

The European Union measures taken to prevent and manage the recent migration flows – from survival to social and economic integration of migrants

Victor NICOLĂESCU*, Gabriela PETRE**

Abstract

Migrant's crisis of 2015 affected the credibility of the social security system built and strengthened over the past three decades by the European Union. Adoption of the refugee quotas in order to be relocated by the Member States of the European Union is a current issue that requires at least two directions of analysis: increasing the efficiency of the European Union humanitarian aid addressed to destination countries and deepening the dimensions of the integrative process of social inclusion of migrants. This article proposes to review the state of implementation mechanisms for supporting measures addressed to migration flows developed by the European Union together with candidate states and the mechanisms developed by international institutions and organization in order to provide specific measures of humanitarian assistance to populations in affected areas war.

Keywords: social inclusion, humanitarian assistance, migration, European Union

Introduction

The approach of migration in recent years in analyses and scientific studies is a challenge that correlates with the global and European realities facing with new phenomena related to vulnerabilities, risks, social exclusion and terrorism. In the context of tested vectors to link humanitarian assistance with development cooperation in order to maintain an equilibrium at the level of effective interventions in migrants' countries of origin, new challenges need to be identified that require a rethinking of European policies on the integration of migrants (Nicolaescu, 2017).

In a more streamlined formula, at European level, migratory flows assessments should be carried out to highlight at least three effects of this phenomenon: effects of migration on the country of origin, on the population of the target country and on the migrants themselves (Nicolaescu, 2011, p. 114).

* Victor NICOLAESCU is Professor at “Petre Andrei” University, Iasi, Romania, e-mail: vic72ro@gmail.com.

** Gabriela PETRE is PhD Student at National School of Political and Administrative Studies, Bucharest, Romania, e-mail: petregabriela.apollo@yahoo.com.



The European Union measures relating migration need to be assessed and implemented under more balanced principles to turn into effective and integrative interventions for migrants located in transition countries and to better link humanitarian aid with development cooperation. In this sense, the article analyses the recent evolution of humanitarian aid addressed to transit countries of migration flows and pay attention to the common objectives established by the European destination countries of migration flows in order to support the migrants and to manage the difficulties encountered by transit countries to respond to recent flows of migration. It also summarizes the new approaches and the main directions of valorisation and dissemination of policies, strategies and measures for social and economic inclusion of migrants in the European Union Member States. Social and economic inclusion of this vulnerable people raises multiple challenges, but also creates significant opportunities in the European construction plan of validation of a system articulated by the principles of justice, freedom and security.

The European space is more than ever affected by the recent migration flows originated from the countries affected by war or post-war conflicts. On the one side, the situation of victims of wars has become a problem which needs to be treated by taking into account the effects of war among people living in the neighbouring countries of conflict areas, people who are deeply affected in exercising their rights and their fundamental freedoms. On the other side, the social inclusion of migrants is a significant challenge for Member States of the European Union, meaning that article analyses the situation actually recorded on poverty, access to the labour market and the educational level of this vulnerable people and the set of measures proposed by European decision fora.

Migration is one of the major challenges faced by the European Union today, and the need for a more coherent policy is based on the solidarity of Member States in responding in a timely and flexible way (King and Sursa, 2016). From the perspective of international organizations, it is worthy to mention the UNHCR regional response to migration which is based on the following key elements (UNHCR, 2015, pp. 15-18): protection monitoring and advocacy; strengthening national asylum systems; people with specific needs; health care and reproductive health services; coordination with national medical services; child protection and assistance; family reunification and prevention of family separation; prevention and response to sexual and gender-based violence; registration; accountability and participation; communication with communities; relocation procedures; resettlement and alternative pathways to protection; assisted voluntary return and reintegration; prevention of sexual exploitation and abuse.

This article highlights the main trends of migration at international and European level, emphasizes the importance of humanitarian assistance in order to achieve effective interventions in the countries of origin of migratory flows, especially in the countries affected by armed conflicts /

war, highlighting the issues Social exclusion faced by migrants. In this process, a balance is achieved in the allocation of funds and the impact of the interventions made so as to ensure a more effective mechanism for diminishing the migration trends and to ensure the social inclusion of the migrants. The absorption of funds available at European level to support regional disparities is an endogenous issue located at the level of Member States' ability to adequately manage European funding mechanisms (Cace *et al.*, 2010a), encouraging the bottom-up approaches to address the needs of vulnerable people (Cace *et al.*, 2012). On the other hand, monitoring and evaluation in the field of measures for increasing social inclusion of refugees also has the role of promoting the social dimension through innovative transnational projects to test new approaches that could have positive influence at the European level (Neguț *et al.*, 2011: 23).

1. The trends of migration flows towards EU Member States

Migration flows, by the magnitude of global and regional effects, are topics of interest to international and European organizations such as the United Nations - UNFPA, UNHCR, IOM, UNICEF, UNDP, OECD, World Bank, European Commission, European Parliament, Council of Europe etc. The increased interest in monitoring and assessing the causes and effects of migration shows that the data processed and provided to decision-makers and the general public have certain limits derived from the registration methodology, the status of migrants, the full identification of the phenomenon, the mobility of migrants, localization at the local level, etc. Of course, each data provider brings the required specifications to the limitations and constraints of data collection and processing, the most important aspect being that it provides evidence of trends in the data provided that fuel the decision-making framework for the development of effective policies and measures for the management of migratory flows

At the UN level, it is estimated that in the year 2016 there were 244 million migrants, and in the period 1990-2015 their number increased by 91 million (60%) with a higher intensity in the period 2000-2010 when additional 4.9 migrants Compared with an annual average of 2 million between 1990-2000 and 4.4 million between 2010-2015 (United Nations, 2016, p. 1). According to other estimates of the United Nations institutions, there are estimated 232 million international migrants (UN DESA, 2013) and 740 million intern migrants (UNDP, 2009) in the world.

At regional distribution level, Europe and Asia account for nearly two-thirds of all migrants in 2015, with 76 million migrants in Europe and 75 million in Asia (United Nations, 2016, p. 2). More than half of international migrants in the world were in 2015 in ten countries: the United States of America hosted 47 million migrants in 2015 (19% of the total), Germany and the Russian Federation

hosted the second and third largest numbers (12 million Each), Saudi Arabia indicated 10 million, United Kingdom revealed nearly 9 million, and United Arab Emirates hosted 8 million. (United Nations, 2016, p. 5).

As for asylum seekers, in 2015 there were 1.65 million new asylum seekers in OECD member countries, of which 1.3 million came to OECD member countries, and of these found that the Syrians were 25% of the applicants and 16% of the Afghans. Germany is the most targeted European country by registering 440,000 formal asylum applications in 2015 and more than one million pre-registrations, while Sweden received the most applications in proportion to its population (1.6%) (OECD, 2016, p. 9).

At European level, in the year 2016, 710.400 asylum seekers were protected, a doubling as compared to 2015, while Member States also reported 14,000 relocated refugees. The largest group of beneficiaries of protective measures in 2016 were citizens from Syria (405 600 persons, 57% of the total number of persons granted protection status in the EU Member States), followed by citizens of Iraq 9%) and those of Afghanistan (61,800 or 9%). Of the 405600 Syrians benefiting from the protection of European measures, more than 70% were registered in Germany (294 700) (EUROSTAT, 2017). In this article, we will not address the issue of smuggling with migrants, taking into account the lack of global data on migrant smuggling and comparative analysis, as well as the ability to inform the development of effective responses (McAuliffe and Laczko, 2016, p. 1).

One of the main issue related to migratory flows is regarding the capacity of receiving states to integrate the new arrived population and to avoid developing social exclusion communities of migrants. Of course, using demographic arguments, different points of view illustrate the benefits of receiving and integrating migrants in the context of other measures to replace generations. Thus, the migratory population has the main trait that it is represented mostly by active and fit to work , so positive net migration can contribute to the reduction of the old-age dependency ratio. According to data provided by the United Nations institutions, during the period from 2015 to 2050, old-age dependency ratios are projected to increase from 26% to 48% in Europe (83 per cent increase), from 22 to 38 in Northern America (68 per cent), from 11 to 31 in Latin America and the Caribbean (170 per cent), and from 18 to 30 in Oceania (60 per cent). Only Africa is projected to have an old-age dependency ratio below 10 older persons for every 100 persons of working age by 2050, with the ratio nevertheless increasing by about 50 per cent between 2015 and 2050 (United Nations, 2017, p. 18).

2. Humanitarian assistance – supporting the chances to survive in conflict/war areas

Currently, the durable reality of conventional warfare indicates the mobilization of the armed forces to engage in theatres of operations, as well as carefully weighed, planned and implemented actions with the active and full participation of the parties involved in the conflict.

Beyond the borders, the outbreak of war in the world is recorded daily by living realities of war victims. Nowadays it is important to review the state of implementation mechanisms for supporting measures addressed to category of migrants from the war affected areas, the mechanisms developed by EU institutions and organisations in order to provide specific measures of assistance addressed to these categories of migrants and the effective ways to prevent to become victims, more specifically to be trapped into social exclusion situations. The situation of victims of war has become a problem which need to be treated by taking into account the effects of war among people living in the conflict areas, people who are deeply affected in exercising their rights and their fundamental freedoms, being defined by absence of means of basic existence and living. Humanitarian assistance is a field that attempts to correct situations actually negative in the areas affected by war, but is important to note the efforts needed at International and European level in order to rethink and implement under more effective principles to reach effective interventions for victims of war, including their particular situations as migrants in the European Union Member States.

The generally accepted international framework on humanitarian law aims at limiting the effects of armed conflicts on civilians, establishes responsibilities for state and non-state actors, regulating fundamental issues regarding the right to receive humanitarian assistance, the protection of civilians, refugees, inmates, injured or sick. In normative terms, humanitarian assistance applies 1949 Fourth Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilians in Time of War and the 1977 and 2005 Additional Protocols. Today, more than ever, the need to report to international humanitarian aid legislation is highlighted by recent migratory flows from areas affected by armed conflict and war. Thus, as the number of asylum seekers doubled in the OECD member states in 2015 compared to 2014, we should point out that this unprecedented increase is partly due to the deterioration of the situation in Syria, Iraq, Libya, and a high level of insecurity in Afghanistan, Pakistan and North Africa (OECD, 2016, p. 29). The current framework of migratory flows is finding in the last decade a series of concerns and demarches at international and European level for the proper management of humanitarian aid.

The Joint Statement by the Council and the Representatives of the Governments of the Member States meeting within the Council, the European Parliament and the European Commission (2008 / C 25/01) on the European Consensus on Humanitarian Aid states that the European Union is

committed to respecting and promote the fundamental humanitarian principles of humanity, neutrality, impartiality and independence (European Consensus on Humanitarian Aid, 2008, p. 3).

Table 1. Fundamental humanitarian principles

1.1. The Principle of Humanity	Human suffering must be combated wherever it occurs, with particular attention to the most vulnerable segments of the population. The dignity of all victims must be respected and protected.
1.2. The Principle of Neutrality	Humanitarian aid does not favour any party to an armed conflict or other dispute.
1.3. The Principle of Impartiality	Humanitarian aid must be provided only on the basis of necessity, without discrimination between affected populations or among them.
1.4. The Principle of Independence	Autonomy of humanitarian objectives in relation to political, economic, military or other objectives, and must ensure that the sole purpose of humanitarian aid remains to ease and prevent the suffering of humanitarian crisis victims.

Source: European Consensus on Humanitarian Aid, 2008, p. 2

Intervention systems in humanitarian assistance are based on evaluations carried out in two phases: 1. The first phase highlights **Index for Risk Management (INFORM)** and **Forgotten Crisis Assessment (FCA)**; 2. The first phase applies **Integrated Analysis Framework (IAF)** which is an in-depth assessment carried out by European Commission's humanitarian experts. Regarding the implementation of concentrated and efficient interventions to manage migration flows in areas affected by armed conflicts / war, it is obvious that it is important to solve with a very specific aspect of the political dialogue and to carry out operations within the legitimate framework defined by the four Principles outlined above. In all areas of intervention for refugees and migrants, the response will remain focused on humanitarian interests, imperatives and principles (UNHCR, 2016, p. 15)

In fact, within the Implementation Plan proposed by the European Commission in 2015, at least three priority areas are set to provide added value in achieving the effectiveness and consistency of actions of both the Commission and individual Member States in the field of humanitarian aid: upholding humanitarian principles and International Humanitarian Law; a stronger needs-based approach; enhanced coordination and coherence (European Commission, 2015, p. 3).

Another way to highlight the structure of interventions in the migration process is indicated by the principles proposed in IOM evaluation (2017): adhering to international standards and fulfilling migrants' rights; using evidence and whole-of-government approaches; developing strong partnerships; advancing the socio-economic wellbeing of migrants and society; addressing the mobility dimensions of crises; safe, orderly and dignified migration.

Interventions for providing humanitarian assistance are carried out by state and non-state actors in close collaboration with the institutions of the United Nations system, and the share of each party is different depending on the resources allocated and the actions taken. In this respect, in the hierarchy of the top donors for humanitarian assistance it is found that besides the institutions of the United Nations and the European Commission, there are also four European states with significant participation in this field (Sweden, Denmark, United Kingdom, The Netherlands).

Table 2. UNFPA Top Humanitarian Donors 2016 (hierarchy by country)

1.	Canada
2.	United States
3.	OCHA including CERF
4.	European Commission
5.	Sweden
6.	Japan
7.	Denmark
8.	Other UN Humanitarian Pooled Funds
9.	Saudi Arabia
10.	Australia
11.	United Kingdom
12.	The Netherlands

Source: UNFPA, 2017, p. 10

The European Union adopted a Regulation (2016/369) on 15 March 2016 in order to be able to provide humanitarian assistance to member states in need due to the asylum crisis with an estimated budget of 700 million EURO for 2016-18 (OECD, 2016, p. 50). Complementary, the EU has also adopted *The rules on humanitarian aid* which allow the EU to spend money for humanitarian aid only outside its territory (i.e. in third countries). Another proposed recommendations for interventions for assistance of refugees and asylum seekers in Europe has been released by UNFPA, indicated several directions: align human resource capacity to deliver in humanitarian contexts; strengthen humanitarian advocacy and communications; increase investment in humanitarian data, risk/resilience/vulnerability analysis and information management, promote strategic partnerships; integrate funding mechanisms in UNFPA to effectively and efficiently finance humanitarian operations (UNFPA, 2017, p. 15). An important aspect of humanitarian assistance also relates to combating smuggling with migrants in close connection with humanitarian assistance so as to avoid tragedies as a result of crossing the sea (McAuliffe and Laczko, Frank, 2016, p. iii).

At the level of humanitarian assistance to the European Union, it is important to take into account the comparative advantages of the European Community derived from the European Consensus on Humanitarian Aid (2008, pp. 9-10) in the activities on the prevention and management

of migratory flows: a global presence; coherence of community policies; promoting good humanitarian practices; the ability to intervene more flexibly in delicate political situations; coordination with other donors and cooperation with the UN system.

3. The Burden of social exclusion brought by recent migration flows

Integration of migrants has been a widely debated issue at European level, in which, before confronting recent migratory flows, a set of rules have been established to achieve their integration. At the beginning, the issue of return seems to be a “vital and integral component” of the EU immigration and asylum policy (COM, 2002, p. 6). In November 2004, at the initiative of the Dutch Presidency, the EU Council adopted a set of Common Basic Principles on Integration (CBP) (see Table 3).

Table 3. The common basic principles (CBP)

1.	Integration is a dynamic two-way process of mutual accommodation by all immigrants and residents of Member States.
2.	Integration implies respect for the basic values of the European Union.
3.	Employment is a key part of the integration process and is central to the overall participation of immigrants in the host society.
4.	Basic knowledge of the host society’s language, history and institutions is indispensable for integration.
5.	Education is critical for preparing immigrants, and especially their descendants, to be successful and active participants in society.
6.	Access for immigrants to institutions, as well as to public and private goods and services, on a basis equal to national citizens and in a non-discriminatory way, is a crucial foundation for integration.
7.	Frequent interaction between immigrants and Member-State citizens is a fundamental mechanism for integration.
8.	The practice of diverse cultures and religions is guaranteed and safeguarded, unless these practices conflict with other inviolable European rights or with national law.
9.	The participation of immigrants in the democratic process and in the formulation of integration policies, especially at the local level, supports their integration
10.	Integration measures and policies should be mainstreamed through all other relevant policy portfolios
11.	Progress towards achieving goals should be regularly evaluated.

Source: EPC/KBF (2005), Beyond the Common Basic Principles on integration, Issue Paper 27, 15 April 2005.

As we can see, the complexity of migrant integration is derived even from a principle that is generous in essence but difficult to put into practice. First of all, we must recognize that there are

differences between states on the interpretation of this concept at European level, and different perspectives on social policies in this area are reached. In the context in which the fight against social exclusion should cover a very wide range of areas (education, employment, vocational training, housing, health care and social protection), it is clear that immigrants and refugees are, in the European Union's view, groups at high risk of social exclusion (Mircea, 2006, p. 327).

Recognizing the social problems faced by migrants - refugees and asylum seekers do not automatically lead to the implementation of the most effective interventions. In this respect, there are a number of barriers for refugees and asylum seekers (discrimination, labour market restrictions linked to migration status, lack of recognition of qualifications, language). In the absence of integration plans that address racial discrimination in the labour market, they get to their employment in the grey economy or fall victim to exploitation (Nwabuzo, 2016). Besides, in correlation with the precarious situation in which these categories of population are found, the racist attacks targeting migrants, asylum seekers, refugees from eight Member States: Austria, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Finland, Germany, Greece, Ireland, and Sweden (Table 4).

Table 4. Racist attacks targeting migrants, asylum seekers, refugees

Member States	Type of attack	Official data	2015	2016
Austria	Attacks against asylum seekers' accommodation	Yes	25	24
Cyprus	Racially motivated violent incidents reported by non-Cypriots	Yes	5	n.a.
Finland	Attacks against reception centres	No	47	n.a.
Germany	Right-wing motivated crimes targeting asylum accommodation	Yes	1031	988
	Acts of violence against asylum seekers and refugees	Yes	n.a.	2545
Greece	Racist incidents targeting immigrants and refugees	No	75	n.a.
Ireland	Racist incidents targeting 'foreigners' and refugees	No	9	34
Sweden	Arson attacks against asylum seekers' accommodation	No	43	n.a.

Source: Nwabuzo, 2016, p. 40

Given that racist attacks against migrants, asylum seekers and refugees have been reported by civil society organizations across the EU, it is necessary to develop more effective policies to support their integration into European societies. It is also becoming more and more to report common threats to national security stemming from terrorism or cross-border crime, threats to the state's right to control and regulate the entry and exit of people onto its territory (McAuliffe and Laczko, 2016).

In the last period, on the background of the social exclusion of migrants, refugees and asylum seekers in the European Union, there are centrifugal tendencies to make quasi-coercive returns / repatriations. Surely, we should see these counter-actions of European societies only as individual

approaches of member states. In this context, each EU Member State intends to preserve a certain degree of autonomy in dealing flexibly with removal procedures without being constrained to comply with common standards on return and readmission issues that are often viewed as being shaped by domestic security concerns (Cassarino, 2006, pp. 7-8).

4. The policies adopted by the EU to tackle migration

At the level of the European Union, it can be considered that the last three decades have been marked by a series of adaptations of immigration and asylum policies, the most important of which are indicated in the table below (Table 5).

Table 5. European policies on migration and asylum

1985 – Signing of the Schengen Agreement	Signature of the Agreement by the Governments of Germany, France and the Netherlands
1986 – The Single European Act	Through the creation of an area of freedom, security and justice, the European Union provides a guarantee for the free movement of persons, the security of European citizens, and the differentiation between the internal border and the external border
1992 – The Treaty of Maastricht	The formula for the three pillars was created and the third Pillar on Justice and Home Affairs (JHA) focused on asylum policy, rules on crossing external borders and immigration policy
1997 – The Treaty of Amsterdam	Migration and asylum policy – one of the EU’s political priorities, has been the subject of joint responsibility and European cooperation; initiatives on justice, freedom and security have become the subject of Community legislation.
1999 – European Council in Tampere	Four axes have been introduced in migration policy: a common European asylum system, a policy of legal migration and the integration of non-EU citizens, the fight against illegal immigration and cooperation with countries of origin and transit.
2000 – European Commission Directive	The European Commission (EC) has proposed a Directive on the conditions of entry and residence of immigrants for economic purposes
2000 – The Treaty of Nice	Accepting the Schengen acquis, the standards imposed in this context in the context of the enlargement of the European Union to Eastern Europe
2004 – The Hague Program	It sets the foundations for a common policy with regard to immigration and asylum
2009 Stockholm Program (2010-2014)	Priority in the Global Approach to Migration – Equality of rights between third-country nationals and EU citizens, partnership with countries of origin; the central theme of the new program is to build a Europe of citizens.
2015	A European Agenda On Migration

Source: Alexe and Paunescu (2011), pp. 15-20

In the European Union, in 2015, the European Migration Agenda was adopted, as well as other measures aimed at addressing the causes and effects of recent migratory flows and reforming the Common European Asylum System (OECD, 2016, p. 9). In this respect, the Commission proposed a set of initiatives based on four pillars: reducing the incentives for irregular migration, strengthening border management, building a strong common asylum policy and establishing a new policy on legal migration (OECD, 2016, p. 47). The Commission proposed reforms on 6 April 2016 which include (OECD, 2016): a corrective allocation mechanism in order to ensure a fair sharing of responsibility between member states in line with the Treaty of Lisbon; once a member state has been considered responsible for 150% of its fair share, the corrective allocation mechanism is automatically triggered and the asylum seekers relocated among the member states below that threshold; the fair share of each member state is calculated based on the size of each member state's population (50% weighting) and the GDP (50% weighting) relative to that of the entire EU; compensating the member state that has taken responsibility, at a cost of EUR 250 000 per asylum seeker.

The illegal immigration at EU level stood permanently to the attention of the EU institutions that have been required to be integrated and associated with cooperation agreements, particularly the countries of the Mediterranean basin (MEDA program) and partnership agreements with the new independent states (NIS) of Central Europe and Central Asia (TACIS Programme), the Balkans (CARDS program) and the ACP (Africa, Caribbean and Pacific) (Rodier, 2006). Also, the European Commission (2002) stated need to reflect the new priorities of foreign policy of mutual aid addressed to the regions which traditionally providing immigrants.

At the European Union there are four main types of financing activities to support asylum seekers and refugees for the financial period 2014-2020 (Table 6), and in the countries most affected by the refugee crisis, expenditure on education and language courses has been increased in countries with large inflows of asylum seekers and refugees, including in Austria, Finland, Germany, Norway and Sweden (OECD, 2016, p. 61).

Table 6. EU funding sources

1.	European Social Fund (ESF) - according to Regulation N°1304/2013, the ESF's main mission is to improve the employment opportunities of the workers living in the Union. Asylum seekers and refugees are eligible under the ESF: "attention should be paid to the participation of those seeking asylum and refugees";
2.	Fund for European Aid to the Most Deprived (FEAD) – according to Regulation N°223/2014 has the specific objective to alleviate the worst forms of poverty in the EU such as homelessness, child poverty and food deprivation and in this way contribute to eradicating poverty in the Union in line with the Europe 2020 strategy. Asylum seekers and refugees are not explicitly targeted and must be mentioned in the operational programme to

	be eligible, but FEAD can take the forms of food and/or basic material assistance operational programme or social inclusion operational programme;
3.	Asylum, Migration and Integration Fund (AMIF) – has aims at strengthening and developing all aspects of the Common European Asylum System, by supporting actions which can relate to the different stages of the asylum procedure and to the different aspects of the asylum policies (reception conditions, asylum procedure), with particular attention is paid to the needs of beneficiaries of international protection and vulnerable groups of migrants (unaccompanied minors, women, youth and children, the elderly, etc.).
4.	European Regional Development Fund 2014-2020 and Territorial Cooperation – ERDF 2014-2020 included a Urban Innovative Actions programme with the topic of migration and EU Territorial Cooperation (Interreg V in the period 2014-20) funded mainly by the ERDF would covered migration management and mostly socioeconomic integration.

Source: CPMR, 2016

Following the consultation with host governments, civil society, local communities, donors, as well as the refugees and migrants it has been proposed, as a result of field-driven planning which bringing together 74 appealing organizations, the 2017 regional RMRP is valued to the sum of 690,935,694 USD (UNHCR, 2016,pp 21-22).

In an assessment by the International Organization for Migration it was revealed the effective funds spent by each country part to the European space in order to offer support for migrants, refugees and asylum seekers (Table 7).

Table 7. European Economic Area Country contribution (migration policies)

	Total
Regional initiatives	6,380,000
Austria	3,570,524
Belgium	6,227,120
Bulgaria	2,215,000
Croatia	2,760,000
Cyprus	2,179,000
Czech Republic	1,779,592
Denmark	3,546,030
Estonia	460,000
Finland	4,041,600
France	2,450,000
Germany	61,281,669
Greece	56,795,035
Hungary	1,351,500
Iceland	436,000
Ireland	1,498,663
Italy	18,700,000
Latvia	300,000
Lithuania	882,700
Luxembourg	688,448

Malta	942,369
Netherlands	14,289,884
Norway	7,760,000
Poland	3,050,000
Portugal	1,505,791
Romania	2,927,000
Slovakia	2,100,000
Slovenia	445,000
Spain	6,742,000
Sweden	15,423,000
Switzerland	6,766,104
United Kingdom	9,704,077
Total	249,198,105

Source: IOM (2017, p. 24)

The realization of specific activities of social inclusion of migrants also refers to the planning and implementation of integration actions on the labour market, recognition of the qualifications obtained in the countries of origin, as well as the acquisition of new competences in the countries of destination. The investment in human resources in the sphere of social inclusion is an approach that is widely discussed in the countries of destination in the European Union and the development of an investment process in education is closely related to the educational objectives (Cace *et al.*, 2012). It is also important to provide a more generous framework for the involvement of local authorities in the countries of destination and to provide opportunities to access the jobs available in the communities in which they live. Another aspect is to capitalize on the potential of the social economy in promoting social inclusion, starting from positive models already recognized at European and national level (Nicolăescu *et al.*, 2011; Nicolăescu, 2012; Nicolăescu, 2013).

At European level, a medium-term horizon is emerging in order to record as clear as possible the social inclusion of migrants, in the context of socially aggravated social problems in other socially excluded categories (children, young people, minorities, elderly people, etc.). In this respect, based on the models of collecting best practices using innovative methodologies (Cace *et al.*, 2010 b) it would be meaningful to provide positive models and evidence-based results on increasing social inclusion of migrants as a current challenge that needs to be solved in the coming period.

Conclusions

The European Union has been confronted with unprecedented events, record migration flows and terrorist attacks over the past two years, while parallel movement registered at the structural level: the UK's decision to leave the European construction was a point to realize the acute need to reform

policies relating migration and asylum. Undoubtedly, the well-being of European space is a target for migratory flows, which makes us understand that the European Union needs to carefully plan and monitor complementarity with humanitarian assistance and development cooperation for countries of origin. After the global economic crisis, recovery tends to be blocked by external migration factors and some tendencies to radicalize debates within the political discourse that may affect the stability of European construction. From this perspective, the standard discourse on the solidarity of the Member States of the European Union is actually the operational platform from which the idea of the united Europe will continue.

The recent migratory flows that have affected the European Union area have indicated at least two contradictory aspects: first, the argument of harnessing the potential of positive migration and of compensating for the demographic decline is the pressure and at the same time the result of poorly social policies oriented to young people and socially excluded people from the Member States of the European Union; secondly, the overlapping of a new category of population with obvious social problems due to the migratory situation in which they find themselves has led to uncertainties and questions about European construction, and in particular on the management of migration, humanitarian and management of community funds.

The solutions adopted in the destination countries indicate a variety of activities designed to ensure the social inclusion of migrants, but from the perspective of the change vectors, there is an increased pressure on the communities in which the migrants are actually relocated. From this point of view, it is appropriate to identify the most effective mechanisms for ensuring the reduction of social exclusion of migrants, to start adjust the external and internal policies for migration (Nicolăescu, 2017) and to share these evidences with other active factors in this field in the European states. Surely, balancing migration policies in line with humanitarian assistance in countries of origin will ensure a fair framework to prevent the worsening of social problems already existing at the level of migrant groups.

References

- Alexe, I. and Paunescu, B. (2011), *Studiu asupra fenomenului imigratiei in Romania. Integrarea strainilor in societatea romaneasca*, Bucuresti: Fundatia Soros Romania, Asociatia Romana pentru Promovarea Sanatatii (electronic edition).
- Cace, C., Cace, S., Iova, C. and Nicolaescu, V. (2010a), Capacity of Phare and structural funds absorption: pre-accession versus post-accession, *Revista de Cercetare si Interventie Sociala*, 28, 78-96.

- Cace, C., Nicolaescu, V., Katsikaris, L. and Parcharidis, I. (2012), *Managementul resurselor umane implicate în economia socială*, București: Editura Expert.
- Cace, S., Scoican, A. N. and Nicolaescu, V. (2010b), *Best Practices in Social Economy sector in Greece and othe UE countries*. Bucharest: Expert Publisher.
- Cassarino, J. P. (2006), *The EU Return Policy: Premises and Implications*, The European University Institute
- COM (2002), *Communication from the Commission to the Council and the European Parliament on a Community Return Policy on Illegal Residents*, 564 final.
- CPRM (2016), *Background note Funds that can be used to support actions targeting migration*, Conference of Peripheral Maritime Regions of Europe, pp. 1-3, retrieved from: http://www.crpm.org/pub/agenda/3020_background_note_-_migration_funds.pdf
- EPC/KBF (2005), *Beyond the Common Basic Principles on integration*, Issue Paper 27, 15 April 2005, retrieved from: http://www.ludenet.org/archives/qeceran/projects/Beyond_basic_principles.pdf
- European Commission (2015), *Implementation Plan of the European Consensus on Humanitarian Aid*, Commission staff working document Brussels, 27.11.2015 SWD(2015) 269 final, retrieved from: http://ec.europa.eu/echo/sites/echo-site/files/2015_Consensus_Implementation_Plan_en.pdf
- EUROSTAT (2017), *Newsrelease 70/2017 - 26 April 2017*, retrieved from: <http://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/documents/2995521/8001715/3-26042017-AP-EN.pdf>
- King, R. and Sursa, A. L. (2016), *Research on Migration: Facing Realities and Maximising Opportunities, A Policy Review*, Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union, retrieved from: https://ec.europa.eu/research/social-sciences/pdf/policy_reviews/ki-04-15-841_en_n.pdf
- McAuliffe M. and Laczko F. (eds.) (2016), *Migrant Smuggling Data and Research: A global review of the emerging evidence base*, Geneva: International Organization for Migration.
- Neguț, A., Cace, C., Koutmalasou, E. and Nicolaescu, V. (2011), *Monitorizare și evaluare în economie socială*. București: Editura Expert.
- Nicolaescu, V. (2011), *Formation of The New Romanian Communities*, *Journal of Community Positive Practices*, 4(XII), pp. 114-125.
- Nicolaescu, V., Cace, S., Koutmalasou, E. and Stanescu, S. (2011), *Economia socială – Analiză comparativă în opt state membre ale Uniunii Europene*. București: Editura Expert.
- Nicolaescu, V. (2012), *Good Practices Assessment in the sector of social economy*. *Revista de Cercetare si Interventie Sociala*, 39, pp. 117-133.
- Nicolaescu, V. (2013), *Ghid de bune practici în economie socială*, Bucuresti: ABB Communication, UNDP

- Nicolaescu, V. (2017), Rethinking Ways to Manage EU Migration – From Development Cooperation with Thirds Countries to Social-Economic Integration of Migrants, in *Understanding and Tackling the Migration Challenge: Mapping Options for a Resilient Approach: Proceedings*, ed.: Nate, S. and Arntzen, A., București: RAO Distribuție, pp. 66-82 (ISBN 978-606-8516-72-1, pg. 288).
- Nwabuzo, O. (2015), *Racist crime in Europe. ENAR Shadow Report 2013-2014*. Brussels: European Network Against Racism, retrieved from: http://www.enar-eu.org/IMG/pdf/shadowreport_2015x2016_long_low_res.pdf
- OECD (2016), *International Migration Outlook 2016*, Paris: OECD Publishing, retrieved from: http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/migr_outlook-2016-en
- Mircea, R. (2006), Politică și practică privind integrarea imigranților și refugiaților în statele europene, *Calitatea Vieții*, XVII (3–4), pp. 319–341.
- Rodier, C. (2006), *Analysis of the external dimension of the EU's asylum and immigration policies*, Brussels: European Parliament, 2006 retrieved from: http://www.europarl.europa.eu/meetdocs/2004_2009/documents/dt/619/619330/619330en.pdf
- UNDP (2009), *Human Development Report 2009 - Overcoming barriers: Human mobility and development*, New York: United Nations, retrieved from: <http://hdr.undp.org/en/content/human-development-report-2009>
- UNFPA (2017), *UNFPA Humanitarian Action 2017 Overview*, New York: United Nations, retrieved from: http://www.unfpa.org/sites/default/files/pub-pdf/Humanitarian_2017_Overview_2017-01-18_web_0.pdf
- United Nations (2016), *International Migration Report 2015 (ST/ESA/SER.A/384)*, New York: Department of Economic and Social Affairs, Population Division.
- United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs (UN DESA) (2012), *World Urbanization Prospects: 2011 Revision*, New York: United Nations retrieved from: www.un.org/en/development/desa/population/publications/pdf/urbanization/WUP2011_Report.pdf