | 2.32 | 1.64 | 1.52 | 1.46 | 1.43 | 1.30 |  |
| Gross reproduction rate (per woman)................ | 1.05 | 1.12 | 1.21 | 1.13 | 0.80 | 0.74 | 0.71 | 0.70 | 0.63 |  |
| Net reproduction rate (per woman).................... | 0.85 | 0.96 | 1.06 | 1.02 | 0.77 | 0.72 | 0.70 | 0.69 | 0.62 |  |
| Infant mortality rate (per 1,000 births)................ | 51 | 38 | 29 | 23 | 21 | 15 | 11 | 8 | 6 |  |
| Life expectancy at birth (years) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Males........................................................ | 65.3 | 66.6 | 67.4 | 67.8 | 67.9 | 69.0 | 70.3 | 71.7 | 72.6 |  |
| Females..................................................... | 69.6 | 71.5 | 72.9 | 73.6 | 73.8 | 75.5 | 76.8 | 78.2 | 79.2 |  |
| Both sexes combined.................................. | 67.5 | 69.1 | 70.3 | 70.8 | 71.0 | 72.5 | 73.8 | 74.8 | 76.0 |  |

B. MEDIUM-VARIANT PROJECTIONS

|  | 1995 | 2000 | 2005 | 2010 | 2015 | 2020 | 2025 | 2030 | 2040 | 2050 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Population (thousands) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total. | 81661 | 82220 | 82365 | 82032 | 81574 | 80996 | 80238 | 79252 | 76531 | 73303 |
| Males. | 39731 | 40266 | 40550 | 40539 | 40410 | 40177 | 39827 | 39357 | 37995 | 36387 |
| Females. | 41930 | 41954 | 41815 | 41493 | 41164 | 40819 | 40411 | 39895 | 38536 | 36916 |
| Sex ratio (per 100 females) | 94.8 | 96.0 | 97.0 | 97.7 | 98.2 | 98.4 | 98.6 | 98.7 | 98.6 | 98.6 |
| Age distribution: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percentage aged 0-4. | 5.0 | 4.6 | 4.2 | 4.1 | 4.2 | 4.4 | 4.4 | 4.3 | 4.2 | 4.4 |
| Percentage aged 5-14. | 11.2 | 10.9 | 9.9 | 9.2 | 8.7 | 8.7 | 9.0 | 9.2 | 9.0 | 9.0 |
| Percentage aged 15-24. | 11.3 | 11.1 | 11.8 | 11.5 | 10.6 | 9.9 | 9.4 | 9.4 | 10.1 | 10.1 |
| Percentage aged 60 or over. | 20.9 | 23.2 | 24.6 | 25.3 | 26.8 | 28.9 | 31.8 | 34.4 | 34.8 | 35.3 |
| Percentage aged 65 or over. | 15.5 | 16.4 | 18.5 | 19.8 | 20.3 | 21.6 | 23.4 | 26.1 | 28.8 | 28.4 |
| Percentage in school ages 6-11... | 6.8 | 6.4 | 5.8 | 5.4 | 5.1 | 5.2 | 5.4 | 5.5 | 5.3 | 5.4 |
| Percentage in school ages 12-14. | 3.3 | 3.5 | 3.2 | 3.0 | 2.7 | 2.6 | 2.7 | 2.8 | 2.8 | 2.8 |
| Percentage in school ages 15-17... | 3.2 | 3.4 | 3.5 | 3.1 | 2.9 | 2.7 | 2.7 | 2.8 | 2.9 | 2.8 |
| Percentage in school ages 18-23................. | 6.8 | 6.6 | 7.1 | 7.2 | 6.5 | 6.1 | 5.7 | 5.7 | 6.1 | 6.1 |
| Percentage of women aged 15-49................. | 46.6 | 46.7 | 46.4 | 44.9 | 42.1 | 39.2 | 38.1 | 37.8 | 36.6 | 36.6 |
| Median age (years)......................................... | 38.4 | 40.0 | 42.1 | 44.1 | 45.9 | 46.9 | 47.3 | 47.6 | 48.7 | 48.4 |
| Population density (per sq km)......................... | 229 | 230 | 231 | 230 | 229 | 227 | 225 | 222 | 215 | 205 |

1995-2000 2000-2005 2005-2010 2010-2015 2015-2020 2020-2025 $2025-2030 \quad 2030-2040 \quad$ 2040-2050

| Population change per year (thousands)............ | 112 | 29 | -67 | -92 | -116 | -152 | -197 | -272 | -323 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Births per year (thousands) | 754 | 693 | 664 | 684 | 701 | 698 | 678 | 639 | 634 |
| Deaths per year (thousands). | 882 | 904 | 930 | 975 | 1017 | 1049 | 1075 | 1111 | 1157 |
| Net migration per year (thousands). | 240 | 240 | 200 | 200 | 200 | 200 | 200 | 200 | 200 |
| Population growth rate (percentage). | 0.14 | 0.04 | -0.08 | -0.11 | -0.14 | - 0.19 | -0.25 | -0.35 | -0.43 |
| Crude birth rate (per 1,000 population)............... | 9.2 | 8.4 | 8.1 | 8.4 | 8.6 | 8.7 | 8.5 | 8.2 | 8.5 |
| Crude death rate (per 1,000 population)............. | 10.8 | 11.0 | 11.3 | 11.9 | 12.5 | 13.0 | 13.5 | 14.3 | 15.4 |
| Net migration rate (per 1,000 population)............ | 2.9 | 2.9 | 2.4 | 2.4 | 2.5 | 2.5 | 2.5 | 2.6 | 2.7 |
| Total fertility rate (per woman). | 1.30 | 1.33 | 1.37 | 1.44 | 1.51 | 1.58 | 1.63 | 1.64 | 1.64 |
| Gross reproduction rate (per woman)............... | 0.63 | 0.65 | 0.66 | 0.70 | 0.73 | 0.77 | 0.80 | 0.80 | 0.80 |
| Net reproduction rate (per woman).. | 0.63 | 0.64 | 0.66 | 0.69 | 0.73 | 0.76 | 0.79 | 0.79 | 0.79 |
| Infant mortality rate (per 1,000 births). | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 4 |
| Mortality under age 5 (per 1,000 births)............. | 6 | 6 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| Life expectancy at birth (years) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Males......................................................... | 73.9 | 74.7 | 75.5 | 76.0 | 76.5 | 77.0 | 77.5 | 78.1 | 78.9 |
| Females. | 80.2 | 80.7 | 81.2 | 81.7 | 82.2 | 82.7 | 83.1 | 83.7 | 84.5 |
| Both sexes combined.................................. | 77.2 | 77.8 | 78.4 | 78.9 | 79.4 | 79.8 | 80.3 | 80.9 | 81.7 |

Source: United Nations Population Division, World Population Prospects: The 1998 Revision.

Table A. 3 (continued)
GERMANY
C. HIGH-VARIANT PROJECTIONS

|  | 1995 | 2000 | 2005 | 2010 | 2015 | 2020 | 2025 | 2030 | 2040 | 2050 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Population (thousands) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total. | 81661 | 82393 | 83056 | 83364 | 83606 | 83811 | 83955 | 84061 | 83977 | 83817 |
| Males. | 39731 | 40355 | 40905 | 41223 | 41453 | 41622 | 41734 | 41825 | 41814 | 41777 |
| Fernales. | 41930 | 42038 | 42152 | 42141 | 42154 | 42189 | 42220 | 42237 | 42162 | 42039 |
| Age distribution: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percentage aged 0-4. | 5.0 | 4.8 | 4.8 | 4.8 | 5.0 | 5.1 | 5.3 | 5.4 | 5.4 | 5.7 |
| Percentage aged 5-14. | 11.2 | 10.9 | 10.1 | 9.9 | 9.8 | 10.0 | 10.3 | 10.7 | 11.0 | 11.3 |
| Percentage aged 15-24. | 11.3 | 11.1 | 11.7 | 11.3 | 10.6 | 10.4 | 10.3 | 10.5 | 11.2 | 11.6 |
| Percentage aged 60 or over. | 20.9 | 23.1 | 24.4 | 24.9 | 26.2 | 27.9 | 30.4 | 32.4 | 31.7 | 30.9 |
| Percentage aged 65 or over........................ | 15.5 | 16.3 | 18.4 | 19.5 | 19.8 | 20.8 | 22.3 | 24.7 | 26.2 | 24.8 |
| Percentage of women aged 15-49................ | 46.6 | 46.7 | 46.0 | 44.3 | 41.3 | 38.7 | 38.0 | 38.0 | 37.7 | 38.9 |
| Median age (years)......................................... | 38.4 | 39.9 | 41.8 | 43.6 | 45.2 | 45.6 | 45.4 | 45.3 | 44.9 | 43.2 |

$\begin{array}{llllllllll}1995-2000 & 2000-2005 & 2005-2010 & 2010-2015 & 2015-2020 & 2020-2025 & 2025-2030 & 2030-2040 & 2040-2050\end{array}$

| Population change per year (thousands)............ | 146 | 133 | 61 | 49 | 41 | 29 | 21 | - 8 | - 16 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Population growth rate (percentage).................. | 0.18 | 0.16 | 0.07 | 0.06 | 0.05 | 0.03 | 0.03 | -0.01 | -0.02 |
| Crude birth rate (per 1,000 population).............. | 9.6 | 9.6 | 9.5 | 9.9 | 10.3 | 10.5 | 10.7 | 10.8 | 11.3 |
| Crude death rate (per 1,000 population)............. | 10.8 | 10.9 | 11.2 | 11.7 | 12.2 | 12.5 | 12.8 | 13.3 | 13.8 |
| Net migration rate (per 1,000 population)........... | 2.9 | 2.9 | 2.4 | 2.4 | 2.4 | 2.4 | 2.4 | 2.4 | 2.4 |
| Total fertility rate (per woman). | 1.36 | 1.53 | 1.63 | 1.73 | 1.83 | 1.93 | 2.02 | 2.04 | 2.04 |
| Gross reproduction rate (per woman)................ | 0.66 | 0.75 | 0.79 | 0.84 | 0.89 | 0.94 | 0.98 | 0.99 | 0.99 |
| Net reproduction rate (per woman)................... | 0.66 | 0.74 | 0.79 | 0.83 | 0.88 | 0.93 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.99 |

D. LOW-VARIANT PROJECTIONS

|  | 1995 | 2000 | 2005 | 2010 | 2015 | 2020 | 2025 | 2030 | 2040 | 2050 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Population (thousands) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total. | 81661 | 82071 | 81879 | 81147 | 80131 | 78831 | 77193 | 75196 | 70312 | 64615 |
| Males. | 39731 | 40189 | 40300 | 40085 | 39669 | 39066 | 38264 | 37275 | 34805 | 31932 |
| Females. | 41930 | 41881 | 41579 | 41062 | 40462 | 39765 | 38929 | 37920 | 35507 | 32683 |
| Age distribution: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percentage aged 0-4. | 5.0 | 4.4 | 3.8 | 3.6 | 3.6 | 3.6 | 3.4 | 3.2 | 2.9 | 3.0 |
| Percentage aged 5-14. | 11.2 | 10.9 | 9.8 | 8.7 | 7.9 | 7.7 | 7.7 | 7.5 | 6.9 | 6.6 |
| Percentage aged 15-24 | 11.3 | 11.1 | 11.9 | 11.7 | 10.6 | 9.5 | 8.8 | 8.7 | 8.7 | 8.2 |
| Percentage aged 60 or over. | 20.9 | 23.2 | 24.7 | 25.6 | 27.3 | 29.6 | 33.1 | 36.2 | 37.9 | 40.1 |
| Percentage aged 65 or over.. | 15.5 | 16.4 | 18.6 | 20.0 | 20.7 | 22.2 | 24.3 | 27.6 | 31.3 | 32.2 |
| Percentage of women aged 15-49. | 46.6 | 46.8 | 46.7 | 45.4 | 42.6 | 39.6 | 38.4 | 37.9 | 35.6 | 33.9 |
| Median age (years). | 38.4 | 40.1 | 42.2 | 44.4 | 46.5 | 47.9 | 48.9 | 49.6 | 51.7 | 53.2 |

$\begin{array}{lllllllllll}1995-2000 & 2000-2005 & 2005-2010 & 2010-2015 & 2015-2020 & 2020-2025 & 2025-2030 & 2030-2040 & 2040-2050\end{array}$

| Population change per year (thousands). <br> Population growth rate (percentage) <br> Crude birth rate (per 1,000 population). <br> Crude death rate (per 1,000 population) <br> Net migration rate (per 1,000 population) <br> Total fertility rate (per woman). <br> Gross reproduction rate (per woman). <br> Net reproduction rate (per woman) |
| :---: |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |


|  | E. CONSTANT-VARIANT PROJECTIONS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1995 | 2000 | 2005 | 2010 | 2015 | 2020 | 2025 | 2030 | 2040 | 2050 |
| Population (thousands) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total...................... | 81661 | 82215 | 82282 | 81792 | 81013 | 79959 | 78586 | 76881 | 72624 | 67552 |
|  | 1995-2000 | 2000-2005 | 2005-2010 | 2010-2015 | 2015-2020 | 2020-2025 | 2025-2030 | 2030-2040 | 2040-2050 |  |


| Population growth rate (percentage).................. | 0.14 | 0.02 | -0.12 | -0.19 | -0.26 | -0.35 | -0.44 | -0.57 | -0.72 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Crude birth rate (per 1,000 population).............. | 9.2 | 8.2 | 7.7 | 7.6 | 7.5 | 7.2 | 6.9 | 6.5 | 6.4 |
| Crude death rate (per 1,000 population). | 10.8 | 11.0 | 11.3 | 12.0 | 12.6 | 13.2 | 13.8 | 14.8 | 16.5 |

Source: United Nations Population Division, World Population Prospects: The 1998 Revision.

TABLE A.4. GERMANY, REPLACEMENT MIGRATION SCENARIOS
GERMANY

|  | Scenario | I | II | III | IV | V |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Medium | Constant | Constant | VI |  |
|  |  | Medium | variant with | total | age group | Ratio 15-64/65+ |
| Period | variant | zero migration | population | 15-64 | not less than 3.0 | or older |


|  |  |
| :--- | ---: |
| $1995-2000$ | 240 |
| $2000-2005$ | 240 |
| $2005-2010$ | 200 |
| $2010-2015$ | 200 |
| $2015-2020$ | 200 |
| $2020-2025$ | 200 |
| $2025-2030$ | 200 |
| $2030-2035$ | 200 |
| $2035-2040$ | 200 |
| $2040-2045$ | 200 |
| $2045-2050$ | 200 |
| Grand total 1995-2050 | 11400 |

A. Average annual net migration (thousands)
1995 B. Total population (thousands)

| 1995 | 81661 | 81 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2000 | 82220 | 80 |
| 2005 | 82365 | 79 |
| 2010 | 82032 | 78 |
| 2015 | 81574 | 76 |
| 2020 | 80996 | 74 |
| 2025 | 80238 | 72 |
| 2030 | 79252 | 70 |
| 2035 | 77989 | 67 |
| 2040 | 76531 | 64 |
| 2045 | 74948 | 61 |
| 2050 | 73303 | 58 |
|  |  |  |


| 1995 | 55763 | 55 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2000 | 56025 | 55 |
| 2005 | 55424 | 53 |
| 2010 | 54917 | 52 |
| 2,015 | 54503 | 50 |
| 2020 | 52995 | 48 |
| 2025 | 50773 | 45 |
| 2030 | 47855 | 41 |
| 2035 | 45353 | 37 |
| 2040 | 44425 | 35 |
| 2045 | 43767 | 34 |
| 2050 | 42706 | 32 |


| 1995 | 4.41 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 2000 | 4.17 |
| 2005 | 3.63 |
| 2010 | 3.38 |
| 2015 | 3.29 |
| 2020 | 3.03 |
| 2025 | 2.71 |
| 2030 | 2.31 |
| 2035 | 2.04 |
| 2040 | 2.02 |
| 2045 | 2.05 |
| 2050 | 2.05 |


| D. Potential support ratio $15-64 / 65$ or older |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 4.41 | 4.41 | 4.41 |
| 4.11 | 4.14 | 4.15 |
| 3.53 | 3.60 | 3.65 |
| 3.23 | 3.35 | 3.42 |
| 3.10 | 3.27 | 3.34 |
| 2.81 | 3.04 | 3.15 |
| 2.45 | 2.74 | 2.91 |
| 2.04 | 2.37 | 2.61 |
| 1.76 | 2.12 | 2.40 |
| 1.72 | 2.14 | 2.39 |
| 1.75 | 2.22 | 2.43 |
| 1.75 | 2.26 | 2.44 |


| 0 | 1398 |
| ---: | ---: |
| 0 | 3251 |
| 0 | 1879 |
| 0 | 2806 |
| 1056 | 3381 |
| 2100 | 5646 |
| 2837 | 6462 |
| 2103 | 4718 |
| 0 | 4016 |
| 0 | 4096 |
| 0 | 188497 |

## TABLE A. 4 (continued)

GERMANY

| Scenario | 1 | 11 | III | IV | V | VI |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Period | Medium variant | Medium variant with zero migration | Constant total population | Constant age group 15-64 | Ratio 15-64/65+ not less than 3.0 | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Constant ratio } \\ 15-64 / 65 \text { years } \\ \text { or older } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| E. Age group 65 or older (thousands) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1995 | 12634 | 12634 | 12634 | 12634 | 12634 | 12634 |
| 2000 | 13444 | 13403 | 13427 | 13435 | 13403 | 13656 |
| 2005 | 15266 | 15176 | 15247 | 15295 | 15176 | 16111 |
| 2010 | 16247 | 16108 | 16250 | 16326 | 16108 | 17687 |
| 2015 | 16575 | 16380 | 16612 | 16709 | 16380 | 18499 |
| 2020 | 17468 | 17190 | 17536 | 17702 | 17383 | 20144 |
| 2025 | 18762 | 18354 | 18854 | 19144 | 19010 | 22732 |
| 2030 | 20721 | 20133 | 20858 | 21351 | 21534 | 27125 |
| 2035 | 22233 | 21405 | 22467 | 23205 | 23604 | 32411 |
| 2040 | 22027 | 20849 | 22378 | 23337 | 23613 | 36805 |
| 2045 | 21323 | 19692 | 21793 | 22968 | 23146 | 40914 |
| 2050 | 20794 | 18689 | 21428 | 22861 | 23250 | 45178 |
| F. Percentage in age group 65 or older |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1995 | 15.5 | 15.5 | 15.5 | 15.5 | 15.5 | 15.5 |
| 2000 | 16.4 | 16.6 | 16.4 | 16.4 | 16.6 | 15.5 |
| 2005 | 18.5 | 19.0 | 18.7 | 18.4 | 19.0 | 15.4 |
| 2010 | 19.8 | 20.6 | 19.9 | 19.6 | 20.6 | 15.5 |
| 2015 | 20.3 | 21.4 | 20.3 | 20.0 | 21.4 | 15.5 |
| 2020 | 21.6 | 23.0 | 21.5 | 20.8 | 21.7 | 15.5 |
| 2025 | 23.4 | 25.3 | 23.1 | 21.9 | 21.2 | 15.3 |
| 2030 | 26.1 | 28.6 | 25.5 | 23.6 | 20.8 | 15.1 |
| 2035 | 28.5 | 31.6 | 27.5 | 24.9 | 20.6 | 15.0 |
| 2040 | 28.8 | 32.2 | 27.4 | 25.1 | 20.6 | 14.9 |
| 2045 | 28.5 | 31.9 | 26.7 | 24.9 | 20.3 | 15.0 |
| 2050 | 28.4 | 31.8 | 26.2 | 24.8 | 20.5 | 15.1 |
| G. Age group 0-14 (thousands) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1995 | 13264 | 13264 | 13264 | 13264 | 13264 | 13264 |
| 2000 | 12751 | 12468 | 12640 | 12700 | 12468 | 14315 |
| 2005 | 11675 | 11123 | 11579 | 11907 | 11123 | 17265 |
| 2010 | 10868 | 10091 | 10896 | 11307 | 10091 | 18635 |
| 2015 | 10496 | 9485 | 10657 | 11067 | 9485 | 18862 |
| 2020 | 10534 | 9294 | 10848 | 11611 | 10726 | 21072 |
| 2025 | 10704 | 9248 | 11219 | 12543 | 13623 | 25244 |
| 2030 | 10675 | 9009 | 11446 | 13531 | 17478 | 32683 |
| 2035 | 10403 | 8533 | 11475 | 14063 | 20085 | 41210 |
| 2040 | 10079 | 8015 | 11470 | 13823 | 19437 | 47007 |
| 2045 | 9858 | 7611 | 11562 | 13447 | 18348 | 51065 |
| 2050 | 9803 | 7379 | 11807 | 13398 | 17264 | 54694 |
| H. Potential support ratio in 2050, by age at entry into non-working-age population |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Age |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 65 | 2.05 | 1.75 | 2.26 | 2.44 | 3.13 | 4.41 |
| 70 | 2.93 | 2.48 | 3.22 | 3.49 | 4.45 | 6.45 |
| 75 | 4.25 | 3.55 | 4.66 | 5.08 | 6.35 | 10.02 |
| 80 | 6.65 | 5.50 | 7.29 | 7.99 | 9.77 | 17.27 |

Note: The six scenarios can be described briefly as follows:

I - Corresponds to the medium variant of the official United Nations population projections (World Population Prospects, 1998 Revision).
II - This scenario amends the medium variant by assuming no migration after 1995.
III - This scenario keeps the total population figure constant at the highest level that it would reach in the absence of migration after 1995.
IV - This scenario keeps the number of persons aged 15-64 constant at the highest level that it would reach in the absence of migration after 1995.
V - This scenario prevents the ratio of persons aged 15-64 to persons aged 65 and above from falling below 3.0.
VI - This scenario keeps the ratio of persons aged 15-64 and above at the highest level that it would reach in the absence of migration after 1995. This scenario is considered to be demographically unrealistic.

Table A.5. Italy, 1998 Revision

## ITALY

| Indicator | A. ESTIMATES |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1950 | 1955 | 1960 | 1965 | 1970 | 1975 | 1980 | 1985 | 1990 | 1995 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Population (thousands) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total. | 47104 | 48633 | 50200 | 52112 | 53822 | 55441 | 56434 | 56771 | 57023 | 57338 |
| Males. | 22934 | 23815 | 24584 | 25508 | 26325 | 27072 | 27472 | 27586 | 27677 | 27840 |
| Females.............................................. | 24170 | 24818 | 25616 | 26605 | 27497 | 28369 | 28962 | 29185 | 29346 | 29498 |
| Sex ratio (per 100 females)............................ | 94.9 | 96.0 | 96.0 | 95.9 | 95.7 | 95.4 | 94.9 | 94.5 | 94.3 | 94.4 |
| Age distribution: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percentage aged 0-4................................. | 9.2 | 8.3 | 8.4 | 8.9 | 8.5 | 7.8 | 6.4 | 5.3 | 4.8 | 4.9 |
| Percentage aged 5-14.............................. | 17.1 | 16.7 | 16.4 | 15.4 | 16.0 | 16.4 | 15.9 | 14.2 | 11.0 | 9.9 |
| Percentage aged 15-24.............................. | 17.0 | 16.7 | 15.5 | 15.1 | 14.8 | 14.2 | 15.3 | 16.4 | 15.6 | 13.5 |
| Percentage aged 60 or over........................ | 12.2 | 12.7 | 13.6 | 14.6 | 16.1 | 17.4 | 17.0 | 18.4 | 21.1 | 22.5 |
| Percentage aged 65 or over........................ | 8.3 | 8.7 | 9.3 | 10.0 | 10.9 | 12.0 | 13.1 | 12.7 | 15.3 | 16.8 |
| Percentage of women aged 15-49............... | 51.4 | 51.4 | 49.8 | 48.3 | 48.1 | 46.8 | 47.1 | 48.3 | 49.0 | 48.7 |
| Median age (years)...................................... | 29.0 | 30.0 | 31.3 | 32.1 | 32.8 | 33.4 | 34.0 | 35.2 | 37.4 | 38.8 |
| Population density (per sq km).......................... | 156 | 161 | 167 | 173 | 179 | 184 | 187 | 188 | 189 | 190 |
|  | 1950-1955 | 1955-1960 | 1960-1965 | 1965-1970 | 1970-1975 | 1975-1980 | 1980-1985 | 1985-1990 | 1990-1995 |  |


| Population change per year (thousands)............ | 306 | 313 | 383 | 342 | 324 | 199 | 67 | 50 | 63 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Births per year (thousands). | 877 | 890 | 963 | 968 | 877 | 728 | 606 | 570 | 559 |
| Deaths per year (thousands) | 472 | 474 | 501 | 514 | 537 | 546 | 539 | 539 | 596 |
| Population growth rate (percentage) | 0.64 | 0.63 | 0.75 | 0.65 | 0.59 | 0.36 | 0.12 | 0.09 | 0.11 |
| Crude birth rate (per 1,000 population). | 18.3 | 18.0 | 18.8 | 18.3 | 16.1 | 13.0 | 10.7 | 10.0 | 9.8 |
| Crude death rate (per 1,000 population).............. | 9.9 | 9.6 | 9.8 | 9.7 | 9.8 | 9.8 | 9.5 | 9.5 | 10.4 |
| Total fertility rate (per woman). | 2.32 | 2.35 | 2.55 | 2.49 | 2.28 | 1.92 | 1.55 | 1.35 | 1.28 |
| Gross reproduction rate (per woman). | 1.13 | 1.14 | 1.24 | 1.21 | 1.10 | 0.93 | 0.75 | 0.65 | 0.62 |
| Net reproduction rate (per woman).................... | 1.09 | 1.07 | 1.16 | 1.15 | 1.05 | 0.88 | 0.74 | 0.63 | 0.61 |
| Infant mortality rate (per 1,000 births) | 60 | 48 | 40 | 33 | 26 | 18 | 13 | 10 | 8 |
| Life expectancy at birth (years) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Males. | 64.3 | 66.3 | 67.4 | 68.2 | 69.2 | 70.4 | 71.5 | 73.1 | 74.2 |
| Females. | 67.8 | 70.8 | 72.6 | 73.9 | 75.2 | 76.9 | 78.0 | 79.6 | 80.7 |
| Both sexes combined.................................. | 66.0 | 68.5 | 69.9 | 71.0 | 72.1 | 73.6 | 74.5 | 76.2 | 77.2 |

B. MEDIUM-VARIANT PROJECTIONS

|  | 1995 | 2000 | 2005 | 2010 | 2015 | 2020 | 2025 | 2030 | 2040 | 2050 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Population (thousands) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total....................... | 57338 | 57298 | 56780 | 55782 | 54448 | 52913 | 51270 | 49533 | 45642 | 41197 |
| Males. | 27840 | 27806 | 27564 | 27087 | 26446 | 25714 | 24928 | 24082 | 22150 | 19951 |
| Females. | 29498 | 29492 | 29216 | 28695 | 28002 | 27199 | 26342 | 25452 | 23492 | 21247 |
| Sex ratio (per 100 females) | 94.4 | 94.3 | 94.3 | 94.4 | 94.4 | 94.5 | 94.6 | 94.6 | 94.3 | 93.9 |
| Age distribution: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percentage aged 0-4. | 4.9 | 4.5 | 4.2 | 3.9 | 3.7 | 3.7 | 3.8 | 3.8 | 3.8 | 3.8 |
| Percentage aged 5-14. | 9.9 | 9.8 | 9.5 | 8.9 | 8.4 | 7.9 | 7.7 | 7.8 | 8.2 | 8.2 |
| Percentage aged 15-24. | 13.5 | 11.1 | 10.1 | 10.0 | 9.9 | 9.4 | 8.9 | 8.4 | 8.4 | 9.0 |
| Percentage aged 60 or over. | 22.5 | 24.2 | 25.5 | 27.4 | 29.1 | 31.4 | 34.6 | 37.7 | 41.5 | 41.2 |
| Percentage aged 65 or over. | 16.8 | 18.2 | 19.7 | 20.8 | 22.6 | 24.1 | 26.1 | 29.1 | 34.5 | 34.9 |
| Percentage in school ages 6-11. | 5.9 | 5.9 | 5.6 | 5.3 | 4.9 | 4.6 | 4.6 | 4.7 | 4.9 | 4.9 |
| Percentage in school ages 12-14. | 3.1 | 2.9 | 3.0 | 2.8 | 2.7 | 2.5 | 2.4 | 2.4 | 2.5 | 2.6 |
| Percentage in school ages 15-17. | 3.4 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 2.8 | 2.7 | 2.5 | 2.4 | 2.5 | 2.6 |
| Percentage in school ages 18-23. | 8.6 | 6.8 | 6.1 | 6.0 | 6.1 | 5.7 | 5.5 | 5.1 | 5.1 | 5.5 |
| Percentage of women aged 15-49................. | 48.7 | 46.9 | 45.4 | 43.8 | 40.9 | 38.1 | 35.2 | 33.6 | 32.5 | 32.2 |
| Median age (years)......................................... | 38.8 | 40.6 | 42.7 | 44.8 | 47.0 | 49.0 | 50.9 | 52.2 | 53.0 | 53.2 |
| Population density (per sq km)......................... | 190 | 190 | 188 | 185 | 181 | 176 | 170 | 164 | 152 | 137 |

1995-2000 2000-2005 2005-2010 2010-2015 $2015-2020 \quad 2020-2025 \quad 2025-2030 \quad 2030-2040 \quad 2040-2050$

| Population change per year (thousands). | -8 | -104 | -200 | -267 | -307 | -329 | -347 | -389 | -445 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Births per year (thousands).............................. | 517 | 484 | 437 | 405 | 391 | 387 | 381 | 360 | 323 |
| Deaths per year (thousands). | 595 | 621 | 652 | 679 | 702 | 716 | 728 | 749 | 767 |
| Net migration per year (thousands) | 70 | 34 | 16 | 8 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Population growth rate (percentage). | - 0.01 | -0.18 | -0.36 | -0.48 | -0.57 | -0.63 | -0.69 | -0.82 | - 1.03 |
| Crude birth rate (per 1,000 population). | 9.0 | 8.5 | 7.8 | 7.3 | 7.3 | 7.4 | 7.6 | 7.5 | 7.4 |
| Crude death rate (per 1,000 population) | 10.4 | 10.9 | 11.6 | 12.3 | 13.1 | 13.7 | 14.5 | 15.7 | 17.7 |
| Net migration rate (per 1,000 population). | 1.2 | 0.6 | 0.3 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total fertility rate (per woman). | 1.20 | 1.22 | 1.26 | 1.33 | 1.40 | 1.47 | 1.54 | 1.63 | 1.66 |
| Gross reproduction rate (per woman). | 0.58 | 0.59 | 0.61 | 0.65 | 0.68 | 0.71 | 0.75 | 0.79 | 0.81 |
| Net reproduction rate (per woman)... | 0.57 | 0.58 | 0.60 | 0.64 | 0.67 | 0.71 | 0.74 | 0.78 | 0.80 |
| Infant mortality rate (per 1,000 births). | 7 | 7 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 5 | 5 |
| Mortality under age 5 (per 1,000 births).............. | 8 | 8 | 8 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 6 | 6 | 6 |
| Life expectancy at birth (years) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Males. | 75.0 | 75.8 | 76.3 | 76.8 | 77.3 | 77.8 | 78.2 | 78.8 | 79.6 |
| Females. | 81.2 | 81.7 | 82.2 | 82.7 | 83.1 | 83.5 | 83.9 | 84.5 | 85.3 |
| Both sexes combined.................................. | 78.2 | 78.8 | 79.3 | 79.8 | 80.2 | 80.7 | 81.1 | 81.7 | 82.4 |

Source: United Nations Population Division, World Population Prospects: The 1998 Revision.

## Table A. 5 (continued)

ITALY
C. HIGH-VARIANT PROJECTIONS

|  | 1995 | 2000 | 2005 | 2010 | 2015 | 2020 | 2025 | 2030 | 2040 | 2050 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Population (thousands) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total............................................................ | 57338 | 57405 | 57201 | 56582 | 55626 | 54490 | 53306 | 52128 | 49651 | 46772 |
| Maies | 27840 | 27861 | 27781 | 27499 | 27053 | 26527 | 25977 | 25418 | 24213 | 22818 |
| Females............................................... | 29498 | 29544 | 29420 | 29083 | 28573 | 27964 | 27329 | 26711 | 25438 | 23954 |
| Age distribution: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percentage aged 0-4. | 4.9 | 4.7 | 4.8 | 4.5 | 4.3 | 4.3 | 4.5 | 4.7 | 5.0 | 5.1 |
| Percentage aged 5-14............................. | 9.9 | 9.7 | 9.6 | 9.6 | 9.5 | 9.1 | 8.9 | 9.1 | 10.0 | 10.5 |
| Percentage aged 15-24............................. | 13.5 | 11.1 | 10.0 | 9.9 | 9.9 | 9.9 | 9.9 | 9.4 | 9.5 | 10.6 |
| Percentage aged 60 or over....................... | 22.5 | 24.2 | 25.3 | 27.0 | 28.5 | 30.5 | 33.3 | 35.8 | 38.1 | 36.3 |
| Percentage aged 65 or over....................... | 16.8 | 18.1 | 19.6 | 20.5 | 22.1 | 23.4 | 25.1 | 27.7 | 31.7 | 30.7 |
| Percentage of women aged 15-49............... | 48.7 | 46.9 | 45.1 | 43.2 | 40.3 | 37.8 | 35.3 | 34.2 | 33.9 | 34.9 |
| Median age (years)........................................ | 38.8 | 40.5 | 42.4 | 44.4 | 46.3 | 48.1 | 49.6 | 50.2 | 49.4 | 48.0 |
|  | 1995-2000 | 2000-2005 | 2005-2010 | 2010-2015 | 2015-2020 | 2020-2025 | 2025-2030 | 2030-2040 | 2040-2050 |  |


| Population change per year (thousands). | 13 | - 41 | - 124 | - 191 | - 227 | - 237 | - 236 | - 248 | - 288 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Population growth rate (percentage)................. | 0.02 | -0.07 | -0.22 | -0.34 | -0.41 | -0.44 | -0.45 | - 0.49 | - 0.60 |
| Crude birth rate (per 1,000 population)............ | 9.4 | 9.5 | 9.0 | 8.6 | 8.6 | 8.9 | 9.4 | 9.9 | 10.0 |
| Crude death rate (per 1,000 population)........... | 10.4 | 10.9 | 11.5 | 12.1 | 12.8 | 13.3 | 13.8 | 14.7 | 16.0 |
| Net migration rate (per 1,000 population)........... | 1.2 | 0.6 | 0.3 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total fertility rate (per woman). | 1.25 | 1.38 | 1.48 | 1.58 | 1.68 | 1.78 | 1.88 | 2.01 | 2.06 |
| Gross reproduction rate (per woman) | 0.61 | 0.67 | 0.72 | 0.77 | 0.81 | 0.86 | 0.91 | 0.97 | 1.00 |
| Net reproduction rate (per woman).................... | 0.60 | 0.66 | 0.71 | 0.76 | 0.81 | 0.85 | 0.90 | 0.97 | 0.99 |

D. LOW-VARIANT PROJECTIONS

|  | 1995 | 2000 | 2005 | 2010 | 2015 | 2020 | 2025 | 2030 | 2040 | 2050 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Population (thousands) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total. | 57338 | 57170 | 56494 | 55341 | 53765 | 51904 | 49841 | 47594 | 42508 | 36789 |
| Males | 27840 | 27740 | 27416 | 26860 | 26095 | 25194 | 24192 | 23083 | 20536 | 17683 |
| Females .......................................... | 29498 | 29430 | 29077 | 28481 | 27670 | 26709 | 25649 | 24511 | 21972 | 19106 |
| Age distribution: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percentage aged 0-4 | 4.9 | 4.3 | 4.0 | 3.6 | 3.3 | 3.1 | 3.0 | 2.9 | 2.6 | 2.5 |
| Percentage aged 5-14.................................... | 9.9 | 9.8 | 9.3 | 8.5 | 7.9 | 7.3 | 6.8 | 6.5 | 6.2 | 5.8 |
| Percentage aged 15-24............................... | 13.5 | 11.1 | 10.2 | 10.1 | 9.8 | 9.1 | 8.5 | 7.9 | 7.3 | 7.1 |
| Percentage aged 60 or over....................... | 22.5 | 24.3 | 25.6 | 27.6 | 29.5 | 32.0 | 35.6 | 39.3 | 44.6 | 46.2 |
| Percentage aged 65 or over...................... | 16.8 | 18.2 | 19.8 | 21.0 | 22.9 | 24.5 | 26.8 | 30.3 | 37.0 | 39.1 |
| Percentage of women aged 15-49................ | 48.7 | 47.0 | 45.7 | 44.1 | 41.2 | 38.3 | 35.3 | 33.6 | 31.6 | 29.7 |
| Median age (years)....................................... | 38.8 | 40.7 | 42.8 | 45.1 | 47.4 | 49.6 | 51.7 | 53.6 | 55.9 | 57.4 |
|  | 1995-2000 | 2000-2005 | 2005-2010 2010-2015 |  | 2015-2020 | 2020-2025 | 2025-2030 | 0-2040 | 0-2050 |  |


| Population change per year (thousands). | -34 | -135 | -230 | -315 | -372 | -413 | -449 | -509 | -572 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Population growth rate (percentage)................. | -0.06 | -0.24 | -0.41 | -0.58 | -0.71 | -0.81 | -0.92 | -1.13 | -1.45 |
| Crude birth rate (per 1,000 population)............... | 8.6 | 8.0 | 7.3 | 6.5 | 6.1 | 5.9 | 5.7 | 5.3 | 4.9 |
| Crude death rate (per 1,000 population).......... | 10.4 | 10.9 | 11.7 | 12.4 | 13.3 | 14.1 | 14.9 | 16.6 | 19.3 |
| Net migration rate (per 1,000 population)........... | 1.2 | 0.6 | 0.3 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total fertility rate (per woman)........................... | 1.14 | 1.14 | 1.17 | 1.17 | 1.17 | 1.17 | 1.17 | 1.17 | 1.17 |
| Gross reproduction rate (per woman) ................ | 0.55 | 0.55 | 0.57 | 0.57 | 0.57 | 0.57 | 0.57 | 0.57 | 0.57 |
| Net reproduction rate (per woman)................... | 0.55 | 0.55 | 0.56 | 0.56 | 0.56 | 0.56 | 0.56 | 0.56 | 0.56 |

## E. CONSTANT-VARIANT PROJECTIONS

|  | 1995 | 2000 | 2005 | 2010 | 2015 | 2020 | 2025 | 2030 | 2040 | 2050 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Population (thousands) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total. | 57338 | 57470 | 57069 | 56105 | 54697 | 53007 | 51149 | 49146 | 44542 | 39227 |

Source: United Nations Population Division, World Population Prospects: The 1998 Revision.

Table A.6. Italy, migration replacement scenarios
ITALY

|  | Scenario | I | II | III | IV | VI |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Medium | Constant | Constant | Constant ratio |  |
| Period | Medium | variant with | total | age group | Ratio 15-64/65+ | 15-64/65 years |
|  |  | variant | zero migration | population | 15-64 | not less than 3.0 |


| 1995-2000 | 70 | 0 | 75 | 203 | 0 | 1261 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2000-2005 | 34 | 0 | 127 | 266 | 0 | 1402 |
| 2005-2010 | 16 | 0 | 193 | 179 | 0 | 757 |
| 2010-2015 | 8 | 0 | 236 | 341 | 404 | 1362 |
| 2015-2020 | 4 | 0 | 255 | 335 | 886 | 1146 |
| 2020-2025 | 0 | 0 | 256 | 456 | 1203 | 1886 |
| 2025-2030 | 0 | 0 | 260 | 613 | 1744 | 3267 |
| 2030-2035 | 0 | 0 | 269 | 581 | 1482 | 3892 |
| 2035-2040 | 0 | 0 | 289 | 507 | 1117 | 4132 |
| 2040-2045 | 0 | 0 | 309 | 268 | 149 | 2740 |
| 2045-2050 | 0 | 0 | 318 | 173 | 32 | 2094 |
| Grand total 1995-2050 | 660 | 0 | 12944 | 19610 | 35088 | 119684 |
| B. Total population (thousands) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1995 | 57338 | 57338 | 57338 | 57338 | 57338 | 57338 |
| 2000 | 57298 | 56950 | 57338 | 58000 | 56950 | 63477 |
| 2005 | 56780 | 56267 | 57338 | 58767 | 56267 | 70487 |
| 2010 | 55782 | 55200 | 57338 | 58783 | 55200 | 74207 |
| 2015 | 54448 | 53840 | 57338 | 59393 | 55943 | 80939 |
| 2020 | 52913 | 52303 | 57338 | 59902 | 59189 | 86764 |
| 2025 | 51270 | 50679 | 57338 | 61064 | 64383 | 96664 |
| 2030 | 49533 | 48962 | 57338 | 63104 | 72808 | 114329 |
| 2035 | 47671 | 47122 | 57338 | 65066 | 80443 | 136391 |
| 2040 | 45642 | 45116 | 57338 | 66630 | 86463 | 160856 |
| 2045 | 43460 | 42959 | 57338 | 66846 | 87419 | 178891 |
| 2050 | 41197 | 40722 | 57338 | 66395 | 87345 | 193518 |
| C. Age group 15-64 (thousands) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1995 | 39234 | 39234 | 39234 | 39234 | 39234 | 39234 |
| 2000 | 38721 | 38486 | 38762 | 39234 | 38486 | 43139 |
| 2005 | 37781 | 37439 | 38208 | 39234 | 37439 | 47661 |
| 2010 | 37015 | 36630 | 38174 | 39234 | 36630 | 50477 |
| 2015 | 35576 | 35179 | 37715 | 39234 | 36671 | 55064 |
| 2020 | 34061 | 33669 | 37332 | 39234 | 38560 | 59072 |
| 2025 | 32026 | 31659 | 36506 | 39234 | 41401 | 65358 |
| 2030 | 29365 | 29026 | 35101 | 39234 | 45990 | 76176 |
| 2035 | 26773 | 26464 | 33799 | 39234 | 50209 | 89650 |
| 2040 | 24432 | 24147 | 32790 | 39234 | 53706 | 104784 |
| 2045 | 22946 | 22681 | 32675 | 39234 | 54607 | 116546 |
| 2050 | 21875 | 21623 | 32985 | 39234 | 55074 | 126808 |
| D. Potential support ratio 15-64/65 or older |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1995 | 4.08 | 4.08 | 4.08 | 4.08 | 4.08 | 4.08 |
| 2000 | 3.72 | 3.72 | 3.74 | 3.78 | 3.72 | 4.08 |
| 2005 | 3.37 | 3.37 | 3.43 | 3.50 | 3.37 | 4.08 |
| 2010 | 3.19 | 3.19 | 3.30 | 3.37 | 3.19 | 4.08 |
| 2015 | 2.90 | 2.90 | 3.06 | 3.16 | 3.00 | 4.08 |
| 2020 | 2.67 | 2.68 | 2.91 | 3.02 | 3.00 | 4.08 |
| 2025 | 2.39 | 2.40 | 2.69 | 2.84 | 3.00 | 4.08 |
| 2030 | 2.04 | 2.04 | 2.37 | 2.59 | 3.00 | 4.08 |
| 2035 | 1.76 | 1.76 | 2.13 | 2.39 | 3.00 | 4.08 |
| 2040 | 1.55 | 1.55 | 1.97 | 2.24 | 3.00 | 4.08 |
| 2045 | 1.50 | 1.50 | 1.96 | 2.22 | 3.00 | 4.08 |
| 2050 | 1.52 | 1.52 | 2.03 | 2.25 | 3.00 | 4.08 |

## Table A. 6 (continued)

ITALY

| Scenario | I | 11 | III | IV | V | VI |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Period | Medium variant | Medium variant with zero migration | Constant total population | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Constant } \\ \text { age group } \\ 15-64 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Ratio 15-64/65+ not less than 3.0 | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Constant ratio } \\ \text { 15-64/65 years } \\ \text { or older } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| E. Age group 65 or older (thousands) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1995 | 9621 | 9621 | 9621 | 9621 | 9621 | 9621 |
| 2000 | 10412 | 10349 | 10362 | 10386 | 10349 | 10578 |
| 2005 | 11213 | 11113 | 11155 | 11212 | 11113 | 11687 |
| 2010 | 11609 | 11487 | 11578 | 11651 | 11487 | 12377 |
| 2015 | 12286 | 12150 | 12310 | 12417 | 12224 | 13502 |
| 2020 | 12733 | 12586 | 12837 | 12984 | 12853 | 14485 |
| 2025 | 13373 | 13218 | 13586 | 13817 | 13800 | 16026 |
| 2030 | 14415 | 14249 | 14780 | 15167 | 15330 | 18679 |
| 2035 | 15249 | 15074 | 15839 | 16442 | 16736 | 21983 |
| 2040 | 15745 | 15566 | 16661 | 17509 | 17902 | 25694 |
| 2045 | 15303 | 15128 | 16647 | 17690 | 18202 | 28578 |
| 2050 | 14377 | 14211 | 16230 | 17444 | 18358 | 31094 |
| $F$. Percentage in age group 65 or older |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1995 | 16.8 | 16.8 | 16.8 | 16.8 | 16.8 | 16.8 |
| 2000 | 18.2 | 18.2 | 18.1 | 17.9 | 18.2 | 16.7 |
| 2005 | 19.7 | 19.7 | 19.5 | 19.1 | 19.7 | 16.6 |
| 2010 | 20.8 | 20.8 | 20.2 | 19.8 | 20.8 | 16.7 |
| 2015 | 22.6 | 22.6 | 21.5 | 20.9 | 21.9 | 16.7 |
| 2020 | 24.1 | 24.1 | 22.4 | 21.7 | 21.7 | 16.7 |
| 2025 | 26.1 | 26.1 | 23.7 | 22.6 | 21.4 | 16.6 |
| 2030 | 29.1 | 29.1 | 25.8 | 24.0 | 21.1 | 16.3 |
| 2035 | 32.0 | 32.0 | 27.6 | 25.3 | 20.8 | 16.1 |
| 2040 | 34.5 | 34.5 | 29.1 | 26.3 | 20.7 | 16.0 |
| 2045 | 35.2 | 35.2 | 29.0 | 26.5 | 20.8 | 16.0 |
| 2050 | 34.9 | 34.9 | 28.3 | 26.3 | 21.0 | 16.1 |
| G. Age group 0-14 (thousands) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1995 | 8483 | 8483 | 8483 | 8483 | 8483 | 8483 |
| 2000 | 8165 | 8116 | 8214 | 8380 | 8116 | 9760 |
| 2005 | 7785 | 7716 | 7976 | 8320 | 7716 | 11140 |
| 2010 | 7157 | 7083 | 7586 | 7898 | 7083 | 11353 |
| 2015 | 6586 | 6512 | 7313 | 7741 | 7048 | 12373 |
| 2020 | 6119 | 6048 | 7169 | 7683 | 7776 | 13207 |
| 2025 | 5871 | 5802 | 7246 | 8013 | 9181 | 15280 |
| 2030 | 5754 | 5687 | 7458 | 8703 | 11488 | 19474 |
| 2035 | 5650 | 5585 | 7700 | 9390 | 13498 | 24758 |
| 2040 | 5466 | 5403 | 7887 | 9887 | 14855 | 30379 |
| 2045 | 5211 | 5150 | 8016 | 9922 | 14610 | 33767 |
| 2050 | 4945 | 4888 | 8124 | 9717 | 13913 | 35615 |
| H. Potential support ratio in 2050, by age at entry into non-working-age population |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Age |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 65 | 1.52 | 1.52 | 2.03 | 2.25 | 3.00 | 4.08 |
| 70 | 2.08 | 2.08 | 2.81 | 3.11 | 4.17 | 5.83 |
| 75 | 3.06 | 3.06 | 4.13 | 4.59 | 6.08 | 8.94 |
| 80 | 5.26 | 5.26 | 7.06 | 7.85 | 10.18 | 15.86 |

Note: The six scenarios can be described briefly as follows:
I - Corresponds to the medium variant of the official United Nations population projections (World Population Prospects, 1998 Revision).
II - This scenario amends the medium variant by assuming no migration after 1995.
III - This scenario keeps the total population figure constant at the highest level that it would reach in the absence of migration after 1995.
IV - This scenario keeps the number of persons aged 15-64 constant at the highest level that it would reach in the absence of migration after 1995.
V - This scenario prevents the ratio of persons aged 15-64 to persons aged 65 and above from falling below 3.0.
VI - This scenario keeps the ratio of persons aged 15-64 and above at the highest level that it would reach in the absence of migration after 1995 This scenario is considered to be demographically unrealistic.

TABLE A.7. JAPAN, 1998 REVISION

## JAPAN

|  | A. ESTIMATES |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Indicator | 1950 | 1955 | 1960 | 1965 | 1970 | 1975 | 1980 | 1985 | 1990 | 1995 |
| Population (thousands) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total................................................... | 83625 | 89815 | 94096 | 98881 | 104331 | 111524 | 116807 | 120837 | 123537 | 125472 |
| Males..................................................... | 41003 | 44111 | 46176 | 48531 | 51205 | 54880 | 57468 | 59393 | 60658 | 61526 |
| Fermales .............................................. | 42622 | 45704 | 47920 | 50350 | 53126 | 56644 | 59339 | 61444 | 62879 | 63946 |
| Sex ratio (per 100 females)............................ | 96.2 | 96.5 | 96.4 | 96.4 | 96.4 | 96.9 | 96.8 | 96.7 | 96.5 | 96.2 |
| Age distribution: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percentage aged 0-4. | 13.4 | 10.6 | 8.5 | 8.3 | 8.5 | 8.9 | 7.4 | 6.2 | 5.3 | 4.8 |
| Percentage aged 5-14. | 22.1 | 23.0 | 21.7 | 17.6 | 15.5 | 15.4 | 16.2 | 15.4 | 13.1 | 11.2 |
| Percentage aged 15-24. | 19.6 | 19.1 | 18.9 | 20.2 | 19.0 | 15.4 | 13.8 | 14.2 | 15.2 | 14.7 |
| Percentage aged 60 or over....................... | 7.7 | 8.1 | 8.9 | 9.6 | 10.7 | 11.7 | 12.9 | 14.8 | 17.4 | 20.5 |
| Percentage aged 65 or over...................... | 4.9 | 5.3 | 5.7 | 6.2 | 7.1 | 7.9 | 9.0 | 10.3 | 12.0 | 14.6 |
| Percentage of women aged 15-49................. | 50.2 | 51.2 | 53.0 | 55.6 | 55.9 | 53.6 | 51.6 | 50.1 | 50.0 | 48.5 |
| Median age (years)...................................... | 22.3 | 23.6 | 25.5 | 27.3 | 29.0 | 30.4 | 32.6 | 35.2 | 37.4 | 39.7 |
| Population density (per sq km)......................... | 221 | 238 | 249 | 262 | 276 | 295 | 309 | 320 | 327 | 332 |
|  | 1950-1955 | 1955-1960 | 1960-1965 | 1965-1970 | 1970-1975 | 1975-1980 | 1980-1985 | 1985-1990 | 1990-1995 |  |
| Population change per year (thousands)............ | 1238 | 856 | 957 | 1090 | 1439 | 1057 | 806 | 540 | 387 |  |
| Births per year (thousands)............................. | 2052 | 1664 | 1662 | 1805 | 2073 | 1733 | 1509 | 1321 | 1213 |  |
| Deaths per year (thousands).......................... | 812 | 715 | 702 | 697 | 712 | 697 | 730 | 773 | 863 |  |
| Popuiation growth rate (percentage)................ | 1.43 | 0.93 | 0.99 | 1.07 | 1.33 | 0.93 | 0.68 | 0.44 | 0.31 |  |
| Crude birth rate (per 1,000 population).............. | 23.7 | 18.1 | 17.2 | 17.8 | 19.2 | 15.2 | 12.7 | 10.8 | 9.7 |  |
| Crude death rate (per 1,000 population)............ | 9.4 | 7.8 | 7.3 | 5.9 | 6.6 | 6.1 | 6.1 | 6.3 | 6.9 |  |
| Total fertility rate (per woman)........................ | 2.75 | 2.08 | 2.02 | 2.00 | 2.07 | 1.81 | 1.76 | 1.66 | 1.49 |  |
| Gross reproduction rate (per woman)................ | 1.34 | 1.01 | 0.98 | 0.97 | 1.01 | 0.88 | 0.86 | 0.81 | 0.73 |  |
| Net reproduction rate (per woman).................. | 1.19 | 0.95 | 0.94 | 0.97 | 0.98 | 0.87 | 0.85 | 0.80 | 0.72 |  |
| Infant mortality rate (per 1,000 births)................ | 51 | 37 | 25 | 16 | 12 | 9 | 7 | 5 | 4 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Males..................................................... | 62.1 | 64.6 | 66.5 | 68.5 | 70.6 | 72.8 | 74.2 | 75.4 | 76.4 |  |
| Females................................................... | 65.9 | 69.1 | 71.6 | 73.9 | 76.2 | 78.2 | 79.7 76.9 | 81.2 78.3 | 82.4 79.5 |  |
| Both sexes combined................................ | 63.9 | 66.8 | 69.0 | 71.1 | 73.3 | 75.5 | 76.9 | 78.3 | 79.5 |  |

B. MEDIUM-VARIANT PROJECTIONS

|  | 1995 | 2000 | 2005 | 2010 | 2015 | 2020 | 2025 | 2030 | 2040 | 2050 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total. | 125472 | 126714 | 127457 | 127315 | 126070 | 123893 | 121150 | 118145 | 111691 | 104921 |
| Males. | 61526 | 62093 | 62423 | 62303 | 61619 | 60471 | 59058 | 57541 | 54395 | 51162 |
| Females. | 63946 | 64621 | 65034 | 65013 | 64451 | 63422 | 62092 | 60604 | 57296 | 53759 |
| Sex ratio (per 100 females) | 96.2 | 96.1 | 96.0 | 95.8 | 95.6 | 95.3 | 95.1 | 94.9 | 94.9 | 95.2 |
| Age distribution: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percentage aged 0-4. | 4.8 | 4.9 | 5.0 | 4.9 | 4.6 | 4.3 | 4.3 | 4.5 | 4.6 | 4.4 |
| Percentage aged 5-14. | 11.2 | 9.9 | 9.6 | 9.9 | 10.0 | 9.6 | 9.2 | 9.0 | 9.4 | 9.4 |
| Percentage aged 15-24. | 14.7 | 12.6 | 11.0 | 9.8 | 9.7 | 10.2 | 10.4 | 10.1 | 9.5 | 10.0 |
| Percentage aged 60 or over. | 20.5 | 23.1 | 25.8 | 29.3 | 31.2 | 32.1 | 32.9 | 34.2 | 37.4 | 37.6 |
| Percentage aged 65 or over. | 14.6 | 17.1 | 19.2 | 21.5 | 24.6 | 26.2 | 26.7 | 27.3 | 30.3 | 31.8 |
| Percentage in school ages 6-11................... | 6.5 | 5.8 | 5.8 | 6.0 | 6.0 | 5.7 | 5.4 | 5.3 | 5.7 | 5.6 |
| Percentage in school ages 12-14................. | 3.7 | 3.2 | 2.8 | 2.9 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 2.9 | 2.7 | 2.8 | 2.9 |
| Percentage in school ages 15-17................. | 3.9 | 3.4 | 3.0 | 2.8 | 3.0 | 3.1 | 3.0 | 2.9 | 2.8 5 | 3.0 |
| Percentage in school ages 18-23.................. | 9.2 | 7.7 | 6.7 | 5.9 | 5.7 | 5.1 | 6.3 | 6.1 | 5.7 | 6.0 |
| Percentage of women aged 15-49................ | 48.5 | 45.3 | 43.0 | 41.5 | 40.3 | 39.1 | 37.0 | 35.6 | 34.8 | 35.6 |
| Median age (years)......................................... | 39.7 | 41.2 | 42.5 | 43.8 | 45.2 | 46.9 | 48.4 | 49.3 | 49.5 | 49.0 |
| Population density (per sq km).......................... | 332 | 335 | 337 | 337 | 334 | 328 | 321 | 313 | 296 | 278 |

1995-2000 2000-2005 2005-2010 2010-2015 $2015-2020 \quad 2020-2025 \quad 2025-2030 \quad 2030-2040 \quad 2040-2050$

| Population change per year (thousands)........... | 248 | 149 | -28 | -249 | -435 | -549 | -601 | -645 | -677 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Births per year (thousands).............................. | 1254 | 1288 | 1246 | 1154 | 1080 | 1054 | 1061 | 1041 | 946 |
| Deaths per year (thousands). | 1005 | 1139 | 1274 | 1403 | 1515 | 1603 | 1662 | 1686 | 1623 |
| Net migration per year (thousands). | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Population growth rate (percentage). | 0.20 | 0.12 | -0.02 | -0.20 | -0.35 | -0.45 | -0.50 | -0.56 | -0.63 |
| Crude birth rate (per 1,000 population). | 9.9 | 10.1 | 9.8 | 9.1 | 8.6 | 8.6 | 8.9 | 9.1 | 8.7 |
| Crude death rate (per 1,000 population). | 8.0 | 9.0 | 10.0 | 11.1 | 12.1 | 13.1 | 13.9 | 14.7 | 15.0 |
| Net migration rate (per 1,000 population)........... | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total fertility rate (per woman)........................... | 1.43 | 1.47 | 1.54 | 1.61 | 1.68 | 1.73 | 1.75 | 1.75 | 1.75 |
| Gross reproduction rate (per woman)................ | 0.70 | 0.71 | 0.75 | 0.78 | 0.82 | 0.84 | 0.85 | 0.85 | 0.85 |
| Net reproduction rate (per woman). | 0.69 | 0.71 | 0.74 | 0.77 | 0.81 | 0.84 | 0.85 | 0.85 | 0.85 |
| Infant mortality rate (per 1,000 births) | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| Mortality under age 5 (per 1,000 births)............. | 6 | 6 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| Life expectancy at birth (years) |  |  |  |  |  | 78.8 | 79.2 | 79.8 |  |
| Males.............................................................. | 76.8 | 77.2 | 87.6 | 78.0 | 78.4 84.5 | 78.8 84.9 | 85.3 | 85.9 | 86.7 |
| Fernales................... | 82.9 | 83.3 | 83.7 | 84.1 | 84.5 81.5 | 84.9 81.9 | 82.3 | 82.8 | 86.7 83.6 |
| Both sexes combined................................. | 80.0 | 80.3 | 80.7 | 81.1 | 81.5 | 81.9 | 82.3 | 82.8 | 83.6 |

Source: United Nations Population Division, World Population Prospects: The 1998 Revision.

Table A. 7 (continued)
JAPAN
C. HIGH-VARIANT PROJECTIONS

|  | 1995 | 2000 | 2005 | 2010 | 2015 | 2020 | 2025 | 2030 | 2040 | 2050 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Population (thousands) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total. | 125472 | 126954 | 128243 | 128727 | 128143 | 126675 | 124832 | 123157 | 120207 | 117119 |
| Males. | 61526 | 62216 | 62827 | 63028 | 62683 | 61899 | 60947 | 60112 | 58763 | 57416 |
| Females. | 63946 | 64738 | 65417 | 65700 | 65460 | 64777 | 63885 | 63045 | 61444 | 59703 |
| Age distribution: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percentage aged 0-4. | 4.8 | 5.1 | 5.4 | 5.3 | 5.0 | 4.8 | 4.9 | 5.4 | 5.7 | 5.5 |
| Percentage aged 5-14. | 11.2 | 9.9 | 9.7 | 10.4 | 10.7 | 10.4 | 10.0 | 9.9 | 11.3 | 11.5 |
| Percentage aged 15-24.. | 14.7 | 12.6 | 10.9 | 9.7 | 9.7 | 10.6 | 11.0 | 10.7 | 10.2 | 11.6 |
| Percentage aged 60 or over. | 20.5 | 23.1 | 25.7 | 29.0 | 30.7 | 31.4 | 32.0 | 32.8 | 34.7 | 33.7 |
| Percentage aged 65 or over......................... | 14.6 | 17.0 | 19.1 | 21.3 | 24.2 | 25.6 | 25.9 | 26.2 | 28.1 | 28.5 |
| Percentage of women aged 15-49................ | 48.5 | 45.3 | 42.8 | 41.1 | 39.9 | 38.8 | 37.0 | 35.8 | 35.4 | 37.3 |
| Median age (years)......................................... | 39.7 | 41.1 | 42.2 | 43.4 | 44.6 | 46.2 | 47.3 | 47.6 | 45.9 | 44.8 |

$\begin{array}{llllllllll}1995-2000 & 2000-2005 & 2005-2010 & 2010-2015 & 2015-2020 & 2020-2025 & 2025-2030 & 2030-2040 & 2040-2050\end{array}$

| Population change per year (thousands)............ | 296 | 258 | 97 | - 117 | - 294 | - 369 | - 335 | - 295 | - 309 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Population growth rate (percentage). | 0.24 | 0.20 | 0.08 | -0.09 | -0.23 | -0.29 | -0.27 | -0.24 | - 0.26 |
| Crude birth rate (per 1,000 population)............. | 10.3 | 11.0 | 10.7 | 10.0 | 9.6 | 9.8 | 10.7 | 11.5 | 11.1 |
| Crude death rate (per 1,000 population). | 8.0 | 8.9 | 9.9 | 10.9 | 11.9 | 12.8 | 13.4 | 13.9 | 13.7 |
| Net migration rate (per 1,000 population)............ | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total fertility rate (per woman). | 1.49 | 1.59 | 1.69 | 1.79 | 1.89 | 1.99 | 2.09 | 2.15 | 2.15 |
| Gross reproduction rate (per woman)................. | 0.72 | 0.77 | 0.82 | 0.87 | 0.92 | 0.97 | 1.02 | 1.05 | 1.05 |
| Net reproduction rate (per woman).................... | 0.72 | 0.77 | 0.81 | 0.86 | 0.91 | 0.96 | 1.01 | 1.04 | 1.04 |

D. LOW-VARIANT PROJECTIONS

|  | 1995 | 2000 | 2005 | 2010 | 2015 | 2020 | 2025 | 2030 | 2040 | 2050 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Population (thousands) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total.. | 125472 | 126474 | 126583 | 125655 | 123497 | 120265 | 116290 | 111858 | 102145 | 91916 |
| Males. | 61526 | 61970 | 61974 | 61451 | 60298 | 58609 | 56564 | 54315 | 49499 | 44495 |
| Females. | 63946 | 64504 | 64609 | 64204 | 63199 | 61656 | 59727 | 57543 | 52646 | 47421 |
| Age distribution: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percentage aged 0-4. | 4.8 | 4.7 | 4.6 | 4.3 | 3.9 | 3.6 | 3.5 | 3.4 | 3.3 | 3.1 |
| Percentage aged 5-14. | 11.2 | 9.9 | 9.5 | 9.4 | 9.0 | 8.5 | 7.9 | 7.4 | 7.4 | 7.1 |
| Percentage aged 15-24. | 14.7 | 12.7 | 11.1 | 9.9 | 9.7 | 9.8 | 9.6 | 9.1 | 8.1 | 8.2 |
| Percentage aged 60 or over | 20.5 | 23.2 | 26.0 | 29.7 | 31.9 | 33.0 | 34.3 | 36.1 | 40.9 | 42.9 |
| Percentage aged 65 or over. | 14.6 | 17.1 | 19.3 | 21.8 | 25.1 | 27.0 | 27.8 | 28.8 | 33.1 | 36.3 |
| Percentage of women aged 15-49. | 48.5 | 45.4 | 43.3 | 42.0 | 40.9 | 39.5 | 37.1 | 35.3 | 33.4 | 32.5 |
| Median age (years). | 39.7 | 41.3 | 42.8 | 44.3 | 45.9 | 47.9 | 49.8 | 51.3 | 53.3 | 54.3 |

$\begin{array}{llllllllll}1995-2000 & 2000-2005 & 2005-2010 & 2010-2015 & 2015-2020 & 2020-2025 & 2025-2030 & 2030-2040 & 2040-2050\end{array}$

| Population change per year (thousands)............ | 200 | 22 | -186 | -432 | -646 | -795 | -886 | -971 | -1 023 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Population growth rate (percentage)................ | 0.16 | 0.02 | -0.15 | -0.35 | -0.53 | -0.67 | -0.78 | -0.91 | - 1.06 |
| Crude birth rate (per 1,000 population)............... | 9.6 | 9.2 | 8.6 | 7.8 | 7.1 | 6.8 | 6.8 | 6.6 | 6.1 |
| Crude death rate (per 1,000 population). | 8.0 | 9.0 | 10.1 | 11.3 | 12.4 | 13.5 | 14.5 | 15.7 | 16.7 |
| Net migration rate (per 1,000 population)........... | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total fertility rate (per woman)........................... | 1.38 | 1.32 | 1.34 | 1.35 | 1.35 | 1.35 | 1.35 | 1.35 | 1.35 |
| Gross reproduction rate (per woman)................ | 0.67 | 0.64 | 0.65 | 0.66 | 0.66 | 0.66 | 0.66 | 0.66 | 0.66 |
| Net reproduction rate (per woman).................... | 0.66 | 0.64 | 0.65 | 0.65 | 0.65 | 0.65 | 0.65 | 0.65 | 0.65 |

E. CONSTANT-VARIANT PROJECTIONS

|  | 1995 | 2000 | 2005 | 2010 | 2015 | 2020 | 2025 | 2030 | 2040 | 2050 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Population (thousands) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total... | 125472 | 126998 | 127871 | 127568 | 125930 | 123193 | 119804 | 116124 | 108043 | 99227 |

1995-2000 $2000-2005 \quad 2005-2010 \quad 2010-2015 \quad 2015-2020 \quad 2020-2025 \quad 2025-2030 \quad 2030-2040 \quad 2040-2050$

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Population growth rate (percentage) $\ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots . .$. | 0.24 | 0.14 | -0.05 | -0.26 | -0.44 | -0.56 | -0.62 | -0.72 |
| Crude birth rate (per 1,000 population) $\ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots .$. | 10.4 | 10.3 | 9.5 | 8.5 | 7.8 | 7.6 | 7.8 | 7.1 |
| Crude death rate (per 1,000 population) $\ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots .$. | 8.0 | 8.9 | 10.0 | 11.1 | 12.2 | 13.2 | 14.1 | 15.0 |

Source: United Nations Population Division, World Population Prospects: The 1998 Revision.

Table A.8. Japan, replacement migration scenarios
JAPAN

|  | Scenario | 1 | 11 | III | IV | V | VI |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Period |  | Medium variant | Medium variant with zero migration | Constant total population | Constant age group 15-64 | Ratio 15-64/65+ not less than 3.0 | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Constant ratio } \\ 15-64 / 65 \text { years } \\ \text { or older } \end{gathered}$ |


| A. Average annual net migration (thousands) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1995-2000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 231 | 0 | 5990 |
| 2000-2005 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 517 | 0 | 5674 |
| 2005-2010 | 0 | 0 | 27 | 818 | 341 | 6224 |
| 2010-2015 | 0 | 0 | 234 | 1056 | 4871 | 7831 |
| 2015-2020 | 0 | 0 | 387 | 483 | 2094 | 3854 |
| 2020-2025 | 0 | 0 | 459 | 200 | 204 | 2335 |
| 2025-2030 | 0 | 0 | 473 | 407 | 303 | 5895 |
| 2030-2035 | 0 | 0 | 472 | 707 | 1151 | 12766 |
| 2035-2040 | 0 | 0 | 472 | 1070 | 3255 | 20543 |
| 2040-2045 | 0 | 0 | 464 | 745 | 3162 | 20776 |
| 2045-2050 | 0 | 0 | 440 | 465 | 3588 | 18811 |
| Grand total 1995-2050 | 0 | 0 | 17141 | 33487 | 94837 | 553495 |
| B. Total population (thousands) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1995 | 125472 | 125472 | 125472 | 125472 | 125472 | 125472 |
| 2000 | 126714 | 126714 | 126714 | 127923 | 126714 | 158061 |
| 2005 | 127457 | 127457 | 127457 | 131475 | 127457 | 191169 |
| 2010 | 127315 | 127315 | 127457 | 135956 | 129104 | 228535 |
| 2015 | 126070 | 126070 | 127457 | 140936 | 153682 | 275471 |
| 2020 | 123893 | 123893 | 127457 | 142402 | 165212 | 303440 |
| 2025 | 121150 | 121150 | 127457 | 141877 | 166849 | 323376 |
| 2030 | 118145 | 118145 | 127457 | 142094 | 168149 | 361530 |
| 2035 | 114987 | 114987 | 127457 | 143811 | 173472 | 437628 |
| 2040 | 111691 | 111691 | 127457 | 147553 | 190219 | 559848 |
| 2045 | 108304 | 108304 | 127457 | 149843 | 207956 | 691148 |
| 2050 | 104921 | 104921 | 127457 | 150697 | 229021 | 817965 |
| C. Age group 15-64 (thousands) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1995 | 87188 | 87188 | 87188 | 87188 | 87188 | 87188 |
| 2000 | 86335 | 86335 | 86335 | 87188 | 86335 | 108454 |
| 2005 | 84355 | 84355 | 84355 | 87188 | 84355 | 129299 |
| 2010 | 81099 | 81099 | 81199 | 87188 | 82357 | 152670 |
| 2015 | 76708 | 76708 | 77681 | 87188 | 96067 | 182833 |
| 2020 | 74101 | 74101 | 76587 | 87188 | 102837 | 202426 |
| 2025 | 72418 | 72418 | 76803 | 87188 | 104213 | 217547 |
| 2030 | 70018 | 70018 | 76509 | 87188 | 105485 | 243694 |
| 2035 | 66671 | 66671 | 75432 | 87188 | 109112 | 292648 |
| 2040 | 62250 | 62250 | 73410 | 87188 | 118822 | 369375 |
| 2045 | 59159 | 59159 | 72729 | 87188 | 128831 | 452377 |
| 2050 | 57087 | 57087 | 72908 | 87188 | 140816 | 535088 |
| D. Potential support ratio 15-64/65 or older |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1995 | 4.77 | 4.77 | 4.77 | 4.77 | 4.75 | 4.77 |
| 2000 | 3.99 | 3.99 | 3.99 | 4.03 | 3.99 | 4.77 |
| 2005 | 3.45 | 3.45 | 3.45 | 3.54 | 3.45 | 4.77 |
| 2010 | 2.96 | 2.96 | 2.96 | 3.14 | 3.00 | 4.77 |
| 2015 | 2.47 | 2.47 | 2.50 | 2.75 | 3.00 | 4.77 |
| 2020 | 2.28 | 2.28 | 2.35 | 2.61 | 3.00 | 4.77 |
| 2025 | 2.24 | 2.24 | 2.35 | 2.59 | 3.00 | 4.77 |
| 2030 | 2.17 | 2.17 | 2.34 | 2.57 | 3.00 | 4.77 |
| 2035 | 2.05 | 2.05 | 2.27 | 2.49 | 3.00 | 4.77 |
| 2040 | 1.84 | 1.84 | 2.11 | 2.33 | 3.00 | 4.77 |
| 2045 | 1.74 | 1.74 | 2.06 | 2.23 | 3.00 | 4.77 |
| 2050 | 1.71 | 1.71 | 2.07 | 2.19 | 3.00 | 4.77 |

## Table A. 8 (continued)



NOTE: The six scenarios can be described briefly as follows:

[^13]Table A.9. Republic of Korea, 1998 Revision

## REPUBLIC OF KOREA

| Indicator |  | A. ESTIMATES |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 1950 | 1955 | 1960 | 1965 | 1970 | 1975 | 1980 | 1985 | 1990 | 1995 |
| Population (thousands) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total. |  | 20357 | 21422 | 25003 | 28530 | 31923 | 35281 | 38124 | 40806 | 42869 | 44949 |
| Males. |  | 10285 | 10497 | 12403 | 14273 | 16057 | 17775 | 19259 | 20576 | 21568 | 22646 |
| Females. |  | 10072 | 10925 | 12601 | 14256 | 15865 | 17506 | 18865 | 20230 | 21301 | 22303 |
| Sex ratio (per 100 females). |  | 102.1 | 96.1 | 98.4 | 100.1 | 101.2 | 101.5 | 102.1 | 101.7 | 101.3 | 101.5 |
| Age distribution: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percentage aged 0-4. |  | 15.7 | 15.6 | 18.6 | 16.5 | 13.7 | 12.7 | 11.3 | 9.1 | 7.7 | 7.7 |
| Percentage aged 5-14. |  | 26.0 | 23.8 | 23.3 | 26.8 | 28.3 | 25.1 | 22.7 | 20.9 | 18.2 | 15.8 |
| Percentage aged 15-24. |  | 18.6 | 20.6 | 18.8 | 17.2 | 17.8 | 21.3 | 23.0 | 21.1 | 20.4 | 18.7 |
| Percentage aged 60 or over |  | 5.4 | 5.6 | 5.3 | 5.1 | 5.4 | 5.8 | 6.0 | 6.8 | 7.7 | 8.9 |
| Percentage aged 65 or over. |  | 3.0 | 3.7 | 3.3 | 3.3 | 3.3 | 3.6 | 3.8 | 4.3 | 5.0 | 5.6 |
| Percentage of women aged 15-49. |  | 46.0 | 49.2 | 47.0 | 45.7 | 46.6 | 49.9 | 52.9 | 54.9 | 56.9 | 57.7 |
| Median age (years)... |  | 19.2 | 19.8 | 19.2 | 18.7 | 19.0 | 19.9 | 21.8 | 24.5 | 26.9 | 29.2 |
| Population density (per sq km). |  | 206 | 216 | 253 | 288 | 322 | 356 | 385 | 412 | 433 | 454 |
|  |  | 1950-1955 | 1955-1960 | 1960-1965 | 1965-1970 | 1970-1975 | 1975-1980 | 1980-1985 | 1985-1990 | 1990-1995 |  |
| Population change per year (thousands)... |  | 213 | 716 | 705 | 679 | 672 | 569 | 536 | 413 | 416 |  |
| Births per year (thousands).................... |  | 773 | 1065 | 1059 | 963 | 969 | 877 | 840 | 690 | 700 |  |
| Deaths per year (thousands). |  | 668 | 345 | 335 | 314 | 297 | 259 | 258 | 256 | 274 |  |
| Population growth rate (percentage). |  | 1.02 | 3.09 | 2.64 | 2.25 | 2.00 | 1.55 | 1.36 | 0.99 | 0.95 |  |
| Crude birth rate (per 1,000 population).. |  | 37.0 | 45.9 | 39.6 | 31.9 | 28.8 | 23.9 | 21.3 | 16.5 | 15.9 |  |
| Crude death rate (per 1,000 population). |  | 32.0 | 14.9 | 12.5 | 10.4 | 8.9 | 7.1 | 6.5 | 6.1 | 6.3 |  |
| Total fertility rate (per woman)............. |  | 5.40 | 6.33 | 5.63 | 4.71 | 4.28 | 2.92 | 2.50 | 1.80 | 1.70 |  |
| Gross reproduction rate (per woman).. |  | 2.51 | 2.95 | 2.62 | 2.19 | 1.99 | 1.36 | 1.17 | 0.84 | 0.79 |  |
| Net reproduction rate (per woman)... |  | 1.79 | 2.28 | 2.11 | 1.83 | 1.73 | 1.26 | 1.10 | 0.80 | 0.77 |  |
| Infant mortality rate (per 1,000 births)..... |  | 115 | 100 | 70 | 58 | 38 | 30 | 23 | 14 | 11 |  |
| Life expectancy at birth (years) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Males... |  | 46.0 | 51.1 | 53.6 | 56.0 | 59.3 | 61.3 | 63.5 | 65.8 | 67.3 |  |
| Females.. |  | 49.0 | 54.2 | 56.9 | 59.4 | 66.1 | 68.4 | 71.1 | 73.7 | 74.9 |  |
| Both sexes combined. |  | 47.5 | 52.6 | 55.2 | 57.6 | 62.6 | 64.8 | 65.9 | 69.6 | 70.9 |  |

B. MEDIUM-VARIANT PROJECTIONS

|  | 1995 | 2000 | 2005 | 2010 | 2015 | 2020 | 2025 | 2030 | 2040 | 2050 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Population (thousands) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total. | 44949 | 46844 | 48548 | 49976 | 51051 | 51893 | 52533 | 52898 | 52700 | 51275 |
| Males. | 22646 | 23624 | 24486 | 25183 | 25679 | 26053 | 26312 | 26438 | 26250 | 25496 |
| Females. | 22303 | 23220 | 24061 | 24793 | 25372 | 25840 | 26221 | 26460 | 26450 | 25779 |
| Sex ratio (per 100 females). | 101.5 | 101.7 | 101.8 | 101.6 | 101.2 | 100.8 | 100.3 | 99.9 | 99.2 | 98.9 |
| Age distribution: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percentage aged 0-4. | 7.7 | 7.2 | 6.9 | 6.4 | 6.0 | 5.7 | 5.6 | 5.5 | 5.3 | 5.2 |
| Percentage aged 5-14. | 15.8 | 14.3 | 14.0 | 13.3 | 12.7 | 12.0 | 11.4 | 11.2 | 11.0 | 10.8 |
| Percentage aged 15-24. | 18.7 | 16.5 | 14.5 | 13.3 | 13.2 | 12.8 | 12.3 | 11.8 | 11.2 | 11.3 |
| Percentage aged 60 or over | 8.9 | 10.6 | 12.0 | 13.5 | 15.6 | 19.0 | 22.3 | 25.1 | 29.4 | 30.4 |
| Percentage aged 65 or over. | 5.6 | 6.7 | 8.1 | 9.3 | 10.6 | 12.3 | 15.3 | 18.1 | 22.8 | 24.7 |
| Percentage in school ages 6-11. | 9.1 | 8.6 | 8.4 | 8.0 | 7.6 | 7.1 | 6.8 | 6.7 | 6.6 | 6.4 |
| Percentage in school ages 12-14.................. | 5.2 | 4.2 | 4.2 | 4.0 | 3.9 | 3.7 | 3.5 | 3.4 | 3.3 | 3.3 |
| Percentage in school ages 15-17.................. | 5.2 | 4.8 | 3.9 | 4.1 | 3.9 | 3.8 | 3.6 | 3.4 | 3.3 | 3.3 |
| Percentage in school ages 18-23................. | 11.5 | 9.9 | 8.9 | 7.8 | 8.0 | 7.7 | 7.5 | 7.1 | 6.7 | 6.8 |
| Percentage of women aged 15-49................ | 57.7 | 57.7 | 55.8 | 52.4 | 49.0 | 46.2 | 43.2 | 41.3 | 39.4 | 39.1 |
| Median age (years).......................................... | 29.2 | 31.4 | 33.7 | 36.0 | 38.0 | 39.7 | 41.3 | 42.3 | 43.6 | 44.4 |
| Population density (per sq km)......................... | 454 | 473 | 490 | 505 | 516 | 524 | 531 | 534 | 532 | 518 |

$\begin{array}{lllllllll}1995-2000 & 2000-2005 & 2005-2010 & 2010-2015 & 2015-2020 & 2020-2025 & 2025-2030 & 2030-2040 & 2040-2050\end{array}$


Source: United Nations Population Division, World Population Prospects: The 1998 Revision.

## Table A. 9 (continued)

REPUBLIC OF KOREA
C. HIGH-VARIANT PROJECTIONS

|  | 1995 | 2000 | 2005 | 2010 | 2015 | 2020 | 2025 | 2030 | 2040 | 2050 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Population (thousands) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total. | 44949 | 46988 | 48978 | 50725 | 52143 | 53380 | 54620 | 55777 | 57430 | 58114 |
| Males. | 22646 | 23701 | 24715 | 25579 | 26253 | 26832 | 27402 | 27940 | 28713 | 29053 |
| Females. | 22303 | 23287 | 24263 | 25147 | 25890 | 26548 | 27218 | 27837 | 28716 | 29061 |
| Age distribution: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percentage aged 0-4 | 7.7 | 7.5 | 7.4 | 7.0 | 6.5 | 6.3 | 6.5 | 6.7 | 6.5 | 6.5 |
| Percentage aged 5-14. | 15.8 | 14.2 | 14.2 | 14.0 | 13.6 | 12.9 | 12.4 | 12.4 | 13.0 | 12.9 |
| Percentage aged 15-24.. | 18.7 | 16.4 | 14.3 | 13.1 | 13.2 | 13.2 | 13.0 | 12.4 | 12.0 | 12.9 |
| Percentage aged 60 or over......................... | 8.9 | 10.5 | 11.9 | 13.3 | 15.2 | 18.5 | 21.4 | 23.8 | 27.0 | 26.8 |
| Percentage aged 65 or over......................... | 5.6 | 6.7 | 8.0 | 9.1 | 10.3 | 11.9 | 14.7 | 17.1 | 20.9 | 21.8 |
| Percentage of women aged 15-49................ | 57.7 | 57.6 | 55.3 | 51.6 | 48.3 | 45.7 | 42.9 | 41.1 | 39.8 | 40.7 |
| Median age (years)......................................... | 29.2 | 31.4 | 33.5 | 35.5 | 37.3 | 38.8 | 39.9 | 40.0 | 40.2 | 40.1 |

D. LOW-VARIANT PROJECTIONS

|  | 1995 | 2000 | 2005 | 2010 | 2015 | 2020 | 2025 | 2030 | 2040 | 2050 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Population (thousands) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total. | 44949 | 46700 | 48039 | 49000 | 49532 | 49750 | 49704 | 49287 | 47277 | 43855 |
| Males. | 22646 | 23548 | 24216 | 24668 | 24882 | 24932 | 24834 | 24555 | 23426 | 21636 |
| Females. | 22303 | 23153 | 23823 | 24332 | 24650 | 24818 | 24870 | 24733 | 23852 | 22219 |
| Age distribution: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percentage aged 0-4. | 7.7 | 6.9 | 6.2 | 5.6 | 5.1 | 4.7 | 4.5 | 4.3 | 3.9 | 3.8 |
| Percentage aged 5-14. | 15.8 | 44.3 | 13.8 | 12.6 | 11.5 | 10.5 | 9.7 | 9.3 | 8.7 | 8.2 |
| Percentage aged 15-24. | 18.7 | 16.5 | 14.6 | 13.5 | 13.3 | 12.3 | 11.4 | 10.6 | 9.7 | 9.4 |
| Percentage aged 60 or over. | 8.9 | 10.6 | 12.1 | 13.8 | 16.0 | 19.8 | 23.5 | 26.9 | 32.8 | 35.5 |
| Percentage aged 65 or over.. | 5.6 | 6.8 | 8.2 | 9.5 | 10.9 | 12.8 | 16.1 | 19.4 | 25.4 | 28.9 |
| Percentage of women aged 15-49. | 57.7 | 57.9 | 56.3 | 53.3 | 50.2 | 47.1 | 43.7 | 41.2 | 38.1 | 36.0 |
| Median age (years)... | 29.2 | 31.5 | 34.0 | 36.5 | 39.0 | 41.2 | 43.2 | 45.1 | 47.7 | 49.9 |


E. CONSTANT-VARIANT PROJECTIONS

|  | 1995 | 2000 | 2005 | 2010 | 2015 | 2020 | 2025 | 2030 | 2040 | 2050 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Population (thousands) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total. | 44949 | 46936 | 48660 | 49977 | 50835 | 51379 | 51730 | 51802 | 50829 | 48406 |


|  | 1995-2000 | 2000-2005 | 2005-2010 | 2010-2015 | 2015-2020 | 2020-2025 | 2025-2030 | 2030-2040 | 2040-2050 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Population growth rate (percentage). | 0.87 | 0.72 | 0.53 | 0.34 | 0.21 | 0.14 | 0.03 | -0.19 | -0.49 |
| Crude birth rate (per 1,000 population)............... | 15.3 | 14.2 | 12.7 | 11.4 | 10.5 | 10.4 | 10.2 | 9.6 | 8.9 |
| Crude death rate (per 1,000 population)............. | 6.2 | 6.5 | 7.0 | 7.6 | 8.2 | 9.0 | 9.9 | 11.5 | 13.8 |

Source: United Nations Population Division, World Population Prospects: The 1998 Revision.

Table A.10. Republic of Korea, replacement migration scenarios

REPUBLIC OF KOREA

| Scenario | 1 | 11 | III | IV | V | VI |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Period | Medium variant | Medium variant with zero migration | Constant total population | Constant age group 15-64 | Ratio 15-64/65+ not less than 3.0 | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Constant ratio } \\ \text { 15-64/65 years } \\ \text { or older } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| A. Average annual net migration (thousands) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1995-2000 | -20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4156 |
| 2000-2005 | -20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7278 |
| 2005-2010 | -20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8378 |
| 2010-2015 | -20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10678 |
| 2015-2020 | -10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16470 |
| 2020-2025 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 207 | 0 | 32950 |
| 2025-2030 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 269 | 0 | 56296 |
| 2030-2035 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 268 | 0 | 98662 |
| 2035-2040 | 0 | 0 | 53 | 286 | 1277 | 163817 |
| 2040-2045 | 0 | 0 | 109 | 141 | 688 | 250241 |
| 2045-2050 | 0 | 0 | 140 | 114 | 353 | 380860 |
| Grand total 1995-2050 | -450 | 0 | 1509 | 6426 | 11595 | 5148928 |
| B. Total population (thousands) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1995 | 44949 | 44949 | 44949 | 44949 | 44949 | 44949 |
| 2000 | 46844 | 46946 | 46946 | 46946 | 46946 | 68768 |
| 2005 | 48548 | 48755 | 48755 | 48755 | 48755 | 110750 |
| 2010 | 49976 | 50291 | 50291 | 50291 | 50291 | 161469 |
| 2015 | 51051 | 51474 | 51474 | 51474 | 51474 | 227364 |
| 2020 | 51893 | 52375 | 52375 | 52375 | 52375 | 328110 |
| 2025 | 52533 | 53020 | 53020 | 54119 | 53020 | 522908 |
| 2030 | 52898 | 53389 | 53389 | 56034 | 53389 | 856241 |
| 2035 | 52979 | 53470 | 53470 | 57776 | 53470 | 1439406 |
| 2040 | 52700 | 53189 | 53470 | 59345 | 59982 | 2412051 |
| 2045 | 52097 | 52580 | 53470 | 59910 | 63752 | 3915529 |
| 2050 | 51275 | 51751 | 53470 | 60125 | 65736 | 6233275 |
| C. Age group 15-64 (thousands) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1995 | 31882 | 31882 | 31882 | 31882 | 31882 | 31882 |
| 2000 | 33623 | 33696 | 33696 | 33696 | 33696 | 48998 |
| 2005 | 34496 | 34644 | 34644 | 34644 | 34644 | 77984 |
| 2010 | 35455 | 35678 | 35678 | 35678 | 35678 | 113307 |
| 2015 | 36106 | 36405 | 36405 | 36405 | 36405 | 159555 |
| 2020 | 36314 | 36649 | 36649 | 36649 | 36649 | 230307 |
| 2025 | 35557 | 35886 | 35886 | 36649 | 35886 | 365720 |
| 2030 | 34506 | 34827 | 34827 | 36649 | 34827 | 595824 |
| 2035 | 33379 | 33689 | 33689 | 36649 | 33689 | 997406 |
| 2040 | 32083 | 32383 | 32578 | 36649 | 37101 | 1667666 |
| 2045 | 31205 | 31495 | 32109 | 36649 | 39156 | 2707304 |
| 2050 | 30401 | 30685 | 31867 | 36649 | 40270 | 4319740 |
| D. Potential support ratio 15-64/65 or older |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1995 | 12.62 | 12.62 | 12.62 | 12.62 | 12.62 | 12.62 |
| 2000 | 10.67 | 10.67 | 10.67 | 10.67 | 10.67 | 12.62 |
| 2005 | 8.77 | 8.77 | 8.77 | 8.77 | 8.77 | 12.62 |
| 2010 | 7.64 | 7.64 | 7.64 | 7.64 | 7.64 | 12.62 |
| 2015 | 6.70 | 6.70 | 6.70 | 6.70 | 6.70 | 12.62 |
| 2020 | 5.70 | 5.70 | 5.70 | 5.70 | 5.70 | 12.62 |
| 2025 | 4.43 | 4.43 | 4.43 | 4.51 | 4.34 | 12.62 |
| 2030 | 3.61 | 3.61 | 3.61 | 3.76 | 3.61 | 12.62 |
| 2035 | 3.07 | 3.07 | 3.07 | 3.29 | 3.07 | 12.62 |
| 2040 | 2.67 | 2.67 | 2.68 | 2.95 | 3.00 | 12.62 |
| 2045 | 2.50 | 2.50 | 2.54 | 2.83 | 3.00 | 12.62 |
| 2050 | 2.40 | 2.40 | 2.48 | 2.76 | 3.00 | 12.62 |

Table A.10. (continued)
REPUBLIC OF KOREA

| Scenario | 1 | II | III | IV | V | VI |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Period | Medium variant | Medium variant with zero migration | Constant total population | Constant age group 15-64 | Ratio 15-64/65+ not less than 3.0 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Constant ratio } \\ & 15-64 / 65 \text { years } \end{aligned}$ or older |
| E. Age group 65 or older (thousands) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1995 | 2527 | 2527 | 2527 | 2527 | 2527 | 2527 |
| 2000 | 3152 | 3159 | 3159 | 3159 | 3159 | 3884 |
| 2005 | 3934 | 3951 | 3951 | 3951 | 3951 | 6182 |
| 2010 | 4639 | 4668 | 4668 | 4668 | 4668 | 8982 |
| 2015 | 5387 | 5432 | 5432 | 5432 | 5432 | 12648 |
| 2020 | 6366 | 6426 | 6426 | 6426 | 6426 | 18256 |
| 2025 | 8020 | 8094 | 8094 | 8131 | 8094 | 28990 |
| 2030 | 9565 | 9653 | 9653 | 9753 | 9653 | 47231 |
| 2035 | 10867 | 10968 | 10968 | 11146 | 10968 | 79064 |
| 2040 | 12024 | 12134 | 12144 | 12409 | 12367 | 132195 |
| 2045 | 12488 | 12603 | 12637 | 12971 | 13052 | 214606 |
| 2050 | 12665 | 12781 | 12851 | 13270 | 13423 | 342421 |
| F. Percentage in age group 65 or older |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1995 | 5.6 | 5.6 | 5.6 | 5.6 | 5.6 | 5.6 |
| 2000 | 6.7 | 6.7 | 6.7 | 6.7 | 6.7 | 5.6 |
| 2005 | 8.1 | 8.1 | 8.1 | 8.1 | 8.1 | 5.6 |
| 2010 | 9.3 | 9.3 | 9.3 | 9.3 | 9.3 | 5.6 |
| 2015 | 10.6 | 10.6 | 10.6 | 10.6 | 10.6 | 5.6 |
| 2020 | 12.3 | 12.3 | 12.3 | 12.3 | 12.3 | 5.6 |
| 2025 | 15.3 | 15.3 | 15.3 | 15.0 | 15.3 | 5.5 |
| 2030 | 18.1 | 18.1 | 18.1 | 17.4 | 18.1 | 5.5 |
| 2035 | 20.5 | 20.5 | 20.5 | 19.3 | 20.5 | 5.5 |
| 2040 | 22.8 | 22.8 | 22.7 | 20.9 | 20.6 | 5.5 |
| 2045 | 24.0 | 24.0 | 23.6 | 21.7 | 20.5 | 5.5 |
| 2050 | 24.7 | 24.7 | 24.0 | 22.1 | 20.4 | 5.5 |
| G. Age group 0-14 (thousands) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1995 | 10540 | 10540 | 10540 | 10540 | 10540 | 10540 |
| 2000 | 10068 | 10091 | 10091 | 10091 | 10091 | 15886 |
| 2005 | 10118 | 10160 | 10160 | 10160 | 10160 | 26585 |
| 2010 | 9882 | 9945 | 9945 | 9945 | 9945 | 39180 |
| 2015 | 9558 | 9637 | 9637 | 9637 | 9637 | 55160 |
| 2020 | 9213 | 9299 | 9299 | 9299 | 9299 | 79547 |
| 2025 | 8956 | 9040 | 9040 | 9338 | 9040 | 128197 |
| 2030 | 8827 | 8909 | 8909 | 9632 | 8909 | 213186 |
| 2035 | 8733 | 8814 | 8814 | 9981 | 8814 | 362937 |
| 2040 | 8592 | 8672 | 8748 | 10286 | 10514 | 612190 |
| 2045 | 8404 | 8482 | 8725 | 10290 | 11543 | 993619 |
| 2050 | 8209 | 8285 | 8752 | 10205 | 12043 | 1571113 |
| H. Potential support ratio in 2050, by age at entry into non-working-age population |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Age |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 65 | 2.40 | 2.40 | 2.48 | 2.76 | 3.00 | 12.62 |
| 70 | 3.55 | 3.55 | 3.66 | 4.06 | 4.39 | 20.96 |
| 75 | 5.61 | 5.61 | 5.78 | 6.39 | 6.90 | 39.32 |
| 80 | 10.44 | 10.45 | 10.75 | 11.83 | 12.81 | 88.83 |

NOTE: The six scenarios can be described briefly as follows:

[^14]Table A.11. Russian Federation, 1998 REVISION

## RUSSIAN FEDERATION

| Indicator | A. ESTIMATES |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1950 | 1955 | 1960 | 1965 | 1970 | 1975 | 1980 | 1985 | 1990 | 1995 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Population (thousands) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total................................................... | 102192 | 111402 | 119906 | 126749 | 130392 | 134233 | 138660 | 143329 | 148292 | 148097 |
| Males................................................... | 43859 | 48826 | 53472 | 57261 | 59368 | 61362 | 63895 | 66497 | 69444 | 69353 |
| Females............................................... | 58333 | 62576 | 66434 | 69488 | 71024 | 72870 | 74765 | 76832 | 78848 | 78744 |
| Sex ratio (per 100 females)........................... | 75.2 | 78.0 | 80.5 | 82.4 | 83.6 | 84.2 | 85.5 | 86.5 | 88.1 | 88.1 |
| Age distribution: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percentage aged 0-4............................... | 9.8 | 11.3 | 11.2 | 9.6 | 7.2 | 7.5 | 7.7 | 8.1 | 7.8 | 5.2 |
| Percentage aged 5-14.............................. | 19.1 | 15.6 | 18.7 | 20.3 | 19.4 | 15.8 | 13.9 | 14.5 | 15.2 | 15.9 |
| Percentage aged 15-24............................ | 21.1 | 19.8 | 16.2 | 13.5 | 16.9 | 18.7 | 17.7 | 14.7 | 13.3 | 14.3 |
| Percentage aged 60 or over....................... | 9.2 | 9.1 | 9.3 | 10.4 | 11.9 | 13.6 | 13.5 | 13.9 | 16.0 | 16.7 |
| Percentage aged 65 or over...................... | 6.2 | 6.3 | 6.3 | 6.6 | 7.7 | 8.9 | 10.2 | 9.7 | 10.0 | 11.9 |
| Percentage of women aged 15-49................. | 55.3 | 55.0 | 50.2 | 47.4 | 49.5 | 50.9 | 49.1 | 47.8 | 45.8 | 48.7 |
| Population density (per sq km).......................................................... | 25.0 | 26.5 | 27.4 | 28.5 | 30.6 | 30.8 | 31.3 | 32.1 | 33.3 | 35.1 |
|  | 6 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 9 | 9 |
|  | 1950-1955 | 1955-1960 | 1960-1965 | 1965-1970 | 1970-1975 | 1975-1980 | 1980-1985 | 1985-1990 | 1990-1995 |  |
| Population change per year (thousands)........... | 1842 | 1701 | 1369 | 729 | 768 | 885 | 934 | 993 | - 39 |  |
| Births per year (thousands)........................... | 2592 | 2772 | 2489 | 1920 | 2011 | 2156 | 2355 | 2333 | 1566 |  |
| Deaths per year (thousands)......................... | 908 | 993 | 1009 | 1080 | 1204 | 1405 | 1565 | 1560 | 1979 |  |
| Population growth rate (percentage) ................ | 1.73 | 1.47 | 1.11 | 0.57 | 0.58 | 0.65 | 0.66 | 0.68 | - 0.03 |  |
| Crude birth rate (per 1,000 population)............. | 24.3 | 24.0 | 20.2 | 14.9 | 15.2 | 15.8 | 16.7 | 16.0 | 10.6 |  |
| Crude death rate (per 1,000 population)............ | 8.5 | 8.6 | 8.2 | 8.4 | 9.1 | 10.3 | 11.1 | 10.7 | 13.4 |  |
| Total fertility rate (per woman)....................... | 2.51 | 2.62 | 2.48 | 2.02 | 1.98 | 1.92 | 1.99 | 2.10 | 1.50 |  |
| Gross reproduction rate (per woman)............... | 1.23 | 1.28 | 1.21 | 0.99 | 0.97 | 0.94 | 0.97 | 1.02 | 0.73 |  |
| Net reproduction rate (per woman) .................. | 1.16 | 1.22 | 1.16 | 0.95 | 0.93 | 0.90 | 0.94 | 0.99 | 0.71 |  |
| Infant mortality rate (per 1,000 births)............... | 98 | 57 | 39 | 31 | 28 | 30 | 26 | 24 | 18 |  |
| Life expectancy at birth (years) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Males .................................................. | 62.5 | 63.0 | 64.0 | 63.9 | 63.1 | 61.9 | 62.1 | 64.3 | 60.6 |  |
| Females................................................ | 70.5 | 71.0 | 72.6 | 73.5 | 73.5 | 73.1 | 73.4 | 74.3 | 72.8 |  |
| Both sexes combined................................ | 67.3 | 67.7 | 69.0 | 69.0 | 68.2 | 67.4 | 67.6 | 69.2 | 66.5 |  |

B. MEDIUM-VARIANT PROJECTIONS

|  | 1995 | 2000 | 2005 | 2010 | 2015 | 2020 | 2025 | 2030 | 2040 | 2050 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Population (thousands) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total.. | 148097 | 146934 | 145549 | 144418 | 142945 | 140639 | 137933 | 135207 | 128875 | 121256 |
| Males............................................................. | 69353 | 68674 | 67879 | 67323 | 66688 | 65662 | 64460 | 63242 | 60412 | 57126 |
| Females.............................................. | 78744 | 78260 | 77670 | 77095 | 76258 | 74977 | 73473 | 71965 | 68463 | 64129 |
| Sex ratio (per 100 females) ........................... | 88.1 | 87.8 | 87.4 | 87.3 | 87.5 | 87.6 | 87.7 | 87.9 | 88.2 | 89.1 |
| Age distribution: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percentage aged 0-4................................. | 5.2 | 4.8 | 5.2 | 5.5 | 5.3 | 4.8 | 4.7 | 4.8 | 4.7 | 4.5 |
| Percentage aged 5-14............................... | 15.9 | 13.4 | 10.4 | 10.2 | 10.9 | 11.1 | 10.5 | 9.9 | 10.0 | 9.8 |
| Percentage aged 15-24.............................. | 14.3 | 15.6 | 16.3 | 13.7 | 10.7 | 10.6 | 11.4 | 11.6 | 10.4 | 10.6 |
| Percentage aged 60 or over........................ | 16.7 | 18.5 | 17.4 | 18.2 | 20.3 | 22.9 | 25.0 | 25.8 | 28.6 | 33.4 |
| Percentage aged 65 or over. | 11.9 | 12.5 | 14.0 | 12.9 | 13.7 | 15.6 | 18.1 | 19.9 | 21.5 | 25.0 |
| Percentage in school ages 6-11................. | 9.7 | 7.4 | 5.9 | 6.2 | 6.6 | 6.6 | 6.1 | 5.8 | 6.0 | 5.8 |
| Percentage in school ages 12-14................. | 4.7 | 5.0 | 3.5 | 30 | 3.2 | 3.4 | 3.4 | 3.1 | 3.0 | 3.1 |
| Percentage in school ages 15-17................. | 4.5 | 4.9 | 4.7 | 3.1 | 3.0 | 3.3 | 3.5 | 3.3 | 3.0 | 3.1 |
| Percentage in school ages 18-23................ | 8.5 | 9.2 | 10.0 | 9.0 | 6.3 | 6.2 | 6.8 | 7.1 | 6.2 | 6.4 |
| Percentage of women aged 15-49................ | 48.7 | 50.6 | 50.8 | 47.9 | 45.4 | 44.7 | 43.9 | 42.3 | 37.0 | 37.7 |
| Median age (years)....................................... | 35.1 | 36.7 | 37.7 | 38.4 | 39.4 | 40.7 | 42.4 | 44.1 | 46.3 | 46.1 |
| Population density (per sq km)........................ | 9 | 9 | 9 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 7 |

1995-2000 2000-2005 2005-2010 2010-2015 2015-2020 2020-2025 2025-2030 2030-2040 2040-2050

| Population change per year (thousands)............ | -233 | -277 | -226 | -295 | -461 | -541 | -545 | -633 | -762 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Births per year (thousands)............................ | 1421 | 1522 | 1610 | 1533 | 1381 | 1313 | 1305 | 1251 | 1135 |
| Deaths per year (thousands).......................... | 2048 | 2098 | 2041 | 1982 | 1947 | 1909 | 1905 | 1939 | 1951 |
| Net migration per year (thousands)................... | 394 | 299 | 204 | 154 | 104 | 55 | 55 | 55 | 55 |
| Population growth rate (percentage)................. | -0.16 | -0.19 | -0.16 | -0.21 | -0.33 | -0.39 | -0.40 | -0.48 | - 0.61 |
| Crude birth rate (per 1,000 population).............. | 9.6 | 10.4 | 11.1 | 10.7 | 9.7 | 9.4 | 9.6 | 9.5 | 9.1 |
| Crude death rate (per 1,000 population)............ | 13.9 | 14.3 | 14.1 | 13.8 | 13.7 | 13.7 | 13.9 | 14.7 | 15.6 |
| Net migration rate (per 1,000 population)........... | 2.7 | 2.0 | 1.4 | 1.1 | 0.7 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.4 |
| Total fertility rate (per woman).............................. | 1.35 | 1.38 | 1.45 | 1.52 | 1.59 | 1.66 | 1.70 | 1.70 | 1.70 |
| Gross reproduction rate (per woman)................ | 0.66 | 0.67 | 0.71 | 0.74 | 0.78 | 0.81 | 0.83 | 0.83 | 0.83 |
| Net reproduction rate (per woman).................. | 0.64 | 0.65 | 0.69 | 0.72 | 0.76 | 0.79 | 0.81 | 0.82 | 0.82 |
| Infant mortality rate (per 1,000 births)............... | 18 | 18 | 16 | 15 | 14 | 13 | 12 | 10 | 9 |
| Mortality under age 5 (per 1,000 births)............. | 22 | 21 | 20 | 18 | 16 | 15 | 14 | 12 | 10 |
| Life expectancy at birth (years) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Males. | 60.6 | 61.3 | 63.3 | 65.3 | 66.8 | 68.3 | 69.5 | 70.9 | 72.8 |
| Females................................................ | 72.8 | 73.2 | 74.2 | 75.2 | 76.0 | 76.8 | 77.6 | 78.8 | 80.3 |
| Both sexes combined | 66.6 | 67.1 | 68.7 | 70.3 | 71.5 | 72.7 | 73.7 | 75.0 | 76.7 |

Source: United Nations Population Division, World Population Prospects: The 1998 Revision.

Table A. 11 (continued)
RUSSIAN FEDERATION
C. HIGH-VARIANT PROJECTIONS

|  | 1995 | 2000 | 2005 | 2010 | 2015 | 2020 | 2025 | 2030 | 2040 | 2050 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Population (thousands) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total. | 148097 | 147856 | 148470 | 149512 | 150232 | 150306 | 150380 | 150806 | 151568 | 151823 |
| Males. | 69353 | 69145 | 69372 | 69927 | 70412 | 70603 | 70820 | 71211 | 72000 | 72723 |
| Females. | 78744 | 78711 | 79098 | 79585 | 79820 | 79704 | 79559 | 79595 | 79568 | 79099 |
| Age distribution: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percentage aged 0-4... | 5.2 | 5.4 | 6.4 | 6.8 | 6.5 | 6.1 | 6.2 | 6.4 | 6.4 | 6.4 |
| Percentage aged 5-14................................. | 15.9 | 13.3 | 10.8 | 11.8 | 13.2 | 13.3 | 12.7 | 12.3 | 12.9 | 12.8 |
| Percentage aged 15-24. | 14.3 | 15.5 | 16.0 | 13.3 | 10.8 | 11.8 | 13.2 | 13.3 | 12.2 | 12.9 |
| Percentage aged 60 or over......................... | 16.7 | 18.4 | 17.1 | 17.6 | 19.3 | 21.4 | 22.9 | 23.1 | 24.3 | 26.7 |
| Percentage aged 65 or over. | 11.9 | 12.4 | 13.7 | 12.5 | 13.0 | 14.6 | 16.6 | 17.9 | 18.3 | 20.0 |
| Percentage of women aged 15-49................ | 48.7 | 50.3 | 49.9 | 46.4 | 44.0 | 43.9 | 43.6 | 42.7 | 39.4 | 41.7 |
| Median age (years).......................................... | 35.1 | 36.5 | 37.0 | 37.1 | 37.7 | 38.6 | 39.8 | 40.8 | 39.3 | 39.5 |
|  | 1995-2000 | 2000-2005 | 2005-2010 | 2010-2015 | 2015-2020 | 2020-2025 | 2025-2030 | 2030-2040 | 2040-2050 |  |


D. LOW-VARIANT PROJECTIONS


| Population change per year (thousands). | -284 | -423 | -449 | -569 | -771 | -910 | -975 | - 1103 | -1262 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Population growth rate (percentage)................... | -0.19 | -0.29 | -0.31 | -0.40 | -0.56 | -0.68 | -0.76 | -0.91 | -1.16 |
| Crude birth rate (per 1,000 population)............... | 9.3 | 9.4 | 9.6 | 8.9 | 7.7 | 7.0 | 6.7 | 6.4 | 5.7 |
| Crude death rate (per 1,000 population)............. | 13.9 | 14.4 | 14.2 | 14.0 | 14.1 | 14.3 | 14.7 | 16.0 | 17.8 |
| Net migration rate (per 1,000 population)........... | 2.7 | 2.1 | 1.4 | 1.1 | 0.8 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.5 | 0.5 |
| Total fertility rate (per woman)........................... | 1.30 | 1.25 | 1.25 | 1.25 | 1.25 | 1.25 | 1.25 | 1.25 | 1.25 |
| Gross reproduction rate (per woman)................. | 0.63 | 0.61 | 0.61 | 0.61 | 0.61 | 0.61 | 0.61 | 0.61 | 0.61 |
| Net reproduction rate (per woman).................... | 0.61 | 0.59 | 0.59 | 0.59 | 0.59 | 0.59 | 0.60 | 0.60 | 0.60 |

E. CONSTANT-VARIANT PROJECTIONS

|  | 1995 | 2000 | 2005 | 2010 | 2015 | 2020 | 2025 | 2030 | 2040 | 2050 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Population (thousands) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total. | 148097 | 147737 | 146999 | 146136 | 144608 | 142120 | 139129 | 135950 | 128334 | 119039 |


|  | 1995-2000 | 2000-2005 | 2005-2010 | 2010-2015 | 2015-2020 | 2020-2025 | 2025-2030 | 2030-2040 | 2040-2050 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Population growth rate (percentage) | -0.05 | -0.10 | -0.12 | -0.21 | -0.35 | - 0.43 | -0.46 | -0.58 | -0.75 |
| Crude birth rate (per 1,000 population)............... | 10.7 | 11.2 | 11.4 | 10.5 | 9.4 | 8.9 | 8.8 | 8.5 | 7.8 |
| Crude death rate (per 1,000 population)............. | 13.9 | 14.3 | 13.9 | 13.6 | 13.6 | 13.6 | 13.9 | 14.7 | 15.8 |

Source: United Nations Population Division, World Population Prospects: The 1998 Revision.

Table A.12. Russian Federation, replacement migration scenarios

## RUSSIAN FEDERATION

| Scenario | 1 | 11 | III | IV | V | VI |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Period | Medium variant | Medium variant with zero migration | Constant total population | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Constant } \\ \text { age group } \\ 15-64 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Ratio 15-64/65+ not less than 3.0 | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Constant ratio } \\ 15-64 / 65 \text { years } \\ \text { or older } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| A. Average annual net migration (thousands) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1995-2000 | 394 | 0 | 611 | 0 | 0 | 746 |
| 2000-2005 | 299 | 0 | 539 | 95 | 0 | 3801 |
| 2005-2010 | 204 | 0 | 387 | 79 | 0 | -3 888 |
| 2010-2015 | 154 | 0 | 392 | 899 | 0 | 2372 |
| 2015-2020 | 104 | 0 | 470 | 1094 | 0 | 6376 |
| 2020-2025 | 55 | 0 | 464 | 994 | 0 | 7995 |
| 2025-2030 | 55 | 0 | 447 | 730 | 0 | 6089 |
| 2030-2035 | 55 | 0 | 486 | 443 | 0 | 2557 |
| 2035-2040 | 55 | 0 | 558 | 695 | 254 | 4480 |
| 2040-2045 | 55 | 0 | 606 | 873 | 2061 | 6347 |
| 2045-2050 | 55 | 0 | 635 | 1189 | 3006 | 11867 |
| Grand total 1995-2050 | 7417 | 0 | 27971 | 35454 | 26604 | 243709 |
| B. Total population (thousands) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1995 | 148097 | 148097 | 148097 | 148097 | 148097 | 148097 |
| 2000 | 146934 | 144960 | 148097 | 144960 | 144960 | 148791 |
| 2005 | 145549 | 142048 | 148097 | 142536 | 142074 | 165588 |
| 2010 | 144418 | 139796 | 148097 | 140718 | 139907 | 144436 |
| 2015 | 142945 | 137434 | 148097 | 143055 | 137640 | 154123 |
| 2020 | 140639 | 134582 | 148097 | 146223 | 134798 | 185030 |
| 2025 | 137933 | 131649 | 148097 | 149146 | 131824 | 226586 |
| 2030 | 135207 | 128727 | 148097 | 150974 | 128858 | 260764 |
| 2035 | 132243 | 125578 | 148097 | 151191 | 125687 | 277531 |
| 2040 | 128875 | 122027 | 148097 | 152318 | 123471 | 303736 |
| 2045 | 125170 | 118186 | 148097 | 154192 | 130491 | 340184 |
| 2050 | 121256 | 114178 | 148097 | 157658 | 143093 | 406551 |
| C. Age group 15-64 (thousands) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1995 | 99200 | 99200 | 99200 | 99200 | 99200 | 99200 |
| 2000 | 101862 | 100467 | 102703 | 100467 | 100467 | 103198 |
| 2005 | 102592 | 100119 | 104480 | 100467 | 100111 | 116950 |
| 2010 | 103028 | 99804 | 105879 | 100467 | 99775 | 103557 |
| 2015 | 100229 | 96455 | 104349 | 100467 | 96398 | 109032 |
| 2020 | 96217 | 92136 | 102179 | 100467 | 92054 | 128725 |
| 2025 | 92021 | 87876 | 100056 | 100467 | 87764 | 156042 |
| 2030 | 88473 | 84327 | 98521 | 100467 | 84185 | 178976 |
| 2035 | 85819 | 81700 | 97915 | 100467 | 81532 | 191288 |
| 2040 | 82322 | 78216 | 96629 | 100467 | 78969 | 209991 |
| 2045 | 78365 | 74244 | 95067 | 100467 | 82658 | 235545 |
| 2050 | 73569 | 69413 | 92796 | 100467 | 89610 | 279890 |
| D. Potential support ratio 15-64/65 or older |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1995 | 5.62 | 5.62 | 5.62 | 5.62 | 5.62 | 5.62 |
| 2000 | 5.54 | 5.51 | 5.60 | 5.51 | 5.51 | 5.62 |
| 2005 | 5.04 | 5.00 | 5.16 | 5.02 | 4.99 | 5.62 |
| 2010 | 5.52 | 5.51 | 5.74 | 5.54 | 5.47 | 5.62 |
| 2015 | 5.13 | 5.15 | 5.45 | 5.31 | 5.08 | 5.62 |
| 2020 | 4.38 | 4.39 | 4.73 | 4.69 | 4.32 | 5.62 |
| 2025 | 3.68 | 3.69 | 4.05 | 4.09 | 3.63 | 5.62 |
| 2030 | 3.28 | 3.29 | 3.67 | 3.78 | 3.25 | 5.62 |
| 2035 | 3.17 | 3.20 | 3.58 | 3.74 | 3.15 | 5.62 |
| 2040 | 2.98 | 3.02 | 3.39 | 3.63 | 3.00 | 5.62 |
| 2045 | 2.74 | 2.78 | 3.16 | 3.43 | 3.00 | 5.62 |
| 2050 | 2.43 | 2.44 | 2.85 | 3.12 | 3.00 | 5.62 |

## Table A. 12 (continued)

RUSSIAN FEDERATION

|  | Scenario | 1 | 11 | III | IV | V | VI |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Period |  | Medium variant | Medium variant with zero migration | Constant total population | Constant age group 15-64 | Ratio 15-64/65+ not less than 3.0 | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Constant ratio } \\ \text { 15-64/65 years } \\ \text { or older } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| E. Age group 65 or older (thousands) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1995 |  | 17664 | 17664 | 17664 | 17664 | 17664 | 17664 |
| 2000 |  | 18393 | 18249 | 18353 | 18249 | 18249 | 18376 |
| 2005 |  | 20341 | 20017 | 20240 | 20033 | 20052 | 20825 |
| 2010 |  | 18670 | 18104 | 18436 | 18139 | 18251 | 18440 |
| 2015 |  | 19532 | 18712 | 19163 | 18909 | 18992 | 19415 |
| 2020 |  | 21985 | 20985 | 21598 | 21423 | 21310 | 22922 |
| 2025 |  | 24989 | 23835 | 24687 | 24550 | 24156 | 27786 |
| 2030 |  | 26938 | 25603 | 26830 | 26594 | 25914 | 31870 |
| 2035 |  | 27112 | 25569 | 27379 | 26855 | 25894 | 34062 |
| 2040 |  | 27661 | 25919 | 28481 | 27683 | 26323 | 37393 |
| 2045 |  | 28620 | 26755 | 30101 | 29301 | 27553 | 41943 |
| 2050 |  | 30315 | 28398 | 32504 | 32168 | 29870 | 49840 |
| F. Percentage in age group 65 or older |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1995 |  | 11.9 | 11.9 | 11.9 | 11.9 | 11.9 | 11.9 |
| 2000 |  | 12.5 | 12.6 | 12.4 | 12.6 | 12.6 | 12.4 |
| 2005 |  | 14.0 | 14.1 | 13.7 | 14.1 | 14.1 | 12.6 |
| 2010 |  | 12.9 | 13.0 | 12.4 | 12.9 | 13.0 | 12.8 |
| 2015 |  | 13.7 | 13.6 | 12.9 | 13.2 | 13.8 | 12.6 |
| 2020 |  | 15.6 | 15.6 | 14.6 | 14.7 | 15.8 | 12.4 |
| 2025 |  | 18.1 | 18.1 | 16.7 | 16.5 | 18.3 | 12.3 |
| 2030 |  | 19.9 | 19.9 | 18.1 | 17.6 | 20.1 | 12.2 |
| 2035 |  | 20.5 | 20.4 | 18.5 | 17.8 | 20.6 | 12.3 |
| 2040 |  | 21.5 | 21.2 | 19.2 | 18.2 | 21.3 | 12.3 |
| 2045 |  | 22.9 | 22.6 | 20.3 | 19.0 | 21.1 | 12.3 |
| 2050 |  | 25.0 | 24.9 | 21.9 | 20.4 | 20.9 | 12.3 |
| G. Age group 0-14 (thousands) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1995 |  | 31232 | 31232 | 31232 | 31232 | 31232 | 31232 |
| 2000 |  | 26679 | 26244 | 27040 | 26244 | 26244 | 27216 |
| 2005 |  | 22617 | 21911 | 23377 | 22036 | 21910 | 27813 |
| 2010 |  | 22720 | 21887 | 23782 | 22112 | 21881 | 22438 |
| 2015 |  | 23185 | 22267 | 24584 | 23679 | 22250 | 25676 |
| 2020 |  | 22437 | 21461 | 24319 | 24333 | 21434 | 33384 |
| 2025 |  | 20923 | 19938 | 23353 | 24129 | 19905 | 42759 |
| 2030 |  | 19796 | 18797 | 22746 | 23913 | 18758 | 49918 |
| 2035 |  | 19313 | 18309 | 22803 | 23869 | 18261 | 52181 |
| 2040 |  | 18891 | 17892 | 22986 | 24168 | 18179 | 56352 |
| 2045 |  | 18185 | 17187 | 22929 | 24423 | 20280 | 62696 |
| 2050 |  | 17372 | 16367 | 22797 | 25023 | 23613 | 76821 |
| H. Potential support ratio in 2050, by age at entry into non-working-age population |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Age |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 65 |  | 2.43 | 2.44 | 2.85 | 3.12 | 3.00 | 5.62 |
| 70 |  | 3.95 | 4.03 | 4.67 | 5.16 | 4.83 | 9.20 |
| 75 |  | 6.66 | 6.91 | 8.02 | 8.87 | 8.11 | 15.80 |
| 80 |  | 12.05 | 12.78 | 15.09 | 16.48 | 14.62 | 30.37 |

[^15]I - Corresponds to the medium variant of the official United Nations population projections (World Population Prospects, 1998 Revision). II - This scenario amends the medium variant by assuming no migration after 1995.
III - This scenario keeps the total population figure constant at the highest level that it would reach in the absence of migration after 1995.
IV - This scenario keeps the number of persons aged 15-64 constant at the highest level that it would reach in the absence of migration after 1995 .
V - This scenario prevents the ratio of persons aged 15-64 to persons aged 65 and above from falling below 3.0.
VI - This scenario keeps the ratio of persons aged 15-64 and above at the highest level that it would reach in the absence of migration after 1995. This scenario is considered to be demographically unrealistic.

## UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND

| Indicator |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1950 | 1955 | 1960 | 1965 | 1970 | 1975 | 1980 | 1985 | 1990 | 1995 |
| Population (thousands) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total... | 50616 | 51199 | 52372 | 54350 | 55632 | 56226 | 56330 | 56618 | 57561 | 58308 |
| Males. | 24575 | 24726 | 25271 | 26368 | 27064 | 27403 | 27436 | 27574 | 28118 | 28574 |
| Females.............................................. | 26041 | 26473 | 27101 | 27982 | 28568 | 28823 | 28894 | 29044 | 29443 | 29734 |
| Sex ratio (per 100 females)........................... | 94.4 | 93.4 | 93.2 | 94.2 | 94.7 | 95.1 | 95.0 | 94.9 | 95.5 | 96.1 |
| Age distribution: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percentage aged 0-4.............................. | 8.6 | 7.5 | 7.9 | 8.7 | 8.1 | 7.1 | 6.0 | 6.4 | 6.7 | 6.4 |
| Percentage aged 5-14. | 13.7 | 15.3 | 15.3 | 14.5 | 16.1 | 16.3 | 14.9 | 12.9 | 12.5 | 12.9 |
| Percentage aged 15-24............................. | 13.6 | 12.9 | 13.3 | 14.6 | 14.7 | 14.3 | 15.5 | 16.4 | 14.3 | 12.7 |
| Percentage aged 60 or over....................... | 15.5 | 16.2 | 16.9 | 17.6 | 18.7 | 19.6 | 20.1 | 20.7 | 20.9 | 20.7 |
| Percentage aged 65 or over....................... | 10.7 | 11.3 | 11.7 | 12.0 | 12.9 | 14.0 | 15.1 | 15.1 | 15.7 | 15.9 |
| Percentage of women aged 15-49................ | 49.2 | 47.1 | 45.3 | 44.6 | 43.6 | 43.6 | 45.3 | 47.5 | 48.1 | 47.6 |
| Median age (years)....................................... | 34.6 | 35.0 | 35.4 | 34.8 | 33.7 | 33.9 | 34.6 | 35.3 | 36.1 | 36.9 |
| Population density (per sq km)........................ | 207 | 210 | 215 | 223 | 228 | 230 | 231 | 232 | 236 | 239 |
|  | 1950-1955 | 1955-1960 | 1960-1965 | 1965-1970 | 1970-1975 | 1975-1980 | 1980-1985 | 1985-1990 | 1990-1995 |  |


| Population change per year (thousands). | 117 | 235 | 396 | 256 | 119 | 21 | 58 | 189 | 149 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Births per year (thousands). | 808 | 849 | 971 | 966 | 811 | 696 | 732 | 775 | 753 |
| Deaths per year (thousands). | 595 | 604 | 629 | 641 | 654 | 668 | 658 | 655 | 656 |
| Population growth rate (percentage) | 0.23 | 0.45 | 0.74 | 0.47 | 0.21 | 0.04 | 0.10 | 0.33 | 0.26 |
| Crude birth rate (per 1,000 population). | 15.9 | 16.4 | 18.2 | 17.6 | 14.5 | 12.4 | 13.0 | 13.6 | 13.0 |
| Crude death rate (per 1,000 population). | 11.7 | 11.7 | 11.8 | 11.7 | 11.7 | 11.9 | 11.7 | 11.5 | 11.3 |
| Total fertility rate (per woman). | 2.18 | 2.49 | 2.81 | 2.52 | 2.04 | 1.72 | 1.80 | 1.81 | 1.78 |
| Gross reproduction rate (per woman). | 1.06 | 1.22 | 1.37 | 1.23 | 1.00 | 0.84 | 0.88 | 0.88 | 0.87 |
| Net reproduction rate (per woman).. | 1.02 | 1.18 | 1.34 | 1.20 | 0.97 | 0.82 | 0.87 | 0.87 | 0.86 |
| Infant mortality rate (per 1,000 births). | 29 | 24 | 22 | 19 | 17 | 14 | 11 | 9 | 7 |
| Life expectancy at birth (years) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Males. | 66.7 | 67.7 | 67.9 | 68.3 | 69.0 | 69.7 | 71.0 | 72.3 | 73.7 |
| Females. | 71.8 | 73.3 | 73.8 | 74.6 | 75.2 | 76.0 | 77.2 | 77.9 | 79.0 |
| Both sexes combined. | 69.2 | 70.4 | 70.8 | 71.4 | 72.0 | 72.8 | 74.0 | 75.0 | 76.2 |

B. MEDIUM-VARIANT PROJECTIONS

|  | 1995 | 2000 | 2005 | 2010 | 2015 | 2020 | 2025 | 2030 | 2040 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Population (thousands) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total....................... | 58308 | 58830 | 59143 | 59331 | 59566 | 59845 | 59961 | 59619 | 58289 |
| Males. | 28574 | 28886 | 29084 | 29208 | 29342 | 29484 | 29531 | 29348 | 28668 |
| Females. | 29734 | 29944 | 30059 | 30124 | 30224 | 30361 | 30430 | 30271 | 29621 |
| Sex ratio (per 100 females) | 96.1 | 96.5 | 96.8 | 97.0 | 97.1 | 97.1 | 97.0 | 96.9 | 96.8 |
| Age distribution: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percentage aged 0-4. | 6.4 | 5.9 | 5.5 | 5.4 | 5.5 | 5.7 | 5.6 | 5.4 | 5.2 |
| Percentage aged 5-14. | 12.9 | 12.9 | 12.2 | 11.4 | 10.9 | 10.9 | 11.2 | 11.3 | 10.8 |
| Percentage aged 15-24............................... | 12.7 | 12.3 | 12.7 | 12.9 | 12.2 | 11.3 | 10.8 | 10.9 | 11.6 |
| Percentage aged 60 or over. | 20.7 | 21.0 | 21.8 | 23.5 | 24.8 | 26.3 | 28.3 | 30.0 | 30.7 |
| Percentage aged 65 or over. | 15.9 | 16.0 | 16.4 | 17.1 | 18.7 | 19.8 | 21.2 | 23.1 | 25.0 |
| Percentage in school ages 6-11. | 7.8 | 7.8 | 7.2 | 6.7 | 6.5 | 6.6 | 6.8 | 6.8 | 6.4 |
| Percentage in school ages 12-14. | 3.7 | 3.9 | 3.9 | 3.6 | 3.3 | 3.2 | 3.3 | 3.4 | 3.3 |
| Percentage in school ages 15-17. | 3.6 | 3.8 | 3.9 | 3.8 | 3.5 | 3.3 | 3.2 | 3.4 | 3.4 |
| Percentage in school ages 18-23. | 7.6 | 7.3 | 7.6 | 7.8 | 7.5 | 69 | 6.5 | 6.5 | 7.0 |
| Percentage of women aged 15-49................ | 47.6 | 46.4 | 46.0 | 45.1 | 43.1 | 40.9 | 39.9 | 39.7 | 39.2 |
| Median age (years) | 36.9 | 38.2 | 39.7 | 41.2 | 42.1 | 42.6 | 43.1 | 43.6 | 44.8 |
| Population density (per sq km). | 239 | 241 | 242 | 243 | 244 | 245 | 246 | 244 | 239 |
|  | 1995-2000 | 2000-2005 | 2005-2010 | 2010-2015 | 2015-2020 | 2020-2025 | 2025-2030 | 2030-2040 | 2040-2050 |
| Population change per year (thousands)............ | 104 | 63 | 38 | 47 | 56 | 23 | -68 | -133 | -162 |
| Births per year (thousands). | 697 | 654 | 641 | 662 | 685 | 670 | 643 | 617 | 614 |
| Deaths per year (thousands) | 632 | 631 | 644 | 656 | 669 | 687 | 711 | 750 | 776 |
| Net migration per year (thousands).................... | 40 | 40 | 40 | 40 | 40 | 40 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Population growth rate (percentage). | 0.18 | 0.11 | 0.06 | 0.08 | 0.09 | 0.04 | -0.11 | - 0.23 | -0.28 |
| Crude birth rate (per 1,000 population). | 11.9 | 11.1 | 10.8 | 11.1 | 11.5 | 11.2 | 10.8 | 10.5 | 10.7 |
| Crude death rate (per 1,000 population)............. | 10.8 | 10.7 | 10.9 | 11.0 | 11.2 | 11.5 | 11.9 | 12.7 | 13.5 |
| Net migration rate (per 1,000 population)........... | 0.7 | 0.7 | 0.7 | 0.7 | 0.7 | 0.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total fertility rate (per woman)........................... | 1.72 | 1.72 | 1.76 | 1.83 | 1.90 | 1.90 | 1.90 | 1.90 | 1.90 |
| Gross reproduction rate (per woman)................. | 0.84 | 0.84 | 0.86 | 0.89 | 0.92 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 |
| Net reproduction rate (per woman).................... | 0.83 | 0.83 | 0.85 | 0.88 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |
| Infant mortality rate (per 1,000 births)................ | 7 | 7 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| Mortality under age 5 (per 1,000 births)............. | 8 | 8 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 5 |
| Life expectancy at birth (years) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Males | 74.5 | 75.3 | 75.8 | 76.3 | 76.8 | 77.3 | 77.8 | 78.4 | 79.2 |
| Females.................................................... | 79.8 | 80.6 | 81.1 | 81.6 | 82.1 | 82.6 | 83.0 | 83.6 | 84.4 |
| Both sexes combined. | 77.2 | 78.0 | 78.5 | 78.9 | 79.4 | 79.9 | 80.4 | 81.0 | 81.8 |

[^16]Table A. 13 (continued)

UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND
C. HIGH-VARIANT PROJECTIONS

|  | 1995 | 2000 | 2005 | 2010 | 2015 | 2020 | 2025 | 2030 | 2040 | 2050 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Population (thousands) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total. | 58308 | 59011 | 59758 | 60481 | 61309 | 62274 | 63243 | 63879 | 64905 | 66131 |
| Males. | 28574 | 28979 | 29399 | 29797 | 30235 | 30729 | 31212 | 31529 | 32056 | 32743 |
| Females. | 29734 | 30032 | 30359 | 30685 | 31074 | 31546 | 32031 | 32350 | 32850 | 33387 |
| Age distribution: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percentage aged 0-4. | 6.4 | 6.2 | 6.2 | 6.2 | 6.3 | 6.6 | 6.6 | 6.5 | 6.6 | 6.9 |
| Percentage aged 5-14. | 12.9 | 12.9 | 12.4 | 12.2 | 12.1 | 12.3 | 12.7 | 13.0 | 12.9 | 13.2 |
| Percentage aged 15-24.. | 12.7 | 12.2 | 12.6 | 12.6 | 12.2 | 11.9 | 11.8 | 12.0 | 12.8 | 12.7 |
| Percentage aged 60 or over......................... | 20.7 | 20.9 | 21.6 | 23.1 | 24.1 | 25.2 | 26.8 | 28.0 | 27.6 | 26.8 |
| Percentage aged 65 or over......................... | 15.9 | 16.0 | 16.2 | 16.8 | 18.2 | 19.0 | 20.1 | 21.5 | 22.4 | 21.3 |
| Percentage of women aged 15-49................ | 47.6 | 46.2 | 45.5 | 44.3 | 42.2 | 40.3 | 39.7 | 39.7 | 40.2 | 40.8 |
| Median age (years)......................................... | 36.9 | 38.1 | 39.4 | 40.5 | 41.0 | 40.9 | 40.8 | 40.8 | 40.2 | 39.1 |
|  | 1995-2000 | 2000-2005 | 2005-2010 | 2010-2015 | 2015-2020 | 2020-2025 | 2025-2030 | 2030-2040 | 2040-2050 |  |


| Population change per year (thousands). | 141 | 149 | 145 | 166 | 193 | 194 | 127 | 103 | 123 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Population growth rate (percentage).................. | 0.24 | 0.25 | 0.24 | 0.27 | 0.31 | 0.31 | 0.20 | 0.16 | 0.19 |
| Crude birth rate (per 1,000 population).............. | 12.5 | 12.5 | 12.5 | 12.8 | 13.3 | 13.4 | 13.2 | 13.3 | 13.8 |
| Crude death rate (per 1,000 population) | 10.8 | 10.6 | 10.7 | 10.8 | 10.9 | 11.0 | 11.2 | 11.7 | 11.9 |
| Net migration rate (per 1,000 population)........... | 0.7 | 0.7 | 0.7 | 0.7 | 0.6 | 0.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total fertility rate (per woman)........................... | 1.81 | 1.95 | 2.05 | 2.15 | 2.25 | 2.30 | 2.30 | 2.30 | 2.30 |
| Gross reproduction rate (per woman)................ | 0.88 | 0.95 | 1.00 | 1.05 | 1.10 | 1.12 | 1.12 | 1.12 | 1.12 |
| Net reproduction rate (per woman)... | 0.87 | 0.94 | 0.99 | 1.04 | 1.09 | 1.11 | 1.11 | 1.11 | 1.11 |

D. LOW-VARIANT PROJECTIONS

|  | 1995 | 2000 | 2005 | 2010 | 2015 | 2020 | 2025 | 2030 | 2040 | 2050 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Population (thousands) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total. | 58308 | 58649 | 58547 | 58273 | 57917 | 57455 | 56775 | 55575 | 52292 | 48403 |
| Males. | 28574 | 28794 | 28779 | 28666 | 28497 | 28260 | 27900 | 27277 | 25597 | 23668 |
| Females. | 29734 | 29856 | 29769 | 29607 | 29420 | 29195 | 28876 | 28298 | 26694 | 24735 |
| Age distribution: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percentage aged 0-4. | 6.4 | 5.6 | 4.8 | 4.7 | 4.7 | 4.6 | 4.5 | 4.2 | 3.9 | 3.9 |
| Percentage aged 5-14. | 12.9 | 13.0 | 12.0 | 10.5 | 9.7 | 9.5 | 9.5 | 9.4 | 8.6 | 8.2 |
| Percentage aged 15-24............................... | 12.7 | 12.3 | 12.9 | 13.1 | 12.2 | 10.8 | 9.9 | 9.8 | 10.0 | 9.2 |
| Percentage aged 60 or over. | 20.7 | 21.0 | 22.0 | 23.9 | 25.5 | 27.4 | 29.9 | 32.1 | 34.2 | 36.6 |
| Percentage aged 65 or over......................... | 15.9 | 16.1 | 16.5 | 17.4 | 19.2 | 20.6 | 22.4 | 24.8 | 27.8 | 29.1 |
| Percentage of women aged 15-49................ | 47.6 | 46.5 | 46.4 | 45.9 | 43.9 | 41.5 | 40.3 | 39.6 | 37.7 | 35.4 |
| Median age (years)......................................... | 36.9 | 38.3 | 40.1 | 41.8 | 43.2 | 44.3 | 45.2 | 46.3 | 48.8 | 50.7 |
|  | 1995-2000 | 2000-2005 | 2005-2010 | 2010-2015 | 2015-2020 | 2020-2025 | 2025-2030 | 2030-2040 | 2040-2050 |  |


| Population change per year (thousands) | 68 | -20 | -55 | -71 | -92 | -136 | -240 | -328 | -389 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Population growth rate (percentage).................. | 0.12 | -0.04 | -0.09 | -0.12 | -0.16 | -0.24 | -0.43 | -0.61 | -0.77 |
| Crude birth rate (per 1,000 population) | 11.3 | 9.7 | 9.4 | 9.4 | 9.3 | 8.9 | 8.4 | 7.8 | 7.6 |
| Crude death rate (per 1,000 population) ............. | 10.8 | 10.8 | 11.0 | 11.3 | 11.6 | 12.0 | 12.6 | 13.9 | 15.3 |
| Net migration rate (per 1,000 population)........... | 0.7 | 0.7 | 0.7 | 0.7 | 0.7 | 0.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total fertility rate (per woman)........................... | 1.63 | 1.50 | 1.50 | 1.50 | 1.50 | 1.50 | 1.50 | 1.50 | 1.50 |
| Gross reproduction rate (per woman)................. | 0.80 | 0.73 | 0.73 | 0.73 | 0.73 | 0.73 | 0.73 | 0.73 | 0.73 |
| Net reproduction rate (per woman).................... | 0.79 | 0.72 | 0.72 | 0.72 | 0.72 | 0.72 | 0.73 | 0.73 | 0.73 |

E. CONSTANT-VARIANT PROJECTIONS

|  | 1995 | 2000 | 2005 | 2010 | 2015 | 2020 | 2025 | 2030 | 2040 | 2050 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Population (thousands) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total.. | 58308 | 58951 | 59377 | 59610 | 59768 | 59860 | 59810 | 59326 | 57634 | 55431 |


|  | 1995-2000 | 2000-2005 | 2005-2010 | 2010-2015 | 2015-2020 | 2020-2025 | 2025-2030 | 2030-2040 | 2040-2050 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Population growth rate (percentage) | 0.22 | 0.14 | 0.08 | 0.05 | 0.03 | -0.02 | -0.16 | -0.29 | - 0.39 |
| Crude birth rate (per 1,000 population)................ | 12.3 | 11.4 | 10.9 | 10.8 | 10.8 | 10.6 | 10.3 | 9.9 | 9.8 |
| Crude death rate (per 1,000 population)............. | 10.8 | 10.7 | 10.8 | 11.0 | 11.2 | 11.5 | 11.9 | 12.8 | 13.7 |

Source: United Nations Population Division, World Population Prospects: The 1998 Revision.

Table A.14. United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, replacement migration scenarios

UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND

|  | Scenario | I | II | III | IV | VI |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Medium | Constant | Constant | Constant ratio |  |
|  |  | Medium | variant with | total | age group | Ratio 15-64/65+ |
| Period | variant | zero migration | population | 15-64 | not less than 3.0 | or older |


|  |  |
| :--- | ---: |
| $1995-2000$ | 40 |
| $2000-2005$ | 40 |
| $2005-2010$ | 40 |
| $2010-2015$ | 40 |
| $2015-2020$ | 40 |
| $2020-2025$ | 40 |
| $2025-2030$ | 0 |
| $2030-2035$ | 0 |
| $2035-2040$ | 0 |
| $2040-2045$ | 0 |
| $2045-2050$ | 0 |
| Grand total 1995-2050 | 1200 |

## A. Average annual net migration (thousands)

| 0 | 0 | 0 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 188 |
| 0 | 0 | 177 |
| 0 | 12 | 241 |
| 0 | 59 | 280 |
| 0 | 100 | 178 |
| 0 | 121 | 47 |
| 0 | 116 | 29 |
| 0 | 2634 | 110 |
| 0 | 6247 |  |


| 0 | 11 |
| ---: | ---: |
| 0 | 62 |
| 0 | 563 |
| 0 | 1529 |
| 0 | 1163 |
| 263 | 1421 |
| 1373 | 1765 |
| 952 | 1365 |
| 147 | 759 |
| 0 | 1079 |
| 0 | 2239 |
| 13674 | 59775 |


| 1995 | 58308 | 58308 | 58308 | 58308 | 58308 | 58308 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2000 | 58830 | 58600 | 58600 | 58600 | 58600 | 58655 |
| 2005 | 59143 | 58694 | 58694 | 58694 | 58694 | 59078 |
| 2010 | 59331 | 58685 | 58685 | 58685 | 58685 | 62066 |
| 2015 | 59566 | 58734 | 58734 | 59724 | 58734 | 70503 |
| 2020 | 59845 | 58833 | 58833 | 60860 | 58833 | 77858 |
| 2025 | 59961 | 58768 | 58833 | 62248 | 60160 | 86856 |
| 2030 | 59619 | 58449 | 58833 | 63690 | 67253 | 97931 |
| 2035 | 59029 | 57883 | 58833 | 64456 | 72598 | 107299 |
| 2040 | 58289 | 57168 | 58833 | 64417 | 73907 | 113699 |
| 2045 | 57488 | 56393 | 58833 | 64197 | 74243 | 121756 |
| 2050 | 56667 | 55594 | 58833 | 64354 | 74398 | 136138 |
| C. Age group 15-64 (thousands) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1995 | 37811 | 37811 | 37811 | 37811 | 37811 | 37811 |
| 2000 | 38328 | 38207 | 38207 | 38207 | 38207 | 38246 |
| 2005 | 38981 | 38739 | 38739 | 38739 | 38739 | 39009 |
| 2010 | 39237 | 38873 | 38873 | 38873 | 38873 | 41244 |
| 2015 | 38661 | 38180 | 38180 | 38873 | 38180 | 46397 |
| 2020 | 38062 | 37468 | 37468 | 38873 | 37468 | 50665 |
| 2025 | 37166 | 36465 | 36510 | 38873 | 37437 | 55979 |
| 2030 | 35914 | 35230 | 35497 | 38873 | 41359 | 62859 |
| 2035 | 34938 | 34266 | 34924 | 38873 | 44429 | 69084 |
| 2040 | 34418 | 33750 | 34902 | 38873 | 45292 | 73616 |
| 2045 | 34009 | 33343 | 35037 | 38873 | 45860 | 79089 |
| 2050 | 33406 | 32745 | 35009 | 38873 | 46266 | 88239 |

D. Potential support ratio $15-64 / 65$ or older

| 1995 | 4.09 | 4.09 | 4.09 | 4.09 | 4.09 | 4.09 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2000 | 4.06 | 4.08 | 4.08 | 4.08 | 4.09 | 4.09 |
| 2005 | 4.03 | 4.06 | 4.06 | 4.06 | 4.06 | 4.09 |
| 2010 | 3.86 | 3.90 | 3.90 | 3.90 | 3.90 | 4.09 |
| 2015 | 3.47 | 3.50 | 3.50 | 3.55 | 3.50 | 4.09 |
| 2020 | 3.21 | 3.23 | 3.23 | 3.33 | 3.23 | 4.09 |
| 2025 | 2.92 | 2.93 | 2.94 | 3.09 | 3.00 | 4.09 |
| 2030 | 2.61 | 2.62 | 2.63 | 2.84 | 3.00 | 4.09 |
| 2035 | 2.41 | 2.41 | 2.45 | 2.68 | 3.00 | 4.09 |
| 2040 | 2.37 | 2.36 | 2.43 | 2.64 | 3.00 | 4.09 |
| 2045 | 2.38 | 2.37 | 2.47 | 2.66 | 3.05 | 4.09 |
| 2050 | 2.37 | 2.36 | 2.49 | 2.64 | 3.06 | 4.09 |

Table A. 14 (continued)

UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND

| Scenario | I | 11 | III | IV | V | VI |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Period | Medium variant | Medium variant with zero migration | Constant total population | Constant age group 15-64 | Ratio 15-64/65+ not less than 3.0 | Constant ratio 15-64/65 years or older |
| E. Age group 65 or older (thousands) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1995 | 9256 | 9256 | 9256 | 9256 | 9256 | 9256 |
| 2000 | 9433 | 9360 | 9360 | 9360 | 9360 | 9362 |
| 2005 | 9675 | 9535 | 9535 | 9535 | 9535 | 9549 |
| 2010 | 10162 | 9976 | 9976 | 9976 | 9976 | 10096 |
| 2015 | 11140 | 10916 | 10916 | 10951 | 10916 | 11357 |
| 2020 | 11859 | 11604 | 11604 | 11684 | 11604 | 12402 |
| 2025 | 12724 | 12431 | 12433 | 12578 | 12479 | 13703 |
| 2030 | 13757 | 13467 | 13481 | 13705 | 13786 | 15387 |
| 2035 | 14478 | 14197 | 14234 | 14530 | 14810 | 16911 |
| 2040 | 14545 | 14280 | 14351 | 14717 | 15097 | 18020 |
| 2045 | 14291 | 14047 | 14161 | 14635 | 15046 | 19360 |
| 2050 | 14107 | 13881 | 14048 | 14722 | 15122 | 21600 |
| F. Percentage in age group 65 or older |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1995 | 15.9 | 15.9 | 15.9 | 15.9 | 15.9 | 15.9 |
| 2000 | 16.0 | 16.0 | 16.0 | 16.0 | 16.0 | 16.0 |
| 2005 | 16.4 | 16.2 | 16.2 | 16.2 | 16.2 | 16.2 |
| 2010 | 17.1 | 17.0 | 17.0 | 17.0 | 17.0 | 16.3 |
| 2015 | 18.7 | 18.6 | 18.6 | 18.3 | 18.6 | 16.1 |
| 2020 | 19.8 | 19.7 | 19.7 | 19.2 | 19.7 | 15.9 |
| 2025 | 21.2 | 21.2 | 21.1 | 20.2 | 20.7 | 15.8 |
| 2030 | 23.1 | 23.0 | 22.9 | 21.5 | 20.5 | 15.7 |
| 2035 | 24.5 | 24.5 | 24.2 | 22.5 | 20.4 | 15.8 |
| 2040 | 25.0 | 25.0 | 24.4 | 22.8 | 20.4 | 15.8 |
| 2045 | 24.9 | 24.9 | 24.1 | 22.8 | 20.3 | 15.9 |
| 2050 | 24.9 | 25.0 | 23.9 | 22.9 | 20.3 | 15.9 |
| G. Age group 0-14 (thousands) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1995 | 11241 | 11241 | 11241 | 11241 | 11241 | 11241 |
| 2000 | 11069 | 11033 | 11033 | 11033 | 11033 | 11048 |
| 2005 | 10488 | 10420 | 10420 | 10420 | 10420 | 10521 |
| 2010 | 9933 | 9836 | 9836 | 9836 | 9836 | 10726 |
| 2015 | 9765 | 9637 | 9637 | 9900 | 9637 | 12749 |
| 2020 | 9924 | 9761 | 9761 | 10303 | 9761 | 14791 |
| 2025 | 10071 | 9872 | 9890 | 10796 | 10245 | 17174 |
| 2030 | 9949 | 9751 | 9854 | 11111 | 12108 | 19686 |
| 2035 | 9613 | 9421 | 9675 | 11053 | 13359 | 21304 |
| 2040 | 9326 | 9138 | 9580 | 10827 | 13518 | 22063 |
| 2045 | 9188 | 9003 | 9635 | 10689 | 13336 | 23307 |
| 2050 | 9153 | 8968 | 9775 | 10759 | 13010 | 26299 |
| H. Potential support ratio in 2050 by age at entry into non-working-age population |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Age |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 65 | 2.37 | 2.36 | 2.49 | 2.64 | 3.06 | 4.09 |
| 70 | 3.38 | 3.37 | 3.55 | 3.80 | 4.34 | 6.17 |
| 75 | 4.97 | 4.95 | 5.21 | 5.61 | 6.34 | 9.57 |
| 80 | 7.99 | 7.97 | 8.38 | 9.02 | 10.16 | 15.92 |

Note: The six scenarios can be described briefly as follows:
I - Corresponds to the medium variant of the official United Nations population projections (World Population Prospects, 1998 Revision).
II - This scenario amends the medium variant by assuming no migration after 1995.
III - This scenario keeps the total population figure constant at the highest level that it would reach in the absence of migration after 1995.
IV - This scenario keeps the number of persons aged 15-64 constant at the highest level that it would reach in the absence of migration after 1995.
V - This scenario prevents the ratio of persons aged 15-64 to persons aged 65 and above from falling below 3.0.
VI - This scenario keeps the ratio of persons aged 15-64 and above at the highest level that it would reach in the absence of migration after 1995. This scenario is considered to be demographically unrealistic.

Table A.17. Europe, 1998 Revision

## EUROPE

| Indicator | 1950 | 1955 | 1960 | 1965 | A. ESTIMATES |  |  | 1985 | 1990 | 1995 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | 1970 | 1975 | 1980 |  |  |  |
| Population (thousands) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total..................................................... | 547318 | 575404 | 604947 | 635066 | 656441 | 676390 | 693260 | 706580 | 722206 | 727912 |
| Males | 255330 | 270176 | 285567 | 301589 | 312918 | 323102 | 332022 | 338968 | 347683 | 351067 |
| Females............................................... | 291988 | 305228 | 319380 | 333478 | 343523 | 353288 | 361238 | 367612 | 374523 | 376845 |
| Sex ratio (per 100 females)............................ | 87.4 | 88.5 | 89.4 | 90.4 | 91.1 | 91.5 | 91.9 | 92.2 | 92.8 | 93.2 |
| Age distribution: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percentage aged 0-4............................... | 9.2 | 9.5 | 9.5 | 9.0 | 8.0 | 7.6 | 7.2 | 7.0 | 6.7 | 5.7 |
| Percentage aged 5-14.............................. | 17.0 | 16.0 | 17.2 | 17.5 | 17.3 | 16.1 | 15.0 | 14.3 | 13.8 | 13.5 |
| Percentage aged 15-24............................ | 17.3 | 16.6 | 15.2 | 14.5 | 15.8 | 16.4 | 16.2 | 15.5 | 14.4 | 14.0 |
| Percentage aged 60 or over........................ | 12.1 | 12.4 | 13.1 | 14.1 | 15.5 | 16.4 | 16.0 | 16.9 | 18.2 | 19.0 |
| Percentage aged 65 or over. | 8.2 | 8.6 | 8.8 | 9.4 | 10.5 | 11.4 | 12.4 | 11.9 | 12.7 | 13.9 |
| Percentage of women aged 15-49................ | 51.8 | 50.9 | 48.1 | 46.7 | 47.7 | 47.9 | 47.7 | 47.9 | 47.5 | 48.6 |
| Median age (years)...................................... | 29.2 | 29.7 | 30.4 | 30.9 | 31.7 | 32.1 | 32.6 | 33.5 | 34.7 | 36.1 |
| Population density (per sq km)....................... | 24 | 25 | 26 | 28 | 29 | 29 | 30 | 31 | 31 | 32 |
|  | 1950-1955 | 1955-1960 | 1960-1965 | 1965-1970 | 1970-1975 | 1975-1980 | 1980-1985 | 1985-1990 | 1990-1995 |  |
| Population change per year (thousands)........... | 5617 | 5909 | 6024 | 4275 | 3990 | 3374 | 2664 | 3125 | 1141 |  |
| Births per year (thousands)............................ | 11740 | 11999 | 11767 | 10923 | 10390 | 10125 | 10054 | 9761 | 8317 |  |
| Deaths per year (thousands)........................... | 5932 | 5933 | 6027 | 6366 | 6704 | 7159 | 7480 | 7534 | 8223 |  |
| Population growth rate (percentage)................. | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.97 | 0.66 | 0.60 | 0.49 | 0.38 | 0.44 | 0.16 |  |
| Crude birth rate (per 1,000 population).............. | 20.9 | 20.3 | 19.0 | 16.9 | 15.6 | 14.8 | 14.4 | 13.7 | 11.5 |  |
| Crude death rate (per 1,000 population)............. | 10.6 | 10.1 | 9.7 | 9.9 | 10.1 | 10.5 | 10.7 | 10.5 | 11.3 |  |
| Total fertility rate (per woman)......................... | 2.57 | 2.59 | 2.56 | 2.36 | 2.14 | 1.97 | 1.87 | 1.83 | 1.57 |  |
| Gross reproduction rate (per woman)............... | 1.25 | 1.26 | 1.24 | 1.15 | 1.04 | 0.96 | 0.91 | 0.89 | 0.76 |  |
| Net reproduction rate (per woman) .................. | 1.14 | 1.17 | 1.18 | 1.09 | 1.00 | 0.93 | 0.89 | 0.87 | 0.75 |  |
| Infant mortality rate (per 1,000 births)............... | 72 | 51 | 37 | 30 | 25 | 22 | 18 | 15 | 12 |  |
| Life expectancy at birth (years) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Males................................................... | 63.5 | 65.4 | 66.7 | 67.0 | 67.2 | 67.3 | 67.9 | 69.1 | 68.5 |  |
| Fermales............................................... | 68.6 | 70.8 | 72.6 | 73.6 | 74.2 | 75.0 | 75.7 | 76.7 | 76.7 |  |
| Both sexes combined............................... | 66.2 | 68.3 | 69.8 | 70.4 | 70.8 | 71.2 | 71.9 | 73.0 | 72.6 |  |

B. MEDIUM-VARIANT PROJECTIONS

|  | 1995 | 2000 | 2005 | 2010 | 2015 | 2020 | 2025 | 2030 | 2040 | 2050 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Population (thousands) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 727912 | 728887 | 727431 | 724242 | 719307 | 711909 | 702335 | 690976 | 662541 | 627691 |
| Males. | 351067 | 351737 | 351215 | 349905 | 347794 | 344427 | 339908 | 334398 | 320511 | 304019 |
| Females | 376845 | 377150 | 376217 | 374337 | 371513 | 367482 | 362427 | 356578 | 342029 | 323672 |
| Sex ratio (per 100 females)............................ | 93.2 | 93.3 | 93.4 | 93.5 | 93.6 | 93.7 | 93.8 | 93.8 | 93.7 | 93.9 |
| Age distribution: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percentage aged 0-4. | 5.7 | 5.1 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 4.8 | 4.7 | 4.7 | 4.7 | 4.7 |
| Percentage aged 5-14.............................. | 13.5 | 12.4 | 10.9 | 10.2 | 10.2 | 10.2 | 10.0 | 9.8 | 9.7 | 9.7 |
| Percentage aged 15-24............................. | 14.0 | 13.8 | 13.6 | 12.6 | 11.1 | 10.5 | 10.5 | 10.5 | 10.3 | 10.3 |
| Percentage aged 60 or over....................... | 19.0 | 20.3 | 20.7 | 22.0 | 23.8 | 26.0 | 28.1 | 29.8 | 32.6 | 34.7 |
| Percentage aged 65 or over...................... | 13.9 | 14.7 | 15.9 | 16.2 | 17.4 | 19.0 | 21.0 | 22.9 | 25.7 | 27.6 |
| Percentage in school ages 6-11. | 8.1 | 7.2 | 6.3 | 6.1 | 6.1 | 6.1 | 5.9 | 5.8 | 5.8 | 5.8 |
| Percentage in school ages 12-14 | 4.1 | 4.1 | 3.5 | 3.1 | 3.1 | 3.1 | 3.1 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 |
| Percentage in school ages 15-17. | 4.1 | 4.1 | 4.0 | 3.3 | 3.1 | 3.1 | 3.1 | 3.1 | 3.0 | 3.0 |
| Percentage in school ages 18-23............... | 8.5 | 8.3 | 8.3 | 7.8 | 6.7 | 6.3 | 6.3 | 6.4 | 6.2 | 6.2 |
| Percentage of women aged 15-49............... | 48.6 | 48.7 | 48.2 | 46.4 | 44.2 | 42.4 | 40.9 | 39.5 | 36.7 | 36.5 |
| Median age (years)...................................... | 36.1 | 37.8 | 39.4 | 40.8 | 42.1 | 43.4 | 44.6 | 45.8 | 47.5 | 47.4 |
| Population density (per sq km) ......................... | 32 | 32 | 32 | 32 | 31 | 31 | 31 | 30 | 29 | 27 |
|  | 1995-2000 | 2000-2005 | 2005-2010 | 2010-2015 | 2015-2020 | 2020-2025 | 2025-2030 | 2030-2040 | 2040-2050 |  |


| Population change per year (thousands)............ | 195 | -291 | -638 | -987 | -1480 | - 1915 | -2 272 | . 2844 | -3485 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Births per year (thousands).............................. | 7493 | 7359 | 7336 | 7196 | 6912 | 6657 | 6503 | 6283 | 5963 |
| Deaths per year (thousands). | 8248 | 8406 | 8509 | 8641 | 8769 | 8877 | 9040 | 9392 | 9712 |
| Net migration per year (thousands). | 950 | 757 | 535 | 458 | 377 | 305 | 265 | 265 | 265 |
| Population growth rate (percentage). | 0.03 | -0.04 | -0.09 | -0.14 | -0.21 | -0.27 | -0.33 | - 0.42 | -0.54 |
| Crude birth rate (per 1,000 population). | 10.3 | 10.1 | 10.1 | 10.0 | 9.7 | 9.4 | 9.3 | 9.3 | 9.2 |
| Crude death rate (per 1,000 population). | 11.3 | 11.5 | 11.7 | 12.0 | 12.3 | 12.6 | 13.0 | 13.9 | 15.0 |
| Net migration rate (per 1,000 population). | 1.3 | 1.0 | 0.7 | 0.6 | 0.5 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.4 |
| Total fertility rate (per woman). | 1.42 | 1.42 | 1.47 | 1.54 | 1.61 | 1.67 | 1.72 | 1.75 | 1.77 |
| Gross reproduction rate (per woman)................ | 0.69 | 0.69 | 0.72 | 0.75 | 0.78 | 0.81 | 0.84 | 0.85 | 0.86 |
| Net reproduction rate (per woman).................... | 0.68 | 0.68 | 0.70 | 0.74 | 0.77 | 0.80 | 0.83 | 0.84 | 0.85 |
| Infant mortality rate (per 1,000 births) | 12 | 11 | 10 | 10 | 9 | 8 | 8 | 7 | 6 |
| Mortality under age 5 (per 1,000 births)............. | 14 | 13 | 12 | 11 | 10 | 9 | 9 | 8 | 7 |
| Life expectancy at birth (years) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Males. | 69.2 | 70.1 | 71.3 | 72.4 | 73.3 | 74.1 | 74.9 | 75.8 | 76.9 |
| Females. | 77.4 | 78.1 | 78.8 | 79.5 | 80.2 | 80.8 | 81.4 | 82.2 | 83.2 |
| Both sexes combined. | 73.3 | 74.1 | 75.0 | 75.9 | 76.7 | 77.5 | 78.1 | 79.0 | 80.1 |

Source: United Nations Population Division, World Population Prospects: The 1998 Revision.

Table A. 17 (continued)
C. HIGH-VARIANT PROJECTIONS

|  | 1995 | 2000 | 2005 | 2010 | 2015 | 2020 | 2025 | 2030 | 2040 | 2050 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Population (thousands) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total. | 727912 | 731714 | 736918 | 741460 | 744534 | 745848 | 746730 | 747670 | 748169 | 745949 |
| Males. | 351067 | 353185 | 356077 | 358732 | 360728 | 361827 | 362666 | 363459 | 364396 | 364599 |
| Females. | 376845 | 378528 | 380840 | 382728 | 383806 | 384022 | 384064 | 384211 | 383773 | 381350 |
| Age distribution: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percentage aged 0-4. | 5.7 | 5.5 | 5.9 | 5.9 | 5.9 | 5.8 | 5.8 | 6.0 | 6.1 | 6.2 |
| Percentage aged 5-14............................... | 13.5 | 12.3 | 11.1 | 11.3 | 11.8 | 11.8 | 11.6 | 11.6 | 12.1 | 12.4 |
| Percentage aged 15-24. | 14.0 | 13.7 | 13.5 | 12.3 | 11.1 | 11.3 | 11.8 | 11.8 | 11.7 | 12.2 |
| Percentage aged 60 or over......................... | 19.0 | 20.2 | 20.4 | 21.5 | 23.0 | 24.8 | 26.4 | 27.6 | 28.8 | 29.2 |
| Percentage aged 65 or over......................... | 13.9 | 14.7 | 15.7 | 15.8 | 16.8 | 18.2 | 19.8 | 21.2 | 22.7 | 23.2 |
| Percentage of women aged 15-49................ | 48.6 | 48.5 | 47.6 | 45.4 | 43.2 | 41.8 | 40.8 | 39.9 | 38.3 | 39.6 |
| Median age (years)......................................... | 36.1 | 37.6 | 38.9 | 39.9 | 40.9 | 41.7 | 42.3 | 42.9 | 42.3 | 41.3 |
|  | 1995-2000 | 2000-2005 | 2005-2010 | 2010-2015 | 2015-2020 | 2020-2025 | 2025-2030 | 2030-2040 | 2040-2050 |  |


| Population change per year (thousands). | 760 | 1041 | 908 | 615 | 263 | 176 | 188 | 50 | - 222 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Population growth rate (percentage).................. | 0.10 | 0.14 | 0.12 | 0.08 | 0.04 | 0.02 | 0.03 | 0.01 | -0.03 |
| Crude birth rate (per 1,000 population)............... | 11.1 | 11.9 | 12.0 | 11.9 | 11.6 | 11.8 | 12.0 | 12.3 | 12.4 |
| Crude death rate (per 1,000 population)............. | 11.3 | 11.5 | 11.5 | 11.7 | 11.8 | 11.9 | 12.1 | 12.6 | 13.1 |
| Net migration rate (per 1,000 population)........... | 1.3 | 1.0 | 0.7 | 0.6 | 0.5 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.4 |
| Total fertility rate (per woman)........................... | 1.53 | 1.68 | 1.78 | 1.88 | 1.99 | 2.07 | 2.12 | 2.16 | 2.17 |
| Gross reproduction rate (per woman)................ | 0.74 | 0.82 | 0.87 | 0.92 | 0.97 | 1.01 | 1.03 | 1.05 | 1.06 |
| Net reproduction rate (per woman).................... | 0.73 | 0.80 | 0.85 | 0.90 | 0.95 | 0.99 | 1.02 | 1.04 | 1.05 |

D. LOW-VARIANT PROJECTIONS

|  | 1995 | 2000 | 2005 | 2010 | 2015 | 2020 | 2025 | 2030 | 2040 | 2050 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total...................... | 727912 | 727358 | 722580 | 715438 | 705509 | 691970 | 675010 | 655025 | 606842 | 549852 |
| Males. | 351067 | 350952 | 348725 | 345388 | 340716 | 334198 | 325891 | 315959 | 291949 | 264120 |
| Females. | 376845 | 376406 | 373855 | 370050 | 364794 | 357772 | 349118 | 339067 | 314893 | 285732 |
| Age distribution: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percentage aged 0-4 | 5.7 | 4.9 | 4.6 | 4.5 | 4.3 | 4.1 | 3.8 | 3.6 | 3.4 | 3.2 |
| Percentage aged 5-14............................... | 13.5 | 12.4 | 10.7 | 9.7 | 9.3 | 9.2 | 8.7 | 8.2 | 7.6 | 7.3 |
| Percentage aged 15-24. | 14.0 | 13.8 | 13.7 | 12.7 | 11.1 | 10.1 | 9.8 | 9.7 | 9.0 | 8.4 |
| Percentage aged 60 or over......................... | 19.0 | 20.3 | 20.8 | 22.3 | 24.3 | 26.7 | 29.2 | 31.5 | 35.5 | 39.6 |
| Percentage aged 65 or over........................ | 13.9 | 14.8 | 16.0 | 16.4 | 17.7 | 19.6 | 21.9 | 24.2 | 28.0 | 31.5 |
| Percentage of women aged 15-49................ | 48.6 | 48.8 | 48.5 | 47.0 | 44.8 | 42.9 | 41.2 | 39.6 | 35.6 | 33.9 |
| Median age (years)......................................... | 36.1 | 37.8 | 39.6 | 41.2 | 42.7 | 44.3 | 46.0 | 47.6 | 50.8 | 52.6 |

$\begin{array}{llllllllll}1995-2000 & 2000-2005 & 2005-2010 & 2010-2015 & 2015-2020 & 2020-2025 & 2025-2030 & 2030-2040 & 2040-2050\end{array}$

| Population change per year (thousands)............ | -111 | -956 | -1428 | - 1986 | -2708 | -3 392 | -3997 | -4818 | -5699 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Population growth rate (percentage).................. | - 0.02 | -0.13 | -0.20 | -0.28 | -0.39 | -0.50 | -0.60 | -0.76 | - 0.99 |
| Crude birth rate (per 1,000 population)............... | 9.9 | 9.2 | 9.1 | 8.7 | 8.1 | 7.6 | 7.2 | 6.8 | 6.4 |
| Crude death rate (per 1,000 population)............. | 11.3 | 11.6 | 11.8 | 12.1 | 12.5 | 13.0 | 13.6 | 14.8 | 16.7 |
| Net migration rate (per 1,000 population)............ | 1.3 | 1.0 | 0.7 | 0.6 | 0.5 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.5 |
| Total fertility rate (per woman).......................... | 1.36 | 1.29 | 1.31 | 1.33 | 1.34 | 1.34 | 1.34 | 1.34 | 1.35 |
| Gross reproduction rate (per woman)................ | 0.66 | 0.63 | 0.64 | 0.65 | 0.65 | 0.65 | 0.65 | 0.65 | 0.66 |
| Net reproduction rate (per woman).................... | 0.65 | 0.62 | 0.63 | 0.64 | 0.64 | 0.64 | 0.64 | 0.65 | 0.65 |

## E. CONSTANT-VARIANT PROJECTIONS

|  | 1995 | 2000 | 2005 | 2010 | 2015 | 2020 | 2025 | 2030 | 2040 | 2050 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Population (thousands) Total | 727912 | 732647 | 734946 | 734282 | 730261 | 722905 | 713259 | 701568 | 670700 | 631047 |
|  | 1995-2000 | 2000-2005 | 2005-2010 | 2010-2015 | 2015-2020 | 2020-2025 | 2025-2030 | 2030-2040 | 2040-2050 |  |
| Population growth rate (percentage).................. | 0.13 | 0.06 |  | -0.11 | -0.20 | -0.27 | -0.33 | -0.45 | -0.61 |  |
| Crude birth rate (per 1,000 population)............... | 11.3 | 11.1 | 10.7 | 10.1 | 9.5 | 9.3 | 9.1 | 8.8 | 8.4 |  |
| Crude death rate (per 1,000 population)............. | 11.3 | 11.5 | 11.6 | 11.8 | 12.1 | 12.4 | 12.8 | 13.7 | 14.9 |  |

Source: United Nations Population Division, World Population Prospects: The 1998 Revision.

Table A.18. Europe, replacement migration scenarios

EUROPE

| Scenario | I | II | III | IV | V | VI |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Period | Medium variant | Medium variant with zero migration | Constant total population | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Constant } \\ \text { age group } \\ 15-64 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Ratio 15-64/65+ not less than 3.0 | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Constant ratio } \\ \text { 15-64/65 years } \\ \text { or older } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| A. Average annual net migration (thousands) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1995-2000 | 950 | 0 | 854 | 0 | 0 | 5844 |
| 2000-2005 | 757 | 0 | 1063 | 0 | 0 | 12410 |
| 2005-2010 | 535 | 0 | 1046 | 293 | 0 | 1868 |
| 2010-2015 | 458 | 0 | 1150 | 3642 | 0 | 17234 |
| 2015-2020 | 377 | 0 | 1478 | 4696 | 0 | 24901 |
| 2020-2025 | 305 | 0 | 1879 | 4847 | 0 | 29817 |
| 2025-2030 | 265 | 0 | 2199 | 4316 | 15049 | 30837 |
| 2030-2035 | 265 | 0 | 2371 | 3511 | 11725 | 30110 |
| 2035-2040 | 265 | 0 | 2519 | 3489 | 8922 | 34504 |
| 2040-2045 | 265 | 0 | 2665 | 3530 | 6020 | 38863 |
| 2045-2050 | 265 | 0 | 2803 | 3945 | 5293 | 50841 |
| Grand total 1995-2050 | 23530 | 0 | 100137 | 161346 | 235044 | 1386151 |
| B. Total population (thousands) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1995 | 727912 | 727912 | 727912 | 727912 | 727912 | 727912 |
| 2000 | 728887 | 723482 | 727912 | 723482 | 723434 | 753810 |
| 2005 | 727431 | 717671 | 727912 | 717671 | 717649 | 814445 |
| 2010 | 724242 | 711598 | 727912 | 713122 | 711623 | 824271 |
| 2015 | 719307 | 704660 | 727912 | 725305 | 704731 | 913174 |
| 2020 | 711909 | 695650 | 727912 | 742496 | 695760 | 1046692 |
| 2025 | 702335 | 684055 | 727912 | 759766 | 684189 | 1212912 |
| 2030 | 690976 | 670167 | 727912 | 773668 | 749368 | 1392793 |
| 2035 | 677745 | 654730 | 727912 | 783008 | 802725 | 1576523 |
| 2040 | 662541 | 637917 | 727912 | 791587 | 844398 | 1789486 |
| 2045 | 645648 | 619792 | 727912 | 799739 | 871749 | 2032569 |
| 2050 | 627691 | 600464 | 727912 | 809399 | 894776 | 2346459 |
| C. Age group 15-64 (thousands) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1995 | 487110 | 487110 | 487110 | 487110 | 487110 | 487110 |
| 2000 | 494102 | 492142 | 495287 | 492142 | 492222 | 513673 |
| 2005 | 496449 | 492555 | 499872 | 492555 | 492680 | 561570 |
| 2010 | 496671 | 491475 | 503224 | 492555 | 491630 | 572861 |
| 2015 | 485578 | 477950 | 494817 | 492555 | 478105 | 628831 |
| 2020 | 469838 | 459414 | 482880 | 492555 | 459554 | 712731 |
| 2025 | 451599 | 438874 | 470673 | 492555 | 438988 | 818857 |
| 2030 | 432691 | 418796 | 460324 | 492555 | 474437 | 935364 |
| 2035 | 414960 | 400452 | 452463 | 492555 | 504056 | 1056366 |
| 2040 | 397473 | 381771 | 444939 | 492555 | 526638 | 1196976 |
| 2045 | 380886 | 363446 | 438583 | 492555 | 542098 | 1358048 |
| 2050 | 364277 | 345100 | 432959 | 492555 | 556871 | 1564343 |
| D. Potential support ratio 15-64/65 or older |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1995 | 4.81 | 4.81 | 4.81 | 4.81 | 4.81 | 4.81 |
| 2000 | 4.60 | 4.65 | 4.67 | 4.65 | 4.66 | 4.81 |
| 2005 | 4.29 | 4.35 | 4.40 | 4.35 | 4.36 | 4.81 |
| 2010 | 4.24 | 4.30 | 4.38 | 4.31 | 4.31 | 4.81 |
| 2015 | 3.89 | 3.92 | 4.03 | 4.02 | 3.93 | 4.81 |
| 2020 | 3.47 | 3.46 | 3.60 | 3.66 | 3.47 | 4.81 |
| 2025 | 3.06 | 3.03 | 3.20 | 3.33 | 3.03 | 4.81 |
| 2030 | 2.73 | 2.70 | 2.90 | 3.08 | 3.00 | 4.81 |
| 2035 | 2.50 | 2.47 | 2.71 | 2.92 | 3.00 | 4.81 |
| 2040 | 2.34 | 2.30 | 2.56 | 2.81 | 3.00 | 4.81 |
| 2045 | 2.21 | 2.16 | 2.46 | 2.72 | 3.00 | 4.81 |
| 2050 | 2.11 | 2.04 | 2.38 | 2.62 | 3.00 | 4.81 |

## Table A. 18 (continued)

EUROPE

| Scenario | 1 | II | III | IV | V | VI |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Period | Medium variant | Medium variant with zero migration | Constant total population | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Constant } \\ \text { age group } \\ 15-64 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Ratio 15-64/65+ not less than 3.0 | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Constant ratio } \\ \text { 15-64/65 years } \\ \text { or older } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| E. Age group 65 or older (thousands) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1995 | 101338 | 101338 | 101338 | 101338 | 101338 | 101338 |
| 2000 | 107439 | 105831 | 105982 | 105831 | 105712 | 106865 |
| 2005 | 115588 | 113249 | 113639 | 113249 | 113117 | 116829 |
| 2010 | 117185 | 114231 | 114912 | 114283 | 114119 | 119178 |
| 2015 | 124910 | 121798 | 122842 | 122522 | 121730 | 130822 |
| 2020 | 135491 | 132589 | 134135 | 134409 | 132569 | 148276 |
| 2025 | 147524 | 144774 | 147081 | 147993 | 144801 | 170355 |
| 2030 | 158482 | 155357 | 158824 | 160149 | 158146 | 194593 |
| 2035 | 165668 | 162033 | 167217 | 168622 | 168019 | 219766 |
| 2040 | 170119 | 166178 | 173647 | 175250 | 175546 | 249019 |
| 2045 | 172046 | 168008 | 178182 | 180882 | 180699 | 282528 |
| 2050 | 172985 | 168986 | 182222 | 187704 | 185624 | 325446 |
| F. Percentage in age group 65 or older |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1995 | 13.9 | 13.9 | 13.9 | 13.9 | 13.9 | 13.9 |
| 2000 | 14.7 | 14.6 | 14.6 | 14.6 | 14.6 | 14.2 |
| 2005 | 15.9 | 15.8 | 15.6 | 15.8 | 15.8 | 14.3 |
| 2010 | 16.2 | 16.1 | 15.8 | 16.0 | 16.0 | 14.5 |
| 2015 | 17.4 | 17.3 | 16.9 | 16.9 | 17.3 | 14.3 |
| 2020 | 19.0 | 19.1 | 18.4 | 18.1 | 19.1 | 14.2 |
| 2025 | 21.0 | 21.2 | 20.2 | 19.5 | 21.2 | 14.0 |
| 2030 | 22.9 | 23.2 | 21.8 | 20.7 | 21.1 | 14.0 |
| 2035 | 24.4 | 24.7 | 23.0 | 21.5 | 20.9 | 13.9 |
| 2040 | 25.7 | 26.1 | 23.9 | 22.1 | 20.8 | 13.9 |
| 2045 | 26.6 | 27.1 | 24.5 | 22.6 | 20.7 | 13.9 |
| 2050 | 27.6 | 28.1 | 25.0 | 23.2 | 20.7 | 13.9 |
| G. Age group 0-14 (thousands) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1995 | 139464 | 139464 | 139464 | 139464 | 139464 | 139464 |
| 2000 | 127346 | 125509 | 126643 | 125509 | 125500 | 133272 |
| 2005 | 115394 | 111867 | 114402 | 111867 | 111852 | 136046 |
| 2010 | 110386 | 105892 | 109776 | 106284 | 105873 | 132231 |
| 2015 | 108819 | 104911 | 110254 | 110227 | 104897 | 153521 |
| 2020 | 106579 | 103647 | 110897 | 115532 | 103636 | 185685 |
| 2025 | 103212 | 100408 | 110158 | 119218 | 100400 | 223700 |
| 2030 | 99803 | 96015 | 108765 | 120963 | 116785 | 262836 |
| 2035 | 97117 | 92245 | 108233 | 121831 | 130651 | 300391 |
| 2040 | 94948 | 89968 | 109326 | 123782 | 142215 | 343491 |
| 2045 | 92717 | 88338 | 111147 | 126301 | 148951 | 391993 |
| 2050 | 90430 | 86378 | 112731 | 129140 | 152282 | 456670 |


| Age |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 65 | 2.11 | 2.04 | 2.38 | 3.60 | 4.81 |
| 70 | 3.13 | 3.04 | 3.53 | 7.38 | 6.36 |
| 75 | 4.88 | 4.77 | 5.53 | 6.15 | 11.94 |
| 80 | 8.36 | 8.18 | 9.52 | 10.52 | 21.44 |

Note: The six scenarios can be described briefly as follows:
I - Corresponds to the medium variant of the official United Nations population projections (World Population Prospects, 1998 Revision).
II - This scenario amends the medium variant by assuming no migration after 1995.
III - This scenario keeps the total population figure constant at the highest level that it would reach in the absence of migration after 1995.
IV - This scenario keeps the number of persons aged 15-64 constant at the highest level that it would reach in the absence of migration after 1995.
V - This scenario prevents the ratio of persons aged 15-64 to persons aged 65 and above from falling below 3.0.
VI - This scenario keeps the ratio of persons aged 15-64 and above at the highest level that it would reach in the absence of migration after 1995. This scenario is considered to be demographically unrealistic.

Table A.19. European Union, 1998 Revision
EUROPEAN UNION

| Indicator | A. ESTIMATES |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1950 | 1955 | 1960 | 1965 | 1970 | 1975 | 1980 | 1985 | 1990 | 1995 |
| Population (thousands) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total. | 296151 | 305088 | 315857 | 330279 | 340576 | 349313 | 355421 | 358732 | 365235 | 371937 |
| Males. | 142059 | 146694 | 152085 | 159683 | 165057 | 169501 | 172616 | 174195 | 177802 | 181615 |
| Females. | 154092 | 158394 | 163772 | 170595 | 175519 | 179812 | 182806 | 184537 | 187432 | 190322 |
| Sex ratio (per 100 females).............................. | 92.2 | 92.6 | 92.9 | 93.6 | 94 | 94.3 | 94.4 | 94.4 | 94.9 | 95.4 |
| Age distribution: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percentage aged 0-4. | 8.7 | 8.3 | 8.5 | 8.8 | 8.3 | 7.3 | 6.5 | 6.1 | 5.9 | 5.6 |
| Percentage aged 5-14.. | 15.8 | 15.9 | 16.1 | 15.7 | 16.4 | 16.5 | 15.2 | 13.4 | 12.3 | 11.8 |
| Percentage aged 15-24. | 15.4 | 15.1 | 14.6 | 14.7 | 14.8 | 15 | 15.8 | 16.3 | 14.9 | 13.3 |
| Percentage aged 60 or over.. | 13.9 | 14.6 | 15.5 | 16.5 | 17.6 | 18.3 | 17.9 | 19 | 20.1 | 20.8 |
| Percentage aged 65 or over.. | 9.5 | 10 | 10.6 | 11.2 | 12.2 | 13.1 | 13.9 | 13.6 | 14.7 | 15.5 |
| Percentage of women aged 15-49................ | 50.1 | 48.7 | 46.7 | 45.6 | 45.8 | 45.7 | 46.8 | 48.1 | 48.4 | 48.4 |
| Median age (years)......................................... | 32 | 32.3 | 32.8 | 32.8 | 32.9 | 33.1 | 33.7 | 34.8 | 36.1 | 37.3 |
| Population density (per sq km)........................ | 91 | 94 | 97 | 102 | 105 | 108 | 110 | 111 | 113 | 115 |
|  | 1950-1955 | 1955-1960 | 1960-1965 | 1965-1970 | 1970-1975 | 1975-1980 | 1980-1985 | 1985-1990 | 1990-1995 |  |
| Population change per year (thousands)............ | 1787 | 2154 | 2884 | 2060 | 1747 | 1222 | 662 | 1301 | 1340 |  |
| Births per year (thousands).............................. | 5390 | 5587 | 6037 | 5900 | 5166 | 4620 | 4423 | 4330 | 4165 |  |
| Deaths per year (thousands)........................... | 3289 | 3340 | 3474 | 3636 | 3706 | 3742 | 3717 | 3704 | 3835 |  |
| Population growth rate (percentage).................. | 0.59 | 0.69 | 0.89 | 0.61 | 0.51 | 0.35 | 0.19 | 0.36 | 0.36 |  |
| Crude birth rate (per 1.000 population)............... | 17.9 | 18 | 18.7 | 17.6 | 15 | 13.1 | 12.4 | 12 | 11.3 |  |
| Crude death rate (per 1,000 population)............. | 10.9 | 10.8 | 10.8 | 10.8 | 10.7 | 10.6 | 10.4 | 10.2 | 10.4 |  |
| Total fertility rate (per woman).......................... | 2.39 | 2.52 | 2.69 | 2.52 | 2.14 | 1.86 | 1.69 | 1.58 | 1.5 |  |
| Gross reproduction rate (per woman)................. | 1.16 | 1.22 | 1.31 | 1.23 | 1.04 | 0.9 | 0.82 | 0.77 | 0.73 |  |
| Net reproduction rate (per woman).................... | 1.07 | 1.13 | 1.23 | 1.16 | 1 | 0.87 | 0.8 | 0.75 | 0.72 |  |
| Infant mortality rate (per 1,000 births)................. | 48 | 39 | 32 | 26 | 21 | 15 | 11 | 9 | 7 |  |
| Life expectancy at birth (years) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Males........................................................ | 64.7 | 66.6 | 67.6 | 68.2 | 68.8 | 69.9 | 71.1 | 72.3 | 73.3 |  |
| Females.................................................... | 69.2 | 71.7 | 73.2 | 74.2 | 75 | 76.5 | 77.7 | 78.9 | 79.7 |  |
| Both sexes combined................................. | 67 | 69.2 | 70.4 | 71.2 | 71.9 | 73.2 | 74.4 | 75.7 | 76.5 |  |

B. MEDIUM-VARIANT PROJECTIONS

|  | 1995 | 2000 | 2005 | 2010 | 2015 | 2020 | 2025 | 2030 | 2040 | 2050 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Population (thousands) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total......................................................... | 371937 | 375276 | 376478 | 375694 | 373831 | 371125 | 367342 | 362201 | 348281 | 331307 |
| Males. | 181615 | 183591 | 184472 | 184287 | 183509 | 182257 | 180401 | 177808 | 170702 | 162314 |
| Females. | 190322 | 191685 | 192006 | 191407 | 190322 | 188868 | 186941 | 184394 | 177579 | 168993 |
| Sex ratio (per 100 females).............................. | 95.4 | 95.8 | 96.1 | 96.3 | 96.4 | 96.5 | 96.5 | 96.4 | 96.1 | 96 |
| Age distribution: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percentage aged 0-4. | 5.6 | 5.2 | 4.9 | 4.7 | 4.7 | 4.8 | 4.7 | 4.7 | 4.6 | 4.7 |
| Percentage aged 5-14.. | 11.8 | 11.4 | 10.8 | 10.2 | 9.7 | 9.6 | 9.7 | 9.7 | 9.6 | 9.7 |
| Percentage aged 15-24. | 13.3 | 12.3 | 11.9 | 11.6 | 11 | 10.4 | 10 | 10 | 10.3 | 10.2 |
| Percentage aged 60 or over | 20.8 | 21.9 | 22.9 | 24.5 | 26.1 | 28.1 | 30.5 | 32.8 | 34.9 | 35.3 |
| Percentage aged 65 or over. | 15.5 | 16.4 | 17.5 | 18.3 | 19.8 | 21.2 | 23 | 25.2 | 28.4 | 28.9 |
| Percentage in school ages 6-11... | 7.1 | 6.8 | 6.4 | 6 | 5.8 | 5.7 | 5.8 | 5.8 | 5.7 | 5.8 |
| Percentage in school ages 12-14. | 3.6 | 3.5 | 3.4 | 3.2 | 3 | 2.9 | 2.9 | 3 | 3 | 2.9 |
| Percentage in school ages 15-17. | 3.7 | 3.6 | 3.5 | 3.4 | 3.1 | 3 | 2.9 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| Percentage in school ages 18-23................. | 8.1 | 7.4 | 7.2 | 7.1 | 6.7 | 6.3 | 6.1 | 6 | 6.2 | 6.2 |
| Percentage of women aged 15-49................ | 48.4 | 47.5 | 46.5 | 45.1 | 42.7 | 40.3 | 38.5 | 37.5 | 36.4 | 36.1 |
| Median age (years)......................................... | 37.3 | 38.9 | 40.7 | 42.6 | 44.2 | 45.5 | 46.4 | 47.1 | 48.1 | 47.9 |
| Population density (per sq km)......................... | 115 | 116 | 116 | 116 | 115 | 114 | 113 | 112 | 107 | 102 |
|  | 1995-2000 | 2000-2005 | 2005-2010 | 2010-2015 | 2015-2020 | 2020-2025 | 2025-2030 | 2030-2040 | 2040-2050 |  |


| Population change per year (thousands)............ | 668 | 240 | -157 | -373 | -541 | -757 | -1028 | -1392 | -1697 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Births per year (thousands).............................. | 3892 | 3686 | 3555 | 3539 | 3548 | 3482 | 3384 | 3250 | 3167 |
| Deaths per year (thousands). | 3799 | 3916 | 4057 | 4219 | 4363 | 4488 | 4622 | 4852 | 5074 |
| Net migration per year (thousands).................. | 574 | 470 | 346 | 308 | 274 | 250 | 210 | 210 | 210 |
| Population growth rate (percentage). | 0.18 | 0.06 | -0.04 | -0.1 | -0.15 | -0.2 | -0.28 | -0.39 | -0.5 |
| Crude birth rate (per 1,000 population)............. | 10.4 | 9.8 | 9.5 | 9.4 | 9.5 | 9.4 | 9.3 | 9.1 | 9.3 |
| Crude death rate (per 1,000 population)............. | 10.2 | 10.4 | 10.8 | 11.3 | 11.7 | 12.2 | 12.7 | 13.6 | 14.9 |
| Net migration rate (per 1,000 population)........... | 1.5 | 1.3 | 0.9 | 0.8 | 0.7 | 0.7 | 0.6 | 0.6 | 0.6 |
| Total fertility rate (per woman).. | 1.44 | 1.45 | 1.5 | 1.57 | 1.64 | 1.69 | 1.74 | 1.78 | 1.8 |
| Gross reproduction rate (per woman). | 0.7 | 0.71 | 0.73 | 0.76 | 0.8 | 0.82 | 0.85 | 0.86 | 0.87 |
| Net reproduction rate (per woman).................... | 0.69 | 0.7 | 0.72 | 0.75 | 0.79 | 0.82 | 0.84 | 0.86 | 0.87 |
| Infant mortality rate (per 1,000 births)... | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| Mortality under age 5 (per 1,000 births)............ | 7.6 | 7.1 | 6.8 | 6.6 | 6.3 | 6 | 5.9 | 5.6 | 5.3 |
| Life expectancy at birth (years) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Males. | 74.3 | 75.1 | 75.7 | 76.2 | 76.8 | 77.3 | 77.7 | 78.4 | 79.2 |
| Females. | 80.7 | 81.3 | 81.8 | 82.3 | 82.7 | 83.2 | 83.6 | 84.2 | 85 |
| Both sexes combined............................... | 77.6 | 78.2 | 78.8 | 79.3 | 79.7 | 80.2 | 80.7 | 81.3 | 82 |

Source: United Nations Population Division, World Population Prospects: The 1998 Revision.

Table A. 19 (continued)
EUROPEAN UNION
C. HIGH-VARIANT PROJECTIONS

|  | 1995 | 2000 | 2005 | 2010 | 2015 | 2020 | 2025 | 2030 | 2040 | 2050 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Population (thousands) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total. | 371937 | 376210 | 379928 | 382168 | 383515 | 384340 | 384866 | 384837 | 383622 | 381264 |
| Males. | 181615 | 184071 | 186244 | 187613 | 188483 | 189044 | 189399 | 189429 | 188840 | 187941 |
| Females. | 190322 | 192139 | 193684 | 194555 | 195032 | 195296 | 195467 | 195408 | 194782 | 193323 |
| Age distribution: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percentage aged 0-4. | 5.6 | 5.4 | 5.5 | 5.4 | 5.4 | 5.5 | 5.6 | 5.7 | 5.9 | 6.1 |
| Percentage aged 5-14............................... | 11.8 | 11.4 | 11 | 10.9 | 10.9 | 10.9 | 11 | 11.2 | 11.6 | 12.1 |
| Percentage aged 15-24.............................. | 13.3 | 12.2 | 11.8 | 11.4 | 11 | 11 | 11 | 11 | 11.4 | 11.8 |
| Percentage aged 60 or over. | 20.8 | 21.8 | 22.7 | 24.1 | 25.5 | 27.1 | 29.1 | 30.9 | 31.7 | 30.6 |
| Percentage aged 65 or over........................ | 15.5 | 16.4 | 17.3 | 18 | 19.3 | 20.5 | 21.9 | 23.7 | 25.8 | 25.1 |
| Percentage of women aged 15-49................ | 48.4 | 47.4 | 46.1 | 44.3 | 41.9 | 39.8 | 38.4 | 37.8 | 37.5 | 38.5 |
| Median age (years)........................................ | 37.3 | 38.8 | 40.5 | 42 | 43.3 | 44.2 | 44.6 | 44.6 | 43.9 | 42.5 |
|  | 1995-2000 | 2000-2005 | 2005-2010 | 2010-2015 | 2015-2020 | 2020-2025 | 2025-2030 | 2030-2040 | 2040-2050 |  |
| Population change per year (thousands)............ | 855 | 744 | 448 | 269 | 165 | 105 | -6 | -121 | -236 |  |
| Population growth rate (percentage).................. | 0.23 | 0.2 | 0.12 | 0.07 | 0.04 | 0.03 | 0 | -0.03 | -0.06 |  |
| Crude birth rate (per 1,000 population)............... | 10.9 | 11.1 | 10.9 | 10.9 | 11.1 | 11.3 | 11.5 | 11.8 | 12.2 |  |
| Crude death rate (per 1,000 population)............. | 10.2 | 10.4 | 10.7 | 11 | 11.4 | 11.7 | 12 | 12.7 | 13.3 |  |
| Net migration rate (per 1,000 population)........... | 1.5 | 1.2 | 0.9 | 0.8 | 0.7 | 0.7 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.5 |  |
| Total fertility rate (per woman).......................... | 1.51 | 1.65 | 1.75 | 1.86 | 1.96 | 2.06 | 2.12 | 2.18 | 2.2 |  |
| Gross reproduction rate (per woman)................ | 0.73 | 0.8 | 0.85 | 0.9 | 0.95 | 1 | 1.03 | 1.06 | 1.07 |  |
| Net reproduction rate (per woman)................... | 0.72 | 0.79 | 0.84 | 0.89 | 0.94 | 0.99 | 1.02 | 1.05 | 1.06 |  |

D. LOW-VARIANT PROJECTIONS

|  | 1995 | 2000 | 2005 | 2010 | 2015 | 2020 | 2025 | 2030 | 2040 | 2050 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Population (thousands) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total. | 371937 | 374518 | 374056 | 371434 | 367102 | 361188 | 353666 | 344232 | 320436 | 292104 |
| Males. | 181615 | 183201 | 183227 | 182099 | 180053 | 177155 | 173380 | 168583 | 156411 | 142204 |
| Females. | 190322 | 191317 | 190829 | 189335 | 187049 | 184033 | 180286 | 175649 | 164025 | 149900 |
| Age distribution: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percentage aged 0-4. | 5.6 | 5 | 4.5 | 4.3 | 4.1 | 4 | 3.8 | 3.6 | 3.4 | 3.4 |
| Percentage aged 5-14. | 11.8 | 11.5 | 10.7 | 9.6 | 9 | 8.7 | 8.5 | 8.2 | 7.6 | 7.3 |
| Percentage aged 15-24. | 13.3 | 12.3 | 12 | 11.7 | 11 | 10 | 9.4 | 9.2 | 9 | 8.5 |
| Percentage aged 60 or over. | 20.8 | 21.9 | 23 | 24.8 | 26.6 | 28.8 | 31.7 | 34.5 | 37.9 | 40 |
| Percentage aged 65 or over.. | 15.5 | 16.4 | 17.6 | 18.6 | 20.1 | 21.8 | 23.8 | 26.5 | 30.9 | 32.7 |
| Percentage of women aged 15-49................ | 48.4 | 47.6 | 46.8 | 45.5 | 43.2 | 40.7 | 38.8 | 37.5 | 35.4 | 33.6 |
| Median age (years)........................................ | 37.3 | 39 | 40.9 | 42.9 | 44.8 | 46.4 | 47.8 | 49.1 | 51.3 | 52.9 |
|  | 1995-2000 | 2000-2005 | 2005-2010 | 2010-2015 | 2015-2020 | 2020-2025 | 2025-2030 | 2030-2040 | 2040-2050 |  |
| Population change per year (thousands)............ | 516 | -92 | -524 | -866 | -1183 | -1504 | -1887 | -2380 | -2833 |  |
| Population growth rate (percentage).................. | 0.14 | -0.02 | -0.14 | -0.23 | -0.32 | -0.42 | -0.54 | -0.72 | -0.93 |  |
| Crude birth rate (per 1,000 population).............. | 10 | 9 | 8.5 | 8.2 | 8 | 7.6 | 7.2 | 6.8 | 6.6 |  |
| Crude death rate (per 1,000 population)............. | 10.2 | 10.5 | 10.9 | 11.4 | 12 | 12.5 | 13.2 | 14.6 | 16.5 |  |
| Net migration rate (per 1,000 population)........... | 1.5 | 1.3 | 0.9 | 0.8 | 0.8 | 0.7 | 0.6 | 0.6 | 0.7 |  |
| Total fertility rate (per woman).......................... | 1.38 | 1.32 | 1.34 | 1.35 | 1.35 | 1.36 | 1.36 | 1.37 | 1.37 |  |
| Gross reproduction rate (per woman)................ | 0.67 | 0.64 | 0.65 | 0.66 | 0.66 | 0.66 | 0.66 | 0.66 | 0.67 |  |
| Net reproduction rate (per woman)................... | 0.66 | 0.63 | 0.64 | 0.65 | 0.65 | 0.65 | 0.66 | 0.66 | 0.66 |  |

## E. CONSTANT-VARIANT PROJECTIONS

|  | 1995 | 2000 | 2005 | 2010 | 2015 | 2020 | 2025 | 2030 | 2040 | 2050 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Population (thousands) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total. | 371937 | 376119 | 378012 | 377362 | 374839 | 370817 | 365477 | 358609 | 340395 | 317555 |

$\begin{array}{llllllllll}1995-2000 & 2000-2005 & 2005-2010 & 2010-2015 & 2015-2020 & 2020-2025 & 2025-2030 & 2030-2040 & 2040-2050\end{array}$

| Population growth rate (percen | 0.22 | 0.1 | -0.03 | -0.13 | -0.22 | -0.29 | -0.38 | -0.52 | -0.69 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Crude birth rate (per 1,000 population)... | 10.9 | 10.1 | 9.5 | 9.1 | 8.8 | 8.6 | 8.4 | 8.1 | 7.8 |
| Crude death rate (per 1,000 population).. | 10.2 | 10.4 | 10.7 | 11.2 | 11.7 | 12.2 | 12.8 | 13.9 | 15.4 |

Source: United Nations Population Division, World Population Prospects: The 1998 Revision.

Table A.20. European Union, replacement migration scenarios

EUROPEAN UNION

| Scenario | 1 | 11 | III | IV | V | VI |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Period | Medium variant | Medium variant with zero migration | Constant total population | Constant age group 15-64 | Ratio 15-64/65+ not less than 3.0 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Constant ratio } \\ & 15-64 / 65 \text { years } \\ & \text { or older } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| A. Average annual net migration (thousands) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1995-2000 | 574 | 0 | 0 | 46 | 0 | 5302 |
| 2000-2005 | 470 | 0 | 263 | 396 | 0 | 6171 |
| 2005-2010 | 346 | 0 | 521 | 545 | 0 | 5095 |
| 2010-2015 | 308 | 0 | 663 | 1596 | 0 | 9012 |
| 2015-2020 | 274 | 0 | 742 | 1938 | 417 | 9557 |
| 2020-2025 | 250 | 0 | 869 | 2424 | 8550 | 12947 |
| 2025-2030 | 210 | 0 | 1032 | 2814 | 10210 | 18312 |
| 2030-2035 | 210 | 0 | 1216 | 2407 | 8176 | 20346 |
| 2035-2040 | 210 | 0 | 1351 | 1593 | 3376 | 18724 |
| 2040-2045 | 210 | 0 | 1416 | 1063 | 0 | 16483 |
| 2045-2050 | 210 | 0 | 1418 | 1097 | 0 | 18153 |
| Grand total 1995-2050 | 16361 | 0 | 47456 | 79605 | 153646 | 700506 |
| B. Total population (thousands) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1995 | 371937 | 371937 | 371937 | 371937 | 371937 | 371937 |
| 2000 | 375276 | 372440 | 372440 | 372680 | 372440 | 400089 |
| 2005 | 376478 | 371065 | 372440 | 373390 | 371065 | 433063 |
| 2010 | 375694 | 368232 | 372440 | 373590 | 368232 | 461257 |
| 2015 | 373831 | 364428 | 372440 | 378554 | 364428 | 510650 |
| 2020 | 371125 | 359936 | 372440 | 385344 | 362130 | 565699 |
| 2025 | 367342 | 354500 | 372440 | 394551 | 401916 | 641056 |
| 2030 | 362201 | 347891 | 372440 | 405592 | 453687 | 748324 |
| 2035 | 355783 | 339947 | 372440 | 414173 | 498026 | 871833 |
| 2040 | 348281 | 330878 | 372440 | 418003 | 518590 | 992383 |
| 2045 | 340013 | 321049 | 372440 | 418422 | 520307 | 1104897 |
| 2050 | 331307 | 310839 | 372440 | 418509 | 519965 | 1228341 |
| C. Age group 15-64 (thousands) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1995 | 249382 | 249382 | 249382 | 249382 | 249382 | 249382 |
| 2000 | 251299 | 249213 | 249213 | 249382 | 249213 | 268773 |
| 2005 | 251625 | 247737 | 248709 | 249382 | 247737 | 291712 |
| 2010 | 250909 | 245587 | 248563 | 249382 | 245587 | 311918 |
| 2015 | 245947 | 239387 | 245055 | 249382 | 239387 | 344093 |
| 2020 | 239216 | 231427 | 240285 | 249382 | 232969 | 379072 |
| 2025 | 230090 | 221083 | 233826 | 249382 | 254334 | 426112 |
| 2030 | 218698 | 208594 | 226054 | 249382 | 282380 | 492818 |
| 2035 | 207975 | 196861 | 219920 | 249382 | 306897 | 570480 |
| 2040 | 199716 | 187775 | 217056 | 249382 | 319230 | 647667 |
| 2045 | 193479 | 180834 | 216656 | 249382 | 322718 | 721736 |
| 2050 | 187851 | 174470 | 216929 | 249382 | 325575 | 803974 |
| D. Potential support ratio 15-64/65 or older |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1995 | 4.31 | 4.31 | 4.31 | 4.31 | 4.31 | 4.31 |
| 2000 | 4.08 | 4.06 | 4.06 | 4.06 | 4.06 | 4.31 |
| 2005 | 3.83 | 3.80 | 3.81 | 3.82 | 3.80 | 4.31 |
| 2010 | 3.64 | 3.60 | 3.64 | 3.65 | 3.60 | 4.31 |
| 2015 | 3.33 | 3.28 | 3.34 | 3.39 | 3.28 | 4.31 |
| 2020 | 3.04 | 2.98 | 3.07 | 3.17 | 3.00 | 4.31 |
| 2025 | 2.73 | 2.66 | 2.78 | 2.94 | 3.00 | 4.31 |
| 2030 | 2.39 | 2.32 | 2.48 | 2.69 | 3.00 | 4.31 |
| 2035 | 2.14 | 2.07 | 2.26 | 2.51 | 3.00 | 4.31 |
| 2040 | 2.02 | 1.94 | 2.18 | 2.43 | 3.00 | 4.31 |
| 2045 | 1.97 | 1.90 | 2.18 | 2.41 | 3.01 | 4.31 |
| 2050 | 1.96 | 1.89 | 2.21 | 2.41 | 3.03 | 4.31 |

## Table A. 20 (continued)

EUROPEAN UNION

|  | Scenario | 1 | II | III | IV | V | VI |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Period |  | Medium variant | Medium variant with zero migration | Constant total population | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Constant } \\ \text { age group } \\ 15-64 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Ratio $15-64 / 65+$ not less than 3.0 | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Constant ratio } \\ 15-64 / 65 \text { years } \\ \text { or older } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| E. Age group 65 or older (thousands) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1995 |  | 57815 | 57815 | 57815 | 57815 | 57815 | 57815 |
| 2000 |  | 61596 | 61349 | 61349 | 61357 | 61349 | 62310 |
| 2005 |  | 65725 | 65179 | 65227 | 65263 | 65179 | 67628 |
| 2010 |  | 68903 | 68186 | 68348 | 68400 | 68186 | 72312 |
| 2015 |  | 73844 | 72975 | 73311 | 73547 | 72975 | 79772 |
| 2020 |  | 78599 | 77580 | 78147 | 78683 | 77656 | 87881 |
| 2025 |  | 84326 | 83096 | 83973 | 84964 | 84778 | 98786 |
| 2030 |  | 91378 | 89889 | 91199 | 92808 | 94127 | 114250 |
| 2035 |  | 97012 | 95173 | 97123 | 99413 | 102299 | 132255 |
| 2040 |  | 99073 | 96772 | 99665 | 102672 | 106410 | 150149 |
| 2045 |  | 98024 | 95184 | 99381 | 103268 | 107144 | 167321 |
| 2050 |  | 95600 | 92240 | 98067 | 103280 | 107603 | 186386 |
| F. Percentage in age group 65 or older |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1995 |  | 15.5 | 15.5 | 15.5 | 15.5 | 15.5 | 15.5 |
| 2000 |  | 16.4 | 16.5 | 16.5 | 16.5 | 16.5 | 15.6 |
| 2005 |  | 17.5 | 17.6 | 17.5 | 17.5 | 17.6 | 15.6 |
| 2010 |  | 18.3 | 18.5 | 18.4 | 18.3 | 18.5 | 15.7 |
| 2015 |  | 19.8 | 20.0 | 19.7 | 19.4 | 20.0 | 15.6 |
| 2020 |  | 21.2 | 21.6 | 21.0 | 20.4 | 21.4 | 15.5 |
| 2025 |  | 23.0 | 23.4 | 22.5 | 21.5 | 21.1 | 15.4 |
| 2030 |  | 25.2 | 25.8 | 24.5 | 22.9 | 20.7 | 15.3 |
| 2035 |  | 27.3 | 28.0 | 26.1 | 24.0 | 20.5 | 15.2 |
| 2040 |  | 28.4 | 29.2 | 26.8 | 24.6 | 20.5 | 15.1 |
| 2045 |  | 28.8 | 29.6 | 26.7 | 24.7 | 20.6 | 15.1 |
| 2050 |  | 28.9 | 29.7 | 26.3 | 24.7 | 20.7 | 15.2 |
| G. Age group 0-14 (thousands) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1995 |  | 64740 | 64740 | 64740 | 64740 | 64740 | 64740 |
| 2000 |  | 62380 | 61879 | 61879 | 61941 | 61879 | 69006 |
| 2005 |  | 59127 | 58149 | 58504 | 58745 | 58149 | 73723 |
| 2010 |  | 55882 | 54459 | 55529 | 55808 | 54459 | 77027 |
| 2015 |  | 54040 | 52066 | 54074 | 55625 | 52066 | 86785 |
| 2020 |  | 53310 | 50929 | 54008 | 57278 | 51505 | 98747 |
| 2025 |  | 52926 | 50320 | 54641 | 60204 | 62805 | 116157 |
| 2030 |  | 52125 | 49409 | 55187 | 63402 | 77181 | 141256 |
| 2035 |  | 50796 | 47913 | 55397 | 65378 | 88831 | 169098 |
| 2040 |  | 49492 | 46331 | 55719 | 65949 | 92951 | 194567 |
| 2045 |  | 48510 | 45031 | 56403 | 65772 | 90445 | 215841 |
| 2050 |  | 47856 | 44130 | 57445 | 65846 | 86786 | 237981 |
| H. Potential support ratio in 2050 by age at entry into non-working-age population |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Age |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 65 |  | 1.96 | 1.89 | 2.21 | 2.41 | 3.03 | 4.31 |
| 70 |  | 2.77 | 2.66 | 3.12 | 3.43 | 4.24 | 6.34 |
| 75 |  | 4.12 | 3.94 | 4.62 | 5.09 | 6.20 | 9.87 |
| 80 |  | 6.81 | 6.50 | 7.61 | 8.37 | 10.07 | 17.14 |

NOTE: The six scenarios can be described briefly as follows:
I - Corresponds to the medium variant of the official United Nations population projections (World Population Prospects, 1998 Revision).
II - This scenario amends the medium variant by assuming no migration after 1995.
III - This scenario keeps the total population figure constant at the highest level that it would reach in the absence of migration after 1995.
IV - This scenario keeps the number of persons aged 15-64 constant at the highest level that it would reach in the absence of migration after 1995 .
V - This scenario prevents the ratio of persons aged 15-64 to persons aged 65 and above from falling below 3.0.
VI - This scenario keeps the ratio of persons aged 15-64 and above at the highest level that it would reach in the absence of migration after 1995. This scenario is considered to be demographically unrealistic.


[^0]:    Source: United Nations Population Division, World Population Prospects: The 1998 Revision.
    Notes:
    ${ }^{a}$ Countries or areas with 150,000 persons or more in 1995.
    ${ }^{b}$ As of 1 July 1997, Hong Kong became a Special Administrative Region (SAR) of China.

[^1]:    * Scenario VI is considered to be unrealistic.

[^2]:    * Scenario VI is considered to be unrealistic.

[^3]:    * Scenario VI is considered to be demographically unrealistic.

[^4]:    * Scenario VI is considered to be demographically unrealistic.

[^5]:    * Scenario VI is considered to be demographically unrealistic.

[^6]:    NOTE: The population in scenario I is slightly smaller than in scenario II because of net out migration.

[^7]:    * Scenario VI is considered to be demographically unrealistic.

[^8]:    * Scenario VI is considered to be demographically unrealistic.

[^9]:    * Scenario VI is considered to be demographically unrealistic.

[^10]:    * Scenario VI is considered to be demographically unrealistic.

[^11]:    * Scenario VI is considered to be demographically unrealistic.

[^12]:    * Stabilizing the age structure at 3 persons of working-age for each person of retirement age would also require very large numbers of immigrants.

[^13]:    I - Corresponds to the medium variant of the official United Nations population projections (World Population Prospects, 1998 Revision).
    II - This scenario amends the medium variant by assuming no migration after 1995.
    III - This scenario keeps the total population figure constant at the highest level that it would reach in the absence of migration after 1995.
    IV - This scenario keeps the number of persons aged 15-64 constant at the highest level that it would reach in the absence of migration after 1995.
    V - This scenario prevents the ratio of persons aged 15-64 to persons aged 65 and above from falling below 3.0.
    VI - This scenario keeps the ratio of persons aged 15-64 and above at the highest level that it would reach in the absence of migration after 1995. This scenario is considered to be demographically unrealistic.

[^14]:    I - Corresponds to the medium variant of the official United Nations population projections (World Population Prospects, 1998 Revision). II - This scenario amends the medium variant by assuming no migration after 1995.
    III - This scenario keeps the total population figure constant at the highest level that it would reach in the absence of migration after 1995.
    IV - This scenario keeps the number of persons aged 15-64 constant at the highest level that it would reach in the absence of migration after 1995.
    V - This scenario prevents the ratio of persons aged 15-64 to persons aged 65 and above from falling below 3.0.
    VI - This scenario keeps the ratio of persons aged 15-64 and above at the highest level that it would reach in the absence of migration after 1995. This scenario is considered to be demographically unrealistic.

[^15]:    NOTE: The six scenarios can be described briefly as follows:

[^16]:    Source: United Nations Population Division, World Population Prospects: The 1998 Revision.

