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1. Annex 1: Evaluation Matrix
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Objectives</th>
<th>Evaluation Criteria</th>
<th>Evaluation questions and judgement criteria</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Data sources</th>
<th>Data collection mechanisms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 2, 3                  | Relevance, coherence, efficiency | EQ1. To what extent was the EU’s cooperation with Moldova relevant to national/local needs and coherent with EU long-term policy objectives? | 1.1.1 Alignment of intervention logic to evolution of broader ENP objectives and EU-Moldova Association Agreement  
1.1.2. Complementarity between programming, implementation and policy dialogue  
1.1.3. Mainstreaming of gender and human rights through analysis and programming is explicit in sampled interventions. | Strategic documents  
EAMRs  
Project/programme documentation  
Opinion of policy dialogue’s and programmes’ stakeholders | Document review  
Interviews with EUD management, programme managers, GoM officials, implementing partners, partner CSOs and IOs. |
| 2, 3                  | JC. 1.1: The overall objectives and result areas of the EU financial assistance are aligned with EU policy and strategic objectives | 1.2.1 extent to which there is coherence between EU strategy and programming, and nationally identified priorities and plans  
1.2.2 extent to which EU strategy and programming incorporate analysis of capacity, needs, and constraints,) and take account of lessons learned from previous periods.  
1.2.3. extent to which programming takes into account human rights obligations and recommendations applicable to Moldova. | Strategic documents  
EAMRs and other regular internal reports  
Project/programme documentation  
Opinion of policy dialogue’s and programmes’ stakeholders  
UPR | Document review  
Interviews with EUD management, programme managers, GoM officials, implementing partners, partner CSOs and IOs. |
| 2, 3                  | JC. 1.2: The overall objectives and result areas of the EU are supportive of national strategies of the Government of Moldova | 1.3.1 EUD reporting explicitly monitored the national context, identified challenges and proposed remedial measures  
1.3.2 Financial allocations and their modifications responded to monitoring results | Strategic documents  
EAMRs and other regular internal reports  
Project/programme documentation | Document review  
Interviews with EUD management, programme managers, GoM officials, }
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Evidence</th>
<th>Methodology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EQ2. To what extent was EU-Moldova bilateral co-operation coherent with and complementary to interventions of EU Member States and other donors, including in particular International Financial Institutions?</td>
<td>1.3.3. Extent to which varied civil society actors and citizens were informed and consulted on the objective, planning, programming and reallocations</td>
<td>Opinion of policy dialogue’s and programmes’ stakeholders</td>
<td>Implementing partners, partner CSOs and IOs. Proceeds of Strategic Communication Programme Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JC 2.1: EU-Moldova cooperation is coordinated, coherent and complementary with strategies and programmes of the EU Member States, international/regional organisations and of the European Financial Institutions.</td>
<td>1.3.4. Public opinion on EU-Moldova cooperation improves</td>
<td>EU/EUMSs/other donors briefing papers and Joint Analysis</td>
<td>Document review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JC 2.2: Political dialogue and cost components of EU-Moldova cooperation are consistent and mutually reinforcing</td>
<td>1.3.5. Extent to which visibility guidelines were respected in sampled interventions</td>
<td>Strategic documents EAMRs and other regular internal reports Project/programme documentation Opinion of policy dialogue’s and programmes’ stakeholders</td>
<td>Document review Interviews with EUD management, programme managers, GoM officials, implementing partners, partner CSOs and IOs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JC 2.3: Blending generated financial leverage with EUMM and other donors and increased visibility of EU cooperation</td>
<td>2.2.1. Correlation between objectives of regional/cross border programmes, and bilateral programmes 2.2.2. Absence of duplication between regional/cross border programmes, and bilateral programmes 2.2.3 Extent to which EU reduction/withdrawal from BS affected political dialogue with GoM</td>
<td>Contribution agreements SS Frameworks Application reports/implementation reports</td>
<td>Document review Interviews with stakeholders (IFI,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQ3. To what extent have the various aid modalities and financial instruments, and their combinations, been appropriate in view of achieving the objectives of EU cooperation with Moldova?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JC.3.1: The mix of aid modalities was coherent, fit for purpose, and limited the risks.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1.1 The assembling of various modalities (grants, contribution agreements, technical assistance, twinning, blending, budget support) formed coherent clusters for sampled interventions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1.2 Explicit match between aid modalities and risk analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1.3 Logical links between programming and implementation, including appropriate sequencing of support in sampled interventions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1.4. Timeliness of implementation of sampled interventions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JC.3.2. The implementation of projects through contribution agreements under the blending modality permitted a timely and adequately monitored implementation of the intervention.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2.1. % of funds under blending operations implemented as foreseen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2.2 number of blending operations which were implemented according to the original timeframe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2.3. volume of funds lost to difficulties in compliance with EU regulations (N+3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU funds disbursed/overall funds disbursed by IFi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contribution Agreements for regional blending operations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS Frameworks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revision of documents prepared by IFIs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>beneficial at different levels</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviews with EUD, Ministry officials, experts from civil society and other international stakeholders, NEAR and other DGs in Brussels</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progress reports of IFIs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU documents (CRIS)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviews with stakeholders (IFI, beneficiaries at different levels)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2, 3</td>
<td>3.4. Budget support contributed to defining and achieving common objectives of the EU and the Republic of Moldova</td>
<td>3.4.1. Planned disbursement of funds compared to actual disbursement of funds</td>
<td>Disbursement notes, minutes of meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1, 3</td>
<td>Effectiveness, impact, sustainability</td>
<td>EQ4. To what extent has the EU support to Moldova contributed to achieving an increase in the competitiveness of the agri-food sector and the diversification of economic activity in rural areas, in line with strategic objectives?</td>
<td>JC.4.1: Allocation of means</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1, 3</td>
<td>JC.4.2: Organisational capacities</td>
<td>4.2.1. Improved service delivery in the agricultural and rural sector including improved education, research and extension services in the agri-food sector in the sampled regions</td>
<td>Opinions of programme stakeholders EU reports</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Effectiveness, impact, sustainability | 1, 3 | JC 4.3: Delivery | 4.3.1 New non-agricultural activities have developed in rural areas  
4.3.2 Competitiveness of new agri-food businesses | Opinions of programme stakeholders  
Programme reports  
National Statistics Office  
Household Budget Survey  
Annual Reports from responsible ministries  
Verification bodies  
Reports from financial institutions WB, EBRD, EIB and MCA  
Trade, competitiveness of the agri-food sector (agri-food and feed chains products) increased  
IOM reports  
The Global Competitiveness Index (by World Economic Forum) | Document review  
Interviews with stakeholders  
Statistical series collection from National Bureau of Statistics and Ministry of Agriculture |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| EQ5. To what extent has the EU support to Moldova contributed to strengthening the democratic institutions and good governance, including the rule of law? | 1, 3 | JC 5.1 Allocation of means | 5.1.1. Corruption prevention regulations adopted in line with European standards in sampled public administrations at national and local level  
5.1.2. Procurement rules, procedures, and practice in line with European standards  
5.1.3. Supported self-governance bodies of the justice system are independent and responsible to regulate their professions | Legislation  
Regulations (MoJ, High judicial bodies)  
Reports of judicial bodies  
International reports (GRECO) | Document review |
<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.1.4. Quality of national threat analysis and strategic plan (MoI)</td>
<td>National reports (Parliament, CSOs, NHRIs, specialised anti-corruption bodies)</td>
<td>MoI strategic documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.1.5. CSOs develop clear strategies on torture prevention and remedies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1, 3</td>
<td>JC 5.2 Organisational capacity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2.1. MTFP elaborated and used at central and decentralized levels</td>
<td>Statistics of independent judicial bodies</td>
<td>Document review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2.2. Hiring/appointment, promotion and firing procedures in public administration are transparent, merit-based, and clearly delineated from political personnel</td>
<td>Opinion of stakeholders</td>
<td>Interviews with MoJ, high judicial/prosecutorial bodies, Bar Association, judges, prosecutors, attorneys in sampled districts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2.3 Percentage of judges, prosecutors and attorneys trained with EU support in supervisory/representative positions</td>
<td>Public opinion, disaggregated for civil servants</td>
<td>Survey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2.4. Percentage of criminal investigations leading to prosecution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2.5. Number of investigations on torture and ill-treatment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JC 5.3 Delivery</td>
<td>5.3.1. Level of detail of sampled budgets and their reporting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.3.2. Investigations, indictments and convictions by specialised corruptions bodies, Corruption index</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.3.3. Trends in CEPEJ indicators (2014 – 2018)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.3.4 Public trust in the police</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.3.5. Number of torture and ill-treatment cases reported decreases</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget of sampled line ministries and districts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TI data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Prosecutor’s Office data and reports</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International reports (GRECO, UNODC)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International reports (e.g. Venice Commission, CEPEJ, UPR, international CSOs, IMF, CPT, GREVIO, Venice Commission, CoE Human Rights Commissioner…)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National reports (NHRIs, Parliament, CSOs National reports (Parliament, CSOs, NHRIs, specialised anti-corruption bodies)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public opinion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MoI and MoJ statistics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opinion of expert stakeholders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviews with anti-corruption bodies, MoJ, MoI, anti-corruption magistrates and law enforcement officers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effectiveness, impact, sustainability</th>
<th>EQ6. To what extent has the EU support to Moldova contributed to better connectivity, increased energy security, energy efficiency, the protection of environment and combatting climate change?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JC 6.1. Allocation of means</td>
<td>6.1.1. EU support as % of overall infrastructure/environment/energy investment (trend 2014-2020)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Official Gazette</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National statistics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU and other donors studies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Documentation review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JC 6.2</td>
<td>Organisational capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JC 6.2</td>
<td>Organisational capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JC 6.2</td>
<td>Organisational capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JC 6.2</td>
<td>Organisational capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JC 6.2</td>
<td>Organisational capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JC 6.2</td>
<td>Organisational capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JC 6.3 Delivery</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JC 6.3 Delivery</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JC 6.3 Delivery</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JC 6.3 Delivery</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JC 6.3 Delivery</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1, 3 Effectiveness, impact, sustainability

EQ7. To what extent has the EU support to Moldova contributed to increased mobility and people-to-people contacts among targeted groups?

1, 3

JC 7.1 Allocation of means

7.1.2. Number of VET institutions restructured/merged

7.1.3. Number of Sectoral Committees established and functional

VET Strategy 2013-2020

VET Action Plan 2013-2020

BS, TA Financing Agreements

TA Policy Matrix

Document review

Semi-structured interviews with MoECR and donors

Public survey

12
| 1, 3 | JC 7.2 Organisational capacity | 7.1.1. Proportion of planned VET leading bodies established and functional | VET Strategy Reports, GoP Reports, Mid-term and Final Evaluation Reports, TA project outputs, Opinions of MoECR, donors | Case studies |
| 1, 3 | JC 7.2 Organisational capacity | 7.2.1. Change in VET institutions revenues after introduction of economic and financial self-management | MoECR data, VET Strategy Reports, Mid-term and Final Evaluation Reports, Opinions of MoECR, MoLHSP, MoARDE, Sectoral Committees, NBS data, NEA data | Document review |
| 1, 3 | JC 7.2 Organisational capacity | 7.2.2. Ratio of VET teachers trained to develop and deliver competence-based curricula vs nb of VET students | Opinions of MoECR, MoLHSP, MoARDE, Sectoral Committees | |
| 1, 3 | JC 7.2 Organisational capacity | 7.2.3. Number of occupational standards developed by the Sectoral Committees, disaggregated by type | | |
| 1, 3 | JC 7.2 Organisational capacity | 7.2.4. % of VET curricula adjusted and accredited to the National Qualifications Framework | | |
| 1, 3 | JC 7.2 Organisational capacity | 7.2.5. % of curricula using educational software and/or dedicated to IT courses | | |
| 1, 3 | JC 7.3 Delivery | 7.3.1. Attractiveness of VET has increased for students and for the market Dropout rate in sampled VET institutions | Opinions of MoECR, MoF, CRDIP, ANACEC, Centre of Excellence, VET Restructuring Plan 2015-2020, VET Strategy Reports | Document review |
| 1, 3 | JC 7.3 Delivery | 7.3.2. Competition for admission (top 5 demanded VET specialities versus top 5 demanded labour market professions) | | Semi-structured interviews with MoECR, MoLHSP, MoARDE, Sectoral Committees, Survey |
### Effectiveness, impact, sustainability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EQ8. To what extent the EU support to Moldova has contributed to improved business environment?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>JC 8.1. Allocation of means</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.1.1. Number of SMEs benefiting from EU supporting projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.1.2 Rate of use by SMEs of finance and business service in sampled areas (in particular in Cahul)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.1.3 Improved business legislation adopted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>JC 8.2. Operational capacity</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.3.1. Number of persons working in and around Innovation and Technology Centre in Cahul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.3.2 Number of Business associations &amp; incubators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>JC 8.3. Delivery</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.3.1. No of social and IT enterprises created with support to IT center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.3.2. Access to finance and to business services for SMEs in Cahul district</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **7.3.3. Number of VET graduates employed** |
| **7.3.4. Perceived access to social and geographic mobility among VET, higher education and research users** |
| **7.3.5. Estimated number of persons who accessed mobility initiatives** |

| **ROM, Mid-term and Final Evaluation Reports** |
| **Labour Market Observatory studies** |
| **National survey results** |
| **Graduates' traceability system** |

| **Official gazette** |
| **SMEs representatives' opinions** |
| **Projects, ROM and evaluation reports** |
| **Business associations** |
| **Chambers of commerce** |

| **MD & EU officials’ opinion** |
| **Projects, ROM and evaluation reports** |
| **Direct observation** |

| **Programme reports** |
| **Opinion of IT Centre users** |

| **Documentation review** |
| **Semi-structured interviews in sampled SMEs** |
| **Semi-structured interviews with stakeholders** |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>EQ9. To what extent has the EU support to Moldova contributed to achieving tangible progress towards a viable solution to the Transnistria conflict?</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1, 3 | Effectiveness, impact, sustainability | JC 9.1. The economic and social rapprochement of the two banks of the Nistru river has been enhanced | 9.1.1 Number of cross-river exchanges and partnerships between businesses and business associations  
9.1.2. Number of SMEs involved in joint activities  
9.1.3. Number of social infrastructure projects implemented in the security zone | Reports and opinions of: Business associations, Bureau for reintegration, Chambers of commerce, regional/local authorities, International, national and local NGOs acting in the security zone, SMEs, Communities and community-based organizations in the security zone, MHLSP, UNDP | Semi-structured interviews with key stakeholders and beneficiaries  
Review of business records  
Statistics specialists on both banks  
Population survey |
| 1, 3 | Effectiveness, impact, sustainability | JC 9.2. The sectoral Rapprochement of the two banks of the Nistru river has been enhanced | 9.2.1 Quality and responsiveness of healthcare plans across on both sides of the Nistru river  
9.2.2. Degree of alignment of services and actions on NCD with international standards  
9.2.3. Patients’ access to long term care | Government of Moldova, Bureau of Reintegration, De-facto authorities from the Transnistrian region  
MLHSP, IOM, GIZ, WHO, MoECR  
Opinion of social care services, health services, cultural heritage management and experts, media experts, CSO representatives | Official records of MHLSP  
Semi-structured interviews  
Survey |
| 1, 3 | Effectiveness, impact, sustainability | EQ10 To what extent has the EU support to Moldova contributed to a strengthened role of the Civil Society in policy making, monitoring and oversight in Moldova, in its priority areas? | 10.1.1. Level of harmonisation of governance structure, financial management, and monitoring mechanisms of sampled CSOs  
10.1.2. Number of CSO networks and cooperation platforms, contributing to the implementation of the Association Agreement | Society in policy making, monitoring and oversight in Moldova, in its priority areas | Semi-structured interviews |
| 1, 3 | Effectiveness, impact, sustainability | JC 10.1. EU support to Moldova has made a contribution to CSO capacity strengthening, networking, monitoring and advocacy for the Association agreement. | TA project to support CSO development  
Beneficiaries and stakeholders of the TA project  
AA Civil society platforms | Documentary evidence on capacity building activities |
| JC 10.2. EU support to Moldova has helped empower the citizens through constructive participation of CSOs in local, regional and national decision-making processes. | 10.2.1 Increasing number and content of citizen input in CSOs’ contributions to local planning (e.g. public infrastructure) and in oversight activities (e.g. of procurement, management and maintenance processes of public infrastructure) in sampled districts | Sample of proceeds of CSO written contributions | Manuals and guidelines created |
| JC 10.2.1 Increasing number and content of citizen input in CSOs’ contributions to local planning (e.g. public infrastructure) and in oversight activities (e.g. of procurement, management and maintenance processes of public infrastructure) in sampled districts | 10.2.2. Percentage of respondents aware of local investments and local development initiatives in sampled districts | Survey responses | Document collection with sample of CSOs |
| JC 10.2.2. Percentage of respondents aware of local investments and local development initiatives in sampled districts | Percentage of respondents aware of local investments and local development initiatives in sampled districts | Local authorities | Population survey |
| JC 10.2.2. Percentage of respondents aware of local investments and local development initiatives in sampled districts | Sample of proceeds of CSO written contributions | Local Media outlets | Media publications |
| JC 10.3. Viable partnerships between civil society, the government and socio-economic actors are created with impact on economic and social development | 10.3.1. Number of innovative social services developed jointly by CSOs and public administration in sampled districts | Feedback from CSOs, local authorities and economic actors in sampled municipalities | Semi-structured interviews in sampled municipalities |
| JC 10.3.1. Number of innovative social services developed jointly by CSOs and public administration in sampled districts | 10.3.2. Level of financial support to social services from public budgets in sampled districts | CSO networks and cooperation platforms like Expert Grup, APE, ADEPT, Pro-Europa |
| JC 10.3.2. Level of financial support to social services from public budgets in sampled districts | 10.3.3. Number of local partnerships targeting socially excluded categories in sampled districts | Social and economic actors |
| JC 10.3.3. Number of local partnerships targeting socially excluded categories in sampled districts | 10.3.4. Number of SMEs supported by Regional Business Hubs in sampled districts | Project implementers - Soros Foundation, East Europe Foundation, KAS and project partners |
| JC 10.3.4. Number of SMEs supported by Regional Business Hubs in sampled districts | 10.3.5. Number of civic initiatives targeting community development in sampled districts | | |
| JC 10.3.5. Number of civic initiatives targeting community development in sampled districts | | | |
Annex 2: Judgement criteria and Indicators
Evaluation question 1: JCs and indicators

EQ1. To what extent was the EU’s cooperation with Moldova relevant to national/local needs and coherent with EU long-term policy objectives including in particular the Association Agreement?

This EQ covers relevance, coherence and efficiency.

JC. 1.1: The overall objectives and result areas of the EU financial assistance are aligned with EU policy and strategic objectives

JC. 1.2: The overall objectives and result areas of the EU are supportive of national strategies of the Government of Moldova

JC. 1.3: The needs and opinions of the citizens of Moldova, and their evolution, are channelled into the programming of EU-Moldova cooperation

JC 1.1 The overall objectives and result areas of the EU financial assistance are aligned with EU policy and strategic objectives

The stabilisation of neighbouring countries and growth of their resilience to internal and external shocks are the EU’s main political priorities outlined in the European Neighbourhood Policy (ENP) review of November 2015 and in the EU Global Strategy of June 2016. Supporting Moldova's political, social and economic development, expanding its opportunities for political association and economic integration with the EU contribute to these objectives.

In December 2016, the government of Moldova approved a national plan on the implementation of the AA/DCFTA 2017-2019. The priorities and indicative allocations for financial assistance to be included in the Single Support Framework are connected to the priority actions set out by the revised 2017-2019 EU-Moldova Association Agenda and the Eastern Partnership priorities reflected in the "20 Deliverables for 2020" endorsed at the Eastern Partnership Summit in Brussels in November 2017. The Association Agreement sets out a reform agenda aiming at Moldova's political association and economic integration with the EU.

The EU financial assistance is well aligned with EU policy and with the commitments signed by Moldova. It supports the implementation of the EU-Moldova Association Agenda, aiming to bring visible results to Moldovan citizens. The overall objectives and result areas of the EU financial assistance are fully aligned – at the levels of sectors and sub-sectors - with the targets mentioned in the EU-Moldova Association Agenda.

EU financial cooperation with Moldova (national and regional NIF) is suitable for building ties with the EU countries, and thus diversifying away from the dependence on Russia and Ukraine infrastructure and markets.

Indicator 1.1.1 Alignment of intervention logic to evolution of broader ENP objectives and EU-Moldova Association Agreement

Strength of evidence: very strong
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main sources of information:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document review</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation of Framework Programme in support of EU-Republic of Moldova agreements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint Communication to The European Parliament, The Council, The European Economic and Social Committee and The Committee of The Regions. Review of the European Neighbourhood Policy, Brussels, 18.11.2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association Agreement between the European Union and the European Atomic Energy Community and their Member States, of the one part, and the Republic of Moldova, of the other part</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interviews</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Survey</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
During the implementation of SSF 2014-2017, EU targeted priorities in the field of Public Administration Reform, Agriculture and Rural Development, Police and Border Police, leveraging resources in implementation of the Association Agenda. In supporting Moldova’s approximation with the EU, as part of the Annual Action Plan (AAP) 2014, budget support operations were launched for Public Financial Management, supporting national macro-economic stability, as well as in support of the DCFTA rollout. A support action for Agriculture and Rural Development was developed and ratified in Q1 2015, complementing the roll out of the DCFTA and leveraging technical assistance to the Food Safety Agency. Furthermore, several ongoing BS interventions were topped up and extended (for example, in water and energy sector) and several twinning operations were launched.

EU assistance to Moldova supports the 20 Deliverables for 2020 agreed at the 2017 Eastern Partnership Summit in Brussels and is linked to the country's reform commitments under the Association Agreement. It aims at improving the quality of life of ordinary Moldovans in a tangible and visible manner, strengthening the rule of law, as well as improving the business climate, with a view to reaping the benefits from the DCFTA (Deep and comprehensive free trade area), and supporting greater connectivity between Moldova and the EU in the areas of energy and transport.

**Governance**

The EU cooperation was fully aligned with the priorities of EU policies and strategies and especially the commitments of the Association Agreement. 2014 was marked by two milestones on Moldova's road of moving closer to the European Union with visa liberalisation and the signature of the Association Agreement leveraged with the adoption of a Deep and Comprehensive Free Trade Agreement (DCFTA).

The national strategies in all field of governance supported by the EU were closely aligned with the Association Agenda, and in turn, the EU programming mirrored these strategies. This is particularly visible in the fields of police and justice reform, as well as public administration reform. In the latter case, the national strategy was itself based on the SIGMA (OECD/EU) baseline assessment. These examples show a cycle of mutually reinforcing EU-backed needs identification, national policy and strategy planning, and EU programming, all in line with the Association Agreement and the Association Agenda. Several programmes in support of policy making, including the EU High Level Advisors’ Mission, have reinforced this pattern.

**Energy**

Moldova is one of the poorest countries in Europe and depends heavily on imported energy, especially natural gas from Russia. The cost of this import is imposing a severe burden on the economy and the accumulated debt to Gazprom and Moldovagaz is a serious liability to the energy sector, creating uncertainty and deterring inward investment. The EU supported the sector from 2011 onward through a SBS programme. By 2016 Moldova produced only 20% of its electricity needs and depended on imports from Ukraine and Transnistria for the rest. The electricity grid operated synchronously with the Ukrainian electricity system, although the government of Moldova aimed to establish interconnection with Romania, which belongs to the ENTSO-E network in Continental Europe. EU supported this effort
with a NIF operation co-financed by EBRD (CRIS C- 400311 Moldova-Romania Interconnection Phase I (2018)), with the works scheduled to be completed by 2024.

Moldova Energy and Biomass Project (Implemented by UNDP) aims to contribute to a more secure and sustainable energy production in Moldova through targeted support to renewable energy in form of biomass from agricultural waste.

**Transport**

EU provided technical assistance “Support to reform of the Transport Sector of the Republic of Moldova” by the consortium led by AVENSA Consulting. The overall objective of the project was to contribute to the reform of the transport sector in line with the transport chapter of the Association Agreement, by providing technical assistance and capacity building to support legal approximation and policy development for fulfilment of the undertaken commitments.

Namely, in Waterborne sector: to prepare legal and operational framework for implementation of EU legal acts related to Flag State and Port State Control; to provide support to the Naval Agency of Moldova and general advice on implementation of remaining EU acts from AA. In Railway sector: to prepare legal and operational framework for implementation of the requirements of the AA and creation of State institutions required by the EU regulations. In Road Transport and Civil Aviation sectors: to provide assistance in implementation of certain EU regulations and directives which are not yet harmonized.

Furthermore, the EU support helped Moldova prepare the relevant legal and operational framework regarding the Accident Investigation Body (one single institution for civil aviation, railways and waterborne transport) as required by the EU legislative acts.

There are several operations co-financed by EU under the Neighbourhood Investment Facility which promote the transport sector. They all serve the overall objective of linking the Moldova more to the EU region.

**Water and Sanitation**

EU is supporting the water and sanitation sector in Moldova since 2008 through the budget support programme. All interventions in the water sector are aligned with the broader ENP objectives, with national policies – notably the Strategy on Water Supply and Sanitation for 2014-2018, and the EU support provided as part of the EU Water Initiative Plus.

*Clean Water for Cahul*: The actions is fully correlated to policy reforms in the sector, including support for the development and introduction of a sustainable and a cost-recovery tariff for the service provision, and will be used as engines of change to promote the implementation of the relevant sectoral reforms included in the Association Agreement. Following up on this project, EU made contributions to several projects in the water sector co-financed under the NIF, such as, for example “Chisinau Water Development Programme”.

**Agriculture and rural development**

The intervention logic of Agriculture and Rural Development sector was aligned to the evolution of broader ENP objectives and the AA. Resilience and transition to democracy and a social market economy are EU's main political priorities outlined in the European Neighbourhood Policy (ENP). The review of the ENP in 2015, set out a new framework for building more effective partnerships between the EU and its neighbours, and highlighted supporting stabilisation as a top priority. Support offered to Moldova’s economic development through its economic integration with the EU contributes to these aims. With regard to Agriculture and Rural Development (ARD) the AA highlights the need for key reforms in: developing and implementing the policy, legal and institutional framework in the area of agriculture and rural development; training central and local administrations on rural development policies; improving the competitiveness of agricultural production and the diversification of economic activities in rural areas; strengthening the capacity of the Moldovan paying agency to ensure transparency, efficiency and predictability of disbursed state aid; and improving the sustainable use of
land and water resources in the agri-food sector. The AA states that Moldova shall carry out approximation of its legislation to the EU acts and internal instruments.

The National Action Plans for the implementation of the AA envisaged cooperation of the EU with Moldova to promote agricultural and rural development, through the progressive convergence of policies and legislation. This was incorporated in the logic of EU Moldova cooperation and reinforced national strategies and programmes in the sector. Analysis of EU programming documents show that agriculture and rural development support was considered a long-term impact to be achieved by the cooperation and special emphasis was put on harmonisation of policies legislation.

**Education**

VET has been one of the key EU priorities in field of education since AAP 2012. As a result, the first and only BS for supporting VET reform was provided in 2014. In the same year, the EU-Moldova AA was signed, containing provisions on cooperation and transparency at all levels of education, yet with a special focus on higher education (Chapter 23, article 122). The SSF 2014-2017 interventions addressed a very limited number of sectors (PAR, agriculture and rural development, police reform and border management), stepping aside from education sector at all (Erasmus+ programme was part of external action under EU internal programme). In 2017 VET BS, of which only 60% was disbursed, was over and so was the supporting TA project. At the same time, the SSF 2017-2020 brought VET up to date, particularly aiming to enhance the functioning of the labour market by ensuring synergy between the needs of the labour market and the skills and qualifications offered by the education, vocational education, and training systems (Sector 3.4, specific objective 2). While education in general and VET in particular regained ground with the latest SSF, it only materialised in 2019 when a VET twinning project kicked off.

**Indicator 1.1.2 Complementarity between programming, implementation and policy dialogue**

**Strength of evidence based: Strong**

**Main source of information:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document review</th>
<th>Interviews</th>
<th>Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strategic documents</td>
<td>CSF TA project and CSF grantees and sub-grantees, WHO-Moldova and WHO beneficiaries, IOM Modova, GIZ, SFM, EED, KAS,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAMRs</td>
<td>Interviews with public officials in Moldova</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project/programme documentation</td>
<td>Interviews with EU officials</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil society Roadmaps, web sites and documents of CSF and EAP CSF National Platform CCBM-VCBM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Association Agreement between the European Union and the European Atomic Energy Community and their Member States, of the one part, and the Republic of Moldova, of the other part Action Documents

Association Implementation Reports (annual)

Programme documents

Steering committees’ notes (when available)

Budget support disbursement reports

Interviews with civil society representatives

**Governance**

EU cooperation with Moldova was strongly aligned with its national strategic documents in fields of justice sector reform, anti-corruption and civil society development. The programmatic interventions were more than in line with national strategies, in fact, the development of strategies in the area and their implementation were strongly linked to the EU conditionalities (especially budget support) and at times substantively dependent on the provision of the expert and material support by the various instruments of the EU (such as, for example, in developing anti-corruption normative and institutional framework). As such, policy dialogue in the area of governance was permanent, at the level of political leadership, with decision-makers in civil service, with mid-level officials, but also with CSOs and media. Despite this high-level engagement and continuous policy dialogue, the governance sector has experienced serious lapses – in particular in justice sector (e.g., Council of Magistrates) and in anti-corruption field (bank fraud scandal). These lapses have been both caused by power-struggles between the partisan leadership, but also involving more the shadow actors of business and political life, and have contributed to further repeated political crises, at times making a policy hostage to political polarization (e.g., cabinet crisis related to the appointment of the Prosecutor General). In these complex circumstances, the documentation and stakeholders suggest, that the EU was at the same time able to retain close communication with GoM on issues of disagreement, uphold the conditionality (halting BS programs), and address the existing shortfalls in areas where effective cooperation with government was in mutual tactical interest (e.g., border management) or through close collaboration with civil society (e.g., through engaging CSOs in monitoring public procurement). Overall, therefore, the EU has demonstrated its creativity and agility in achieving mutually re-enforcing relationships between programming, implementation, and policy dialogue as a response to, in particular, the bank fraud crisis. The interlocutors and the study of documents suggests, however, that these complementarities can be used by the EU more proactively, through improved reporting on the implementation context and more promptly, by integrating the programming closer with strategic discussion on impact of its interventions.

**Civil society**
CSF: The programming of the CSF envisaged two specific objectives: (1) to develop CSO’s internal capacity, and (2) to build partnerships between the government, CSOs and other economic actors in policy dialogue in the field of good governance, social and economic development and social protection. On the level of implementation this was translated into one TA project, aimed at supporting CSO development, and 3 granted projects (SFM, EED, KAS) in the areas pointed out above. The TA project, awarded to KMOP was well tuned to address these specific objectives. During the implementation of the TA project, however, changes were made in its objectives, approved by two interim reports, which affected its performance. The need highlighted in the CSF Action document that “Civil society organizations’ technical and financial capacities and expertise need to be reinforced, especially in terms of enhancing the role of the civil society in monitoring policy reforms” was not accentuated in terms of outreach and capacity building. Most of the efforts were put on grant management and monitoring of sub-granted projects. Capacity building in policy making and policy monitoring were not strategically addressed, and this approach was altered only after a mid-term evaluation. On the other hand, as regards the expected result of building partnerships through civil society contribution to reforms in the social service system, social and economic development, the CSF has performed remarkably well through the three grants to SFM, EED and KAS. The advancement towards the expected result on programming level of achieving innovations in the field of social service delivery, while creating synergies with local government needs to be especially underlined.

Civil society has been engaged in policy dialogue also through two platforms. The EU-Republic of Moldova Civil Society Platform (CSP) and the National Platform of the Eastern Partnership Civil Society Forum (EaP CSF Platform). The CSP was established in 2016 and complements the political bodies existing within the framework of the EU-Moldova Association Agreement. It allows CSOs to monitor the implementation process and prepare recommendations to the relevant authorities both in Moldova and the EU. The platform conducts regular monitoring and reports to the AA Council. The last meeting of the Platform took place in February 2020 in Chisinau. The National Platform of the Eastern Partnership Civil Society Forum (EaP CSF Platform) in Moldova is a key stakeholder in the policy dialogue.

CBM

Good coherence between programming, implementation and policy dialogue was observed:

- In CBM-IV component I: Sectoral confidence building measures and infrastructure projects (UNDP), and Component II and IV: Support to civil society, and support to ATU Gagauzia (though CfP), as well as component V: Transposition of sectoral programs to Transnistria (WHO and IOM) programming and implementation were in accord. In the case of component III: Support to technical dialogue and working groups: in 2017, € 4 million were de-committed following the expiring of the contracting deadline. No agreement was reached with the authority (the Bureau for Reintegration - BRI) to contract a TA support and it was not considered as a priority for the next CBM. In terms of policy dialogue both the WHO and IOM implemented projects made a tangible contribution in their respective areas.

- In CBM-V, most components were implemented by UNDP, except for health sector modernization. While the UNDP project has scored remarkable achievements in all its areas, the GIZ implemented project could be faced with challenges stemming from the need to align the socio-medical care system in Transnistria with that of Moldova. There is, however, a good example already with a Day-care center for children with disabilities in Transnistria where such challenges were overcome in collaboration with the municipality.

Both CBM-IV and CBM-V have a good synergy with CSF and Twinning.

General: A good example of launching a new programme and implementing it in practice has been the Citizen Empowerment project, developed by EUD. The project is innovative (with civil society involved in infrastructure projects), based on good knowledge of the local needs and expected to have a good impact. This points to the importance of aligning with the role of Brussels and that of the EUDs.

Agriculture and rural development

There was extensive cooperation and policy dialogue between the EU and the Government of Moldova in the area of agricultural and rural development through the Ministries of Agriculture and Economy and
other relevant bodies such as the Joint Partnership Council, which fed into policy- and decision-taking at the level of the Inter-Ministerial Committee for Strategic Planning.

The complementarity between programming, implementation and policy is exemplified by the dialogue between the EU and the GoM in approving the rural development strategy, updating regional development, as well as agriculture and rural development strategies. Through this process a clearer territorial vision was articulated, and which included elements of upgrading on-going policy as well as institutional development. Programming complemented the achieved progress on policy level by offering support through interventions such as ENPARD Budget support. Furthermore, in 2017 a mid-term evaluation of the National Agriculture and Rural Development Strategy 2014-2020 was conducted, which - with an extensive support from the EU - led to a revision of strategy and action plan for 2018-2020. The mid-term evaluation of NARDS and the consequent revision of the strategy along its Action Plan contributed to a more balanced programme, placing a particular emphasis on improving living conditions in the rural areas.

Public Finance Policy Reforms
The programme, Sector Reform Contract (SRC) “Support to Public Finance Policy Reforms in Moldova (PFPR)” aims to support the efforts of the Government of the Republic of Moldova to progress in some of the crucial areas foreseen by the Association Agreement, which are linked with the improvement of public governance, economic recovery, and growth. The reforms envisaged under this programme aimed at enhancing transparency of and accountability in Moldovan public finances. At the same time, improvements in public finance policy were expected to contribute to the maintenance of fiscal sustainability and the promotion of economic policies, a necessary condition in support of Moldova’s efficient growth and development in the medium and longer term.

Further to the budget support, as complementary measures, technical assistance has been provided and two calls for proposals have been launched for (1) “Strengthening role of civil society in economic governance and public finance management” and (2) Procurement “Technical assistance to Improve Public Finance Policy and Public Financial Management of Moldova”.

Even though there were some delays in distribution of budget support tranches during the implementation period, they nonetheless were a source of for permanent policy dialogue between the Government of Moldova and EUD. The presence of the technical assistance team and – later on - the EU High level Technical Advisors contributed to permanent dialogue as well.

Education
Good complementarity between programming, implementation and policy dialogue was recorded in VET support. BS for supporting VET reform was provided when the Government prioritised VET among other sectors. SPSP implementation was monitored, and two reviews of instalments were conducted, informing further decisions on disbursement and other interventions supporting VET reform. MECR oversaw donors’ cooperation and coordination through the National Coordination Council. At the same time, policy dialogue and coordination on a bilateral level was quite extensive.

Water Sector
EU support to the water and sanitation sector is complementary to policy dialogue. National Policy Dialogues (NPDs) have started in 2006 and are supported by the EU, EU Member States and Switzerland. NPDs are implemented with the support of OECD and UNECE, as implementing partners of the EUWI. Support has been provided for the approximation of EU water legislation according to the EU-Moldova Association Agreement, signed in 2014. in 2020 the following results were reported: The new water law was discussed in the context of NPD. NPD-related Government Order was adopted on wastewater discharges from municipal sources. National targets under the Protocol on Water and Health
were adopted. A National Financing Strategy for urban and rural Water Supply and Sanitation (WSS) was developed.

**Energy Sector**

Sector Policy Support Program (PSPS) “Energy Sector Reform Assistance” has been provided form 2011 until 2014 and aimed to support the Government of the Republic of Moldova in implementing energy sector reforms with particular emphasis on security of supply, energy efficiency and renewable energy. After the completion of the BS and during the reference period for this evaluation the EU supported Moldova’s efforts in a variety of ways. The EU-funded project, “Support to the Modernisation of the Energy Sector in the Republic of Moldova” (2017-2020) gives policy advice is given to the Energy Department across a range of big energy issues. Analytical support is also being provided to develop a long-term scenario-driven Energy System optimisation model to assist the authorities in assessing different national energy futures as well as to support the coming National Energy Climate Plan. Other activities included the establishment of the Renewables Single Buyer (the Central Electricity Supplier) and advice on the Electricity Distribution Pricing methodology.

The project has also led efforts to improve the deployment of Energy Efficiency across the country. At a national level, assistance has been provided to Government to implement an energy efficiency programme in state-owned buildings, to develop the first energy efficiency obligations scheme and to help the government in strengthening a revamped energy efficiency agency.

At a local level, support is underway to assess city energy use in a number of municipalities (comprising over 100,000 citizens) that will facilitate future energy efficiency investments as well as provide capacity building-seminars across the country to facilitate the development of local energy efficiency plans.

As a result, in 2020 Moldova will have a comprehensive energy policy in place, while international commitments with the Energy Community Treaty and Association Agreement with the EU will be fulfilled. In addition, the energy planning capacities of Moldova are expected to be fully functional.

Policy dialogue is assured by the high-level advisor on energy (ALEXANDRU SANDULESCU) as part of the EU High Level Advisor Mission.

1.1.3 Mainstreaming of gender and human rights through analysis and programming is explicit in sampled interventions.

**Main source of information:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document review</th>
<th>Interviews</th>
<th>Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strategic documents</td>
<td>EUD</td>
<td>Media research survey, conducted by the evaluation on how the press in the Republic of Moldova,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAMRs</td>
<td>SFM,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSF documentation, SFM documentation, reports and sites of CSO networks, publications</td>
<td>Alliance of People with Disabilities,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Union - Moldova Association Agreement</td>
<td>Alliance of Active NGOs in Child and Family Social Protection,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association Implementation Reports (annual)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EU Annual Report on Human Rights and Democracy in the World - Update Republic of Moldova
Universal Periodic Review
Status of ratification of UN and CoE human rights treaties (ohchr.org; coe.int)
Project/programme documentation including:
Budget Support to Police Reform
PGG/CoE
Civil society grants ("Let us all say no to torture", complementary support grant to police reform budget support, etc)
People’s Advocate Office Special Report on the situation of persons apprehended and held in police custody, 2019
Equality Council of Moldova General Reports 2015, 2016, 2018, 2019, 2020 (2017 not available. Reports cover the previous year)
Action Document for the "ENPARD Moldova – Support to Agriculture and Rural Development"
Action Document for the Development of Rural Areas in the Republic of Moldova
ECtHR case law (HUDOC)
Recommendations by UN and CoE monitoring bodies (CPT, CAT, CEDAW, Human Rights Commissioner…)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Governance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All indicators, as well as the body of EU project documentation, show that the promotion of human rights has resulted in increased awareness, recognition and understanding of the importance of respect, protection, and fulfilment of human rights. Gross and prima facie human rights violations have become more and more rare during the evaluation period, testifying to an increased respect for and protection of human rights. Particularly strong effort has been put on prevention of torture in preliminary detention (through third-party monitoring by CSOs, assistance to public defender, training of the police, support to the justice system). Despite the evidence of substantive amelioration since 2015 (e.g., CPT did not receive complaints about ill-treatment in custody in 2020), including through EU assistance offered to the</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
police through budget support, some problems with ill-treatment remain in the places of deprivation of liberty, especially when it comes to foreigners, and when it is taking place in psychiatric wards.

EU has supported anti-discrimination activities (including the prevention and addressing gender discrimination), including several projects implemented with and through CSOs. The Equality Council – a consultative body involving both the officials and CSOs - has been also backed up by several EU projects, and provides a platform for dialogue, as well as substantive study and analysis of the discrimination trends and suggesting policy solutions. In the reporting period, the Equality Council became the reference in the field, as witness by interviews.

CSOs (particularly those involved in human rights monitoring and advocacy supported by the EU) and specialised bodies (chiefly the PAO and the Equality Council) have considerably increased their capacity, the quality and frequency of their reporting. Human rights focused CSOs also enjoy increased influence in a more inclusive policy dialogue with the EU.

Key problems remain when it comes to access to rights, especially by vulnerable groups and in certain areas, also considering the lack of effective control of the Moldovan authorities in Transnistria. The COVID-19 crisis has particularly accentuated the shortfalls related to access to economic and social rights, especially in healthcare.

Through its budget support framework, the EU has worked to create incentives and provide advice to expanding the share and role of women in the police. A special coordination group was created, which developed a 2017 Action plan to this end, covering the period 2018-2020. This plan foresees adjustment of the institutional structure and human resources practices through gender lens. Importantly, these were developed in cooperation with the Association of Women in Police. Nonetheless, there is only a mild trend of growing engagement of women in the police, according to the PromoLex report on the matter. Further to the police reform, specific legislative, regulatory, and training measures were supported by the EU through various instruments, to help Moldova combat gender-related offences (including trafficking).

In justice system, use of the gender lens is not adequately documented. The Justice Sector Development Strategy documents covering periods 2011-2016, and 2019-2022 do not explicitly refer to gender. It is also not evident from program documents whether EU assistance included explicit references to furthering gender-specific objectives. At the same time, the EU is supporting Gender Analysis for the project "Strengthening the capacities of the justice sector actors to deliver justice in line with European standards, in particular to fight discrimination", which is implemented by the Council of Europe.

Civil society

EARM 2014 Regarding the promotion of democracy and human rights, projects in the field of anti-corruption, minority rights and vulnerable population were launched (EIDHR, CSF call) and increased advocacy and dialogue with civil society organisations (CSO) was fostered through participation in senior-level events, including participation in dialogue with the Prime Minister and Political Parties.

CSF: The human rights of vulnerable groups and particularly persons with disabilities have been particularly addressed in the CSF, in the framework of the SFM grant "Better Social services through a Sustainable Partnership between the Civil Society and the Government", by targeting CSOs active in the social sector and two national networks – The Alliance of People with Disabilities (30 member CSos) and the Alliance of Active NGOs in the Field of Child and Family Social Protection (close to 90 members). The grant has allowed for the development of innovative and sustainable social services jointly with the public administrations at the local level, with Transnistria and Gagauzia included. With a sub-grant of EUR 38 000 from CSF, a Day Care centre for children with disabilities and their parents has been established in Ribnitsa (Transnistria) by Triniti NGO - the first and only such centre in Transnistria, with cost-sharing on the part of the municipality.
CBM: CBM CfP (2015) has supported HR through grants implemented in the period under review: social services for persons with disabilities, socio-vocational integration of disadvantaged youth, cross-river partnerships for sustainable development and human rights, etc. Under CBM-V an effort is now under (GIZ) way to establish of a Centre for Long-term care for elderly people in Transnistria.

EIDHR and CSO&LA: NGO projects targeting people with mental disabilities have been supported by EIDHR and CSO&LA CfP and they promoted their rights.

Agriculture and rural development

Human rights and a gender equality perspective have been identified in the context and problem analysis during programme design and addressed by the key interventions in the sector. In the agricultural sector gender was addressed by means of mainstreaming in planning and programming.

EU support was in line with ongoing reforms in terms of gender equality. The GoM is implementing the National Strategy on Gender Equality 2016-2020 is crosscutting with rural development, especially in the implementation of the article 14 of the Convention on the Elimination of all forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW) on the rights of rural women.

The largest interventions implemented in the sector such as the European Neighbourhood Programme for Agriculture and Rural Development (ENPARD) Moldova and the Development of Rural Areas in (DEVRAM) Moldova promoted gender equality and women's empowerment. Relevant ENPARD interventions in support of implementing the NARDS included encouraging rural women entrepreneurs and women organizations acting in agriculture, to take a more active role in the agri-rural policy dialogue. This was important to promote gender equality and women's empowerment which is also very much reflected in women's significant leadership role with regard to the Local Action Groups.

Access to finance is an important issue in the agriculture sector, particularly for smallholders. Moldova’s agri-food sector suffers from low investment. Recognising this, the EU set out to support Moldovan companies including women entrepreneurs to gain access to finance through loans and investment grants for women-led businesses. In this regard the support of the EU to the MADRE and AIPA contributed to making rural development actions more inclusive through the new Start-up Measure (women and Youth in Agriculture) under the advance payment scheme. DEVRAM also set out to stimulate private investment, improve the economy and create employment opportunities for both men and women. The latter also contributes to the EU Gender Action Plan by promoting women enterprise ownership and/or management in the rural areas of Moldova.

Infrastructure

Human rights and a gender equality perspective have been identified in the context and problem analysis during programme design and addressed by the key interventions in the water sector. Transport and energy interventions can be considered as "gender neutral".

EU Delegation and EUMS prepared a gender analysis on Moldova which provides guidance on the EU GAP II's targeted areas of intervention that should be implemented. These areas are also in line with the objectives of the Government Gender Equality Strategy 2017-2021. These objectives have been mainstreamed into the current programming EU assistance and are reflected in both the new SSF 2017-2020 and the Joint Response document. Specific projects are ongoing aim at combatting discrimination and gender stereotypes and supporting economic empowerment of women. In 2019 UN Women started a project focused on Gender equality, mainstreaming and combating violence against women with EU support (EU contribution at EUR 5 million, supplemented by 250,000 EUR from UN Women).

Education

Gender equality was at the heart of the EU’s Eastern Partnership’s initiatives. While Erasmus+ exchange opportunities are provided to men and women without discrimination, the EU4Youth programme has set a 75% target to support young women, with particular focus on vulnerable and disadvantaged
communities. VET interventions did not have a particular focus on gender-related matters, but at the same time, advocated non-discriminatory and equal access to education. No reference to human rights obligations.

**PFM**

No evidence on gender or pro-poor budgeting could be traced. No reference to human rights obligations.

**Infrastructure**

No gender lens has been applied to the programs Moldovan Railways Restructuring Project, and Moldova road rehabilitation project Phase IV (Bahmut Bypass), due to their inherent character. Gender aspects were taken into account in Clean Water for Cahul and also applied in small infrastructure grants given for small infrastructure projects to civil society (CBM).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JC 1.2 The overall objectives and result areas of the EU are supportive of national strategies of the Government of Moldova</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| EU cooperation with Moldova is relevant to national and local needs, increases the visibility of EU and demonstrates EU as a reliable development partner, with assistance provided in line with its values and other conditionalities. The EU cooperation with Moldova is relevant to national and local needs – especially what concerns an improved access to justice, reduction of corruption and improvement of service delivery to the population. All EU interventions financed under budget support were aligned with the national strategies of the Government of Moldova. However, frequent political changes and alterations in cabinets meant that the strategies negotiated and approved by one composition of the cabinet had to be implemented by other(s), which meant that while the general direction of reforms was, as a rule, respected, the implementation of the specific strategies and agreed-upon steps sometimes lagged. Protracted reforms in justice sector serve as a prime example of this issue. This affected predictability of disbursement of BS tranches.


EU support is tackling all GoM priorities either under the SSF 2017-2020 or through NIF contributions. All national interventions financed under NIF are complementary to loans requested by the Government of Moldova from the development banks, and as such they correspond to the needs expressed by the Government.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GoM Priority</th>
<th>EU Sector</th>
<th>NIF support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Roads</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>Sector 1: Economic development and market opportunities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy</td>
<td>Connectivity, energy efficiency, environment and climate change</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pension Reform</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sector 2: Strengthening institutions and good govern</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sector 4: Mobility and people-to-people contacts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Indicator 1.2.1 extent to which there is coherence between EU strategy and programming, and nationally identified priorities and plans**

**Strength of evidence: Very Strong**

**Main sources of information:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document review</th>
<th>Interviews</th>
<th>Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National development Strategy of Moldova</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sector National Strategies in all sectors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association Implementation Reports (annual)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action Documents, contract, latest/final report (as available) for sampled interventions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint Communication to The European Parliament, The Council, The European Economic and Social Committee and The Committee of The Regions. Review of the European Neighbourhood Policy, Brussels, 18.11.2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programming of the European Neighbourhood Instrument (ENI)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviews with public officials in Moldova</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviews with EU officials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviews with civil society representatives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Governance**

Approximation in fields of governance, rule of law and human rights represents one of the crucial, core elements of the EU-Moldova Association Agreement, which creates positive obligations on part of the GoM. As a result, all key the strategic policy documents – Justice Reform Strategy, Police Reform Strategy, anti-Discrimination strategy – as well as legislative drafts and amendments aimed at transposition of *acquis* in this area are directly referencing the relevant EU frameworks and objectives. Moreover, most of the reforms in field of governance and the rule of law were substantively supported by the EU budget support and the full panoply of available instruments, both to assist the government and to ensure the participation of civil society. Nonetheless, the research showed that while at the strategic level the alignment was full, and the nationally identified priorities and plans often tracked these strategic objectives, in practice of implementation the GoM has, at times, deviated from the spirit of the common undertakings with the EU, especially when it comes to the reform of the justice sector and its self-regulating bodies. Overall, however the coherence of the EU and national objectives was retained in this field, and the effected adaptations were mostly tactical: modification of the beneficiaries, (re)prioritization of the actions, imposing of conditionality provisions, etc.

**Civil Society**

The National Development Strategy (NDS) Moldova 2020 represents the overall strategic development vision for the Republic of Moldova and covers the period from 2012 to 2020. The main national policy documents of Moldova, guiding the approach to civil society development, have been the Strategies/Road Maps for civil society development and their implementation plans. There are two Roadmaps covering the period under review. In 2014 the EU Delegation to the Republic of Moldova together with EU Member States elaborated a Roadmap for Engagement with Civil Society (2014-2017), guiding EU engagement with local civil society, based on intensive consultations with civil society organisations and emphasizing...
the need to develop the capacities of civil society in becoming a stronger counterpart for the government, monitoring of the implementation of Moldova-EU Agreements and supporting local, smaller NGOs.

The 2018-2020 Road Map was also developed in a participatory manner, through a number of consultations with three working groups of CSOs, MPs and government officials. The Strategy and its Action Plan include concrete deadlines for the implementation of specific measures that strengthen Moldovan civil society further, along with responsible implementing actors and planned sources of funding. The Strategy is in line with EU strategy and programming, and nationally identified priorities and plans and reflected in EU programming for civil society in Moldova.

**Agriculture and rural development**

EU sectoral strategy and programming in the agricultural sector were coherent and built on the implementation of national priorities identified in the relevant national strategies and their corresponding action plans. The national priorities as established in relevant strategic documents were reflected in design and implementation phases of programming interventions.

The AA highlights the need for key priority reforms for: developing and implementing sectorial policy, legal and institutional framework; training central and local administrations on rural development policies; improving the competitiveness of agricultural production and the diversification of economic activities in rural areas; strengthening the capacity of the national agencies to ensure transparency, efficiency and predictability of disbursed state aid; and improving the sustainable use of land and water resources in the agri-food sector. It is key that reform of agriculture and rural development develop Moldova’s capacities to benefit from the preferential trade regime within the DCFTA.

In line with the AA, The Government’s strategic vision has been to modernize agriculture to improve competitiveness and better integrate producers into markets. This has been particularly the case considering aspiration to increase agricultural exports to the EU under the AA and the DCFTA. The GoM identified agriculture as one of the main drivers of growth in its 2020 National Development Strategy (NDS) also referred to as “Moldova 2020”. In the field of agriculture and rural development, the priorities of the NDS encompass 3 aspects, namely: a) increasing competitiveness, b) ensuring sustainable management of natural resources in agriculture and improvement of living standards in rural areas.

The sectoral document that ensures the implementation of the NDS is the National Agriculture and Rural Development Strategy 2014-2020 (NARDS) which was adopted by the GoM in 2014. With the NARDS the GoM emphasized the importance of the agri-food sector and rural development as a prerequisite for the long-term development of the country. The vision of the NARDS is “a competitive, restructured, and modernized agri-food business sector. Improved living and working conditions in rural areas. Agri-food activities existing in harmony with the natural environment maintaining the biodiversity, cultural and traditional values for future generations.”

The priorities for EU financial support to Moldova are reflected in the multiannual programming documents, the Single Support Framework for EU support to Moldova (SSF) 2014-2017 and 2017-2020. Agriculture and rural development, together with budget support for public financial administration reform and police reform were the key policy areas of the SSF action plan covering 2014-2017. Yet, in the SSF 2017-2020, agriculture and rural development were not specifically identified as a key priority sector.

The EU supports policy formation and implementation in the agricultural and rural development sector. With extensive support from the EU, various sectoral planning documents and legal acts were developed and or modified. In 2017 a mid-term evaluation of NARDS was conducted, which led to a revised NARDS and action plan for the remaining period 2018-2020. The NARDS was updated with particular emphasis on strengthening General Objective 3: Improving living conditions in the rural areas. The mid-term evaluation of NARDS and the consequent revision of the strategy along its Action Plan contributed to a more balanced programme among its three priorities. Among others also amendments to legal acts such as the Law on the principles of subsidising agricultural producers were adopted in 2018 to reflect the
policy update in line with the review of the NARDS. These provided for the introduction of rural development support measures to improve living conditions and the sustainable use of natural resources.

**Energy**

Moldova has been a member of the Energy Community since 2010 and signed an Association Agreement with the European Union on 27 June 2014. It therefore had until December 2017 to make its legislation conform to the EU *acquis*, which is the core EU energy legislation related to electricity, oil, gas, the environment, competition, renewables, efficiency and statistics.

In February 2013, Moldova introduced its updated National Energy Strategy (NES) 2030, setting energy sector objectives for 2020 with an outlook to 2030. The updated NES targets are closely aligned with Energy Community Treaty requirements, even exceeding them in some cases: for instance, the Treaty’s binding target for renewables in total final consumption (TFC) is 17%, whereas the NES sets a 20% goal.

The main NES targets for 2020 are: 20% renewable energy sources in TFC; 10% biofuels in transport; 10% renewables in electricity generation; 10% energy intensity reduction; 25% reduction in greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions from the 1990 level; 20% reduction in energy consumption in buildings from the 2009 level 10% rehabilitation of public building stock and 8.2% improvement in energy efficiency. Complementing the NES are the National Energy Efficiency Action Plans (NEEAPs) 2013-15, 2016-18, 2019-21 and the National Renewable Energy Action Plan (NREAP) 2013-20. The NEEAPs and the NREAP were designed consistent with Moldova’s commitments under the Energy Community Treaty.

EU Support in the energy sector is fully in line with national strategies: the support provided under (CRIS C- 400311 Moldova-Romania Interconnection Phase I (2018) is diversifying Moldova’s energy inflows away from Russia and Ukraine.

The EU 4 Energy Programme ‘Covenant of Mayors – Demonstration Projects’ (CoM-DeP) with EUR 14.2 million was developed by the European Commission to respond to the challenges facing small (with population up to 200 thousand residents) towns which are the signatories of the All-European initiative ‘The Covenant of Mayors’ in the Eastern Partnership countries in the context of absence or undue level of their own technical and financial capacity to implement Sustainable Energy Action Plans (SEAPs). The program aims to adequately support the implementation of the action plans submitted by the selected towns by the professional Support Team. Within a two-stage competition the European Commission selected 19 projects out of which three were from Moldova. The objective is to reduce the green-house gas by at least 30% by 2030. It helps municipalities to prepare and implement Sustainable Energy and Climate Action Plans, reducing dependency on fossil fuels, improving the security of energy supply, and allowing them to contribute more actively to climate change mitigation.

**Education and R&I**

Education and R&I interventions were fully in line with Moldovan strategic framework. VET was a priority in the National Development Strategy “Moldova 2020”, and was built into the Education Strategy 2014-2020, becoming central through a distinct VET Strategy 2013-2020. Strengthening higher education and enhancing R&I were among priorities of the Education Strategy, therefore Erasmus+ and Horizon 2020 programmes, as well as VET were aligned to the overarching sector strategies.

**Indicator 1.2.2 extent to which EU strategy and programming incorporate analysis of capacity, needs, and constraints, and take account of lessons learned from previous periods.**

**Strength of evidence based:** Medium
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main source of information:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document review</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action Documents, contract, latest/final report (as available) for sampled interventions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint Communication to The European Parliament, The Council, The European Economic and Social Committee and The Committee of The Regions. Review of the European Neighbourhood Policy, Brussels, 18.11.2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU-Moldova Association Agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association Implementation Reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Union Joint Analysis of Programming in the Republic of Moldova until 2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Interviews**
- Interviews with public officials in Moldova
- Interviews with EU officials
- Interviews with civil society representatives

**Survey**

**Governance**

EU Strategy 2017-2020 considers the results of a joint analysis of with national stakeholders, EU member states, other development partners and civil society. Programming and selection of focal sectors is the result of joint programming with EU Member States and other development partners. Risk analysis is undertaken by the EUD reportedly on an annual basis, but the evaluators were not given access to these internal documents.

All Action Documents prepared for interventions under the SSF 2014-2017 and SSF 2017-2020 include a chapter analysing the public policies of the respective sector as well as an analysis of the stakeholders and the problems to be addressed. Chapter 3 of the Action Document is analysing the lessons learnt.
The evaluation found that the joint strategy development with the stakeholders was undoubtedly a good example for adjusting policy against the background of the bank fraud scandal. This process led to joint assessment of the implementation context and created a blueprint for common approach. It was not, however, designed for adjusting the programmatic interventions – and this process was, logically, undertaken within the individual organizations, and the linkage with the joint assessments made during the strategic planning process is often implicit, rather than explicit, without clearly delineated adaptations to the theory of change. The SSF 2017-2020 clearly contains the expression of the lessons discussed during the joint planning process, especially in field of governance, where serious adaptations were made, especially when it comes to reducing the BS programs and re-targeting assistance. At the same time, the adaptation of the programmatic documents, and especially the practical adaptation of implementation modalities took place with significant delays, related to protracted programming cycles.

The assessment of capacities of the national partner institutions was done consistently by the program teams also taking into account third-party assessments (e.g., CSO reports) that were supported through EUD funding. In most of the cases, internal assessments relate more to their human resources, technical, expertise and other practical capacities, with lesser accent on their ability to implement the required change, from the point of view of managerial processes, integrity, and the degree of real influence on policy within the cabinet.

**Agriculture and rural development**

EU strategy and programming were based on stakeholder analysis which often also involved stakeholder engagement through consultations with relevant key bodies in the agricultural sector. The SSF 2017-2020 specifically recognised Government’s capacity needs and envisaged complementary support for capacity development and institution building. This involved capacity for coordination of policy and legislative development and implementation and well as external assistance, insurance of coherence between the budgetary processes and policy agenda, and to monitoring of the implementation of the AA/DCFTA and envisaged Complementary support for capacity development and institution building.

The programmatic interventions also drew on the needs assessment by local stakeholders, together with priorities identified in national strategies approved by the GoM such as the NARDS. Respondents to the interviews specified that institution building interventions, where very relevant to priorities and capacity gaps of key stakeholders including the Ministry of Agriculture and The Agriculture and Intervention Payments Agency (AIPA) and the National Food Safety Agency (ANSA).

Moreover, strategy and programming considered lessons learned from previous periods, which were reflected in multiannual programming documents, the Single Support Framework for EU support to Moldova (SSF) 2014-2017 and 2017-2020. Specific lessons learned in this regard included the importance of mainstreaming cross-cutting issues, notably civil society, gender, environment, and confidence building measures which as have been identified in the context and problem analysis and addressed by programmatic interventions that followed. Another lesson learned was the need to programme assistance within the framework of a clear sector strategy which was very much a key focus point of ENPARD. Learning was also based on reviews of on-going and former programmes funded by the EU and other donors which for example also were reflected in the design of ENPARD and DEVRAM.

All project identification fiches include a section on lessons learned and an assessment of capacities of the sectors. Tailor-made technical assistance - either in form of service contracts or twinning projects is provided.

Difficulties encountered by the older budget support interventions (and mentioned in the Court of Auditors report) have been taken into count while formulating more recent BS interventions, which heralded a major shift in the areas of assistance. There were several training sessions related to budget support offered by the EUD. The technical assistance provided complementary to the Public Finance Sector budget support, offered support (on demand) to the sectors which were still benefitting from BS interventions, while enhancing the dialogue.
Water and Transport

For the water and transport sector the EU was already very active before the SSF 2014-17, (Sector Policy Support Programme in the water sector ENPI AAP 2009) thus the weaknesses of the different sectors and capacity needs were well known according to interviews, even though this is not apparent from project documentation. Furthermore, while preparing the EAMR the EUD also reports on the lessons learnt.

Civil Society

The EU strategy and programming with respect to civil society have taken into consideration the constraints voiced by civil society during the process of the joint development of the EU-Civil society Roadmaps. The first generation of the EU Country Roadmap for Engagement with Civil Society in Moldova covered the period 2014-2017. The updated second-generation Roadmap, covering the period 2018-2020, is aligned to EU support to the implementation of the Civil Society Facility as part of the Single Support Framework (2017-2020), and the European Joint Development Cooperation Strategy (Joint Programming Document), covering the period 2018-2020. It has been based on a comprehensive, coherent and shared analysis of the EU and Member States of the civil society landscape, its enabling environment and the challenges and opportunities faced by civil society organizations. The document also identified common EU priorities and concrete steps for engaging with and supporting CSOs in the Republic of Moldova. It has been underlined that for Moldova, a proactive involvement of civil society in policymaking, reform, governance and service delivery is critical for achieving the development objectives, including the implementation of the Association Agenda (AA) and Deep and Comprehensive Free Trade Area (DCFTA). For this to be effective, the roadmap strategized inclusive participation of a wide range of actors including local CSOs, business associations, trade unions and chambers of commerce, and other socio-economic stakeholders that will facilitate the implementation of the national reform agenda. The Civil Society Facility (CSF) with its TA project and the three large grants with sub-granting schemes have responded to the identified challenges and met the pre-defined objectives.

Confidence-building measures

EU strategy and programming with respect to CBM-IV and CBM-V (the object of the current evaluation), have built on the previous CBM cycles and lessons learned, as well as on the joint programming document. CBM-V has also been advised by the Mid-term evaluation and final reports under CBM-IV, as well as the lessons learned, drawing upon the experience of the previous CBM packages and their impact assessment. Some of the explicit recommendations related to avoidance of top-down approach, continued inclusion of the banks in design and implementation, prioritisation to the demand-driven interventions, while ensuring that the needs are practical. Additional recommendations related to the need for more effective coordination with major stakeholders and ensuring engagement of CSOs. The evaluation has found that these lessons have been translated into practice.

Indicator 1.2.3. Extent to which programming takes into account human rights obligations and recommendations applicable to Moldova.

Strength of evidence based: Strong

Main source of information:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document review</th>
<th>Interviews</th>
<th>Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Project/programme documentation

Action Document for the “ENPARD Moldova – Support to Agriculture and Rural Development”


Action Document for the Development of Rural Areas in the Republic of Moldova

Joint Communication to The European Parliament, The Council, The European Economic and Social Committee and The Committee of The Regions. Review of the European Neighbourhood Policy, Brussels, 18.11.2015


EU-Moldova Association Agreement

Association Implementation Reports (annual)


EU Annual Report on Human Rights and Democracy in the World

People’s Advocate Office Annual reports 2014-2019 (2015 and 2020 unavailable)

Interviews with public officials in Moldova

Interviews with EU officials

Interviews with civil society representatives
Governance

Respect towards the human rights obligations of Moldova forms an integral part of the AA as well as the national strategies in field of governance, providing a fundamental basis for rooting the EU programming into the context of respect to human rights obligations. Human rights and democracy are being discussed in the framework of the main meetings related to the implementation of the Association Agreement, such as the Association Committee and the Subcommittee on Justice, Freedom and Security. Specifically human rights concerns are addressed in a structured manner by the EU-Moldova Human Rights Dialogue. In terms of public messaging, the HR/VP’s spokesperson has issued various statements that pertain to the human rights related concerns, including wider issues related to the electoral process. The Head of EU Delegation reiterated those messages in his public appearances in media.

In several areas, such as the police reform (through BS) development of the judiciary, the human rights concerns were explicitly mainstreamed in programmatic documents. For example, the Standard Operating Procedures for the police service, and the Guidebook on Human Rights-based Policing, were issued by the Soros Foundation under the EU-funded grant.

Particular and specific emphasis on human rights was reflected in the EU support to the fight against torture and ill-treatment in places of deprivation of liberty, which was chiefly accomplished through CSO grants, in cooperation with the national human rights institutions. A complementary support CSO grant under the police budget support programme was dedicated to “external monitoring, contribution and oversight to implementation of programme-related reforms and activities, with special focus on respect for human rights”, which includes issues of ill-treatment in police custody. Within the justice sector reform initiatives, the EU funded a technical assistance project on “Support to the enforcement, probation and rehabilitation systems”, which includes a component on adherence to human rights (including the prevention of torture and ill-treatment).

The National Preventive Mechanism of Moldova was established in 2016 after protracted debates on its format. The Ombudsman+ format was retained, in the form of the Council for Prevention of Torture, based on a cooperation between the PAO as the National Human Rights Institution, and several specialized CSOs. The NPM has since then gradually gained capacity, but still struggles to operate harmoniously, due to different levels of capacity between

Infrastructure/Water
The current level of financing of tariffs for the water supply and sanitation sector from key sources (user charges, international loans and grants and government budgetary support to the sector) is not sufficient for maintaining assets at their current low operational levels, nor for providing adequate levels of service. The GoM and local operators are aware of this challenge to achieve sustainability; however, higher water and waste-water tariffs are not affordable for a major share of the population. The “Water for Cahul” project aims to provide a pro-poor criterion, to avoid tariff hike for the poorest. However, there is no evidence that in selection and design of other projects a specific pro-poor or pro-minority approach is used.

**Agriculture and rural development**

EU Strategy and programming in the agriculture and rural development sector was in line with the human rights obligations and recommendations applicable to Moldova and took into account the five working principles of the Rights-Based Approach. Programmatic interventions increasingly more explicit reference to the working principles of the rights-based approach in program documentation.

ENPARD among others set out to enhance participation of civilians including women and youth in participating in regional/rural policy dialogue and the role of civil society (including farmer and rural community organisations) and local authorities associations’ role in local development initiatives monitoring, implementation. This approach also implied participation of the variety of public and non-public organisations and associations at national, regional and local level in a structured dialogue and fostering linkages and enhance discussion on policy issues between the Ministries and the stakeholders that have a stake in rural development through platforms such as the “National Rural Network”.

In terms of equal access SSF, in particular Objective Six (‘To promote inclusive growth and social cohesion through stimulation of job creation in less favoured areas, in particular rural areas promoted equal possibilities for development in rural areas which was also financially supported through the Focal Regions Programme. Moreover, stimulating and facilitating development of initiatives based on the LEADER principle and local strategies that were based on the generic needs of the rural community contributed to increased involvement and participation or rural population in development processes.

Programmatic interventions also took into account the results of Human Rights Watch reports which among others pointed towards corruption as a major drawback in guaranteeing protection of human rights. In this regard, transparency and accountability are key principles of a human rights-based approach to development that are also integral to successful anti-corruption strategies. Under ENPARD the new subsidy system under the advance payment scheme was introduced for increasing the transparency of the system. The programme also involved regular monitoring of budget support eligibility criteria of macro-economic and public finance management developments, budget transparency, as well as progress in implementation of the public policy. The Focal Regions programme also aims to strengthen the capacities of citizens to identify, report, and mitigate corrupt practices within Local Public Authorities and agencies responsible for the delivery of public services and the rollout of preventive anti-corruption measures as prescribed in the local anti-corruption strategies.

Human rights are taken into consideration in civil society programming, and specifically in the CSF grant on better social services implemented by SFM and its sub-granting scheme, where sub-grants have been awarded to most vulnerable groups in protection of their human rights to equal access to services. This is also seen with the CBM-V programme and the UNDP managed sub-grants, but also with the long-term project awarded to GIZ aiming at improving socio-medical care for people with long term care needs on both side of the Nistru river.

**JC 1.3: The needs and opinions of the citizens of Moldova, and their evolution, are channelled into the programming of EU-Moldova cooperation**
EU increased the focus on the needs of the citizens – especially during the programming period 2017-2020. Strong involvement of civil society was looked for in all sectors, especially in terms of monitoring of progress in implementation of policies; several interventions were designed in a way which assured that civil society can present their own projects (calls for proposals, ODIMM).

Many of the interventions improve in a direct way the quality of life of Moldovans by offering better access to water and energy (biomass), better roads, easier access to subsidies for the rural sector, credit facilities for investments of Moldovans returning back to their home country, etc. The interventions that have shifted the focus to the local level, civil society/small business initiatives, are designed to reach and engage citizens more directly, while continuing to provide the government with necessary assistance for structural reforms. Use of Barometers of Public Opinion has been verified in the agriculture sector to monitor the perceptions of service delivery and identify needs.

**Indicator 1.3.1 EUD reporting explicitly monitored the national socio-economic context, identified challenges and proposed remedial measures**

**Strength of evidence based:** Medium

**Main source of information:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document review</th>
<th>Interviews</th>
<th>Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EAMRs</td>
<td>Interviews with public officials in Moldova</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU-Moldova Association Agreement Implementation Reports (annual)</td>
<td>Interviews with EU officials</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC Implementing decisions</td>
<td>Interviews with civil society representatives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EU is reporting annually in the EARM on the national socio-economic context, challenges and EUD response. The Association Implementation Report is also published annually, providing the assessment of progress. The EU Annual Report on Human Rights and Democracy in the World also provides a regular update in the relevant areas. Furthermore, EUD is undertaking an annual risk assessment which covers possible risks and identifies remedies and proposes how EUD should tackle these risks. The risk assessment was not shared with the evaluators, which limits the ability of the evaluators to assess the
extent to which the monitoring results was integrated into programming/implementation. However, it is obvious, that most of the context analysis exercises are annual, while the program planning cycle is spanning three years, which limits its ability to adapt to the transformation in context. The Joint Analysis (2015) document stands out as a best practice, both in its consultative format and in its integration of the context analysis into programming implications at the highest level, however this process did not foresee a similarly structured, regular re-assessment of the context analysis, or the feedback loop from the implementation of the programs it has influenced, therefore the relevance of its conclusions five years down the road remains unaddressed.

**Agriculture and rural development**

Programming documents and progress reporting reflect the results of consistent monitoring of the socio-economic context in Moldova with regard to the agriculture and rural development and present the respective response of the EU. This included the developments in the sector in terms of sector performance such as production and trade patterns, challenges and risks faced in the sector, etc. The monitoring and programming implications included consultation with the Government, Civil Society Organisations, multilateral and bilateral donors, International Financial Institutions, and International Organisations. It also included use of use of national-level barometers and polls such as the Barometer of Public Opinion, which reflects upon the perceptions of rural population with matters such as public service delivery, access to jobs, living standards, wages and pensions, fighting corruption, industry and agricultural development. This contributed towards increased EU support to rural development interventions. The mid-term evaluation of the NARDs for example resulted in inclusion of rural development measures in the revised NARDs and helped address the previous situation in which the measures were aimed only at developing the agricultural sector and did not take into consideration the objectives of rural development.

In Moldova EU has promoted a proactive involvement of civil society in policymaking, reform, governance and service delivery is critical for achieving the development objectives, including the implementation of the Association Agenda (AA) and Deep and Comprehensive Free Trade Area (DCFTA). Thus, EUD has promoted participation of a wide range of actors including local CSOs, business associations, trade unions and chambers of commerce, and possibly other socio-economic stakeholders in the monitoring of the national reform agenda. Civil society is participating in policy dialogue at different levels, including during the joint assessment and programming of development partners assistance.

### 1.3.2 Financial allocations and their modifications responded to monitoring results

**Main source of information:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document review</th>
<th>Interviews with public officials in Moldova</th>
<th>Interviews with EU officials</th>
<th>Interviews with civil society representatives</th>
<th>Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EAMRs Association Implementation Reports (annual)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC Implementing decisions Action Documents, contract, latest/final report (as available) for sampled interventions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The review of allocations under the Annual Action Programmes shows a clear evolution of the thematic priorities and their financial allocations, which reflect the outcomes of monitoring, as witnessed in the EAMRs and annual Association Implementation Reports.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Special measures + AAPs</th>
<th>Topics</th>
<th>SM (million)</th>
<th>AAP (million)</th>
<th>Total (AAP +SM)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Support to the implementation of DCFTA process in Moldova</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Support to Public Finance Policy Reforms in Moldova (PFPR)</td>
<td></td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ENPADR Moldova – Support to Agriculture and Rural Development</td>
<td></td>
<td>64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Support to Public Administration Reform (PAR)</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Support to Police Reform</td>
<td></td>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Civil Society Facility (Moldova)</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Technical Cooperation Facility</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Development of Rural Areas in the Republic of Moldova</td>
<td></td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Technical Cooperation Facility 2016</td>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Citizens' Empowerment in the Republic of Moldova</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strategic communication and media support</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>50,75</td>
<td>50,75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inclusive economic empowerment of focal regions of the Republic of Moldova</td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU Support to Confidence Building (CBM) Measures V (2019-2022)</td>
<td>10,5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthen the rule of law and anti-corruption mechanisms in the Republic of Moldova</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support for the Implementation of the EU-Moldova Association Agreement</td>
<td>9,25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2019</strong></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>18</strong></td>
<td><strong>18</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annex 1: EU4Moldova – Start-up City Cahul</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annex 2: EU4Moldova – Clean water for Cahul</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2020</strong></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>40</strong></td>
<td><strong>40</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annex I: “EU4Moldova: Local Communities”</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annex II: “EU4Moldova: Facility to support the health response to the COVID-crisis and Association Agreement related Reforms”</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total 2014-2020</strong></td>
<td><strong>428,75</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This evolution, from one SSF to the next, also reflects in the types of interventions which are planned:

**Figure 1: Planned amounts 2014-2017**

Planned amounts 2014-2017
(Source: ET's consolidated portfolio list)
(Total= € 511.7 million)
Agriculture and rural development

In terms of responses to monitoring results in the agriculture and rural development sector, the monitoring of the socio economic context by the EU among others resulted in reduction of the support to be provided through the Annual Action Programme 2017 and withdraw of the action "Strengthening the growth potential of the Republic of Moldova through a more transparent, efficient, competitive and resilient economic environment" which was aimed to support to the implementation of the AA and respective amending of the Commission Implementing Decision C(2017)7533 of 8.11.2017.

On the programme level, results of monitoring efforts also formed the bases for changes in terms of financial allocations to interventions. This for example involved the cancelation of financial contribution through ENPARD to development of a Management Information System for donor coordination due to difficulties in setting the system up and lack of government commitment in that regard.

BS interventions

EU monitored systematically the progress made in PFM and in the sectors in which sector budget support interventions were under implementation. The assessments of the progress achieved in respective sectors was reflected in the tranche assessments and related disbursement of tranches. Failure to achieve the agreed results was automatically triggering the freeze on disbursement of funds.

1.3.3. Extent to which varied civil society actors and citizens were informed and consulted on the objective, planning, programming and reallocations

Strength of evidence based: Strong

Main source of information:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document review</th>
<th>Interviews</th>
<th>Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interviews with civil society representatives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Civil society actors have been consulted through the two Roadmaps for EU-Civil society Engagement, and through the EU policy dialogue structures. The EU-Moldova Civil Society Platform (CSP), established in 2016, complements the political bodies existing within the framework of the EU-Moldova Association Agreement.

CSP is one of the bodies set up within the framework of the Association Agreement that enables civil society organizations from both sides to monitor the implementation process and prepare their recommendations to the relevant authorities on the two sides, as well as endorse declarations outlining progress made and addressing issues of concern. CSP had six meeting till now. It is consulted on issues related to the implementation of the AA and each of its meetings is followed by a Joint Declaration reflecting the position of civil society on all aspects of the AA. The sixth meeting of the CSP was held on 13 February 2020 in Chisinau. It discussed the state of play regarding the implementation of the Association Agreement and called for resolute implementation of the reform agenda, particularly in the area of fight against high level corruption, proper implementation of the public administration reform, development of the infrastructure for transportation and communication between the EU and the Republic of Moldova, etc., while welcoming the EC decision to adjust the financial assistance to the Republic of Moldova, recognizing the results achieved in terms of bilateral trade, and the impact of the visa free travel regime. The CSF tackles also the social and labour aspects of the AA, public procurement and environmental governance issues.

To some extent, through the EaP Civil Society Forum, the National EaP CS Forum Platform of Moldova is also consulted on the EU priorities in the Eastern Neighbourhood and the EU priorities in Moldova, through its participation in the 5 working groups of the Platform: WG1: Democracy, Good Governance, Human Rights and Stability; WG2 – Economic Integration and Convergence with EU Policies; WG3: Environment, Climate Change and Energy Security; WG4: Contacts between People; WG5: Social and Labour Policies and Social Dialogue.

The AA encourages exchange of information and experience between national, regional and local authorities, socio-economic actors and civil society. EU programming in the ARD sector set out to be inclusive and create opportunities for meaningful participation of relevant stakeholders (including local authorities, civil society organizations, community groups) at all stages of the cooperation. Moreover, EU support recognized and stressed that policy and legislative development needs be evidence-based, costed and subject to appropriate internal and external stakeholder consultations at the right time of the legislative and policy-making process. This included meaningful consultation at the intervention level during design and planning stages, actions that include activities aimed at capacity building and mentoring programmes to strengthen the capacities of civil society organisations, including women’s organisations, grassroots organisations and social entrepreneurs: for improved engagement in local planning, and community-led development and for monitoring of decision-taking processes. This contributed to increased participation of the civil society in policy formation and implementation processes that the EU contributed to such as the review of the NARDS.
With technical assistance provided in the framework of ENPARD, which delivered capacity building and institutional strengthening, working groups were set up to develop sectoral policies and national networks were established to facilitate this process further. Policy formation processes are now as a result more inclusive and more broadly based on effective consultation procedures. Working with MARDE the National Rural Network of Moldova was established as a structure facilitating the participation of the stakeholders/civil society with a stake in rural development to work together and express their views on important issues for the future of rural areas. The NRN was established as an institutional structure that provides a policy dialogue platform for ensuring a good level of communication between the competent public authorities and the stakeholders representing the variety of rural society at national, regional and local level including civil organizations involved in agriculture and rural development field. With support from the EU the National LEADER Network was established which is the association that aims to promote the LEADER approach in the Republic of Moldova, representing and supporting the interests of the Local Action Groups (LAG).

Nevertheless, the challenging political situation in Moldova and the misrepresentation of the resolutions of the European Parliament to suspend the macro-financial assistance and the budgetary assistance raised concerns among both nongovernmental organizations, independent national observers and the EU on familiarity of the Moldovan public in the regions with actual the situation of the country’s development including the essence of the reforms supported by the EU in Moldova, the benefits of the Association Agreement, and the importance of Moldova fulfilling its commitments made at the European level for the country’s sustainable development. The EU therefore implemented an information campaign in Moldovan regions aimed to inform civil society and rural population on the essence and level of implementation of the reforms supported by the EU, the real fulfilment of the conditionalities for providing macro-financial assistance and other forms of financial support.

The EU together with the Member States and Switzerland adopted the European Joint Development Cooperation Strategy (Joint Programming Document), covering the period 2018-2020. Civil Society is a cross-cutting priority of the Joint Document, with the objective to strengthen civil society’s capacity to play an effective role in policy dialogue, implementation and monitoring at national and local levels, and to contribute to private sector development, sustainable economic growth and social innovation. All Budget support operations of previous assistance included a part of monitoring by CSOs for implementation of reforms. The Annual Action Programme 2017 includes support to CSOs to monitor local infrastructure projects and to enhance citizens’ engagement in decision-making processes. The Annual Action Programme 2018 foresees engagement of CSOs in anti-corruption efforts, economic governance and public budgets transparency, regional development in two pilot micro-regions, gender equality and combatting violence against women and children, as well as for confidence building aspects.

**Indicator 1.3.4. Public opinion and visibility of EU-Moldova cooperation improves**

**Strength of evidence based:** Very strong

**Main source of information:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document review</th>
<th>Interviews</th>
<th>Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SSFs, EC Implementing decisions, Action Documents, contract, latest/final report (as available) for sampled interventions</td>
<td>Review of all interviews with Moldovan citizens from CSOs, media, Government through the lens of their level of knowledge/perception of EU support in their respective sector(s).</td>
<td>Landell Mills targeted Evaluation Survey 2021, Questions 29 to 33 and disaggregation as per Questions 1 to 6.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Interviews with civil society representatives

Overall, the attitudes towards EU-Moldova cooperation are positive. This is particularly encouraging as most survey respondents find themselves fairly well informed about EU-Moldova cooperation (with an average rating at 63% level of information). At the same time, not all interviewees proved aware of the portfolio of projects going on in their sector. In some sectors, such as justice and anti-corruption, many interviewees had a very sketchy overview of the EU’s cooperation in their area of work. This indicates that, while the communication efforts of the EU since 2017 bear fruit on the public’s general awareness, more targeted communication towards specialized and expert audiences remains insufficient.

The overwhelming majority of our interviewees in the respective sectors have a good level of trust and satisfaction towards their country’s cooperation with Moldova, and more specifically this cooperation in their sector. With rare exceptions, most of them trust that the EU is genuinely trying to support positive changes in the country and in their sector, and they feel the effects of this support. This general perception is shared by the citizens of Moldova: almost 53% respondents consider that the EU has changed a lot of important things in their lives (almost 27%) or some important things (almost 26%). Some 31% think it has changed a few little things, and only 9.5% nothing at all. This is coherent with the EU Neighbours East surveys, according to which about 66% think the EU provides tangible benefits in peoples’ lives (but not specifically in their own life). The perception of the EU’s support is not significantly affected depending on the sex of respondents, or on their dwelling (rural/urban).

The early polling figures worryingly showed that the EU got associated with the 2015 bank fraud corruption scandal in the minds of Moldovans. In 2016 and 2017, the absence of corruption was the positive value least associated to the EU (61% Moldovans in 2016, and only 40% in 2017 thought the EU was very strongly or strongly representing this value). This was even more concerning as the absence of corruption was one of the most important values rated by the respondents. Following the launch of the 2017-2021 SSF, which rerouted a lot of EU support towards citizens, civil society and the local levels, and perhaps in connection with new communication avenues of the EU, the trend was inverted: from 52% positive perception in 2016 and as low as 43% in 2017, it started to grow steadily in 2018, to reach 61% in 2020.

Trust figures show similar trends, though the 2017 dip is more perceptible, and the new SSF was followed by a quick raise and plateau: trust towards the EU decreased down to 54% in 2017, and then plateaued from 2018 to 2020 around 64% (+/− 1%, which is likely within the statistical margin of error).

The online survey conducted for this evaluation, while asking different questions and having a different sample, confirm some trends identified in the EU Neighbours East public opinion survey. The evaluation focused on trust towards the EU and decomposed into “ends” and “means” of the EU, and the respondents’ trust towards them. In average, respondents credit the EU with 74% of trust on its good intentions for Moldova, and 68% of trust on its capacity to deliver on its objectives. The most educated (advanced university degrees) are generally the most sceptical about the EU’s ability to change thing: they are less likely to consider its cooperation with Moldova decisive, or to consider it has changed things in their own life – although they are more likely than others to have accessed EU support personally or studied/trained in the EU. The “trust plateau” identified in the EU Neighbours East surveys could be attributed to this: trust towards the EU’s intentions has clearly progressed more that Moldovans’ beliefs on its ability to deliver on its promises.

The level of trust in the various branches of the State (in 2020, Parliament: 18% trust, Government: 25% trust) and in the political class (parties: 14% trust in 2020), and the belief in the effectiveness of EU’s assistance (down to 37% respondents thought it effective or very effective in 2017, followed by a steady raise up to 58% in 2020, with lowest credit to effectiveness in the areas of corruption, law enforcement,
justice, economic development and democracy) suggest an explanation of this perceived gap between “ends” and “means”, which several interviewees also evoke: the dominant opinion is that the EU is animated by good intentions, it is doing broadly what it should do, it could work somewhat better to drive more change (in terms of timeliness and reactivity), or prioritize differently (for instance it should work more on anti-corruption, health care, education and economic development according to the EU Neighbours East surveys and to several interviewees) – but the main limitation to the EU as a trusted driver of change is the way this assistance is received in the country, chiefly by the services of the State. To summarize the statements of several Moldovan interviewees, which corroborate the survey results, the EU is not perfect, it should continue to improve its support to Moldova, but no matter how hard the EU tries, there needs to be a will and a readiness for change for this cooperation to truly change anything – and these are not present in all sectors.

Yet, interviewees and respondents are very attached to the continuation of EU support, because their find it extremely important for their country’s future. Most interviewees’ key message was that without the EU’s support, the situation in their respective sector would be much worse, and they pleaded for “not being left down”. On a scale of 1 to 4, respondents rate the EU’s importance at 3,5%. 77% consider it “decisive” for the future of Moldova. The younger the respondents, the more important they rate EU cooperation, and this is true for all age groups. Other factors do not have significant influence on the results, except that Gagauzia and Transnistria residents are less likely than others to consider the EU as important or decisive, or to consider that EU cooperation has changed something important in their lives. This could point to a gap in targeting of EU assistance and/or communication, or to language/choice of media outlets creating barriers to access to EU communication.

The response of public opinion towards the EU and EU-Moldova cooperation is also characterized by an important inertia: between a marking event, or a strong public communication stance, and major evolution of the public opinion trends, as much as two years can elapse. This difficulty is compounded by the long programming cycles of the EU: there is also an important inertia in the reaction of the EU’s cooperation and especially funding to important events. Boosting communication, as has been the case during the second SSF of the period, is therefore essential but not sufficient: the EU can only communicate on what it is actually doing, and no amount of communication will compensate for tardy reaction.

Since 2014, the EU has deployed six visibility projects amounting to a total of approximately three million Euros, and one media support and communication project amounting to close to five million Euros. After modest funding afforded to communication in 2014 (only one service contract of less than 300 000 Euros), the EU’s investment in this area soared during the second SSF of the evaluation period.

Indicator 1.3.5. Percentage of programmes and contracts highlighting gender-based problem analysis and foreseeing gender transformative results

Strength of evidence based: Strong

Main source of information:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document review</th>
<th>Interviews</th>
<th>Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EC Implementing decisions Action Documents, contract, latest/final report (as available) for sampled interventions CEDAW reports Moldova</td>
<td>- Interviews with public officials in Moldova - Interviews with EU officials - Interviews with civil society representatives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Gender is mainstreamed through all Annual Action Programmes. **Focal Regions approach** for two municipalities with the branding EU4Cahul and EU4 Ungheni: Under this umbrella, the majority of assistance from the Annual Action programmes 2018 and 2019 started implementing inclusive socio-economic development, supporting gender mainstreaming in local policies and the fight against gender-
Based on the analysis, violence, and improving living conditions of the population households in the region of Cahul through a broader access to quality water supply and sanitation and therefore the minimisation of health risks. However, the projects in this area are not underpinned by fully elaborated gender analysis.

According to the EAMR 2018, the Gender Analysis on Moldova prepared by the EU Delegation and EUMS provides guidance on the EU GAP II’s targeted areas of intervention that should be implemented. This analysis is coherent with the CEDAW Concluding Observations issued in 2020. In addition, these areas are also in line with the objectives of the Government Gender Equality Strategy 2017-2021 in order to support the efforts made by the Government. These objectives have been mainstreamed into the current programming EU assistance and are reflected in both the new SSF and Joint Response document. Specific projects ongoing aim at combating discrimination and gender stereotypes and supporting economic empowerment of women.

It was not possible to calculate a percentage of programmes and contracts from the entire evaluation portfolio, as the evaluation team did not receive descriptions of actions for all programmes. In the sampled interventions, about half of the programmes foresee explicitly gender transformative results. These are usually the programmes which are based on a gender analysis.

At the same time, gender issues have been considered in the allocation of resources through all the shortlisted interventions in the agriculture and rural development sector. In the agriculture and rural development sector, all the supported interventions included gender-based problem analysis in varying levels of detail and gender analysis informed the interventions. The shortlisted interventions foresaw gender transformative results which address non-discrimination and gender-related discrepancies and aimed to contribute to improve the socio-economic conditions and resilience of women as socially disadvantaged society groups in target areas/communities (considering a gender perspective). This involved addressing gender gaps such as inequalities in income, participation, and employment.

In the governance and rule of law sector, the integration of a gender lens in programming varies a lot depending on the thematic areas. In the justice sector, gender analysis is limited to issues related to domestic violence. In the anti-corruption field, gender is hardly looked at as a relevant issue. There is no analysis of what corruption specifically means for women and girls, for instance. On the other hand, a gender lens was used in analysing the needs for police reform support budget support programmes and complementary support. This analysis proved to be inclusive, it was based on consultation of women’s organisations. Programmes in the field of human rights almost always integrate a gender lens.

### Indicator 1.3.6. Number and size of projects specifically targeting gender transformative results (trend)

**Strength of evidence based:** Strong

**Main source of information:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document review</th>
<th>Interviews</th>
<th>Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EC Implementing decisions Action Documents, contract, latest/final report (as available) for sampled interventions</td>
<td>- Interviews with public officials in Moldova - Interviews with EU officials - Interviews with civil society representatives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The programmes that do foresee gender transformative results tend to become more numerous as time passes, particularly from 2018 (corresponding to the preparation of a gender analysis). Overall, programmes with large budgets are less likely to include gender transformative results (notable exceptions being the SME support programme and police budget support programme). Programmes with a smaller budget are more likely to integrate a gender lens to their results framework.
In the governance area, the gender-based results framework are very uneven. In the justice and anti-corruption areas, there are almost no gender-specific indicators or expected results. In police support, the budget support programme foresees specific indicators and targets dedicated to gender balance. In the area of human rights, some programmes have a specific gender equality results framework (e.g., support to the National Equality Council, or programmes on torture and ill treatment prevention, including in psychiatric institutions).

All of the shortlisted projects in the agricultural and rural development sector, including the tree largest (groups) of bilateral interventions namely ENPARD, DEVRAM and Focal Regions interventions which accounted for more than 87 percent of the total funding directed towards this sector by the EU targeted gender transformative results.

In the area of governance, specific examples include the ongoing EU support to police sector reform which saw Moldova’s Policewomen’s Association established and further supported. The same programme sets targets for increased numbers of female officers at all ranks.

In the area of support to the private sector and business environment, there are several examples of gender transformative results. A good example is in the area of DCFTA implementation and support to the private sector, where a specific grant scheme is aimed at supporting women in business.

Evaluation question 2: JCs and indicators

EQ2. To what extent was EU-Moldova bilateral co-operation coherent with and complementary to regional and cross border programmes and other EU instruments, as well as with interventions of EU Member States and other donors, including in particular International Financial Institutions?

This EQ covers Efficiency, coherence, Coordination & complementarity, EU added value
JC.2.1: EU-Moldova cooperation is coordinated, coherent and complementary with strategies and programmes of the EU Member States, international/regional organisations, EU macro-economic assistance and of the European Financial Institutions.
JC 2.2: Political dialogue and cost components of EU-Moldova cooperation are consistent and mutually reinforcing.
JC.2.3: Blending generated financial leverage with EUMM and other donors and increased visibility of EU cooperation

JC 2.1: EU-Moldova cooperation is coordinated, coherent and complementary with strategies and programmes of the EU Member States, international/regional organisations, EU macro-economic assistance and of the European Financial Institutions.

Thanks to a joint analysis and programming exercise bringing together the EU, EUMSs, international financial institutions and key other countries (such as Switzerland), EU cooperation is coherent and complementary with strategies and programmes of the EU Member States and to a certain extent also with international and regional organizations. Support provided by development banks (KfW, EIB and EBRD) have a somewhat different logic, as they correspond originally to loan applications presented by the Government of Moldova and EU NIF support corresponds to additional funds provided (on demand of the development bank) to the overall financing package. However, there is a strong alignment between the strategic objectives of the EU and of international financial institutions, which materializes in the blending operations. While programming seems to work very well, coordination and approaches are not completely harmonized during the programme/project implementation periods.
### Indicator 2.1.1. Internal coherence among EU bilateral and regional interventions with the support provided under the EU Macro Financial Assistance Programme

**Strength of evidence: Medium**

#### Main sources of information:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document review</th>
<th>Interviews</th>
<th>Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SSFs, AAPs/EC Implementing Decisions</td>
<td>Interviews with public officials in Moldova</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memorandum of Understanding EU- Moldova, signed 7/2020</td>
<td>Interviews with EU officials</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macro-Financial Assistance (MFA) programme 2017-2020</td>
<td>Interviews with civil society representatives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020 REPORT FROM THE COMMISSION TO THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT AND THE COUNCIL on the implementation of macro-financial assistance to third countries in 2019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020. Macro-financial assistance to the Republic of Moldova of up to EUR 100 million MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING between The European Union as Lender and Republic of Moldova as Borrower</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020. COMMISSION STAFF WORKING DOCUMENT Background Analysis per beneficiary country Accompanying the document REPORT FROM THE COMMISSION TO THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
AND THE COUNCIL on the implementation of macro-financial assistance to third countries in 2019

Ex-ante evaluation statement accompanying the Commission proposal (January 2017)


Review of portfolio overview

Moldova benefits from bilateral, regional and thematic instruments, all of which are programmed to allow maximum complementarity, synergy and impact. This is achieved by programming EU assistance along the policy priorities of the 20 Deliverables for 2020 and by quality assurance between HQ and the Delegation in the design phase and implementation of projects. Regional programmes include environment, climate, border management, cross border cooperation, justice, trade and SME development.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action type</th>
<th>EC Planned amounts</th>
<th>€</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blending</td>
<td>€ 95.505.400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget support</td>
<td>€ 347.611.561</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project</td>
<td>€ 536.440.470</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macrofinancial assistance</td>
<td>€ 60.000.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>€ 1.039.557.431</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3: EC planned amounts by action type

The majority of EU support to Moldova is bilateral. Regional and cross-border support represent, together, 29% of this support, particularly targeting the areas of agriculture, rural development, energy and biomass (plus some regional blending in the field of SME support).
Following a request by the Republic of Moldova, the European Commission adopted on 13 January 2017 a proposal for a Macro-Financial Assistance (MFA) programme of up to EUR 100 million, out of which up to EUR 40 million would be provided in grants and up to EUR 60 million in medium-term loans at favourable financing conditions. All disbursements under the programme were tied to the political preconditions for MFA regarding the respect of democratic mechanisms, the rule of law and human rights, as well as to Moldova’s track record under the IMF programme and the fulfilment of the specific policy conditions laid down in the Memorandum of Understanding. On 24 November 2017, the Commission, on behalf of the EU, and the Moldovan authorities signed the Memorandum of Understanding, which includes measures in areas such as public governance, financial sector governance, energy sector reforms and tackling corruption. The first instalment of EUR 30 million was released in October 2019. The second instalment of EUR 30 million was released in July 2020. The third and final instalment of the programme was cancelled, as the availability period of the programme ended in July 2020.

The Macro-Financial Assistance related to the COVID emergency is linked to the same preconditions. As such there is internal coherence as same criteria are applied for Macro-Financial Assistance as for BS interventions (general conditions). Funds can be used for the same sectors as highlighted in the SSF2019-2020.

### Agriculture and rural development

The EU MFA is complementary to the EU bilateral support to the Agricultural and Rural development Sector. The MFA follows the fulfilment of the Moldova’s policy commitments agreed with the EU, as laid down in the Memorandum of Understanding which included important measures in the fields of financial sector governance, public sector governance, the fight against corruption and money laundering, energy, and business climate and the implementation of the Deep and Comprehensive Free Trade Area (DCFTA). The latter two areas are important for agricultural development in the country. As agriculture is to be most influenced sector by the DCFTA.
As a part of the overall EU package of assistance, the MFA is expected to contribute to support the EU’s objectives of economic stability and economic development in Moldova. By supporting the authorities’ efforts to establish a stable macroeconomic framework and improve economic governance, the proposed assistance would help improve the effectiveness of other EU financial assistance to the country, including budgetary support operations.

The EU’s MFA is also expected to complement the standard EU aid packages mobilised under the ENI. By supporting the adoption, by the Moldovan authorities, of an appropriate framework for macroeconomic policy and structural reforms, the EU’s MFA would enhance the added value and effectiveness of the EU's involvement through other financial instruments.

**Energy and Water Sectors**

EU support to the Energy and water sectors was designed to be coherent with regional programmes (EU4 Energy, EU4 Business, EU4 Environment).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator 2.1.2. Occurrences of EU programmes sharing analysis through dedicated mechanisms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strength of evidence basis:</strong> Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Main source of information:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Joint Development Cooperation Strategy (Joint Programming Document) For the Republic of Moldova</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviews with public officials in Moldova</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRIEFING BOOK From Development Partners of Moldova, 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviews with EU officials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviews with civil society representatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action Documents, contract, latest/final report (as available) for sampled interventions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall, Sub-Committees and Steering Committees of large programmes (such as facilities and budget support programmes) are preferred avenue for sharing analysis on the context and implementation of EU programmes. The occurrences analysed in the Education and Agricultural sectors provide examples of such horizontal cross-fertilization:

**Agriculture and rural development**

The EU cooperated with Moldova’s key development partners to analyse and identify a response to the needs in various sectors including Agriculture and Rural Development. During 2015 the “Briefing Book Group” of eight development partners consisted of EUD in Moldova, the United Nations, the World Bank, the USAID, the German Agency for International Cooperation, the Austrian Development Agency, the
Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation in partnership with the diplomatic missions of the United States, Sweden, Switzerland, Germany and Austria) carried out a joint analysis of key Issues and Challenges in various sectors including Agriculture and Rural Development and presented common positions on reform priorities and provided a platform for dialogue with the government.

**Education**

The Sub-Committee on science and technologies, informational society, policies in audio-visual, education, training and youth, culture, sport and physical training (cluster 4) has wide membership. It comprises representatives of the Ministry of Education, Culture and Research, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and European Integration, the Ministry of Economy and Infrastructure, the Academy of Science, the National Agency for Research and Development, the Audio-Visual Council and the EUD.

The Sub-Committee has gathered five times since 2015. Despite COVID-19 pandemic, the last Sub-Committee meeting took place in July 2020 and was largely productive. The purpose of the meeting, facilitated by the European External Action Service, as well as of previous meetings, was to give an account to the European Commission on the progress in implementing the AA. Participants took stock of recent achievements, addressed challenges and discussed ways for better using opportunities provided by the EU programmes, particularly Erasmus +, Horizon 2020, eTwinning, Creative Europe etc. As such, these sectoral meetings with high level officers and specialised experts were useful for exchanging views and boosting further actions.

The European Training Foundation (ETF) ETF supports the European Commission and the EU's External Action Service by providing inputs to the relevant bilateral sub-committees, follow up of the Mobility Partnership and contributing to the annual country reporting on education and training and employment developments. The ETF also supports the Government through providing high quality analytical inputs and facilitates sectoral dialogue on how to use Torino process recommendations in the context of the overall reform of skills development.

Where these platforms are less dynamic, if they are disrupted by a difficult political context or by challenges in implementation, as was the case in the justice sector for instance (witnessed by the interruption of budget support to this sector), they are less effective in permitting cross-fertilization of the analysis performed by EU programmes. For instance, the evaluation team observed that overlapping programmes on anti-corruption in the justice sector (e.g., ongoing technical assistance, which followed the CLEP project completed in May 2020 with some time overlap) did not perform briefings or use each other’s reporting products.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator 2.1.3 Occurrences of EU programmes dividing work with other donors through dedicated mechanisms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strength of evidence based: Strong</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Main source of information:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document review</th>
<th>Interviews</th>
<th>Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>European Joint Development Cooperation Strategy (Joint Programming Document) For the Republic of Moldova</td>
<td>Interviews with public officials in Moldova</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRIEFING BOOK From Development Partners of Moldova, 2015</td>
<td>Interviews with EU officials</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Bank for Reconstruction and Development</td>
<td>Interviews with civil society representatives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interviews with other donors and partners</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Joint programming

On 28 February 2018, the EU Delegation to the Republic of Moldova and the EU Member States, together with the Swiss Cooperation Office, presented the European Joint Development Cooperation Strategy 2017-2020 (Joint Programming Document) to the Moldovan government. The Joint Strategy reflects the revised European Neighbourhood Policy (ENP), the Association Agenda 2017-2019 and Eastern Partnership Priorities. It builds on the Joint Analysis that was presented to the Government of Moldova in October 2016. It is structured in line with the European Union Single Support Framework 2017-2020 and is aligned with Moldova’s National Development Strategy (“Moldova 2020”). The Joint Strategy is structured around four broad areas of intervention encompassing the common strategic objectives of the EU, EU Member States and Switzerland and is aligned with the EU-Moldova Single Support Framework 2017-2020:

- Economic development and market opportunities including sustainable and inclusive economic growth, social protection and health
- Strengthening institutions and good governance including the Rule of Law and Security
- Connectivity, energy efficiency, environment and climate change
- Mobility and people-to-people contacts including support to the Visa Liberalisation benchmarks and to education, training and research.

Three cross-cutting priorities are also included: civil society, gender equality and strategic communication. The choice of priority sectors in the SSF 2017-2020 was guided by the Joint programming process through the Joint Analysis that was presented to the Government in October 2016 – and programmes, in turn, reflected this joint analysis. The indicative budget allocations reflect the focus on delivering tangible and visible results for citizens, although the actual spending followed only years after the Joint Analysis was conducted.

Although not being directly part of the joint analysis and joint strategy, EU ensured permanent coordination with the Council of Europe, UN institutions, the World Bank, European Bank for Reconstruction and Development, USAID and other partners.

The development banks are implementing interventions co-financed with NIF, so the EU cooperation is with them demand-driven – the banks receive a request for credit from the Government of Moldova and apply to the EU for complementary NIF funding, which forms part of the overall financing package.
**Division of labour at programme level:**

The research of the program documentation and interviews has shown evidence that EU programmes are dividing work with the EU Member States, through contribution and/or delegation agreements with other international partners, such as the relevant UN agencies, Council of Europe, OSCE, national agencies such as GIZ and ADA. The EY also co-finances projects and financing instruments with European Development Banks (KfW, EBRD, EIB).

Some of the identified examples include:

- NIF (national and regional projects) co-financed with EBRD, EIB and KfW.
- Clean Water Cahul – delegation agreement with KfW.
- Anticorruption – delegation agreement with GIZ.
- CBM – contribution agreement with UNDP.
- Start Up City Cahul – implemented with SIDA.
- Water Cantemir – delegation agreement with ADA.
- Development of Rural Areas - delegation agreement with ADA.
- Support for agriculture and rural development in ATU Gagauzia and Taraclia district (SARD)-delegation agreement with UNDP.
- Coordination/collaboration with IMF related to BS.
- Multiple twinning interventions implemented with institutions from EU Member States.

The agriculture and rural development sector provide a good case study. Within the general community of development partners there was a division of labour in terms of donor coordination based on comparative advantage. The WB for example has been the principal voice on energy and governance issues and, together with the EU Delegation, the EU Commission and EU member states, ensured consistency of development partners’ views on budget support.

In terms programmatic support to the agriculture and rural development sector there are a large number of donors, both multilateral and bi-lateral, assisting Moldova in the field of agriculture and rural development. There were signs of division of labour based on the discussions with some of the stakeholders working in the sector who perceived that could have been the underlying factor for EU not focusing support on irrigation projects as other donors already focused on that particular area. According to IATI data the largest donor in the sector has been the Millennium Challenge Account which aimed to improve agricultural productivity and expand access to markets and services through critical investments in irrigation and road infrastructure.

In terms division of labour within the European community, based on the results of the joint analysis, the European Joint Development Cooperation Strategy for Moldova made a clear division of labour. In accordance with the strategy the agriculture and rural development sector was one of the main areas of intervention for Austria, Czech Republic, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Romania and the EU. This was generally also reflected in terms of contribution to the sector on a programmatic level. The DEVRAM project for example involved co-financed in joint co-financing by the ADA for an amount of EUR 800,000 and the Polish support was very visible for continued application of the LEADER method.

**Education**

In VET, since 2014 when BS was provided, the EU became the leading donor and other donors, and country development partners aligned their programmes accordingly, to ensure complementarity and avoid overlapping. BS termination in 2017 and a two-year break from supporting VET, followed by a switch to twinning project, influenced other donors’ decisions on how to further assist the Government. Among other things, a tendency of other donors, particularly LED and ADA, to withdraw investments in infrastructure and focus on continuous training, occupational standards and qualifications was observed. While the EU was the guiding spirit and coordination among donors was carried though, some overlaps came about (in case of the EU twining programme and LED).
JC 2.2: Political dialogue and cost components of EU-Moldova cooperation are consistent and mutually reinforcing

Policy dialogue takes place through structured meetings under the Association Agreement, through formal Steering Committees, including for budget support programmes and jointly with EUMS and other development partners on issues of particular importance or political sensitivity which are essential in terms of supporting EU policy objectives. Budget support programmes and related withholding of tranches were used as an instrument for stimulating policy dialogue on issues as transparency, anti-corruption, and good governance. A close policy dialogue was held with the Ministry of Finance, the National Bank of Moldova, the Supreme Audit Institution, and the Budgetary Committee of the Parliament in view of increasing the transparency in Public Financial Management.

There is substantive evidence that policy dialogue was/is permanent involving not only the Government of Moldova but also other actors including civil society.

Although the interruption of BS disbursements and the reduction of instalment related to the failure to achieve indicators has created some challenges for Ministry of Finance and sectors, policy dialogue has not been significantly affected.

**Indicator 2.2.1 Correlation between objectives of regional/cross border programmes, and bilateral programmes**

**Strength of evidence based: strong**

**Main source of information:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document review</th>
<th>Interviews</th>
<th>Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>European Neighbourhood-wide measures</td>
<td>Interviews with EU officials</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbourhood Investment Facility Operational Annual Report 2014, 2015</td>
<td>Interviews with civil society representatives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association Implementation Reports 2017, 2018, 2019</td>
<td>Action Documents, contract, latest/final report (as available) for sampled interventions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Overall, the review of documentation for all sampled interventions revealed that, where a sector is served by both bilateral and regional/cross border programmes, the objectives of this programmes are compatible and mutually reinforcing.

For instance, in the rule of law/people-to-people contact sectors, there was perfect adequation between the support to the VLAP on the one hand (bilateral) and the EUBAM and other cross-border projects on border management on the other end. The objectives of all related projects were aligned on the Association Agenda and on the VLAP, and therefore perfectly correlated.

Another case study is found in the agriculture and rural development. One of the three strategic objectives of the European Neighbourhood Instrument is to contribute to economic integration and sector cooperation. In the NIF Strategic Orientation 2014-2020, ‘Promoting smart, sustainable and inclusive growth’ is one of three strategic objectives and direct reference is made to DCFTAs and to SME development and financing.

The regional approach of the EU set out to consider national specificities to ensure that regional policy and programmes are in coherence with other EU policies and programs. Two ENI CBC programmes have been identified in the financing period that involved Moldova and were of relevant to agriculture and rural development. These involved the:

- Romania-Ukraine-Republic of Moldova 2007-2013 Joint Operational Programme (RO-UA-MD JOP), and the following Romania – Republic of Moldova 2014-2020.
- The Black Sea Joint Operational Programme
- the Interreg Danube Transnational Programme.

Through the RO-UA-MD JOP, the people in border areas were encouraged to further develop the border economy, confront environmental challenges and enhance their preparedness for emergency situations. The programme also promoted greater interaction between people and communities living in the border areas. This JOP had three main priorities, namely:

- Priority 1: Towards a more competitive border economy.
- Priority 2: Environmental Challenges and Emergency Preparedness.
- Priority 3: People to People Co-operation.

The strong focus of the RO-UA-MD programme on improving the competitiveness and economic performance of the border area through the diversification and modernization of the border economy created a great correlation between objectives of regional/cross border programmes, and bilateral programmes. The priorities of the Romania – Republic of Moldova 2014-2020 JOP did not explicitly target competitiveness, nevertheless, the programme was relevant to and correlated with the objectives of bilateral programmes. This was the case with the Interreg Danube Transnational Programme which finances projects for the development and practical implementation of policy frameworks, tools and services and concrete small-scale pilot investments. Strong complementarities with the broader EU Strategy for the Danube Region (EUSDR) are sought. The Priority of Area 8 of the Danube Region Strategy also aims to support the competitiveness of enterprises in the Danube Region. An Action is an important issue requiring intervention by the countries and stakeholders involved to meet the objective of the Priority Area.

**Indicator 2.2.2. Absence of duplication between regional/cross border programmes, and bilateral programmes**

**Strength of evidence based: Strong**

**Main source of information:**
There was no evidence of duplication between regional/cross border programmes and bilateral programmes in any of the sectors reviewed. There was on the other hand evidence of complementarity between regional/cross border programmes, and bilateral programmes. This for example involved cross border projects aimed to boost the interaction between farmers and ecological agriculture service providers to promote organic agriculture when development of organic agriculture was also supported through bilateral technical and financial assistance. Likewise, VLAP support and EUBAM/other cross-border projects on border management had a clear division of labour in terms of national policy and capacity support versus field support on the site of border crossings.

Almost all CBS programmes were committed to ensure complementarity and synergies during design and implementation and to avoid duplication and double funding. Consequently, programme documents contained a section on coherence with other programmes and existing strategies, which provide the backdrop for the implementation of CBC activities. Applicants were asked to demonstrate the complementarity of their project with other EU and national initiatives. According to the Ex-post Evaluation of the ENPI CBC Programmes, there were increasingly more mechanisms to facilitate synergies with other programmes. Coordination and synergies also took place given the overlap of programme management structures and/or people involved in them. This for example involved the Interreg programmes, which often involved JMC members from ENPI CBC programmes.

Indicator 2.2.3 Extent to which EU reduction/withdrawal from BS affected political dialogue with GoM

Strength of evidence based: medium

Main source of information:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document review</th>
<th>Interviews</th>
<th>Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EAMR 2014-2020</td>
<td>EUD stakeholders</td>
<td>GoM stakeholder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association Implementation Reports 2017, 2018, 2019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action Documents, contract, latest/final report (as available) for sampled interventions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The research found no substantive evidence that EU reduction/withdrawal from BS affected significantly political dialogue with GoM. Rather, it is the unstable political situation which affected the implementation
of budget support programmes – but dialogue remained active, albeit more challenging. Although no new Budget support operations were concluded in Moldova since 2015 and budget support programmes were gradually phasing out since, this situation was used as a basis for policy dialogue and as a leverage to promote and obtain the implementation of agreed reforms in key areas such as trade, visa-liberalisation, rural development, to support macro-economic stability and the related IMF programme and to improve the economic governance (stronger and more transparent budgeting process, stronger budget oversight by the Court of Auditors and the Parliament). Strong application of conditionalities permitted the EU to underline with GoM that EU financial support is clearly linked with progress made on the rule of law, human rights, and democratic principles.

Interruption and withholding of disbursement of budget support was a factor pushing for an increased coordination and policy dialogue with IMF and EU Member States.

Stakeholders from Government of Moldova indicated that policy dialogue was ongoing but noted that the non-disbursement or reduction of instalments of budget support funds has created difficulties for the Ministry of Finance and tackled sectors, as planned working programmes had to be revised and additional financing had to be found for complying with already committed expenditures. Stakeholders at operational level report not always being clearly informed on the reasons for no disbursement or reduction of instalments. A specific difficulty for stakeholders at sector level was related to withholding of tranche disbursements due to non-compliance with the general conditions of BS i.e., with factors outside the control of the sector.

JC 2.3: Blending generated financial leverage with EUMM and other donors and increased visibility of EU cooperation

There is clear evidence that blending operations – both at the national and regional level- created an important leverage with international development banks (and in a specific case also with AFD). EU support provided additional funding for activities which would have been difficult to be financed by development banks (i.e., additional technical assistance); furthermore, EU support permitted to reduce the average cost of financing, making thus the investment more attractive for Moldovan Government. EU cooperation is quite visible in the websites, social media, EUD participated in visibility activities.

At national Moldova level blended operations focus on large-scale infrastructure projects, the most prominent being the electricity interconnector with Romania and thus the European Electricity Market. Other projects support the transport sector, mostly key roads, locomotives, railway restructuring, or transport systems and environmental projects such as the Chisinau Water Treatment Plant. At regional level NIF funds are blending financial instruments. Access to finance is provided through the DCFTA facility and provided through five local banks. Up to 2019 more than 300 SMEs have benefited from a DCFTA targeted access to finance support in Moldova, and more than 17 660 SMEs have benefited from EU support for access to finance in Moldova under EU4Business (SME Finance Facility, DCFTA Facility, EFSE, GGF). Access to finance is often provided together with business management/planning support as Moldova is not a traditional country for private/SME lending and the facility increased coverage after the first success stories were actively communicated. Access to finance by the EU is regarded as a trustworthy system that SMEs prefer over purely local financing alternatives.

The SSF 2014-2017 identified three priority sectors of intervention to be financed through the national envelope: Public administration reform, Agriculture and Rural development; Police reform and border management. As such national Moldova Blending operations during the reference period 2014-2017 were not in line with national SSF but complementary to the 3 priorities of the SSFs; however, they were fully in line with the Strategic Orientations for Neighbourhood Investment Facility and with the National Strategy Moldova 2000. They concentrated on the transport and water sectors.
Projects with a NIF Component implemented at national level (in Moldova) correspond to the National Strategy Moldova 2000 priority “Public investment in the national and local road infrastructure to reduce transportation costs and increase the speed of access”. Energy projects correspond to “Reducing energy consumption by increasing energy efficiency and using renewable energy sources.

Related to NIF operations at regional level: since 2010 EU is supporting SMEs in the region by providing additional support with NIF funds to the financial instruments put in place. As such all Regional Blending operations are in line with the priority of the SSF (1) “Reducing financing costs by increasing competition in the financial sector and developing risk management tools; (2) Establishing better and more sustainable energy and transport interconnections (between the EU and neighbouring countries and between the neighbouring countries themselves), improving energy efficiency and demand management, promoting the use of renewable energy sources, strengthening energy security through diversification of energy supplies and energy market integration.

The project “Moldova-Romania Interconnection Phase I” is fully in line with the priority 3 of the SSF 2017-2020 and with the priority 5 of the Strategy “Moldova 2000”.

There is although a full alignment with Strategic Orientations for Neighbourhood Investment Facility (especially with Strategic objective 1 “Establishing better and more sustainable energy and transport interconnections (between the EU and neighbouring countries and between the neighbouring countries themselves), improving energy efficiency and demand management, promoting the use of renewable energy sources, strengthening energy security through diversification of energy supplies and energy market integration, and supporting investments related to the implementation of EU agreements, including DCFTAs, as set out notably in the ENP Association Agendas / Action Plans and in the follow-up to Taskforce meetings.”

National Blending operations had an important leverage effect (1:3 up to 1:19,7). NIF funds permitted to reduce overall costs of investments - and facilitated such approval of projects by Parliament. Financing of technical assistance permitted to accompany financing of investments – especially in a volume which normally cannot be financed by international development banks as an accompanying measure (grant). This is important as beneficiary countries are most often reluctant to take grants for paying international technical assistance. NIF funds at regional created as well important leverage effects, i.e., in 2016, 12 NIF projects from the Regional ENI programme with a budget of EUR 120 M were supporting blending of more than EUR 600 M in donor contributions and loans.

All blending operations which financed infrastructure projects faced some challenges during implementation and needed extension in time or faced an increase in costs. This seems justified as the implementation of infrastructure projects is not easy in the Moldovan context: design of infrastructure, elaboration, and approval of terms of reference, international tenders and undertaking works in a political challenging climate made it difficult to stick to the original chronogram. A further difficulty faced by several of the work contracts was the lack of qualified workers in Moldova as many have emigrated to Russia and EU countries. However, the EU faced difficulties to respond with the available instruments to these challenges, in fact some funds were lost as contracts could not be signed in time (N+3).

Visibility of EU in the context of blending operations is acceptable. Interviews with EBRD project officers and EU project officers confirmed that for national blending projects the EU Delegation is invited for meetings. EUD is participating in regular meetings with implementing partners and assures presence during important events. The website EU4Moldova gives a lot of visibility and information on EU financed blended projects and programmes.

**Indicator 2.3.1 Blending operations (for Moldova) in line with Single Support Frameworks**

Strength of evidence based: strong

The National Development Strategy (“Moldova 2020”) identifies seven priorities which are:

- Aligning the education system to labour market needs in order to enhance labour productivity and increase employment in the economy.
- Public investment in the national and local road infrastructure in order to reduce transportation costs and increase the speed of access.
- Reducing financing costs by increasing competition in the financial sector and developing risk management tools.
- Improving business climate by streamlining the regulatory framework and applying information technologies in public services for businesses and citizens.
- Reducing energy consumption by increasing energy efficiency and using renewable energy sources.
- Financial sustainability of the pension system in order to ensure an appropriate rate of wage replacement.
- Increasing the quality and efficiency of justice and fighting corruption in order to ensure equity for all citizens.

The projects co-financed under NIF 2014-2017 are aligned with the priorities mentioned in the National Development Strategy, but not directly with the priorities of the SSF 2014-2017:

**National Projects**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRIS-No</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Starting Year</th>
<th>Implementing Partner</th>
<th>EU Contribution</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Moldova 2000 Priority</th>
<th>SSF 2014-2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35543</td>
<td>Moldova Roads Rehabilitation IV</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>EBRD</td>
<td>1.541.650,5</td>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35380</td>
<td>Moldova Roads Rehabilitation IV</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>EBRD</td>
<td>13.758.349,5</td>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Further to the projects mentioned before the following NIF interventions financed before NIP 2014-2017 were still under implementation during the reference period.

Table Regional projects financed before SSF 2014-2017 but under implementation during the reference period

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRI S-No</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Starting</th>
<th>Implementing Partner</th>
<th>EU Contribution</th>
<th>End</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Moldovan partner IFI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>255-366</td>
<td>EIB-04 SME Finance Facility - EIB window</td>
<td>22/12/2010</td>
<td>EIB</td>
<td>5.100.000</td>
<td>31/12/2020</td>
<td>Response to the effect of the 2008 financial crisis on SMEs in EaP. EU/NIF grant provides interest subsidy, loss coverage and Technical Assistance and TA</td>
<td>Procredit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>255-386</td>
<td>SME Finance Facility Phase I - EBRD/KfW</td>
<td>22/12/2010</td>
<td>EBRD, KfW</td>
<td>10.200.000</td>
<td>22/12/2019</td>
<td>BT Leasing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SSF 2017-2020: In the SSF 2017-2020 four priority sectors of intervention to be financed through the national envelope have been defined:

- Sector 1: Economic development and market opportunities, including sustainable and inclusive economic growth.
- Sector 2: Strengthening institutions and good governance.
- Sector 3: Connectivity, energy efficiency, environment, and climate change
- Sector 4: Mobility and people-to-people contacts

Projects with a NIF Component financed at national level SSF 2017-2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRIS-No</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Starting</th>
<th>Implementing Partner</th>
<th>EU Contribution</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Moldova 2000 Priority</th>
<th>SSF 2017-2020 Priority sector</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Regional Projects

Regional projects financed during this period are mainly promoting the economic development of small and medium producers of the agricultural and agri-food sector. They are in line with SSF sector 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRIS-No</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Starting Date</th>
<th>Implementing Partner</th>
<th>EU Contribution</th>
<th>End Date</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>376-993</td>
<td>DCFTA Initiative East (EIB) Guarantees Window</td>
<td>19/12/2016</td>
<td>EIB via EIF</td>
<td>50.000.000</td>
<td>31/12/2021</td>
<td>Support to the DCFTA implementation in GE, MD and UA by providing targeted financial and technical support to SMEs with a focus on the agri-food sector. Procredit Moldova</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>376-993</td>
<td>DCFTA Initiative East (EIB) Risk Capital Window - Technical Assistance for Microfinance Institutions</td>
<td>19/12/2016</td>
<td>EIB</td>
<td>2.800.000</td>
<td>31/12/2021</td>
<td>Support to the DCFTA implementation in GE, MD and UA by providing targeted financial and technical support to SMEs with a focus on the agri-food sector. Procredit Moldova</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>376-993</td>
<td>DCFTA Initiative East (EIB) Technical Assistance Window</td>
<td>19/12/2016</td>
<td>EIB</td>
<td>7.800.000</td>
<td>31/12/2021</td>
<td>Support to the DCFTA implementation in GE, MD and UA by providing targeted financial and technical support to SMEs with a focus on the agri-food sector. Procredit Moldova</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 1: 373-0812</td>
<td>Phase 2: 389-994</td>
<td>DCFTA Facility EBRD DCFTA programme phase 1 and phase 2 INCENTIVES FOR SMEs - DCFTA &amp; Currency hedging UA</td>
<td>EBRD</td>
<td>48.000.000</td>
<td>Eu has blended the EBRD DCFTA loans to SMEs with an incentive grant of 10-15% under specific verification of the sub-loan implementation.</td>
<td>Mobiabanci, Procredit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 1: 373-0812</td>
<td>Phase 2: 389-994</td>
<td>DCFTA Facility EBRD TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE</td>
<td>EBRD</td>
<td>9.000.000</td>
<td>TA to support the lending operations,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 1: 373-0812</td>
<td>Phase 2: 389-994</td>
<td>DCFTA Facility EBRD DCFTA programme phase 1 and phase 2 TRADE FINANCE PROGRAMME</td>
<td>EBRD</td>
<td>800.000</td>
<td>EBRD offered technical assistance to the DCFTA PFI-s and SMEs order to enhance trade transactions between the DCFTA countries and EU.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>228-707; 398-298</td>
<td></td>
<td>EFSE (Neighbourhood Window of the European Fund for Southeast Europe) ;)</td>
<td>17/12/2009</td>
<td>KfW</td>
<td>55.100.000</td>
<td>Subscription and management on behalf of EC to EFSE for lending to financial institutions in the EaP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>334-927; 404478; 401728</td>
<td></td>
<td>GGF - Extension to NIF East Region; GGF Extension to Neighbourhood East II;</td>
<td>334-927 20/12/2013 404478 and 401728:1 9/12/2018</td>
<td>KfW</td>
<td>24.670.000</td>
<td>Subscriptions in the Green for Growth fund, specialized in support to advance energy efficiency in EaP region though investing in local lending institutions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EU has funded advisory support services to SMEs in the EaP region to enhance the disbursement of the EBRD loans to SMEs.

With all blended interventions financed under the SSF 2017-2020 there is a full alignment with Strategic Orientations for Neighbourhood Investment Facility.

**Strategic objective 1:** Establishing better and more sustainable energy and transport interconnections (between the EU and neighbouring countries and between the neighbouring countries themselves), improving energy efficiency and demand management, promoting the use of renewable energy sources, strengthening energy security through diversification of energy supplies and energy market integration, and supporting investments related to the implementation of EU agreements, including DCFTAs, as set out notably in the ENP Association Agendas / Action Plans and in the follow-up to Taskforce meetings.

They are aligned with SSF 2017-2020 priorities 1 and/or 3.

**Indicator 2.3.2 Financial leverage generated (%)**

Strength of evidence based: strong

**Main source of information:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document review</th>
<th>Interviews</th>
<th>Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Own calculations made on the basis of the contribution agreements</td>
<td>EUD staff</td>
<td>EBRD staff</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Blended operations at national level had an important leverage effect. (1:3 up to 1:19.7). NIF funds permitted to reduce overall credit costs of investments; by mixing NIF grant funds with loan funds provided by development banks average financing costs of the overall financing package decreased; this corresponded to an important support to Moldova and facilitated the approval of the respective investment projects by Parliament. Part of the EU funds were used for financing the accompanying technical assistance. The financing of TA facilitated the implementation of investment projects; this is important as international development banks in most cases cannot provide the necessary accompanying technical assistance with grant funds. On the other hand, the Government is reluctant to use loan funds for financing technical assistance.

**National Projects**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRIS-No</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Startin g</th>
<th>Cofinancier s</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
<th>EU Contribution</th>
<th>EBRD (M€)</th>
<th>EIB (M€)</th>
<th>Leverage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>355431</td>
<td>Moldova Roads Rehabilitation IV</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>EBRD</td>
<td>€245</td>
<td>16,200,000</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>1: 15,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>353807</td>
<td>Moldova Roads Rehabilitation IV</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>EBRD</td>
<td>€315,5</td>
<td>15,000,000</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>1:21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>353812</td>
<td>Moldovan Railways Restructuring Project</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>EBRD</td>
<td>€107,7</td>
<td>52,5</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>19,7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NIF funds at regional created important leverage effects, i.e., in 2016, 12 NIF projects from the Regional ENI programme with a budget of EUR 120 M were supporting blending of more than EUR 600 M in donor contributions and loans. Financial instruments financed under DCFTA have been important for Moldova, however, consumption of funds was reported as lower than in other countries of the region due to the weakness of the banking sector.

Indicator 2.3.3 Extent to which EU visibility guidelines have been applied in blending operations

Strength of evidence based: medium

Main source of information:

- Document review
- Interviews
- Interviews with EUD staff
- Interviews with EBRD, CoE
- Interviews with implementing partners of sampled interventions
- Interviews with Moldovan Officials (beneficiary institutions of sampled interventions)
- Survey
- Websites of sampled interventions (where applicable)
- Progress reports of IFIs, several reports in the Moldovan newspapers where EU is mentioned, website EU4Moldova Action Documents, contract, latest/final report (as available) for sampled interventions.

Agriculture and rural development

The EU has increasingly implemented holistic rural development interventions which involved large social infrastructure such as wastewater systems. This has also been the result of adopting lessons learned from previous multi-annual planning efforts. These efforts have contributed towards increased visibility of EU Moldova cooperation and improved public recognition of EUs support to the country’s development. This has been generally the case but was particularly noticed in discussions with stakeholders in the focal regions where the EU is active.

Introduction and expanding implementation of the Leadership approach has also been beneficial in terms of visibility and positive opinion of rural population the support of EU in the country. Through the Local Action Groups rural population has benefited from the financial support of the European Union in a very tangible and demand driven manner.

In addition, the EU has also been more active about promotion of visibility in the regions of Moldova through various information campaigns targeting the rural population such as the EU for Rural Moldova which is designed to reflect on the support and consequent changed achieved in rural areas.
**Governance:**

Review of the available publications and websites from projects in the field of governance show good adherence to the visibility guidelines of the EU. The EU is usually clearly depicted as the donor. Pictures from events, corroborated by interviews, show that visibility guidelines are followed. Moldovan officials show a fair level of awareness of the EU’s contribution, when it comes to projects they have participated in for instance, they clearly associate their trainings to EU funding, even when these trainings are organised by another international organisation. The evaluation team found no indication that beneficiaries confused EU projects with other initiatives.

**Infrastructure**

Interviews with EBRD project officers and EU project officers confirmed that EU visibility guidelines have been applied by implementing partners. EU Delegation is invited for meetings. EUD is participating in regular meetings with implementing partners and assures presence during important events.

EU NIF contribution is mentioned in most of the documents which can be found online. For example, for the Moldovan Railways Restructuring Project: a visibility plan is annexed to the report of EBRD (2019) and includes 9 visibility activities.

**Education**

One of the most successful communication activities implemented in 2019 was the Special Lesson about Education Opportunities funded by the EU in the Republic of Moldova, which has been conducted in more than 1200 schools from the country during the youth and education campaign, targeting 330,000 pupils. Some of the schools organized open activities that were intensively disseminated to the public by local media for greater awareness.

The National Communication Campaign “Stronger Together: Creating Opportunities for Youth!” was a pilot initiative to organise a communication campaign of this scale, together with the regional campaign on the same topic implemented by the EU Neighbours East project.

Erasmus+ programme (and previous similar programmes, such as Tempus, for instance) are well known and have a long history of setting out visibility throughout. The Horizon 2020 programme is gaining more and more acclaim, including through visibility measures. Based on the 2020 Annual Survey Report, the infrastructure development projects are the most well-known EU-financed programmes in the country (58% of Moldovans aware of EU-funded programmes), followed by ‘educational programmes’ (43%, up 6%), which may be an attestation of the continued participation in Horizon 2020, Erasmus+ and Mobility Partnership Programme.

**Business environment**

All EU supported infrastructure projects (blended with NIF funds) are presented in the EU4Moldova website; same all interventions related to DCFTA (regional projects blended with NIF funds) can be found there. Furthermore, EU financed a specific action for increasing visibility for actions related to AA/DCFTA implementation in the framework of EU-funded assistance programmes.

There were positive communication opportunities in 2019 underlining how EU assistance is supporting Moldova’s citizens and the political commitments such as the 5th Anniversary of the AA and DCFTA for which a large exhibition was organised by the EU Delegation with a nation-wide communication campaign ‘Created in Moldova – appreciated in the World’ and several other communication tools under the EU4Business branding were developed.
Evaluation question 3: JCs and indicators

**EQ3. To what extent have the various aid modalities and financial instruments and their combinations been, and are at present appropriate in view of achieving the objectives of EU cooperation with Moldova?**

This EQ covers Efficiency and Relevance

JC 3.1: The mix of aid modalities and financial instruments was coherent, fit for purpose, and limited the risks.

JC 3.2: The implementation of projects through contribution agreements under the blending modality permitted a timely and adequately monitored implementation of the intervention.

JC 3.3: Budget support contributed to defining and achieving common objectives of the EU and the Republic of Moldova

**JC 3.1: The mix of aid modalities and financial instruments was coherent, fit for purpose, and limited the risks.**

The EU has mixed project approaches (twinning, technical assistance, contribution agreements, grants) with conditional financial support (budget support, blending, macro-financial assistance) coherently with its subject areas, and with its risk analysis. However, it may not always overcome difficulties and challenges, which sometimes may have contributed to occasional delays, or to cancellations of programmes, activities and payments.

This mix of modalities and the types of programmes which were cancelled or interrupted (budget support in particular) removed some of the Government’s leverage on the utilization of funds, as compared to the period before 2016 (budget support cuts) and 2017 (new SSF). It is coherent with the lessons learned from the risks which realized, as witnessed by exposure of the bank fraud scandal, in 2015-2016: the mix of aid modalities and types of financial support limited the re-materialisation of such risks, by diversifying these risks and increasing mitigation opportunities. It is also matching the thematic areas, and with the targeted groups. Assorted with strong conditionalities, it is fit for purpose: supporting the strategic objectives of the Association Agreement, with the Association Agenda, and the Twenty Deliverables for 2020 – provided some key external assumptions of the intervention logic were met, which was often not the case, which remains outside of the EU’s control.

Budget support programmes still accounted for a significant amount of the EU assistance before payments were suspended in 2015 due to the theft of EUR1billion from the banking sector and risks to macroeconomic stability of the country. With the second SSF, the re-targeting of a large part of EU support towards the local level and the citizens, directly led to increased recourse to blending and project modalities, because these were most adequate in these thematic areas, and for the concerned target groups.

This approach was coherent with increased efforts on energy and environment, biomass, support to SMEs. In parallel, support to the governance sector carried on mostly through technical assistance, contribution agreements and to a lesser extent twinning as a key means of support: project-based approaches have revealed great potential to accompany normative and institutional changes.
Indicator 3.1.1 Proportion of various modalities (grants, contribution agreements, technical assistance, twinning, blending, budget support) in the clusters identified for sampled interventions

Strength of evidence based: ARD-strong

Main source of information:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document review</th>
<th>Interviews</th>
<th>Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EC Implementing Decisions and their annexes Action Documents, contract, latest/final report (as available) for sampled interventions Portfolio review (database)</td>
<td>- Interviews with public officials in Moldova - Interviews with EU officials - Interviews with civil society representatives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The proportion of various modalities varies a lot from sector to sector. More resource-intensive sectors, such as agriculture and rural development, infrastructure, energy and biomass, as well as private sector support, more frequently resort to blending. Other sectors are more widely project-based, and, to a lesser extent, based on budget support.

The governance sector chiefly features a mix of technical assistance, financing agreements (with EU member States cooperation agencies or with other international organisations) and, on the decreasing trend, budget support, complemented by civil society grants.

In the agriculture and rural development sector financed bilaterally, the main modality involved contribution agreements which account for 55 percent of the total financing dedicated to the sector followed by budget support which equalled to 35 percent, twinning 4 percent, action grants 4 percent, technical assistance and other services which equalled to about 2.5 percent. Blending projects were primarily targeting private sector development in exception to the “Fruit Garden of Moldova” project which specifically targeted the horticultural sector. The total planned budget of the Fruit Garden of Moldova project alone (€120 million) exceeded the bilateral financing significantly.

There was a varied mix of implementation modalities in the case of civil society and confidence building: TA projects, grants, winning, indirect management with international organisations (UNDP, WHO, IOM) indirect management with member state organisation (GIZ).

Overview of key interventions includes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Contract title</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Planned amount</th>
<th>Paid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Civil society advocacy for inclusive and fair elections in the Republic of Moldova, compliant with EU and OSCE/ODIHR recommendations and human rights commitments – CSO grant</td>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>€ 400.000</td>
<td>€ 360.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Strengthening of the policy development process in the context of the implementation of the Association Agreement - TA</td>
<td>TA</td>
<td>€ 1.825.000</td>
<td>€ 884.591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Assistance to the implementation of the European Union High Level Advisors' mission to the Republic of Moldova 2016-2018 - TA</td>
<td>TA</td>
<td>€ 11.212.959</td>
<td>€ 11.212.959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>Amount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>AGREED - Activating Governance Reform for Enhancing Development - Grant</td>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>€359,279</td>
<td>€95,625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Support to Public Finance Policy Reforms in Moldova (PFPR) – BS and complementary support</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>€26,700,000</td>
<td>€26,700,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Consolidation and Strengthening the External Public Audit in the Republic of Moldova - Grant</td>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>€1,438,262</td>
<td>€1,438,262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Support to development of an effective internal control and audit environment in the public sector in Moldova - Grant</td>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>€1,200,000</td>
<td>€1,000,172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>Technical assistance on developing e-procurement system in the Republic of Moldova - TA</td>
<td>TA</td>
<td>€1,178,920</td>
<td>€235,784</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>TWINNING - Capacity building of the National Centre for Personal Data Protection of the Republic of Moldova - Twinning</td>
<td>TW</td>
<td>€999,911</td>
<td>€872,614</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Support to public administration reform processes - TA</td>
<td>TA</td>
<td>€2,794,400</td>
<td>€1,140,534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Support to the professional capacity development and motivation of the Public Administration employees in the Republic of Moldova - TA</td>
<td>TA</td>
<td>€1,994,200</td>
<td>€1,067,260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Twinning Support to the Civil Service Modernization in the Republic of Moldova in line with EU best practices - Twinning</td>
<td>TW</td>
<td>€1,097,028</td>
<td>€1,097,028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Improvement of Regional Statistics in the Republic of Moldova - TA</td>
<td>TA</td>
<td>€1,945,050</td>
<td>€1,945,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Support to local public authorities in ATU Gagauzia - TA</td>
<td>TA</td>
<td>€3,000,000</td>
<td>€2,970,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Cutting edge improvements in the public procurement system in Moldova through inclusiveness, creativity and law-abiding practices - Grant</td>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>€232,105</td>
<td>€208,895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Total for Good governance and public administration</td>
<td></td>
<td>€89,681,952</td>
<td>€54,533,611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Scale-up of Budget Support SPSP Energy - BS</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>€1,000,000</td>
<td>€1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Chisinau Water Development Programme - Blending</td>
<td>BL</td>
<td>€13,785,000</td>
<td>€9,230,426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Moldova Roads Rehabilitation IV</td>
<td>BL</td>
<td>€13,758,350</td>
<td>€5,625,090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Moldovan Railways Restructuring Project</td>
<td>BL</td>
<td>€5,200,000</td>
<td>€2,200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Project Title</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>Project Amount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Renewables and Energy Efficiency for Public Buildings (REEPB)</td>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>€ 859,693</td>
<td>€ 430,004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Comprehensive demonstrational project for sustainable energy development in the town of Orhei.</td>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>€ 767,699</td>
<td>€ 632,810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Green Light Moldova - Modernisation and Saving Energy at Street Lighting.</td>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>€ 400,000</td>
<td>€ 392,274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Moldova Energy and Biomass Project (Phase II)</td>
<td>Financing agreement (not BL)</td>
<td>€ 9,410,704</td>
<td>€ 9,244,294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Moldova Roads Rehabilitation IV</td>
<td>BL</td>
<td>€ 1,541,651</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Support to modernisation of the Energy Sector in the Republic of Moldova</td>
<td>TA</td>
<td>€ 1,374,800</td>
<td>€ 1,098,840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Construction of Water Supply and Sanitation infrastructure as well as Energy Efficiency in Public buildings</td>
<td>BL</td>
<td>€ 39,800,000</td>
<td>€ 11,916,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Creation of excellence center through piloting demonstrative new energy efficiency technologies and renewable energy sources in Festelita community</td>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>€ 500,000</td>
<td>€ 441,152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Cantemir Thermal Rehabilitation of Educational Buildings CanTREB</td>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>€ 674,240</td>
<td>€ 510,043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Efficient public lighting in Calarasi city - Firefly in the heart of forests</td>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>€ 544,600</td>
<td>€ 407,433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EU4ENV EU4WI+EU4ENERGY</td>
<td>Grant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Moldova-Romania Interconnection Phase I</td>
<td>BL</td>
<td>€ 40,750,000</td>
<td>€ 810,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Support to the reform of the Transport Sector in the Republic of Moldova</td>
<td>TA</td>
<td>€ 901,510</td>
<td>€ 707,910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>EU4MOLDOVA: Clean Water for Cahul</td>
<td>Financing agreement (not BL)</td>
<td>€ 10,900,000</td>
<td>€ 734,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total for Energy, infrastructure, environment and biomass</td>
<td></td>
<td>€ 142,210,485</td>
<td>€ 45,422,916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EIB-004 SME Finance Facility-EIB window</td>
<td>BL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SME Finance Facility Phase I - EBRD/KfW</td>
<td>BL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DCFATA Initiative East (EIB) Guarantees Window</td>
<td>BL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DCFATA Facility EBRD DCFATA INCENTIVES FOR SMEs</td>
<td>BL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EFSE</td>
<td>BL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>SUPPORT TO THE QUALITY INFRASTRUCTURE FRAMEWORK WITHIN A DCFTA CONTEXT IN THE REPUBLIC OF MOLDOVA</td>
<td>TA</td>
<td>€ 7.907.738</td>
<td>€ 5.599.855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Direct grant to ODIMM “Support to SMEs in rural areas”</td>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>€ 4.000.000</td>
<td>€ 2.589.069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Business Academy for Women (BAW)</td>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>€ 223.938</td>
<td>€ 200.734</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Support to the implementation of the VET reform in Moldova</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>€ 15.100.000</td>
<td>€ 15.100.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Financial support to the participation of the Republic of Moldova in the EU programme Horizon 2020 for the years 2016-2017</td>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>€ 985.193</td>
<td>€ 880.023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Erasmus + (structural, capacity building projects, ICM ~EUR 30 mil. 2014-2020)</td>
<td>Grant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Better Social services through a sustainable partnership between the civil society and the government</td>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>€ 1.989.888</td>
<td>€ 1.634.111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Joint Initiatives of Civil Society Organizations from both Nistru riverbanks for Socio Vocational Integration of Disadvantaged Youth from Republic of Moldova (SVIS Moldova)</td>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>€ 590.990</td>
<td>€ 555.909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Technical assistance to support CSO development in the Republic of Moldova</td>
<td>TA</td>
<td>€ 860.500</td>
<td>€ 688.400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXXX</td>
<td>Respective components of the three grants under CSF (EEF, SFM, KASS)</td>
<td>Grant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>Expenditure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Local civil society contributes to economic and social development in Moldova</td>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>€ 2,000,000</td>
<td>€ 1,800,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Citizens' Empowerment in the Republic of Moldova</td>
<td>Financing agreement (not BL)</td>
<td>€ 4,900,000</td>
<td>€ 1,070,385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total for Civil Society</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>€ 10,341,378</strong></td>
<td><strong>€ 5,748,805</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>CBM V</td>
<td>Financing Agreement (not BL)</td>
<td>€ 10,600,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>CBM IV</td>
<td>Financing Agreement (not BL)</td>
<td>€ 23,000,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXXX</td>
<td>Twinning project culture</td>
<td>TW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total for Transnistria</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>€ 33,600,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>€</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>&quot;ENPARD Moldova – Support to Agriculture and Rural Development&quot; SRC</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>€ 64,000,000</td>
<td>€ 48,946,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Increasing the competitiveness of the agri-food sector through integration to domestic and global value chains and strengthening the water supply and sanitation infrastructure in rural areas focusing on safe wastewater disposal in Cantemir</td>
<td>Financing agreement (not BL)</td>
<td>€ 8,200,000</td>
<td>€ 5,400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>EU4Moldova: focal regions</td>
<td>Financing Agreement (not BL)</td>
<td>€ 22,800,000</td>
<td>€ 5,377,884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXXX</td>
<td>Moldova Fruit Garden Project</td>
<td></td>
<td>€ 8,600,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>LEADER approach for rural prosperity in Moldova</td>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>€ 1,000,000</td>
<td>€ 655,073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total for Agriculture and Local Development</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>€ 104,600,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>€ 60,378,957</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Increased Efficiency, Accountability and Transparency of Courts in Moldova</td>
<td>TA</td>
<td>€ 2,078,700</td>
<td>€ 2,078,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Support to the Pre-Trial Investigation, Prosecution and the Defence Set-Up in Moldova</td>
<td>TA</td>
<td>€ 1,853,585</td>
<td>€ 1,853,585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Consolidate capacity of the national anti-discrimination system in the Republic of Moldova through inclusive society participation</td>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>€ 185,723</td>
<td>€ 185,723</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Support to the Constitutional Court of Moldova</td>
<td>TA</td>
<td>€ 1,317,146</td>
<td>€ 1,317,146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXXX</td>
<td>CoE PGG I and II (hate crime, CLEP, economic crime etc)</td>
<td>Financing Agreement (not BL)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Project Title</td>
<td>Grant Type</td>
<td>Grant Amount</td>
<td>Appropriation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Increasing the respect for women's rights in Moldova through combating gender-based violence</td>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>€ 350,000</td>
<td>€ 332,756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Twinning: Support to the strengthening of the operational capacities of the Law Enforcement Agencies of the Republic of Moldova in the field of prevention and investigation of criminal acts of corruption.</td>
<td>TW</td>
<td>€ 1,000,000</td>
<td>€ 987,743</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Palanca Jointly Operated Border Crossing Point</td>
<td>Financing agreement (Not BL)</td>
<td>€ 4,500,000</td>
<td>€ 4,430,675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Sustainable community partnerships to support the rights of persons belonging to minorities in Moldova</td>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>€ 380,000</td>
<td>€ 378,098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Support to efficient prevention and fight against corruption in the justice sector</td>
<td>TA</td>
<td>€ 2,000,000</td>
<td>€ 1,273,872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Reform of the initial and continuous training of the police system in the Republic of Moldova</td>
<td>TW</td>
<td>€ 2,000,000</td>
<td>€ 1,800,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Support to the police reform in the Republic of Moldova</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>€ 2,699,400</td>
<td>€ 1,350,185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Civic monitoring of the Police Reform in Moldova</td>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>€ 384,000</td>
<td>€ 260,243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Let All of Us Say NO to Torture in Moldova: Civil Society against Torture</td>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>€ 697,243</td>
<td>€ 627,519</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Support to the enforcement, probation and rehabilitation systems in Moldova</td>
<td>TA</td>
<td>€ 1,790,700</td>
<td>€ 1,790,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>Strengthen the rule of law and anti-corruption mechanisms in the Republic of Moldova</td>
<td>Financing agreement (not BL)</td>
<td>€ 7,800,000</td>
<td>€ 1,717,584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>Support to the development and implementation of justice policies in the Republic of Moldova</td>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>€ 59,917</td>
<td>€ 46,834</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total for Rule of Law</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>€ 29,096,414</strong></td>
<td><strong>€ 20,431,364</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Indicator 3.1.2 Explicit match between aid modalities and risk analysis**

Strength of evidence based: Medium

**Main source of information:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document review</th>
<th>Interviews</th>
<th>Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>European Court of Auditors Publications Special Report 25/2019:</td>
<td>Interviews with public officials in Moldova</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Data quality in budget support: weaknesses in some indicators and in the verification of the payment for variable tranches

Action Documents, contract, latest/final report (as available) for sampled interventions SSFs

Interviews with civil society representatives

Risk analysis is reportedly systematically done by the EUD (but could be shared with consultants). SSFs and project documents systematically include a list of risks weighing against successful implementation. Aid modalities matched the risk analysis as presented in the multiannual support frameworks. In particular, based on risk analysis, according to interviewees, the overall volume of budget support was drastically reduced from 2015 onward, to be replaced by project modalities, while regional blending increased.

The risks most frequently anticipated by the SSFs, and the project documents enter three main categories:

- Risk regarding political environment and governance such as Political instability and uncertainty disagreements between the line ministries as to policies.
- Risk regarding cooperation and coordination: Including conceptual disagreements between the Government and the donors/IFIs regarding the priorities, objectives and approach to be pursued in order to stimulate rural development; Lack of agreement with regard to the prioritization.
- Risk Regarding Lack of Resources: Lack of financial resources including budgetary resources necessary to co-finance investment projects and human resource capacities to drive sector policies; Lack of interest amongst local entrepreneurs and foreign investors.

However, the evaluation team could not find, in any of the reviewed document, a full-fledged risk analysis quantifying:

- The likelihood of the risks,
- The level of impact in case risks realised,
- The preventive measures to be taken against realisation of the respective risks,
- The mitigating measures to be taken in case of realisation of the respective risks.

A good practice of most explicit risk management can be found in the agricultural sector. Following an assessment of ARD in Eastern Partnership countries during 2012, various gaps and priorities were identified, including a general lack of rural development policy and supporting measures. The chosen modality of budget support reacted to these risks. Budget support as a modality is often effective to incentivise changes in the policy context. The EU monitored the progress in this regard to make sure that for example the Government of Moldova approved a rural development strategy, which is consistent with the agriculture and rural development priorities for the sector reform. In this context, the Government approved the 2014-2020 National Agricultural and Rural Development Strategy (NARDS) in March 2014, which addressed some of the gaps identified earlier and contributed to changes within associated legislation and budget allocations. Release of first Fixed Tranche of the budget support component among others was dependent on the progress regarding the implementation of public policy as laid out in the NARDS. Such as condition was viewed as a precondition for receipt of EU budget support.

Moreover, the modalities were complementary as the technical assistance interventions were highly effective in terms of helping the government to achieve target budget support indicators. The purpose of the technical assistance in the framework of ENPARD was to assist the MARDE and its subordinated agencies and the NFSA in the accomplishment of ENPARD BSPs overall objectives.
Improved capacities and platforms for donor and wider sectoral coordination has been one of the main aims of EU financed Technical Assistance support. The technical assistance interventions allowed capacity building and institutional strengthening of government institutions including MARDE. As conformed by stakeholder interviews the latter has made substantial improvements in how it communicates and interacts with the relevant interest groups who represent the agricultural and rural development sectors. Working groups that were set up to develop sectoral policies are now more inclusive and more broadly based and the consultation procedures on policy initiatives are much more genuine and do not at all resemble the previous system whereby consultations with the relevant interest was a mere formality. Although the need remains to improve aid coordination further.

To address financial risks, next to the other modalities that address risks regarding lack of resources, EU support through blending aimed to leverage financial means to address risks regarding lack of financial resources. The Fruit Garden of Moldova project provides new opportunities for financing for the horticultural sector businesses through the access to the resources of the European Investment Bank provided through the financing contract signed between the Republic of Moldova and the EIB.

Indicator 3.1.3 Logical links between programming and implementation, including appropriate sequencing of support in sampled interventions

Strength of evidence based: Strong

Main source of information:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document review</th>
<th>Interviews</th>
<th>Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Action Documents, contract, latest/final report (as available) for sampled interventions</td>
<td>Interviews with public officials in Moldova</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review of portfolio (database)</td>
<td>Interviews with EU officials</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programming of the European Neighbourhood Instrument (ENI) - 2014-2020.</td>
<td>Interviews with civil society representatives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There were logical links between the EU support envisaged and the interventions financed. EU support supported the targeted sectors by mixing several forms of cooperation: for example, in the case of the support to public finance sector, a budget support operation was accompanied by a technical assistance contract and projects identified based on call for proposals and aiming to strengthen civil society’s capacity to monitor the public budget.

Appropriate sequencing of support in sampled interventions and the evolution of programming was reflected in implementation. The first multiannual programming document SSF 2014-2017 had a predominant focus on agriculture development through development of the policy, legal and institutional framework in the agriculture and rural development sector and contributing to the competitiveness of the agri-food industry. This was logical, considering the identified deficiencies in that regard and the need for a sound policy environment as a bases for provision of further support. The focus on the agricultural
sector included development of the policy, legal and institutional framework and capacity development of sectoral policy for Moldova’s agriculture and rural areas. The strong link between programming and implementation in this regard was among others created through the largest bilaterally financed intervention in the sector namely ENPARD. Significant progress has been made regarding creation of the policy environment in the sector including development and modification of national planning documents such as the NARDS and improving local capacities. Funding through the Fruit Garden of Moldova programme followed the same logic and aimed to revitalising the horticulture sector in Moldova.

The second multiannual programming document SSF 2017-2020 was more directed towards rural development and general improvement of the business environment, private sector development and trade facilitation. The focus on agricultural development was therefore less explicit. In terms of programme implementation during 2017-2020 through interventions such as DEVRAM and EU: Focal Regions although support to the development of the policy environment and boost competitiveness of the agri-food sector continued, nevertheless increasingly more focus was laid on general rural development through support to business development and general social infrastructure.

Overall, in sectors where the risk was assessed as more acceptable, the mix of modalities was more diverse. For instance, support to Public Finance Management and police support, included budget support, technical assistance (including high level advisors and classical technical assistance), twinning, civil society grant and CSO strengthening. EU support (technical assistance) to the transport sector, followed a budget support programme financed in 2011 but still under implementation.

Sectors where higher risk was identified were supported mostly through project modalities (justice support) but with a variety of project types (contribution agreements with international organisations, technical assistance, CSO grants). Another approach to limit the risks, in the private and infrastructure sectors for instance, was the use of blending operations in partnership with international financial institutions.

**Indicator 3.1.4. Timeliness of implementation of sampled interventions**

**Strength of evidence based:** Medium

**Main source of information:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document review</th>
<th>Interviews</th>
<th>Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Action Documents, contract, latest/final report (as available) for sampled interventions</td>
<td>Interviews with public officials in Moldova</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review of portfolio (database)</td>
<td>Interviews with EU officials</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programming of the European Neighbourhood Instrument (ENI) - 2014-2020.</td>
<td>Interviews with civil society representatives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programming of the European Neighbourhood Instrument (ENI) – 2017-2020</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The sampled interventions using a project approach were generally implemented in a timely manner although some of the interventions are still in progress and no progress reports and final evaluations of the larger interventions were available to the evaluation team. Nevertheless, there were signs of that some of the components in certain interventions had to be cancelled and or modified as they were not timely.

A few budget operations were delayed, or, in the case of the justice sector, interrupted due to non-achievement of progress towards targets on time. An example in this regard was development of the Proposal for organisational structure of MARDE in the framework of ENPAR TA. This output was planned when the reorganisation of MARDE was on the agenda in 2016 /2017. Yet the reorganisation was completed before this output was produced and so it no longer was appropriate.

Careful review of the programme documents revealed that, more than the timeliness of interventions, comparison between planned and paid amounts was indicative of whether implementation was on track. Based on our portfolio as communicated by the EUD, about a half of the planned amounts were effectively disbursed by October 2020. This difference relates to the cancellation of some projects/programmes or activities, or to delays.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Sum of Planned amount</th>
<th>Sum of Paid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>€ 181,947,015</td>
<td>€ 133,684,066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>€ 141,006,550</td>
<td>€ 118,916,470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>€ 74,350,613</td>
<td>€ 43,932,684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>€ 114,404,061</td>
<td>€ 48,295,124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>€ 168,684,723</td>
<td>€ 36,889,562</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>€ 89,337,954</td>
<td>€ 18,498,009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>€ 63,400,860</td>
<td>€ 655,073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Other – see below)</td>
<td>€ 60,425,654</td>
<td>€ 28,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>€ 893,557,431</td>
<td>€ 428,870,987</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Under ‘other’ in the table above, planned and paid amounts include:
• Total indicative amounts of EC contribution to the entire regional project of Partnership for Good Governance with the Council of Europe I (PGG I) (2015-2018) (€ 30,400,000) and Partnership for Good Governance with the Council of Europe II (PGG II) (2019-2021) (€ 2,025,654). Paid amounts were not available to the ET for this project.
• The action ‘Sector budget support to the Justice Sector Reforms’ which did not have an assigned contract year in the data used. The amount of € 28,000,000 was indicated for both planned and paid amounts. However, it is the ET’s understanding that this was blocked in 2017.

Figure 5: sum of planned and paid amounts

As reported by IFIs, several blending operations also suffered from delays in the attainment of targets towards the disbursement of tranches. This was the case, for instance, of blending operations in the area of transport, or SME support, due to difficulties in the procurement process, linked to low capacity of potential applicants within Moldova.
Based on limited sources available regarding the key interventions, the evaluation team found several examples of projects which were not fully on target.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intervention components selected (final sample)</th>
<th>Planned duration</th>
<th>Planned start date/contract signed</th>
<th>on schedule</th>
<th>extended</th>
<th>reported deliverables completed on time</th>
<th>reported deliverables delayed.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Core programme: Budget support ENPARD including complementary measures (AT + CBM);</td>
<td>60 months</td>
<td></td>
<td>No (latest report)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018 ENI 400.308 Support to police reform TA</td>
<td>38 months</td>
<td>Sep/18</td>
<td>85% activities addressed but not finished</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core programmes: ENPI 2014 349.066 “ATRECO” GIZ Courts; PGG 2349 CEPEJ.</td>
<td>30 months</td>
<td>29/09/2014</td>
<td>No (latest report)</td>
<td>Yes, extended to 42 months</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core programme: NEAR TS 2017 388.469 Grant Institute for Dem (Let us all say no to torture).</td>
<td>36 months</td>
<td>01/12/2017</td>
<td>ROM report in 2019 highlights delays</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction of water supply and sanitation infrastructure as well as energy efficiency in public buildings</td>
<td>39 months</td>
<td>12/12/2017</td>
<td>14 projects ongoing</td>
<td>4 projects temporarily suspended</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU Moldova Biomass Project</td>
<td>35 months</td>
<td>22/12/2014</td>
<td>Extended from 35 to 47 months</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complementary programme - Twinning project “Support to promote the cultural heritage in Moldova”</td>
<td>24 months</td>
<td>07/09/2017</td>
<td>Extended- was 26 months</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
JC 3.2. The implementation of projects through contribution agreements under the blending modality permitted a timely and adequately monitored implementation of the intervention.

All operations co-financed under the blending modality at national level faced some challenges during implementation and needed extensions in time or faced an increase in costs. Reasons for need of extension were most often related to the complexity of design of works, cumbersome procedures of elaboration and tendering (according to implementing partners rules), limited acceptable technical and financial offers of tenderers, lack of qualified workers available in the Moldovan market, need for revision of design and/or cost increases.

EU financial regulations (n+3) seem difficult to adapt in this context and made Moldova loose important volume of grant funds.

Indicator 3.2.1. % Of funds under blending operations implemented as foreseen

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strength of evidence based: Strong</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Main source of information:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document review</th>
<th>Interviews</th>
<th>Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Progress reports provided by implementing partners</td>
<td>EU officials</td>
<td>EBRD officials</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is impossible to establish exactly the progress in implementation of the blending operations as all actions are composed of multiple activities, some of these activities have been implemented on time, others suffering important delays. However, it seems evident that none of the blended programmes implemented in Moldova has been implemented as foreseen. The following table gives an overview of the situation of national investment projects blended with NIF funds.

Delays are more frequently related to difficulties with procurement; that means long time needed to prepare tender documents acceptable for all involved parties, complex tender procedures (with no-objections from different stakeholders involved), poor response to tenders by national and international companies. A specific difficulty is related to the social and environmental standards applied by international banks which imply complex processes in the case of land acquisition. Other difficulties are related to the lack of available qualified manpower in Moldova as there was/is a big worker emigration to Russia and EU Member States.

In some cases, there were difficulties for implementing partners to prepare the preconditions for disbursement of funds from development banks.

In general, the period of 3 years foreseen for NIF funds to be contracted (N+3) appears too short in the challenging context of co-financing an investment project with different international development banks.

National Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRIS-No</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Starting</th>
<th>Implementing Partner</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Bank</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Moldova Roads Rehabilitation IV</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>EBRD</td>
<td>Due to delays, the implementation period was extended for 24 months up to 30. November 2022. (Addendum 1). The contribution of EU funding was engaged in the phase 2 of the Action. As a result of the delays in procurement of Vulcanesti bypass works (due to implementation capacity bottlenecks at SRA and slow preparatory process, including land acquisition and design) the 3-year contracted deadline based on EU NIF financing conditions has expired on 21 December 2017 and the grant was no longer be available to fund the works and supervision. The amount of EUR 9.7 million of grant has been therefore lost by the Government. For the same reasons as procurement of works the supervision tenders have been delayed as well and for Bahmut bypass the supervision contract has been signed only in April 2018. As the contracting deadline on EU NIF has funds expired it is now funded from EIB loan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moldovan Railways Restructuring Project</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>EBRD</td>
<td>With the EU NIF funds mainly part of the acquisition of 12 locomotives is financed. The handover of the locomotives was in 2020. There seem to be less delays related to the EU co-financed action then with the overall project. However, in December 2018 EU granted an “Extension of the Last Availability Date of Grant Financing” by 18 months to 14 March 2021. The difficulties encountered with the project relate mostly to the following: (i) weak implementation capacity on the client’s side (both CFM and the related government entities) and poor support from the procurement consultant in early stages (was replaced). (ii) delays with obtaining relevant approvals and comments, including in relation to Project-related TC assignments. (iii) payment delays of an auditor’s invoices by the authorities, hence, delay in providing IFRS audit reports; and (iv) delays in providing progress reports due to poor support of the relevant consultant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chisinau Water Development Programme</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>EBRD</td>
<td>This is a EUR 59 million Priority Investment Programme to modernise the City’s water supply, sewage collection system and treatment in order to improve living conditions, reduce health risks for the City’s population and prevent excessive exploitation of natural resources and environmental pollution. The EBRD is providing a EUR 24 million loan to ACC to implement the Project with co-financing from the EIB in the form of a EUR 24 million loan and from the EU NIF in the form of a EUR 11 million capital expenditure grant. There are important delays in execution of works and an addendum for extension</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the implementation period will be necessary. Main problems are related to design issues which led to cost increase and delays.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRIS-No</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Starting</th>
<th>Implementing Partner</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>366717</td>
<td>Moldova North Water Project</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>EBRD</td>
<td>The project has been cancelled as the Government of Moldova could not comply with the preconditions and sign the loan agreement in time. The project was cancelled in March 2018.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>308751</td>
<td>Moldelectrica Power Transmission Project</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>EBRD</td>
<td>The project entered into force the 10.4. 2013; due to delays the overall implementation period was extended to 90 months, that means up 9. october 2021.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400311</td>
<td>Moldova-Romania Interconnection Phase I</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>EBRD</td>
<td>Contribution Agreement signed in December 2018 only. In a recent presentation a delay of 7 months due to COVD-19 is indicated as highly possible.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The regional programmes seem to have faced less problems concerning the implementation period. However, there is some evidence that the absorption of funds in Moldova of regional blended programmes was less, due to the weakness and reluctance to give loans of the banking sector (after the bank fraud in 2015).

**Indicator 3.2.2 number of blending operations which were implemented according to the original timeframe**

Strength of evidence based: Strong

**Main source of information:**

- Document review
- Interviews
- Survey
- Contribution Agreements and Addenda
- EBRD “cloud” Huddle
- EUD staff
- EBRD staff

All blending operations faced some challenges and needed extension in time or faced an increase in costs. It is impossible to establish exactly the progress in implementation of the blending operations as all actions are composed of multiple activities, some of them being implemented in time, others suffering important delays.

**National Projects**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRIS-No</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Starting</th>
<th>Implementing Partner</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>265-548</td>
<td>Moldova Road Rehabilitation Project III</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>EBRD</td>
<td>Due to delays, the implementation period was extended for 24 months to 14.3.2021 Extension of the Last Availability Date of Grant Financing by 18 months to 14.3.2021</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The regional programmes seem to have faced less problems during the implementation period. This seems normal as regional programmes concentrated in blending financing instruments.

**Indicator 3.2.3. volume of funds lost to difficulties in compliance with EU regulations (N+3)**

Strength of evidence based: strong

**Main source of information:**

- Document review
- Interviews
- Interviews with EUD staff
- Interviews with EBRD staff
- Survey

As a result of the delays in procurement of Vulcanesti bypass works (due to implementation capacity bottlenecks at SRA and slow preparatory process, including land acquisition and design) the 3-year contracted deadline based on EU NIF financing conditions has expired on 21 December 2017 and the grant was no longer be available to fund the works and supervision. The amount of EUR 9.7 million
of grant has been therefore lost by the Government. For the same reasons as procurement of works the supervision tenders have been delayed as well and for Bahmut bypass the supervision contract has been signed only in April 2018. As the contracting deadline on EU NIF has funds expired it is now funded from EIB loan. Reasons for delays are mainly: difficulties with procurement (not enough qualified offers); difficulties in finding qualified manpower.

JC 3.3. Budget support contributed to defining and achieving common objectives of the EU and the Republic of Moldova

- All budget support interventions were tackling priority sectors for the development of Moldova. BS was the preferred instrument for implementation of EU cooperation with Moldova. Almost all-important sectors received budget support (Transport, Water, Health, Police, Justice, PFM, Public Sector, VET, etc). Budget support permitted the EU to promote the development of Moldova by strengthening national policies. However, although EU supported national policies, their implementation did not always as quick as foreseen. Frequent changes of the political context affected the appropriation of policies. The signature of the EU–Moldova DCFTA started a new process in EU and Republic of Moldova relations.

- After 2015 no new budget support programmes were approved by EU for Moldova; existing budget support programmes were either put on hold or suffered from delays in disbursement of tranches because the general conditions of budget support contracts were not considered as complied with. Nevertheless, budget support programmes – even put on hold- permitted EU to concentrate on policy dialogue and to make GoM understand that EU financial support is conditioned by progress in reform of the justice sector, fight of corruption and progress in implementation of DFCA.

- NIF contributions to investment projects implemented in Moldova strengthened the physical integration of Moldova with the European Union by supporting transport and energy sector. NIF contributions to the regional financial instruments for the private sector including SME supported the DFCA.

Budget Support programmes accounted for a significant amount of the EU assistance (more than 30% of the overall financing volume) before payments were suspended in 2015 due to the theft of EUR1billion from the banking sector and risks to macroeconomic stability of the country. During this period, the EUD had used policy dialogue and technical assistance to promote the implementation of agreed reforms.

EU used budget support as an instrument for pushing for reforms and for undertaking a policy dialogue with the Government of Moldova, IMF and EU Member States. Application of strict conditionalities for financial assistance underlined the willingness of EU to link support with progress made on the rule of law, human rights and democratic principles.

In November 2016, Moldova formalised a USD179 M programme with the IMF, following steps taken to address financial sector governance issues. On this basis that general conditions were met, payments of EUR45.2 M under EU BS were made in December 2016. At the same time, in close cooperation, our partners, the World Bank and Romania also resumed payments in complementary programmes. This milestone also provided the basis for the signature of a new Police Budget Support programme with an overall budget of EUR 57 M, a key sector identified under the SSF. In designing this programme, the recommendations of the September 2016 report of the European Court of Auditors were duly considered.

From 2017 onward no new budget support operations were concluded in Moldova. Most budget support programmes are gradually phasing out and were used as a basis for policy dialogue and as a leverage to promote and obtain the implementation of agreed reforms in key areas such as trade, visa-liberalisation, rural development, to support macro-economic stability and to improve the economic
governance (stronger and more transparent budgeting process, stronger budget oversight by the Court of Auditors and the Parliament.

Specific attention was given to strengthening the public administration in Moldova and to the assessment of both general and specific conditions agreed with the Moldovan authorities. This has been continued over the full implementation period in line with the Council Conclusions of February 2018 on the Republic of Moldova and the EP resolution of November 2018 on the implementation of the EU association agreement with Moldova, in 2018, the Commission has continued to apply strict conditionality in its financial assistance. The EU Delegation played a key role in implementing this policy and due to, with the following two achievements: In light of the deterioration of the rule of law and democratic principles in Moldova in 2018 (i.e. most emblematic element is the non-transparent invalidation of the mayoral elections in the capital city of Chisinau), the Commission has re-calibrated and reduced the EU assistance to Moldova (to about € 50 M for year 2017 and 2018 down from €80 M when reforms were ongoing) and redirect support to projects that impact directly citizens.

For the same reason, Macro financial assistance (€ 100 M) and Budget Support payments (worth € 44 M) have been put on hold pending tangible progress are made on the rule of law, human rights and democratic principles. However, due to the political instability in Moldova and slow progress in reforms the predictability of funds is rather limited. In fact, in many cases the achievement of indicators remained outside the control of the sectors. The timing of budget support disbursements has been significantly delayed, adding to its unpredictability as a source of resources. Budget planning and resource allocation decision-making were adversely affected by uncertainty over budget support disbursements.

**Indicator 3.3.1. Planned disbursement of funds compared to actual disbursement of funds**

**Strength of evidence based:** strong

**Main source of information:**
- Document review
- Interviews
- Survey
- Interviews with stakeholders in the Ministry of Finance EU and Technical Assistance

Budget Support programmes were a highly appreciated instrument and accounted for more than 30% of the overall financing volume of EU national cooperation with Moldova. However, in 2015 budget support operations were suspended after the major fraud in the banking sector, which affected the stability of the country as well. From this time onward no new BS interventions were financed with exception of new Police Budget Support programme (financed in 2016). Precondition for the signature of the Police Budget Support was the formalization of a Macroeconomic Programme with the IMF.

Close co-ordination of EU with the IMF programme was ensured and disbursements of budget support for 2017 only took place in December 2017 following the positive conclusions of the second IMF review. As a result of this careful assessment of performance against agreed targets, a total of €36.3 million out of maximum €75.5 million was disbursed. There were no disbursements under the Justice budget support programme (out of a possible maximum of €28.2 million) due to insufficient progress in implementing the National Justice reform strategy.

This overall context made that predictability of disbursement of funds is rather limited. The timing of budget support disbursements has been significantly delayed. Due to strict application of the conditionality criteria in most cases only part of the maximum tranche could be disbursed, according to interviews with Ministry of Finance budget planning and resource allocation decision-making were adversely affected by uncertainty over budget support disbursements.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRIS number and Title of the Programme</th>
<th>EU financing</th>
<th>Implementation period</th>
<th>Disbursed</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENPI 2010/ 258-486 Sector Policy Support Programme on Economic Stimulation in Rural Areas</td>
<td>€42,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EaPIC 2012 - top-up of the SPSP Economic Stimulation in Rural Area</td>
<td>€14,000,000</td>
<td>2010-2012</td>
<td>M€13,16 paid in 2014</td>
<td>Final Evaluation available considering the 3 different programmes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENPI/2010/258-486 EaPIC Top-up 1 of ESRA EaPIC Top-up 2 of ESRA Sector Policy Support Programme: ESRA Finance Agreement</td>
<td>€42,000,000 +€30,000,000 (including toping ups)</td>
<td>11/2010-11/2014</td>
<td>almost all spent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENI/2014/034-132 Support to Implementation of the DCFTA process Finance Agreement (SCR)</td>
<td>€25,000,000 + €5,000,000 (CM)</td>
<td>11/14-8/19</td>
<td>M€ 16,04</td>
<td>Final Evaluation available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENPI/2013/024-405 SRC &quot;SUPPORT THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE VISA LIBERALISATION ACTION PLAN&quot;</td>
<td>€20,000,000</td>
<td>2014-2018</td>
<td>Disbursed M€ 15,9</td>
<td>Final Evaluation available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENI/2014/034-128 ENPARD Moldova – Support to Agriculture and Rural Development</td>
<td>€ 53,000,000 BS € 11,000,000 (CM)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Closed -paid M€ 48,946</td>
<td>Final Evaluation started</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENI/2014/033-684 Support to Public Finance Policy Reforms in Moldova (PFPR)</td>
<td>€ 33,000,000 BS M€ 4,000,000 (CM)</td>
<td>17.10. 2014- 2020 + closure period</td>
<td></td>
<td>A final evaluation report is available (12/2018)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support to the implementation of the VET reform in Moldova</td>
<td>M€15,1</td>
<td>2014-2017</td>
<td></td>
<td>Evaluation is ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENI/2012/023-420 Sector budget support to the Justice Sector Reforms</td>
<td>M€ 58</td>
<td>2013-2017</td>
<td></td>
<td>M€ 28 were blocked in 2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ENPI/2015/038144 Police Reform**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Forseen Payments</th>
<th>2017 Q2</th>
<th>2018 Q2</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fixed component</td>
<td>7,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable component</td>
<td>10,000,000</td>
<td>12,000,000</td>
<td>10,000,000</td>
<td>12,000,000</td>
<td>44,000,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7,000,000</td>
<td>10,000,000</td>
<td>12,000,000</td>
<td>10,000,000</td>
<td>12,000,000</td>
<td>51,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENPARD Moldova – Support to Agriculture and Rural Development € 53 million for budget support € 11 million for complementary support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2015</strong></td>
<td><strong>2016</strong></td>
<td><strong>2017</strong></td>
<td><strong>2018</strong></td>
<td><strong>2019</strong></td>
<td><strong>paid</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fixed component</strong></td>
<td>17,000,000</td>
<td>0 (2Q)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>ENI/2014/034-132 Support to Implementation of the DCFTA process Finance Agreement (SCR)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2014</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fixed component</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Variable component</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>paid</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>ENPI/2011/280724 SPSP &quot;Support to Reform of the Energy Sector&quot;</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2011</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fixed component</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Variable component</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>paid</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**comments**
1. M€ 40 signed 6/12/2011
2. Top up in 2013 with an additional variable tranche of M€ 10
   i. The top-up tranche was postponed twice: from July 2015 to Dec.2015; From Dec2015 to Dec.2016
3. Then interruption EU budget support disbursements until mid-2019 due to deterioration of the rule and law and democracy
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fixed component</td>
<td>8,000,000</td>
<td>8,000,000</td>
<td>8,000,000</td>
<td>9,000,000</td>
<td>9,000,000</td>
<td>9,000,000</td>
<td>33,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable component</td>
<td>17,000,000 (2Q)</td>
<td>8,000,000 (2Q)</td>
<td>8,000,000 (2Q)</td>
<td>9,000,000 (Q2)</td>
<td>9,000,000 (Q2)</td>
<td>9,000,000 (Q2)</td>
<td>53,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>17,000,000</td>
<td>17,000,000</td>
<td>17,000,000</td>
<td>17,000,000</td>
<td>17,000,000</td>
<td>17,000,000</td>
<td>53,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>paid</td>
<td>17,000,000</td>
<td>14,856,111</td>
<td>17,100,000</td>
<td>17,100,000</td>
<td>17,100,000</td>
<td>17,100,000</td>
<td>48,956,111</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ENI/2014/033-684 Support to Public Finance Policy Reforms in Moldova (PFPR) € 33 million for budget support, EUR 4 million for complementary support**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fixed component</td>
<td>8,000,000</td>
<td>8,000,000</td>
<td>8,000,000</td>
<td>9,000,000</td>
<td>9,000,000</td>
<td>9,000,000</td>
<td>33,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable component</td>
<td>17,000,000 (2Q)</td>
<td>8,000,000 (2Q)</td>
<td>8,000,000 (2Q)</td>
<td>9,000,000 (Q2)</td>
<td>9,000,000 (Q2)</td>
<td>9,000,000 (Q2)</td>
<td>53,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>17,000,000</td>
<td>17,000,000</td>
<td>17,000,000</td>
<td>17,000,000</td>
<td>17,000,000</td>
<td>17,000,000</td>
<td>53,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>paid</td>
<td>17,000,000</td>
<td>14,856,111</td>
<td>17,100,000</td>
<td>17,100,000</td>
<td>17,100,000</td>
<td>17,100,000</td>
<td>48,956,111</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ENPI/2012/023420 Support to the Justice Sector Reform M€ 60 (M€ 52 ENPI, M€ 8 EaPIC) M€ 58,2 + 1,8 complementary supports**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fixed component</td>
<td>15,000,000</td>
<td>15,000,000</td>
<td>15,000,000</td>
<td>13,630,000</td>
<td>13,630,000</td>
<td>13,630,000</td>
<td>36,200,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable component</td>
<td>15,000,000</td>
<td>15,000,000</td>
<td>14,570,000</td>
<td>14,570,000</td>
<td>14,570,000</td>
<td>14,570,000</td>
<td>58,200,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15,000,000</td>
<td>15,000,000</td>
<td>15,000,000</td>
<td>15,000,000</td>
<td>15,000,000</td>
<td>15,000,000</td>
<td>58,200,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>paid</td>
<td>15,000,000</td>
<td>13,200,000</td>
<td>13,200,000</td>
<td>13,200,000</td>
<td>13,200,000</td>
<td>13,200,000</td>
<td>28,200,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

27-11-2013 8/2014 No disbursement recommended.
18-7-2017
Addendum No. 1: extension of the target date for the achievement of the third variable tranche performance criteria; extension of the operational implementation period and of the period of execution of the Financing Agreement; update and non-substantial modification of the Financing Decision C (2013)5199

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fixed component</strong></td>
<td>No fix component</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Variable component</strong></td>
<td>3,500,000 (2Q 2014)</td>
<td>10,000,000 (2Q 2015)</td>
<td>11,500,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>25,000,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Paid</strong></td>
<td>3,500,000 (12/2016)</td>
<td>7,000,000 (12/2016)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4,600,000</td>
<td>15,100,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The first payment was suspended for political reason as of 14/07/2015.
The second payment was suspended for political reason.
The third payment was suspended for political reasons and was released following political change in the country in June 2019.

---

**ENPI/2013/024-045 SRC "SUPPORT THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE VISA LIBERALISATION ACTION PLAN"**

€ 20,000,000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Variable tranche planned</strong></td>
<td>6,000,000 (end of 2014)</td>
<td>7,000,000 (2Q - postponed to 30.6.2017)</td>
<td>7,000,000 (2Q - postponed to 2/2017)</td>
<td>20,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>6,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Paid</strong></td>
<td>5,811,000 (20 November 2014)</td>
<td>5,089,000 (paid 2019?)</td>
<td>4,900,000 (paid 2020?)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Indicator 3.3.2. Explicit correlation between disbursement and conditionality

Strength of evidence based: strong

Main source of information:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document review</th>
<th>Interviews</th>
<th>Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Court of Auditors Special Report EU assistance for strengthening the public administration in Moldova, 2016</td>
<td>EU officials</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Court of Auditors Special Report</td>
<td>GoM officials</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data quality in budget support: weaknesses in some indicators and in the verification of the payment for variable tranches, 2019</td>
<td>TA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The performance monitoring system and disbursement criteria are the key points of budget support and provide a framework for conditionality. Variable tranches are linked to progress against specific conditions: they create incentives for improved performance because partial performance is matched with partial payment. Thus, it should be analysed whether the conditions for tranche disbursement provided meaningful incentives for reform and whether disbursements were consistently based on the fulfillment of these conditions. The Court of Auditors Report of 2016 and 2019 still highlighted some weaknesses in the older programmes implemented between 2007 and 2014, especially concerns the quality of indicators, the big number of indicators used and unspecified targets. However, there is substantive evidence that EU applied the principle of strict conditionalities in the reference period and especially from 2015 onward.

Due to strict application of the conditionality criteria in most cases only part of the maximum tranche could be disbursed. EU support to the Republic of Moldova and its citizens is conditioned by the macroeconomic stability, strengthening of the rule of law and democracy, and fight against corruption.

A clear indicator is that after interruption of payments under budget support, resumption of disbursements came in 2019 after a nearly two-year period during only. Payments had been put on hold because of a deterioration of the rule of law situation in the country. As in 2019 the new government has taken important decisions, the EU was able to assess that the conditions have been met to resume its budget support to the Republic of Moldova in particular, the new Government had expressed its commitment to implement the reform agenda as enshrined in the EU-Moldova Association Agreement, it has given the fight against corruption a high priority of its programme. Some steps have been made towards investing on the bank fraud, local elections have been undertaken and GoM reached an Agreement with IMF.

Indicator 3.3.3. Correlation between evolution of BS spending and intensification of policy dialogue

Strength of evidence based:

Main source of information:
There is some evidence that policy dialogue was intensified during periods where budget support programmes were put on hold and disbursement of tranches was delayed. By referring to the general conditions of the budget support programmes, disbursements were put on hold and/or delayed and have been used as a mean of demonstrating disagreement with undemocratic decisions of the Government of Moldova contradictory to agreements signed between the EU and the Republic of Moldova. As such EU suspended all budget support disbursements in 2015 after major fraud was discovered in the banking system. Disbursements were resumed at the end of 2016 following the agreement on a programme between Moldova and the IMF. However, budget support allocations were suspended again in 2018, following the cancellation of the results of the Chisinau Mayor election.

No disbursements under budget support operations took place in 2015 due to a significant deterioration of the macroeconomic situation after banking fraud. Furthermore, the overall political decision and the difficulty to form a stable coalition government remained a major risk, which hampered the development of stability-oriented macroeconomic policies. As such the European Commission indicated the signature of an agreement with IMF as a pre-condition for resuming budget support operations.

The Delegation conditioned its budget support operations to Moldova adopting an IMF programme and strongly lobbied with the State Chancellery to have the Ministry of Finance closely associated in the development coordination meetings, coordination of EU assistance and development of the annual action plans. EU lobbied for the direct involvement of the Ministry of Finance in budget support programmes within a sound budgetary planning framework. EU indicated clearly that medium term budgetary plans and progress against Association Agreement criteria should be considered in the overall budgetary planning process; furthermore, the need for appropriate allocation of financial and human resources to ensure timely implementation of EU support has been proposed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dates</th>
<th>Key issues related to budget support disbursements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>All budget support disbursements in 2015 after major fraud was discovered in the banking system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End of 2016</td>
<td>Disbursements were resumed at the end of 2016 following the agreement on a programme between Moldova and the IMF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017 and 2018</td>
<td>The European Commission was cutting its financial assistance to Moldova by 20 million euros ($22.7 million) per year for both 2017 and 2018 amid concerns about the rule of law and the democratic backsliding of the country. The financial assistance earmarked by the European Union for the two years amounted initially to a total of 140 million euros ($158 million). Furthermore, the 100-million-euro macro financial assistance (MFA) program for the country had now been suspended until further notice after being initially frozen temporarily in July.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 2019</td>
<td>In July 2019 the Delegation announced the resumption of disbursements after a nearly two-year period during which such payments had been put on hold because of a deterioration of the rule of law situation in the country. An amount of M€14,54 was disbursed corresponding to 3 different BS programmes: SRC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Following the banking crisis in 2015 the head of the European Union delegation to Moldova, announced on Tuesday (7 July) that the EU would freeze financial aid until the country forms a new government. The following day, the EU delegation to Moldova issued a press release, which states that “budget support payments are subjected to the fulfilment of all conditions laid down in the agreements signed with the Republic of Moldova”.
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Evaluation question 4: JCs and indicators

EQ4. To what extent has the EU support to Moldova contributed to achieving an increase in the competitiveness of the agri-food sector and the diversification of economic activity in rural areas, in line with strategic objectives?

This EQ covers Effectiveness, impact and sustainability

JC. 4.1: Trade, competitiveness of the agri-food sector (agri-food and feed chains products) diversified and increased

JC.4.2: EU support contributed to improved conditions for production, processing, and marketing (infrastructure and agricultural service delivery) in sampled rural areas (targeted by EU support)

JC.4.3 New activities have developed in rural areas

JC 4.1: Trade, competitiveness of the agri-food sector (agri-food and feed chains products) diversified and increased

Exports of agri-food products grow significantly over the past 10 years. In terms of trade competitiveness, there has been a reduction of non-tariff barriers to trade for Moldova’s exports to the EU, or in other words, Moldovan producers have gradually been better able to meet EU standards and overcome any non-tariff barriers.

Yet the main agricultural exports still primarily involve low added value products such as cereals and seeds and unprocessed material at low prices and the size of the processing sector (excluding wine) in exports is relatively small. The competitiveness of product groups that often previously were already competitive such as cereals oils seeds, fruits and vegetables and honey improved further which also resulted in significantly increased exports of these products. On the other hand, exports of animal products (meat, fish, hides) and sugar reduced which mainly reflect the lack of skills and experience of exporting to the very demanding EU market and inability of Moldovan producers to meet the for exporting to the EU.

An important issue in terms of competitiveness has been the slow development of productivity. Low productivity has hampered growth in the agricultural sector particularly as Moldova has been unable to maintain steady productivity growth. Next to limited access to land, low productivity and competitiveness levels is also fuelled by limited access to other inputs such as water/irrigation, finance, technical inputs, support services and quality workforce.

The most competitive producers, those that are able to export directly, are often large agricultural enterprises that are fully integrated – from producing to storing and packaging – with technical and
managerial capacity. Although technologies for high-class production are available and in use by some of the most advanced producers, small-scale farmers, for the most part, have not adopted them. Moldovan SMEs find it very difficult to engage in exports and access to the EU market.

The EU supported trade liberalisation and regulatory approximation to the EU acquis. Moldova made significant progress regarding adoption and implementation of EU acquis in several areas, such as sanitary and phytosanitary matters and technical barriers to trade. However, the agri-food producers still face may challenge with meeting the demands of the EU market. The necessary institutional framework for complete implementation and oversight of these new provisions is however still weak.

**Indicator 4.1.1: Revealed Competitive Advantage of Agricultural products improved during the evaluation period.**

**Strength of evidence based:** Strong

**Main source of information:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document review</th>
<th>Interviews</th>
<th>Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interviews with civil society representatives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The EU has grown into Moldova's largest trade partner. Compared to 2010, exports to EU member states had more than doubled by 2019. The main agricultural exports of Moldova to the EU and the product groups that experienced the largest export growth involve Vegetables and fruit, Oilseeds (especially sunflower seeds) and Cereals. During the same period, exports of agricultural products from Moldova to Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS) countries fell by more than 45 percent.

Yet, despite the DCFTA, since 2014 the number of agri-food product groups (HS 4-digit product level) that enjoyed a Revealed Comparatives Advantage (RCA) in the EU market decreased. In 2014, 69 agri-food product groups had a comparative advantage, while this number reduced to 59 product groups in 2019. The products with the highest RCA ratings in 2019 among others involved sunflower seed, seed oils, nuts, grain sorghum, maize and honey. In terms of climbers the highest improvements among products with an RCA in 2019 involved, fruits, tea, honey, and fruits and vegetables. In 2019 there were no animal products that had a comparative advantage on the EU market.

Moldova has consequently improved the competitiveness of a number of conventional exports to the EU market yet at the same time it has been unable to fully utilize the potential of the DCFTA to diversify its exports significantly towards other (higher added value) products on the EU market. Animal products produced in Moldova generally failed to gain a comparative advantage on the EU market although during recent years there has been progress in terms of creating the necessary regulatory environment and quality infrastructure for exports of products with animal origin to the EU market.

In terms of accessing local and international markets, the agri-food sector as a whole is among others facing problems with creating market institutions; establishing marketing and distribution channels;
meeting EU quality, veterinary and phytosanitary standards; and building the administrative capacity to support these processes.

**Indicator 4.1.2 Productivity in the agricultural sector increased since 2014**

Strength of evidence based: Strong

**Main source of information:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document review</th>
<th>Interviews</th>
<th>Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
An important factor regarding competitiveness has been the slow development of productivity. Low productivity has generally hampered growth in the agricultural sector particularly as Moldova has been unable to maintain a steady productivity growth. Even though public resources devoted to the agri-food sector with the support from the EU have increased, yet the yields are generally quite low, and the sector wide productivity is evolving slowly. In some areas the productivity of the agricultural sector is one of the lowest when comparing to peer countries and progress has been slow, while there has been a clear improving trend among peer countries such as Ukraine. The latter initially scored lower than Moldova in terms of value added per worker in Agriculture and yet improved on this indicator by 2019 and surpassed the productivity levels of Moldova bay far.

The dualistic nature of agriculture – comprising a modern competitive sector that is thriving and a stagnant subsistence sector that is becoming increasingly marginalized – is also very much reflected in productivity of agricultural producers. In terms of agricultural production in fields dominated by large private enterprises such as cereals, the productivity has increased by more than 26 percent. Yet again also in these areas, despite the high level of natural soil fertility and favourable climate for the main crops, productivity of remains low. Compared to EU member states total cereals yield in Moldova is approximately 2 times lower of the average EU and 3 or even more times lower that of the Netherlands.

Productivity in specific areas did improve as for example the average yields per hectare for fruit production more than doubled during the previous decade. Productivity of grape production also increased by about 57 percent since 2010. Here again however the increase of productivity was more visible at larger producers. One of the major underlying factors for this is the limited access of small farms - which form the over majority of agricultural farms - to agricultural land and extreme fragmentation of land ownership. High land fragmentation is a key factor with regard to low productivity and competitiveness of small farms. Enlargement of farms and reduction of fragmentation at the same time, remains therefore critical for the improved productivity and competitiveness in the entire country. Yet land market is gradually developing as few farms give-up their land and so farms are more likely to shrink than to grow.

Next to limited access to land, low productivity and competitiveness levels is also fuelled by limited access to other inputs such as water/irrigation, finance, technical inputs, support services and quality workforce. This harms the ability of firms to adjust to weather and market shocks and places them at a disadvantage compared to peers in the EU that have access to more advanced inputs and technologies. Among others traditional cultivation methods used by smaller producers, with low levels of mechanization and low productivity remain hampering factors for development of both local and international value chains.
Poor access to irrigation due to deterioration of state-run irrigation systems over the last decades has become a serious impediment in the process of transition to higher value agriculture and consequently higher returns. Difficulties with irrigation tend to cause crop yields to drop much below their potential.

In this regard, the AA envisaged increased cooperation towards improving water quality and agricultural irrigation. Accordingly, the water resource management environment benefited greatly from EU support. The Action Plan for the harmonization of the legislation with the EU triggered a substantial reform of the entire environmental legal framework. Further to development of the legislative framework EU investments were also directed towards construction of public water supply and sanitation infrastructure in rural areas. As a result, approximately 15,700 people gained access to sufficient and safe drinking water. Nevertheless, irrigation has not really been at the focus of EU support. Along with improvements in the availability of irrigation, it would be necessary to improve the managerial capacity and ability of farmers to produce profitably given the cost of water and irrigation management.

Lack of adequate quality workforce or inadequate workforce skills are also significant obstacles to productivity. Almost two-thirds of respondent firms participating in the OECD Enterprise Survey indicated that an inadequately educated workforce is the single most pressing barrier to growth. In this regard, agricultural workers have one of the worst composition of skills as workers lack both occupation-specific and socio-behavioural skills. In particular, the skills of young workers are of more concern to employers than those of older workers indicating general apprehensions about the ability of the current education system of Moldova to properly equip students with the skills needed to satisfy the job market. Such issues contribute to the reduced capacity of farmers to ensure high yields. In terms of smallholders most small firms and family farms lack the necessary skills, knowledge and knowhow needed to practice farming in a more efficient, competitive and profitable way which is needed to ensure a gradual transition from a subsistence agriculture to one with commercial elements and towards a fully commercial and sustainable farming. The lack of access to skilled labour force is further worsened by unfavourable demographic tendencies such as ageing, depopulation and mass migration.

The EU has been providing substantial support to reform the agricultural vocational education through programmes such as ENPARD and DEVRAM which among others set out to revise occupational and qualification standards, curricula, build the capacities of Vocational Education and Training (VET) institutions and connecting the Agri-VET education to the business community. These initiatives helped increase the quality of education and training courses, enhance the image of VET, and better prepare students for the labour market and private sector demands. The EU support targeted existent gaps and contributed to improved education, research and extension services in the agri-food sector, including facilitating information systems. Also, support was provided for improving educational, research and expansion services in the agricultural and agri-food sectors. In this framework new agricultural entrepreneurial curricula for the agricultural Post-Secondary Colleges subordinated to MARDE were developed and approved. With support from the ENPARD also the curriculum of the ‘Fundamentals of Entrepreneurship’ course was designed for agricultural colleges. Currently also the European Investment Bank is financing government investments into Moldova’s horticulture training institutions via the Fruit Garden of Moldova. This allows to further modernise education in the horticultural sector.

To improve access to knowledge and technical capacity, the Government of Moldova (GoM) with support of the EU enhanced services provision through the Rural Extension Services Network. As a result, rural extension services are provided annually to about 340 thousand agricultural producers, which cultivate about 670 thousand ha of agricultural land. Also, in the framework of ENPARD farmers were trained by service providers. Assessment of the extension services show that these services deliver solid returns on investment and boost agricultural productivity and competitiveness and satisfaction with the services is rather high, nevertheless challenges exist with regard to sustainability as initially, the extension service providers were set up and supported by international donors. Moreover, currently research and education spending are dominated by the wage bill with little left for activities that could boost productivity in the sector. With a large network of educational institutions, education programmes still often remain outdated, and the equipment and buildings depleted, while the results of agricultural research are scarce and do
not meet the expectations of the private farm sector. Research and the curricula at agricultural colleges do not respond to farmer’s needs.

**Indicator 4.1.3 Improved Underperforming Index score of Moldovan agri-food products since 2014**

**Indicator 4.1.4 Increased diversification of the agri-food production basket**

**Main source of information:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document review</th>
<th>Interviews</th>
<th>Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

With the improved market access under the DCFTA, it would be expected, ceteris paribus, that the market share of Moldovan exports in the EU would be higher than its global market share. If the market share is less in the EU, this would indicate other barriers non-tariff barriers to trade exist (such as technical regulations, standards) in addition to tariffs. Therefore, it would be expected that over time, the number of underperforming products would reduce.

Since introduction of the DCFTA in 2014, the number of underperforming products (that is where Moldova’s market share in EU is less than Moldova’s global market share) reduced. By 2019, the aggregate number of underperforming Moldovan exports reached 164 products (groups). This points towards a reduction of non-tariff barriers to trade for Moldova’s exports to the EU, or in other words, Moldovan producers have gradually been better able to meet EU standards and overcome any non-tariff barriers.

Although it’s important to note reduction of the number of underperforming products can also have been affected by other factors besides the EU Moldova trade regime. This may include the trade restrictions with the Russian Federation which served as a traditional market for Moldova’s exports. The Russian-imposed import restrictions on Moldovan goods, exports fuelled a shift away from markets in the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS) in favour of European markets.

**Indicator 4.1.4 Increased diversification of the agri-food production basket**

**Main source of information:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document review</th>
<th>Interviews</th>
<th>Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
The structure of agricultural production in Moldova changed during the evaluation period. The share of fruits, nuts, berries and grapes in the structure of agricultural production significantly increased. Similar to agricultural production, compared to 2010 the highest growth rates in the processing sector was also that of fruits and vegetables which grow by more than 300 percent. Yet the share of dairy products reduced from 9.8 percent in 2014 to 5.6 percent of the total production. This was also the case with production of livestock and poultry which also reduced during the evaluation period.

The changes in the structure of agricultural production indicate a tendency towards increased share of intensive crops such as grapes, fruits, vegetables, tobacco etc. and a decrease in the share of products that require less capital such as wheat, corn, sunflower, etc.

Small farms engage in more diverse production activities, yet only a small share of their products go to markets. Smallholders usually practice a crop mix of crops (vegetables, berries, herbs, vines, and others) and grains (usually maize and wheat), which they use to feed animals and poultry. Smallholders rely on direct relations with the buyers because their agricultural and processed products usually do not meet international standards on food quality. However, there are single cases where small dairy producers do veterinary and sanitary controls, showing that there is a chance of improving quality and earning a decent profit, even with a small investment.

Large-scale agricultural companies on the other hand specialize in the production of commodities specifically low-value crops such as cereals, oilseeds and sugar beets and are mostly export-oriented. These enterprises employ a relatively little labour force due to the high mechanization level of their farm operations. Such a specialization has been determined by factors, such as relatively low production costs for these crops, the availability of agricultural machinery enabling the cultivation of large areas, relatively simple and low-cost post-harvest handling requirements, and ensured markets for these commodities.

**Indicator 4.1.5 Production of new agricultural products successfully promoted by EU interventions in Moldova**

**Main source of information:**

- Document review
- Interviews
- Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commission Staff Working Document.</td>
<td>Interviews with public officials in Moldova</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual reports and info sheets on implementation of EU Free Trade Agreements Accompanying the document Report from the Commission to the European Parliament,</td>
<td>Interviews with EU officials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Council, The European Economic and Social Committee and The Committee of The Regions on Implementation of Eu Trade Agreements 1 January 2019 - 31 December 2019, Brussels 2020</td>
<td>Interviews with civil society representatives active in the sector</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Strength of evidence based: Strong
In the framework of the DCFTA, the EU supported trade liberalisation and regulatory approximation to the EU acquis. Reforms of as a result of the approximation process contributed to adoption and implementation of EU acquis in several areas, such as sanitary and phytosanitary matters and technical barriers to trade. Although there have been delays caused by issues such as the complexity of the legislation, lack of capacity and financial resources; nevertheless, Moldova made significant progress. EU supported development of the institutional capacities of key government bodies. Moldova’s legislative and institutional framework is operational. Over 25,000 European standards were adopted and 7,000 conflicting standards from the GOST system were withdrawn. However, the sector still faces challenges with meeting the demands of the EU market. Low quality and heterogeneity of agricultural products are often the cause of the limited marketing opportunities currently available to Moldovan producers. The tariff-free quotas agreed in the DCFTA regarding many product lines are not being exhausted and the major barrier in this context are problems with the compliance with EU Sanitary and Phytosanitary Standards (SPS). Meeting these standards are critical for ensuring increased access to the EU market for Moldovan products, particularly for products of animal origin such as meat, eggs and dairy. A key requirement here regard relates to traceability and safety of any raw material used.

The national laboratory infrastructure is still underdeveloped and the progress in terms of enhancing this infrastructure is slow and fragmentary. Capacitation of laboratories in many sectors is problematic, the reference laboratories are in some cases not identified and their role is not clearly defined. The National Reference Laboratory for Veterinary and Food Safety and the Republican Veterinary Diagnostic Centre are not fully equipped with the most advanced equipment for testing parameters in the field of food safety. Also, the National Centre for Verification and Certification of Plant and Soil Production is not fully capable of testing all food safety parameters, such as pesticide residues, heavy metals, Genetically Modified Organisms (GMOs), DNA sequencing. Consequently, testing of some products destined for export to the EU for certain indicators is still carried out outside of Moldova. These issues are particularly challenging taking into account the limited quality infrastructure and implementation capacity in rural areas.

In terms of direct support to production, the EU supported implementation of various interventions that contributed to a more conducive environment for growth of production and exports. This included both financial and technical assistance to Moldovan producers towards improved production capacity, improving their ability to reduction meet developing market demands. In this framework, since 2016 within the Fruit Garden of Moldova project 45,9 million euros were dedicated to loans that were disbursed
for developing and restructuring of the entire value chain of the horticultural sector. These EIB loans are to be co-financed by project beneficiaries at a minimum of 50% and so the total amount of investments in development of the Moldovan horticulture value chain in the framework exceeded 95.3 million Euros. These investments mainly contributed to upgrading the equipment and facilities of the horticultural enterprises, restructuring and revitalizing the orchards and table grape vineyards, as well as by mechanization of the agricultural processes. Also, through the DEVRAM, the EU granted about Euro 3 million to increasing the competitiveness of the agri-food sector through integration to domestic and global value chains, in particular in the soybeans sector.

JC.4.2: EU support contributed to improved conditions for production, processing, and marketing (infrastructure and agricultural service delivery) in sampled rural areas (targeted by EU support)

During the evaluation period agricultural production experienced considerable growth (almost 27 percent, reaching about 34.6 billion Lei in 2019. Crop/plant production fuelled the growth in the sector where sunflower seed production doubled and production of seed fruits, nuts and grapes during the same period multiplied 3, 11 and 2.6 times respectively.

Although agricultural output generally grew during the previous decade, the average annual growth has been rather varied among individual sub sectors and years. The fluctuation in the production were mainly due to the sector’s high vulnerability to weather conditions. The volatility mainly grows based on the weather-dependence of agricultural products.

The support of EU to the horticulture sector has been significant and contributed to expansion of the sector and increased resilience of producers. The support of the EU has also helped the government to increase public funding directed to the agricultural sector in support of production, processing, and marketing. The agricultural subsidies represent about 50 percent of total public support for agriculture and subsidy fund increased by more than 50 percent, reaching 900 million Lei from 400 million in 2010.

During the evaluation period, both large and small agri-food producers managed to increase production volumes. Yet larger enterprises (with more than 10 ha) managed to increase their production far more than smaller producers.

Indicator 4.2.1. Increased agri-food production in Moldova and EU target areas.

Strength of evidence based: Strong

Main source of information:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document review</th>
<th>Interviews</th>
<th>Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RM National Bureau of Statistics data bank.</td>
<td>Interviews with public officials in Moldova I and interviews with EU officials</td>
<td>Results for questions Q11 and Q12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Progress Report 2020 Moldova Fruit Garden project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
During the evaluation period overall, agricultural production grows by almost 27 percent, reaching about 34.6 billion Lei in 2019. Crop/plant production makes for the largest activity in the sector, including cereals (24.3 percent), fruits nuts and berries (13.4 percent), and potatoes (12.1 percent). Crop production also experienced the largest growth during the evaluation period followed by agricultural services, reaching 42 and 37 percent respectively in 2019. Nevertheless, the growth of crop/plant production was primarily fuelled by production of sunflower seeds which compared to 2010 had doubled in quantities in 2019 and horticulture including Seed fruits nuts and grapes which during the same period multiplied 3, 11 and 2.6 times respectively. Animal husbandry is good for 25.1 percent of the agricultural output. This includes livestock and poultry (16.6 percent), milk (5.6 percent) and eggs production (2.9 percent). The contribution of animal husbandry to the economy nevertheless declined during the previous decade as production fell.

According to the most recent General Agricultural Census carried out in 2011, there are around 900,000 farms working on 2,243,540 hectares of land in Moldova. Smallholder farms (defined as farms of less than three hectares) make up 95 percent of all farms and account for 52 percent of total agricultural output yet most of the available farmland (63 percent) is cultivated by a few large farms. The agricultural sector in Moldova, therefore, has a strong dualistic structure. During the evaluation period, both large and small agri-food producers managed to increase production volumes. Yet larger enterprises (with more than 10 ha) managed to increase their production far more than smaller producers.

This was also reflected in the shrinking share of small producers in the total agricultural production. During the 2010 – 2019 period the production of agricultural products by small producers fell from 63 to 52 percent of the total agricultural production. Larger producers consequently were more successful in terms of increasing their production capacity. Small farm activities are as a result declining, while subsistence farming is becoming more important.

Although agricultural output generally grew, the average annual growth has been rather varied among individual sub sectors. Agricultural turnover slowed after 2016, while other sectors of the economy grew harder. The fluctuation in the production were mainly due to the sector’s high vulnerability to weather conditions. Although final statistics on agricultural production in 2020 were not officially publicised yet, nevertheless initial data suggest a fall of 27 in agricultural production in 2020 compared to 2019. The largest decline involved crop production which fell by 36 percent. The volatility mainly emanates from reliance on weather-dependent agricultural products such as sunflower seeds, wheat, grapes, and fruits – but also from external and internal shocks such as the dispute with Russia that led to a ban on Moldova’s agri-food exports. Such a volatility has been one of the underlying factors in the record disbursements amounting 17.1 million euro, done in the framework of the Fruit Garden of Moldova project in 2020 as producers understood the need for drip irrigation in their orchards to maintain an economically sound yield level.

The support of EU to the horticulture sector has been significant and contributed to expansion of the sector and increased resilience of producers. The EU worked together with international financing institutions and development partners such as EIB, EBRD, KfW, the International Trade Centre, OECD, the World Bank, and national entities such as the Organisation for Small and Medium Size Enterprises Sector Development (ODIMM), and Project Group International. EU contribution of 47 million euros in this framework reportedly triggered about 194 million worth of loans to companies. One of the technical staff working the Fruit Garden of Moldova’ project that works with businesses on the ground in the country said:

“Basically, we’re putting the people together, because before it was a problem for Moldovan farmers to access finance. So, we help both farmers and banks to work together and improve access to finance for Moldovan SMEs.”

As a result of direct EU co-financing, in the framework of the Fruit Garden of Moldova project 614.29 ha of Nuts plantations, 714.66 ha of orchards 56 ha of Berries plantations, 112,74 ha of vineyards, and 45 ha of vegetable plantations were established.
Indicator 4.2.2. Improvement of road infrastructure/feeder roads in rural areas

Strength of evidence based: Strong

Main source of information:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document review</th>
<th>Interviews</th>
<th>Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RM National Bureau of Statistics data bank.</td>
<td>Interviews with public officials in Moldova</td>
<td>Results for question Q17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interviews with civil society representatives active in the sector</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Road infrastructure in Moldova generally and rural areas improved in recent years. As of 2019, Moldova had a road network that equalled about 9,431.5 km, of which 5,842.0 km were classified as National Roads and the remaining 3,589.5 km as Local Roads. The length of roads increased slightly (0.8 percent during the evaluation period in all of the regions of the country except for T.A.U Gagauzia where the length of the roads decreased by 3.6 percent.

In terms of payment on the national level, majority of the roads or 97 percent have a hard surface. The share of the roads with a hard surface increased by about 2.3 percent during the evaluation period. The share of the roads with a hard surface is the highest in the North and Center Regions where about 98 percent of the roads have a hard surface. The South and T.A.U Gagauzia have the lowest percentage of hard surface roads which account for 94 and 90 percent of the road infrastructure respectively.

The World Economic Forum Global Competitiveness Report (2020) ranked the quality of overall infrastructure of Moldova 86th out of 141 countries. Among the categories analysed by this study, Moldova ranked 70th on road connectivity. Yet, in terms of the quality of roads, Moldova scored particularly low and was ranked 129th, although this was a significant improvement compared to 2014 where Moldova ranked 140th out of 144 countries.

About 50 percent of the survey respondents from rural areas indicated that in their perspective the road network in Moldova has improved since 2014, while 28 percent indicated that the road network stayed the same and 22 percent indicated that in their opinion the road network worsened.

Indicator 4.2.3. The score of Moldova on the Logistics Performance Index improved.

Strength of evidence based: Strong

Main source of information:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document review</th>
<th>Interviews</th>
<th>Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>World Bank and Turku School of Economics, Logistic Performance Index Surveys. Data are available online at: <a href="http://worldbank.org/lpi">worldbank.org/lpi</a>.</td>
<td>Interviews with public officials in Moldova</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interviews with EU officials</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interviews with civil society representatives active in the sector</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to the World Bank Logistics Performance Index (LPI) which measures countries’ trade logistics efficiency, Moldova, was ranked 116th out of 160 countries. Compared to 2010, Moldova’s ranking worsened as the country was ranked 104 in 2010. The country’s performance is below the world and regional average (Europe and Central Asia) meaning that Moldova has a less conducive climate for trade. Its strongest logistics indicator is timeliness, while its lagging ones are tracking and tracing quality of infrastructure for logistics, and efficiency and effectiveness of customs which adversely affect both trade costs and reliability of cross-border movement of goods.
To enhance access to finance, with support from the EU, the GoM provides investment subsidies to farmers for production and post-production needs, and secured lines of credit. Subsidies provided through the Agency of Intervention and Payments for Agriculture (AIPA) are the most important public mechanism for supporting agricultural production. The main objectives of the subsidies are to encourage creation of businesses, to improve their economic performance, create new jobs and increase investments in innovative technologies. Agricultural subsidies represent about 50 percent of total public support for agriculture. The subsidy fund increased by more than 50 percent, reaching 900 million Lei from 400 million in 2010.

The ENPARD budget support contributed to the implementation of the national subsidy schemes. In the framework of ENPARD 4,444 farmers/agri-food enterprises received subsidies for investments in processing and marketing of agricultural products, environmental actions, improvement of (post-harvest) infrastructure and holdings. The EU also supported the Capacity building of the AIPA for the application of EU norms and standards for the administration of agricultural and rural development support schemes. This included development of information systems and improving amalgamation of different databases for AIPA in order to increase the efficiency of the financial management of subsidy payments which contributes to the efficiency of the system.

Although there has been limited evaluation of the impact of these subsidies along with the evaluation of the general implementation and achievements of the NARDS, qualitative evidence show that the subsidies are more difficult to access by SMEs and mainly reach large enterprises that may find alternative ways to finance their recurrent spending. Also, subsidies for capital-related expenditures
appear to not be sufficiently oriented towards innovative technologies and the insurance subsidy program has not stimulated a faster adoption of agricultural risk insurance. Investments in agriculture machinery and equipment mainly relate to the acquisition of tractors or other conventional machinery. Moreover, subsidies for conventional machinery, particularly when devoted to larger farmers, are likely to distort input choices as they influence opportunity-costs of the inputs including replacing workers with machineries or diverting investments from new technologies.

**Indicator 4.2.5. Access to credit in the agricultural sector increased generally and financed under EU financed national projects**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main source of information:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RM National Bureau of Statistics data bank.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMF, International Financial Statistics and data files, and WB and OECD GDP estimates.data.worldbank.org</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AXA. 2020. Republic of Moldova: Baseline study report of EUUnlocking project. Link</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Assistance for the Implementation of Sector Reform Contract: “European Neighbourhood Programme to Agriculture and Rural Development” Final Report, July 2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although EU support through initiatives such as the Fruit Garden of Moldova project contributes to lending in the country, nevertheless, Moldovan firms deal with significantly high costs and limited access to external funds. Lending to the agricultural sector declined during the previous years and the contribution of capital to growth has generally been relatively small. Limited access to finance scored as the fourth biggest obstacle to growth in the OECD Enterprise Survey of Moldova in 2019. Accessing external financing proves to be difficult as almost 70 percent of all investments in fixed assets are financed with internal funds.

Banks are the main providers of external finance to SMEs, accounting for more than 90% of the total supply of credit, with alternative sources of SME financing remaining limited. Domestic credit to the private sector in Moldova stood at only 23.5% of GDP in 2018, the second lowest value in the Eastern Partner region; this is substantially lower than the EU average of 140%. Relevant to the agricultural sector is that banks typically do not accept land and plantations as collateral, and they perceive high risks when lending to the sector. Furthermore, the financial management competences of smallholders and family farms are very limited which also negatively influences their ability to access financing. As results SMEs particularly have considerably lower access to financing sources when compared to large enterprises.
Entrepreneurship in the agri-food sector increased during the evaluation period. In the 2015-2019 period, the number of enterprises in the agriculture and manufacturing (food processing, accounts for 37% of total manufacturing output and 26% of employment in the manufacturing sector) in Moldova increased by 40 and 9% respectively. The largest increase in terms of the number of enterprises in the agriculture and manufacturing sectors occurred in T.A.U. Gagauzia where the enterprises increased by 91 and 16% respectively. Gagauzia was followed by the Centre and North regions. The number of enterprises in various regions is presented in the following table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Whole country</td>
<td>Agriculture, forestry and fishing</td>
<td>3168</td>
<td>3439</td>
<td>3847</td>
<td>4210</td>
<td>4428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>4482</td>
<td>4535</td>
<td>4686</td>
<td>4860</td>
<td>4906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chisinau</td>
<td>Agriculture, forestry and fishing</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>531</td>
<td>561</td>
<td>627</td>
<td>619</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>2491</td>
<td>2514</td>
<td>2597</td>
<td>2705</td>
<td>2717</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>Agriculture, forestry and fishing</td>
<td>967</td>
<td>1026</td>
<td>1167</td>
<td>1239</td>
<td>1341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>615</td>
<td>611</td>
<td>633</td>
<td>643</td>
<td>655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centre</td>
<td>Agriculture, forestry and fishing</td>
<td>1012</td>
<td>1129</td>
<td>1260</td>
<td>1380</td>
<td>1481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>908</td>
<td>946</td>
<td>979</td>
<td>1025</td>
<td>1031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>Agriculture, forestry and fishing</td>
<td>498</td>
<td>536</td>
<td>584</td>
<td>634</td>
<td>642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.A.U. Gagauzia</td>
<td>Agriculture, forestry and fishing</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

During the same period also the profitability of enterprises in both sectors grew. This involved both an increase in the generated turnover and the percentage of enterprises that generated a profit. On the
national level the turnover of agriculture and manufacturing enterprises increased by a considerable 48 and 32 percent. The growth of turnover in agriculture was the largest in T.A.U. Gagauzia where the total turnover of agricultural enterprises increased by more than 73 percent. Gagauzia was followed by the north which generates the largest agricultural turnover which increased by 54 percent reaching 6,970 million Lei. On a national level in 2019 compared to 2015 the number of enterprises that generated a profit in the agricultural sector grew by 68 percent and by 23 percent in manufacturing.

JC. 4.3 New activities have developed in rural areas

Certain non-agricultural sectors developed in rural areas however this has been not significant and the agriculture's role as an employer has become even more important.

During the evaluation period the gross value added of trade of motor vehicles - the largest economic sector in Moldova – along with construction grow nationally. Similarly, contribution of trade and repair of motor vehicles and construction grow in all of the regions of the country. The contribution of manufacturing (including food processing) and agriculture on the other hand slightly shrank. The importance of the agricultural sector slightly reduced for the northern and central areas while the sector become a stronger contributor to the economy of the south and Gagauzia.

At the same time agricultural enterprises increased significantly in rural areas, as the sector has remained the most active sector in terms of entrepreneurship and employment. Employed population in non-agricultural activities reduced and the role of agriculture in terms of employment grew. The reduction of the added value of the sector along with the increased employment in the sector point towards low added value jobs as the value added per worker in the agricultural sector is one of the lowest compared to peer countries and even worsened during the evaluation period.

The EU has been supporting diversification of economic activity in rural areas though various measures. Among others the policy framework for Rural Infrastructure has been improved through the introduction of new subsidy measures. Also, the number and volume of locally driven rural development interventions increased significantly through initiatives such as the LEADER approach.

Indicator 4.3.1. % Of persons employed in non-agricultural activities (increase since 2014)

Strength of evidence based: Strong

Main source of information:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document review</th>
<th>Interviews</th>
<th>Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RM National Bureau of Statistics data bank.</td>
<td>Interviews with EU officials</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interviews with civil society representatives active in the sector</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Employed population in non-agricultural activities reduced from 70 percent in 2014 to 64 percent in 2018 throughout Moldova. The role of agriculture is therefore growing in terms of employment. Based on the Labour Force Survey data in 2018, agriculture accounted for about 36 percent of total employment in 2018 which is a considerable increase (44 percent) compared to 2010.

It is worth noting that the increased importance of the agricultural sector in terms of employment occurred despite the slight reduction of agriculture’s contribution to the GDP as a sector. The value added per worker in the agricultural sector is one of the lowest when comparing to peer countries and worsened during the evaluation period.
**Indicator 4.3.2. Share of non-agriculture and agri-food sector in GDP (trend since 2014)**

Strength of evidence based: Strong

**Main source of information:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document review</th>
<th>Interviews</th>
<th>Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RM National Bureau of Statistics data bank.</td>
<td>Interviews with public officials in Moldova</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interviews with EU officials</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interviews with civil society representatives active in the sector</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Trade of motor vehicles - the largest economic sector - grow during the same period, while the contribution of manufacturing slightly shrank. The relative contribution of the agricultural sector to Moldova’s economy fell during the evaluation period, reaching 11.7 percent.

In terms of regional importance, agriculture plays the greatest role in the economic structure of the South region (36.2 percent). The South is followed by the Gagauzia (30.8 percent) the Center (25.0 percent) and the North (23.2 Percent). The importance of the Agri-food sector for the economy of the northern and central and southern areas slightly reduced during the evaluation period while the sector become a stronger contributor to the economy of Gagauzia.

**Indicator 4.3.3 Number of non-agricultural enterprises and jobs created in sampled rural areas (sampled districts) since 2014**

Strength of evidence based: Strong

**Main source of information:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document review</th>
<th>Interviews</th>
<th>Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RM National Bureau of Statistics data bank.</td>
<td>Interviews with public officials in Moldova</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interviews with EU officials</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interviews with civil society representatives active in the sector</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The number of enterprises in Moldova generally increased yet the agricultural sector experienced a much faster growth rate in this regard compared to non-agricultural sectors. In the period of 2015-2019 the total number of enterprises in general increased by 11 percent. The highest percentual growth occurred in educational sector where the number of educational entities increased from 407 entities in 2015 to 576 in 2019. The education sector was followed by the agricultural sector where the number of enterprises increased by 1260 or 40 percent.

Non-agricultural enterprises on average increased by 9 percent. On the national level, the number of non-agricultural enterprises grew in all sectors of the economy in exception to the mining sector.
As a result, the share of agricultural enterprises as part of the total number of enterprises increased. Enterprises offering services grew by 30%, Water supply; sewerage, waste management (26%), Information and communication 24% and other services (19%). In the regions outside of Chisinau (North, Centre, South and T.A.U. Gagauzia) entrepreneurial activity was the highest in the Agricultural sector followed by services.

**Indicator 4.3.4 Number and volume of locally driven rural development interventions increased (since 2014)**

**Strength of evidence based: Strong**

**Main source of information:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document review</th>
<th>Interviews</th>
<th>Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Case study on the implementation of the LEADER approach in the Republic of Moldova, EaP, CSF 2020.</td>
<td>Interviews with EU officials</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENPARD, 2019. Final Report Technical Assistance for the Implementation of Sector Reform</td>
<td>Interviews with civil society representatives active in the sector</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation of the “Support to Agriculture and Rural Development” SARD Programme in ATU Gagauzia and Taraclia district and neighbouring communities, Mehlmauer-Larcher and Cojocau. 2018</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report on the assessment of potential legal solution for the registration and operation of LEADER Local Action Groups (LAGs) in Moldova EU financed SARD Programme implemented by UNDP. 2017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The LEADER approach for the development of rural areas has been an important contributor to locally driven rural development interventions. Implementation of the LEADER approach in the Moldova has been carried out since 2016 with the support of the EU, the Republic of Poland and other partners such as the USAID and the UK Embassy. Introduction of the LEADER approach was carried out through the Support for Agriculture and Rural Development (SARD) initiative.

There are currently 32 Local Action Groups (LAGs) operating in the country, covering about 35% of the country’s rural areas. The LEADER initiative among others provides (potential) entrepreneurs with the opportunity to access grants provided by the LAGs for business ideas related to (i) strengthening and diversifying the rural economy, (ii) improving public services and infrastructure, (iii) protecting and promoting heritage local cultural and natural.
With the introduction of the LEADER in Moldova Local Action Groups and their Association National LEADER Network supported to design local development strategies and to raise their voice to become local partners in implementing projects under the bottom-up approach of the EU LEADER method. In 2018 the LAGs implemented around 160 micro projects with a total co-financing budget of about €7 million MDL. In 2019 the projects implemented by the LAGs accounted reached around 200 micro-projects with a total budget of about 10 million MDL. The number of the implemented projects by the LAGs in 2020 increased further to about 350 projects that together had a budget of 20 million MDL.

According to local representatives, the year of 2020 was a remarkable year, filled with uncertainty. Despite all this, the LAG has managed to strengthen and implemented in 2020, as in 2019, many beneficial projects that will enhance the local economic development, tourism infrastructure, and local public services.

The LEADER approach has consequently been able to contribute to locally driven development. This involves interventions that target present issues in support of local development and motivate and unite rural communities.

The leader approach is gradually moving towards institutionalization. In December 2020, the draft law on LAG was voted by the Government of the Republic of Moldova. The Law provides for the creation of the legal framework on the activity of Local Action Groups as legal entities and will regulate the establishment, activity, reorganisation and liquidation of the LAGs. Yet still many challenges remain to exist. In this regard, many unclarities remain to exist with regard to state funding of the LAGs and the transfer of the LEADER system to local funding is a working process. project development and approval processes need to be further optimized.

**Main findings for EQ 4**

- Trade competitiveness of the agri-food sector increased, although diversification was limited.
- EU support contributed to improved conditions for production, processing, and marketing through development of infrastructure and agricultural service delivery.
- Development of new activities in rural areas has been limited.

**Evaluation question 5: JCs and indicators**

**EQ5. To what extent has the EU support to Moldova contributed to strengthening the democratic institutions and good governance, including the rule of law?**

This EQ covers Effectiveness, impact and sustainability

JC 5.1 The institutional and/or functional independence, effectiveness and accountability of the rule of law sector (Police and judiciary) have advanced and are recognized.

JC 5.2 Corruption is prevented in public administration, and prosecuted by dedicated bodies

JC 5.3 Public administration and public finance management at national and local level was improved

JC 5.4. Fundamental rights and freedoms (including freedom of the media) are increasingly respected, protected, fulfilled and promoted by duty bearers
JC. 5.1 The institutional and/or functional independence, effectiveness and accountability of the rule of law sector (Police and judiciary) have advanced and are recognised

Justice:

In 2011, the parliament of Moldova adopted Moldova’s 2011-2015 Strategy (extended since then) for Justice Sector Reform. It has been prolonged several times and is still the reference strategic document for justice reform to date. Other draft strategic documents are not yet adopted. While the existence of a new draft shows a gradual increase in the policy making capacity of the MoJ, its pending adoption also highlights the sensitivity of all reforms touching the justice sector. Finally, there is a general tendency to equate “reform” with “legislative amendments”. This approach has two negative outfalls: it leads to the constant redrafting of the legal environment of the judiciary, which decreases the legal certainty of both the judicial personnel and the justiciable; and it derails the reform efforts from deep change management within the justice system and among its actors. Overall, all stakeholders concur to say that the justice system reform is slow, difficult and sensitive, although characterized by “islands of excellence”.

Evaluation of ENPI/2012/023-420 “Support to the Justice Sector Reforms” noted that the general condition no 1 (“Satisfactory progress in the implementation of the 2011-2016 Justice Reform Strategy (JSRS) and Action Plan with financing requirements consistent with budgetary allocations” for the disbursement of the 3rd and 4th tranches (2014-2015) was not met, citing delays in adoption of the legislation, personnel rotation at MoJ, unwillingness of the actors subjected to new legislation to implement its provisions, deficiencies in protecting human rights and tackling corruption, as well as the overly ambitious objectives combined with insufficient capacity of the staff to implement them.

Chronologically, before the start of the evaluation period, in 2012-2013, late implementation of the Strategy and Action plan is cited as the main obstacle. The National Council for Law-Enforcement Bodies Reform, charged with implementation of the JSRS met first in Dec 2012 took until April 2013 reconvene. Also, both the financial support and the mechanism for the implementation were put in place by the EU in 2013, which was 2 years after the start of the JSRS. In 2014-15, political instability, lack of budget funding, resistance from key actors to change, and the lack of measurement of the conducted activities were considered by the EU to be the key obstacles.

The situation did not vastly improve in the following year: the Court of Accounts of Moldova in “Performance Audit report of the JSRS for 2011-2016” (this covered activities implemented up to 2016) stated that the performance was poor. Regarding the audit’s general objective: “The Republic of Moldova has not attained significant progress in Justice Sector Reform”. In its conclusions: “The efforts undertaken by key relevant actors were not conclusive and effective, thus compromising the expected effect of the justice reform.” In its 2016 report for Moldova the European Court of Auditors remarks that “international indicators cast doubt on whether there had been progress”. The GRECO 2016 report was mostly negative in its assessment on corruption in the justice sector and the independence of the judiciary. It particularly expressed “serious misgivings about the composition and operation of the SCM. The Human Rights Report, the State Department of the USA noted among others, “widespread corruption, especially within the judicial sector”. It also notices that “during the year (2016) the government made some progress in investigating corruption cases involving public officials and the judiciary. These actions were mostly perceived as selective justice.”

Since 2017, the information available shows that while the Technical Assistance projects have continued to deliver on the activity and output levels, the political and institutional impediments to the justice sector reform gradually accumulated to cause a stalemate. As a result, the objectives for 2016 and 2017 were considered not met. The body of internal as well as external reports and evaluations is unanimous in attesting to the disfunction of what is supposed to be a mutually re-enforcing interaction of various independent bodies governing the justice sector.
After the collapse of the Maia Sandu Government, the new Minister of Justice decided to take over his predecessor’s previous commitment and disseminated beginning of January 2020 a new draft document entitled “The Strategy for ensuring the independence and integrity of Justice Sector 2020-2023”, accompanied by an Action Plan. These documents were initially prepared by the Ministry of Justice, without sufficient consultation and involvement of stakeholders and international partners. The CoE High Level Delegation on 20 and 21 January 2020 recommended to slow the drafting process down for broad consultation. To date, the draft strategy is ready, and has gathered some contributions from a wider scope of consulted stakeholders, but it has not been adopted.

Indicators depict a judicial system in tension. The EU-supported efforts to bring the legal and regulatory framework in line with international and European standards, and to foster practices that are in line with the ethics of the profession, have created a necessary basis for an independent, accountable, effective and efficient judicial system. Capacity building supported by the EU has fostered lasting changes in the training system for judicial practitioners, performance and career management systems are mostly in place, and the efficiency of courts has increased as a result of the EU’s complex intervention. However, these necessary conditions do not yield the desired impacts yet. Budget support disbursement have been interrupted, corruption remains high in the opinion of all actors despite dedicated EU projects, the public’s perception is timidly improving, and in-depth change management among practitioners is just beginning – for instance, trial monitoring has encountered obstruction, which is symptomatic of an organisational culture which resists to change.

**Police:**

The 2016-2020 police reform strategy pursues objectives which are very much in line with this judgement criterion, and the budget support and complementary assistance have effectively accelerated these dynamics. The implementation of the strategy is mostly on track, according to interviewees and budget support disbursement reports.

However, clear delineation between the political and functional levels remains unfinished. A sound decision to clearly delineate the responsibilities of the police (maintaining and ensuring public order) from Carabinieri (restoring public order) ended in half-measure. The carabinieri remain mostly untouched, despite attempts, clearly due to lack of independence and lack of political will to transform this body into a service-oriented, citizen-focused law enforcement service.

Besides, the independence of the institution vis-à-vis political appointees is only one aspect of independence: next in line is the functional independence of individual officers, who should enjoy a broader margin of appreciation in the exercise of their functions, within the limits of the law and regulations, their job descriptions and ethical guidelines, and within the priorities set forth by the Strategy and their tactical instructions. This fine balance supposes that all law enforcement officers would fully understand and embrace the objectives of their service, and that functional delegation of decision-making would accompany the decentralisation of the police service. That would also suppose sufficient analytical functions and capacities at the local level, so that each officer may take informed decisions in the daily exercise of their duties.

Internal and external accountability mechanisms, including civil society oversight, ethical safeguards and deontology training, became stronger during the period, particularly with the support of EU programmes complemented by other donor initiatives. There is an accent placed on human rights-compliant policing, and budget support clearly helped put the material conditions in line with this requirement. Yet, internal investigations and disciplinary procedures remain scarce compared to the analysis of the perception of the public and the expert community regarding breaches committed by police officers (such as cases of petty corruption as seen by the general public including those who have used police services recently, excessive use of force and possible cases of ill-treatment as pointed by the reports of the People’s Advocate’s Office). It appears that this aspect of internal accountability has been under-invested by EU support, which could partly explain why it is lagging behind.
The effectiveness of the Moldovan law enforcement (which supposes efficient use of resources, sufficient quality of service, and results in terms of tackling security threats) has strongly improved during the evaluation period. This is particularly the case of the Border Police, which directly flows from the high investment of the EU and of the Moldovan State, through the EUBAMs, for the implementation of the VLAP and, henceforth, of the visa-free regime. This is also the case of the General Police Inspectorate, particularly thanks to the redistribution of its human and material assets towards the patrol police. Progress also took place in the area of criminal investigation, particularly in forensic capacities. The budget support programme, through its incentive structure and the material investments it allowed, played a big role in this progress.

The Moldovan law enforcement is therefore much more effective now than before 2014, and this is recognized by all interlocutors and documentation.

**Indicator 5.1.1. Supported self-governance bodies of the justice system are independent, ready, willing and able to regulate their professions**

Strength of evidence based: Very strong

**Main source of information:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document review</th>
<th>Interviews with 28 persons including Moldovan officials, CSOs, EU officials, others.</th>
<th>Perception of Judges, Prosecutors and Lawyers on justice reform and fight against corruption, Legal Resource Center Moldova 2015 Evaluation survey Public Opinion Barometer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EuropeAid/138640/DH/SER/MD ENPI/2012/023-420 “Support to the Justice Sector Reforms”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moldova 2011-2016 Strategy on Justice Sector Reform</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moldova 2019-2022 Draft Justice Sector Development Strategy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moldova 2021-2024 Draft Strategy for ensuring independence and integrity of the justice sector the law no 154 of 05 July 2012 on the selection, performance evaluation and career of Judges (…)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law no 178 of 25 July 2014 on the disciplinary liability of judges, regulating the procedure of dismissal of judges.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRECO Reports on Moldova (all)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Superior Council of Magistracy:

The Parliament of the Republic of Moldova adopted the law no 154 of 05 July 2012 on the selection, performance evaluation and career of judges, defining the procedure of selection, continuous training, and promotion of judges. Law number 153 adopted on 05 July 2012 by the Parliament amended the rules for the appointment of judges and clarified the role of the Superior Council of Magistracy (SCM) into this strategic process. During 2014, 269 out of 414 judges have been evaluated by SCM. The timing of the amendments adopted in 2012 were in line with the Judicial Reform Action Plan timeline, but their content was criticized. However, in 2013-2014 no relevant amendments to the Law on SCM took place. In December 2013 (Law no. 326) the legislation introduced a ban for judges on ex parte communication. The rules for selection and promotion of judges have not changed since 2012.

The Superior Council of Magistracy (SCM) approved on 05 March 2013 the Regulation on the criteria for selection, promotion and transfer of judges. The content of the SCM regulation has been constantly criticized by the CSOs as not in line with European best practices and Venice Commission opinions.

The law no 178 of 25 July 2014 on the disciplinary liability of judges, regulating the procedure of dismissal of judges was adopted. However, it disregarded important Venice Commission recommendations (e.g., role of inspector judges, ban on transfer of judges during the period of disciplinary sanctions, grounds for dismissal of judges).

In 2018, the Government prepared a draft law on amending and supplementing the constitution with respect to the superior council of magistracy, which the Venice Commission welcomed but which was never adopted to date.

The General Assembly of Judges on 27 September 2019 ruled to dismiss the elected judges’ members of the Superior Council of Magistrates (SCM) alleging the lack of independence vis-à-vis the executive power. Together with the earlier resignation of the President of the SCM in July 2019 this has effectively blocked the ability of the EU to provide support to SCM, since it was not operational.

Throughout 2019 it proved impossible to implement the methodology of the new legislation on Integrity, Disciplinary and Ethics. The creation of the relevant working group was de-prioritized by the MoJ, giving priority to the re-evaluation of Judges within the framework of a vetting process in 2019. Nevertheless, as the foreseen re-evaluation process of judges includes an evaluation of their integrity, the EU project team reported it being of crucial importance to master the Integrity evaluation methodology and was expecting follow up for 2020.

In January 2020, following an urgent request by the Minister of Justice, the Venice Commission issued an urgent Joint Opinion on the draft law on amending the law No. 947/1996 on Superior Council of Magistracy. The Venice Commission welcomed most of the draft provisions but expressed “serious concern about the manner in which four lay members of the SCM have just been elected, which seems to defeat the proclaimed aim of the legislative amendments of December 2019 to restore the public trust in the SCM. These four lay members have been elected in a controversial, non-consensual manner and for a full mandate of four years, which hampers the positive impact which the constitutional amendments ought to have brought. The transitional constitutional provision to the effect that the sitting members of the SCM will terminate their mandate acquires a totally different perspective against this background.”
The legislative amendments were adopted by the Parliament and entered into force following their promulgation by the President of the Republic on 31 January 2020.

Overall, the SCM has been equipped, thanks to EU support, with a number of internal processes and tools to fulfil its role. The Board of Ethics in particular, can rely on a compliant new Code of Ethics. Yet, at the date of drafting this report, the SCM is split between diverging interests and its membership is considered illegitimate by many actors: the latest appointment process was marred by insufficient competition and other issues of legitimacy, the CSM has been impaired by its inability (or alleged unwillingness) to meet the required quorum for important decisions, judges consider that they are underrepresented in the CSM. Despite the technical tools placed at its disposal, and the presence of change agents within, as a collegial body the SCM it is neither ready, willing or able to perform its mission of independent, impartial, effective and efficient governance of the body of judges.

**Prosecution (Superior Council of Magistracy and General Prosecutor’s Office):**

In 2019 the Maia Sandu Government amended the Law on Prosecutor’s office to establish a new selection process for the appointment of the General Prosecutor. The draft law envisaged an extraordinary Evaluation Committee for the selection of at least two candidates to be submitted to the Superior Council of Prosecutors (SCP), which then would propose to the President of the Republic the chosen candidate after evaluation and interview.

The draft law was adopted by the Parliament on 16 September 2019. In compliance with this law, the MOJ has established the extraordinary Evaluation Committee, which pre-selected four candidates to be submitted to the SCP. However, the Minister of Justice cancelled on 6 November 2019 the contest results for the position of General Prosecutor, stating that the members of the commission received, after announcing the preliminary results of the selection, additional information regarding some candidates that was unknown to them. Consequently, the Prime Minister Maia Sandu assumed responsibility for modifying the Law on the Prosecutor’s Office and put forward two candidates for the position of General Prosecutor, according to the procedure foreseen by Article 106.1 of the Constitution. In response, the Socialist Party filed a motion of censure, which was voted by 63 MPs on 12 November 2019 and led to the collapse of the government. However, the new Minister of Justice has considered that the selection procedure of the General Prosecutor was legal and decided to submit the four candidates pre-selected by the extraordinary Evaluation Committee to the SCP, which has approved the candidature of Mr. Alexander Stoianoglo. On 29 November 2019, the President of the Republic signed a decree appointing him to the post of General Prosecutor.

Due to these problems EU support to SCP was impeded, although to a lesser extent than in case of SCM. EU-supported assessments were issued: i) on the law on Prosecution Service including prosecutors’ selection, appointment, evaluation, promotion and disciplinary ii) on the criminal procedure code regarding the prosecutor’s independence in matters related to prosecutorial decision-making; iii) on the legislative and practical safeguards for prosecutors; and iv) on the amendment of the Code of Prosecutor’s Conduct were prepared by EU experts.

EU cooperation also supported the General Prosecutor’s Office towards independence, accountability, and transparency. The revision of the Code of Ethics was an important step. Another major output was the assessment of the Prosecution’s Inspectorate, a key actor to hold prosecutors accountable. The assessment was rated positively and recommended important changes. Series of trainings took place with prosecutors, particularly on ethics. However, despite these important contributions to the framework on accountability and independence, the documents and interviews do not point to measurable changes from the perspective of the daily performance of prosecutors.

The documentation shows that the SCP is only starting to incorporate the changes promoted by the Strategy and by EU projects. Most interviewees consider both the SCP and the General Prosecutor’s Office as hard to reach and consider that the SCP cannot be considered, as of yet, ready, willing and able to strongly contribute to the independence, accountability and efficiency of the judiciary.
Supreme Court:

The above-mentioned Law on the reform of the supreme court of justice and the prosecutor’s office, adopted in 2019, beside provisions on the Prosecutor’s Office and Superior Council of Prosecution, envisaged a vetting process for sitting judges and a profound rehaul of the Supreme Court. The draft Law was commented by the Venice Commission who expressed serious concerns at the combination of several targets and purposes within the same law (prosecution, Supreme Court, vetting of judges, changes to the SCM): according to the Venice Commission, “This combination between two different purposes obstructs the justification for subjecting all the sitting Supreme Court judges to extraordinary re-evaluation and for the interference with the principle of being able to remove judges. This justification is even more important as a vetting scheme may create a dangerous precedent and may lead to an expectation that there will be a vetting scheme after each change of government, which would undermine the motivation of the judiciary and reduce its independence.” The Law was not adopted, but the process demonstrates the fragility of the architecture of governance of the Moldovan judiciary, regardless of the Government in place. Currently, most interlocutors consider that the quality of the work of the Supreme Court of Justice requires serious improvement.


Strength of evidence based: Very Strong

Main source of information:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document review</th>
<th>Interviews</th>
<th>Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>European judicial systems Efficiency and quality of justice CEPEJ STUDIES No. 23 Edition 2016 (2014 data)</td>
<td>Interviews with 28 persons including Moldovan officials, CSOs, EU officials and implementing partners, others.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project reports (349066 ATECO, PGG CEPEJ)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation reports (PGG CEPEJ, Four Justice support Technical Assistance projects)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall, CEPEJ indicators have improved during the evaluation period, and considering its budgetary challenges, Moldova does not rank badly among the 45 reviewed countries. Progress is most noteworthy in areas which were directly supported by the EU, particularly through technical assistance projects and contribution agreements with the Council of Europe.

1. Budget of the judicial system (including courts, legal aid and prosecution services) per capita (as per latest available population census): In 2014, of the 45 States evaluated by the European Commission for the Efficiency of Justice (CEPEJ), Moldova had the lowest amount of public budget allocated to the judicial system per capita: 8 EUR. Yet, compared to its wealth, Moldova made a relatively high budgetary effort for the judicial system. This effort gradually increased further until 2018 (latest data available in CEPEJ reports), with 13.23 EUR per inhabitant – still far below the European median of 61.3 EUR, but a significant effort compared to the GDP per capita. Within this budget, the highest proportion is dedicated to the functioning of the courts (7.03 EUR per capita, a clear increase from 4.85 EUR in 2014), followed by the prosecution (whose part in the judicial budget more than doubled from 2.05 to 5.74 EUR per capita during the period). Meanwhile, the budget per capita dedicated to legal aid remained almost unchanged, from 0.33 to 0.47 EUR per capita. The budgetary priority put on courts and prosecution services could
contribute to increased efficiency of the judiciary. However, an increased effort on prosecution services, compared to the rights of the defence/victims, especially the most vulnerable who require legal aid, is concerning. It also needs to be considered in the light of the modest efforts of EU-Moldova cooperation on supporting the defence (only one dedicated project during the evaluation period). Overall, the judicial system is mostly financed by the State budget, and only modestly by court taxes.

2. Human resources: The number of judges per 100,000 inhabitants has increased modestly during the period from 10.8 in 2014 to 16.41 in 2018. This is just under the European median of 17.66. This is only sustainable if the incoming cases are commensurate, which is currently the case, with 2.23 cases per 100 inhabitants at first instance in civil courts, 1.62 in criminal courts and 0.33 in administrative courts – but these numbers increase steadily albeit slowly, and potential shortcomings could be anticipated. The number of prosecutors per 100,000 inhabitants increased significantly from 19.58 in 2014 to 24.16 in 2018, well above the European median of 11.25 (in 2018). Meanwhile, the number of lawyers per 100,000 inhabitants has increased from 47.07 to 78.87, which is modest if one considers the European median at 123. Again, this reflects slight over-investment in prosecution, and under-investment in the defence, mirrored in the number of EU support projects associated to the respective components of the judicial system. In interviews, most interlocutors nuance the assessment of the clearance rate, deploiring that judge and (to a lesser extent) prosecutors deal with too many cases at the same time. While praising the success of the IT-based randomisation of case distribution, which tends to harmonize the workload between judges, interviewees also regret that the complexity of cases is not well factorized by the system. This is acknowledged in the relevant project reports, and by technical partners including the CEPEJ, and an update of the system is upcoming to correct possible discrepancies.

3. The clearance rate of cases (number of cases cleared divided by number of cases received in a year) is commensurate, raging around 100% in all jurisdictions and at all levels, which is in line with European medians. Clearance rates at first instance levels in all types of jurisdictions have increased significantly during the period, particularly in criminal courts, which needs to be correlated with the bulk of EU support to the efficiency of courts. In the stages after the first appeals, clearance rates tend to decrease slightly. The disposal time varies much more, depending on the jurisdictions and the level of jurisdictions, from 24 days in the highest instances of administrative courts, to 205 days at first instance in administrative courts – the civil and criminal courts having a disposal time of 142 and 170 days in the first instances of civil and criminal courts respectively. All disposal times in Moldovan courts are under European medians (which is positive), except for first instance criminal courts. The tends of disposal time over the period are similar to those of clearance rate, which shows that the evolutions mirror efficiency gains or losses linked to changes in the tools, processes and capacity of the existing human resources. This also likely reflects the hiring of new, well-trained judges who went through the EU-supported National Judicial Academy. They currently perform mostly at first instance level and their efficiency has likely boosted the corresponding indicators. As these judges reach the higher echelons, and new well-trained judges join the institution, it is possible that their efficiency level is mirrored in higher jurisdictions – provided they retain their aptitudes, know-how and motivation.

4. Salaries (start of career): Judges’ and prosecutors’ salaries have steadily increased during the period, but so have the national average gross salary. While the prosecutors’ salary progression is parallel to that of the national average gross salary, judges’ salaries increased much less, to the extent that the national average gross salary caught up with judges’ salaries. Most interlocutors during interviews considered that judges were underpaid in Moldova, which creates vulnerabilities to corruption.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main source of information:</th>
<th>Interviews</th>
<th>Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JSRS of the Republic of Moldova; Review of implementation, Assessment and Recommendations; COE, Directorate General Human Rights and Rule of Law/05.12.2017</td>
<td>Interviews with 28 persons including Moldovan officials, CSOs, EU officials and implementing partners, others.</td>
<td>Support to efficient prevention and fight against corruption in the justice sector: Survey report on NIJ initial and continuous training, 2019.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support to efficient prevention and fight against corruption in the justice sector: project documents and reports</td>
<td>Increased efficiency, accountability and transparency of Courts (ATRECO project): project documents and interim report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The National Institute of Justice (NIJ), established in 2006 offers initial and continuous training to judges and prosecutors and their assistants, as well as court registry employees, court chancellery employees, prosecutor consultants, probation officers, and attorneys providing free legal aid. Despite repeated requests, it was not possible to obtain the exact proportion training participants who hold supervisory positions, but document analysis and interviews show that the population of NIJ trainees reflects the general population of judicial practitioners, which is extremely positive.

The 18-month Initial Training is a formal requirement and precondition for appointment to the positions of judges or prosecutors: candidates are trained on domestic legislation and legal framework; relevant European and international treaties, court jurisprudence of the domestic courts and of the Constitutional Court; the jurisprudence of the European Court of Human Rights (ECtHR) as well as the European Court of Justice (ECJ). All magistrates that were appointed since 2006 therefore undertook the NIJ’s initial training. These are overwhelmingly junior judges and prosecutors born in the 1980’s and working in first instance courts. Magistrates working in the Courts of Appeal and in the Supreme Court were overwhelmingly appointed before the creation of the National Institute of Justice and have not undertaken the initial training.

Once appointed, the judicial practitioners listed above are required to 40 hours of training per year. The training offer is structured in modules, several of which were designed through EU-funded projects (such as the Partnership for Good Governance, a joint EU/Council of Europe programme, as well as technical assistance programmes ATRECO and Support to efficient prevention and fight against corruption in the justice sector). According to a survey conducted by the project Support to efficient prevention and fight against corruption in the justice sector in 2019, it seems that the legal requirement is respected for almost all judges and prosecutors, including those in supervisory positions.

Apart from the fact that few went through initial training, the specificity of magistrates in supervisory positions is therefore to be found in the type of continuous training modules they choose to attend, and which do not necessarily include the most needed topics (as assessed by the technical partners) such as management, anti-corruption, ECtHR judgements and human rights. There are also reports of the most senior practitioners signing in to training modules because they are legally obliged but in reality, attend only a small portion of them.
Throughout the period, public confidence in the justice system has been very low, while fluctuating between 8% (second semester 2016) and 24% (first semester 2017). There is no evidence of any relationship between the reform efforts or policy moves, supported by the EU or not, and the evolution of the public’s trust in their justice system. The only possible exception is the suspension of budget support to the judicial sector in 2017 – but that year is also when further revelations came to light on the “Laundromat” case, and attribution is hard to establish. Arguably, both events corroborated each other in the eyes of the public.

These fluctuations mostly mirror those of the trust rates in other public institutions (except the Army) and tend to correspond to the aftermath of the largest corruption scandals. But parallel trends of trust in the justice and other State institutions do not only mean that confidence in the judiciary responds to similar factors as confidence in State institutions overall – they also mean that the two reinforce each other. As the LCRM report says, “if public confidence in all that a state means decreases, confidence in the justice system will inevitably decrease as well.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public trust rate in the justice system overall</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>19% Dip between 1st and 2d semester</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public trust rate in the prosecution</td>
<td>No data available</td>
<td>No data available</td>
<td>No data available</td>
<td>23% Plunge between 1st and 2d semester</td>
<td>18.5% Up-down fluctuation</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major events</td>
<td>Bank fraud revelation</td>
<td>Major legislative changes on organisation of the justice system</td>
<td>Laundromat revelations Suspension of budget support to justice reform</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The majority of interviewees highlight that low trust of the citizens in the justice system relates to the public’s perception that judicial practitioners are corrupt and part of what is referred to as “the system”: a
complex of personal loyalties, advantages and pressures inherited from the immediate post-soviet system, and which has gradually evolved into the capture of the judiciary. Interviewees further consider that the inability of the judicial system to prosecute the two major corruption scandals (the “bank fraud” and the “laundromat” cases) for the past few years creates an impression of incapacity at best, unwillingness and collusion at worst. They also point to the media coverage of high-profile cases, and of the judiciary in general, which they consider to be often suggestive. The protracted debates over the appointments of members of the Superior Council of Magistracy, investigations and dismissals at the highest level of the judiciary further spined this coverage, and arguably public perception.

But our survey mostly suggests that the poor reputation of the justice system also has much to do with its actual performance with the daily delivery of justice. The 1304 respondents who used the services of the justice system rated their experience in average at 1.7 out of a four-star rating. Overall, respondents associate the justice system the most with the words “corrupt” (87%), “politcized” (73%) and unprofessional (43%). Among those who used the services of the justice system during since 2014, the figures are slightly better, showing that some justice users are pleasantly surprised by their experience, but they remain fairly similar: “corrupt”, “politcized” and “unprofessional” remain the most frequently associated words (83%, 66% and 45% respectively). While the efficiency of justice has gradually progressed since 2014, and is close to European medians, challenges obviously remain with the quality of justice, and the experience of the citizens. Among our interviewees who are close to, or part of the judicial system, informed opinions are split between a short majority who believe that most judicial practitioners are subject to “the system” and get along with it due (among other reasons) to lack of professionalism and competence as well as vulnerability to corruption or compromising deals, and a minority who believe that most judicial professionals are devoted, integrous and professional. Yet, all interviewees agree that “something is wrong” with the justice system and, if not the efficiency, surely the quality of judicial decision. The informed opinion of stakeholders involved in justice reform is therefore very similar to that of the vast majority of Moldovan citizens who took our survey. The Legal Reform Center Moldova, quoting among others a World Bank survey from 2017, finds the same patterns: the trend is therefore sustained over the years, regardless of reform efforts. In all groups of respondents, all negative words outnumber by far all positive words. The most likely positive word to be associated with the justice system is “impartial”, but with only 16% of respondents picking it.

It is worth noting that women are significantly less likely than men to have used the services of the justice system (only 457 women out of 1304 self-reported users) – but their judgement on the performance or characters of the judicial system are not significantly different from that of men.

Interestingly for questions about the level of access to the justice system, and how this may influence perception, there was no significant difference between rural and urban respondents regarding their likelihood to have used the services of the justice, nor regarding their satisfaction or opinions of the justice system.

The level of trust towards the EU does not affect this perception significantly: respondents have comparable results regardless of whether they rather trust, or rather distrust the EU's intentions.

Therefore, Moldovans’ opinions about their justice seem to be both very marked and very consensual among the population: they are not significantly affected by the conditions of the respondents – which is not the case for other series of questions, on the economy or local services for instance. One can only conclude that it will take a lot of time, efforts and results to affect them, and there is no obvious population group that should be prioritized to build better trust between the citizens and their justice system.

In 2016-2017 studies showed that the perception of citizens and actors deteriorated as regards corruption and Human Rights. The Judicial sector is considered one of the main corruption sources and citizens’ opinions for it are unfavourable up to 76%. Opinions as for the MoJ's activity are also unfavourable (68%). The Judicial Framework and Independence rating declined from 4.75 to 5.00 “due to intimidation of judges who are not in line with the political agenda, lack of reforms to ensure integrity in the appointment of
judges, and the politicized decision of the Constitutional Court that pre-empted a popular mobilization in favour of direct presidential elections”.

**Indicator 5.1.5. Evolution of Public trust in the police (%)**

Strength of evidence based: Very Strong

**Main source of information:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document review</th>
<th>Interviews</th>
<th>Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

From 2014 to 2018 (public opinion barometer available) the trust rates towards the police fluctuated around 31% (between and 39% and 25%, starting and ending at 31% over the period), right behind the Prime Minister and around the average rating of State services. The fluctuations in this trust rate do not have obvious links to stages of the police reform, or to key events, except an ephemeral soar to 46% during the first semester of 2017, followed by a plunge to 29% in the second semester, which could be attributed to various factors including the effects of the ongoing reform, the deployment of the 2016-2020 police development strategy, the launch of budget support, or various events covered by the media. There seems to be a clear increase in public trust in the police since 2019, but this needs to be confirmed in 2020 and 2021 to make a convincing trend. So far, the first figures for 2021 show a slight decrease at 37.5%, indicating that the improvement may not be so well established.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2014 (Public opinion barometer)</th>
<th>2015 (Public opinion barometer)</th>
<th>2016 (Public opinion barometer)</th>
<th>2017 (Public opinion barometer)</th>
<th>2018 (Public opinion barometer)</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020 (Ministry of Internal Affairs)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public trust rate in the police</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>25.5%</td>
<td>37.5% (1st semester 46%, second semester 29%)</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondents were more likely to have interacted with the police than with the justice system (close to 900 of our respondents) since 2014, which is unsurprising, especially with the gradual decentralisation of the General Police Inspectorate and a gradual redeployment of police services closer to the grassroots. Those who have rate their satisfaction on this occasion at 2.1 on a four-star scale.

Overall, our survey respondents associate the police with the words “corrupt” (70%), “unprofessional” (51%) and “politicized” (49%). Respondents who have interacted with the police do not have a significantly different opinion from others (68%, 52%, 44% for the same words respectively).
Women are less likely than men to have had contacts with the police. However, they rate their experience with the police almost identically to men, whether or not they have interacted with the police since 2014 – though those who have interacted with the police are less likely to consider the police “politicized”. In all respondent groups, all negative words outweigh by far all positive words. Generally, the older the respondents, the more severe they are towards the police – though this trend is within the margin of error. The best score attained by a positive word is 18% for “friendly”.

Rural respondents were only marginally less likely to have been in contact with the police during the period, which is positive in terms of coverage of the territory and access. The same is true of contacts with the police depending on regions. However, these factors do not significantly affect the satisfaction or perception towards the police, which is fairly stable regardless of location or type of dwelling.

The level of trust towards the EU does not affect this perception significantly: respondents have comparable results regardless of whether they rather trust, or rather distrust the EU’s intentions.

Therefore, just like with the justice system, opinions about the police seem to be both very marked and very consensual among the population: one can only conclude that it will take a lot of time, efforts and results to affect them, and there is no obvious population group that should be prioritized to durably build strong trust between the citizens and their police.

The increase of the public trust in the police was understood as one of the programming priorities for the EU. The budget support instrument “Support to the Police Reform” lists this as its general objective. The reference value of confidence is given as of April 2014 - 31% and the target set for the implementation of the general objective was at least 41% by 2019.

The opinion of stakeholders who are close to police reform differ significantly from survey results. All our interviewees, regardless of their viewpoint, consider that there has been a clear improvement in the performance of the police services towards citizens since 2014. It is possible that the better public trust figures for 2019 encouraged interviewees to see a lasting positive trend in the public’s confidence towards their police service, but the evaluation team considers such conclusions premature: there is clearly a possibility and a door open, but it remains subject to change and cannot be confirmed without continuous improvements.

There were some “soft” anticorruption measures taken to tackle the problem – as well as public perception – in the long run. The anticorruption section was founded in the General Police Inspectorate (GPI) in 2017. Although the section has no investigative powers, it was tasked with assessing and preventing corruption risks in the police. While the concept is sound in principle, the resource allocation did not match the policy intention – the section had only 4 staff compared to a total of 8 600 GPI employees.

**Indicator 5.1.6. Number of internal investigations in law enforcement (trend since 2014)**

Strength of evidence based: Very Strong

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main source of information:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document review</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police General Inspectorate statistics and report on disciplinary actions and criminal cases against police officers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy of police development for the years 2016-2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget Support tranche disbursement reports 1, 2, 3.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
According to the Police General Inspectorate’s internal reporting, the statistics of internal disciplinary sanctions and criminal investigations against police officers are as follows for the period:

**Figure 7: internal disciplinary sanctions and criminal investigations against police officers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of disciplinary sanctions pronounced for police misconduct in relation with citizens (including cases related to ill-treatment)</td>
<td>No data</td>
<td>No data</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of disciplinary sanctions pronounced for other acts of misconduct</td>
<td>No data</td>
<td>No data</td>
<td>720</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of criminal investigations initiated (corruption cases not included)</td>
<td>No data</td>
<td>No data</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of criminal investigations initiated (corruption cases included)</td>
<td>No data</td>
<td>No data</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The breakdown of criminal investigations is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Serious intentional injury to bodily integrity or health</td>
<td>No data</td>
<td>No data</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abduction of a person</td>
<td>No data</td>
<td>No data</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illegal deprivation of liberty</td>
<td>No data</td>
<td>No data</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torture, inhuman or degrading treatment</td>
<td>No data</td>
<td>No data</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual harassment</td>
<td>No data</td>
<td>No data</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The number of disciplinary sanctions for police misconduct in relation to citizens is extremely, perhaps abnormally low. This could indicate, either a tendency to refer any suspicious case to the justice system, or to under-report suspicious cases within the Police General Inspectorate, or to under-sanction disciplinary offences. Interviews are inconclusive in this regard, which shows at least that limited attention is devoted to internal police accountability, especially in terms of redress mechanisms.

The current Police Reform Strategy reiterates the principle of adherence to human rights and has specific objectives on this topic under its second General Objective. There is also, since 2017, a Governmental Action Plan on reducing maltreatment, abuse and discrimination against persons in police custody, but there is very little reporting on its implementation. Within the Strategy, the corresponding measures are mostly preventive, which is commendable but not sufficient: these measures are limited to training, adaptation of premises, and a general pledge to uphold human rights in various settings. Active identification of breaches of the legal and regulatory framework by police officers is not a part of the strategy, and redress mechanisms are limited to “the establishment of a complaints system against police personnel on discrimination and ill treatment acts in Police activity”: in practice, it then falls upon the victims of police misconduct to lead the charge against misconduct.

While police support interventions of the EU put the limelight on police accountability, transparency and respect for rights (very present throughout the five objectives of the budget support programme, and specifically targeted by two CSO monitoring grants), the dedicated expected results target mostly:

1. The improvement of premises (especially for police detention).
2. Training, including on respect for human rights.
3. Control and identification of corruption.

The programme does not target redress mechanisms for police misconduct in relation with citizens within the police service, especially internal investigations.

Criminal cases against police officers still concern mostly ill treatment, but the number of cases is steadily decreasing, which shows the effects of prevention measures.

Corruption cases concern overwhelmingly passive corruption (44%), followed by abuse of office (17%), influence peddling (17%), excessive use of force (11%), fakes in official documents (7%), and negligence (3%).

Other infringements are, on the other hand, tackled by a high number of disciplinary actions. This makes the steady decrease of such disciplinary actions more indicative: there is clearly a decrease in the number of such disciplinary actions since the start of the budget support programme, which points to a decrease in the number of such infractions.

It should be noted that the legal framework surrounding deontology in the police service remains incomplete, particularly as regards use of force: under Law No. 218 (2012) on the Police Status and Activity, police use of force is to be used "in strict accordance with the law, and if non-violent methods do not ensure the fulfillment of police attributions", which is vague.
Indicator 5.1.7. Number of illegal border crossings (trend since 2014)

Strength of evidence based: Very strong

Main source of information:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document review</th>
<th>Interviews</th>
<th>Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IPRE Moldova, Five Years of EU-Moldova Visa Free Travel, Policy Paper, October 2019</td>
<td>Interviews with 5 persons including Moldovan and EU officials and implementing partners, civil society representatives</td>
<td>EU Neighbours East Surveys 2016-2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 April 2014, decision to transfer the Republic of Moldova to the list of third countries whose nationals are exempt from visa requirement Commission staff working document accompanying the document report from the Commission to the European Parliament and the council: Third report under the visa suspension mechanism (2019) Commission reports on implementation of benchmarks for Western Balkans and Eastern Partnership countries, December 2017</td>
<td>Statistics provided by the Moldovan General Border Police Inspectorate EUBAM project documents EU4Border Security project documents Palanca Jointly Operated Border Crossing Project documents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The overall EU action in support of border management has aimed to support the Visa Liberalisation Action Plan (VLAP) in preparation of the visa-free regime for Moldovan citizens, and, following the lifting of the visa regime in 2014, to sustain Moldova’s capacity to manage its borders safely and efficiently in the context of the visa-free regime with the Schengen Zone.

Throughout the reporting period, the flagship programmes of the EU in support of border management have been the series of EU Border Assistance Missions to Moldova (EUBAM): this series of projects started in 2015. During the reporting period, the EU ran four such projects (EUBAM 9 to 12) targeted a complete reform of border management, particularly of the General Border Police Inspectorate under the Ministry of Interior. The EU complemented the EUBAM projects with the Palanca Jointly Operated Border Crossing Project (2014-2018), implemented by UNDP, and the EU4Border Security Project (multi-country project including Moldova, ongoing), implemented by IOM, both targeting joint border management with Ukraine at important border crossing points between the two countries.

Throughout the evaluation period, the effects of these projects have been reported as a success, and the reform of the General Border Police Inspectorate as a showcase success story.

The statistics of illegal border crossings from Moldova to the Schengen Zone have steadily decreased since 2015 (with an ephemeralous and small increase in 2017):
The statistics of illegal border crossings into Moldova have sharply decreased in the two years following the completion of the VLAP, then fluctuated above their historical low of 2016, but remained around a half of their 2014 levels:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Violation of the term of stay in the Republic of Moldova</td>
<td>2272</td>
<td>1403</td>
<td>1041</td>
<td>1183</td>
<td>1332</td>
<td>1184</td>
<td>532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attempted illegal crossing / crossing of BCPs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clandestine</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of false documentation</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside of BCPs</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL persons</td>
<td>2373</td>
<td>1521</td>
<td>1101</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1448</td>
<td>1300</td>
<td>654</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Indicator 5.1.8. Level of turnover at senior level in Police General Inspectorate

Strength of evidence based: Very strong

Main source of information:

Document review
https://politia.md/ro/menu/conducerea
https://politia.md/sites/default/files/organigrama_IGP.pdf

Interviews
Interviews with 15 persons from Moldovan authorities, CSOs, EU officials and implementing partners.

Survey
N/A

Organigramme of the Police General Inspectorate

FINAL REPORT: United Nations Development Programme Republic of Moldova Support to Police Reform Project February 2020

BS disbursement reports: notes 1, 2, 3 to Director NEAR on Support to Police Reform ENI/2015/038-144

Twinning: “Support to the strengthening of the operational capacities of the law enforcement agencies of the Republic of Moldova in the field of prevention and investigation of criminal acts of corruption” – twinning fiche, final report
During the period covered by the evaluation, four different officials headed the Police General Inspectorate (data confirmed by the Police General Inspectorate). These changes coincide with changes in the Government. Documents and interviews suggest that the adequation of views between the Ministry/Minister of Interior and the Chief of Police General Inspectorate remains the norm. Under the Head of Police General Inspectorate, the positions of Deputy Chiefs also rotate considerably. Interviews document analysis show that, despite the adoption of the 2016-2020 Police Development Strategy and corresponding Plan of Action, this turnover at the highest level creates turbulences in the ability of the Police service to maintain optimal momentum in the reform, and in the absorption of the EU’s support – in particular the absorption of the deep changes required by the development strategy and supported by the EU and other partners. The stability of this layer is indeed correctly identified as an assumption by several EU and non-EU projects. All documentation points to the pivotal importance of support to institutional transformation at the top level, and some project reports deplore that turnover of key staff, without significantly impairing the implementation of project activities, slows down the transformative effect of the projects. It should also be noted that the assessment team for budget support also had a high turnover, which could have compounded the effects of turnover at the most senior level in the Police General Inspectorate.

The carrier paths of our interviewees show that heads of Directorates and their cadre experience both lateral and vertical moves, but fortunately at a much lower frequency. Advisory functions remain more stable than others, ensuring continuity in the practitioners’ contributions to decision- and policymaking. This has proven essential in limiting the effects of turnover at the most senior level, because this is the institutional layer at where reliable change agents are needed to carry the intentions of the reforms (as materialized in the Strategy) through changes at the top level. However, this role can only be fulfilled if the expert cadre is empowered through delegation and allowed to show leadership. This factor is difficult to measure without direct field observation, but documents and interviews suggest a very progressive transition in this direction.

While there is sustained renewal of the workforce at the first-line level (in particular patrol police), the most stable layer is therefore the police mid-level management at local level. In terms of change management, this layer is also the most likely to resist the change involved by the Strategy and supported by the EU, because in the short run, the introduction of community policing, deconcentration and delegation mostly affect the leverage of local police station chiefs. It its therefore extremely important to curb the constant turnover at the most senior levels, in order to insufflate stability in the push for reform efforts.

**JC. 5.2 Corruption is prevented in public administration, and prosecuted by dedicated bodies**

During the period covered by this evaluation, Moldova has had two anti-corruption strategies: 2011-2015 and 2017-2020, which mostly materialized in a comprehensive body of legislation and by-laws, chiefly oriented towards the creation and operationalization of specialized anti-corruption bodies and procedures. This EU, EUMSs and other international partners have steadily supported this entire normative framework throughout the evaluation period.

Indicators show small fluctuations in perception of corruption, without any decisive trends, all the while the general level of perception of corruption remains high. The adoption of a body of laws and regulations
was aimed at curbing corruption but was marred by imprecisions and diluted by overlapping mandates; indecisive implementation of the body of anti-corruption normative acts was characterized by the slow prosecution of high-profile cases, limited prosecution of petty corruption, and isolated prevention measures. These indicators depict a constant tension between the efforts to curb corruption by some actors in all constitutional branches of governance, supported by the EU and other international partners and by civil society and media actors on the one hand – and repeated attacks against the rule of law aimed to facilitate corruption and state capture on the other hand. While corruption is being prevented and at times prosecuted through the dedicated institutions, at the same time a system of advantages, compromissions, personal and political loyalties (in short - of corruption) constantly competes with the rule of law and penetrates the very legal and institutional order.

The adoption of a body of laws and regulations was aimed at curbing corruption but was marred by imprecisions and diluted by overlapping mandates; indecisive implementation of the body of anti-corruption normative acts was characterized by the slow prosecution of high-profile cases, limited prosecution of petty corruption, and isolated prevention measures. Interviews, survey data and existing open-source indicators/research show that the joint efforts of Moldovan and EU actors have clearly increased the awareness of corruption and its devastating effects – but the prevention of corruption remains of limited effects and prosecution of corruption is still unconvincing.

Indicator 5.2.1. Corruption perception composite index (trend since 2014)

**Strength of evidence based:** Strong

**Main source of information:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document review</th>
<th>Interviews</th>
<th>Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GRECO page in Moldova <a href="https://www.coe.int/en/web/greco/evaluations/republic-of-moldova">Link</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although Moldova is taking steps to adopt European and international standards for combating corruption and organised crime, corruption remains a major problem. The wider Moldovan public also has a general perception that corruption is prevalent among high-level officials.

Data (Source *Statistica* and Transparency International) indicate that the corruption perception index score of Moldova from 2012 to 2020 has decreased from 36 in 2012 to 32 by 2019, but then rose to 34 in 2020. The index itself is a composite indicator that includes data on the perception of corruption in areas such as bribery of public officials, kickbacks in public procurement, embezzlement of state funds, and effectiveness of governments’ anti-corruption efforts. The highest possible score in perception of corruption is 0, whereas a score of 100 indicates that no corruption is perceived in the respective country. For comparison, the world average in 2019 based on 177 countries is 43 points. Variations during the period 2014-2020 dwindled from 35 to 32 points, but there is no clear trend.

Figure 8: Corruption Perceptions Index Score:
The 2017 report "Moldova: Overview of corruption and anti-corruption" published by Transparency International and U4 Anti-corruption Resources Centre (a permanent centre at the Chr. Michelsen Institute) observe, some "evidence suggest that corruption in the country appears to be becoming more engrained in politics and society, affecting the quality of life for ordinary Moldovans. In particular, the consolidation of an oligarchic elite’s position at the reins of the state apparatus is seen to have fuelled corruption in politics, business and public administration. An example of the country's problem with grand corruption was provided by the 2014 banking scandal, which led to the imprisonment of the former prime minister and precipitated an economic crisis.”

The results of the survey undertaken in the context of the evaluation confirm the a.m. observations: more than 86% of interviewees indicated that they consider the justice system in Moldova as corrupt and more than 72% of interviewees considered it as politicized, more than 70% considered the police as corrupt and almost 49% as politicized. Same, about 45% of interviewees consider that petty corruption has increased and nearly 40% consider that it has remained the same. What concerns high level corruption almost 75% consider that it has increased and almost 20% of interviewees consider that it has remained the same.

**Indicator 5.2.2. Number of investigations, indictments and convictions by specialised corruptions bodies (trends since 2014)**

| Strength of evidence based: Very strong |

**Main source of information:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document review</th>
<th>Interviews</th>
<th>Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Statistics of the National Anti-Corruption agency</td>
<td>Interviews with 22 persons including Moldovan officials, CSO representatives, EU officials and implementing partners, others</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The National Anti-Corruption Agency has recorded the following cases during the evaluated period:

It should be noted that during the reference period some of the criminal cases that were sent to court by the criminal investigation body of the National Anti-corruption Centre (NAC), could have been merged in court, and NAC does not hold such data. At the time of drafting this report, the specialised anti-corruption prosecution had not shared its data.

The overall number of cases managed by the NAC fluctuates around 1000 per year, and the number of cases initiated around 7000 per year, without clear upwards or downwards trends. The number of completed cases in front of the courts tends to decrease during the period, but this is largely due to the merging of cases, which is a positive trend towards higher efficiency. The number of convictions has increased until 2017, after which it decreased to reach 76 convictions in 2019, which is less than in 2014.

Every year, the NAC receives in average 347 cases from other agencies, and refers in average 252 cases, which means the NAC tends to take over significantly more cases than it refers. This trend could show growing recognition of the NAC by other agencies.

The charges motivating investigations include crimes of corruption, economic crime and money laundering, as well as other criminal offences such as fraud, false documentation and declarations, unlawful administrative or judicial decisions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criminal cases, with adopted solutions, calendar period</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Criminal cases managed (860 cases remained at 31.12.2013) and retained to be managed during the annual period</td>
<td>1850/990</td>
<td>1025</td>
<td>1298</td>
<td>1149</td>
<td>1097</td>
<td>1156</td>
<td>943</td>
<td>8518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>initiated by the criminal investigation body of NAC</td>
<td>617</td>
<td>655</td>
<td>795</td>
<td>722</td>
<td>714</td>
<td>640</td>
<td>644</td>
<td>4787</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>received from other criminal investigation bodies</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>487</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>2435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>resumed in management from the annulled, suspended criminal cases</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed criminal cases (composed of cases sent to court and annulled / terminated)</td>
<td>646</td>
<td>662</td>
<td>612</td>
<td>610</td>
<td>619</td>
<td>596</td>
<td>517</td>
<td>4262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sent to court</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>1756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>annulled / terminated</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>407</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>2506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal cases in which other solutions have been adopted</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>730</td>
<td>492</td>
<td>632</td>
<td>708</td>
<td>618</td>
<td>3861</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To suspend the criminal case</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To merge the criminal cases</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>1818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To send according to the competence</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>1768</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conviction sentences</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>845</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Indicator 5.2.3. Perceptions and attitudes towards corruption among civil servants

Strength of evidence based: Strong

Main source of information:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document review</th>
<th>Interviews</th>
<th>Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UNDP, 2019, National integrity and anticorruption strategy impact monitoring survey Moldova 2019</td>
<td>Interviews with 22 persons including Moldovan officials, CSO representatives, EU officials and implementing partners, others</td>
<td>Survey of 1000 members of the police service (Technical Assistance project) Survey of judges and prosecutors 2015 Evaluation survey</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The survey conducted for this evaluation shows that respondents who are employed in the public sector tend to be less pessimistic, or less severe than the general population as regards corruption - although, like the vast majority of respondents, they see corruption as a highly prevalent problem. 43% civil servants who took our survey consider that petty corruption has increased, against 46% in the general population (and a bit more if we subtract civil servants). 71% civil servants consider that high-level corruption has increased, against 74% in the general population. Although civil servants are about as likely as other respondents to have used the services of the police or the justice system, and although they also have mostly negative associations with these sectors, they are significantly less likely to consider them involved in corruption: 58% civil servants consider the police corrupt, against 70% in the general population. 79% consider the justice system corrupt, against 87% of the general population.

Finer analysis of survey results also show that civil servants are less likely than the general population to consider politicized behaviour of a police officer or a judicial professional as corruption: civil servants are significantly more likely to consider these services politicized (52% for the police, against 48% in the general population; 76% for the justice against 73% in the general population), but less likely to consider them corrupt (see above). This shows that a significant fringe of the civil service tolerates political affiliation even in the most sensitive areas of public service.

Interviewees concur with this observation, and even consider the problem more widespread. All interviewees in and around the justice sector considered that at least a significant proportion of judges and prosecutors were corrupt - not necessarily by monetary bribes but rather by undue (if indirect) political and/or personal influence and pressure. The vast majority of them considered this problem not just significant or widespread but conditioning the entire justice sector and affecting most judges and prosecutors. They all considered that there is an organised system of pressure and intentional compromise of magistrates rendering them vulnerable to further political and personal loyalties, which obliterates independence and greatly affects the impartiality, legality and equity of judicial processes and decisions. As regards the police, there is a general consensus to consider that large corruption has been mostly eradicated, but that petty corruption, while diminishing, remains a problem. While all deplore this phenomenon, they tend to consider it difficult to completely prevent as long as salaries are not increased.

All interviewees in the public sector who discussed corruption in a more general sense, considered that the gravest levels of corruption are found in the justice system, the Parliament, and around public procurement and banking. All of them considered corruption one of the most important problems facing Moldova, if not the most important. There is also a recurrent opinion that, while high-level corruption is of the gravest sort and weighs heavily on public finances and the provision of public goods including legal certainty, petty corruption at all levels of the society feeds into the phenomenon. Several interviewees considered that both civil servants and the general public had a certain tolerance and leniency towards petty corruption, which then makes public servants vulnerable to more serious corruption as they advance in their career.
What is particularly concerning is the perception, among almost all public servants interviewed, that the fight against corruption is the business of specialised anti-corruption institutions – not of the police or the justice system. The attitude is that the police and the judiciary (except the anti-corruption specialised prosecution) are only expected to identify corruption within their ranks, but that they should not investigate or prosecute any corruption case beyond that.

EU support has specifically targeted anti-corruption and the vulnerability and perception of public servants towards corruption in several projects, reaching a large number of the most vulnerable public agencies:

Projects specifically supporting anti-corruption action

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Project Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>EU Project &quot;Support to the implementation of the European Union High Level Advisers Mission 2019 – 2021&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>EU/GIZ &quot;Strengthen the rule of law and anti-corruption mechanisms in the Republic of Moldova&quot;, 2020 - 2024, budget of EUR 10 600 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>UNDP project “Curbing corruption by building sustainable integrity in the Republic of Moldova”, 2019-2021, budget 2,019,516 USD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>EU Twinning Project &quot;Enhancing the system of prevention and combating money laundering and terrorism financing in the Republic of Moldova”– 36/39 months, budget of EUR 2 000 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>US/CoE Action against corruption project (2020) - 18 months and a budget of $250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>EU Support to the Police Reform project, launched in 2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Targeted agencies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Agency Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>National Anticorruption Center (NAC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>National Integrity Agency (NIA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Anticorruption Prosecutor’s Office (APO)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Prosecutor’s Office for Combating Organized Crime and Special Cases (PCCOCS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Office for Prevention and Combating of Money Laundering (Financial Intelligence Unit - FIU)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Criminal Assets Recovery Agency - CARA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Prime Minister’s Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>State Chancellery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Ministry of Internal Affairs (SPIA – Internal Protection and Anticorruption Service)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Superior Council of Magistracy (SCM)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Main State Tax Service (STS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Customs Service (CS)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is also an anti-corruption component in virtually all justice and police support projects, as well as in most projects working on public administration and civil service reform, which is fully relevant to addressing the perceptions outlined above. However, these projects mostly target the upper levels of the said agencies, and only just started reaching to the grassroot level of service delivery to the citizens recently. This connotes the prioritization of high-level over petty corruption. While it is fully in line with the most widespread perceptions and opinions within and about corruption in the public sector, this approach may fail to address the root causes of corruption, and the dynamics of petty corruption of public employees creating the entire system’s vulnerability to corruption including at the highest levels. Tackling more systematically grassroot petty corruption and working on reducing its social acceptability could be a key to limit the compromission of civil servants, and their future risk levels.
### Indicator 5.2.4. Corruption prevention regulations adopted in line with European standards in sampled public administrations at national and local level

Strength of evidence based: Very Strong

**Main source of information:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document review</th>
<th>Interviews (5)</th>
<th>Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Government Officials  
Transparency International | |

**Includes:**

- Criminal Code of the Republic of Moldova
- Criminal Procedure Code of the Republic of Moldova
- Electoral Code of the Republic of Moldova
- Law on Political Parties
- Law on Prevention and Fight against Corruption
- Law on Prevention and Combating Money Laundering and Terrorism Financing
- Law on Declaration and Control of the Income and Ownership of the State Dignitaries, Judges, Prosecutors, Public Functionaries and Certain Persons Vested with Managerial Functions
- Law on Public Procurements
- Law on the Protection of Witnesses and Other Participants in Criminal Proceedings
- Law on Access to Information
- Law on Personal Data Protection
- Law on National Anti-Corruption Center
- Law on the Public Prosecutor’s Office
- Law on National Integrity Commission
- Law on the People’s Advocate
The Republic of Moldova has ratified the United Nations Convention Against Corruption (hereinafter – UNCAC) by virtue of Law No. 158 of 2007, reaffirming thus its adhesion to the international principles, values and rules for preventing and combating corruption, along with its commitment to transpose the universal anti-corruption standards into the national legislation and legal practices. The fulfilment of the commitments taken by UNCAC signatory countries is tracked through a Review Mechanism1. The Republic of Moldova underwent the first review cycle which ended in 2016 and whose object was the implementation of Chapters III “Criminalization and Law Enforcement” and IV “International Cooperation” of UNCAC. The international evaluators concluded that the Republic of Moldova had made progress in terms of transposing UNCAC provisions into the national legislation and practices.
The Government of Moldova has undertaken first steps for creating an appropriate framework for fighting corruption, but the enforcement of laws, regulations and appropriations of new systems will need a medium- to long-term engagement from all stakeholders. Multiple new laws and regulations have been approved and are under implementation, as such the existing system seems adequate, but its implementation and enforcement face challenges. In general, the anti-corruption system is too fragmented, with blind spots (some areas nobody by no-one), and others with overlaps. Further to the GoM there are multiple actors aiming to support Moldova to reduce and prevent corruption. However, this will be a medium to long-term exercise which does not only depend on laws, regulations and control, but also on a progressive change in mindset of all stakeholders.

The main institutions active in the area of anti-corruption and anti-money laundering are the National Anti-Corruption Centre (NAC) the National Integrity Authority (NIA), the General Prosecutor's Office (GPO), the Specialised Anti-Corruption Prosecutor's Office (APO), the Specialised Prosecutor's Office on Organised Crime and Special Causes (PCCOCS), The Office for Prevention and Fight against Money Laundering (FIU), the Criminal Asset Recovery Agency (ARO) under the NAC, the Police and the Ministry of Interior, the Tax Authorities, the Court of Accounts, the Customs and the National Bank of Moldova. MoF is entering the anti-corruption scene very aggressively (establishment of new tax investigation service, modelled after Guardia di Finanza, partly on the Russian financial investigation service). In the summer 2020, the new law on sanctions on money laundering was passed. Interviewees acknowledge that the HLA mission and the relevant twinning were instrumental to complete the draft law, which is very innovative. Its implementation will need to be closely monitored.

EU providing a specific support for reducing corruption in public procurement by financing a project with the NGO "Viitorul", which is aiming to improve the transparency and efficiency of public procurement by strengthening capacity and collaboration between key participants of the public procurement process. Key elements of the project are the strengthening the CSOs in the monitoring of public procurements and supporting the establishment and operation of complaint mechanisms.

So far, the government has developed and enacted a series of laws designed to address legislative gaps, including the Law on Preventing and Combating Corruption, the Law on Conflict of Interests, and the Law on the Code of Conduct for Public Servants. During the period covered by the evaluation, Moldova adopted the following key measure for preventing corruption:

- The Code of ethics of prosecutors was elaborated and approved by Superior Council of Prosecutors Decision nr12-173/15 on the approval of the Code of ethics and behaviour of the prosecutor. The Code of Ethics has been approved in 2015.
- The Code of ethics of judges was approved by the General Assembly of Judges on 11 September 2015.
- The Code of ethics of lawyers was approved on 01 July 2016 by the Congress of the Lawyers Union.
- The Code of ethics of bailiffs was approved at the IXth Congress of bailiffs on 18 September 2015.
- The law on personal asset and interest statement was approved by the Parliament on 17 June 2016. It foresees the obligation to declare the personal asset and interest by people in positions of public dignity, by staff of the cabinet of people in positions of public dignity, judges, prosecutors, public servants and by other persons performing a public function, the way of declaring and performing the control over the assets of these persons, the way of making the statements and solving conflict of interests, of incompatibilities.
- The new law on the National Integrity Authority was adopted by the Parliament on 17 June 2016. It reforms this institution, which has the power to control the personal assets and interests, to observe the legal regime of the conflict of interests, incompatibilities and restrictions. The assessment of achievements of the National Anti-Corruption Strategy 2011-2015 concluded that not all performance indicators were achieved. Some of the indicators revealed improvements, while others registered a deteriorating trend, returning to the level of the indicators at the
beginning of the Strategy implementation. As such the Republic of Moldova, has adopted in May 2017 a new sector-wide National Integrity and Anticorruption Strategy (NIAS) and an Action Plan. It involves for the first time all relevant institutions. A step in the implementation of the Strategy was taken with the elaboration of nine sectorial anti-corruption plans. The NIAS has also put in place a 3-tier monitoring mechanism for transparency and accountability. The monitoring mechanism includes 3 separate monitoring groups that are chaired by top level officials.

- In 2016, Moldova started the reform of the prosecution system and created a specialised prosecution agency – The Anticorruption Prosecution Office. The same year, the Moldovan Parliament passed in the first reading the Law on the National Integrity Authority and the Law on Disclosure of Assets and Conflict of Interest by Public Officials. In addition, Parliament passed two new statutes to the Criminal Code criminalising the misuse of international assistance funds, which would help to identify and prosecute any misuse of international donors’ assistance by Moldovan public officials in public acquisitions, technical assistance programmes and grants areas.
- The Law on Whistle-Blowers, which establishes a mechanism for reporting integrity incidents, irregularities and abuses, and which provides protection for whistle-blowers, was adopted in July 2018 and entered into force in November 2018.
- The monitoring mechanism under the 2017-2020 National Integrity and Anticorruption Strategy 2017-2020 was made operational through three monitoring groups, consisting of key institutions and CSOs active in the anticorruption sector.
- The draft law on increasing financial penalties in corruption cases has been under discussion in Parliament since June 2016.

The 4th evaluation of GRECO (10/2020) noted some progress, with the adoption of the new Law on normative acts, which systemises the law-making process (requiring explanatory notes for draft legislation, regulating public consultations and various types of expertise). The law also provides for the setting-up of a unified e-legislation portal for draft laws, which was expected to be operational in 2019. It was also noted that adequate implementation of the legal framework was still a challenge and that many laws were still adopted in fast-track procedures.

Despite the established anti-corruption framework, the number of cases involving prosecution of corruption did not meet international expectations (given corruption perceptions), and enforcement of existing legislation is widely deemed insufficient. The latest UNDP report assessing Moldova national integrity and anti-corruption strategy was aimed to provide a comprehensive assessment of the effectiveness and impact of the implementation of the National Integrity and Anti-corruption Strategy 2017-2020, based on the impact and progress indicators stipulated in the strategy, as well as to better understand the experience and perception of the public about corruption.

The EU-financed High Level Advisors Programme is providing support to the National Anti-Corruption Process Office, the National Integrity Authority, and the whole PM office. The overall objective is the consolidation of Anti-corruption Strategy and its implementation.

The EU/GIZ corruption prevention project started implementation in 2019 only and implementation is delayed by the COVID crisis. The biggest anti-corruption project in Moldova, with a budget of almost Euro 11 million.

There is evidence of specific anti-corruption bodies being created in particularly sensitive ministries. For example, anticorruption section was founded in the General Police Inspectorate (GPI) in 2017, tasked with risk assessment and prevention, rather than investigation. Its limited capacity but it had only 4 staff compared to a total of 8 600 GPI employees. Although the section has no investigative section, it was tasked with assessing and preventing corruption risks in the police.
JC. 5.3 Public administration and public finance management at national and local level was improved

Public financial management (PFM) reform continued during the last years and gave good improvements of the medium-term and annual budget planning. Positive progress was observed related to the comprehensiveness of the budgetary documentation, improvements in sectoral consultations of the medium-term budgetary framework, methodology to improve revenue forecasting, revenue performance (both for tax and customs), positive steps in reforming public procurement (mainly on the legal side) and improvements of the quality of monthly and annual reports. The 2019 budget was consistent with the agreed deficit target with the IMF and was adopted and published on time. However, this budget had underestimated the impact of the reform of public sector wages that had been introduced in the last quarter of 2018. An amended budget was therefore prepared and approved by the new authorities following discussions with the IMF. Overall, PFM reforms remain satisfactory. Transparency also increased thanks to the introduction of stricter requirements on accounting, reporting and external audit in large SOEs and joint stock companies.

Indicator 5.3.1 MTFP elaborated and used at central and decentralized levels

Strength of evidence based: strong

Main source of information:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document review</th>
<th>Interviews (7)</th>
<th>Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Final report of the Technical Assistance; Report CG36(2019)15final 4 April 2019</td>
<td>EU Officials</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local and regional democracy in the Republic of Moldova. DOAs and reports of projects: Support to the Public Administration Reform process. Final Evaluation of the Budget Support Programme “Support to Public Finance Reform in Moldova” Project No.2018/399273</td>
<td>Ministry of Finance Officials</td>
<td>Former TA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NSO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Further to budget support interventions EU supported the Ministry of Finance (Technical Assistance to Improve Public Finance Policy and Public Financial Management in Moldova EuropeAid/136587/DH/SER/MD) with technical assistance in a broader package supporting Public Financial Management Reforms. Additionally, a call for proposals was launched for “Strengthening role of civil society in economic governance and public finance management”

The final report of the technical assistance as well as interviews with national stakeholders and EU officials give evidence that at central level the Ministry of Finance is undertaking mid-term financial planning. The EU consultants revised the existing Midterm Budget Framework, identified weaknesses

3 On 1 December 2018, the Government of Moldova introduced a new unitary pay system in the public sector. The aim of this reform was to make the public pay system simpler, more transparent, and fairer. The ILO together with German GIZ and the European Union provided technical assistance and played a critical role in facilitating the process leading up to the adoption of the new law. The reform boosted salary increases of lower-paid public sector workers such as employees in the health and education sectors. As a consequence of the public sector pay reform, more than 8,000 people working as in the education sector will benefit from the wage increase of nearly 90%.
and shortcomings in the structure and content and made recommendations. They made recommendations to improve the content of the MTBF document and strengthen the preparation process by proposing upgraded submission templates by sector and introduced MTBF policy hearings. A complete guiding outline for the upgraded MTBF document was prepared that aided the preparation of the MTBF 2018-2020 that was approved by the Government. Stakeholders in interviews confirm that the Ministry of Finance took the process of undertaking mid-term financial planning seriously, there have been important improvements in the last 4 years. The process is ongoing even after the completion of the technical assistance contract. Even after the end of the program they continue to work. Fiscal Affairs also undertook spending reviews.

There is no evidence of MTBF preparation at the local level. In general planning and budgeting capacities are good in major cities but are very limited in rural areas. Since 2015 local governments have full budget autonomy, but the capacity to prepare budget forecasts and manage the budget is very limited. In fact, many of the local governments count with 2-3 staff only.

American USAID is supporting with the Comunitatea Mea program annual budget planning and review process at local level. The programme is working with local public officials to help them prepare the budgets and financial forecasts. This includes opening budget hearings to the public and institutionalizing regular financial reporting. To date, the program has assisted 20 LPAs. Of these, 17 communities have organized public budget hearings and attracted over 500 residents to participate.

**Indicator 5.3.2. Increased level of detail in national budget, per objective and per type of expenditure**

**Main source of information:**
- Interviews
- Survey
- Moldovan national budget (MoF website)
- GoM officials
- Staff Ministry of Finance AT, HLA
- AT, HLA

The EU support to the Public Finance Policy Reforms in Moldova” (PFPR) was delivered through a Sector Reform Contract, with a total budget of EUR 37 million. The Programme included a budget support component (EUR 33 million over 3 years) and complementary support in the amount of EUR 4 million including technical assistance (EUR 3,327,500 contracted amount, 3-year duration) and a call for proposals “Strengthening role of civil society in economic governance and public finance management” (EUR 232,105 contracted amount, 30 months duration). The EU support is supporting the PFM Reform Strategy (2013-20) developed by the Ministry of Finance. The budget support (BS) component of PFPR was designed for operational implementation in 2015-2017.

The specific objective of the BS was to assist the Government (notably the Ministry of Finance), Parliament (notably the Committee for Economy, Budget and Finance) and the Supreme Audit Institution (Court of Accounts) of Moldova in the process of enhancing good governance, effective fiscal policy, transparent and accountable public finance policy and strengthened public financial management systems. The TA project started in November 2015 and was completed in November 2018.

- The key contribution of the TA in PFM reforms is presented below by 7 components.
- Improved capacity and regulatory framework at MoF in fiscal governance, macroeconomic forecasting and revenue projection
• New MTBF processes, improved presentation of annual budget annexes, support in the rationalisation of the budget-programme and economic segments of the budget classification
• Support in the development and publication of the Citizens’ Budget, Moldova’s participation in the Open Budget Survey, as well as in improving the parliamentary oversight and external audit
• Support in improving budget execution, including the effectiveness of commitment management and liquidity management, development of National Public Sector Accounting Standards
• Support in improving public debt management, including Government Securities, domestic and external borrowing, on-lending and operational risk management
• Support in improving capital investment, including the regulatory framework to strengthen public investment management, development of the Register of Public Investment Projects database
• Raising awareness on the EU budget support instrument, and link with national medium-term resource allocation process.

There will not be necessarily more details in the National budget of Moldova, as it already has a high level of details; however at least part of the weaknesses in budget classification (budget classification not fully compliant with international standards set out by GFS 2001 (and COFOG)), which may affect rational planning and resource allocation. This weakness has also been mentioned in the PEFA review of 2015. The classification system has been reported as problematic. The problems are identified in the overall logic, the definition of items, and the code structure.

This aspect was not within the direct objectives of the EU support, but partly tackled by the technical assistance provided as complementary support to the PFM Sector Support.

As indicated in the final report of the TA project (end 2018), during the technical assistance contract changes have been agreed to be introduced in the 2019 Budget document. The new format for presenting budget data and information in a user-friendly manner is aimed at improving budget management, and the analysis of basic fiscal and budgetary information. The changes will also align Moldova with good international practice.

In the context of the overall technical assistance to PFM reforms recommendations were made by the TA team (2015-11/2018) for the revision and rationalisation of the budget-programme and economic segments of the budget classification. Although the MoF has not been able to implement changes in the classification system within the lifespan of the EU TA to PFM reforms, the support provided gave guidance on how to rationalise the budget classification system.

Improved public access to budget information through Citizens Budget has been achieved, budget-related material is made available weekly through Parliament’s website.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator 5.3.3 Public employment and Procurement rules, procedures, and practice in line with European standards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strength of evidence based: Strong</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Main source of information:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document review</th>
<th>Interviews</th>
<th>Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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Procurement

The 2016 Law on Public Procurements aligned Moldovan governmental practices with the EU practices and the WTO Government Procurement Agreement. The elaboration and promotion of the state policy in the field of public procurement being a basic function of the Ministry of Finance.

To carry out the public procurement processes, a set of legislative and normative acts are used; the basic norm is Law no. 131 of July 3, 2015, on public procurement. The law has established new rules on public procurement and detailed the procurement procedures, to transpose EU directives into national law. Most of the law’s provisions entered into force as of 30 April 2016. To implement the provisions of the Moldova-EU Association Agreement, as well as measures for the implementation of the Agreement on public procurement of the World Trade Organization, the Ministry of Finance has developed the Strategy for the development of the public procurement system for 2016-2020. The action plan regarding its implementation, was approved by Government Decision no. 1332 of 14 December 2016.

At the level of the Ministry of Finance the “Policy Service for the regulation of public procurement” is the department responsible for the elaboration and promotion of the legislative and normative framework that regulates the field of public procurement. The Public Procurement Agency is a specialized body subordinated to the Ministry of Finance, which ensures the implementation of the state policy in the field of public procurement.

In 2018, there were many changes regarding the public procurement process in Moldova and the role of the Public Procurement Agency was modified. According to the amended Public Procurement Law, the Public Procurement Agency is tasked with monitoring contracts. Monitoring implies the random selection of any public procurement and its monitoring throughout the process.

To tackle corruption and attract more suppliers to the public procurement market, Moldova is piloting a new, radically transparent e-procurement system called MTender with the support of the European Bank of Reconstruction and Development (EBRD). MTender’s public platform allows anyone to access timely, user-friendly information on more than 60,000 contracting procedures conducted since 2017. Since October 2018, MTender covers all procurement above both national and European thresholds. MTender is an open-source system and (according to the web) is not always customer friendly. As such in September 2019, the Delegation of the European Union to the Republic of Moldova issued an EUR 1.2 million contract to an eGP company European Dynamics to finish the development of an e-procurement system in Moldova.

The TA project which is complementary support to the PFMR has (between others) the objectives of assisting governmental authorities, procurement regulators and contracting authorities to comply with the principles of good governance benchmarks to improve the public procurement system and therefore the quality of public investments. This aspect was only partly tackled by the TA project, but transparency aspects addressed by grant to civil society organisation. Civil society associations are monitoring the tender processes and making their own analysis. A Government decision of 2019 to take the tender of medicines out from the e-tender process has been heavily criticized, as it affects transparency and may lead to higher costs.

In summary:

- The Moldovan procurement system is quite well aligned with EU standards.
Public procurement procedures are overseen by the **Public Procurement Agency**. The Agency publishes procurement announcements in an electronic bulletin that can be accessed via an online subscription.

All Moldovan government agencies can conduct procurements. All-important acquisitions require competitive bidding with strict formal requirements.

An electronic procurement system has been implemented. The platform was extended to encompass the entire range of procurements organized by public authorities.

Interviews and public reports indicate that public procurement practices are still cumbersome for foreign companies. The time allowed for preparing bids after the announcement of a tender is frequently short and documentation requirements, including translation into Romanian, can be onerous for companies not based in Moldova. This may affect the interest of companies from EU Member States to participate in public tenders in Moldova and as such affect's competition.

### Indicator 5.3.4 increased % of budget resources decentralized

**Strength of evidence based:** Medium

**Main source of information:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document review</th>
<th>Interviews</th>
<th>Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of the Moldovan Government Action Plan for 2020-2023</td>
<td>EU officials</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study_Administrative-Territorial Reform Scenarios in MoldovaFinal Ve....pdf</td>
<td>Ministry of Finance officials</td>
<td>EU Member States</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is almost impossible to access data concerning the overall volume of funds decentralized. There is a list of budget transfers to Local Governments foreseen annexed to the national budget, but data are somewhat confusing and do not permit an analysis over time. Local Governments are heavily depending on transfers from national government budget, but further to budget transfers receive (and reimburse loans) and receive additional funds from other sources.

About 67% of the budget of first level local governments and 68% of second level local governments correspond to transfers, the capacity of local governments to create own income is extremely limited.

There is evidence that the National Decentralisation Strategy has not been implemented, or only to a minor extent; that most elements of the roadmap have not been implemented. In 2011 was founded the Parity Commission (CALM) (50% central 50% LGUs representatives) as a consultation mechanism between GoM and municipalities. The decentralization strategy of 2010 has only been partly implemented (by now only intergovernmental and fiscal system chapters are fully implemented – the rest not fully implemented.) This decentralization strategy was started without having made a territorial reform (CALM is opposing the territorial reform, as such it is unclear, how this reform should be implemented, and when this process can start). If the GoM does not take the decision to reduce the number of municipalities, decentralization remains an academic exercise.

There are thirty-five territorial units corresponding to the second level of local government authority: thirty-two districts (rayons), two municipalities (municipii) -Chisinau and Balti, one autonomous territorial unit (UTA Gagauzia), and one un-recognized territorial unit (Transnistria). The thirty-five units are divided into 896 first-level territorial units–towns (oraşe) and villages (sate).

Thus, Moldova currently has more than 900 local governments (municipalities), most of them very small. Many of the local governments have only 2-3 people of staff and lack funding and have no implementation capacity. It is risky to give funds to municipalities as they have no or only low operative and administrative capacity.
Indicator 5.3.5. Frequency of internal controls on budget execution

Strength of evidence based: Medium

Main source of information:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document review</th>
<th>Interviews</th>
<th>Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Report on AT (Yiannis Hadziyiannakis); TWINNING PROJECT FICHE</td>
<td>Interviews with EU officials including Technical Assistance</td>
<td>Interviews with MoF officials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support to development of an effective internal control and audit environment in the public sector in Moldova</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In accordance with the Moldova-EU Association Agreement, the Republic of Moldova is implementing the system of internal public financial control (CFPI) at national level in accordance with internationally recognized methodologies and standards, as well as EU best practices. That means a comprehensive reform in the field of internal control and audit in the public sector is ongoing. The CFPI concept was developed by the European Commission to provide a structured and operational model to assist national authorities in reshaping their internal control environment and to update public sector control systems in line with international standards and best practices of the EU.

According to the Law on public internal financial control No. 229 of 23.09.2010, the responsibility for the design and modelling of the CFPI in the Republic of Moldova rests with the Ministry of Finance, which, through the Central Harmonization Unit, develops, promotes and monitors policies, as well as develops, updates and harmonizes the regulatory framework in the field of CFPI; monitors and evaluates the quality of the internal audit activity, as well as of the financial management and control systems; presents annually to the Government a consolidated report on CFPI for the previous year; conducts training in the field of financial management and control, internal audit, as well as developing certification mechanisms for internal auditors in the public sector.

To monitor CFPI, the CFPI Council is established under the Ministry of Finance, as an advisory body responsible for approving draft normative acts in the field of CFPI, approves the consolidated annual report on CFPI, examines issues related to the operation of CFPI system and submits proposals to remedy them. The Council includes representatives of the Ministry of Finance, of the internal audit units of public entities, teachers with scientific titles and other specialists in the field.

EU supported the process by financing between 2014 and 2016 a twinning project aiming to improve accountability and management of public funds in the Republic of Moldova through enhanced external audit capacity in conformity with recognized international audit standards and in line with European best practice.

The Board of the Court of Auditors (CoA) has taken steps to implement the Strategic Development Plan and to introduce the changes required by the new law of the CoA. The most important steps taken are:

- approval of the Audit Strategy 2019-21, which gives a clear strategic direction to the audits of the CoA and allocates the audit resources accordingly.
- elaboration, approval and first steps in implementation of the audit certification system.
• developments regard to the annual financial audit reports (3 annual budgets + 9 consolidated ministerial reports) – audit opinions moving towards full compliance with the applicable standards, planning and executing of these audits as a package has started.

• decision to move towards using specialised audit management software.

The EU support provided by EU (Support to Public Finance Reform) was not limited to the Ministry of Finance but attempted as well to foster change and reform at the Court of Accounts (Moldova’s Supreme Audit Institution), and with the Parliamentary Committee on Economy, Budget and Finance (PCEBF). Document review and interviews suggest that the results were mixed:

• At the Court of Accounts, EU support has succeeded in encouraging progress towards full compliance with International Standards of Supreme Audit Institutions (ISSAIs) and to promote more attention to the independent evaluations and reporting of the performance and results of public services through performance auditing. However, the quality of the performance audits carried out is not yet standardized and a high turnover of trained performance audit staff risks loss of gained experience.

• The attempts of EU (in the context of Support to Public Finance Reform Programme including complementary actions) to engage the PCEBE in anti-corruption issues in legislative work have failed. The PCEBE has the understanding that corruption issues should be addressed by the Parliament as a whole.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator 5.3.6. Instances of public consultation and oversight of national, regional and local strategies (in sampled districts)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strength of evidence based:</strong> Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Main source of information:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roadmaps for engagement with civil society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU-Moldova progress reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSO shadow reports</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Consultation between the central and local levels have proven challenging throughout the period. The Congress of Local Authorities of Moldova is the main platform for such consultations, but the central Government and the Congress have opposed views on territorial reform, rendering consultations and compromise challenging.

Encouraged by EU support, consultation of civil society for policy making has continued to increase during the evaluated period. The drafting of the justice development strategy is a good example: it first took place with very limited consultation, but then opened up following the pressure of the EU and the CoE. Comprehensive public consultations have been conducted in the process of development of the two Roadmaps for engagement with civil society. The 2014 Roadmap highlighted the need to develop the capacities of civil society in becoming a stronger counterpart for the government, especially in promoting good governance, including oversight and monitoring of the implementation of Moldova-EU Agreements, and also - the need to support local, smaller NGOs and their umbrella organisations. The new Roadmap for Engagement with Civil Society (2018-2020) reflects the joint understanding of the Government and
civil society that proactive involvement of civil society is needed in policymaking, reform, governance and service delivery, as a critical precondition for achieving the development objectives. Building on joint understanding, the roadmap strategized inclusive participation of a wide range of actors (CSOs, business associations, chambers of commerce, and other socio-economic stakeholders) to facilitate the implementation of the national reform agenda.

Horizontal consultations are also conducted in the framework of the two platforms involved in the monitoring of the Association Agreement – the EU-Republic of Moldova Civil Society Platform (CSP) and the National Platform of the Eastern Partnership Civil Society Forum (EaP CSF Platform). On sectoral level most intensive have been the consultations in the area of social services, which have brought about the development of innovative social services meeting the needs of various vulnerable groups.

However, these consultations mostly take place in urban areas, chiefly in Chisinau. In rural areas and more generally at local level, interviews and reports show that the involvement of civil society and citizens at large is extremely challenging, because of strong polarization, lack of interest or ability to conduct negotiations and find compromises both from the part of authorities and on the side of the citizens and CSOs. The evaluation team found a few positive precedents in select localities, which have been supported by the EU or other donors (e.g., in Ungheni, Cahul).

JC. 5.4. Fundamental rights and freedoms (including freedom of the media) are increasingly respected, protected, fulfilled and promoted by duty bearers

All indicators, as well as the body of EU project documentation, shows that the promotion of human rights has resulted in increased awareness, recognition and understanding of the importance of respect, protection, and fulfilment of human rights. Gross and prima facie human rights violations have become more and more rare during the evaluation period, which shows increased respect for and protection of human rights. CSOs (particularly those involved in human rights monitoring and advocacy supported by the EU) and specialised bodies (chiefly the PAO and the Equality Council) have considerably increased their capacity, the quality and frequency of their reporting. Human rights focused CSOs also enjoy increased influence in a more inclusive policy dialogue with the EU.

However, many loopholes remain, particularly the fulfilment of economic, social and cultural rights, and the protection and fulfilment of human rights in general for certain vulnerable groups of citizens, and in high-risk places such as places of deprivation of liberty. Most of these potential violations happen by omission, particularly as regards access to certain rights. They mostly relate to the lack of funds, lack of technical knowledge, and resistance to change, rather than to disrespect for human rights. The COVID crisis vividly exposed such violations, as highlighted by the PAO.

Indicator 5.4.1. Level of transparency and diversity of media ownership and editorial lines (development of Word Press Index since 2014)

Main source of information:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document review</th>
<th>Interviews</th>
<th>Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>World Press Index (Reporters without borders): <a href="https://rsf.org/en/ranking">https://rsf.org/en/ranking</a></td>
<td>Interviews with 7 persons from the media sphere, including public officials and civil society actors/media actors</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Since 2014, this situation related to freedom of the press in Moldova has improved steadily. Moldova’s world press index has considerably improved:
According to interviewees, this has a lot to do with the improvement of the legislation and regulation of journalism and the media, and better self-regulation in the sector. The Audio-visual Council and the regulatory environment of audio-visual media, in particular, represent a success story which was vastly supported by the European Union since 2016 through a project on Promoting Media Freedom, implemented by the Council of Europe.

Media ownership is easy to track, but it is not diverse. In its 2020 World Press Index report, Reporters Without Borders notes “Moldova’s media are diverse but extremely polarized, like the country itself, which is characterized by chronic political instability and the excessive influence of its oligarchs. The editorial line of the leading media outlets correlates closely with the political and business interests of their owners, a problem that is particularly striking during election campaigns. The media empire built by former billionaire and Democratic Party boss Vladimir Plahotniuc has lost its influence but has been quickly replaced by a media group affiliated to the Democratic Party’s rival, the pro-Russian Party of Socialists. Ownership concentration and the lack of editorial independence and quality journalism are therefore major challenges for Moldova’s media.”

Interviews also show that the problem is exacerbated by the indigency of the more independent media outlets, because the advertisement market and readership/auditory in Moldova are extremely small, which reduces the media outlets’ source of income: media outlets in Moldova are structurally in deficit. Therefore, they depend on sponsoring, which makes them all the more vulnerable to politically affiliated funding.

### Indicator 5.4.2. Number of torture and ill-treatment cases reported (trend since 2014)

**Strength of evidence based:** Strong

**Main source of information:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document review</th>
<th>Interviews</th>
<th>Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>People’s Advocate Office Annual reports 2014-2019 (2015 and 2020 unavailable)</td>
<td>Interviews with 13 persons including Moldovan Officials, EU officials, civil society representatives</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People’s Advocate Office/National Preventive Mechanism reports 2012, 2017, 2018</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People’s Advocate Office Special Report on the situation of persons apprehended and held in police custody, 2019 CPT reports on periodic visits to Moldova: 2016 (2015 periodic visit), 2020 (2020 periodic visit) Report to the Government of the Republic of Moldova the visit to the Republic of Moldova carried out by the European Committee for the Prevention of Torture and inhuman or Degrading Treatment or punishment (CPT) from 5 to 11 June 2018 US State Department Moldova 2019 human rights report Law on the people’s advocate (ombudsman) no. 52 - 03.04.2014 (as amended, official translation by the Venice Commission) OHCHR, 2016, Universal Periodic Review Moldova</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
During the reporting period, the EU supported the fight against torture and ill-treatment in places of deprivation of liberty, chiefly through CSO grants. This field of work includes two specialised projects: “Let us all say no to torture”, a CSO grant to the Democratic Institute implemented in cooperation with the People’s Advocate Office (the national human rights institution of Moldova); “Advancing and monitoring the rights of persons with mental disabilities”, a CSO grant to Alliance of Organisations for Persons with Disabilities. In addition, a complementary support CSO grant under the police budget support programme is dedicated to “external monitoring, contribution and oversight to implementation of programme-related reforms and activities, with special focus on respect for human rights”, which includes issues of ill-treatment in police custody (Soros Foundation grant). Finally, within the justice sector reform initiatives, the EU funded a technical assistance project on “Support to the enforcement, probation and rehabilitation systems”, which includes a component on adherence to human rights (including the prevention of torture and ill-treatment).

There are no centralized and aggregated statistics in Moldova on the number of cases of torture and ill-treatment in places of deprivation of liberty (which include prisons, police custody, closed psychiatric and social institutions, places for administrative detention of migrants). The most comprehensive reporting is done by the People’s Advocate Office (PAO) and by the National Preventive Mechanism (which combines the PAO and specialised civil society organisations conducting visits to places of deprivation of liberty).

The National Preventive Mechanism of Moldova was established in 2016 after protracted debates on its format. The Ombudsman+ format was retained, in the form of the Council for Prevention of Torture, based on a cooperation between the PAO as the National Human Rights Institution, and several specialized CSOs. The NPM has since then gradually gained capacity, but still struggles to operate harmoniously, due to different levels of capacity between the trends reported by the PAO annual reports, and by the NPM reports, show significant improvement overall in the number of cases of torture and ill treatment between 2014 and 2020, although the NPM notes serious problems leading to a worsening of the situation of torture and ill-treatment between 2017 and 2019. This information is precious, as the Committee for Prevention of Torture of the Council of Europe (CPT), who conducted its regular visits in 2015 and 2020 respectively, and therefore did not have an opportunity to point to this fluctuation in 2018. Yet, the CPT published in 2018 a report on its ad-hoc visit to three prisons which in 2015 were criticized for various violations.

All documentary sources and interviews concur to observe that, despite gradual improvements overall, especially in the conduct of the staff of the various places of deprivation of liberty, the efforts to prevent ill treatment, and the gradual reduction of cases of ill treatment (especially intentional), grey areas still exist. The most frequently observed failures concern the state and adequation of the facilities to European standards (ECHR), prison overcrowding, disproportionate use of force or contention (e.g. excessively tight or long handcuffing in police or penitentiaries, recourse to chemical restraint in psychiatric facilities), continued use of “informal prison leaders” in some penitentiary facilities, issues with the record of complaints and of incidents, staff vacancies in all types of institutions, and issues of access to medical attention of persons deprived of liberty. As regards the facilities for persons deprived of liberties, there is a clear trend towards improvement where foreign aid has been deployed – including EU assistance through budget support to the police in particular.

Penitentiary: In 2019, the PAO registered 851 applications from detainees in the penitentiary system on conditions of detention, and 27 complaints for excessive use of force in the penitentiary system – but no allegations of ill treatment. In 2020, the CPT received “a few allegations of recent physical ill treatment” at Chisinau prison used as punishment for earlier incidents. In sectors which receive limited international funding, such as the penitentiary, the renewal of the immovable assets dedicated to deprivation of liberty
is lagging behind: for instance, the CPT noted in 2020 that “the construction of a new remand prison in Chişinău with a capacity of 1,536 places, which was expected to replace Prison No. 13. However, the delegation was informed that the construction works had been postponed yet again and that the opening of the new prison was not envisaged before 2024”. Careful review of all PAO, NPM and CPT reports show a clear correlation between the state of the premises and the likelihood of allegations of ill treatment – not just of detention conditions, but also including physical abuse.

Police custody: During its latest visit in 2020, the Committee for Prevention of Torture did not receive any allegation of torture or inhuman or degrading treatment in police custody. The CPT noted a clear improvement of the respect for the detainees’ right to freedom from torture since its previous visit in 2015, when, according to the 2016 CPT report on its 2015 periodic visit to Moldova, the CPT had received several complaints for excessive use of force (but no complaints on ill-treatment). On the other hand, in 2019 (reporting on year 2018), the PAO reports that the General Police Inspectorate did not receive any complaints by detainees in their custody – although the same General Police Inspectorate self-reported 110 incidents related to ill-treatment in police custody, and the penitentiary administration reports over 300 cases of bodily injuries among the persons entering the penitentiary system from police custody. According to the PAO, this mismatch suggests under-reporting of failure to uphold the rights of persons in police custody, which is a reasonable interpretation. The latest CPT report formulated a recommendation on recording and documenting all bodily injuries of all persons which go through police detention facilities. It should also be noted that violations of rights linked to inadequate detention premises has been vastly addressed, particularly thanks to budgetary investments which are directly linked to the implementation of EU budget support. The in-service and continuous training developed with the support of the ongoing twinning programme also entail human rights component. But identification of and sanctions against cases of ill treatment or excessive use of force still require active measures for improvement, especially as the renewal of the police human resources – and therefore exposure to initial training as a defining experience – is a very progressive phenomenon. The new Standard Operating Procedures for the police service, and the Guidebook on Human Rights-based Policing, issued by the Soros Foundation under the EU-funded grant, are a step forward but will now need to be promoted and enforced within the police service.

Other places of deprivation of liberty: The same 2019 PAO report further highlights some allegations of ill-treatment of foreigners in administrative detention, and of abuse of patients in psychiatric facilities, without clearly quantifying them. The report also notes that most social care facilities do not have a system to record complaints and cases of ill-treatment or abuse. The 2020 CPT report mentions a few allegations of ill-treatment regarding psychiatric wards other than the one visited. In social care institutions, the CPT heard no credible complaints on ill-treatment and noted an improvement of the general situation since its 2015 visit.

**Indicator 5.4.3. Perception of tolerance and discrimination according to expert stakeholders**

**Strength of evidence based:** Very strong

**Main source of information:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document review</th>
<th>Interviews</th>
<th>Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Anti-discrimination in Moldova is chiefly led by the Equality Council, an institution that has been significantly supported by the EU through several projects during the evaluation period. The level of satisfaction towards this support is high, and the institutional capacity of the Equality Council has steadily increased, as an immediate result of this cooperation coupled with the effort of a dynamic team within this institution. This is witnessed by the quality, regularity and comparability of publications, and the opinion of all expert stakeholders interviewed on this issue. Therefore, not only is there increased capacity to combat discrimination, but there is also a solid evidence base to assess the impact of these efforts.

According to the Equality Council’s survey on equality perception and attitudes, published in 2015 and which serves as a good baseline, the groups most discriminated against were the poor (32%), the elderly (29%), and persons with mental (26%) and physical (24%) disabilities. Gender-based discrimination was also a serious concern. According to the survey, the highest level of discrimination was in terms of access to healthcare services, followed by the discrimination in employment.

At the start of the evaluation period, the Equality Council would find discrimination on the grounds of disability and of gender in respectively close to 10% and 9% of the complaints where the Council found discrimination. 35.7% of the public authorities, did not include in their internal documents provisions about forbidding discrimination, and 60% of the premises of public administration authorities were not adapted for the needs of the persons with disabilities, although Moldova’s legal framework regarding the accessibility of buildings and constructions was quite comprehensive already. The situation in terms of the accessibility of courthouses was similar - 60% of the court buildings had no access ramps for people with locomotor disabilities.

In terms of perception (which is one of, but not the only root cause of discrimination), according to the Equality Council survey, the groups that the population is most willing to accept are the persons with physical disabilities. The groups toward which the society has an average level of acceptance are people of a different race, the people holding a different citizenship, and the people with mental disabilities. The groups that the population is most reluctant to accept in their families or among their friends are the persons infected with HIV and LGBT persons. These trends, which are self-reported, should be taken carefully: other research shows that stigmatisation of persons belonging to minorities, especially the Roma, are still vastly stigmatized.
This shows that, aside the issue of acceptance, at the start of the evaluation period, discrimination had a lot to do with problems of provision of, and access to services for certain groups. The EU supported anti-discrimination efforts mostly through CSO grants, which targeted perception issues and remedies against acts of discrimination, mostly for persons belonging to minorities or persons with disabilities. Only marginally did it target directly or explicitly target the provision of, and access to services for the groups mostly discriminated against according to the survey, which could point to a mismatch in programming. For instance, there was no large EU programme on healthcare, social care, or access to services for the most vulnerable (e.g., the poor, the elderly, and persons with disability). On a positive note, these CSO grants envisaged cooperation with the Equality Council, an approach which was highly praised by both CSOs and Equality Council, because it strongly contributed to establishing the Equality Council as a strong, widely recognized and respected anti-discrimination actor in Moldova. By the end of the evaluation period, the Equality Council clearly became the reference in this field, and the quality of its outputs has steeply increased. The number of complaints received by the Equality Council had continuously increased (from 151 in 2014 to 256 in 2019), which testifies to its recognition by the public as an effective recourse. This increase is particularly noteworthy as regards discrimination on the grounds of gender, which also shows increased recognition of gender-based discrimination as unacceptable.

By the end of the evaluation period, according to the 2020 report of the Equality Council, the situation with regard to discrimination against the groups identified above was slightly improved in terms of the measures taken. Yet, their actual experience is probably not deeply affected. Discrimination on the grounds of gender represented 25% of the cases where the Council found discrimination, on the ground of ethnicity 23% and on the grounds of disability 14%. 54.5% of the discrimination cases occurred in the area of access to assets and publicly available services, showing that the trends identified five years earlier were slightly, but not fundamentally modified. Overall, the main obstacle to enjoyment of equal rights and freedom from discrimination is not found in the law: the Moldovan legislation is quite comprehensive (though imperfect, witness the large proportion of unfulfilled recommendations of the Council regarding legal or regulatory amendments). It is found in the lack of action, and funding, to guarantee equal access for persons most vulnerable to discrimination. Stigmatisation is still very prevalent against regards persons living with HIV/AIDS.

Indicator 5.4.4. Trends for Moldova in “Freedom House Ranking”

Strength of evidence based: Very strong

Main source of information:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document review</th>
<th>Interviews</th>
<th>Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Freedom House World Reports/Moldova Country Reports 2015-2020</td>
<td>Interviews with 58 persons including Moldovan officials, Civil Society actors, EU officials, others.</td>
<td>Evaluation Survey Moldova Public Opinion Barometer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freedom House Nations in Transit/Moldova Reports 2014-2020</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With 61 out of 100 on Freedom House freedom score in 2021, 100 being the highest score, Moldova is qualified in the Freedom in the World reports as “partly free”. The score is a composite indicator, aggregating sub-ratings including political rights and civil liberties.

With 3.11 out of 7 on Freedom House democracy score in 2020 (7 being the highest score), Moldova is qualified in the Nations in Transit reports as a “transitional or hybrid regime. The score is a composite indicator, aggregating sub-ratings including national democratic governance, electoral processes, civil society, independent media, local governance, judicial framework and independence, and corruption.

In both cases, the rating of each year reflects the evolutions of the previous year. While all Freedom House reports consider Moldova to be generally protective of freedoms of assembly, speech, and religion.
However, despite the efforts of Moldova’s technical and financial partners including the EU, the country’s ratings have failed to take off during the reporting period and have even dwindled at mid-course. The key obstacles to improvements, according to Freedom House reports, mostly concern the rule of law (especially the justice system’s lack of independence and accountability), pervasive corruption, and assaults against the democratic constitutional order motivated by financial and political interests. The results of our survey regarding the perception of corruption, and the words associated to the justice system, as well as the public opinion barometer results on the various aspects of the Freedom House scores, show that this opinion is vastly shared among the population. All our interviewees also concur with the overall assessment reflected in Freedom House’s ratings: at best, the level of freedoms and democracy has been stagnating with small fluctuations. When some domains improve, others worsen, and the most often quoted root causes for this are corruption, lack of functional independence of those supposed to embody the rule of law and attempts to capture the governance structures by political and financial interests.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Freedom House Moldova Freedom Score /100</td>
<td>Not available</td>
<td>Not available</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freedom House Moldova Democracy Score /7</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>Not available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key reason for fluctuation</td>
<td>No notable changes from 2014</td>
<td>Bank fraud scandal, corruption rating dropped</td>
<td>Degradation of justice rating, fallout of the bank fraud</td>
<td>Controversial 2017 electoral law, laundromat, LGBT march stopped</td>
<td>Degradation of justice rating, invalidation of Chisinau mayoral elections</td>
<td>Slight improvement in anti-corruption rating, wiretapping scandal, high-profile cases in court</td>
<td>Anti-corruption measures, V. Plahotniuc charged</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Main findings for EQ 5

- Although the budget support programmes faced some challenges, the support provided by the complementary technical assistance on PFM was useful and contributed to improvement of different sectors of PFM (revenue forecast, budget planning, debt issues,)

- EU support has greatly contributed to the normative framework creating the basic conditions for an independent, effective, efficient and accountable governance sector.

- Cooperation with the EU, including policy dialogue, policy support and conditionalities, have contributed to the emergence of a policy-making framework, but without sustainable capacities and political will to elaborate and implement them, policy documents are no guarantee of reforms.

- EU support has been instrumental in developing the necessary capacities and infrastructure in the governance sector, which in turn has improved the effectiveness and efficiency of some public services thanks to a pool of committed change agents.
• Despite the combined efforts of the EU and key change agents, the existing power and incentive structures make the rule of law sector vulnerable to corruption, which continues to impair the independence, effectiveness and accountability of this sector.

• Governance interventions lack genuine theories of change, and their monitoring and evaluation frameworks remain insufficiently developed, which disincentivises intermediate level change and contribution to it.

• Historically, the strategic approach prioritizing the normative and institutional framework over in-depth change management was ill-equipped to tackle the key unfulfilled assumptions of the EU’s intervention logic in the governance sector: it has started to evolve but the results of this evolution are still hard to detect.

2. Evaluation question 6: JCs and indicators

EQ6. To what extent has the EU support to Moldova contributed to better connectivity (in energy & transport), increased energy security, energy efficiency, the protection of environment and combatting climate change?

This EQ covers Effectiveness, impact and sustainability.

JC 6.1 Investments have been channelled into infrastructure, energy, and environment

JC 6.2 Sample infrastructure projects achieve return on investment and/or have sufficient income streams to continue operation and adequate maintenance.

JC 6.3 The administrative capacity to implement environment and climate change chapters of the AA is enhanced and progress in the approximation of environmental acquis is attested

JC. 6.1 Investments have been channelled into infrastructure, energy, and environment.

Important volume of investments has been channelled into the improvement of infrastructure, energy sector and environment. Investments were financed under different implementation modalities and instruments.

• EU has a long-term compromise with the infrastructure, energy and environment sectors; in fact, after initial budget support interventions other more focused implementation methods were used, this bringing a more direct and tackled benefit to final beneficiaries (the population).

• An important share of interventions in the a.m. sectors are implemented at the level of local governments. It permitted to realize infrastructures at local and to bring direct benefits to the population.

• Whenever possible cooperation with EU Member States, financing institutions and other development partners was looked for, creating thus synergies between interventions.

• EU support provided under NIF permitted EU to participate in the financing of big infrastructure projects, bringing added value by financing technical assistance, feasibility studies, social and environmental assessments or reducing the overall cost of financing for the Government of Moldova.

• EU support through national instruments has been completed by interventions financed under regional envelopes (i.e., EU4Environement, EU4 Energy, Danube Transnational Programme).
Moldova lacks energy resources, it is almost wholly dependent on fossil fuel and electricity imports, however the trend shows that dependency on fossil fuel and electricity decreased. However, since 2013 a positive trend in slight reduction from dependency on fossil fuel and electricity imports can be observed; at the same time there is an increase in production of renewable energy.

- In 2015 only 13.7% of Moldova’s energy demand was met by domestic sources. Natural gas, which serves most of its energy needs, was entirely imported from Russia via Ukraine up to the end of 2014. In August 2014 the Iasi-Ungheni gas interconnector between Romania and Moldova was commissioned and became operational in 2015. Once at full capacity in 2020, the pipeline is expected to supply almost all the gas Moldova consumes, but not that of the Transnistria region.
- Currently (2020) still 2,200 ktoe – or almost 74% of energy consumption– is imported. However, the structure of energy imports and production has hardly changed in the past eight years, although its own production of biofuels and biogas has grown by more than a third. Over the past eight years, the share of renewable energy in the total energy consumption has increased from 21% to 28%.
- Half of all energy (1,346 ktoe) is consumed by the population. The second half is used by different sectors of the economy, most of all transport. It should be noted that since 2010, energy consumption has increased by almost 15%. The most consumed types of energy are oil, gas and biofuels, at 32%, 28% and 26% respectively.
- Biofuels and coal are most used for heating homes. Gas is used in this case by 55%. Almost 40% of gas consumed is spent on cooking. Interestingly, cooking takes up more than 70% of all consumed petroleum products (liquefied gas, specifically). Electric power is also used for this purpose – about 20% of total consumption.

Indicator 6.1.2 - Number of population targeted by EU financed/co-financed projects in the water and sanitation sectors (since 2014)
Strength of evidence based: Strong

Main source of information:
Document review (DTA and final reports of projects)
Interviews
EU staff, development partners involved in Project implementation, EBRD
Survey
Only information related to the approval of service provision
In Moldova, access to safe water and sanitation services for all is weak. Water and sanitation services are the responsibility of local governments. The EU is supporting the water and sanitation sector since 2009 (water and sanitation sector support).

It is difficult to estimate the exact number of populations targeted by interventions in the water and sanitation sector since 2014, as the water and sanitation budget support programme (financed in 2009 but still ongoing in 2014) and smaller interventions financed under call for proposals or regional projects have to be considered as well (and are difficult to retrieve). The EU assistance provides direct access to improved water and sanitation services to about 1.300.000 beneficiaries including the support provided through NIF co-financed interventions. EU co-financed interventions are not only tackling access to water and sanitation, but as well the improvement of quality of services.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Targeted population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EU4MOLDOVA: Clean Water for Cahul (UE pentru Moldova: Apă Curată pentru Cahul)</td>
<td>14.000 direct beneficiaries (120.000 indirect beneficiaries)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract no ENPI/2014/353-786) *Chisinau Water Development Programme</td>
<td>800.000 inhabitants of Chisinau Agglomeration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moldova Utilities Development Programme</td>
<td>200,000 inhabitants in Soroca, Floresti, Hincesti, Orhei, Leova, Ciadir-Lunga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Moldova Water</td>
<td>190,000 inhabitants in the districts of Soroca, Floresti, Drochia, Riscani, Singerei, Telenesti and in Balti municipality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rehabilitation of the water supply system in the Municipality of Nisporeni, Republic of Moldova Project reference C-251612</td>
<td>60.000 persons – 20,000 sanitations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Indicator 6.1.3 - % of EU financial investment in selected priority projects over the reference period

Strength of evidence based: Medium

Main source of information:
- Interviews
- Survey
- Document review
- SSF Project Documents related to bilateral and regional projects
- EU staff at EUD level
- N/A

Financial investments in the Connectivity, energy efficiency, environment, and climate change sectors have no explicit targets in the SSD 2014-2017. Social and technical infrastructure in rural areas is covered under the agricultural sector. It is difficult to define the exact amounts committed or spent by EU for infrastructure, energy and environment projects during the reference period for this evaluation, as further to national projects there are multiple projects financed under regional initiatives of indirectly as subprojects under other interventions. I.e. projects implemented through non state actors (CBM) are difficult to identify.

Tentatively the amounts are:
- Energy Sector: EUR 119,460,000 (includes NIF and regional funds)
- Transport Sector: EUR 37,100,000 (includes NIF and regional funds)
- Water and Sanitation Sector: EUR 39,200,000 (does not include the investments under CBM in the water and sanitation sector).

|----------------|---------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Connectivity, energy efficiency, environment, and climate change | No target quantified | - Moldovan Railways Restructuring Project (NIF)  
- Moldova Energy and Biomass Project (Phase II)  
- Comprehensive demonstrational project for sustainable energy development in the town of Orhei.  
- Chisinau Water Development Programme  
- Green Light Moldova - Modernisation and Saving Energy at Street Lighting.  
- Renewables and Energy Efficiency for Public Buildings (REEPB)  
- Support to the Development of an Energy Statistics System in the Republic of Moldova  
- Moldova North Water Project (NIF) |

|----------------|--------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Connectivity, energy efficiency, environment, and climate change | EUR 71 million - EUR 87 million | - Clean water Cahul: EUR 14,000,000  
- Construction of water supply and sanitation infrastructure as well as energy efficiency in public buildings EUR 39,800,000  
- TA support to the Transport sector  
- Increasing the competitiveness of the agri-food sector through integration to domestic and global value chains and strengthening the water supply and sanitation infrastructure in rural areas focusing on safe wastewater disposal in Cantemir  
- Support to modernisation of the Energy Sector in the Republic of Moldova  
- Support to the reform of the Transport Sector in the Republic of Moldova |
JC. 6.2 Sample infrastructure projects achieve return on investment and/or have sufficient income streams to continue operation and adequate maintenance.

Indicator 6.2.1. Evidence of sufficient income streams for assuring sustainability (operation, maintenance and replacement)

Strength of evidence based: medium

Main source of information:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document review</th>
<th>Interviews</th>
<th>Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring Report (Clean Water Cahul)</td>
<td>EU staff at EUD level, development partners, technical assistance providers</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is no clear evidence on the availability of sufficient income stream or return on investment. However, in the case of the railway project, EBRD/EIB have undertaken detailed economic analysis, thus once the project is completed the institution should be strengthened and able to sustain operation and maintenance of the system. The situation for the projects in the road sector should be similar (clean water Cahul has just started implementation).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Sustainability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Clean water Cahul | - The sustainability of the intervention should be promoted by the participation of Moldovan and Romanian, companies in implementation; this should permit their future involvement in the maintenance of the system  
- Another positive aspect promoting sustainability is the strong component on capacity building. The intervention contains a strong content of capacity building. However, a specific attention has to be given to maintain trained staff in the company and in relevant positions. (Due to low salaries, there is a significant turn-over of staff, thus training easily gets lost).  
- For the sustainability of the intervention and of ACC, the adequation of tariffs is a central issue. The current tariff charged to the customers had been approved by Agenţia Naţională pentru Reglementare în Energetică a Republicii Moldova (ANRE), the Regulator, in May 2017. However, the 2018 adjustment request was rejected. Following a new application in May 2020, the publication of new tariffs is expected early 2021. However, the current tariffs are based on the calculations made during the Feasibility Study. There is no indication available on the affordability for households and non-households, particularly SMEs, as well as on the affordability of the connection rates for the customers.  
- Should the Company’s economic model impose higher that the commonly accepted 5 per cent of poor customer’s income, and should such increase be accepted by the Regulator, subsidized schemes by the Municipality could be envisaged. |
| Moldovan Railways Restructuring Project | • The financing partners provide support to institutional reform to improve transparency and accountability, as well as financial sustainability.  
• applying energy efficient technologies and standards and encouraging lower emission modes to reduce energy consumption should contribute to sustainability  
• However, according to newspaper, Moldova’s state railway company, CFM, has had its accounts blocked after auditors released a highly critical report lambasting years of mismanagement and corruption that have left it unable to pay staff salaries. (feb 2021)  
https://balkaninsight.com/2021/02/05/moldova-blocks-indebted-railway-companys-accounts-after-damning-report/ |
| --- | --- |
| Moldova road rehabilitation project Phase IV (Bahmut Bypass) | • Rehabilitation of national roads is vital to improve access to EU markets. The poor present condition of road network is seen as acting as a significant deterrent to investment in the country and the development of external trade links to the West and the East. There exists a road fund in Moldova which should permit the maintenance of national highways and roads:  
• LAW OF THE REPUBLIC OF MOLDOVA of February 2, 1996, No. 720-XIII (as amended on 27-07-2018) created the road fund, which should assure the maintenance of (first level) road infrastructure in Moldova.  
• Sources of formation of fund are:  
- annual assignments from number of excises on excisable oil products, except for liquefied gas, in the amount of, the established law on the government budget for the corresponding year.  
- 50 percent of total amount of the usage charge fee highways the cars registered in the Republic of Moldova collected at the national level and other road charges levied according to the tax legislation.  
- charges for issue of permissions to implementation of the international motor transportation carriages of goods and, occasionally, passengers.  
- non-compliance with rules of passenger traffic, spoil of highways, road constructions and the equipment, plantings along roads.  
- collection for realization of natural gas, held for use as fuel for vehicles.  
• The Moldova road rehabilitation project Phase IV focus as well on two reform areas: reform of road sector financing and institutional strengthening, particularly to improve the SRA’s capacity to manage the road network and execute works in a transparent and efficient manner. The establishment of a reliable and stable financing mechanism for the road sector is a key transition objective of the project. |
| Construction of water supply and sanitation infrastructure as well as energy efficiency in public buildings | The project will construct and put into service 10 Water Supply and Sanitation systems, as well as implement 8 Energy Efficiency projects in schools throughout the country. The project is still ongoing. Once the infrastructures are completed it is expected that the investments will generate lower bills and savings that can be used for other services. |
JC. 6.3 The administrative capacity to implement environment and climate change chapters of the AA is enhanced and progress in the approximation of environmental acquis is attested

Indicator 6.3.1 - Level of appreciation of stakeholders on quality of draft and adopted legislation and regulatory acts (linked to EU support)

Strength of evidence based: Medium

Main source of information:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document review</th>
<th>Interviews</th>
<th>Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>European Parliament: European Implementation Assessment (update)</td>
<td>Interviews with EU officials</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOINT STAFF WORKING DOCUMENT: Association Implementation Report on Moldova, 2019</td>
<td>Interviews with Moldovan officials</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The 2020 National Development Strategy and other strategic documents (Environmental Strategy for 2014-23, the National Strategy for Sustainable Development of Agriculture in 2008-15) integrate green economy objectives. In 2015, the National Programme for the Promotion of the Green Economy was launched to guide government efforts to green economic development.

The EU laws on environment included in the AA cover all the areas from the environmental governance, air pollution, water quality and the marine environment to the waste management, natural habitats, industrial pollution, chemical management and the climate change. Despite the AA provisions aimed at the strengthening of the institutional framework, Ministry of Environment still lack adequate capacity to implement AA provisions, and therefore ensure proper environmental protection and fight climate change.

The following information were collected from interviews:

Environmental institutional reforms were not planned strategically, and in some cases weakened the Ministries of Environment, instead of strengthening them. In Moldova, the Ministry of Environment is part of the Ministry of Agricultures; as a result, there exists a conflict of interests between the agricultural industry – which is often a strong polluter – and environmental protection.

EU is providing important support which helps national institutions to prepare draft laws and regulations, however, the approval by Parliament is most often delayed.

Although legislation exists, environmental compliance and enforcement institutions remain inadequate. Environmental institutions’ limited capacity results in weak integration of environmental policy and poor implementation of laws, even if adopted in line with European and international standards.

Two governmental decisions were adopted in June 2018, one on the establishment of the Environment Agency and one on the creation of the Environmental Protection Inspectorate. Draft chemicals legislation aligning Moldovan legislation with the EU REACH Regulation is under discussion in the Parliament.

Indicator 6.3.2. Rhythm of preparation and adoption of legislative and regulatory acts increases over the period (linked to EU support)

Strength of evidence base: Medium

Main source of information:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document review</th>
<th>Interviews</th>
<th>Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JOINT STAFF WORKING DOCUMENT: Association Implementation Report on Moldova, 2019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Moldova has adopted a number of laws in line with the Association Agreements – most notably on water, waste, and Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) and Strategic Impact Assessment (SEA). These laws require a cross-cutting approach in implementation, as they pertain to both environmental sectors – such as nature protection or water, air, waste and chemicals management – and economic sectors – like energy, agriculture, transport, infrastructure and tourism. However, their adoption often remains only nominal, due to EaP countries’ inadequate institutional frameworks and persisting corruption.

On the environment, two regulations, one on the management of waste from electric and electronic equipment and one on the establishment of a waste electronic information system, were adopted by the government in June 2018.

A 2018-2028 national strategy on air quality has also been developed. An overarching reorganisation of the subordinated institutions in the Ministry of Agriculture, Regional Development and the Environment’s portfolio was launched in the second phase of the public administration reform. However, climate change mainstreaming in all areas of policymaking remains a challenge.

On climate change, Moldova’s international commitments under the Paris Agreement have shaped the country’s legal and strategic framework in this field.

- The low emissions development strategy until 2030 and the 2015-2020 climate change adaptation strategy are under implementation.
- A regulation on measuring, reporting and verifying greenhouse gas emissions was developed in compliance with the respective United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change and EU provisions, and awaits governmental approval.

EU financed the “Implementation of the Shared Environmental Information System principles and practices in the Eastern Partnership countries (ENI SEIS II East)”

As mentioned before, the implementation capacities of national institutions are still weak; staff is rather low paid (even after the recent salary reform); existing challenges cannot simply be resolved by capacity building measures, as staff turn-over is high. Technical assistance for the elaboration of draft laws, regulations and policies can be provided, however the bottlenecks continue at the level of the Parliament (which is not approving laws and regulations) and now of their implementation.

Examples of laws and regulations implemented related to the environment sector:

- Moldova transposed the Directive 2010/30/EC on the indication by labelling and standard product information of the consumption of energy and other resources by energy-related products, by adopting the Law 44/2014 referring to labelling for energy-related products. Also, the Government approved energy labelling requirements (GD 1003/2014), which transposed 11 Commission Delegated Regulations on energy labelling requirements. The Government subsequently approved the eco-design requirements for different defined energy-related products (GD 750/2016), according to which 17 Commission Regulations on eco-design requirements were transposed.
- The Law on Energy Performance of Buildings was approved in July 2014, but the law hasn’t fully transposed the Directive 2010/31/EU on the energy performance in buildings. Moldova is working on changing the existing law in accordance with EU directive.
The elaboration of an updated NDC (2021-2030) and the first National Energy and Climate Plan (2021-2030) showed Moldova’s commitment to climatic issues. It was initiated, the plan is elaborated with support of the EU technical assistance provided through EU Delegation in Moldova (STARS project).

**Indicator 6.3.3. Interviewees judge that administrative capacity is enhanced**

**Main source of information:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document review</th>
<th>Interviews</th>
<th>Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Reform and Climate Change Adaptation in the Eastern Partnership Civil Society Analysis and Recommendations</td>
<td>Development partners, TA providers</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interviewees confirmed that there is a certain progress and interest in environment and climate change chapters of the AA, however the capacity to enforce laws and regulations remains limited.

Moldova has adopted a number of laws in line with the Association Agreements – most notably on water, waste, and Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) and Strategic Impact Assessment (SEA). These laws require a cross-cutting approach in implementation, as they pertain to both environmental sectors – such as nature protection or water, air, waste and chemicals management – and economic sectors – like energy, agriculture, transport, infrastructure and tourism. However, their adoption often remains only nominal, due to EaP countries’ inadequate institutional frameworks and persisting corruption.

**Indicator 6.3.4. Increase of initiatives or projects related to green economy (% or numbers) thanks to EU support**

**Main source of information:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document review</th>
<th>Interviews</th>
<th>Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><a href="https://www.greengrowthknowledge.org/country/republic-moldova">https://www.greengrowthknowledge.org/country/republic-moldova</a></td>
<td>EU staff, Development partners, TA providers</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is an increased attention to the concept of green economy. The green growth concept has been promoted in the Republic of Moldova as a model of social and economic development for economic growth, improved human well-being and social equity. Its goal is to achieve a low-carbon, resource-efficient and socially inclusive economy, significantly reducing environmental risks and the impact on human health. EU is supporting the Programme EaP Green at regional level. (EU funding with support of OECD and UN organizations)

Another target of this strategy is to promote the generation of renewable energy and improvements in energy efficiency. This can be pursued by diversifying the mix of domestic energy resources, including renewables; modernizing the energy system such that it is able to support non-conventional energy resources; reducing energy intensity in housing, industrial, transport and agricultural sectors; and implementing energy-efficient technologies.

The High-Level National Round Table “GREEN ECONOMY – Made in Moldova” took place on 29 January 2021. The meeting objectives were to:
• promote the Green Economy Concept at the highest political level in Moldova and EaP countries, in all social-development sectors of the country, attracting the private sector, development partners, NGOs, media and the general public.

• promote of European Green Deal objectives and priorities in Moldova and at the EaP regional level, including exchange of experiences between EaP countries on this issue.

• present the contribution of the EU4Environment programme to the implementation of Green Economy principles in the EaP region.

• increase awareness of stakeholders from businesses, governmental agencies and the general public on the application and benefits of the Green Economy principles for sustainable economic development.

• Greening Program of Small and Medium Enterprises (by Government Decision 592/2019 from 27.11.2019) will be implemented by ODIMM with the purpose to promote, support and develop the entrepreneurial capacities of SMEs, in order to adopt in production processes and services providing the greening practices. The Program provides an integrated approach of support for SMEs oriented to introduce green economy principles. (Water Efficiency, Waste Recycling, Energy Efficiency, Management System).

The event gathered representatives from governmental agencies (MEI, MARDE, ODIMM), EC (DG NEAR, DG Env), EUD, EU4Environment IPs, NACs and beneficiaries, international organizations, embassies, businesses and enterprises / private sector, academic sector, environmental NGOs and experts, mass-media from Moldova and EaP countries.

It is impossible to identify the percentage of funds spent for green economy or the number of projects financed as in almost all sectors “green economy” can be considered as transversal. Thus, as green economy can be considered.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The energy efficiency projects and quality water supply and sanitations services.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Moldova Energy and Biomass Project:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clean Water Cahul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy Efficiency Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>energy efficiency by thermally rehabilitation of two more educational buildings in the town of Cantemir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modernization project of the street lighting in Ocniţa and Cantemir “Green Light Moldova!”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EU4Environment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EU4Environment has developed the platform that provides small and medium enterprises in the Republic of Moldova with clear information on how they can improve their resource efficiency and environmental performance, increasing their competitiveness by reducing their costs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 June 2020, the Organisation for Small and Medium Enterprises Sector Development (ODIMM) with participation of EU4Environment implementing partners organised a kick-off conference on the National Greening Program for Small and Medium Enterprises (SMEs).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By the promotion of eco-labelling in the framework of EU4Environment programme the Republic of Moldova will align to the EU requirements and procedures in the domain.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EU4Climate Moldova Buildings Energy Efficiency

The proposed Project (just started is a blending operation with EBRD/EIB that will finance energy efficiency measures, focusing on improvements to the building envelope, heating systems, ventilation and air-conditioning systems, lightings, and introduction of renewable energy sources.

Green for Growth Fund (GGF) ENPI/2013/334927

The objective of the programme is to enhance energy efficiency and reduce CO2 emissions through support of the renewable energy sector. Moldova benefitted from several small loans.

Key projects in the energy sector financed/implemented during the period 2014-2020 are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title of the Project</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Amount Euro</th>
<th>Technical Assistance Provider</th>
<th>Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Support to Reform of the Energy Sector (CRIS/2011/22515)</td>
<td>closed</td>
<td>42.600.000</td>
<td>Government of Moldova</td>
<td>2011 to 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support to the Modernisation of the Energy Sector in the Republic of Moldova</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
<td>1.500.000</td>
<td>Technical Assistance Provider</td>
<td>2017-2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ungheni-Chisinau gas pipeline NIF financing in cooperation with EBRD and BEI</td>
<td>closed</td>
<td></td>
<td>EBRD</td>
<td>-2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction of the electricity interconnection between Moldova and Romania ENI 2018/400311</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
<td>40.750.000</td>
<td>EBRD</td>
<td>2018-2025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total cost Euro</td>
<td>270.750.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moldova Energy and Biomass Project</td>
<td>closed</td>
<td>23 410 000</td>
<td>United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)</td>
<td>2011 to 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction of Water Supply and Sanitation infrastructure, as well as Energy Efficiency in public buildings</td>
<td></td>
<td>39,800,000</td>
<td>GIZ</td>
<td>2018-2021</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Furthermore, Moldova benefited from the Eastern Europe Energy Efficiency and Environment Partnership (E5P) Programme.
The E5P is a €242 million multi-donor fund initiated during the Swedish Presidency of the European Union in 2009 to encourage municipal investments in energy efficiency and environmental projects in the Eastern Partnership region. Initially active in Ukraine, in 2014 the fund formally extended its activities to Armenia, Georgia and Moldova, Belarus joined in 2017, and Azerbaijan in 2019. The E5P merges financial contributions from the European Union and a group of 24 nations, including countries which are benefiting from the fund. The contributions are used as grants to support municipal sector projects. Moldova benefitted from the following projects:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Eastern Europe Energy Efficiency and Environment Partnership (E5P)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chișinău energy efficiency project</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chisineau Solid Waste</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balti District Heating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balti Trolley Bus</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Creation of excellence center through piloting demonstrative new energy efficiency technologies and renewable energy sources in Festelita community, Stefan-Voda district - Moldova Social Innovations Fund”, NGO, EUR 800.000 Duration: 2018 – 2020 The project will implement the actions set up in Festelita village’s SEAP through innovative technology-transfer and piloting demonstration projects on new technologies utilization of solar and biomass RES.

**Key projects in the transport/connectivity sector financed/implemented during the period 2014-2020 are:**

EU support to the transport sector is composed of technical assistance to support the reform of the transport sector in line with the transport chapter of the EU-MD Association Agreement, by providing technical assistance and capacity building to support legal approximation and policy development for fulfillment of the undertaken commitments. That included:

- In Waterborne sector: to prepare legal and operational framework for implementation of EU legal acts related to Flag State and Port State Control; to provide support to the Naval Agency of RM and general advice on implementation of remaining EU acts from AA; to organize a study tour to an EU member-state maritime administration, aiming for know-how transfer on ship registration and flag and port controls issues.
- In Railway sector: to prepare legal and operational framework for implementation of the requirements of EU-MD AA and creation of State institutions required by EU legislative acts.
- In Road Transport and Civil Aviation sectors: to provide assistance in implementation of certain EU regulations and directives which are not yet harmonized.
- To prepare relevant legal and operational framework regarding the Accident Investigation Body (one single institution for civil aviation, railways and waterborne transport) as required by the EU legislative acts.
- Assistance to the Beneficiary institutions in the harmonisation process with other potential institutions.
In the aviation sector, the EU funded TA has supported the Common aviation agreement and the legislative improvement (new law). Nevertheless, it should be mentioned that the Moldovan maritime fleet and many of the Moldovan air carriers remain blacklisted.

Further support was provided under NIF road projects (Moldova road rehabilitation project Phase III and IV); although EU contribution was limited compared to the overall investment costs, visibility was high.

Furthermore, EU supported road safety and support to the road maintenance fund (in cooperation with USAID and BEI.) Further funding under NIF was provided for the railway sector (locomotives purchase in cooperation with EBRD/BEI).

Additionally, a feasibility study and cost analysis for a project of supply of equipment to the Port Complex of Giurgiulesti was financed by EU.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title of the Project</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Amount Euro</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Moldovan Railways Fleet Renewal ENPI/2014/ 353-812</td>
<td>EU part completed</td>
<td>EUR 5,000,000 (NIF) total cost: MEUR 116,75 (loans EBRD/EIB)</td>
<td>EBRD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moldova Road- Rehabilitation project Phase III Ungheni Bypass ENPI/2011/ 265-548</td>
<td>Closed</td>
<td>€16,2M NIF grant €150M loan EBRD&amp;EIB</td>
<td>EBRD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moldova Road-Rehabilitation project Phase IV ENPI/2014/ 353-807 ENI/2014/355-431</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>€15M NIF grant €300,5M EBRD&amp;EIB</td>
<td>EBRD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Water and Sanitation**

EU financed several important projects in the water and sanitations sector using different instruments and implementation modalities. The EU assistance provides direct access to improved water and sanitation services to about 1,300,000 beneficiaries including the support provided through NIF co-financed interventions. EU co-financed interventions are not only tackling access to water and sanitation, but as well the improvement of quality of services.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title of the Project</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Amount Euro</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENPI/2014/353-786) &quot;Chisinau Water Development Programme&quot; (NIF)</td>
<td>closed</td>
<td>13,400,000</td>
<td>EBRD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU4MOLDOVA: Clean Water for Cahul ENI/2019/042-233</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
<td>MEUR 10 800 000</td>
<td>KfW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Description</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Utilities Development Programme in the Republic of Moldova</td>
<td>closed</td>
<td>EUR 10,000,000</td>
<td>EBRD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rehabilitation of the water supply system in the Rayon Nisporeni: Municipalities of Nisporeni, Varzaresti and Grozesti, Republic of Moldova</td>
<td>closed</td>
<td>MEUR 5,000,000</td>
<td>ADA - Austrian Cooperation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. **Evaluation question 7: JCs and indicators**

**EQ7. To what extent has the EU support to Moldova contributed to increased mobility and people-to-people contacts among targeted groups?**

This EQ covers Effectiveness, impact and sustainability

- JC 7.1 VET institutional network strengthened, and curricula modernised
- JC 7.2 Attractiveness of VET including Life-Long Learning has increased
- JC 7.3. EU support in higher education, research and innovation has increased mobility and people-to-people contacts
- JC 7.4. Free visa regime operates effectively, and projects are being implemented under the Mobility Partnership

**JC 7.1 VET institutional network strengthened, and curricula modernised**

With the VET budget support, a foundation of a modern and effective VET system was built. The MECR, supported by the EU TA project and other donors (e.g., LED, GIZ and ADA), put the screws to VET reform implementation and some effects transpired indeed. Particularly commendable were achievements related to restructuring of VET institutions, establishment of ANECEC, gradual introduction of the new financing formula and VET schools’ self-management, as well as shifting to a new curricula development approach, based on qualification and occupational standards. Each and every fundamental VET managing body was established since start of VET reform supported by the EU BS. However, some key bodies are virtually non-functional and social dialog through Sectoral Committees and beyond has yet to be enhanced.

**Indicator 7.1.1. Number of VET managing bodies established and functional, by type**

**Strength of evidence based: Very Strong**

**Main source of information:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document review</th>
<th>Interviews</th>
<th>Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Each and every fundamental VET managing body was established since start of VET reform implementation supported by the EU BS. The MECR is accountable for VET policy making, monitoring and evaluation, as well as implementation. VET Department is the key unit in the MECR, which coordinates these activities, supported in its efforts by the NFQ Department and LLL Department. The CRDIP was further created to back MECR in implementation of VET policy. A VET Coordination Council, comprising representatives of the key line ministries, the Employment Agency, the VET institutions and the labour market representatives was established with a view to enhancing social partnership. The ANACEC was set up to take care of VET quality assurance, being specifically in charge of VET programmes and institutions’ accreditation.

The MECR, supported by the EU TA project and other donors (particularly LED, GIZ and ADA), put the screws to VET reform implementation and some effects transpired indeed. However, after termination of the TA project (2017), halfway to the end of VET strategy, the MECR found itself in a wearisome position, whereby it had to deliver on reform, despite limited human capacity (3-4 people in VET Department), high turnover in the MECR management (7 ministers during 2014-2020), scarce financial resources and enduring political crisis. On top of that, CRDIP has been understaffed ever since its creation and, despite many reanimation attempts, it is virtually unfunctional. Thus, it could not support the MECR with reform implementation. Likewise, the VET Coordination Council proved to be anaemic and ceased activity in 2016. On the other end, ANACEC is performing reasonably well, to the point that it intends to carry out quality assurance of all VET programmes and institutions by the end of 2021. The VET twinning project launched in March 2019 has vastly contributed to strengthening institutional and operational capacities and staff competences of the ANACEC. The Economic Council to the Prime Minister was also getting increasingly involved in supporting VET, especially regarding dual education.

**Indicator 7.1.2. Number of VET institutions created/restructured, in line with mapping recommendations**

Strength of evidence based: Very Strong

**Main source of information:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document review</th>
<th>Interviews</th>
<th>Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Financing Agreement for supporting the implementation of VET Strategy</td>
<td>Head of VET Department, MECR</td>
<td>Survey of 37 VET institutions across all regions of Moldova</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VET Strategy and Action Plan 2013-2020</td>
<td>Former and present EUD Programme Managers on Education and Research</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
VET network mapping study (2014) and Restructuring Plan (2015-2020) Mid Term and Final Reports of the TA project supporting implementation of VET reform 2 Reviews of the VET Sector Policy Support Programme (1st, 2nd and 3rd instalments)

The VET BS programme envisaged a number of activities regarding reorganisation of the schools’ network. More specifically, MECR committed to develop and approve a VET Sector Restructuring Plan with a corresponding Procurement Plan and to create and secure funding for 10 CoE.

Consequently, a mapping of VET schools’ network was carried out and a restructuring masterplan was approved. Reorganisations commenced in 2015, when the schools’ network was as large as 106 institutions, of which 61 were VET secondary institutions (46 professional schools, 15 craft schools) and 45 post-secondary institutions (45 colleges, including 4 private colleges). In 2021, after reorganisation, the number of institutions dropped to 91, of which 42 are professional schools (secondary VET), 36 are colleges, including 6 private colleges (post-secondary VET) and 13 CoE (post-secondary and partially secondary VET).

Thus, during 2013-2020 13 CoE were established, 2 VET institutions were closed, 10 absorbed and 5 reorganised. As such, the VET Restructuring Plan, based on the mapping of VET institutions, was partially implemented. To obtain effectiveness and efficiency gains, further downsizing may be needed, particularly considering negative demographic trends leading to a steady drop in the number of VET students and teachers. Based on the survey of 37 VET institutions we could single out a number of outliers – VET schools with only 25 and 40 enrolled students, of which only 8 and 21 respectively graduate (see Figure 9 below). Schools with 50-80 students, of which only half graduate, are not an exception too. As regards CoE, while a lot of material and intellectual resources were injected in these by the EU and other donors and country development partners, most are yet to fulfil their functions related to supporting ascribed VET institutions, especially in terms of continuous training provision. The concentration of CoE in Chisinau (10 out of 13) and lack of these in the South of Moldova, adds inequity to the VET system.

Figure 9 Data from schools’ survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of school</th>
<th>Students that applied</th>
<th>Enrolled students</th>
<th>Average grade (enrolment) – max. 10</th>
<th>Students that dropped out studies</th>
<th>Graduate students</th>
<th>Average grade (end of studies) – max. 10</th>
<th>Graduate students that continue studies</th>
<th>Employed graduates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>6,91</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>7,99</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>6,07</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>7,87</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>5,9</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>7,43</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>6,29</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>7,97</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>404</td>
<td>6,4</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>7,65</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>6,05</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>7,3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>6.09</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>7.46</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>6.89</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>7.15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>6.47</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>8.78</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>6.58</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>7.89</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>6.14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>7.98</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>6.23</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>7.53</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>7.24</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>6.45</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>7.57</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>6.24</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>6.27</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>7.52</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>5.66</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>6.49</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>7.07</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>5.87</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7.52</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>6.38</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>7.89</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>6.65</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8.67</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>5.49</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>5.89</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>8.36</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>6.02</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>7.22</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>5.76</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>7.65</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>6.21</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>6.68</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5.77</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>7.33</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>5.79</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>7.49</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>5.87</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>7.49</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>5.63</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>7.28</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>5.73</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>7.99</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The VET BS Financial Agreement envisaged creation of SCs in 7 specialisation fields. More specifically, EU envisaged support in setting up of four Sector Committees: Agriculture and Food Industry; Transport and Road Infrastructure; Information and Communication Technologies; and Constructions. Additionally, support for the full functioning of three additional Sector Committees: Trade, Food Services and Tourism; Light Industry: Textiles and Confection, Shoes and Leather; Energy was to be provided. These seven SCs were to be helped in drafting proposals for new professions, assessment of existing curricula in line with the labour market needs.

During 2018-2020 six SCs were established in: Constructions; Agriculture and Food Industry; Light Industry; Trade, Hotels and Restaurants; Financial Intermediation and Insurance, Real Estate Transactions; Water distribution, Sanitation, Waste Management, Decontamination activities. A SC in IT is operating, without being formally established though. More about functionality and activity of SCs could be found under I 7.1.5 - Number of occupational standards developed by the Sectoral Committees, disaggregated by type.

**Indicator 7.1.4. % Of VET teachers trained to develop and deliver competence-based curricula**
One of the objectives of the BS was to increase the quality of the teaching staff, including by upgrading the initial and continuous professional development of teaching staff for the VET, and improving the motivation, so that, by 2020, the entire teaching staff is trained according to the National Qualifications Framework. The objective was partially achieved – about 70 % of teachers were trained to develop and deliver competence-based curricula (MECR estimation).

Overall, while lifelong learning got more attention during last years, continuous training is yet to be accommodated and delivered within VET institutions. There are a number of training courses designed for teachers provided by universities, particularly by the Moldovan Technical University (psychopedagogical training). However, in terms of specialised training, the CoE, despite being supported up until now by the EU twining project and other donors and country development partners, are yet to fulfil this role in a sustainable manner. Accreditation of courses is lengthy and demanding, whereas the financial means to build physical and human capacity for continuous training delivery are lacking (the number of teachers is small – 3473 and dropped by 17% since 2014).

**Indicator 7.1.5. Number of occupational standards developed by the Sectoral Committees, disaggregated by type**

Strength of evidence based: Very Strong

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main source of information:</th>
<th>Interviews</th>
<th>Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document review</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financing Agreement for supporting the implementation of VET Strategy</td>
<td>Representatives of NQF Department, MECR</td>
<td>ETF VET Good Multilevel Governance Assessment Report (2020) partially based on self-assessment survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VET Strategy and Action Plan 2013-2020</td>
<td>Head of VET Department</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid Term and Final Reports of the TA project supporting implementation of VET reform</td>
<td>Representatives of the NQF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Reviews of the VET Sector Policy Support Programme (1st, 2nd and 3rd instalments)</td>
<td>ETF Country Coordinator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Representatives of the Continuous Training Centre from the Technical University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Beyond the accomplishment of BS target regarding the number of SCs created, what was even more important was to support SCs in enhancing social dialogue in general and developing OSs in particular. In this respect, there is a lot of room for improvement. By March 2021 only 55 OSs were developed and approved\(^4\) (7 OSs were developed by the EU-funded project on increasing competitiveness of the agri-food sector). The construction sector is the only sector, where trade unions were extremely active and produced SOs for all trades. The SC on trade, hotels and restaurants is probably the most under-represented by private sector.

Most SCs are neither pro-active nor easy to mobilise. Constituent economic agents are often not acknowledging the usefulness of developing OSs as part of SCs and if they actually do, resources to cover these extra activities are often lacking. The MHLSP budgets earmarked for OSs’ development are very scarce and donors (EU, LED, USAID) have only provided financial support for a limited number of OSs. A more common procedure is for the SCs to develop occupational profiles, with a more general content than that of the OSs based on which qualification standards and curricula are developed. However, often, qualification standards and curricula are not backed even by occupational profiles.

While functionality of SCs has proved to be unsatisfactory, VET schools are building direct partnerships with businesses and social dialogue is gradually being enhanced, particularly through dual education, which hit off since 2014 with donors’ support, particularly that of GIZ. To date, more than a quarter of all VET institutions have already signed partnership agreements with about 100 economic agents.

---

**Indicator 7.1.6. % Of VET curricula adjusted to the National Qualifications Framework and accredited**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strength of evidence based: Very Strong</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Main source of information:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document review</th>
<th>Interviews</th>
<th>Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Financing Agreement for supporting the implementation of VET Strategy</td>
<td>Representatives of NQF Department, MECR</td>
<td>ETF VET Good Multilevel Governance Assessment Report (2020) partially based on self-assessment survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global inventory of regional and national qualifications frameworks, ETF, 2019</td>
<td>Head of VET Department MECR</td>
<td>Survey of 536 students (in graduation year)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MECR administrative data</td>
<td>ETF Country Coordinator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One of BS Financial Agreement objectives was to synchronise scientific, cultural and methodological provision of the VET, so that 100% of curricula is adjusted to the NQF by 2020. To date only around 40% of VET curricula was adjusted to the NQF. More specifically since the Government adopted the NFQ based on professional knowledge, skills and competencies the following curricula were accredited:

- 26 curricula were approved in 2017: 16 at Post-Secondary VET and 10 at Secondary VET
- 29 curricula were approved in 2018: 11 at Post-Secondary VET and 18 at Secondary VET
- 35 curricula were approved in 2019: 24 at Post-Secondary VET and 11 at Secondary VET
- 27 curricula were approved in 2020: 17 at Post-Secondary VET and 10 at Secondary VET

However, as mentioned above, in most cases, the rational steps in developing curricula – occupational standards translated into qualification standards and the latter into curricula - are often not being followed. This reveals once again the disconnect between educational offer and labour market demand.

At the same time, over a half of surveyed students (53,2%) think that education process has improved since admission, 20,3% consider it has remained the same and only 8,6% believe it has worsened (see Figure 10 below)\(^5\).

\(^4\) [https://ism.gov.md/ro/content/standarde-ocupatie](https://ism.gov.md/ro/content/standarde-ocupatie)

\(^5\) Data from the students’ survey across 15 VET institutions (536 respondents from the graduation year) carried out in March 2021.
Figure 10: Students’ perception of evolution of educational process in VET institution (Source: students’ survey March 2021)

Students’ perception regarding evolution of educational process in VET institution since enrolment
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**Indicator 7.1.7. % Of curricula using educational software**

Strength of evidence based: Strong

**Main source of information:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document review</th>
<th>Interviews</th>
<th>Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Financing Agreement for supporting the implementation of VET Strategy</td>
<td>Head of VET Department, MECR</td>
<td>Survey on the online education in VET institutions during COVID-19 pandemic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ETF Country Coordinator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The VET BS promoted, among other things, delivery of IT courses by VET institutions (Result 9). According to MECR, to date, about 22% of VET institutions are delivering IT courses: 4 VET colleges, 3 VET centres of excellence and 17 VET professional schools.

While only about one fifth of VET institutions deliver IT courses, the situation regarding IT culture has markedly improved during COVID-19 pandemic. Donors and country development partners have played a key role in this. For instance, the EU twinning project supported VET institutions in developing online teaching platforms (Google Classroom, Moodle) and digital learning materials (about 70), which have significantly eased transition to remote or hybrid teaching. However, switching to online or blended learning was not easy; most VET institutions and students were caught unprepared and unequipped, let alone that vocational education and training implies practical lessons and activities in workshops, which were largely dropped during pandemic, thus affecting overall learning outcomes. The survey on online VET education carried showed that about 40% of respondents had some difficulties to access online learning\(^6\). Since the start of distance learning 30% of students could not fulfil practical tasks because they lacked equipment and inputs.

---

\(^6\) The Survey financed by LED, was carried out through the National Students’ Council (NSC) on a sample of 8116 students across all types of VET institutions.
To gauge the attractiveness of VET we delved into students’ competition, number of students in VET, dropout rate and employment rate of VET graduates across our 37 sampled schools. On the whole data suggest that VET gained some prestige throughout the years and a number of reform champions surfaced. However, VET remains the second-best choice for students and is a place for second-best students.

**Indicator 7.2.1. Competition for admission (top 5 demanded VET specialities versus top 5 demanded labour market professions)**

**Strength of evidence based: Very Strong**

**Main source of information:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document review</th>
<th>Interviews</th>
<th>Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Labour Market Study, GIZ, SDC, Moldova, 2020</td>
<td>Head of VET Department, MECR</td>
<td>Survey of 37 VET institutions across all regions of Moldova</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education, Training and Employment Development, ETF, 2019</td>
<td>Former and present EUD Programme Managers on Education and Research ETF Country Coordinator</td>
<td>Survey of 536 students (in graduation year)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skills Mismatch Measurement, ETF, 2019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LMO Research, 2020</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEA Report, 2019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distribution of places by professions and specialities, 2020-2021 school year, MECR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In 2021, according to labour market forecast and professions barometer most demanded professions are tailors, drivers, telecommunication operators, electric gas welders, IT specialists, doctors and medical assistants. Demand for these professions does not come as a surprise amid COVID-19 pandemic. We also looked at the distribution of places in VET institutions by professions and specialities prepared by MECR on a yearly basis. Top five professions/specialities (both with and without tuition fee) for 2020/2021 school year are the following: auto mechanic, cook, accountant, tourism, electro gas welder mechanic. Drawing from this we can hardly conclude that VET offer matches labour market demand, as was expected after seven years of VET reform implementation.

Beyond that we looked at students’ competition for admission in 37 surveyed institutions. We found out that competition is not particularly high – there are only five schools where barely two students are competing for one place (as per table above). On average, competition is very low – over 90% of applying students are accepted. Particularly worrying is the average admission grade – 6,13 (out of 10), which indicates that VET accommodates the second–best students. At the same time, throughout studies, students increase learning outcomes to an average of 7,73 at graduation. Nevertheless, drawing from the students’ survey, low competition, along with the proximity of the school and dormitories conditions, are the three least important reasons why students choose a particular VET institution (see Figure 11 below). At the same time, the top three reasons for choosing to study in a particular VET institution are forward looking – students pick a particular school because they want to learn a profession, obtain a diploma and necessary qualifications for the future job. Despite these initial considerations, some students do not complete their studies.

---

7 Survey of 2949 employers from various fields carried out during 18 November – 24 December 2020.
8 MECR, distribution of places by professions and specialities, 2020-2021 school year.
https://mecc.gov.md/ro/content/admititerea-1
While analysing education-labour match is backbreaking, additional evidence points to other critical issues. As such, during 2014-2020 structural changes in the labour market led to significant adjustments in the overall education demand. However, the latter were unbalanced. The number of populations with higher education was growing and that with primary education or no education was dropping. These changes were not accompanied, unfortunately, by a proportional growth of population with VET\(^9\). This shows that higher education remains the number one preference among students. The growth in the number of populations with higher education translated into an increase in the number of active populations with this level of education. At the same time, the number of higher education graduates was greater than that demanded on the labour market, and some went inactive. However, one important phenomenon perpetuated - a part of excess higher education graduates took less qualified jobs from VET graduates, pushing the latter away from the labour market, even though jobs with less advanced training and qualifications are more demanded (only 15% jobs demand higher education).\(^{10}\) More details could be found under I 7.2.4 - Number of VET graduates employed as a share of the total number of VET graduates.


According to the BS Financing Agreement the number of VET students had to increase by 10% from 2013 until 2020, which is a proxy indicator for the increase in attractiveness of the VET. The reality was opposite though – in the backdrop population decline (by 8%) and associated decrease in youth aged 15-29 (by 27%) and children aged 0-15 (by 5.2%) the number of VET students shrank from 47,3 thousand in 2014-2015 to 43,6 thousand in 2019/2020 (see Figure 12 below)\(^1\). Against all odds, the number of VET students enrolled during the pandemic year 2020/2021 has increased to 44,9 thousand (2.9% increase as compared to previous school year). At the same time, unlike overall enrolment in VET, enrolment in dual education is on an upward slope for a number of years and has also increased by 13% during pandemic.

Figure 12: Decline in population and VET students (National Bureau of Statistic, 2021)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total population</th>
<th>Children, age 0-15</th>
<th>VET students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>47318</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>46523</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>46791</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>46586</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>44348</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>43564</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>44343</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Indicator 7.2.3. Dropout rate in sampled VET institutions

Strength of evidence based: Very Strong

Main source of information:

- Document review
- Interviews
- Survey
- VET institutions Self-assessment reports for 2019-2020 school year
- Head of VET Department
- MECR
- Survey of 37 VET institutions across all regions of Moldova

We looked at dropout rates of 37 sampled VET institutions. The average dropout rate is 19.6% (as per table above). The highest is 52.3% and the lowest is 2%. There are various reasons for school dropout – emigration, dissatisfaction with the studying choice, quality of education or living conditions in dormitories and various personal matters.

Dropout rates vary from country to country, but all face the challenge of students leaving school\(^2\). This is more acute in Tunisia, where every second student leaves the school, less severe in Turkey where 30% students drop schools and not a big problem in Montenegro where 95% of students complete education. As such, the dropout rate is not particularly high in Moldova, as compared to other countries. However, attention needs to be paid to those schools where the dropout is eminent.

Indicator 7.2.4. Number of VET graduates employed as a share of total number of VET graduates

Strength of evidence based: Very Strong

---

\(^1\) Data from National Bureau of Statistics, www.statistica.md

According to BS Financial Agreement it was expected that vocational training will be based on competences and will be adjusted to the labour market requirements, so that employment rate increases by 10%, from 50.6% in 2012, for graduates from the secondary specialised education, and from 50% in 2012 for graduates from the secondary vocational education (we assume the objective was set for 2020).

This objective was not achieved. Quite the opposite, in 2019 (latest data), the employment rate of secondary specialised graduates dropped to 49.2% and that of secondary vocational education graduates to 47.5%\(^\text{13}\). Low employment is largely linked with a low level of remuneration. While the average salary has doubled since 2014, remuneration for most VET professions in Moldova is fairly unattractive\(^\text{14}\).

We have checked with our sampled VET institutions how many graduates got employed in 2020. In average 55% of all graduates did. On the extremes lay schools that reported 90.5% and 23% employed graduates. 6.6% of graduates continue to study either in an upper education level or change speciality. Among our sampled VET institutions, there is one school were 30% of graduates continue studies and four schools were none do so. What is worrisome is that VET graduates represent a third of the inactive population. Also, over 40% of people from the group “Not in Employment, Education or Training” (NEET) are aged 15-29 with secondary vocational studies and 33.4% with post-secondary vocational studies\(^\text{15}\). At the same time, almost one third of surveyed students claimed they expect to find a job on the learned profession, another third will continue studies, yet 9.5% plan to emigrate.

It is important to note that these data were obtained via an online request with support from VET Department, provided that the Tracer Study mechanism expected to be functional until 2020 (as per VET Strategy) was not implemented.

Drawing from our online survey, VET graduates (9% of all respondents) are doing relatively well. Most are employed (60%), 9.6% live abroad and only 10.5% are unemployed. However, their perception about how their wellbeing evolved since 2014 is not very pessimistic. Most (41.3%) believe their economic condition has worsened and 27.7% considered it has neither worsened nor improved. The economic situation in the country aggravated even more, in their view; 63.5% of VET graduates believe it has worsened and the confidence in the future economic situation is quite low (33 out of 100).

### Indicator 7.2.5. % Of VET Strategy activities implemented with the EU support

**Main source of information:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document review</th>
<th>Interviews</th>
<th>Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Financing Agreement for supporting the implementation of VET Strategy</td>
<td>Head of VET Department, MECR</td>
<td>ETF VET Good Multilevel Governance Assessment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


\[^{14}\] The gross average salary in the economy was 4089 lei in 2014 and increased to 8860 lei (417 Euro) in the fourth quarter of 2020. The gross average salaries in agriculture, forestry, fishing (5553 lei), transport (6982 lei), processing industry (7647 lei) and constructions (8271 lei) are the lowest. On the other end, the highest average gross salaries are paid in information and communication (20311 lei) and financial activities and insurance (16006 lei). Source: National Bureau of Statistics.

The national VET Strategy 2013-2020, along with a detailed action plan developed in anticipation of EU budget support, comprehensively addressed VET enduring frailty. Subsequently, in 2014 the EU signed the Financial Agreement on SPSP “Support to the implementation of the VET reform in Moldova”, worth 25 million Euro (AAP2013). It was preceded by an allocation of 5 million Euro to cover the technical assistance needs (AAP2012). The SPSP’s overall objective, six specific objectives and nine expected results were fully in line with VET Strategy. A SPSP Policy Matrix operationalised selected VET Strategy activities. Approximately 40% of VET Strategy activities were implemented with the EU support.

The EU funding ended in 2017, halfway through the time frame of the VET Strategy. Various assessments (Mid-term and Final Reports prepared by TA project implementing partner, the two SPSP reviews), have largely agreed that with VET budget support, a foundation of a modern and effective VET system was built. Particularly commendable were achievements related to restructuring of VET institutions, establishment of ANECEC, gradual introduction of the new financing formula, VET schools’ self-management and shifting to a new curricula development approach, based on qualification and occupational standards. Dual education, started by ETF in 2014 and turned over to GIZ a few years ago is believed to be the greatest success of VET reform – 100 companies have contractual arrangements with VET institutions, engaging 9.8% of VET students.

Nonetheless, only 60% (15.1 million Euro) of VET budget support was disbursed. Frequent changes of ministers (4 ministers during BS implementation), insufficient MECR staff (4 people in VET Department) and turnover of TL in the TA project (4 during project implementation) hindered delivery on VET reform in general and lead to delays in implementing certain activities (e.g., creation of SCs, strengthening capacities of CRDIP and refurbishment of CoE etc.). Moreover, BS was new for MECR; its management was basically learning by doing throughout and absorption capacity was low.

In conclusion, although the Policy Matrix activities were straightforward, most activities were supply-side (education), without much consideration to the demand side (labor market). As a result, there was virtually no impact upon the attractiveness of VET sector (number of students in constant decline, dropout rates high), employment levels of VET graduates (at the same level as in 2014) or a better match with the labour market demand. Unfortunately, VET continues to be of marginal importance up until now (in terms of Government finance and staffing) and there is no clear-cut medium and long-term vision and strategy after 2020.

JC 7.3. EU support in higher education, research and innovation has increased mobility and people-to-people contacts
During 2014-2020 Moldova participated in two overarching EU programmes - Erasmus+ and Horizon 2020 supporting higher education and R&I. Participation of Moldova in these programmes has increased mobility and people-to-people contacts, but more importantly, they boosted institutional and systemic changes. While Moldova had a positive development under both programmes, EaP countries with a similar size, such as Georgia and Armenia outmatch Moldova in Erasmus+ programme in terms of funding, mobilities and number of projects. At the same time, Moldova stands much better regionally in Horizon 2020 programme.

Indicator 7.3.1. Number of students and academic staff that benefited from Erasmus+ academic mobility

Strength of evidence based: Strong

Main source of information:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document review</th>
<th>Interviews</th>
<th>Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

During 2014-2020 3624 students and academic staff have benefitted from Erasmus+ academic mobility between Moldova and the EU. At the same time, Erasmus+ programme is broader and goes beyond individual opportunities. It also addresses institutional and systemic issues in HE. As such, during the last seven years there were 21 CBHE projects, of which 7 were structural projects, the latter aimed at promoting reforms in HE system. All in all, the total budget awarded to Erasmus+ projects in 2014-2020 amounted to 30 million Euro – almost two thirds for CBHE projects and almost one third for ICM projects.

With Erasmus+ programme universities’ internationalization expanded: 25 universities from Moldova partnered with more than 200 European universities in ICM projects and with about 160 Programme and Partner countries’ higher education institutions in CBHE projects (more than 100 European HEIs and almost 60 HEIs from Partner countries). Internationalisation was particularly successful because of improvements in the legal framework (e.g., national regulation on academic mobility and recognition of degrees, joint and double degrees’ study programmes elaboration; National roadmap on Internationalisation of Higher Education and Research), as well as teachers’ training and curricula modernisation.

Within the Erasmus Mundus Joint master’s degree projects 30 scholarships in total were awarded to Moldova. Under the Jean Monnet Action, which promotes excellence in teaching and research, Moldova is granted up to 4 projects annually (22 in total). In terms of credit mobility Moldovan participation improves year by year – from nearly 300 international credit mobilities for short term exchanges in 2015 to 1179 now (including those obtained through the additional 2.85 million Euro top-up budget for ICM for Moldova in 2020 Call).

While success rate in ICM was gradually increasing – from 44.9% in 2015 to 93.7% in 2020, the success rate in CBHE and Jean Monet projects was unsteady and overall, quite low; the highest was in 2020 - 12.5% for CBHE and 30.8% for Jean Monnet projects. Other Eastern Partnership countries of a similar

16 Data provided by National Erasmus+ Office in Moldova.
17 CBHE – 19.28 million Euro, ICM – 9.8 million Euro and Jean Monnet – 0.9 million Euro.
population size, such as Armenia, but particularly Georgia, have a greater number of Erasmus+ projects and mobilities\textsuperscript{18}.

We have carried out media content research and looked at the extent and frequency of media coverage of Erasmus+ programme on both Nistru riverbanks. Overall, there is large media coverage on the right bank. However, looking at the content of 10 media outlets from the left bank, only five articles in which Erasmus+ programme was mentioned (outwardly) were spotted. This can be explained by the fact that young people on the left bank have limited ICM opportunities, because the State University in the region is not accredited in Chisinau, hence its students are ineligible, as only students from the left bank who study at accredited universities can participate in Erasmus+. In addition, to travel abroad, they must hold the citizenship of Moldova or of any other officially recognized state.

### Indicator 7.3.2. Number of young people from Moldova that took part in EU-funded non-formal education projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strength of evidence based: Strong</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### Main source of information:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document review</th>
<th>Interviews</th>
<th>Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SALTO-YOUTH website: <a href="https://www.salto-youth.net/">https://www.salto-youth.net/</a></td>
<td>Representatives of the Info Centre for Erasmus + Youth &amp; European Solidarity Corps</td>
<td>Online Survey on EU-Moldova cooperation 2014-2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to DG EAC data, 5,011 young people took part in EU funded non-formal education projects (except EU4Youth participants) since 2014. Based on SALTO-YOUTH network data\textsuperscript{19}, there were 4,479 learners (of which 2,726 were Moldovan learners) under Erasmus+ Youth and European Solidarity Corps during 2014-2019\textsuperscript{20}. Due to the pandemic, there were only about 35 young participants in 2020, of which up to 5 were from the left bank. However, all these numbers are believed to be an underestimation of the reality – some Moldovan young people participate in these programmes with Romanian or Ukrainian citizenship.

It is important to note that reliable data for 2014-2020 was not available at the moment of data collection (both for ICM and non-formal mobilities). One reason could be the fact that the monitoring and reporting system is mixed. The decentralised actions are managed in each programme country by National Agencies that are appointed by their national authorities. At the same time, the centralised actions are managed at a European level by the Education, Audio-visual and Culture Executive Agency, which oversees the complete life-cycle management of projects, from the promotion of the programme, the analysis of the grant requests, the on-the-spot monitoring of projects, up to the dissemination of the projects’ and programme’s results. While in case of centralised actions the EC gets all the data automatically, in case of decentralized actions data is collected by each NAs and then sent to the EC. The process of data collection by NAs and dissemination to EC is uneven. Therefore, despite introduction in 2018 of the Mobility Tool+ system, which allows Erasmus+ & European Solidarity Corps beneficiary


\textsuperscript{19} Moldovan Info Centre for Erasmus+ Youth & European Solidarity Corps (established in 2017) is managed by SALTO-YOUTH, which is a network of seven EU Resource Centres working on European priority areas within the youth field. As part of the European Commission's Training Strategy, SALTO-YOUTH provides non-formal learning resources for youth workers and youth leaders and organises training and contact-making activities to support organisations and National Agencies (NAs) within the frame of the European Commission's Erasmus+ Youth programme, the European Solidarity Corps, and beyond.

\textsuperscript{20} Data on Moldova could be found on the SALTO-YOUTH website: [https://www.salto-youth.net/](https://www.salto-youth.net/). There is data until 2019 – no data for 2020, as most activities were on stand-by.
organisations to access and manage their project information and submit final reports to NAs, at times updated information is not readily available.

Overall, the Moldovan performance in non-formal education projects was fair to middling. After visa liberalisation in 2014 Moldovan young people would make their own way to the EU countries without any programme support. Also, the lack of follow-up activities under Erasmus+ Youth demotivated young people to participate (in the previous Youth in Action Programme, there was a budget for follow-up activities). Likewise, Moldova is behind Georgia and Armenia in terms of the number of activities, as well as a number of native and foreign young learners. However, the number of organisations accredited to work with volunteers in Moldova has increased. There were only 3 organisations involved in 2017 and 6 in 2018-2019 and the budget doubled.

Among our online survey respondents, about 9% were young people (aged 18-25) with higher or advanced education. Unlike VET graduates, more than half of these respondents believe their economic situation has improved and less than a third think it has stayed the same. However, most of young very educated people (41,5%) believe the economic situation in the country has worsened and a fourth said it has stayed the same. While most of these young people (42%) were not able to access EU funding, over a half studied in the EU and 84% believe the EU support is decisive for the future of Moldova.

### Indicator 7.3.3. Success rate in HORIZON 2020 programme – number of retained proposals to the total number of eligible proposals

**Strength of evidence based:** Strong

**Main source of information:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document review</th>
<th>Interviews</th>
<th>Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Horizon 2020 in brief, EC, 2014</td>
<td>Interim Head of the National Agency for Research and Development from Moldova, Representative of DG Research and Innovation, EC</td>
<td>Online Survey on EU-Moldova cooperation 2014-2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horizon 2020 Description of the Action</td>
<td>Head of the Republic of Moldova Mission to the EU MOST Office Official Representative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horizon 2020 Grant Contracts, 2014, 2017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Review of the Moldovan Research and Innovation system, Horizon 2020 Policy Support Facility, 2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Narrative Report on Horizon 2020 implementation, 2020</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Strategy for Horizon Europe, Version 1.0, 2020</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The success rate of Moldova in Horizon 2020 programme is 14,5%. This is the highest rate among EaP countries after Azerbaijan (21,43%); the latter, however, had almost seven times less applications than Moldova. Belarus is very close – 14,4%, but other EaP countries are lagging behind - Georgia – 12,5%, Armenia - 11,9%, Ukraine – 9,5%.

Up today, 528 Moldovan organisations applied - 447 applications were eligible, and 64 grants were signed, involving the participation of 82 organisations. Marie Skłodowska-Curie Actions are by far the most international component of Horizon 2020, accounting for more than 50% of all participations of third (non-EU) countries and allow research and academic organisations in Moldova to reach out to

---

21 All attempts to arrange a meeting with the MECR representative from R&D Department failed.

22 Final calls and figures are not ready yet – in April - May there will be more reliable data on Moldova’s participation in Horizon 2020, but the final ones will be ready in 2022. For the moment, the EC’s online dashboard, which is regularly updated, is the most reliable source of data, [https://webgate.ec.europa.eu/dashboard/sense/app/a976d168-2023-41d8-acce](https://webgate.ec.europa.eu/dashboard/sense/app/a976d168-2023-41d8-acce) e77640154726/sheet/0c8af38b-b73c-4da2-ba41-73ea34ab7ac4/state/analysis/select/Country/Moldova%20(Republic%20of).
international partners and set-up strategic partnerships worldwide. The MSCA are also more competitive than the rest of Horizon 2020, meaning we can only fund proposals of extremely high quality. So far Moldova participated in 14 MSCA projects.

Indicator 7.3.4. Funding received by HORIZON 2020 projects participants
Strength of evidence based: Strong
Main source of information:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document review</th>
<th>Interviews</th>
<th>Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Peer Review of the Moldovan Research and Innovation system, Horizon 2020 Policy Support Facility, 2016</td>
<td>Interim Director of the National Agency for Research and Development from Moldova Representative of DG Research and Innovation, EC</td>
<td>Global Innovation Index Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horizon 2020 Description of the Action</td>
<td>Head of the Republic of Moldova Mission to the EU</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Strategy for Horizon Europe, Version 1.0, 2020</td>
<td>MOST Office Official Representative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC online dashboard: <a href="https://webgate.ec.europa.eu/dashboard/sense/ap">https://webgate.ec.europa.eu/dashboard/sense/ap</a>...</td>
<td>EU High Level Advisor on Education and Research</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The net EU contribution to support Moldovan participation in Horizon 2020 programme was 7,11 million Euro (after deduction of their linked third-party funding). The top five Moldovan participants are: Research and Educational Networking of Moldova (1,05 m Euro), Institute of Applied Physics (975 k Euro), National Agency for Research and Development (700,1 k Euro), Institute for Electronic Engineering and Nanotechnologies (539 k Euro) and Moldovan Technical University (526,1 k Euro).

Moldova’s the second among EaP countries (after Ukraine) regarding both the number of grants signed and funding received. However, in terms of innovations, which is the backbone of the Horizon 2020 successor (Horizon Europe), Moldova is clearly underperforming. As such, the Global Innovation Index of Moldova (GII) fell from 40.74 in 2014 to 33 in 2020 (0=weakest)23. Moldova is doing well in terms of ease of doing business, spending on education, ICT services exports, as well patents, trademarks, industrial design, utility models by origin etc. At the same time, the GII was dragged down because of weaknesses regarding state of cluster development, university/industry research collaboration, logistics performance, general infrastructure, innovation linkages and domestic market scale etc.

The State financing for science is limited (about 0.2% of GDP) and is on a downward slope. In 2018, as part of government reform, the budget allocations for science was reduced significantly, halving the number of scientists (from 4000 to 2000).

Indicator 7.3.5. Perception of the benefits of the Erasmus + and HORIZON 2020 among target groups
Strength of evidence based: Strong
Main source of information:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document review</th>
<th>Interviews</th>
<th>Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EaP Regional Report on Erasmus+ CBHE Action, EACEA, 2020</td>
<td>Vice rector of the State University</td>
<td>Annual Survey Report: Republic of Moldova, OPEN Neighbourhood — Communicating for a stronger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roadmap for HE internationalisation (2020-2025)</td>
<td>Vice Rector of the Technical University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

23 https://knoema.com/atlas/Republic-of-Moldova/topics/World-Rankings/World-Rankings/Global-innovation-index
We gathered perceptions about Erasmus+ and Horizon 2020 programmes from three sources, specifically:

- The interviews with four apex Moldovan universities.24
- The Annual Survey Report on the EU visibility and communication in Moldova prepared in 2020.25
- The online survey on EU-Moldova cooperation conducted in 2021, to learn, among other things, how many respondents have studied in the EU.26

We have interviewed four Universities of Moldova to find out their perceptions about Erasmus+ and Horizon 2020 programmes. All four universities have a vast experience in Tempus/Erasmus Mundus/Erasmus+ projects and shared an opinion about strengths and weaknesses of each, including of Horizon 2020 (in the latter they have been involved only recently). As such, the following strong points have been conveyed by interviewees:

- **At the individual level** Erasmus+ increased capacities and skills. University staff have become more skilled in preparing applications, building partnerships, managing projects, they better speak foreign languages. They use this knowledge in other applications, beyond Erasmus+ programme. Students have also many benefits in terms of increased knowledge and capacity, but more importantly, Erasmus+ is a reason why some young people do not leave Moldova.

- **At the institutional level** there were achievements through CBHE projects. Collected opinions on the impact of CBHE projects are largely in line with the 2020 Regional Report on CBHE Action findings. CBHE projects boosted a multi-level cooperation never experienced before, specifically: i) within Moldovan universities; ii) among Moldovan universities; iii) between Moldovan and international universities; and iv) between Moldovan universities and the Government. With Erasmus+ projects institutional capacity was built. Universities’ management and academic staff learned how to prepare applications and coordinate projects. English proficiency increased and so did the emphasis on studying foreign languages. Universities’ management is much more interested in cooperation now. They followed the calls and adjusted the university strategy to capture topics and objectives addressed in Erasmus+. Financial departments improved operations and project management. Universities obtained material support too - built labs, centres, repositories for online education. One success story is the Problem Based Learning approach, which was tested and introduced in a wide range of university programmes. Even though it is an institutional project it has also dealt with the HE regulatory framework. There were (are) other successful projects, such MHELM, CONNECT, MINERVA, TEACH ME, SMART and RESTART.

- **At the HE system level** there were also gains, specifically through structural projects. Erasmus+ lead to modernization of HE in line with Bologna Process. With Erasmus+ a jump to internationalization of Moldovan universities occurred, including integration in the EHEA and

---

24 Moldovan State University, Moldovan Technical University, Academy of Economic Studies of Moldova and Balti State University.
26 The Survey was deployed during 15 February and 8 March 2021 and was completed by 3689 respondents across all regions of Moldova and Moldovan citizens living abroad.
ERA. A draft Roadmap for HE internationalisation (2020-2025) was prepared by MECR\textsuperscript{28}. The HER regulatory framework was improved, and HE became more transparent. The National Agency for Quality Assurance in Education and Research was established as part of Erasmus project. Other successful structural projects were (are) EUniAM, COMPASS and ELEVATE.

There are also a number of Erasmus+ weaknesses in view of the universities:

- There are issues regarding mobility component. The scholarships for post-doctoral studies (very much appreciated under Erasmus Mundus) were removed. Also, mobility duration has been shortened to 5 days only. More predictability in terms of mobilities would also be necessary; with short notice, professors have difficulties adjusting.
- Another issue relates to remuneration in capacity building projects. Remuneration for Moldovan participants is very small as compared to other EaP countries\textsuperscript{29}. With reduced rates, motivation of Moldovan academic staff to prepare applications and implement projects has been affected. As an alternative, they switch to research programmes. Teachers implement small research projects co-financed by the state. Some embassies also provide small funds for research activities. Horizon 2020 is the best alternative, though. The fact that academic staff ‘transits’ from education to research is not a negative trend. With recent decentralisation of research and transition from ASM to universities it is finally reaching its home and more and more professors turn to research. At the same time, universities are looking for ways to combine research activities with programmes, curricula and methodologies’ development.

There are a number of problems at the HE system level, specifically related to accreditation, which is very complex and lengthy. It is also believed that universities’ network is hefty. For a small country like Moldova, with a decreasing number of population and number of students (for instance Balti State University has only 4 thousand students, compared to 11-12 thousand a decade ago) there are too many universities (21 in total). While some mergers are occurring now, there is no political will to tackle this issue more systematically. There are universities with a very limited number of students (some have 200 students only), but which bear high management costs and a number of ‘sleeping’ universities, especially in the South of the country. The political situation in the country has also damaged the reputation of Moldovan universities abroad. For instance, it is believed that Georgia is doing much better in Erasmus+, because, among other things, it has no identity and integrity problems, and the political situation is much more balanced.

Based on the 2020 Annual Survey Report, the infrastructure development projects are the most well-known EU-financed programmes in the country (58% of Moldovans aware of EU-funded programmes), followed by ‘educational programmes’ (43%, up 6%), which may be an attestation of the continued participation in Horizon 2020, Erasmus+ and Mobility Partnership Programme. In terms of benefits from the current EU support, only 8% of respondents claimed they have fairly benefited from EU support as regards better education, and three quarters of respondents claimed they did not benefit much or at all. At the same time, according to our online survey deployed during 15 February-8 March 2021 over one third of respondents have claimed that either themselves or a member of their family have studied or attended training in the EU.

JC 7.4. Free visa regime operates effectively, and projects are being implemented under the Mobility Partnership

- 79 projects have been completed, 25 are ongoing and another 10 are under consideration in the framework of the EU-Moldova Mobility Partnership in areas like: consolidation of the

\textsuperscript{28}https://mecc.gov.md/sites/default/files/anexa_foaia_de_parcurs_ord.997.pdf
\textsuperscript{29}The gross daily rates are the following: manager – 47 Euro, professor/researcher – 33 Euro, technical staff – 20 Euro, administrative assistant – 17 Euro. Ukrainian counterparts’ rates are much higher (above 100 Euro for teachers). It is believed that rates are originating from Tempus programme, yet a lot has changed since 2014, but the rates stayed the same. In Ukraine the economic situation worsened, and Moldovan average salary has increased ever since.
national migration system, social protection of migrants, cooperation in border management, fight against illegal migration and trafficking in human beings, diaspora consolidation, labour migration schemes, etc.

- transfer of expertise from the right bank of Moldova to the Transnistrian Region and enhancement of the cooperation in the area of migration management between the two banks

### Indicator 7.4.1. Number of measures under the Mobility partnership

**Strength of evidence based: Strong**

**Main source of information:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document review</th>
<th>Interviews</th>
<th>Scoreboard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EU MP core documents, independent external evaluations of the MP (Moldova included) of ICMPD and the Maastricht Graduate School of Governance, CBM-IV action document, IOM CBM-IV project documentation and reports, External Mid-term evaluation of CBM-IV, web sites</td>
<td>Interviews with IOM-Moldova and think tank NGOs</td>
<td><a href="http://scoreboard.mfa.gov.md/projects">http://scoreboard.mfa.gov.md/projects</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The European Union Mobility Partnerships (MP) was developed already in 2008 as a multilateral cooperation framework to enhance migration governance. The Joint Declaration on a Mobility Partnership between the EU and the Republic of Moldova was signed in 2008.

The MP is far from being a project or cluster of projects. It is an instrument, that helps promote a lot of horizontal measures with repercussion on numerous areas like migration and the institutional capacity to manage migration, asylum and refugee protection, promoting labour employment, also through pre-departure training and support to temporary workers, facilitating studying abroad, integration and protection of migrants, managing the return of irregular migrants, reducing the danger of trafficking, etc. It facilitates twinning projects, and the development of extensive operational cooperation between Frontex and the Border Guard Service of the Republic of Moldova and so on.

The EC sponsored a lot of initiatives in Moldova prior to the period of the current evaluation with different implementing partners. In the period under review there have been two efforts that should be mentioned: the Scoreboard ([http://scoreboard.mfa.gov.md/projects](http://scoreboard.mfa.gov.md/projects)), and the project “Supporting the implementation of the migration and development component of the EU-Moldova Mobility Partnership and harnessing its benefits for the residents of the Transnistria Region of the Republic of Moldova”, implemented by IOM in the period 2015-2017 within the framework of CBM–IV.

The scoreboard is a monitoring tool, which provides information on the initiatives under the MP, with information about partners, contact points, implementing period, funding source and other relevant information. It is also a tracking instrument for the evolution of the MP and a synthesis tool, presenting ongoing, completed and planned initiatives/projects under the EU-Moldova Mobility Partnership.

As seen from the Scoreboard that so far 79 projects have been completed, 25 are ongoing and another 10 are under consideration in areas like: consolidation of the national migration system, social protection of migrants, cooperation in border management, fight against illegal migration and trafficking in human beings, diaspora consolidation, labour migration schemes, etc.

The project “Supporting the implementation of the migration and development component of the EU-Moldova Mobility Partnership and harnessing its benefits for the residents of the Transnistria Region of
the Republic of Moldova" was a very novel and relevant initiative, especially having in mind that before this no mapping was ever conducted of the Transnistrian diaspora and no cooperation existed between the academia or migration data practitioners from both banks. The project has been effective in providing a lot of capacity building also for the de-facto authorities in Transnistria how to manage migration and has strengthened the cooperation between academia and migration data practitioners from both banks of the river. It had an impact on strengthening the human, institutional and legislative capacities for the successful implementation of legal commitments such as the readmission agreement and visa facilitation agreement, thus leading to enhanced border management and reduction of irregular migration. An intangible impact, as suggested from the field interviews, has been the change of attitude and the building of confidence through work with the Ministry of Interior in Transnistria, the academia, practitioners, NGOs, and vulnerable groups (victims of labour migration, victims of domestic violence, etc.).

Indicator 7.4.2. Number of legal entries in Schengen zone from Moldova

Strength of evidence based: Strong

Main source of information:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document review</th>
<th>Interviews</th>
<th>Surveys</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><a href="https://bluehub.jrc.ec.europa.eu/atlas/finalExt/FinalExt.pdf">https://bluehub.jrc.ec.europa.eu/atlas/finalExt/FinalExt.pdf</a></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

During the evaluation period, the number of emigrants from Moldova to the EU has continued to increase. This trend follows the implementation of the VLAP. From these overall numbers, the number of irregular migrants has steadily gone down, proof that the number of legal migrants is on an upwards trend. These indicators clearly point to better opportunities for mobility in accordance with the law between the EU and Moldova, which was both an objective and an outcome of the VLAP. At the same time, the proportion of returns among irregular migrants was lower in 2019 than in 2016 according to the figures available: this shortcoming points to the need to accompany the opportunities for legal geographic mobility, with an effort towards returns. The number of asylum seekers from Moldova has continued to increase, but the proportion of granted asylum has continued to decrease, reaching less than 1% in 2020.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Emigrants from Moldova to EU (in thousands)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>471</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(source UNDESA)

Figure 13: Asylum in the EU: first instance decisions in the EU 2017-2020 (Source: Eurostat)

---


31 Ibid
Main findings for EQ 7

- Most fundamental VET sector elements were built and strengthened, yet after eight years of reform implementation, VET governance is unsteady and a coherent medium-term and long-term vision is missing
- VET prestige is gradually building up, but it continues to be the second-best choice for students and is barely matching labour market demand
- Erasmus+ and Horizon 2020 programmes have increased mobility and people-to-people contacts, strengthened individual and institutional capacity and boosted reforms in higher education and R&I, which are yet to be complete
4. Evaluation question 8: JCs and indicators

EQ8. To what extent the EU support to Moldova has contributed to improved business environment?

This EQ covers Effectiveness, impact and sustainability.

JC 8.1. Access to finance and to business services for SMEs has been enhanced and their productivity increased?
JC 8.2. The EU financial assistance has contributed to the implementation of the DCFTA chapters related to the business environment
JC 8.3: EU support contributed to the development/improvement of the policy, legal and institutional framework for an effective development of Moldova’s economic sector including rural and agricultural sectors

JC 8.1. Access to finance and to business services for SMEs has been enhanced and their productivity increased

EU support strengthened the banking sector in general through a specific intervention (Strengthening the National Bank of Moldova’s capacity in the field of banking regulation and supervision in the context of the EU requirements) and provided access to financing and to guarantees through regional blending operation (with KfW, EBRD, EIB) and through projects. Especially the different credit lines implemented by ODIMM (and supported by EU) are reported as successful. Business support services have been provided by regional and national projects.

Survey and interviews with development partners showed that the access to credit and business services provided has been important. However, EU support provided can only cover a small part of the needs on financial services and business support services actually existing.

According to the World Bank, specific study performance of Moldovan companies has improved since 2013. Labour productivity growth in Moldova in 2019 was 0.5 percent, higher than the average in Europe and Central Asia (ECA). Yet, firms still faced two big constraints to growth: skilled labour force and access to finance. Almost one third identified lack of an adequately skilled labour force as a major constraint, and the proportion of skilled workers among production workers has decreased by 25 percent since 2013. Further, rejections of loans applications doubled since 2013, with nearly 40 percent of companies experiencing loan rejections, four times higher than in ECA, suggesting that the country has not fully recovered from the 2014 bank fraud.

Indicator 8.1.1. % Of SMEs indicating in the questionnaire a benefit generated by an EU supporting project

Strength of evidence based: Strong

Main source of information:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document review</th>
<th>Interviews</th>
<th>ODIMM reports</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ODIMM reports</td>
<td>ODIMM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Economy</td>
<td>EBRD,</td>
<td>Percentage of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in Eastern</td>
<td>Development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbourhood</td>
<td>Partners</td>
<td>interviewees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and in the</td>
<td>EUD</td>
<td>who had got</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Balkans</td>
<td></td>
<td>Access to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country report</td>
<td></td>
<td>credit (but</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Moldova, -</td>
<td></td>
<td>not % of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 2018</td>
<td></td>
<td>SMEs)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
26.77% of interviewees indicated that they had access to financing with EU funds. However, there are no data related to the % of SMEs.

### Indicator 8.1.2. Number of SMEs having access to finance and business services with EU support (either at national level or/and in sampled areas)

**Strength of evidence based:**

**Main source of information:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document review</th>
<th>Interviews</th>
<th>Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project documents</td>
<td>ODIMM, EBRD, Development Partners EUD</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An important number of SMEs has benefitted from finance and business services with EU support. It is not possible to indicate data at level of sampled areas as data are available are not disaggregated. Some of the support has been provided through the budget of the Government of Moldova.

Further difficulties are related to the fact that several projects are still ongoing or are just starting. As such the following tables have to be taken as indicative and as an example, a considerable number of additional direct or indirect beneficiaries will be available.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Achievements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ESRA</td>
<td>▪ More than 3 000 grants and offered 200 loan guarantees were provided, more than 10 000 new jobs were created.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Business incubators: eight new business incubators in the rural areas of Leova, Stefan Voda, Rezina, Singerei, Cosnita, Cedir Lunga, Nisporeni and Cimisla.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusive economic empowerment of focal regions</td>
<td>▪ 28 companies, start-ups and social entrepreneurship initiatives benefited from grants of up to €700,000 to expand business, create new jobs and increase the attractiveness of key regions for new investment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBM</td>
<td>▪ 29 projects financed under “business development “component</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biomass project</td>
<td>▪ 16 projects financed additionally in the framework of business development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Numerous enterprises with more than 7000 workers are involved in the biomass sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confidence Building Measures</td>
<td>- 26 young entrepreneurs from the left bank of the Nistru have obtained financial support for the creation or development of their businesses:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support to Quality Infrastructure Framework within the DCFTA context</td>
<td>▪ 113 companies participated in workshops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ 45 companies benefitted from tailor-made coaching</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Beneficiaries of regional projects (only Moldova beneficiaries)**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRIS No</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>PFI-s</th>
<th>Supported SMEs</th>
<th>New jobs triggered by disbursed loans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>255-366</td>
<td>EIB-04 SME Finance Facility - EIB window</td>
<td>Procredit</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>255-386</td>
<td>SME Finance Facility Phase I - EBRD/KfW</td>
<td>BT Leasing</td>
<td>701</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>376-993</td>
<td>DCFTA Initiative East (EIB) Guarantees Window</td>
<td>Procredit Moldova</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>phase 1:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>phase 2: 373-0812</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>phase 2: 389-994</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DCFTA Facility EBRD DCFTA programme phase 1 and phase 2 INCENTIVES FOR SMEs - DCFTA &amp; Currency hedging UA</td>
<td>Mobiasbanca, Procredit</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>228-707; 398-298</td>
<td>EFSE (Neighbourhood Window of the European Fund for Southeast Europe); The EU Currency Partnership Initiative (EFSE)</td>
<td>BT Leasing</td>
<td>15647</td>
<td>2800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>334-927; 404478; 401728</td>
<td>GGF - Extension to NIF East Region; GGF Extension to Neighbourhood East II; Extension to Neighbourhood II</td>
<td>BT Leasing MD (Business support)</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>Ready to Trade programme, an EU4Business project for the Apparel sector</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Indicator 8.1.3 Number of Business associations & incubators created or supported by EU under sampled projects**

Strength of evidence based: high

**Main source of information:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document review</th>
<th>Interviews</th>
<th>Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ESRA reports (evaluation)</td>
<td>ODIMM, EBRD, Development Partners EUD GIZ Project team</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU4MOLDOVA: Start-up City Cahul</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ESRA:** Business incubators: eight new business incubators in the rural areas of Leova, Stefan Voda, Rezina, Singerei, Cosnita, Cedir Lunga, Nisporeni and Cimislia.

**EU4MOLDOVA: Start-up City Cahul,** the EU has proposed to finance the establishment of a regional ICT centre for innovation in Cahul. The overall objective of the EU support is to support inclusive economic development in Moldova by increasing the potential of the digital economy and enhancing regional competitiveness and its business and investment environment. The project is part of the EU Single Support Framework for Moldova 2017 – 2020: Sector 1: Economic development and market opportunities, including sustainable and inclusive economic growth. The Government of Sweden has entered into a delegation agreement with the European Delegation in June 2020 for the implementation.
of Start-up City Cahul Project aiming to develop a regional ICT Innovation centre for the Cahul region. The tender for the physical construction of the infrastructure is still open.

**Confidence Building Measures**

- Creating a sustainable **system of business education in Transnistria** for beginner entrepreneurs, mid-level managers and CEOs, as well as creating a sustainable pool of local business trainers
- 4 cross-river business platforms managed by the Chambers of Commerce on both sides, as well as by Fruit, Essential Oils, and Beekeepers Associations, are cooperating for the capacity development of peer Associations and their members' competitiveness enhancement.
- 3 Associations in partnership with private companies from both banks are developing and implementing innovative business solutions to strengthen the resilience of entrepreneurial communities to market disruptions.
- 60 entrepreneurs on both banks of the river Nistru will receive individual support to overcome the consequences of the pandemic crisis.

**Indicator 8.1.4 % of SMEs indicating in the questionnaire that their access to finance and business services has improved**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strength of evidence based:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Main source of information:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document review</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

26.77% of interviewees indicated that they had had a loan grant with EU support

- This is identical to indicator 8.1.1.

**Indicator 8.1.5. % Of SMEs with increased productivity from 2014 to 2020**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strength of evidence based:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Main source of information: medium/strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019 SBA Fact Sheet</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SMEs in Moldova account for 70.6 % of employment and 70.7 % of value added, above the respective EU averages of 66.5 % and 56.3 %. SMEs played a significant role in the upswing of the Moldovan 'nonfinancial business economy'. In 2014-2017, SME value added increased by 51.1 %, while SME employment stagnated. No more recent figures have been traced yet.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SMEs</th>
<th>Number of enterprises</th>
<th>Number of persons employed</th>
<th>Added value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Micro</td>
<td>27,950</td>
<td>78,051</td>
<td>577,3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Social entrepreneurship is in an early stage of development in the Republic of Moldova, although over the last few years, several initiatives to develop social enterprises, including with the support of the European Union, were launched. In 2020, the European Union, through grants to NGOs with a total of €5 million, contributed to the establishment of 13 social enterprises in the country.” Actually, the initiative EU4Youth - Unlocking the potential of young social entrepreneurs in Moldova and Ukraine is under implementation. The project will be implemented up to 2022 and aims to establish an active network of 500 social enterprises contributing to the promotion of public-private partnerships in Moldova and Ukraine; furthermore it aims to raise public awareness on social entrepreneurship, integrate social entrepreneurship topics into the university curriculum, and support young social entrepreneurs to earn public recognition for their innovative efforts to tackle social exclusion, inequalities and environmental degradation.

With the support of EU4Youth in February 2021 over 100 social entrepreneurs, national authorities and experts in the field of social entrepreneurship participated in one of the largest social entrepreneurship events of the year - the National Conference on the legislation of Social Entrepreneurship in the Republic of Moldova.

Social entrepreneurship is an entrepreneurial activity whose main purpose is to solve social problems in the interest of the community. The basic law governing entrepreneurship activity, including social entrepreneurship, is the Law of the Republic of Moldova on Entrepreneurship and Enterprises.[13] According to this, “entrepreneurial activity” represents the activity of production manufacturing, execution of works and provision of services, carried out by citizens and their associations independently, on their own initiative, on their behalf, at their own risk and under their patrimonial responsibility in order to ensure a permanent source of income.

Based on this law, the social entrepreneurship can be conducted by social enterprises and social insertion enterprises, focusing on improving living conditions and providing opportunities for people in disadvantaged categories of the population by strengthening economic and social cohesion, including at the level of local communities, by employment, by developing social services in the community’s interest, by enhancing social inclusion.

Non-profit organizations like public associations, foundations, religious cults, and private institutions can practice social entrepreneurship, only if they receive special statute. There are two special statues for NGO’s who can practice social entrepreneurship: social enterprise and social insertion enterprise.

According to the national law, social entrepreneurial activities are activities in the fields oriented towards:

| Source: 2019 SBA Fact Sheet MOLDOVA |

**Indicator 8.1.6. Examples of social enterprises created with EU support**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strength of evidence based:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Main source of information:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU4 Youth unlocking the potential of social enterprises in Moldova and Ukraine;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Social entrepreneurship is in an early stage of development in the Republic of Moldova, although over the last few years, several initiatives to develop social enterprises, including with the support of the European Union, were launched. In 2020, the European Union, through grants to NGOs with a total of €5 million, contributed to the establishment of 13 social enterprises in the country.” Actually, the initiative EU4Youth - Unlocking the potential of young social entrepreneurs in Moldova and Ukraine is under implementation. The project will be implemented up to 2022 and aims to establish an active network of 500 social enterprises contributing to the promotion of public-private partnerships in Moldova and Ukraine; furthermore it aims to raise public awareness on social entrepreneurship, integrate social entrepreneurship topics into the university curriculum, and support young social entrepreneurs to earn public recognition for their innovative efforts to tackle social exclusion, inequalities and environmental degradation.
• creating jobs and employment, as a priority, of people from disadvantaged categories of the population.
• protecting and promoting the rights of people with disabilities and their families for the purpose of social inclusion.
• promoting the possibilities of employing people from the disadvantaged categories of the population through the provision of labour mediation services, information and professional counselling, guidance and training, counselling and assistance in initiating entrepreneurial activity.
• carrying out activities to contribute to the implementation of public regional development policies, including reducing imbalances between levels of social and economic development in and within regions,
• strengthening financial, institutional and human opportunities for the socio-economic development of the regions, supporting the work of the authority’s local government and local communities, oriented to the socio-economic development of localities and coordination of their interaction with national, sectoral and regional development strategies and programs.
• providing and developing social services as well as ensuring financial sustainability in order to develop and expand social services.
• promoting environmental protection activities.
• waste management in order to reduce and re-introduce them in the economic circuit, as well as to prevent environmental pollution.
• promotion of national heritage protection activities.
• performing tourism and sports activities for recreation and socialization purposes.
• carrying out extra-curricular activities.
• carrying out activities in the fields of education, culture, health, social protection and welfare, welfare
• and community development if these activities are directed exclusively towards strengthening economic
• and social cohesion and increasing social inclusion.

A social enterprise is an enterprise who carry out social entrepreneurial activities in order to solve social problems of community interest and which meet the conditions mentioned above. In order to be granted the status of social enterprise or social insertion enterprise, it will be necessary to file to the National Commission for Social Entrepreneurship the dossier containing documents confirming the carrying out of the social entrepreneurial activity. The statute is awarded for a period of 3 years, with the possibility of extension if it is proved that the conditions underlying the award of the status have been respected and is obtained from the moment of registration of the syntagma "Social enterprise" or "Social insertion enterprise" in the enterprise incorporation documents and in the State Registry in which the legal entity is registered.

**JC 8.2. The EU financial assistance has contributed to the implementation of the DCFTA chapters related to the business environment**

EU financial assistance is supporting almost all sectors covered by DCFTA in Moldova by a mix of instruments During the evaluation period, Republic of Moldova has made moderate progress in further developing a conducive business environment for SMEs. Moldova has advanced in the implementation of the SME Development Strategy 2012-2020 with substantial progress in the reduction of burdensome regulation, the implementation of regulatory impact analysis and the provision of business development services for SMEs. Noteworthy reforms also include reinforced policy framework for entrepreneurial learning, start-up support for young entrepreneurs, an expansion of the credit guarantee scheme, broadened e-government services and a formalised public-private dialogue platform.

SME promotion would need a more effective competition policy and a transparent and independent judiciary. Same further support is needed for entrepreneurial learning/business support services, including promotion of better matching of available skills of human resources with needed resources of SMEs.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Market access, goods</strong></th>
<th>Since September 2015, the EU has almost completely opened its market for tariff-free imports from Moldova. Trade with EU markets has already increased significantly.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Technical standards</strong></td>
<td>The adoption of European technical standards for industrial and agri-food products is of high importance for making the Moldovan industry competitive. Former Soviet standards has to be abandoned and precise European standards have to be applied. The process is still ongoing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>(TBT)</strong></td>
<td>With regard to food safety, Moldova is – with the support of the EU – implementing a strategy for applying EU sanitary and phytosanitary regulations, this process is still ongoing. The application of the European standards will increase the trust of the Moldovan consumer and increase the possibilities for exporting Moldovan products to international markets. However, the adoption of food safety standards creates difficulties for small producers, especially what concerns the tracing of animal origin.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Procurement</strong></td>
<td>Moldova has made significant progress towards bringing its public procurement system into compliance with EU, but some implementation problems remain, in particular with electronic procurement. In relation to intellectual property rights, the legal framework is largely consistent with international rules as well as those of the EU, but enforcement similarly needs strengthening. Moldova largely complies with the DCFTA requirements on competition policy, but the institutional capacity of the Competition Council needs reinforcement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transport</strong></td>
<td>The DCFTA sets out the EU’s detailed rules and regulations for most modes of transport (road, rail, inland waterways, sea and intermodal). Reforms along these lines are progressing. The EBRD, EIB and European Commission are funding major investments in transport infrastructures and adopting a more conditionality-driven approach with a focus on advancing the sectoral reforms. EU has financed technical assistance to support reforms. Reduction of transport costs is directly improving the business environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Energy Sector</strong></td>
<td>The legal provisions of the Agreement and DCFTA in the energy sphere correspond mainly to commitments made under Moldova’s accession to the Energy Community Treaty in 2010, including the EU’s Third Energy Package. Compliance with these provisions is proceeding slowly. The Moldovan market for both gas and electricity are currently dominated by Russian companies. Projects for diversification are being developed through network connections with Romania for both gas and electricity and privatisation of some gas assets with the participation of Romanian companies. EU funding is provided. However, the advances are somewhat slow. No evidence of decrease of energy prices yet.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Agricultural sector
EU is supporting the rural sector since many years with different interventions. Moldova has considerable potential for agricultural development, and in recent years its agri-food exports to the EU have grown. The major challenge is to increase the low level of productivity. There are substantial EU technical assistance and funding projects to support the process, with grants from the EU and capital from the EIB.

### Environment
Moldova’s environmental policy is being aligned with EU legislation, although implementation presents some challenges due to insufficient financial and human resources. Environmental investment projects are being funded by the EBRD, EIB, the European Commission and some member states.

### Labour Market - Social
Moldova has developed an elaborate legislative and institutional framework for governing the labour market, which for the most part corresponds to EU standards and those of the International Labour Organization. Other domains for legislative approximation include company law and consumer policy.

### Education
Basic educational reforms are supported in the Association Agreement, notably for higher education through the ‘Bologna process’, and with concrete programmes like Erasmus+, which benefits a large number of Moldovan students. There are extensive possibilities for Moldova’s inclusion in the EU’s agencies and programmes, with the potential to develop institutional capabilities and advance policy reforms. For example, in 2014 there was agreement on Moldova becoming a full participant in the EU’s main research programme, Horizon 2020.

### Indicator 8.2.1. Number of EU projects supporting DCFTA.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strength of evidence based: High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Main source of information:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[<a href="https://www.eu4business-">https://www.eu4business-</a> ebrdcreditline.md/](<a href="https://www.eu4business-">https://www.eu4business-</a> ebrdcreditline.md/)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019 SBA Fact Sheet</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Almost all projects and programmes implemented since 2014 are supporting directly or indirectly DCFTA implementation. As such in this chapter only the most relevant projects and facilities will be mentioned again.

**Support to Quality Infrastructure Framework within the DCFTA context**

The project is a technical assistance project aiming to support Republic of Moldova in the strengthening of the country's Quality Infrastructure framework within a DCFTA context.

Specific objectives:
To further align the country’s Quality Infrastructure and Market Surveillance structures with EU requirements.

To enhance the country’s private sector competitiveness aspects by improving SMEs’ production, quality and business processes.

To design the concrete multi-layered DCFTA visibility and communication action plan in particular in the field of Quality Infrastructure, Market Surveillance and internal and external market conditions and opportunities as well as in the implementation of its different awareness, communication and visibility actions related to Quality Infrastructure, Market Surveillance and internal and external market conditions and opportunities.

Results:

The legal and normative Moldovan Quality Infrastructure (QI) and Market Surveillance (MS) frameworks are closely aligned with EU requirements as per the relevant GoM Action Plans.

Overall competitiveness of Moldovan businesses within a DCFTA context in the fields of quality, production, export promotion and marketing and management are improved.

MoEl is assisted in the execution of its different awareness, communication and visibility actions in the field of Quality Infrastructure, Market Surveillance and internal and external market conditions and opportunities.

**DCFTA Facility**

The DCFTA Facility is a blended programme which helps local entrepreneurs to take full advantage of the opportunities offered by the Deep and Comprehensive Free Trade Area (DCFTA) between Moldova and the EU.

DCFTA will accelerate growth, help Moldova’s economy to modernise further and become more competitive. To reduce additional costs related to the reforms in the short and medium term, funds have been committed to Moldova under DCFTA Facility. Put in place jointly with EBRD, EIB and KfW, it consists of a set of programmes designed to increase SMEs’ competitiveness, ease their access to finance, help them to seize new trade opportunities and comply with new food safety, technical and quality standards, as well as with environmental protection measures implied by the DCFTA implementation. Not only does this boost access to EU market but also increases consumer safety in Moldova.

SMEs benefit through different instruments of support, such as risk sharing mechanisms, local currency hedging, investment incentives (e.g., grants provided to SMEs investing in the EU standards compliant machinery or production processes) and overall technical assistance (e.g., support to assessment of the compliance with the EU standards). **EBRD Credit Line project has supported SMEs in Moldova with investing €10.3 million in 70 projects.**

**ESRA-SBSP**

The ESRA-SBSP contributed to:

- ‘Capitalising credit lines to stimulate competitiveness of producers and potential exporters in rural areas’; ‘Provide financing for the purchase of equipment by SMEs’;
- Create a network of business incubators.
- ‘Ensure the functioning of the regional development agencies’; and
- ‘Increased the capitalization of the AIPA grant system in order to pilot ‘ENPARD’ like interventions.

The interventions supported through budget support also provided the foundations for the introduction of rural development as a government policy priority. These pilot outcomes can only be considered as making a very limited direct contribution to ‘sustainable economic development of rural areas in Moldova’ It is also difficult to determine to what extent these outcomes were the result of the ESRA-SBSP, given
that substantial, parallel financing was provided through EU-funded Technical Assistance and Twinning projects, Member State contributions, IFI loans and grants, and other donor support.

Most of the inputs and outputs from ESRA-SBSP were delivered not by the beneficiary, but either by EU-funded technical assistance or de facto budgetary transfers into AIPA, PARE 1+1, the Loan Guarantee Scheme, the NPEEY and the Business Incubator Network.

With respect to ESRA-SBSP, based upon the available data provided through AIPA, the national agriculture and rural development programme budget and numbers of beneficiary has gradually expanded over the period of budget support.

- There is also evidence of a gradual increase in the number of women and young people benefiting from rural development funding over the period. However, it is impossible to disaggregate the use of budget support funds from other support for rural development provided by a significant number of donors (including a number of Member states) over the same period.
- The support to the development of the business incubators and the BI Network (RIAM)7 yielded positive results. There are 10 incubators established with EU support, which comprise 197 resident businesses, against a target of 170. It is reported that 800 jobs have been created, compared to a target of 700. The occupation and activity rates are good (averaging in the 80%-85% range). The activity rates for those businesses which have graduated after three years incubation, is lower, at approximately 70%. The Network of Business Incubators plays an active role in the local community, and it does to some extent contribute to job creation and poverty alleviation at the Region level. However, the number of incubated companies is small, the total jobs created is modest when compared to labour market activity rates, and the companies are better described as micro rather than small.
- The Business Academy for Women (BAW) achieved all that it had promised in the grant application. 10 sub-grants were disbursed to 10 companies, although the recipient companies were very small. 314 women entrepreneurs were trained (target 300) and the target of 30 mentors trained was also met. There is no evidence to suggest that there have been specific outcomes from the assistance and BAW is seeking further funding to repeat the exercise. The funds allocated via the budget support intervention have enhanced the scale and impact of the implementation of PARE 1+1 as a mechanism to support small businesses and start-ups. As the two tables below illustrate, the number of beneficiaries was higher (+162) than the original target, and women and young people were significant beneficiaries of the programme.
- The 360 companies (SMEs,) which used the Guarantee Fund, would have not otherwise obtained the loans from the respective bank. An additional outcome has been that ODIMM has been able to develop credibility with nine Moldovan banks and should in future be able to capitalise on the low level of defaults (1.39%). The LGF has facilitated 550 new jobs, of which a small majority (284) were jobs for women.

The following table gives an overview of the progress of implementation of DCFTA and related EU support programmes.

Figure 15:Overview of DCFTA in Moldova and EU programmes supporting the different chapters related to business environment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter</th>
<th>Achievements/progress</th>
<th>EU Financial support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. Market access, goods</td>
<td>Increase of exports to EU emerge, now reaching 66% of total</td>
<td>Several programmes:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- ESRA,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- ENPARD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Support and Measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 6. Customs services             | Significant progress, but still inefficiencies and perception of corruption | - Support to the modernization of Customs Service of Moldova in line with AA requirements (twinning)  
- High Level Advisor  
- EU Border Assistance Mission |
| 7. Technical standards (TBT)    | Adoption of EU standards progressing, some institutions are still weak       | • EU4Business-EBRD credit line  
• EU support for the National Institute for Standardization of the Republic of Moldova to comply with CEN and CENELEC full membership criteria (twinning)  
• Support to Quality Infrastructure Framework within the DCFTA context |
| 8. Food safety (SPS)            | Adoption of EU SPS proceeds, but with delays, poor facilities and corruption | - Support to ANSA (twinning)  
- Support to Quality Infrastructure Framework within the DCFTA context  
- TA support (e-procurement),  
- technical assistance (PFM SRC) |
| 10. Public procurement          | Approximation well advanced, some implementation problems remain            | - Support to Enforcement of Intellectual Property Rights |
| 11. Intellectual property rights| Legal regime fairly advanced, enforcement issues remain                     | - Support to the Competition Council – Enpi/2015/367-197  
- Adjustment of Moldova’s Competition Law to European Union Competition Law  
- EU provides direct support (TA project and provision of equipment) |
| 12. Competition policy          | Institutional capabilities of Competition Council need strengthening        | - Support to the Competition Council – Enpi/2015/367-197  
- Adjustment of Moldova’s Competition Law to European Union Competition Law  
- EU provides direct support (TA project and provision of equipment) |
| 13. Statistics                  | Implementation according to European standards has accelerated             | - Support to the Competition Council – Enpi/2015/367-197  
- Adjustment of Moldova’s Competition Law to European Union Competition Law  
- EU provides direct support (TA project and provision of equipment) |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>14. Macroeconomics</th>
<th>Recovery of macro growth underway; macro-aid conditions not met</th>
<th>- Technical Assistance PFM SRC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15. Financial services</td>
<td>2014 bank fraud still not resolved; governance reforms proceed slowly</td>
<td>- Twinning project with Central Bank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Transport</td>
<td>Fast growing sector for air and road; extensive approximation</td>
<td>1. TA undertake studies for 2. Several Blending operations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Energy</td>
<td>Approximation advances; de-monomopolisation of gas and electricity difficulties</td>
<td>3. TA studies, HLA 4. Blending operations 5. Projects on energy efficiency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Digital</td>
<td>ICT usage advances rapidly; approximation advances</td>
<td>9. ICT Cahul EU4Digital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Consumer protection</td>
<td>Approximation advances, institutional capacities to be enhanced</td>
<td>10. Support to ANSA (twinning) 11. Twinning support until 2012 12. Support to Quality Infrastructure Framework within the DCFTA context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Agriculture</td>
<td>Agri-food exports to EU grow; big challenge to enhance productivity</td>
<td>Several interventions under BS and project approach,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Employment/ social</td>
<td>Approximation advanced; liberalization of labour code suspended</td>
<td>Several interventions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Indicator 8.2.2.** Interviewees judge that EU finance assistance has contributed to DCFTA objectives achievements

Strength of evidence based: medium

**Main source of information:**

| Document review | Interviews | Survey |
All interviewees indicate that the EU finance assistance has contributed to the progress in achieving DCFTA objectives. As stated, before most DCFTA chapters have been supported by interventions under different modalities, being also twinning and technical assistance important.

**JC.8.3: EU support contributed to the development/improvement of the policy, legal and institutional framework for an effective development of Moldova’s economic sector including rural and agricultural sectors**

There is evidence that EU support – especially support provided under service contracts and twinning has contributed to an improvement of the policy, legal and institutional framework. Transposition of standards has proceeded well, with some 24,900 European standards now adopted, a compliance rate of approximately 91.7%; laboratories have been equipped; institutional competencies have been refined, institutions have been reorganised and substantial institution-building and human resource capacity development has taken place. The achievements are related to the DCFTA-SRC, and substantial parallel support provided through the High-Level Policy Advice Mission, technical assistance, supply and Twinning contracts and many of Specific Conditions in the Policy Specific Contract 2018/401-914/2 (SIEA 2018). The DCFTA-SRC helped to make starting the process of implementation of the DCFTA.

However, the achievement is affected by several key issues: the application and enforcement of the revised legal documents has been limited to date; the harmonised legislation is deemed to apply only to export/import markets. Ensuring that these quality and safety standards are reflected in the domestic market has yet to be realized. This is particularly true with respect to Food Safety; There appears to be limited interest and/or capacity amongst entrepreneurs to obtain accreditation, use the available services and/or access EU markets.

Government officials and other projects active in this area indicate that many entrepreneurs are still unwilling to take advantage of the opportunities presented by the DCFTA because of the investment costs involved, the need to diversify their product range, the extensive compliance procedures and the financial risks linked to exporting. Furthermore, most of the enterprises are microenterprises, owners are often advanced in age and do not know how to make applications for loans and other support; thus, being unable to take advantage of existing opportunities. Consequently, there has been limited take-up of the agreed quotas for most non-traditional products. Interviewees suggest that the growth in the value of exports to the EU that has been achieved is predominantly a consequence of existing (bigger) exporters increasing their activity rather than a reflection of greater market penetration by an increasing number of Moldovan entrepreneurs.

**Indicator 8.3.1 Extent to which the sectoral changes achieved have achieved legislative alignment with the EU acquis**

Strength of evidence based: Medium

**Main source of information:**

- Document review
- Interviews
- Survey
- Project Documents
- EUD officials
- NA
There is evidence on the adoption by the Parliament of the Republic of Moldova of numerous legislative acts in line with the country’s commitments enshrined in the AA, namely related to public administration, public financial management and justice system reforms; underlines the importance of a full implementation of these acts, including by adopting secondary legislation. Transposition of standards has proceeded well, with some 24,900 European standards now adopted.

For example, Moldova has managed to make significant progress in implementing EU regulations on sanitary and phytosanitary standards. Between 2014 and 2019 the ISM (National Standardisation Institute of Moldova) managed to adopt over 5000 European and international standards in the food sector (over 2000 of which are European standards). Moldova is also gradually withdrawing from the Soviet norms which still apply in some sectors. About 700 of these are still in force, but almost 350 were cancelled between 2014 and 2016.

Simultaneously the ‘e-ANSA’ system was implemented in order to ensure an efficient and secure exchange of data between authorities in electronic format. One of the key achievements of this strategy is the setup of a ‘one-stop shop’ for the export and import of agricultural products.

**Food Safety**

During 2018, over 60 laws and regulations were amended. Thanks to Law 185, which came into force at the end of 2018, the monitoring functions have been transferred to ANSA (the National Food Safety Agency). Previously, these rights had been divided among the Ministry of Health, ANSA and other state authorities. In October 2018 (Government Decision No. 938), the ANSA became the only institution with the right to carry out sanitary and phytosanitary inspections at the border. Both those decisions secured the effectiveness of the ‘one-stop shop’ solution and increased ANSA's effectiveness. Importantly, border control procedures have been significantly simplified. The number of control stages during border inspections has been reduced to only one (previously, inspections were carried out both at the producer's warehouse, and at the border). The time required to receive a phytosanitary certificate has also been reduced to about 2 hours (the procedure is carried out in parallel with the loading of the goods in the presence of an inspector). Declarations of the Origin of Goods have been introduced. The provisions on laboratory tests have also been changed; currently they are not performed for each carriage of goods, but for the entire group of products intended for export.

Unfortunately, despite the noticeable progress, some areas still require special attention and action. One of the biggest problems concerns the quality infrastructure, which in some sectors is almost non-existent. The financial and institutional efforts needed to improve the situation are insufficient, and do not allow a systemic change in quality control.

- For example, although some food testing laboratories are operational in the country, there are no reference laboratories for various sectors (such as honey).
- Also, the costs that producers have to incur in order to adapt to the new requirements are often too high, which slows down the process of change (this concerns almost all animal products). In general, it seems that an overall national assessment of progress and challenges regarding the SPS strategy is required. Investment shortages are one of the main reasons why Moldova is still struggling with the problem of exporting products of animal origin (especially chicken meat and eggs). Most manufacturers do not have a technology line that complies with European standards.

There is a positive trend in the approximation of EU legislation. The procedures for legal amendments have been initiated and/or finalised concerning the following EU regulations: Examples:

- In July 2016, a law entered into force that transposes into national legislation the provisions of the Regulation (EC) 510/2006 on the protection of Geographic Indications (GI) and Designations of Origin (DO) for agricultural products and foodstuffs. The same law includes the
harmonisation on Regulation (EC) 1216/2007 on agricultural products and foodstuffs guaranteed as traditional specialities.

- In June 2017, the draft law on organic agro-food production and the labelling of eco products was approved by the Government and was sent to the Parliament, where it is currently pending approval. The law transposes Regulation (EC) 834/2007 on organic production and labelling of organic products and the implementing Regulations (EC) 889/2008 and 1235/2008
- The Government started to harmonize the national legislation to the provisions of the Regulation (EC) 1760/2000 on bovine animal identification and the labelling of beef and beef products and implementing Regulations (EC) 1825/2000 and (EC) 566/2008
- In September 2017, consultations began on draft regulations to transpose into national legislation Regulation (EC) 273/2008 on quality evaluation of milk and milk products,
- Directive 66/401/EEC on the marketing of fodder plant seed has been transposed into the national legislation.

Indicator 8.3.2. National policies and strategies developed and implemented

Strength of evidence based: medium

Main source of information:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document review</th>
<th>Interviews</th>
<th>Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Websites GoM</td>
<td>EUD officials</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Development Strategy Moldova 2030</td>
<td>GoM officials</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The National Waste Management Strategy (NWMS) 2013-2027</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU4 Business Country Report Moldova</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

During the reference period a number of national policies and strategies were elaborated in Moldova, many of them with the support of EU. However, development and implementation of national policies is challenging in the Moldovan context. Frequent change of governments, sharing different priorities, values and work principles. An oligarchic governance by the Democrat Party of Moldova (2019) compromised the European path of the country and affected public trust in democracy and rule of law, was substituted by the government set by a Parliamentary majority formed of two pro-European political parties (ACUM – an alliance between the Party of Action and Solidarity and Dignity and Trues Platform Party) and the pro-Russian Socialist Party informally headed by the President of the country.

Furthermore, also policies have been designed their implementation is often challenging due to limited financial means and human resources. Although GoM has implemented a public sector Reform which includes increase of salaries for public employees, salary levels remain low; this leads to frequent turnover of staff and for leaving qualified staff for positions in the private sector or outside the country.

National Development Strategy Moldova 2030

In September 2015, the Republic of Moldova committed to implement the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. In line with this commitment, the main strategic planning document of the country - the National Development Strategy "Moldova 2030" – was drafted and will be re-approved by the new Government. The strategy defines long-term sectoral development priorities, focusing on improving the quality of citizens’ lives in four pillars:

- Sustainable and inclusive economy.
- Strong human and social capital.
• Fair and efficient institutions.
• Healthy environment.

Moreover, the principles of gender equality and women’s empowerment are underpinning the implementation of the Moldova 2030 strategy. Furthermore, Moldova set up a National Council for Sustainable Development, which is to coordinate the implementation of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). This permanent body supervises the adaptation, integration and implementation of the 2030 Agenda and its goals. It comprises representatives from ministries, the National Bank, the statistics authority, trade unions, employers’ associations and the national association of local authorities.

The main goal of the strategy “Moldova 2030” is a noticeable improvement in the quality of life of the population of the Republic of Moldova. Such an approach also implies poverty eradication in all relevant aspects of this phenomenon, and not just strictly in monetary terms, because it implies not only the level of income, but also equal and undeniable access to qualitative public and private goods and services. Implementation of politics directed at stimulation through incentives of productive employment will be particularly important for economic growth and income of the population. Improvement of the quality of life implies increase of income level and improvement of the quality of environment.

Moldova 2030 includes ten sustainable development objectives that the country is to achieve by 2030. Unlike in previous years, the focus is no longer on economic development, but on people. As a result, the strategy offers a holistic framework for both the implementation of the 2030 Agenda and the Association Agreement with the European Union.

However, although the government is supporting the implementation of the 2030 Agenda in the country, there is still a lack of specific approaches for the process. This is mainly due to the fact that there are still no appropriate structures for planning and monitoring in accordance with the 2030 Agenda. This means that the prerequisites for fact-based policy are not yet met and the implementation has so far been tied to the logic of the Millennium Development Goals.


The strategy establishes national decentralisation mechanisms and was developed and adopted by Law No. 68 of 2012. Over the two decades of developing the appropriate legal framework for decentralisation, various proposals for reform have been made and some incremental changes undertaken. It has become increasingly clear that decentralisation and local governance are a viable approach sustainable development, but the process is very slow, and the political will is not evident.

Law No. 436 of 28.12.2006 on local public administration (LPA) regulates the organisation and functioning of public authorities at local, town and rayon levels. The law defines LPAs’ competences at level 1 and 2 in fields of activity established by the Law on Administrative Decentralisation. Thus, there is a potential for a certain level of autonomy, however limited human and financial sources of local authorities are hindering a real decentralization process.

National Agriculture and Rural Development Strategy for 2014-2020 (NARDS)

EU support was important for updating the National Agriculture and Rural Development Strategy, especially what concerns the objective “Improving living conditions in the rural areas.” New activities have been introduced, such as improvement of rural infrastructure, village renewal and development, and diversification of economic activities in rural areas beyond agriculture. Same thanks to EU support the advance payment subsidy principle has been developed and started implementation in 2020. Rural development support measures, which will be financed by the National Fund for Agriculture and Rural Development (NFARD).

The strategic policy framework is represented by the National Strategy on Agriculture and Rural Development for 2014–20, approved in June 2014, together with an Action Plan adopted a year later. The major goals are increasing the competitiveness of the Agri-food sector, ensuring sustainable management of natural resources in agriculture and improving living standards in rural areas. Related policies concern food safety, services in rural areas and regional development, SMEs, energy, transport
and logistics, IT and tourism. Particular attention is devoted to digitising the agricultural sector, with an ‘e-agriculture’ strategy, aimed at improving IT infrastructure for public services in this domain.

The strategy involves efforts to build capacity in the planning and assessing activities of the line ministries (in particular the MARDE). Improving the subsidy mechanisms administered by the Interventions and Agriculture Payments Agency is a key priority. The subsidy mechanism significantly changed in recent years. Since 2017, the share of subsidies offered for heavy machines was cut from 55% to 33%. In exchange, more money became available for investing in high value-added agricultural products (HVAAP), and in post-harvest infrastructure. Moreover, 5% of allocations are devoted to innovative techniques in agriculture.

National Regional Development Strategy (NRSD)

In April 2016, the Government adopted the National Regional Development Strategy (NRSD) 2016–2020, which is aligned with related sectoral strategies, notably the Water Supply and Sanitation Strategy 2014-2028, Small and Medium Enterprises’ Sector Development Strategy 2012-2020, the Energy Strategy up to 2030, the Agriculture and Rural Development Strategy 2014-2020 and the draft Strategy for Research and Innovation. The overall objective of the NSRD is to achieve balanced and sustainable development in all regions of the Republic of Moldova.


The objective of the strategy is to ensure gradual access to safe water and adequate sanitation (SDG 6) for all. The overall policies in Moldova related to the WSS are:

- Exclusive competence for LPAs to establish, organise, coordinate and control public services.
- Improvement of the operational and financial performance of WSS service providers in order to enhance safety and quality of services.
- Extension/regionalisation of WSS systems and the provision of access to WSS services, as well as development of centralised/regionalised water supply systems and connections to nearby localities.

The National Waste Management Strategy (NWMS) 2013-2027

The strategy is developed pursuant to Article 89(b) of the EU-Moldova Association Agreement. It foresees a systematic, integrated approach to waste management and regionalisation of waste management services into eight waste management zones covering the entire territory of the country. Furthermore, Integrated Solid Waste Management Strategies for the three development regions (North, Center, South) were developed and adopted by the respective Regional Councils in 2016.

A Solid Waste Management Investment Programme was developed by the European Investment Bank (EIB) on this strategic basis. At request of the Moldovan Government, eight feasibility studies were launched with the support of various development partners (EIB, GIZ, and the Czech development agency).

The Waste Law was adopted in July 2016 and entered into force on 27 December 2017. It introduces modern principles of waste management (prevention, reuse, recycling and sanitary landfilling), as well as waste recycling targets to be achieved. So far, five regulations have been approved to implement the law, and draft implementing regulations are being developed in line with the respective EU requirements and legislation in these areas,

SMEs

The SME Development Strategy 2012-2020 and its associated Action Plan are the main strategic documents guiding policy support for SMEs. The documents emphasise improving the business climate and reducing administrative burdens on SMEs, encouraging entrepreneurship (especially among women), improving access to finance, encouraging cluster development and supporting SME internationalisation. The Strategy is aligned with broader national development strategies, which do not
specifically include SME-related provisions but aim at supporting entrepreneurship through a number of priority actions (e.g., fostering a sustainable and inclusive economy, or building strong human and social capital). In terms of the implementation of the Strategy, substantial progress was made in the reduction of regulatory burdens, the implementation of regulatory impact analysis and the provision of business development services for SMEs. Noteworthy reforms include, among other things, a reinforced policy framework for entrepreneurial learning, an expansion of the credit guarantee scheme, broadened e-government services and a formalised public private dialogue platform.

**Education Code and the Education Development Strategy for 2014-2020**

This education strategy provides a sound basis for new policies in the education sector, including Vocational Education and Training (VET) and Higher Education (HE). Principles expressed in the strategic vision are in line with the Association Agreement. However, the main problem remains the implementation of the reforms foreseen in these documents.

**Gender and Human Rights**

The Constitution of the Republic of Moldova and primary legislation guarantee the rights of women and children. In addition, the Public Administration Reform strategy 2016-2020 and its Action Plan 2016-2018 also include measures to train central and local public authorities in the application of principles and criteria specific for gender sensitive decentralisation. The legislation and policy oblige the local authorities to localise the plans and actions for gender equality. The responsibility for designating, ensuring, and coordinating the work of the gender units lies with the districts’ presidents and mayors. Moreover, actions to localise and follow the “The European Charter for Equality of women and men in local life” have been undertaken by some local authorities.


| Indicator 8.3.3. Quality standards for production, packaging and marketing introduced |
|-----------------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Strength of evidence based: medium      |
| **Main source of information:**         |
| Document review                        |orenchos                       |
| Interviews                             | Survey                        |
| Final report twinning ANSA             | EUD officials                 |
|                                         | ANSA                          |
|                                         | AIPA                          |
|                                         | NA                            |

Efforts have been made to introduce quality standards for production, packaging, and marketing:

- EU has provided significant support to ANSA for implementing food safety regulations. However, Moldova still lacks financial and institutional resources to fully implement the commitments on SPS. Institutional weaknesses in the key government agency (ANSA), at the local level, the poor infrastructure of laboratories and corruption cases (phytosanitary certificates) are serious constraints on the growth of the agri-food sector. So far Moldova has been able to export to the EU only three categories of goods of animal origin: caviar, honey and egg flour, although other non-animal foods (apple, nuts) and wines have given bitter results.
- the opportunities offered by the DCFTA have given better results than expected and agri-food exports (fresh and processed products alike) benefitted more than industrial products. Since the inception of the DCFTA, exports of agri-food products have increased by USD 820 million (2015-2018) – an upsurge of 52% compared to 2011-2014. However, there is still considerable room for
further leveraging the potential offered by the DCFTA. This is due also to poor compliance with technical requirements related to packaging, poor pre- and post-harvesting practices, and a lack of proper infrastructure (it still needs to be improved to adapt to EU market standards). For example, Moldovan agriculture significantly lags are the export of products of animal origin (e.g., meat, eggs, dairy products) due to the failure to comply with EU standards, often because of poor infrastructure (i.e., accredited laboratories for animal health) and low investment in its renovation. Legal approximation in line with the AA/DCFTA is in progress, but with substantial delays on organic farming and animal health.

- There is an increasing demand for quality standards, good packaging and marketing: At national level critical changes in the organisation of the food system can be observed. This includes the decline of traditional wholesale systems, the increased presence of supermarkets and supply chains and increasingly demanding private standards for product quality and safety. The supply-side implications of these changes are becoming apparent: smaller and under-capitalised Moldovan producers are unable to meet the new requirements, resulting in the exclusion of many small producers. The expansion of major retail chains has also promoted a rapid development of the private label product segment – products manufactured by one company but sold under another company’s brand.

**Indicator 8.3.5 Procedures for Regional and Rural Development funds management adopted.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strength of evidence based:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Main source of information:</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Local governments in Moldova are organised in a two-tier system. The first level comprises 898 local governments (primaria); the second level comprises 35 administrative-territorial units – including 32 raions; Only the municipalities of Chişinău and Bălţi are simultaneously tier 1 and tier 2 units, and Gagauzia is an autonomous territorial unit. Especially first level local governments face considerable problems related to Budget and human resources available. 282 tier 1 administrative units (UATs), or 31 %, have four or fewer employees. Only 10 % of tier 1 UATs have seven or more employees. The average number of staff in tier 1 UATs with a population of more than 20.000 is around 17 employees. Similarly, 30 % of tier I UATs have less than 1500 inhabitants, despite 1500 being the minimum legal requirement for forming a local administrative unit. In addition, around 89 % of tier I UATs have a population of less than 5000 inhabitants. As a result, local public administration in Moldova is characterised by a high degree of fragmentation, inadequate human and financial resources, and limited administrative capacity.

EU is not directly promoting decentralisation, as this is a very sensitive process in Moldova, however EU is implementing several projects and programmes at local level, strengthening thus local governments. (i.e., Project Modernisation of local public services in the Republic of Moldova, Construction of Water Supply and Sanitation Infrastructure and Energy Efficiency in Public Buildings).

The Decentralisation Policy Framework (NDS) consisting of the “National Decentralisation Strategy and Action Plan 2012-2015”. The strategy establishes national decentralisation mechanisms and was developed and adopted by Law No. 68 of 2012. Over the two decades of developing the appropriate legal framework for decentralisation, various proposals for reform have been made and some incremental changes undertaken. However, implementation of decentralisation and local governance is progressing only slowly. **Law No. 436 of 28.12.2006 on local public administration (LPA)*** regulates the organisation and functioning of public authorities at local, town and rayon levels. The law defines LPAs’ competences at level 1 and 2 in fields of activity established by the Law on Administrative Decentralisation.

The Regional Development Agencies (RDAs) implement the Regional Development Strategies and the Regional Operating Programmes, which feed into the National Regional Development Strategy (NRDS)
and applications for finance from the National Regional Development Fund. The Regional Development Agencies (RDAs) have benefited from capacity building activities and are actively acting as facilitators at local level on regional development issues.

In April 2016, the Government adopted the National Regional Development Strategy (NRSD) 2016-2020, which is aligned with related sectoral strategies, notably the Water Supply and Sanitation Strategy 2014-2028, Small and Medium Enterprises’ Sector Development Strategy 2012-2020, the Energy Strategy up to 2030, the Agriculture and Rural Development Strategy 2014-2020 and the draft Strategy for Research and Innovation. National Fund for Regional Development (NFRD) the national fund for regional development represents the main instrument for financing projects and programs for regional development, focused primarily on the disadvantaged areas of the Development Regions.

The fund consists of annual allocations from the state budget, as a distinct position for regional development policy, as well as from other sources. The size of the Fund represents 1% of the approved revenues of the state budget for that year, except for the special purpose revenues provided by the legislation. Other financial resources can be attracted to the Fund from the public and private sectors at local, regional, national, and international level, in addition to the resources offered by the assistance programs of the European Union.

The volume of the Fund is approved by the annual law of the state budget. The fund is under the management of the authority for the implementation of the regional development policy, which carries out the allocation of its means, with the prior approval of the NCCRD. The form of formation and use of the funds of the Fund is according to the regulation approved by the Government.

Money from the Fund shall be allocated as a priority to the disadvantaged areas of the Development Regions.

The financial means received from the component budgets of the national public budget by the Regional Development Agencies are managed through the Single Treasury Account of the Ministry of Finance, and the financial operations for executing the investment project financed by the regional development partners are carried out by Regional Development Agencies through commercial banks.

One aspect of regional development policy in the Republic of Moldova is related to the financial support of this process. According to the legislation in force, the programs and projects defined as priority, included in the Single Programming Document and approved by the National Council for Coordination of Regional Development, are financed by means of the National Fund for Regional Development, which represents 1% of the budget revenues for that year, except for special-purpose revenue.

At the same time, the implementation of the regional development policy in the Republic of Moldova is also supported by the external development partners. Starting with 2010, the European Union, the governments of Great Britain, Germany, Romania, and Sweden, through their cooperation agencies and other external partners, provide financial, logistical, and multi-dimensional support to regional development policy. In this respect, assistance is provided for the implementation of various investment projects oriented towards infrastructure development, increasing the efficiency and quality of public services, and strengthening the institutional capacity of the beneficiaries. Support for development partners also covers the policy framework.

Thus, with a twinning project supported by the European Union, the capacities for regional development have been strengthened. With the participation of the external partners, the regional development strategies for the North, Central, and South regions, the regional operational plans for the regions concerned were elaborated. Support was also given to the development of the Sectoral Regional Program in the fields of water supply and sanitation, solid waste management, energy efficiency in public buildings,
and regional and local roads. The implementation of the Sectoral Regional Program will be ensured by identifying a flow of "ready-to-finance" projects, including feasibility studies, environmental impact assessments, etc., for investments in the identified sectors.

The LEADER approach was first piloted in the southern part of the Moldova in 2016 in the context of the EU SARD Programme. Since then, the number of Moldovan Local Action Groups (LAGs) – institutionalised partnerships between public sector, private sector, and civil society representatives – has grown to 32. These involve over 3,000 people from local communities and have implemented 250 development projects to the benefit of over 600,000 inhabitants in rural areas. The **LEADER-EU Rural Development Fund** is a tool implemented by the Solidarity Fund PL in Moldova in partnership with the LEADER National Network in the Republic of Moldova. In 2020 it is implemented within the project “LEADER approach for rural prosperity in Moldova”, financed by the Delegation of the European Union to the Republic of Moldova, co-financed by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Polish Republic under the Polish development cooperation program – Polish aid. **The LEADER approach will be introduced into the national legislative framework further to Parliament's own initiative.**

[1] Law on Entrepreneurship and Enterprises, Nr. 845 of 03.01.1992, Art. 1

5. Evaluation question 9: JCs and indicators

**EQ9. To what extent has the EU support to Moldova contributed to achieving tangible progress towards a viable solution to the Transnistria conflict?**

This EQ covers Effectiveness, impact and sustainability

JC 9.1. The economic and social rapprochement of the two banks of the Nistru river has been enhanced

JC 9.2. The sectoral rapprochement of the two banks of the Nistru river has been enhanced (health, social services, culture and media)

**JC 9.1. The economic and social rapprochement of the two banks of the Nistru river has been enhanced**

The Transnistrian conflict substantially hinders Moldova’s socio-economic development. The two CBM programmes have made a contribution to the social and economic rapprochement of the two banks of the Nistru river. They fostered cross river economic cooperation between the two banks of the by establishing partnerships between businesses and business communities, strengthening SMEs and promoting their cooperation through launching infrastructure projects. Jobs and livelihood opportunities were created in this process. Social rapprochement has been enhanced through grants and sub-grants for promoting the rights of various disadvantaged and vulnerable groups, community development, CSO strengthening and also through infrastructure projects with the involvement of the local authorities, which ensures their sustainability.

**Indicator 9.1.1 Number of cross-river exchanges and partnerships between businesses and business associations**
Increased cross-river cooperation of economic actors has been one of the specific objectives of the CBM-IV project *Increased opportunities and better living conditions across the Nistru River*, implemented by UNDP over the period March 2015-December 2018. The project had targeted economic actors (SMEs, Chambers of Commerce, business associations, etc.) from both banks of the Nistru River and dedicated much effort on business development and promoting the common interests and cooperation of business actors from both banks, also in the context of EU integration. Business to business interaction has focused on the facilitation of cooperation between business associations, supporting business cooperation networks, and building local capacities.

The activities implemented in this area have been *relevant* and *effective*. They promoted cooperation between existing business associations. Grants were made available to the Chamber of Commerce and Industry of Moldova, Chamber of Commerce and Industry, Transnistria region, Tiraspol, the Association of Fruit producers and Exporters, the Agency for Regional Development of Transnistria, the Agency for Sustainable Local Economic Moldova Development, the Federation of Agricultural Producers, etc.; the business partners promoted joint offers through common stands of products and services from both banks’ producers at international and local fares.

The project reported the facilitation of 102 cross-river contracts and partnerships between business associations from both banks, between associations and consulting companies, as well as private companies. 54 study visits were organized in the country and abroad (Austria, Germany, Cyprus, Lithuania, Poland, Romania, Ukraine, Belarus, etc.) to support the business service providers from both banks to learn from international best practices. Intensive training, conferences and workshops to the members of business associations, platforms and entrepreneurs were provided.

The follow on CBM-V project, again implemented by UNDP (January 2019-ongoing), also has as one of its core areas support to economic development and entrepreneurship. The efforts to promote cross-river business platforms were continued and supported through grant allocation for joint projects, as for example: the Association of Beekeepers from the left bank and the Moldovan National Association of Beekeepers (for preservation and recreation of the gene fund of Carpathian bee); the Association of Lavender Growers and Processors in Chisinau and the Union of Eco Farmers in Tiraspol (for business revival); the Association of Fruit Producers in Chisinau and the Association Dnestrovski Fruct in Tiraspol (for increasing fruit competitiveness); the Chambers of Commerce and Industry in Moldova and Transnistria (for export promotion platform development), etc.

Currently 4 cross river Business platforms are operational, developing business services and representing over 300 members. The Beekeepers Platform has successfully launched in operation a Mobile Bee Breeding Centre and gathered already 130 service requests from both banks; the Lavender Oil Platform published a Guide on the cultivation of aromatic plants; the Fruit growers platform provided specialized training on fruit cultivation, the Chamber of Commerce and Trade from Chisinau and Tiraspol helps the registration of companies on the European Enterprise Network Platform and facilitating cooperation offers.
The number of cross river exchanges and partnerships has thus risen tremendously compared to the previous CBM-IV. Key constraints faced by the business sector are being addressed and export opportunities are bettered.

Some examples of project proposals funded under the business development component CBM-V

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>amount</th>
<th>Implementer</th>
<th>Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preservation and recreation of the gene fund of Carpathian bee through creating a Center for breeding and artificial insemination of queen bees</td>
<td>24,226 €</td>
<td>Association of Beekeepers from the left side of the River Nistru &amp; Moldovan National Association of Beekeepers</td>
<td>2019-2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AroMed business revives on the banks of Nistru</td>
<td>23,955 €</td>
<td>Association of lavender growers and processors from Moldova, Chisinau &amp; PA Union of eco-farmers and consumers, Tiraspol</td>
<td>2019-2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increasing fruits' competitiveness on the traditional and alternative markets through cooperation of fruit-trees’ growers from both sides of the Nistru river</td>
<td>24,222 €</td>
<td>Association of fruit producers and exporters Moldova Fruct, Chisinau &amp; Association Dnestrovschii fruct (Transnistrian Fruit), Tiraspol</td>
<td>2019-2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of a collaborative export promotion platform on both banks of Nistru river</td>
<td>22,181 €</td>
<td>Chamber of Commerce and Industry (CCI) Moldova &amp; Chamber of Commerce and Industry (CCI) Transnistria</td>
<td>2019-2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Start for Youth Plus&quot; Programme on the Left Bank of the Nistru River</td>
<td>265,311 €</td>
<td>Chamber of Commerce and Industry of Transnistria</td>
<td>2019-2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COVID-19 response measures: organization of Online International Conference &quot;Digital Quarantine&quot;</td>
<td>3,648 €</td>
<td>Non-commercial partnership &quot;Agency for innovation and development&quot;</td>
<td>2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COVID-19 response measures</td>
<td>3,500 €</td>
<td>EDUJOCSRL</td>
<td>2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study on 2 Focus groups with young entrepreneurs from both banks</td>
<td>874 €</td>
<td>Independent Sociology and Information Service &quot;Opinia&quot;</td>
<td>2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact and Needs Assessment of Target Beneficiary MSMEs under COVID-19 Crisis</td>
<td>1,220 €</td>
<td>AO Expert Grup</td>
<td>2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization of express school on tourism</td>
<td>8,000 €</td>
<td>NGO Agency for Regional Development</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Examples of project proposals funded under the business development component CBM IV

Source UNDP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support the CSOs and BAs to develop their capacities</th>
<th>9,314 €</th>
<th>Chamber of Commerce and Industry of Moldova</th>
<th>2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In-depth analysis of the Business Development Services market on both banks of the Nistru River</td>
<td>67,568 €</td>
<td>NGO Alternative Internationale de Dezvoltare</td>
<td>2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve the opportunities and services available for business communities on both banks of the Nistru River</td>
<td>171,376 €</td>
<td>NGO Alternative Internationale de Dezvoltare</td>
<td>2015-2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study on entrepreneurship perception among youth (aged 18-35) on the left bank of the Nistru River</td>
<td>22,519 €</td>
<td>CBS-AXA SRL</td>
<td>2015-2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic research and forecasts about the economic situation of the Transnistrian region</td>
<td>60,011 €</td>
<td>A.O. Centrul Analtic Independent EXPERT-GRUP</td>
<td>2015-2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creation of Job Opportunities through Business Support for Youth in the Transnistrian region</td>
<td>344,489 €</td>
<td>Chamber of Commerce and Industry, Transnistria region, Tiraspol</td>
<td>2015-2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boosting the CCI capacity of offering sustainable consultancy services to the beneficiaries from both banks of the Nistru River</td>
<td>135,330 €</td>
<td>Chamber of Commerce and Industry of Moldova</td>
<td>2016-2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measures to provide business education and staff development of business structures in order to enhance business activities in the Transnistria region</td>
<td>134,776 €</td>
<td>Chamber of Commerce and Industry, Transnistria region, Tiraspol</td>
<td>2015-2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing capacities of export and internationalization consultants on both banks of the Nistru River</td>
<td>104,105 €</td>
<td>NGO Alternative Internationale de Dezvoltare</td>
<td>2016-2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide consultancy services for Competitiveness Improvement</td>
<td>177,381 €</td>
<td>CPM Consulting</td>
<td>2016-2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Amount (€)</td>
<td>Partner</td>
<td>Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>through training and certification of Business Consultants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of a sustainable cooperation platform of women agricultural</td>
<td>52,633</td>
<td>Federation of Agricultural Producers Agroinform</td>
<td>2016-2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>entrepreneurs from both banks of the Nistru River</td>
<td>€</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperation platform of fruit growers on both sides of Dniester in</td>
<td>51,665</td>
<td>Association of Fruit Producers and Exporters Moldovafruit</td>
<td>2016-2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>increasing their competitiveness on traditional and alternative fruit</td>
<td>€</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>markets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of tourist business on both sides of the Nistru River by</td>
<td>44,360</td>
<td>ANTRIM - National Association of Inbound Tourism</td>
<td>2016-2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>establishing sustainable partnerships</td>
<td>€</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Bridge Platform - revival of business confidence on both banks of</td>
<td>42,826</td>
<td>C.C.I. Moldo-Italiana</td>
<td>2016-2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the Nistru River</td>
<td>€</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of consortium of hospitality industry on both banks of the</td>
<td>48,710</td>
<td>Agency for Regional Development of Transnistria ARDT</td>
<td>2016-2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nistru River</td>
<td>€</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrated platform for berry value chain development BERRYDEV</td>
<td>51,607</td>
<td>BizGates Agency for Sustainable Social Economic Development</td>
<td>2016-2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Through communication and cooperation to a better life</td>
<td>49,628</td>
<td>Association Cutezatorul</td>
<td>2016-2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trans-Dniester partnership on marketing research</td>
<td>48,836</td>
<td>C.C.I. France-Moldavie</td>
<td>2015-2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>€</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thus, the two CBM projects implemented in the period under review contributed to consolidation of the business services market, bolstered the capacities of business actors from both banks and promoted a culture of entrepreneurship. There has been also a special effort on enabling youth from both banks to become successful entrepreneurs.

**Indicator 9.1.2. Number of SMEs involved in joint activities**

Strength of evidence based: Strong for CBM. Other aspects of SMEs – addressed under JC 8

**Main source of information:**

- Document review
- Interviews
- Survey
The CBM-IV UNDP implemented project "Increased opportunities and better living conditions across the Nistru/Dniestr River" has been effective. The target of having at least 200 SMEs involved in joint activities and received business support services" was greatly over-fulfilled. Over 1,000 companies from both banks are reported to have carried out joint actions and received support services, and this is well documented. In addition – they were exposed to good practices, helping them promote their goods and find new partners. A study on the Business Development Services Market on both banks of the Nistru river was carried with recommendations for the further development of the sector. The results of the study served as the basis for targeted interventions and can still be as a resource for further initiatives.

The project had a strong impact on youth enterprise development: 31 new enterprises were created within the Grants for Youth Programme (16 from the Transnistria region) and received continuous support through consultancy and coaching. Representatives of over 100 companies were exposed to best practices in ecological agriculture and hotelier services. Information centres were created in the area of tourism and agriculture.

CBM-V has built on these achievements and included as a specific objective “to contribute to economic and social development by ensuring more equal access to the opportunities provided by the AA and its DCFTA. Since 2019, under CBM-5, another 300 SMEs have been involved in joint activities and it is planned to have about 20 new businesses created and supported through the SME grant programme by early 2021. The programme also set up a framework for transferring the experience of the Organisation for Support to Small and Medium Enterprises Sector Development on the right bank (ODDIM) – to the left bank and it was linked to a counterpart on the left riverbank to facilitate the support to SMEs there. This has built on the impact and sustainability of the previous CBM project.

**Indicator 9.1.3. Number of new jobs created and livelihood opportunities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strength of evidence based: Strong for CBM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Main source of information:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document review</th>
<th>Interviews</th>
<th>Survey N /A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CBM-IV and CBM-V UNDP implemented project documentation, and mid-term reports, Mid-term evaluation of CBM-IV, review of all grants disbursed under this component</td>
<td>Interviews with EUD, interviews with the project implementer - UNDP and grantees from both banks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Over the period 2016-2018, 166 permanent jobs were reported to have been created by the CBM-IV UNDP implemented project, including: 123 new jobs created by 31 young entrepreneurs supported in the frame of 2 mirror Grants for Youth projects (70 of them on the left bank). Another 43 permanent jobs were created by the newly established 10 associations, 3 centres and 8 assisted platforms. Indirectly 124 jobs were reported to have been created by association members. The number of temporary jobs reported is over 200. Although there are no separate statistics on the jobs created under the project, this is well documented for each granted project and reported to the Steering committee, where key stakeholder is represented.

Livelihood opportunities were promoted with the support to over 3,500 farmers and agriculture producers, who were assisted to enhance their sales capabilities through participation in training how to grow
ecological products and implement environmentally friendly agricultural practices, and with support to the establishments of new contacts and trade links. Over 500 employees of 24 fruit producing companies developed a joint working plan and learned new methods on how to prepare their orchards for the winter.

The livelihood opportunities are further promoted by the 4 cross-river Business platforms.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator 9.1.4. Number of social infrastructure projects implemented</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strength of evidence based:</strong> Strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Main source of information:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document review</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBM-IV and CBM-V UNDP implemented project documentation, and mid-term reports, Mid-term evaluation of CBM-IV, detailed review of all grants disbursed under this component, publications across both banks for various infrastructure projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interviews</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviews with EUD, interviews with the project implementer - UNDP and grantees from both banks, as well as the Head of the Coordination council on Technical and Humanitarian Assistance of Transnistrian region and the President's office in Tiraspol, Solidarity fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Survey N/A</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media research survey, conducted by the evaluation on how the press in the Republic of Moldova, including media on the left bank of the Nistru river covers the EU support, projects and programmes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Community development has been a powerful component of CBM to achieve social rapprochement, addressed in many of the CBM interventions – both in the awarded projects under the CBM Call for proposals, and the UNDP implemented projects in the framework of CBM-IV and CBM-V. In the majority of cases community development has been promoted through social infrastructure projects.

Already under CBM-IV, there has been high interest from communities from both banks to the opportunity to implement social infrastructure projects. Big amount of project proposals was submitted, and 31 infrastructure projects ideas were selected and implemented by the end of 2018. These included: renovation of 8 schools, 7 community centres, 3 social protection facilities, 5 health care institutions, 3 sports centres, 1 road infrastructure, 1 sewage network, 1 fire station and 2 tourism info centres. The total number of people who benefitted from improved social infrastructure objects is estimated to be over 100 000 people.

The Programme also identified the need for additional assistance to the Local Public Administrations (LPAs) on both banks for the assessment of community needs, and improving the capacities for planning, implementation, and sustainability of the social infrastructure projects. To address these needs, a capacity development programme was implemented by two consulting companies from each bank of the Nistru River. At least 30 communities (20 from the right bank and 10 from the left bank) which had not before that benefitted from CBM funding, were assisted to identify relevant confidence building project ideas. Confidence building elements were incorporated in the Local plans.

Tackling the growing disparity between the Transnistrian region and the rest of the country by supporting local development and CSOs has become a Specific objective of CBM-V. The idea to establish specialized thematic platforms of collaboration developed further and worked out well, given that all social infrastructure projects funded under the CBM framework fall under five major activity fields – education, healthcare, sports, culture and environment protection. The platforms are operational and gather further momentum and recognition. Feedback from the field shows some of them have been very useful for Transnistria during the pandemic. The Health Platform, for example, did quick needs assessment and undertook practical steps for the delivery of personal protection equipment, blood test kits, extended help to vulnerable groups, etc. The Education Platform was also very effective in the pandemic – it helped introduce distance learning solutions for educational institutions on both banks, and this is ongoing.
New 14 social infrastructure projects were launched in 2019, and are being implemented under CBM-V. The Rezina-Ribnita bridge lighting project was inaugurated at the beginning of 2020 and received great coverage. The bridge over the Nistru river is now lit up for the first time since 1993, allowing around 60,000 people from the region to travel safely between Rezina and Ribnita even at night. Another 4 projects (renovation of a kindergarten and a gymnasium, a sports field and waste management collection system) were completed shortly afterwards. Special mention should be made of the Waste management project in Speia – Telita villages, introducing modern waste collection methods and ensuring a greener environment for some 7000 villagers. As part of the project 6 waste collection platforms were built, specialized waste trucks procured, and the local authorities contributed to this effort by buying waste bins. The rest of the projects are implemented with some delay due to the Covid crisis but expected to be completed soon. The research on media implemented by the project has revealed that these projects have been among the best covered by the media in Transnistria.

Some examples of most recent infrastructure / community development projects funded under CBM

Source: UNDP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Implementer</th>
<th>Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Renovation of public lighting in the district: Lomonosov street, Rezina - the bridge over the Nistru river, RTbnita</td>
<td>28,699 €</td>
<td>Compania Electrica SA</td>
<td>2019-2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction of the Social Center in Malaesti Vechi village, Balabanesti commune, Criuleni district and replacement of roof and renovation of the canteen with adjacent premises in Gymnasium from Roscani village, Anenii Noi district</td>
<td>161,065 €</td>
<td>Aria Grup SRL</td>
<td>2019-2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renovation of kindergarten Albinuta in Teiul village and at school in Malaesti village, Grigoriopol district</td>
<td>117,440 €</td>
<td>Lavsar SRL</td>
<td>2019-2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of technical design for the refurbishment of multifunctional sports fields located in Tiraspol, Corotna village, Camenca town and Sanatauca village</td>
<td>7,199 €</td>
<td>Sauras SRL</td>
<td>2019-2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refurbishment of multifunctional sports fields located in Tiraspol, Corotna village, Camenca town and Sanatauca village</td>
<td>201,482 €</td>
<td>Iati SRL</td>
<td>2019-2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extending the system for waste management (arranging 6 platforms with containers for collecting household waste) in Speia - Telita, Anenii Noi and Speia, Grigoriopol</td>
<td>27,372 €</td>
<td>Marconex Prim SRL</td>
<td>2019-2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extending the system for waste management (procurement of garbage truck) in Speia - Telita, Anenii Noi and Speia, Grigoriopol</td>
<td>39,467 €</td>
<td>Ravitan SRL</td>
<td>2019-2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replacement of roof of the Cultural Hall in Holercani village, Dubasari district and renovation of Garofita kindergarten, Cocieri village, Dubasari district</td>
<td>120,778 €</td>
<td>Giesena SRL</td>
<td>2019-2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Description</td>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>Contractor</td>
<td>Timeline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renovation of the community center of Ternovca village</td>
<td>51,305 €</td>
<td>Lavsar SRL</td>
<td>2019-2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restoration of the public infrastructure of the National Park in Cioburciu village, Slobozia district</td>
<td>80,953 €</td>
<td>Iati SRL</td>
<td>2019-2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of feasibility study for extending the electrical transportation network (trolleybus line) from the streets' junction Panin-Ermakov-Engels of Bender city - Tighina street of Varnita village - industrial area &quot;Severnii&quot; District of Bender city</td>
<td>8,762 €</td>
<td>SIG-Engineering SRL</td>
<td>2019-2021</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Another project "Access to success: partnerships for self-sustainable community development" (2017-2020) has used local development as a means to build trust between people leaving on both banks of the Nistru river, gathered together around common challenges, resources and territory. The project fostered learning-by-doing cooperation experience with a strong people-oriented dimension and promoted the EU community-led local development approach. The project worked in over 40 communities and implemented a broad capacity building programme for local authorities, community leaders and activists with a series of training sessions on project management and financial management, as well as the Assets-Based Community Development (ABCD) method, used within the Action. This increased the competences of the participants in local public services, community planning and participation, empowerment of women and marginalized groups, etc. Initiative groups from local communities were provided with support to develop strategic documents for local communities by the national and international experts. It is estimated that over 450 local community leaders took part in the programme. Local partnerships gathering local leaders from different sectors were established in 41 local communities. Parallel to this support was provided to 42 communities from both banks of the river, and 41 of them developed strategic plans, based on community involvement and consultations with different local stakeholders. At the time of the evaluation 15 partnership projects had been selected for implementation under the Small Grants Fund of the project.

List of partnership projects (Source: Solidarity Fund)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partnership and the name of the partnership project</th>
<th>Priorities</th>
<th>Hard component</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dubasarii Vechi - Dubasari A common dream - it's a reality</td>
<td>Social field, with involving youth people; culture and sport</td>
<td>Dubasarii Vechi: The Park revitalisation Dubasari: The school multifunctional playground</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telita- Maiac New Life Stories</td>
<td>Initiatives focused on cultural and sports modernization</td>
<td>Maiak: Creation of an open-air sport field in the village of Maiac Telita: Works on arranging the local museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rezina- Tiraspolul Now Through synergy, tourism and ecology to a sustainable trust</td>
<td>Environmental solutions, sustainable and eco-</td>
<td>Rezina: Connection to the sewer for a neighborhood housing including kindergarten</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Area</td>
<td>Initiatives</td>
<td>Projects/Activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>between the communities of both banks of the Dniester</strong></td>
<td>friendly tourism in Dniester fluvial basin</td>
<td>Tiraspolul Nou: Expedition &quot;Scanning of the natural and anthropogenic potential of the Dniester River basin in the region of Rezina-Ribnitsa - Lalovo-Butuceni&quot;. Trainings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pelinia- Butuceni Awareness, involvement, development - Key factors for improving the quality of life in Pelinia - Butuceni communities</td>
<td>Cultural promotion</td>
<td>Pelinia: repairing the Fest Hall in the Pelinia Theoretical Lyceum (installation of the heating system) Butuceni: repairing the Gym (repair works of the floor, plastering and painting walls);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barboieni- Corotnoe</td>
<td>Initiatives focused on social modernization</td>
<td>Barboieni: arrangement and endowment of recreation zone Corotnoe: repair works of the roof of Centre of family medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Together for prosperous communities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gura Bicului - Crasnogorca</td>
<td>Local culture initiatives, public space modernization, building trust and collaboration between communities</td>
<td>Gura Bicului: Renovation works in the House of Culture Crasnogorca: Renovation works in the kindergarten</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A step towards future</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milesti- Ternovca</td>
<td>Development of culture and tourism on the local level, including music, arts, sports activities and exchange of cultural traditions</td>
<td>Milesti: Procurement of bicycles; Marking the bicycles paths and elaboration of maps Ternovca: Reconstruction activities in House of Culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two banks - one tradition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ocnita - Gisca (Bender)</td>
<td>Initiatives focused on social modernization</td>
<td>Ocnita: creation of the Youth Centre for self-development of young Gisca: creation of a Youth Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young people in the spotlight</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cliautii de Jos - Rascov</td>
<td>Community development through development of rural tourism; Initiatives focused on business infrastructure in rural areas</td>
<td>Cliautii de Jos: arrangement of 4 houses in Cliautii de Jos for tourists’ accommodation and food provision Rascov: creating tourist centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unforgettable halt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chiscareni- Hirtop</td>
<td>Local Economy and Tourism Development; Social Modernisation-based initiatives</td>
<td>Chiscareni: repair works of the craftsmen’s center Hirtop: creation of the Multifunctional Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Initiative</td>
<td>Details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Cuizaucă - Jura People and culture | Initiatives focused on cultural and social modernization | Cuizaucă: repair works and gasification of the House of Culture  
Jura: repair works and gasification of the House of Culture |
| Soroca - Caragas Social integration without borders | Initiatives based on social development | Soroca: procurement of tandem bicycles  
Caragas: workshop studio |
| Cisla - Butor Culture unites communities | Local culture initiatives, public space modernization, building trust and collaboration between communities | Cisla: construction of the summer stage  
Butor: reconstruction and assembly work of heating system in 8 rooms of the House of Culture |
| Sircova - Ofatinti All together | Sport, culture, modernisation, local development | Sircova: creation of the stadium - multifunctional sports ground, procurement and installation of the sports equipment  
Ofatinti: renovation of the stadium, multifunctional sports ground, procurement and installation of the sport equipment |
| Sanatauca - Chitcani Youth constellation | Social and cultural modernization, development of the creative potential of the youth from both localities | Sanatauca: development and organization of mini eco-routes in the park zone  
Chitcani: creating conditions in the House of Culture in Chitcani - repairmen works in 3 rooms and partial arrangement of the local park |

An important dimension of confidence building was that trust between Transnistrian local communities and representatives of de facto authorities in the region (especially local authorities and the Coordination Council for Technical and Humanitarian Aid) towards the EU in general, particularly EU member states was strengthened as well as the EU development instruments and policies. This is also related to the possibility of getting exposed to the practices in an EU member country. Beneficiary communities participated in study visits to Poland. The purpose has been to familiarize them with the EU experience, accumulated in Poland, on community development following ABCD approach. The participants of the visit were divided groups by interests: Cultural heritage, Community initiatives; Social entrepreneurship; Rural and agro-tourism; Libraries in villages; Processing local food product; Local economic development. The majority of participants got interested in the rural and agro-tourism initiatives, social initiatives and cultural heritage.
JC 9.2. The sectoral Rapprochement of the two banks of the Nistru river has been enhanced (health, culture and media)

Significant rapprochement of the two banks of the Nistru river has been achieved in the sectors of health, medical and social care and protection of the cultural heritage, thanks to CBM-IV, CBM-V and a Twinning project in the area of cultural heritage protection. Support is being rendered to media companies and media outlets from both banks for better audio-visual quality and joint audio-visual and new media productions, that will also increase EU visibility. As regards media content, biggest on the left bank has been the coverage related to community infrastructure projects - refurbishment of kindergartens, renovation of schools and policlinics, inauguration of sports and educational facilities, etc. Social projects were also well covered, and increased EU visibility.

Indicator 9.2.1 Degree of alignment of public health systems

Strength of evidence based: Strong

Main source of information:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document review</th>
<th>Interviews</th>
<th>Survey N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CBM-IV and CBM-V action documents and projects implemented by the WHO and GIZ, projects, Final and Interim reports of the above projects, Mid-term evaluation of CBM-IV, Call for proposals under CBM</td>
<td>Interviews with UNDP, MoHSP, WHO, project beneficiaries of the WHO project from Transnistria, CSOs, the Health Platform (covering both banks), Keystone Moldova, GIZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Public health has been in the focus of the attention of two long terms projects since 2015. Already in 2015, the "Technical assistance and capacity building activities in the health sector between both banks of the Nistru River" project has been launched under CBM-IV with focus on Transnistria, where the health system has been largely following the Soviet model, with little access to modern models and methods. The project was implemented by the World Health Organization (WHO) in the period 01 April 2015-31 December 2018. The Relevance of this intervention is quite evident and driven not only by the need to reduce the gap in health care on the two banks, but also by the demographic and epidemiological situation, the challenges to the health systems in terms of better governance, improvement of service provision, alignment to international standards and best practices, etc. While structural alignment of the health sector on both banks has not been envisaged, nor possible for political reasons, the project has been Effective in fulfilling its major objectives to strengthen the health policy analysis and action planning capacities of the health authorities and to improve the public health services and actions on non-communicable diseases. The project mapped the health systems structures and functions, reviewed the possibilities of health systems financing and workforce planning and deployed a large-scale training and capacity building programme that was unprecedented till then.

The Impact of this effort is seen above all in the improved capacity of health professionals. The project implemented cross-cutting capacity building activities, involving more than 550 health professionals in health service delivery, mapping health systems structures and functions, health systems financing, health workforce planning and management, etc. Next to this it also provided capacity building to health managers and public health specialists in topics such as public health and emergency management, international health regulations, use of guidelines in primary health care, human resource management and planning, "best buys" on non-communicable diseases and awareness on WHO Framework Convention. Some reforms were initiated in Chisinau – review of hospital structures, hospital financing, reform of public health services, but the frequent changes resulting from national and local elections and the subsequent staff rotation obstructed their continuance. The project’s impact also relates to its innovativeness. Some of the training had never happened before, like these on life threatening conditions
and the training for emergency workers. A beneficiary from Transnistria, now a Chief doctor in the Tiraspol Emergency Centre, reported that he is applying what he learned now in the Covid-19 crisis, and that not only the clinical trainings but also these on organizational management are particularly valuable in the current pandemic situation. The campaigns implemented under this project are also up to-date, and particularly these on prevention and immunization.

Another project aimed at providing general support to the Transnistrian health system alignment, with focus on primary health care is the current CBM-V project: “Improvement of medico-social care for people with long-term care needs on both sides of the Nistru river” (implemented by GIZ and the Czech Development Agency) under CBM-V. It is aimed at ensuring the cohesion of two public sectors involved in the process: the health care sector and the social protection sector. Although it is under the title of Health Sector Modernization in the respective action document, it is not purely health related. The focus is more on long term care, thus departing from the genuine health sector, with an accent on service provision. One of the specific outputs expected relates to opening a pilot day care center for patients from both sides of the Nistru River.

The Relevance of the project is clear as regards the needs of long-term care patients and the absence of relevant services on both banks of the river. Goodwill on both banks also exists and voiced. While it is still early to estimate the Effectiveness of the effort, some challenges have surfaced. These are both logistical and of substance nature. On logistical level they related to the change of location of the Centre, despite prior agreement and investments already made. More significant are the substantive challenges – the definition of the services to be provided their anchoring in the local (Transnistrian) legislation. This would also require relevant processes (for example the development of medical/social minimal standards, as well as setting the rules for licensing and medical accreditation for services of this kind. It could be difficult to align the Transnistria social legislation to EU standards in home care and this would perhaps be the biggest problem. A compromise solution will probably have to be found to adapt the Transnistrian legislation to European standards and overcome possible resistance. This raises the issue of the continuity of the investments already made by the EU in the previous long-term WHO-implemented project. Instead of building on its achievements, a switch has been done to a totally new area, more related to social services than to health.

Health and socio-medical care were not the only sectors where rapprochement happened. Next to these long-term projects, there were also other projects in the framework of CBM Call for proposals (2015) where rapprochement of the social protection systems was targeted.

Through the development of social protection for people with disabilities, the project “Social services for persons with disabilities to increase the trust between both banks of the Nistru river” did increase trust between both banks of the Nistru River. With EU funds the project supported the renovation of public buildings and bought vehicles to drive to remote villages, established mobile teams for delivery of social services to children with disabilities and their families from five districts on both banks of the Nistru River, established a Day care centre in Tiraspol (TN), triggered legislative changes. In Tiraspol they even used the legislation from Chisinau. To address the stigma and discrimination of people with disabilities, Keystone Moldova provided training to journalists from both banks, built the capacity of the local authorities and the specialists from the mobile teams and the day care centre in case management and quality monitoring, offered mini-grants for local CSOs and journalists for promoting social inclusion and non-discrimination of people with disabilities, developed and strengthened the CSO network on both banks of Nistru River and even provided support to self-advocates for promoting initiatives and participating in community life.

The local NGO partner - Centre for Rehabilitation and Consultancy (OSORC) - facilitated the dialogue with the authorities in Transnistria, while Keystone was the communication point for the authorities on the other bank. A hotline for PwD to report on their rights violation and seek counselling was started, the service was approved by the Government and since 2019 the MoHSP is funding the hotline service.
There some more projects from the same Call for proposals in this category. Other grants from the same call worked to raise trust between teachers on both banks of the river, build regional capacities for continuous development of teacher’s skills, facilitated the social and vocational integration of disadvantaged youth, or created partnerships for community development.

Another grant focused on joint initiatives of CSOs from banks for socio vocational integration of disadvantaged youth, providing a set of comprehensive assistance services: social, psychological, legal, vocational. At the same time, the project activities strengthened the relations between youth from the right and left riverbanks and also worked towards the creation of a regulatory framework for these types of services. Young people have been the beneficiaries of yet another project that pursued to raise the mutual trust between teachers. The project helped strengthen the capacities for continuous development of teachers’ skills and introduce proactive methods of human rights education. It also worked for institutionalisation of the consultation mechanisms between CSOs and education institutions and contributed to establishing partnerships and cooperation between education institutions, teachers and CSOs from Moldova and the Transnistrian region.

An outreaching sub-granting scheme supported joint initiatives of CSOs from the two banks aimed at building confidence through educational activities. These encompassed a wide range of priorities like: internet technologies; modern proactive teaching methods of human rights education; improving the legal knowledge of teachers and starting a legal clinic; intercultural education; creation of two clubs for young civic journalists; training in new methods of teaching international law and standards for human rights protection; studying and promotion of social rights, methodological analysis of curricula and work programs on legal subjects in order to determine the scope of legal and theoretical materials on social human rights, etc.

Other projects from the same call also contributed to building bridges between civil society and communities from both banks and helped establish partnerships for sustainable development and promotion of human rights.

Indicator 9.2.2. Cross-river encounters around cultural heritage sector

**Main source of information:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document review</th>
<th>Interviews</th>
<th>Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CBM-V project documents and interim reports, media publications on cultural heritage preservation from both banks</td>
<td>Interviews with UNDP, the Resident Twinning Advisor in Moldova, the President's administration in Transnistria, the Head of the Coordination council on Technical and Humanitarian Assistance of Transnistrian region, the Director of Bender Fortress in Transnistria, UNDP grantees in the area of culture</td>
<td>Media research survey, conducted by the evaluation on how the press in the Republic of Moldova, including media the on left bank of the Nistru river covers the EU support, projects and programmes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Culture / historical heritage was highlighted comparatively recently as a priority in EU-Moldova cooperation, as a specific sector in CBM-V. This has been a very relevant step, considering the role which the common heritage, historical legacy and monuments can play in uniting the people round common values, while at the same time investing in the country’s future, facilitating development and conflict resolution.

A rather successful Twinning project “Support to promote cultural heritage in the Republic of Moldova through its preservation and protection”, (September 2017 – November 2019) laid a good basis for this. The project focused on the inter-sectorial dimension of cultural heritage, as enabler and driver of
sustainable, equitable and people-centred development and well-being, along the lines of the most updated European and international approaches to cultural heritage and culture at large. Overall, the project has been very effective and impactful. It worked to improve the legislation for protection and sound management of Moldova’s many heritage assets; helped increase the administrative and management capacity of the Ministry of Education, Culture and Research and its subordinated agencies, cultural offices and other relevant stakeholders; developed and implemented training programmes related to the protection and restoration of cultural heritage at secondary vocational education and at higher education levels, supported Moldovan heritage protection institutions on digitization of cultural heritage and sustainable management.

As the confidence building dimension of the historical-cultural heritage is new to the Republic of Moldova, CBM-V capitalized on the results of the EU-Funded Twinning Programme, which had among other things also conducted preliminary assessments of two flagship projects: Bender Fortress and Chisinau Circus. Based on these assessments, complex tendering procedures were launched by the UNDP project in the framework of CBM-V, targeting detailed technical designs for conservation works and Masterplans, as a road map for long term development and promotion of these sites. While the Covid-19 crisis put challenges, in view of the involvement of Italian partners and travel restrictions, the progress made is reasonable and the detailed technical design for the Bender fortress was launched in early 2020. There is now a final list of priorities to be addressed and a tender for the first phase conservation works was announced in late 2020. The selection of the contractor is pending in 2021.

Another activity with expected potential tangible impact for both banks relate to the creation of “EU fund for conservation-restoration of cultural heritage” (as specified in the Action document for CBM-V. Progress today includes the development of the modality of the Fund, with the support of international expertise, assessments and consultations with experts from both banks, and it was approved by the Steering Committee in the end of 2019. In line with this modality a public Call for ideas to support small scale cultural heritage sites was conducted in January 2020 that gathered over 200 ideas. In the end, 10 such sites have been selected (5 from each bank) and this will be followed by signing of MoUs, design of conservation works, coordination and actual conservation activities in 2021. The sites relate to Synagogue ruins, church ruins, a family tomb, windmill, water mill, etc. The Sustainability of this effort is more than evident.

**Indicator 9.2.3. Media content quality trends in pilot areas**

**Main source of information:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strength of evidence based: Strong</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBM-V UNDP project documents and interim reports, review of grants disbursed under the Media support component, reports of projects related to media, funded under CSO-LA Call for proposals, media publications from both banks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviews with UNDP and UNDP grantees (Artwatt and beneficiaries)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviews with CSO-LA grantees (API and beneficiaries)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media research survey, conducted by the evaluation on how the press in the Republic of Moldova, including media the on left bank of the Nistru river covers the EU support, projects and programmes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Media is another comparatively new priority in EU-Moldova cooperation, as a specific sector in CBM-V, but even before this media across both banks have been outreach, involved and supported throughout other programmes. Already before the evaluation period, for example, the Agency for Investigative Journalism (API) implemented a project under CSO-LA/2014 “Quality Journalism for Democracy”. The project was implemented 2016-2018 and had as a goal to promote democratic processes and enhance the professional level of journalists from both banks of the river Nistru. It established a national Centre of investigative journalism with a video department and five regional departments, one of them covering Transnistria. Already at this time, the issue of producing joint materials with analytical elements, establishing and strengthening the cooperation between both banks of the river Nistru and eliminating
false preconceptions were raised - topics and problems which are still Relevant. The project produced a report: “Analysis of the situation of the media, access to information and freedom of expression in Transnistria” and a Practical guide, “Reporter in Transnistria” on access to information and tips on how to work as a foreign journalist in Transnistria, paving the way for subsequent efforts in this area.

CBM-V continued work in this direction. One of its components relates specifically to cooperative media local content development and focuses on support to media from both banks for better quality audio-visual and new media productions in a collaborative and joint manner. This is being done through capacity building, exchange of experience and a grant programme to support joint work. An open call for proposals was announced covering the period October 2019-December 2020 and was efficient in selecting around 20 projects. Projects selected today include: 7 documentary films/series, 2 talk shows, real life reportage, road shows, sexual education podcast series, one animation movie and one fiction movie. Their Effectiveness and Impact will be difficult to measure and will take a long period of time. This is a first good step, the more so that interviews from the ground suggested numerous difficulties for closer media cooperation due to administrative border restrictions, the limited media market on the left bank and its dependencies (political and in terms of ownership), the general sensitivity in this area, due to its proximity to politics, fear on the side of journalists and media outlets from cooperation, the absence of initiative of journalists on the left bank, etc.

Some examples of media projects implemented in the framework of CBM-V (Source: UNDP)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Implementer</th>
<th>Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Odissea MD-2020&quot; (Documentary film)</td>
<td>46,468 €</td>
<td>Alternative Arts Association &quot;Artwatt&quot;</td>
<td>2020-2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusion of the left bank community agenda into the informational flow on the right bank through the TV show Reghionaly on TV8</td>
<td>59,905 €</td>
<td>Public Association &quot;Pilgrim-Demo&quot;</td>
<td>2020-2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reality Show &quot;Frontline 24&quot;</td>
<td>43,676 €</td>
<td>Public Association &quot;Filmul pentru drepturile omului&quot;</td>
<td>2020-2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nistru People</td>
<td>22,579 €</td>
<td>Public Association &quot;Sud Est Media&quot;</td>
<td>2020-2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between two riverbanks/&quot;Asfalt de Moldova&quot;</td>
<td>61,729 €</td>
<td>Public Association Center for Health Promotion and Education &quot;Health&quot;</td>
<td>2020-2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artefacts</td>
<td>39,290 €</td>
<td>Non-profit partnership - Creative Association &quot;APT-noxog&quot;</td>
<td>2020-2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Nistru Riverbanks submissive to love</td>
<td>5,006 €</td>
<td>Natolir SRL</td>
<td>2020-2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexplicatii</td>
<td>19,200 €</td>
<td>Press Agency &quot;Onixmedia&quot; SRL</td>
<td>2020-2021</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The evaluation conducted a comparative monitoring of media content on both banks in the past 5 years, around several non-political key phrases with the purpose to identify to which extent the media on the left bank of the Nistru river have covered the efforts and programmes of the European Union on both banks of the river. The monitoring has revealed a difference between the way state media from the Transnistrian region, on one hand, and the private and CSOs media, on the other, cover the events within the EU programmes.

UNDP has conducted, and continues to conduct a large-scale campaign to cover the activities and achievements of CBM-IV and CBM-V. Only in the framework of CBM-IV about 150 events, campaigns, tours and other activities for the press were carried out during that project period. Still, it has been observed that the state media in Transnistria avoided highlighting the role of the European Union in financing projects carried out in the region. It was noted that the press and civil society organizations on the left bank of the Nistru river have covered the programme's activities in the region in approximately 500 news articles, features and other media coverage. For comparison, about 2,000 such media coverage events were published on the right bank of the Nistru river. However, it must be mentioned that there is also a much bigger number of media institutions on the right bank of the Nistru river compared to the left bank.

As regards the content, biggest on the left bank has been the coverage related to community infrastructure projects - refurbishment of kindergartens, renovation of schools and policlinics, inauguration of sports and educational facilities, etc. Social projects were also relatively well covered, as well as the renovation the Bender Fortress, but not the opportunities under Erasmus. There is practically no information about the Erasmus+ programme opportunities on the left bank of the Nistru river. The media in the region hasn’t written practically anything about the Erasmus+ programme, compared to the right bank of the Nistru river, where there is a large number of news and articles about the programme's activities, opportunities and success stories. It seems that one of the reasons is that young people on the left bank of the Nistru river have less opportunities to participate in Erasmus + programmes because the University in the region is not accredited in the Republic of Moldova. They must also have citizenship of Moldova or any other internationally recognized state in order to travel abroad.

There is a need for a better media coverage of Erasmus + opportunities in the media on the left bank of the Nistru river, including the identification of different solutions to enable young people in the region to participate in mobility projects.
Main findings for EQ 9

The two projects implemented by UNDP under CBM4 and CBM5 changed the landscape of cross river cooperation and increased the trust between people on both sides of the Nistru River by supporting joint activities in two core areas: business development and improving community infrastructure. The increased cross-river cooperation of business actors is already leading to improved employment opportunities and livelihoods across the Nistru River and the local communities get empowered through joint projects addressing pressing development needs and improving critical community infrastructure.

Significant improvements were noted in the health sector: strengthened capacity of the public health systems in areas like policy analysis, action planning and capacity building and advancement of measures for improvement of the medico-social care for people with long-term care needs on both sides of the Nistru river. Particularly successful has been the cooperation in the protection of the common cultural heritage, with efforts related to the Bender Fortress and some smaller cultural heritage objects. There has been advancement in the improvement of the legislation for protection and sound management of Moldova’s many heritage assets, the administrative and management capacities of the stakeholders have been increased, digitization of cultural heritage was started. Significant landmark will be the creation of "EU fund for conservation-restoration of cultural heritage" and activities in this direction are already under way.

- EU support to Moldova has intensified the cross-river contacts, partnerships and cooperation of the main economic actors, thus contributing to the economic rapprochement of the two banks
- The social rapprochement of the two banks has been promoted with the help of EU interventions and has improved the standards of living of the targeted communities, vulnerable groups and the population at large. The development of infrastructure projects has a strong social impact and promotes the visibility of the EU
- EU support to Moldova in the sectors of health and socio-medical care is reducing the gaps and bringing about alignment of the public health systems
- The efforts for protection and preservation of the common cultural heritage have been enhanced with EU support and increased EU visibility in Transnistria
- Media on both banks are beginning to produce locally attractive, qualitative and professional content.

Evaluation question 10: JCs and indicators

EQ10. To what extent has the EU support to Moldova contributed to a strengthened role of independent the Civil Society actively participating in decision and policy making, monitoring and oversight in Moldova, in its priority area and the implementation processes of the EU-Moldova Association Agreement?

This EQ covers Effectiveness, impact and sustainability
JC 10.1. EU support to Moldova has made a contribution to CSO internal capacity strengthening, professionalism, collaboration and ability of CSOs to advocate for their enabling environment and to monitor the implementation of the Association Agreement
JC 10.2. Sustainable partnerships between civil society, the government and socio-economic actors in policy dialogue have been established in EU-sponsored projects and they contribute to good governance, social and economic development and social protection
JC 10.1. EU support to Moldova has made a contribution to CSO internal capacity strengthening, professionalism, collaboration and ability of CSOs to advocate for their enabling environment and to monitor the implementation of the Association Agreement

Summary response to JC 10.1

The internal technical and financial capacity of civil society has been further developed with EU support in the period under review. A long-term technical assistance project helped improve the human resources and financial management of CSOs, strengthened their governance structures and supported three grantees and their sub-grantees in project management, implementation and monitoring. It produced manuals to guide the larger civil society, and also provided training based on demand, as requested by the three grantees. Yet, during most of its duration, it had focused mostly on supervision of the sub-grantees. Only logistical support was provided to the two CSO platforms and there was no streamlined effort to monitor the implementation of the Association Agreement. However, CSO monitoring was still done and there are good examples in the period under review where various projects financed under CIP included components on monitoring of the implementation of sector reforms by CSOs, or where think tanks and CSO platforms monitored closely the developments in the different areas of the AA. Civil society has been actively engaged in improving its enabling environment, though mostly with the help of other donors, and a new law on non-commercial organisations was adopted.

Indicator 10.1.1. Extent to which governance structure, financial management, and monitoring mechanisms of sampled CSOs are harmonised and match European standards

Strength of evidence based: Strong for sampled CSOs (SFM, EED and their partners and grantees; KAS and KAS grantees)

Main source of information:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document review</th>
<th>Interviews</th>
<th>Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EU documents related to civil society and Moldova, CSF documentation, Road Maps for Civil society Development from 2015 and 2018, TA project - interim and final reports, Mid-term evaluation of the CSF, websites, civil society reports and publications on civil society from different sources and donors</td>
<td>Interviews with EUD, the TA project and the 3 CSF grantees (SFM, KAS, EED); interviews with sub-granted project implementers; interviews with CSO think tanks (Expert Grup, Ipre), EaP CSF Platform, grantees of EIDHR and CSO&amp;LA</td>
<td>Survey conducted by the evaluation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the period 2014-2016 there have been no specific actions targeting civil society capacity building. The CSF launched in 2016, and particularly the project “Technical Assistance to Support CSO Development in the Republic of Moldova” (September 2017-September 2020) was expected as per ToR to produce five main results, two of which pertained directly to the strengthening of CSO in the above areas. The project was expected to help enhance the knowledge and skills of CSOs in EU project implementation and policy monitoring, strengthen CSO governance structures, financial management systems and sustainability, promote the coordination, networking and consortium building capacities among CSOs, while at the same time providing support to the sub-grantees of SFM, EEF and SFM. This mission was in line with the two Road Maps for Civil Society development from 2015-2017 and 2018-2020, and the second Road Map was actually adopted during its mandate.
The overall **effectiveness** of this component of the TA project **has not been as strong**. The prime focus of the project has been on monitoring the performance and improving the skills of the sub-grantees in a rather narrow segment (grant management, project monitoring and reporting). As indicated by the MTE, the project misunderstood its role and did not fulfil all its objectives. Only after this MTE, this approach was revised and more capacity strengthening activities were launched to support CSOs in strengthening their governance structure and financial management with trainings on human resources, fundraising strategies, advocacy, lobbying, public relations, event planning and organization, financial management, community mobilization, cross cutting priorities. It is indicative, however, that most of these activities happened in the summer of 2020, just before the closure of the project in September 2020. They seem to have been conducted in haste and apparently without a prior overarching strategy. This is also due to the fact that for some reason, as traced by the current evaluation, already in its Second Interim Report the project requested the cancelation of components related to institutional capacity development of local CSOs (and this originally envisaged the definition of a comprehensive institutional capacity assessment model, accountability self-assessment tool and Guidelines, capacity strengthening of CSO internal institutional development, mentoring and coaching on organisational strengthening, individual organisational reform plans, etc.). Following the advice of the MTE report the project took the decision, together with the EUD to reactivate this activity and elaborate a Capacity Building Programme for local CSOs and this obviously resulted in the congregation of so many new training courses all in the summer of 2020. Even in such a short timeframe, this yielded results. With support from the project, the three Grantees undertook reforms in their financial and human resources structures, updated their salary grids, etc. A good sustainable result are two manuals: The Guide Manual on Human Resources and Financial Management for Non-Commercial Organisations in the Republic of Moldova and the Regulation on Remuneration and the Salary Grid within CSOs.

On the level of policy making tailored training was provided to the grantees, and the feedback from their interviews is that it has been valuable and useful. Thematically this included: child’s rights and child protection, referral mechanisms and case management (for SFM and its sub-grantees); accreditation to social services for SFM and its sub-grantees dealing with social service delivery: accounting and taxation of revenue in non-profit organisations engaged in entrepreneurial activity (for EEF and its sub-grantees).

While the above trainings have strengthened the capacity of these organisations in policy dialogue and policymaking, this has come after the elimination of another key activity in the 5th Interim Report related to Building the capacity of local CSOs in policy dialogue processes (including a Capacity building programme on policy dialogue for CSOs). Another key area - policy monitoring, strongly highlighted in the Road Map (2018-2020) - remained marginal in terms of capacity strengthening efforts.

As a conclusion, the **TA project fulfilled its mission only partially**. Capacity building in policy making and policy monitoring were not strategically addressed by the TA project. The need highlighted in the CSF Action document that “Civil society organisations technical and financial capacities and expertise need to be reinforced, especially in terms of enhancing the role of the civil society in monitoring policy reforms” was not accentuated.

However, the three CSF grantees performed quite successfully. SFM, for example, conducted extensive training on participatory monitoring and evaluation of social services for CSOs; capacity strengthening on social accountability and even promoted a mechanism for social accountability. Also, there are other good examples in the period under review where various projects financed under CfP included components on monitoring or implementation of sector reforms.

On thematic level, with EU support, there have been such efforts, too. Most outreaching has been the
monitoring of the reform in the justice sector. Also, the European Business Association (EBA) project
partner to EED, has been closely monitoring different problems faced by the private sector. In the
framework of the project “Better Social Services through a Sustainable Partnership between the Civil
Society and the Government”, for example, capacity strengthening was provided on participatory
monitoring and evaluation of social services for CSOs, social accountability, mechanisms for social
accountability, etc. and there are other good examples in the period under review for such practices,
where other grantees and projects financed under CfP included components on monitoring or
implementation of sector reforms by CSOs.

A project needs to be mentioned, implemented under a Call for proposals for Strengthening the role of
civil society in monitoring budget support operations. The project “Facilitating active engagement of the
civil society actors in the agro-rural policy dialog” started in March 2017 based on a partnership of three
local partners namely “AGROinform” (at present FARM), “The Republican Association of Agricultural
Producers”, the “National Farmers Federation from Moldova” and two external partners from Latvia and
Romania. The purpose of the project has been to enhance the role of civil society in the process of
developing, implementing and monitoring agro-rural development policies, with the specific objectives to
build the capacity of farmers’ organizations and their rural constituents in monitoring and evaluation agro-
rural policies, in particular budgetary policies and improving the dialogue between public authorities at
central and local level, farmers’ organizations, women’s organizations, and CSOs through the
establishment of agro-rural policy dialogue platforms.

At the end of the project over 40 CSOs had received capacity building activities, 10 Regional Platforms
were established, and a National Rural Development Network was started. Some 30 local community
groups were functioning, and several position papers were elaborated with more than 35 policy
recommendations. The project sent a strong message that agro-rural policy dialogue is an important tool
for solving economic, social, environmental, and other rural problems, and it does not involve only
representatives of the central and local public authorities but also entrepreneurs and farmers from rural
areas, who are directly involved in day-to-day farming activities. The project worked in synergy with
another EU funded project “Technical Assistance for the implementation of the Sector Reform Contract:
European Neighbourhood Programme to Agriculture and Rural Development (ENPARD)”.

Budget process and budgetary transparency is another area of current activities. A capacity building
programme aimed at strengthening the role of the CSOs is under way in the framework of a project
“Transparent public authorities for active and informed citizens” project (2020-2021), implemented in the
framework of the “Development of grassroots civil society” Grants Programme. The project is building the
capacity of CSOs to monitor budgetary transparency and implicitly promotes the accountability of the
local public authorities.

Accompanying sector-specific projects with civil society monitoring components seems to be both a
relevant and effective approach to foster a policy dialogue.

A relevant step to enhance these efforts is the new TA project “Support for Structured Policy Dialogue,
Coordination of the Implementation of the Association Agreement and Enhancement of the Legal
Approximation Process “, launched in 2020, which has as one of its purposes to enhance the structured
policy dialogue with civil society and support the communication and awareness raising on AA issues.

During the period under review civil society has been actively engaged in working on a new legislation
for its enabling environment. The process of drafting the new law started in March 2016, initiated by the
Ministry of Justice which created a working group with representatives of the public authorities and civil
society. The adoption of a new NGO law was a provision of the National Action Plan on the
implementation of the Association Agreement. The law was one of a package of laws sought by Brussels
in respect of the Association Agreement and a precondition for the release of financial aid to Moldova.

On 27 July 2020, the new law on Non-commercial Organisations (NCO Law) was published in
the Official Gazette of Moldova. It was adopted by Parliament with the support of 95 out of 101 deputies,
and after heated debates, as some restrictions were initially intended. The law was adopted without these
restrictions in the end, and it unifies the regulation for all non-profit/non-commercial legal entities (i.e.,
associations, foundations and private institutions). Key support in this effort was provided by the
European Centre for Non-Profit Law. ECNL organized expert comments, shared comparative information
on good European standards and examples from other country laws and supported an inclusive process engaging all stakeholders. Key interlocutors have indicated that “the law reduces bureaucracy and establishes guarantees for registration, simplifies internal organisation of non-commercial organisations, institutes principles of fair play in accessing public funds and state support, limits the possibility of unjustified interventions in the activity from the state.”

### Indicator 10.1.2. Number of events and papers/public statements issued by CSOs in relation to the AA

Strength of evidence based: Strong

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main source of information:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document review</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSF documentation, TA project, CSO Shadow Reports on the implementation of the AA, IPRE and Expert Grup publications, websites, reports and publications of the EaP CSF platform, EU-Moldova progress reports</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the period under review, civil society did not receive targeted support on the monitoring of the AA project, although the TA project envisaged such support.

However, this assistance was interpreted and translated in practice as logistical assistance only and this component of the TA project was not effectively implemented. The support provided by the TA project included the development of the Strategic Plans (2018-2020) of the two platforms, support to workshops in the key thematic areas of the AA. As a result of every workshop, specific thematic policy papers were produced on key issues related to the 2020 deliverables. Yet, as indicated in the MTE report the CSF that “TA activities regarding support to the AA platforms have been focusing on the organisation of meetings with government and on the provision of event-based or opportunity-based support, without having a clear support or engagement strategy and without an analysis of emerging needs for engagement of the civil society”.

Instead, CSOs organisations have mobilized themselves for horizontal and vertical monitoring of the implementation of the AA. The most comprehensive effort relates to the AA shadow reports (under the leadership of IPRE and Expert Grup). Already 6 such reports have been published since 2014, the last one from October 2020, with support from KAS. The reports analyse the key areas, which have a spillover effect, under the five titles of the Agreement: political dialogue and reforms; Justice, Freedom and Security; Economic and other sector cooperation; Trade and Trade-related Matters (DCFTA); Financial Assistance, Anti-Fraud and Control Provisions. Based on the findings, the reports propose as recommendations a set of updated priorities for the next period, including in the context of the negotiation of the future post-2020 EU-Moldova Association Agenda.

On thematic level there have been such efforts, too. Most outreaching has been the effort on monitoring of reform in the justice sector. A sub-grantee of EEF - the European Business Association (EBA) project partner, has also been closely monitoring different issues faced by the private sector and issued over 30 position papers and advisory notes.

---
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Generally, in the period under review, civil society did not benefit from support on the monitoring of the AA. A relevant step to enhance these efforts is the new TA project “Support for Structured Policy Dialogue, Coordination of the Implementation of the Association Agreement and Enhancement of the Legal Approximation Process”, launched in 2020, which has as one of its purposes to enhance the structured policy dialogue with civil society and support the communication and awareness raising on AA issues.

JC 10.2. Sustainable partnerships between civil society, the government and socio-economic actors in policy dialogue have been established in EU-sponsored projects and they contribute to good governance, social and economic development, and social protection.

Summary response to JC 10.2

With EU support, and particularly the outreaching CSF sub-granting mechanism, civil society created and was actively engaged in partnerships with various government and socio-economic actors, and this contributed to good governance, social and economic development, and social protection. In the area of business development six business hubs were created, 15 social enterprises, 10 Youth entrepreneurship funds. Very impactful has been the work in the sector of social service delivery – development of innovative social services in particular. Over 40 social services in partnership with the public authorities or public institutions were developed and implemented - supported living service, community home services, community-based services for children in risk situation, etc. all around the country. The project also helped the deinstitutionalization of persons with intellectual and psychosocial disabilities. Another corner stone has been the implementation of infrastructure projects with comparatively little budgets, but improving the environment and standards of living, and giving a lot of ownership.

Indicator 10.2.1. Number and content of partnerships created in the area of good governance i.e. local planning and oversight activities in sampled districts (development since 2014)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strength of evidence based: Strong</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Main source of information:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSF project documentation, CfP, review of sub granted projects, websites of KAS and partners in this effort (Adept, APE, Expert grup, ProEurope), web sites of GIZ and partners (AGER, API, Procore, ProEurope), and some sub-granted projects</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Good governance has been in the focus of attention of several large scale projects: The “Grassroots Civil Society Development Facility in the Republic of Moldova”, implemented by KAS under the CSF aims at contributing to the development of civic engagement and of grass-roots civil society to become actively involved in policy and decision making, which in turn promotes and monitors the transparency and accountability of public institutions, including in the implementation of the EU-Moldova AA. The Citizen Empowerment project, implemented by GIZ has a very similar aim - to empower citizens through
constructive participation of CSOs in local, regional and national decision-making processes. Both projects are still under way, with a very similar implementation modality (each one with several partners covering different parts of Moldova, and a sub-granting scheme, organized round specific priorities and grants of different scale – big, medium, or small).

Structurally the first project includes three types of grants: big scale, small scale and micro-grants for civic initiatives. This has been both relevant and effective, so far meeting the expectation that the big grants will initiate and strengthen existing civil society partnerships in good governance with an enhanced grassroots CSOs involvement, and this will have an enhanced impact on the cooperation with public authorities and other socio-economic actors. By the end of 2020, 13 big grants had been awarded, covering the whole territory of the country, and they are producing good impact and sustainable results.

The project has also focused on conducting advocacy campaigns that promote good governance and the implementation of the AA Agreement. A good example is the big-scale grant awarded to the Association of Independent press (API) which is recognised as one of the most important mass-media organisations in Moldova. The project promotes the principles of good governance among the citizens through video materials explaining the building blocks of good governance, monitoring decision making transparency and public procurement procedures, and is organizing along these lines’ public debates and TV debates, publication of materials and spreading motivational message on good governance. An innovative initiative of the project is the “Green line” space for reporting violations.

For the small-scale grants, the accent is on policy decision making and monitoring, with the idea that grassroots CSOs will be capacitated to hold public authorities at national and local levels transparent and accountable in order to ensure good governance. Under this component 57 grants have been disbursed, and the results are tangible again. Some flagship big and small projects include promoting digitalization in the interaction between citizens and authorities through innovative tools that stimulate civic participation, reengineering the social assistance system, increasing the accessibility of public buildings, promoting civic and political activism among students, citizen education through non formal education, partnerships to improve the social services system, increasing transparency through local media, etc.

The Citizen’s Empowerment project moves well ahead in accomplishing its specific objectives of promoting participatory planning; participatory monitoring and awareness raising so that citizens (including pupils of public schools) are informed about investments in the areas of WSS and SWM, relevant environmental issues related to local public services and the relevance of cost-recovering tariff setting of their provision.

**Indicator 10.2.2. Number and content of partnerships created in the area of social service delivery in sampled districts (development since 2014)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main source of information:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviews with EUD, SFM and its partners - Keystone Moldova, the Alliance of NGOs in the field of Child and Family Protection (APSCF), the Alliance Organization of People with Disabilities, and sub-grantees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media research survey, conducted by the evaluation on how the press in the Republic of Moldova, including media the on left bank of the Nistru river covers the EU support, projects and programmes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
beneficiaries from both banks, etc.

Even before the launch of CSF, which put a special focus on social service delivery, there were several projects with tangible impact on the development and delivery of social services, which set a model of partnership between civil society and public authorities on central and local level in Moldova.

An EIDHR-2015 funded project “Advancing and monitoring the rights of people with mental disabilities in neuro-psychiatric institutions” (2016-2019), implemented by Keystone Moldova, with a European partner deserves special recognition. The project worked in 6 residential institutions - it built partnership with the public authorities on central and local level, developed policies and procedures for innovative social services, piloted these services and ensured their financial sustainability with public budget. A lot of advocacies was carried out to advance the deinstitutionalization process and as a result the Government approved a national programme on deinstitutionalization. In addition, CSOs built their capacity to monitor the implementation of the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD) in neuro-psychiatric residential institutions.

The project “Social services for persons with disabilities to increase the trust between both banks of the Nistru river” – (CBM CIP-2015), implemented by the same organization worked to develop the social protection system for people with disabilities in five districts on both banks of the Nistru River through the development of five mobile teams and a Day center, strengthening the capacity of local public administrations in case management and quality monitoring and offering mini grants for local CSOs and journalists to promote social inclusion and non-discrimination of PwD, provided support for initiatives and participation in community life, and also triggered legislative changes.

With the launching of the CSF and the grant to SFM “Better social services through sustainable partnership between civil society and government” this work was further deepened towards the empowerment of CSOs in promoting and implementing innovative solutions for advancing social inclusion of persons with disabilities and vulnerable children in partnership with local public authorities.

The project awarded 33 grant contracts to CSOs for the development of innovative and sustainable social services, jointly with the public authorities. The services targeted persons with disabilities and vulnerable children. Till the end of 2020 the project had developed over 40 social services in partnership with the public authorities or public institutions supported living service, community home services, community-based services for children in risk situation, etc. all around the country. The project also helped the deinstitutionalization of 60 persons with intellectual and psychosocial disabilities, whereas 6 persons were referred to biological/extended families and 54 in Supported living and Community home services. Regulation and quality standards were developed with CSOs support, the policies and procedures on child protection and prevention of violence and abuse were further developed in a participatory way with services providers and grantee CSO. Key support was rendered to four organisations which intend to become social service provider to get accreditation and access the financial resources from state budget. All four grantees are in the process of self-assessment of their organization to prepare for accreditation and social contracting.

38 Annual report, 2020 Keystone Moldova
**Indicator 10.2.3. Number and content of partnerships created in the area of economic development, social enterprise development and new economic opportunities (development since 2014)**

Strength of evidence based: Strong for CSF, Country wide – addressed under JC 8

**Main source of information:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document review</th>
<th>Interviews</th>
<th>Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CSF project documentation, EEF interim reports, detailed review of sub granted projects, review of sub granted projects by KAS and partners in this effort (Adept, APE, Expert grup, ProEurope)</td>
<td>Interviews with EUD, EEF and partners (European Business Association, HelpAge International, Centre Partnership for Development, Centre for Social and Innovation)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The CSF grant “Local civil society contributes to economic and social development in Moldova”, implemented by EEF, made a key contribution to the creation of partnerships in the area of economic development, social enterprise development and new economic opportunities, through its components related to development of business hubs; social enterprise development; establishment of youth entrepreneurship funds.

Six business hubs were created throughout the country, Gagauzia and Transnistria included

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BUSINESS HUBS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>HUB name</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Techno Textile HUB</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

39 Table developed by the evaluation team based on documents
Support to youth entrepreneurs with innovative ideas

Farmers support

Tailored packages for different clients: for entrepreneurs - practical trainings, for youth - weekly curricula “School of little bloggers”, for potential entrepreneurs - Start up Academy, interest clubs for entrepreneurs

General support to association members

Start-ups, working with youth interested to open a business

The project created 10 Youth entrepreneurship funds. Sub grants were awarded 10 regional youth-led entrepreneurship funds (one in Transnistria) which supported over 60 ideas of young people selected in an open competition. This component addresses exclusively the youth initiative groups, as well as the Local Youth Councils.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fund name</th>
<th>CSO name</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Youth Entrepreneurship Support Fund Ialoveni</td>
<td>NGO “Eco Razeni” Ialoveni v. Razeni</td>
<td>Razeni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entrepreneurship Support Fund Gagauzia</td>
<td>NGO European Center “Pro-Europa”</td>
<td>Comrat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Entrepreneurship Support Fund Singerei</td>
<td>NGO “Centre Consensus”</td>
<td>Singerei</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovative-Entrepreneurial Youth Fund (FIAT NGO “Caroma Nord”</td>
<td>NGO “Caroma Nord”</td>
<td>Balti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entrepreneurship Support Fund Maramonovca</td>
<td>NGO “Viitorul din Maramonovca”</td>
<td>Maramonovca village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Entrepreneurship Support Fund Stefan Voda</td>
<td>Association for sustainable development</td>
<td>Stefan Voda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Entrepreneurship Support Fund Stefan Cahul</td>
<td>NGO “Perspectiva”</td>
<td>Cahul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Entrepreneurship Support Fund Orhei</td>
<td>NGO Rural development agency</td>
<td>Orhei</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Entrepreneurship Support Varnita</td>
<td>NGO Youth association</td>
<td>Varnita</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Entrepreneurship Support Fund Stefan Tiraspol</td>
<td>NGO Agency for regional development</td>
<td>Tiraspol, Transnistria</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ibid..
15 social enterprises were established (6 in Transnistria)

This is a comparatively new activity in Moldova, but there are already various initiatives led by CSOs, which pursue social objectives. The CSF, and particularly the grant implemented by EEF, made a contribution to the development of this sector. The Baseline survey conducted in the framework of the project revealed the existing good practices, models and the need of supporting mechanisms and initiated the launch of 15 social enterprises all around the country, Transnistria included. This has been done through sub-grants to local CSOs, and a series of training programs, designed to build capacities of CSOs in the area of social entrepreneurship. Particular attention in the process was given to CSOs working with disadvantaged and vulnerable groups. The target groups of some of the selected sub-grantees include people with Autism, people at risk of HIV, vulnerable children and youth, hospice clients or people in home care, etc.

These social enterprises cover different economic sectors like agriculture (honey production, agricultural services), eco business (production of bark and wood concrete), services (catering, cleaning, hair dressing), manufacturing (production of nails), health care (manual therapy), etc.
Project ‘Local civil society contributes to economic and social development in Moldova’ (Source: East Europe Foundation):

Indicator 10.2.4. Number and content of civic initiatives targeting community development in sampled districts (development since 2014)
Strength of evidence based: Average

Main source of information:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document review</th>
<th>Interviews</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CSF project documentation, KAS reports, review of</td>
<td>With EUD, KAS, KAS partners and grantees, GIZ, GIZ partners and grantees,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lists of sub-granted projects with topics and budgets,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>publications in the press from both banks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Media research survey, conducted by the evaluation on how the press in the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Republic of Moldova, including media the on left bank of the Nistru river</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>covers the EU support, projects and programmes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A quite innovative effort in the period under review is the micro-grants for civil initiative under the grant implemented by KAS (CSF) ranging from Eur 1000 to Eur 10,000 for up to 12 months for local and grassroots CSOs, newly established organizations and registered civic initiatives. The projects targeted mainly the involvement in community development activities. 25 such grants were disbursed by the end of 2020. These are grassroots CSOs which are very sensitive, fragile and can disappear in a month. However, they know very well the local situation and can contribute to their area of expertise. They were thus involved in local communities’ development and citizen mobilization to resolve community problems and get civic ownership with their achievements. They can attract small funds and mobilize people locally and this is their strength, but they need more help. However, as the project works only with registered NGOs, a target group like CBOs has been lost even though the application procedure has been simplified to encourage them to get registered. The Citizen empowerment project was very innovative in getting CSOs engaged in infrastructure issues – sanitation, water supply, energy and waste collection, etc. Three are remarkable examples of impactful and sustainable solutions implemented with small or middle-sized grants. One NGO has interesting cooperation with schools and emergency departments. While in the autumn the three leaves were burnt and this created emergencies, now awareness is raised, drones are used (bought with project money) and volunteers are mobilized to lessen the risk. Another NGO is focused on waste reutilization, explaining to the population how to minimize waste, and producing cases for compost making, etc. There are such good examples from all regions where the project works. Interviews from the field suggested the coordination between KAS and GIZ in the above two projects is absent or even missing.

Main findings for EQ 10

The internal technical and financial capacity of civil society has been further developed with EU support in the period under review. A long-term technical assistance project helped improve the human resources and financial management of CSOs, strengthened their governance structures and supported three grantees and their sub-grantees in project management, implementation and monitoring. It produced manuals to guide the larger civil society, and also provided training based on demand, as requested by the three grantees. Yet, during most of its duration, it had focused mostly on supervision of the sub-grantees. Only logistical support was provided to the two CSO platforms and there was no streamlined effort to monitor the implementation of the Association Agreement. However, CSO monitoring was still done and there are good examples in the period under review where various projects financed under CIP included components on monitoring of the implementation of sector reforms by CSOs, or where think tanks and CSO platforms monitored closely the developments in the different areas of the AA.

With EU support, and particularly the outreaching CSF sub-granting mechanism, civil society created and was actively engaged in partnerships with various government and socio-economic actors, and this contributed to good governance, social and economic development, and social protection. In the area of
business development six business hubs were created, 15 social enterprises, 10 Youth entrepreneurship funds. Very impactful has been the work in the sector of social service delivery – development of innovative social services in particular. Over 40 social services in partnership with the public authorities or public institutions were developed and implemented - supported living service, community home services, community-based services for children in risk situation, etc. all around the country. The project also helped the deinstitutionalization of persons with intellectual and psychosocial disabilities.

Another corner stone has been the implementation of infrastructure projects with comparatively little budgets but improving the local standards and giving ownership.

The EU did not have a strong role in improving the enabling environment for CSOs. A new law on non-commercial organisations was adopted in 2020 after many years of efforts on behalf of civil society. Its adequate implementation will require help and monitoring.
Annex 3: List of institutions consulted
Summary

Total number of interviewees: 168
Total number of interviews conducted: 127

Interviewees by function (n=161)
- EU/IMPLEMENTING PARTNER: 36%
- STATE AUTHORITY: 23%
- CIVIL SOCIETY/PRIVATE: 28%
- OTHER: 13%

Gender of Interviewees (n=161)
- Male: 55%
- Female: 45%

List of institutions consulted

EU staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EU staff and implementing partners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EU Delegation to Moldova</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Erasmus + Office in Moldova</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Commission, DG EAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Commission, DG GROW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Commission, DG TRADE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Commission, DG NEAR, Centres for Thematic Expertise (COTE) Public administration Reform and Justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Commission, DG RTD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### State authorities' representatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State authorities’ representatives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prime Minister’s Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialised Anti-Corruption Prosecution Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audiovisual Council of Moldova</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Chancellery General Secretariat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chisinau Courts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordination council on Technical and Humanitarian Assistance of Transnistrian region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members of Parliament (current and former)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stefan Cel Mare Academy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Police Directorate (current and former representatives)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Education, Culture and Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Economy and Infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Finance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Environment and Forest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Foreign Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Interior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moldovan office for Science and Technology (MOST)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Agency for Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Institute of Justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Integrity Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People’s Advocate’s Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superior Council of Magistracy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superior Prosecution Council</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Civil society and private actors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Civil society and private actors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Association for participatory democracy (Adept) (CSO)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alliance of Active NGOs (CSO)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alliance of Organizations for Persons with Disabilities of the Republic of Moldova (CSO)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Foreign Policy Association of Moldova (APE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artwatt (CSO)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association of Independent Journalists Moldova (CSO)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association of Independent Press (CSO)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bender Fortress, Transnistria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBM Health Platform (CSOs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centre for Innovation and Policy in Moldova (CSO)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### East Europe Foundation (CSO)
### EU Moldova Civil society platform (CSO)
### European Business Association
### Expert Group think tank (CSO)
### Institute for European Policies and Reforms (CSO)
### Journalists (private)
### National Council for Prevention of Torture (CSO)
### Organization for SME Sector Development
### Procore
### ProEuropa
### Promolex (CSO)
### Soros foundation (CSO)
### The Solidarity Fund
### Trinity (CSO)
### Youth & European Solidarity Corps

### Other actors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academy of Economic Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balti State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCI France Moldova (Chamber of Commerce)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council of Europe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Organisation for Migration (IOM)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liechtenstein Development Service (LED)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation for Security and Coordination in Europe (OSCE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIGMA (OECD/EU)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swedish Cooperation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State University of Moldova</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical University of Chisina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Bank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Health Organisation (WHO)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For 20+ ongoing and past technical assistance, twinnings and contribution agreements: Projects Team Leaders and Technical Advisers representing domestic and international companies and CSOs
Annex 4: List of Documents consulted
The table below summarises the various types of data that has been collected.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Documents</th>
<th>Interviews</th>
<th>Survey data</th>
<th>Focus groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Primary (directly concerning EU intervention)</strong></td>
<td>All EU strategic and project documents, proceeds of political and policy dialogue formats, reports published by implementing partners in the frame of EU interventions. No changes.</td>
<td>Review of existing surveys on EU intervention Survey by evaluation team (component on EU assistance)</td>
<td>One focus group with EU programming and implementing partner (Council of Europe) due to interconnection of interventions implemented by this partner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Secondary (related to changes in the country, but with no direct link to EU interventions)</strong></td>
<td>National strategic, legislative and regulatory documents, general reports and statistics published by CSOs, international organisations, academia. Documentation from local stakeholders (e.g. municipal budget and plans) are unlikely to be obtained without field travel.</td>
<td>Interviews with EU Member States' representatives in Moldova, other international organisations, CSOs not directly involved in EU interventions. No changes</td>
<td>Review of existing surveys on respective sectors Survey by evaluation team (components on sectors)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annual Action Plans and action documents

European Commission 02/05/2014 C(2014) 2988 Common Implementing Decision Special measure 2014 in favour of Georgia and Moldova to be financed from the general budget of the European Union
European Commission 16/10/2015 C(2015) 7150 Commission Implementing Decision on the Annual Action Programme 2015 in favour of the Republic of Moldova to be financed from the general budget of the European Union
Annex 1 ENI/2015/038-135 Action Document for Support to Public Administration Reform (PAR)  
Annex 2 ENI/2015/038-144 Action Document for Support to Police Reform  
Annex 3 ENI/2015/038-137 Action Document for the Civil Society Facility (Moldova)  
Annex 1 ENI/2016/039-554 Action Document for the Development of Rural Areas in the Republic of Moldova
Annex 2 ENI/2017/040-490 Action Document for Strategic communication and media support
European Commission 2018 DRAFT Annual Action Programme 2018 in favour of the Republic of Moldova
Annex 1 2018 Action Document for Inclusive economic empowerment of focal regions of the Republic of Moldova
Annex 3 2018 Action Document for strengthening the rule of law and anti-corruption mechanisms in the Republic of Moldova
Annex 4 2018 Action Document for Support for the Implementation of the EU-Moldova Association Agreement
Annex 1 ENI/2019/042-243 Action Document for "EU4MOLDOVA: Startup City Cahul (UE pentru Moldova: Startup Orașul Cahul)"

Anti-Corruption
Council of Europe October 2020 GRECO and CoE Fourth Evaluation Round: ‘Corruption prevention in respect of members of parliament, judges and prosecutors’ Second Compliance Report
JHA IND/EXP 61407 Peer Assessment mission to Republic of Moldova on 22-26 February 2016
TAIEX Institution Peer Review on the National Anti-Corruption Centre and the National Integrity
Commission, Chisinau-MD, November 30- December 4th 2015
2015 UNDP National Anticorruption Center public perception survey
ENI 2018 041-244 Action Document ENI/2018/041-244 "Strengthen the rule of law and anti-corruption
mechanisms in the Republic of Moldova"
ENI 2018 041-244 Financing Agreement July 2019 ENI/2018/041-244
Annex 1 Technical and Administrative Provisions ENI/2018/041-244 "Strengthen the rule of law and
anti-corruption mechanisms in the Republic of Moldova"
ENI 2019 410-242 Description of the Action ENI 2019 410-242 "Strengthen the rule of law and anti-
corruption mechanisms in the Republic of Moldova"
ENPI 2012 023-421 First Progress Report June 2018 "Controlling Corruption through Law Enforcement
and Prevention"
ENPI 2012 023-421 Second Progress Report June 2019 "Controlling Corruption through Law
Enforcement and Prevention"
ENPI 2012 023-421 Annex II to Financing Agreement ENPI 2012/023-421
ENPI 2012 023-421 Description of the Action March 2017 "Controlling corruption through law
enforcement and prevention (CLEP)- the Republic of Moldova"

**Bilateral Assistance**
Table of EU bilateral assistance to MD 2007 ENPI to 2014 ENI

**Budget Support**
‘Deep & Comprehensive Free Trade Area Sector Reform Contract’ 2018/401/914/2
2016 Court of Accounts budget support Final report SR_MOLDOVA
2019 Court of Accounts budget support data 2019
2018 Final Evaluation of the Budget Support Programme “Support to Public Finance Reform in
Moldova”
2014 Financing Agreement ENI/2014/033-684 Sector Reform Contract Support to Public Finance Policy
Reforms in Moldova (PFPR)
2014 Annex 1 to Financing Agreement ENI/2014/033-684
2014 Annex 1 Modified Table C of Technical and Administrative Provision of Financing Agreement No
ENI/2014/033-684
Annex 1 ENI/2019/042-243 Action Document for "EU4MOLDOVA: Startup City Cahul (UE pentru
Moldova: Startup Orașul Cahul)"
Annex 1 ENI/2016/039-554 Action Document for the Development of Rural Areas in the Republic of
Moldova

**Civil Society**
ENI 2017 040-474 Citizen Empowerment Action Document for Citizens’ Empowerment in the Republic of
Moldova ENI 2017/040-474
ENI 2017 040-474 Citizen Empowerment GIZ Factsheet Citizens’ Empowerment in the Republic of
Moldova
ENI 2017 040-594 (EaP CSF Regional actions) Action Document for the Eastern Partnership Civil Society
Facility 2017 – Regional Actions No ENI 2017 040-594
ENI 2015 038-137 (CSF Moldova) 2019 Mid-term evaluation of the Civil Society Facility (Moldova)
ENI 2017 388-484 First Interim Report September 2017-March 2018 Technical Assistance to Support
CSO Development in the Republic of Moldova
ENI 2017 388-484 Fourth Interim Report April - September 2019 Technical Assistance to Support CSO Development in the Republic of Moldova
ENI 2017 394-124 First Interim Report February 2019 "Local Civil Society contributes to economic and social development in Moldova"
ENI 2017 394-124 Second Interim Report February 2020 "Local Civil Society contributes to economic and social development in Moldova" 2017/394-124
ENI 2017 394-358 First Interim Report "Better Social Services through a Sustainable Partnership between the Civil Society and the Government" 2017/394-358
ENI 2018 397-510 KAS Grassroots Civil Society Development Facility in the Republic of Moldova
ENI 2018 397-510 Interim Narrative Report Grassroots Civil Society Development Facility in the Republic of Moldova
ENI 2018 397-510 Annex A.2 Full application form
ENI 2018 397-510 Project Factsheet
ENI 2018 397-510 Grant call guidelines 2nd call for proposals
EU_Moldova AA Action Document for Support for the Implementation of the EU-Moldova Association Agreement
NEAR-TS 2017 391-674 Project Factsheet "Civil society advocacy for inclusive and fair elections in the Republic of Moldova, compliant with EU and OSCE/ODIHR recommendations and human rights commitments"
NEAR-TS 2017 391-674 Annex 1 Full application form "Civil society advocacy for inclusive and fair elections in Moldova, compliant with EU and OSCE/ODIHR recommendations and human rights commitments"
2014-2017 EU Country Roadmap for Engagement with Civil Society
Rapid Response Mechanism NEAR.C2/CoTE Civil Society Support Working Methodology for the Rapid Response Mechanism
2018-2020 EU Roadmap for engagement with civil society in the Republic of Moldova
2014-2017 EU Country Roadmap for Engagement with Civil Society
Contract Cris N 2017 / 383-476 Interim Narrative Report 'Cutting edge improvements in the public procurement system in Moldova through inclusiveness, creativity and law - abiding practices’
Contract Cris N 2017 / 383-476 Evaluation Report ‘Cutting edge improvements in the public procurement system in Moldova through inclusiveness, creativity and law - abiding practices’
2017 Final evaluation report “Public Budget is My Money Too!”
2014/354-629 FINAL NARRATIVE REPORT PROJECT: “PUBLIC BUDGET IS MY MONEY TOO!”
2018/404-600 INTERIM NARRATIVE REPORT 'Inform, Empower, Act. Civil Society for good budgetary governance in Moldova'

Comms and media


Confidence building measures

ENPI 2014 355-339 Initial logframe
ENPI 2014 355-339 Amended logframe
ENPI 2014 355-339 Budget
ENPI 2014 355-339 Progress report 2015
ENPI 2014 355-339 Progress Report 2018
ENPI 2014 355-339 Agreement with IOM
ENI 2018 404-319 Annex VI Communication and Visibility Plan
ENI 2018 404-319 Annex I Description of the Action
ENI 2018 404-319 2019 Progress Report
ENI 2018 404-319 Agreement with UNDP
ENI 2018 404-319 Budget
ENI 2018 404-319 Annex I Description of the Action
ENI 2018 404-319 Contribution Agreement with GIZ GmbH
ENI 2018 404-319 Annex VI to the Contribution Agreement
ENPI 2014 354-587 2019 Final Report Increased opportunities and better living conditions across the Nistru/Dniestr River
ENPI 2014 354-750 First Interim Report "Confidence Building Measures: Technical assistance and capacity building activities in the Health Sector between both banks of the Nistru River 2015-2016’
ENPI 2014 354-750 Addendum No1 to Contribution Agreement 2014/353-750
ENPI 2014 354-750 Budget
ENPI 2014 354-750 Final Report June 2019
ENPI 2014 354-750 Contribution Agreement with the World Health Organization March 2013
Mid-term evaluation of Confidence Building Measures from the European Union (EU CBM) Rev.3 2017/390751/1

Democracy and elected bodies

ENI 2018 404-139 Project Factsheet "International observation of the Parliamentary Elections in the Republic of Moldova”
ENI 2018 404-139 2020 Final Narrative Report "International Observation of the Parliamentary Elections in the Republic of Moldova”
ENI 2018 404-243 Project Factsheet "Information campaign in Moldova’s regions about the democratic situation and EU assistance for the country’s development”
ENI 2018 404-243 2019 Final Narrative Report "[Information campaign in Moldova’s regions about the democratic situation and EU assistance for the country’s development]"
ENI 2019 410-458 Project Factsheet "International Observation of the Local Elections in the Republic of Moldova 2019”
ROM Report C-387983 “’Twining Strengthening the capacities of the Parliament of Moldova for EU approximation process”
EaP
Eastern Partnership September 2018 '20 Deliverables for 2020: Monitoring- State of Play 2018'
Mobility partnerships, visa facilitation and readmission agreements
Eastern Partnership Multilateral Platforms: General Guidelines and Rules of Procedure

Education and Research
MD 15 ENI SO 01 18 (MD/34) Annex C1: Twinning Fiche Project title: Enhancing the quality and effectiveness of the Vocational Education and Training (VET) system
MD 15 ENI SO 01 18 (MD/34) Twinning Proposal “Enhancing the quality and effectiveness of the Vocational Education and Training (VET) system”
MD 15 ENI SO 01 18 (MD/34) Annex C15 Rolling Work Plan No1
MD 15 ENI SO 01 18 (MD/34) Annex C15 Rolling Work Plan No2
MD 15 ENI SO 01 18 (MD/34) Twinning Fiche Enhancing the quality and effectiveness of the VET system
ENPI 2013 333-798 Final Report “Support for VET Sector in the Republic of Moldova”
ENPI 2013 333-798 EuropeAid/133700/C/SER/Md/12 Letter of Completion
ENPI 2012 023-419 ENPI 2012/023419 Financing Agreement
ENPI 2014 350-207 2016 Mid-Term Evaluation of the VET Reform in Moldova ENPI/2014/350-207
ENPI 2014 350-207 Template for a Final Report Budget Support Republic of Moldova
ENPI 2013 024-404 Action Fiche “Support to the implementation of the Vocational Education Strategy of Moldova”
ENPI 2017 387-025 Final Report Twinning Project “Support to promote cultural heritage in the Republic of Moldova through its preservation and protection” 2017-2019
European Training Foundation 2020 "Policies for Human Capital Development Republic of Moldova"
European Training Foundation "Moldova: Education, Training and Employment Developments 2019"
European Training Foundation 2019 "Moldova: Education, Training and Employment Developments 2018"
European Training Foundation Country Strategy Paper 2020 Update: Moldova
European Training Foundation Digital Factsheet December 2019
European Training Foundation “Global Inventory of regional and national qualifications frameworks 2019 Volume II: National and regional cases”
European Training Foundation 2019 "Continuing Professional Development for Vocational Teachers and Principals in Moldova 2018: Executive summary”
European Training Foundation 2019 “Skills Mismatch Measurement in Moldova”
European Training Foundation "Moldova VET Governance ETF Partner Country Profile”
European Training Foundation 2019 "Policies supporting youth transition to work in Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Georgia, Moldova and Ukraine
European Training Foundation "Youth Transition to work in Moldova”
ERASMUS+ Programme in the Republic of Moldova
ERASMUS+ 2019 ERASMUS+ Programme in the Republic of Moldova
ERASMUS+ 2015 - 2019 Higher Education ERASMUS+ projects, Republic of Moldova
August 2020 Final Narrative Report on Horizon 2020, August 2020
Horizon 2020 brochure with success stories
SPSP and VET Policy Matrix 2014-2016
August 2013 Annex II Terms of Reference VET

**EUBAM**
EUBAM 11 Annex IV European Union Border Assistance Mission to the Republic of Moldova and Ukraine
EUBAM 12 Annex I Description of the Action Document for European Union Border Assistance Mission to the Republic of Moldova and Ukraine

**European Court of Auditors**
ECA (December 2019) Special Report No 25/2019: Data quality in budget support: weaknesses in some indicators and in the verification of the payment for variable tranches
ECA (September 2016) Special Report No13: EU assistance for strengthening the public administration in Moldova
ECA (March 2016) Special Report No9: EU external migration spending in Southern Mediterranean and Eastern Neighbourhood countries until 2014
ECA (January 2009) Special Report No9 Effectiveness of EU support in the area of Freedom, Security and Justice for Belarus, Moldova, Ukraine
ECA (January 2016) 2015 Special report No23 Water quality in the Danube river basin: progress in implementing the water framework directive but still some way to go
ECA (December 2019) Press release ‘EU budget support to partner countries not always backed up by sufficiently relevant and robust performance data, say Auditors’

**Human Rights**
NEAR-TS 2016 378-030 Grant Application Call "Increasing the observance of women’s rights in Moldova through combating gender based violence"
NEAR-TS 2016 378-030 Project Factsheet "Increasing the respect for women's rights in Moldova through combating gender based violence"
NEAR-TS 2016 378-030 Final Narrative Report "Increasing the respect for women's rights in Moldova through combating gender based violence"
NEAR-TS 2017 388-469 Project Factsheet "Let All of Us Say NO to Torture in Moldova: Civil Society against Torture"
NEAR-TS 2017 388-469 Interim Narrative Report "Let All of Us Say NO to Torture in Moldova: Civil Society against Torture"
NEAR-TS 2017 388-469 ROM Report 29/01/20 "Let All of Us Say NO to Torture in Moldova: Civil Society against Torture"
NEAR-TS 2017 389-612 April 2020 Final Report “Sustainable community partnerships to support the rights of persons belonging to minorities in Moldova”
NEAR-TS 2017 389-612 Project Factsheet “Sustainable community partnerships to support the rights of persons belonging to minorities in Moldova”
EIDHR Call for Proposals 2016/2017 EuropeAid/151888/DD/ACT/MD
EIDHR 2016 Global Call for Proposals EuropeAid/152550/DH/ACT/Multi
June 2016 The Equal Rights Trust Country Report Series 7 ‘From Words to Deeds: Addressing Discrimination and Inequality in Moldova’
Infrastructure and Transport

ENI 2017 391-480 GIZ Progress Report No.2 for Construction of water supply and sanitation infrastructure as well as energy efficiency in public buildings’ Action
ENI 2011 265-548 EBRD Annual Progress Report 2012 "Moldova Road Rehabilitation Project”
ENI 2011 265-548 EBRD Annual Progress Report 2017 "Moldova Road Rehabilitation Project”
ENI 2014 353-807 EBRD Annual Progress Report 2016 "Moldova Road Rehabilitation Project IV”
ENI 2014 353-807 EBRD Annual Progress Report 2017 "Moldova Road Rehabilitation Project IV”
ENI 2014 353-807 EBRD Annual Progress Report 2018 "Moldova Road Rehabilitation Project IV”
ENI 2014 353-812 Moldovan Railways Restructuring Project Progress Report No2 May 2019
ENI 2014 353-812 Moldovan Railways Restructuring Project Progress Report No2 May 2017
ENI 2014 353-812 EU Contribution Agreement with EBRD ENPI/2014/353-812
398212 COWI November 2018 "Feasibility Study and cost analysis for a project of supply of equipment to the Port Complex of Giurgiulesti: Final Report”

Justice

ENI 2019 410-443 Project Factsheet “Support to the development and implementation of justice policies in the Republic of Moldova”
ENI 2018 398-120 2020 Progress Report SUPPORT TO EFFICIENT PREVENTION AND FIGHT AGAINST CORRUPTION IN JUSTICE SECTOR”
ENI 2018 398-120 Project Factsheet “Support to Efficient Prevention and Fight against Corruption in the Justice Sector”
ENI 2018 398-120 Human Dynamics December 2017 Technical Offer “Support to Efficient Prevention and Fight against Corruption in the Justice Sector”
ENI 2018 399-648 Description of the Action "European Union/Council of Europe Partnership for Good Governance”
ENI 2017 387-983 Annex A1 Description of the Action: Twinning Work Plan
ENI 2017 387-983 Project Factsheet "Twinning Strengthening the capacities of the Parliament of Moldova for EU approximation process”

2349- Moldova EU PGG Annual Plan for Action 2019-2021: "Support to further strengthening the efficiency and quality of the judicial system in the Republic of Moldova"

2349- Moldova Project Factsheet "Support to further strengthening the efficiency and quality of the judicial system in the Republic of Moldova"

2350- Moldova CoE/ EU PGG Annual Plan for Action 2019-2021: "Strengthening the capacities of the justice sector actors to deliver justice in line with European standards, in particular to fight discrimination"

2350- Moldova Project Factsheet "Strengthening the capacities of the justice sector actors to deliver justice in line with European standards, in particular to fight discrimination"

2352- Regional Project Factsheet "Strengthening measures to prevent and combat economic crime"

2352- Regional CoE/ EU PGG Annual Plan for Action 2019-2021: "Strengthening measures to prevent and combat economic crime"

2353- Regional Project Factsheet "Strengthening the profession of lawyer in line with European standards"

2353- Regional CoE/ EU PGG Annual Plan for Action 2019-2021: "Strengthening the profession of lawyer in line with European standards"

2354- Regional Project Factsheet "Strengthening the access to justice through non-judicial redress mechanisms for victims of discrimination, hate crime and hate speech in Eastern Partnership countries"

2354- Regional CoE/ EU PGG Annual Plan for Action 2019-2021: "Strengthening the access to justice through non-judicial redress mechanisms for victims of discrimination, hate crime and hate speech in Eastern Partnership countries"

2354- Regional August 2019 Baseline study for assessing the national non-discrimination mechanisms in the Republic of Moldova

MD 13 ENPI OT 02 17 (MD/28) Twinning Project Final Report March 2020 “Strengthening the capacities of the Parliament of Moldova for EU approximation process”


2017/394931/1 April 2019 Final evaluation of four Technical Assistance Projects (Support to the Justice Sector Policy Reforms in Moldova (AAP 2011)) -2017/394931/1


Freedom House REPORT ON MONITORING THE SELECTIVITY OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE, Freedom House, Chisinau 2019

JHA IND/EXP24475/60944 Peer Assessment mission to Republic of Moldova on the Supreme Court of Justice and the Supreme Council of Magistracy, January 2016

International Commission of Justice "«Only an Empty Shell» The Undelivered Promise of an Independent Judiciary in Moldova” 2019


Council of Europe and European Commission for the Efficiency of Justice, CEPEJ Report 2016: 'European judicial systems: Efficiency and quality of justice’ CEPEJ STUDIES No. 2


EuropeAid138640DHSERMD ‘SURVEY REPORT ON NIJ INITIAL AND CONTINUOUS TRAINING’

"Support to efficient prevention and fight against corruption in the justice sector"
EuropeAid/138640/DH/SER/MD ‘ASSESSMENT REPORT ON THE IMPACT OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE ETHICS AND CONDUCT CODE OF PROSECUTOR “Support to efficient prevention and fight against corruption in the justice sector”

EuropeAid/138640/DH/SER/MD” ‘ASSESSMENT REPORT ON THE IMPACT OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE CODE OF ETHICS AND PROFESSIONAL CONDUCT OF JUDGES “Support to efficient prevention and fight against corruption in the justice sector” ‘

Macro financial assistance
EEAS 11/10/2017 Press Releases ‘Moldova: EU cuts budget support programme for justice reforms’
EEAS 21/12/2017 Press Releases ‘Republic of Moldova: EU supports job creation and better public administration’

Mobility
Mobility partnerships, visa facilitation and readmission agreements
Council of the European Union 21/05/2008 “9640/08 Joint Declaration on a Mobility Partnerships between the European Union and the Republic of Moldova"
Information Newsletter Edition No2, May 2010 ‘Mobility Partnership Moldova- European Union’
European Union 20/06/2013 L. 168/3 Agreement between the European Union and the Republic of Moldova amending the Agreement between the European Community and the Republic of Moldova on the facilitation of the issuance of visas

Other Related Evaluations/ Reports
Evaluation Roadmap: Evaluation of the EU-Georgia and the EU-Moldova Deep and Comprehensive Free Trade Areas
API, IPRE, LRCM, Promo-LEX, National Environment Center, ADEPT 2020 02 07 Analysis of the Moldovan Government Action Plan
December 2016 'Mid-term evaluation of the Framework Programme in support of EU-Republic of Moldova agreements (including Comprehensive Institution Building instrument)’ Contract 2016/376754

Police Reform
ENI 2015 038-144 Annex I to Financing Agreement “Support to Police Reform”
ENI 2015 038-144 Overview of Payments “EU Support to Police Reform in the Republic of Moldova”
ENI 2018 398-977 MD 15 ENI JH 01 17 (MD/32) Twinning Proposal "Reform of the initial and continuous training of the police system in the Republic of Moldova"
ENI 2018 400-308 2018 Inception Report "Support to the Police Reform in the Republic of Moldova"
ENI 2018 400-308 Annex 1 Logframe "Support to the Police Reform in the Republic of Moldova"
EU Support to Police Reform (Budget Support) Overview EU Assistance
CGRA (Common Group of Risk Analysis) COMMON DOCUMENTARY REPORT of risk evaluation in combating cross border crime, human beings’ trafficking and illegal immigration for 2014
Ministry of Internal Affairs, Republic of Moldova ‘STRATEGY OF POLICE DEVELOPMENT FOR THE YEARS 2016-2020’
Ministry of Internal Affairs, Republic of Moldova 2015 Proces verbal sedinta
Ministry of Internal Affairs, Republic of Moldova 2016 Proces verbal
Ministry of Internal Affairs, Republic of Moldova 2017 Proces verbal
Ministry of Internal Affairs, Republic of Moldova 29 September 2017: Newsletter ‘Ministry of Internal Affairs: 14th International Donors Coordination Meeting’
Ministry of Internal Affairs, Republic of Moldova 2017 Ordin sistem de coordonare a SB. Cu privire la coordonarea unitară a reformei Poliției
Ministry of Internal Affairs, Republic of Moldova Perception Surveys November 2018 BOP

Political Dialogue
2018 08 24 Association Agreement
2018 European Joint Development Cooperation Strategy for the Republic of Moldova
2017 Recommendations on the EU- Republic of Moldova Association Agenda
Eastern Partnership EaP Summit map
2018 06 27 EEAS Joint Statement on the invalidation of Chisinau mayoral elections
2016 02 15 Press Release Council conclusions on the Republic of Moldova
2018 02 26 Council conclusions on the Republic of Moldova
EU Moldova Association Association Agreement Institutional Framework main bodies
European Commission (19th October 2018) Fifth Meeting of the EU-Moldova Association Committee in Trade Configuration, Joint Report
Joint press release following the first Association Council meeting between the European Union and the Republic of Moldova
Eu-Moldova Parliamentary Association Committee (December 2018) Seventh Meeting Statement and Recommendations pursuant to article 441(3) of the Association Agreement (Adopted on 19/12/2019)
2016 European Union Joint Analysis Programming in the Republic of Moldova until 2020

Public Administration Reform
ENI 2017 385-047 Twinning Interim Quarterly Report Contract Number MD 13 ENPI JH 05 17 (MD/21)
ENI 2017 385-047 Third Interim Quarterly Report July 2018 MD 13 ENPI JH 05 17 (MD/21) "Support to the strengthening of the operational capacities of the law enforcement agencies of the Republic of Moldova in the field of prevention and investigation of criminal acts of corruption"


ENI 2017 385-047 Twinning Project Interim Quarterly Report September 2019 MD 13 ENPI JH 05 17 (MD/21)

ENI 2017 385-047 Quarterly Financial Report No7 MD 13 ENPI JH 05 17 (MD/21)

ENI 2017 385-047 Twinning Interim Quarterly Report Number 4 October 2018 Contract Number MD 13 ENPI JH 05 17 (MD/21)

ENI 2017 385-047 Twinning Interim Quarterly Report Number 6 April 2019 Contract Number MD 13 ENPI JH 05 17 (MD/21)

ENI 2017 385-047 Twinning Interim Quarterly Report Number 2 April 2018 Contract Number MD 13 ENPI JH 05 17 (MD/21)

ENI 2018 041-244 Action Document ENI/2018/041-244 "Strengthen the rule of law and anti-corruption mechanisms in the Republic of Moldova"

ENI 2018 041-244 Financing Agreement July 2019 ENI/2018/041-244

ENI 2018 041-244 Annex 1 Technical and Administrative Provisions ENI/2018/041-244 "Strengthen the rule of law and anti-corruption mechanisms in the Republic of Moldova"

ENI 2018 399-347 Lattanzio May 2018 Technical Proposal "Strengthening of the policy development process in the context of the implementation of the association agreement"

ENI 2018 399-347 October 2019 Progress Report 1 (draft 2) "Strengthening of the policy development process in the context of the implementation of the association agreement"

ENI 2018 399-347 November 2018 Draft Inception Report "Strengthening of the policy development process in the context of the implementation of the association agreement"

ENI 2019 410-242 GIZ Description of the Action ENI 2019 410-242 "Strengthen the rule of law and anti-corruption mechanisms in the Republic of Moldova"

ENPI 2012 023-421 CoE First Progress Report June 2018 "Controlling Corruption through Law Enforcement and Prevention"


ENPI 2012 023-421 Annex II to Financing Agreement ENPI 2012/023-421

ENPI 2012 023-421 Description of the Action March 2017 "Controlling corruption through law enforcement and prevention (CLEP) - the Republic of Moldova"

NEAR-TS 2018 404-612 Multi-Annual Action Programme for years 2015 part II, 2016 and 2017 “Civil Society Organisations and Local Authorities” to be financed from the general budget of the European Union

NEAR-TS 2018 404-612 Annex I Description of the Action "AGREED - Activating Governance Reform for Enhancing Development"
Informative Note on the draft Action Plan for 2016-2018 on the implementation of the Public Administrative Reform Strategy for 2016-2020

Action Plan for 2016-2018 on the implementation of the Public Administrative Reform Strategy for 2016-2020

Public Administration Reform Strategy 2016-2020


ROMs

ROM reviews until 2015
ROM Reviews MD 2015 - 2019

Twinning

Final Report Contract n. MD/13/ENPI/OT/01/16/(MD/26) – ENPI/2017/387-025 Twinning Project “Support to promote cultural heritage in the Republic of Moldova through its preservation and protection”

Final Report July 2019 ENPARD EuropeAid/137050/DH/SER/MD

Twinning Final Report (25th March 2020) MD 13 ENPI FI 07 17 (MD/19)

Twinning Final Report MD 13 ENPI FI 07 17 (MD/19)


EUD Documents

6. 2014

338966 2014 Support to the Development of an Energy Statistics System in the Republic of Moldova

- Addendum No1 to Specific Contract No 2014/338-966 (25/11/2014)
- Specific Contract No 2014/338-966 (18/04/2014)
- Specific Terms of Reference EuropeAid/132633/C/SER/multi (25/04/2014)

341828 2014 Capacity building on management of EU institution building programmes

- Addendum No1 to Specific Contract No 2014/341828
- Specific Contract No 2014/341828
- Specific Terms of Reference EuropeAid/132633/C/SER/multi

345294 2014 Review and evaluation of the ENPI 2010 SPSP EaPic Top-Ups

346992 2014 Financial support to the participation of the Republic of Moldova in the EU programme Horizon 2020

- Annex I Description of the Action Financial support to the participation of the Republic of Moldova in the EU programme Horizon 2020
- Annex II General Conditions
- Addendum No1 to Grant Contract Number 2014/346-992 (14/06/2016)

348415 2014 REVIEW OF MOLDOVA SRC ENPI/2013/024-405 "SUPPORT THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE VISA LIBERALISATION ACTION PLAN"

- Specific Contract No 2014/348415

348659 2014 Consolidation and Strengthening the External Public Audit in the Republic of Moldova

- Special Conditions
- Annex A2 General Conditions applicable to European Union-financed grant contracts for external actions
- Annex C4 Twinning Interim Quarterly Report (10/02/2015)
- Annex C4 Twinning Interim Quarterly Report No2 (08/04/2015)
- Annex C4 Twinning Interim Quarterly Report No3 (01/07/2015)
- Annex C12 Addenda; Amendment No1 to Twinning Contract Consolidation and Strengthening the External Public Audit in the Republic of Moldova
- Annex C4 Twinning Interim Quarterly Report No4 (01/10/2015)
- Annex C4 Twinning Interim Quarterly Report No5 (19/04/2016)
- Annex C4 Twinning Interim Quarterly Report No6 (15/04/2016)
- Annex C4 Twinning Interim Quarterly Report No7 (07/07/2016)
- Annex C4 Twinning Interim Quarterly Report No8 (05/09/2016)

348701 2014 Support to implementation of Visa Liberalisation Action Plan

- Financing Agreement CTR 2090766
- Ministry of Finance of the Republic of Moldova ‘Support to implementation of Visa Liberalisation Action Plan, CRIS Reference ENPI/2013/024-405: Payment request for the EUR 7.189 million’ (21/20/2016)

349066 2014 Increased Efficiency, Accountability and Transparency of Courts in Moldova
- Service Contract No 2014/349-066 “Increased Efficiency, Accountability and Transparency of Courts in Moldova”

- Addendum No2 to Service Contract No 2014/349-066 “Increased Efficiency, Accountability and Transparency of Courts in Moldova” (June 2017)

- Addendum No1 to Service Contract No 2014/349-066 (November 2015)


349164 2014 Support to the enforcement, probation and rehabilitation systems in Moldova

- Service Contract No 2014/349-164 (October 2014)

- Annex 1 General Conditions No 2014/349-164

- Budget Breakdown Support to the enforcement, probation and rehabilitation systems in Moldova

- Addendum No3 to Service Contract No 2014/349-164 (31/01/2018)

- Addendum No1 to Service Contract No 2014/349-164 (October 2015)

- Addendum No2 to Service Contract No 2014/349-164 (19/07/2017)

- Annex III Terms of Reference REVISED (2013)

- Annex V for Addendum No3 Updated Budget Breakdown (January 2018)

- Project Factsheet No ENPI 2014/349-164

- Service Contract Notice No ENPI 2014/349-164

349372 2014 Support to the Pre-Trial Investigation, Prosecution and the Defence Set-Up in Moldova

- Annex 1 General Conditions

- Annex V Budget EuropeAid/135322/DH/SER/MD

- Special Conditions and Service Contract No ENPI/2014/349-372

- Addendum No1 to Service Contract No ENPI/2014/349-372 (14/12/2015)

- Contract Forecast Notice Moldova-Chisinau: ENPI — Support the pre-trial investigation, prosecution and the defence set-up in Moldova 2013/S 245-425684 (18/12/2013)

349632 2014 Improvement of Regional Statistics in the Republic of Moldova

- Service Contract No 2014/349-632 (20/10/2014)

- Annex I General Conditions ENPI 2014/349-632

- Addendum No2 to Service Contract No 2014/349-632 (15/01/2016)

- Inception Report Improved Regional Statistics in the Republic of Moldova EuropeAid/135392/DH/SER/MDDraft Contract No 2014/349-632 (04/02/2015)
- Annex II to the Contract No 2014/349-632 Improvement of Regional Statistics in the Republic of Moldova
- Final Report Improved Regional Statistics in the Republic of Moldova EuropeAid/135392/DH/SER/MDDraft Contract No 2014/349-632 (20/03/2017)

349711 2014 EBRD - Lead IFI remuneration for the project "MOLDELECTRICA POWER TRANSMISSION NETWORK REHABILITATION"
- Neighbourhood Investment Facility Implementation Agreement ENPI/2014/349-711
- Addendum No2 to the Financing Agreement Support to Reform of the Energy Sector ENPI/2011/022-515 (06/06/2014)
- Annex I General Conditions (June 2011)

349823 2014 Scale-up of Budget Support SPSP Energy.
- Addendum No2 to the Financing Agreement Support to Reform of the Energy Sector ENPI/2011/022-515 (06/06/2014)
- Annex I General Conditions (June 2011)

350207 2014 Support to the implementation of the VET reform in Moldova
- Financing Agreement ENPI/2013/024-404 Special Conditions (2014)

350741 2014 Twinning Project for the Agency of Land Relations and Cadastre (ALRC)
- Annex A2 General Conditions
- Twinning Contract MD/13/ENP/OT/15 (24/10/2014)

3524822014 Assessment of the achievements of the Water Budget Support top-up programme in Moldova (ENPI/2009/020520)
- Annex I General Conditions
- Final Report Contract No ENPI/2014/352-482 (14/11/2014)
353290 2014  "Support to the implementation of DCFTA process in Moldova" SRC
- Financing Agreement ENI/2014/034-132 Sector Reform Contract Special Conditions

353323 2014 Support to Public Finance Policy Reforms in Moldova (PFPR)
- Financing Agreement Sector Reform Contract Special Conditions Ref. Ares(2014)3618989 (31/10/2014)

353786 2014 Chisinau Water Development Programme
- European Union Contribution Agreement No ENPI/2014/353-786
- Addendum No1 to Contribution Agreement No ENPI/2014/353-786 (29/10/2018)

353807 2014 Moldova Roads Rehabilitation IV
- Financial Monitoring Report Republic of Moldova Grant No. 45094 January 01 2018 to December 31 2018 (September 2019)

353812 2014 Moldovan Railways Restructuring Project
- Moldovan Railways Restructuring Project Progress Report No.2 (10 May 2017)
- Annex I Description of the Action Agreement ENPI/2014/353-812
- Financial Status Report 31 December 2015 Moldovan Railways Restructuring Project ENPI/2014/353-812
- Moldovan Railways Restructuring Project Progress Report No.1 (30 June 2016)

354229 2014 Consolidate capacity of the national anti-discrimination system in the Republic of Moldova through inclusive society participation
- Grant Contract 2014/354-229 (26/12/2014)
- Annex II General Conditions

354517 2014 Renewables and Energy Efficiency for Public Buildings (REEPB)
- Annex II General Conditions
- Grant Contract 2014/354-517 (20/12/2014)
- Annex III Budget for the Action 2014/354-517
- Progress narrative report 2014/354-517 (01/10/2015)
354556 2014 Comprehensive demonstrational project for sustainable energy development in the town of Orhei.

- Annex II General Conditions

354587 2014 Increased Opportunities and Better Living Conditions across the Nistru/Dniestr River

- Contribution Agreement ENPI/2014/354-587 (March 2013)
- Annex II General Conditions
- Project Document: Support to Confidence Building Measures 2015-2018
- Final Report ENPI/2014/354-587 (June 2019)

354589 2014 Green Light Moldova - Modernisation and Saving Energy at Street Lighting.

- Annex II General Conditions

354629 2014 Public budget is MY money too!

- Grant Contract 2014/354-629
- Annex II General Conditions
- Annex III Budget for the Action 2014/354-629
- Forecast Budget and follow-up Contract 2014/354-629
- Final Evaluation Report ‘Public budget is MY money too!’ (June 2017)

354630 2014 Transparency and accountability of local authorities through CSO- Mass media joint activities

- Grant Contract 2014/354-630 (December 2014)
- Annex II General Conditions

354638 2014 Strengthening the capacity of CSOs for inclusive participation in society of the most marginalised parents and children

- Grant Contract 2014/354-638 (December 2014)
- Annex II General Conditions
- Annex I Grant Application Form EuropeAid/135-788/DD/ACT/MD (07/07/2014)

354695 2014  Rights for me and you - Children’s participation in education and society
- Grant Contract 2014/354-695 (December 2014)

3547502014  Technical assistance and capacity building activities in the Health Sector between both banks of the Nistru River
- Addendum No1 to Contribution Agreement 2014/354-750 (21/06/2018)
- Annex III Budget for the Action 2014/354-750
- Final Narrative Report ENI 2014/354-750 (June 2019)
- Annex II General Conditions
- Contribution Agreement 2014/354-750 (18/12/2014)

3548962014  Moldova Energy and Biomass Project (Phase II)
- Addendum No1 to European Union Contribution Agreement ENPI/2014/354-896 (June 2016)
- Addendum No2 to European Union Contribution Agreement ENPI/2014/354-896 (February 2018)
- Annex III Budget for the Action ENPI/2014/354-896
- Annex II General Conditions
- Special Conditions Contribution Agreement 2014/354-896 (March 2013)

3550242014  Palanca Jointly Operated Border Crossing Point
- Addendum No1 to Contribution Agreement No 2014/355-024 (February 2017)
- Addendum No3 to Contribution Agreement No 2014/355-024 (September 2018)
- Annex II General Conditions
- Contribution Agreement 2014/355-024 (22/12/2014)

3553392014  Supporting the implementation of the migration and development component of the EU-Moldova Mobility Partnership and harnessing its benefits for the residents of the Transnistria Region of the Republic of Moldova
- Budget for the Action 2014/355-339
- Contribution Agreement 2014/355-339 (December 2014)
- Annex II General Conditions
7. 2015

3571122015 Twinning Support to the Civil Service Modernization in the Republic of Moldova in line with EU best practices
   - Budget Contract No 2015/357-112
   - Annex A3 Budget Contract No 2015/357-112
   - Twinning Project Final Report (July 4th 2017)
   - Special Conditions 2015/357-112 (March 2015)
   - Twinning Contract ENPI 2011/022679 MD/14/ENP/OT/18
   - Annex C1 Standard Twinning Project Fiche ENPI 2011/022679 MD/14/ENP/OT/18

3571512015 Strengthening of the standards and metrology sector according to the best practice in the EU Member States
   - Twinning Project Fiche ENPI 2011/022-679
   - Twinning Contract ENPI 2011/022-679 MD/13/ENP/TR/14
   - Annex A2 General Conditions
   - Programme ENPI 2011/022-679 Twinning Contract 2015/ 357-151

3576622015 Support to Government of Moldova on capacity building of the forensic laboratories of the Ministry of Interior
   - Contract ENPI/2015/357-662 (March 2015)
   - Annex I General Conditions

3596852015 Review of the Sector Policy Support Programme (1st and 2nd instalments) VET
   - Aide Memoire Lot 9 ENPI/2014/350/207
Review of Moldova Sector Policy Support Programme ENPI/2012/023-420 "Support for Justice Sector Reforms" evaluation for the disbursement of the 3rd, 4th instalments and final evaluation of the Programme
- Specific Contract Nr 2015/360992 (July 2015)
- Specific Terms of Reference ENPI/2012/023-420

Strengthening the National Bank of Moldova's capacity in the field of banking regulation and supervision in the context of the EU requirements
- Annex A1 Description of the Action: Twinning Work Plan
- Twinning Project MD14/ENP/FI/16 Final Report (16th October 2017)
- Annex A2 General Conditions
- Twinning Project MD14/ENP/FI/16 Interim Quarterly Report No1 (20th October 2015)
- Twinning Project MD14/ENP/FI/16 Interim Quarterly Report No2 (22nd January 2016)
- Twinning Project MD14/ENP/FI/16 Interim Quarterly Report No3 (22nd April 2016)
- Twinning Project MD14/ENP/FI/16 Interim Quarterly Report No4 (22nd July 2016)
- Twinning Project MD14/ENP/FI/16 Interim Quarterly Report No5 (26th October 2016)
- Twinning Project MD14/ENP/FI/16 Interim Quarterly Report No6 (31st January 2017)
- Twinning Project MD14/ENP/FI/16 Interim Quarterly Report No7 (25th April 2017)
- Twinning Project MD14/ENP/FI/16 Interim Quarterly Report No8 (15th June 2017)
- Twinning Contract MD14/ENPI/FI/16 (June 2015)

Development and consolidation of the National Commission for Financial Markets' operational and institutional capacities in the field of prudential regulation and supervision
- Final Report Twinning Project ENI/2015/363-321 November 2017
- Annex A2 General Conditions
- Twinning Contract Number ENI/2015/363-321 December 2015
- Twinning Project Interim Quarterly Report No5 ENI/2015/363-321 8th December 2016
- Twinning Project Interim Quarterly Report No6 ENI/2015/363-321 March 2017
- Twinning Project Interim Quarterly Report No7 ENI/2015/363-321 21st June 2017
- Twinning Contract MD14/ENP/Fl/17 (11/06/2015)

3633842015 Technical assistance for the implementation of the sector policy support programme "Support to Reform of the Energy Sector" (Dummy to main Contract 294-811)
- Final Report 2012/294-811 (January 2016)

3649722015 Support for the National Accreditation Centre MOLDAC to successfully undergo the EA peer evaluation process in order to be accepted as a signatory of the EA MLA for the selected scope
- Amendment No. 01 to Twinning Project MD14/ENPI/TR/20
- Annex A2 General Conditions
- Twinning Contract Project MD14/ENPI/TR/20

3656752015 Technical Assistance for the Implementation of DCFTA Moldova
- Addendum No1 to Service Contract No. 2015/365675 (June 2016)
- Service Contract No ENI 2015/365-675
- Annex I General Conditions

3666212015 Preparation of Draft Law on the Transnistrian Settlement Process
- Specific Terms of Reference ENPI AAP/2013 024-401

3671532015 Technical assistance for the procurement of diagnostics kits for Avian Influenza and NewCastle Disease
- Specific Contract Nr 2015/367153 (01/02/2016)
- Final Report Request for Services No: 2015/367153/1

3671972015 Support to Competition Council
- Annex I General Conditions
- Draft Contract No ENPI/2015/367-197 (November 2015)
- Annex II Terms of Reference CTR 367197

3672752015 Technical Assistance to Improve Public Finance Policy and Public Financial Management of Moldova
- Financial Proposal July 2015 EuropeAid/136587/DH/SER/MD
- Final Report EuropeAid/136587/DH/SER/MD (November 2018)
- Annex I General Conditions
- Inception Report EuropeAid/136587/DH/SER/MD (February 2016)
- First Progress Report 24th November 2015 – 31st May 2016 (June 2016)
- Second Progress Report 1st June – 30th November 2016 (December 2016)
- Fourth Progress Report 1st June to 30th November 2017 (December 2017)
- Fifth Progress Report 1st December 2017 to 31st May 2018 (June 2018)
- Draft Contract No ENI/2015/367-275
- Annex II Terms of Reference (ENI/2015/367-275)

3675592016 Promoting media freedom and pluralism in the Republic of Moldova
- Annex III Budget for the Action 2015/367-559
- Annex I Description of the Action 2015/367-559
- Annex II General Conditions for PA Grant or Delegation Agreements Contract No 367-559 (May 2015)
- Interim Financial Report covering period 17/01/2016 to 17/01/2018 Contract No 2015/367-559
- Grant Agreement 2015/367-559

3696982015 Assessment of conditions related to macro-economy, PFM, budget transparency for tranche releases under budget support programmes implemented in Moldova in 2016-2017
- Specific Contract Nr 2015/369698 (December 2015)

3702652015 European Union Border Assistance Mission to Moldova and Ukraine (EUBAM) Phase 11
- Annex III Budget for the Action 2015/370-265
- Annex II General Conditions for PA Grant or Delegation Agreement 2015/370-265
- EU Delegation Agreement 2015/370-265

3708112015 Visibility of EU and EU assistance in the Republic of Moldova in 2016
- Annex I General Conditions
- Service Contract No 2015/370-811
- Annex II Terms of Reference (15/07/2015)

3714452015 E5P Expansion to Eastern Partnership – Moldova
- Annex I Description of the Action ENI/2015/371-445
- Project Report Balti District Heating (22nd November 2019)
- E5P Project Pipeline Moldova (October 2016)
- Annex V.I ENI/2015/371-445

3719072015 "ENPARD Moldova – Support to Agriculture and Rural Development" SRC
- Financing Agreement Sector Reform Contract ENI/2014/034-128
- Annex II General Conditions ENI/2014/034-128

3719162015  "Support to Agriculture and Rural Development through promotion of confidence building measures"
- Support to Agriculture and Rural Development through promotion of confidence building measures 2016-2018 CRIS 2015/371-916
- Addendum No1to Delegation Agreement number: 2015/371-916
- Annex 2 Budget for the Action 2015/371-916
- Annex II General Conditions

3720962015  Assistance to the implementation of the European Union High Level Advisors’ mission to the Republic of Moldova 2016-2018
- Annex I General Conditions 15th July 2015
- Service Contract No ENPI 2015/372-096
- Annex II Terms of Reference ENPI 2015/372-096

3721122015  Quality Journalism for Democracy
- Annex II General Conditions
- Grant Contract 2015/372-112

3721312015  Improving access to community-based early years and preschool support services for vulnerable children with special needs in Moldova
- Part B Full Application Form 2015/372-131
- Final financial report period 11/01/2016 – 10/01/2019 Contract No 2015/372-131
- Interim financial report period 11/02/2016 – 10/01/2018 Contract No 2015/372-131
- Interim report 1 2015/372-131 (10/03/2017)
- Interim report 2 2015/372-131 (16/03/2018)
- Grant Contract 2015/372-131 (December 2015)

3722212015  Financial support to the participation of the Republic of Moldova in the EU programme COSME for 2014-2015
- Annex II General Conditions 2015/372-221 (15th July 2015)
- Grant Contract 2015/372-221 (December 2015)
8. 2016

3723172016 Support to the Constitutional Court of Moldova
   - Annex I General Conditions (15th July 2015)
   - Service Contract No 2016/372-317

3741552016 Advancing and monitoring the rights of people with mental disabilities in neuropsychiatric residential institutions
   - Annex III Budget for the Action Grant Contract 2016/374-155
   - Grant Contract 2016/374-155 (April 2016)
   - Annex II General Conditions
   - Annex I Grant Application Form (November 2015)

3752312016 Provision of laboratory services to the National Food Safety Agency
   - Annex I General Conditions
   - Service Contract No 2016/375-231
   - Annex II Terms of Reference 2016/375-231

3780302016 Increasing the respect for women's rights in Moldova through combating gender based violence
   - Annex III Budget for the Action CRIS 2016/378-030

3783602016 GaMoCon - Gagauzian Modernization Convention
   - Annex A.2 Full application form EuropeAid/150382/DD/ACT/MD
   - Annex II General Conditions
   - Grant Contract 2016/378-360

3785052016 Social Services for persons with disabilities to increase the confidence between the both banks of the Nistru river.
   - Addendum No1 to Grant Contract No 2016/378-505 (June 2017)
   - Annex III Budget for the Action 2016/378-505
   - Annex A2 Full Application Form EuropeAid/150382/DD/ACT/MD
   - Final Narrative Report No 2016/378-505 November 2016-March 2019
- Annex II General Conditions
- Interim Report No 2016/378-505 01.11.2016 – 01.11.2017
- Grant contract 2016/378-505

3785072016 Raising Mutual Trust between Teachers on Both Banks of the Nistru River: Building Regional Capacities for Continuous Development of Teachers' Skills of the Modern Pro-active Methods of Human Rights Education

- Final narrative report 2016/378-507 (June 2019)
- Annex II General Conditions 2016/378-507
- Grant Contract 2016/378-507

3785102016 Joint Initiatives of Civil Society Organizations from the both Nistru river banks for Socio Vocational Integration of Disadvantaged Youth from Republic of Moldova (SVIS Moldova)

- Annex III Budget for the Action 2016/378-510
- Grant Contract 2016/378-510
- Interim Narrative Report CRIS No 2016/378-510 (December 2017)
- Annex II General Conditions
- Annex VI Interim Narrative Report (20/10/2016 - 19/10/2017)

3786572016 Building bridges, facing challenges building bridges between the civil society and communities on two banks of Nistru River

- Budget Addendum No1 Contract No 2016/378-657 (01/10/2017-31/05/2019)
- Annex III Budget of the Action
- Annex A.2 Full application form EuropeAid/150382/DD/ACT/MD
- Final Narrative Report No 2016/378-657 (March 2020)
- Annex II General Conditions
- Interim Narrative Report Grant No 2016/378-657 (February 2019)
- Grant Contract 2016/378-657

3792152016 Towards a Cross-River Partnership for Sustainable Development and Human Rights

- Annex I Description of the action 2016/379-215
- Annex II General Conditions
- Annex VI Final Narrative Report (01/01/2017 – 31/05/2019)
- Grant Agreement 2016/379-215

**3792552016  Access to Success: partnerships for self-sustainable community development**
- Annex A.2 Full Application Form EuropeAid/150382/DD/ACT/MD (14/02/2016)
- Annex II Contract No ENPI/2016/379-255
- Grant Contract 2016/379-255

**3794612016  Support to Enforcement of Intellectual Property Rights**
- Annex I General Conditions
- Service Contract No ENPI/2016/379461

**3794742016  Strengthening civil society in Gagauzia ATU**
- Annex A.2 Full application form EuropeAid/150382/DD/ACT/MD
- Annex II General Conditions 2016/379-474
- Grant Contract 2016/379-474

**3799702016  Strengthening of the Medicines and Medical Devices Agency of Moldova as regulatory agency in the field of medicines, medical devices and pharmaceutical activity**
- Twinning Project Fiche MD16/ENP/HE/23 ENPI 2012/023-421
- Annex A2 General Conditions 2016/379970
- Interim Quarterly Report No1 (15th May 2017)
- Annex A Twinning Contract Special Conditions CTR CRIS 2016/379970

**3801392016  Capacity building of the Moldovan Agency for Intervention and Payment in Agriculture (AIPA) for the application of EU norms and standards for the administration of ARD support schemes**
- Annex A2 General Conditions
- Twinning Contract MD 14 ENI AG 01 16 CRIS No 2016/380-139
- Twinning Project Fiche MD16/ENI/AG/22

**3801712016  Technical Assistance for the implementation of the Sector Reform Contract: European Neighbourhood Programme to Agriculture and Rural Development (ENPARD)**
- Addendum No1 to service contract No 2016/380-171
- Addendum No2 to service contract No 2016/380-171
- Annex V Budget Breakdown No 2016/380-171
- Annex I General Conditions
- Service Contract No 2016/380-171
- Annex II Terms of Reference No 2016/380-171

3804182016 Support to the National Food Safety Agency of the Republic of Moldova
- Annex A1 Description of the Action 2016/380-418
- Twinning Contract MD 12 ENPI AG 01 16 CRIS No 2016/380-418
- Standard Twinning Project Fiche MD 12 ENI AG 01 16 (MD/25)
- Annex A6 Expenditure Verification MD 12 ENI AG 01 16 (MD/25)

3804202016 Review of the VET SPSP (3rd Disbursement)
- Final Report Contract No 2016/380420 (September 2017)

3824592016 Financial support to the participation of the Republic of Moldova in the EU programme COSME for 2016-2017
- Final source of funding COSME 2016 2017 (15th January 2016)
- Annex II General Conditions
- Annex VI Final Narrative Report ENPI/2016/382-459
- Grant Contract ENPI/2016/382-459

3832312016 Business Academy for Women (BAW)
- Annex II General Conditions CTR 2016/383-231
- Grant Contract 2016/383-231
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3834762017 Cutting edge improvements in the public procurement system in Moldova through inclusiveness, creativity and low-abiding practices

3850472017 Twinning: Support to the strengthening of the operational capacities of the Law Enforcement Agencies of the Republic of Moldova in the field of prevention and investigation of criminal acts of corruption.

3869802017 Financial support to the participation of the Republic of Moldova in the EU programme Horizon 2020 for the years 2016-2017

3870252017 Twinning ”Support to promote cultural heritage in the Republic of Moldova through its preservation and protection”

3872802017 Technical assistance to improve the quality of regularity and performance audits conducted by the Court of Accounts of the Republic of Moldova

3873172017 Support to local public authorities in ATU Gagauzia
- Annex I Description of the Action 2017/387-317
3873492017 Support to modernisation of the Energy Sector in the Republic of Moldova
- Service Contract No 2017/387-349
- Annex I General Conditions
- Annex II Terms of Reference No 2017/387-349

3875642017 Technical assistance for the integration of ATU Gagauzia in the national framework for regional development
- Annex I General Conditions 2017/387-564
- Contract No 2017/387-564

3878712017 TWINTING - Capacity building of the National Centre for Personal Data Protection of the Republic of Moldova
- Detailed Budget Twinning Project MD 13 ENPI JH 03 17
- Twinning Final Report MD 13 ENPI JH 03 17 (MD/29)
- Annex A2 General Conditions
- Twinning contract MD 13 ENPI JH 03 17 Ctr 2017/387-871

3878872017 Support to development of an effective internal control and audit environment in the public sector in Moldova
- Annex A2 General Conditions
- Twinning contract MD 13 ENPI FI 06 17 (MD/30) Contract No 2017/387-887

3878982017 Twinning Light Project - EU support for the National Institute for Standardization of the Republic of Moldova to comply with CEN and CENELEC full membership criteria
- Twinning Light Contract 2013/024403 2017/387-898
- Annex A2 General Conditions 2017/387-898

3879832017 Twinning Strengthening the capacities of the Parliament of Moldova for EU approximation process
- Addendum No1 to Twinning Contract No. CRIS 2017/387-983
- Annex A3 Budget No 2017/387-983
- Annex A1 Description of the Action Twinning Work Plan
- Final Report Twinning Project Reference No MD 13 ENPI OT 02 17 (MD/28) Reporting Period 16th September 2017 – 15th December 2019
- Annex A2 General Conditions 2017/387-983
- Twinning Interim Quarterly Report number 1 MD 13 ENPI OT 02 17 (MD/28) 23rd January 2018
3880232017 Visibility and Communication for actions related to AA/DCFTA implementation in the framework of the EU funded assistance programme

- Annex I General Conditions
- Second Progress Report 01.03.2018– 31.08.2018
- Service Contract No 2017/388-023

3882042017 Twinning Project “Support to the modernisation of Customs Service of Moldova in line with AA requirements”

- Annex A2 General Conditions
- Twinning Contract MD 13 ENPI FI 07 17 (MD/19) Contract No 2017/388204

3884692017 Let All of Us Say NO to Torture in Moldova: Civil Society against Torture

- Project Factsheet NEAR-TS/2017/388-469
- Annex III Budget for the Action 2017/388-469
- ROM Report C-388469 29/01/2020
- Annex A.2 Full Application Form EuropeAid/152550/DH/ACT/Multi (2016)
- Annex II General Conditions 2017/388-469
- Interim financial report 2017/388-469 Implementation period of the contract (01/12/2017-30/11/2020)
- ROM Report C-388469 20/12/2019
- Grant Contract 2017/388-469 (November 2017)

3884842017 Technical assistance to support CSO development in the Republic of Moldova

- Addendum No1 to Service Contract No 2017/388-484 (June 2019)
- Annex II Terms of Reference 2017/388-484
- Annex III Organisation and Methodology No 2017/388-484
- Addendum No2 2017/388-484 (February 2020)
- Annex V Budget 2017/388-484
- Annex I General Conditions 2017/388-484
- Service Contract 2017/388-484 (September 2017)

3886522017 SUPPORT TO THE QUALITY INFRASTRUCTURE FRAMEWORK WITHIN A DCFTA CONTEXT IN THE REPUBLIC OF MOLDOVA
- Annex I General Conditions 2017/3886-652

3896122017 Sustainable community partnerships to support the rights of persons belonging to minorities in Moldova
- Final financial report Contract No 2017/389-612
- Annex II General Conditions 2017/389-612

3898572017 Increasing the competitiveness of the agri-food sector through integration to domestic and global value chains and Strengthening the water supply and sanitation infrastructure in rural areas focusing on safe wastewater disposal in Cantemir
- Budget of the Action 2017/389-857
- General Conditions 2017/389-857

3902202017 Educating Moldovan consumers of information to reduce the effect of the false information and manipulation through the media
- Annex II General Conditions 2017/390-220
- Grant Contract 2017/390-220 (December 2017)

3902912017 Empowering Youth to Become Civic Actors (EYCA)
- Grant Contract 2017/390-291
- Annex A.2 Full Application Form EuropeAid/151888/DD/ACT/MĐ
- Final Evaluation 2017/390-291 (October 2019)
- Annex II General Conditions 2017/390-291
- Specific Contract 2017/390-291

3904562017  Assessment of conditions on public finance management and budget transparency for tranche releases under budget support programmes; technical assistance on wage policy and payroll management

- Specific Contract 2017/390456 (December 2017)
- Specific Terms of Reference 2017/390456

3914802017  Construction of Water Supply and Sanitation infrastructure as well as Energy Efficiency in Public buildings

- Annex III Budget for the Action ENI 2017/391-480
- Description of the Action ENI 2017/391-480 (November 2017)
- Annex II General Conditions 2017/391-480
- Progress Report No1 2017/391-480
- Progress Report No2 2017/391-480
- Specific Contract 2017/391-480

3916742017  Civil society advocacy for inclusive and fair elections in the Republic of Moldova, compliant with EU and OSCE/ODIHR recommendations and human rights commitments

- Annex A.2 Full application form EuropeAid/151888/DD/ACT/MD
- Annex II General Conditions 2017/391-674
- Specific Contract 2017/391-674 (December 2017)

3920442017  EUBAM 11 – Extension

- Addenda Budget 2015/370-265
- Annex I Description of the Action EUBAM
- Annex C1 Terms of Reference EUBAM

3928152017  Establishing Regional Business Information and Support Centre for the Gagauzia Region of the Republic of Moldova

- Annex A.2 Full application form ‘Establishing Regional Business Information and Support Centre for the Gagauzia Region of the Republic of Moldova’
- Annex II General Conditions 2017/392-815
- Grants Contract 2017/392-815

3928822017  „South Open Gate of Moldova” for Businesses and Investments

- Grants Contract 2017/392-882
- Annex A.2 Full application form EuropeAid/155272/DH/ACT/Multi
- Annex II General Conditions 2017/392-882
3929922017  Creation of excellence center through piloting demonstrative new energy efficiency technologies and renewable energy sources in Festelita community
- Annex III Budget for the Action 391-992
- Annex A.2 Full Application Form EuropeAid/155713/DH/ACT/Multi
- Annex II General Conditions 2017/392-992
- Specific Contract 2017/392-992 (December 2017)

3929952017  Cantemir Thermal Rehabilitation of Educational Buildings CanTREB
- Annex II General Conditions 2017/392-995
- Grant Contract 2017/392-995

3930272017  Efficient public lighting in Calarasi city - Firefly in the heart of forests
- Specific Contract 2017/393-027
- Addendum No1 Annex A.2 Full Application Form 2017/393-027
- Annex II 2017/393-027

3934182017  Edinet – Economic Growth Pole in North region of Moldova
- Description of the Action EuropeAid/155272/DH/ACT/Multi
- Annex II General Conditions 2017/393-418
- Grants Contract 2017/393-418

3935942017  Visibility of EU and EU assistance in the Republic of Moldova in 2018.
- Final Report no. 2017/393-594 (30th December 2018)
- Annex I General Conditions no. 2017/393-594
- Service Contract No 2017/393-594

3941242017  Local civil society contributes to economic and social development in Moldova
- Annex I Full application form 2017/394-124
- Annex II General Conditions 2017/394-124
- First Interim Report 2017/394-124 (February 2019)
- Second Interim Report 2017/394-124 (February 2020)
- Grant Contract 2017/394-124

3943582017  Better Social services through a sustainable partnership between the civil society and the government
- Description of the Action EuropeAid/152768/DD/ACT/MD
- Annex II General Conditions 2017/394-358
- Specific Contract 2017/394-358

3948072017  Review of the Moldova Energy and Biomass Project
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3947172018  Direct grant to ODIMM "Support to SMEs in rural areas"
- Addendum No1 to Grant Contract 2017/394-717 (September 2018)
- Addendum No2 to Grant Contract 2017/394-717 (April 2020)
- Addendum No3 to Grant Contract 2017/394-717 (July 2020)
- Budget of the Action 2017/394-717
- Annex II General Conditions 2017/394-717
- Grant Contract 2017/394-717 (March 2018)

3971142018  EUBAM Moldova/Ukraine Phase 12 (European Union Border Assistance Mission)
- Contract 2018/397-114
- Annex I Description of the Action
- Annex II General Conditions 2018/397-114

3975102018  Grassroots Civil Society Development Facility in the Republic of Moldova (2017 – 2020)
- Budget for the Action 2018/397-510
- Annex A.2 Full Application Form 2018/397-510
- Annex II General Conditions 2018/397-510
- First Interim report 2018/397-510 (November 2019)
- Grant Contract 2018/397-510

3981202018  Support to efficient prevention and fight against corruption in the justice sector
- Progress Report EuropeAid/138640/DH/SER/MD 23 July 2019 – 22 January 2020 (February 2020)
- Project Factsheet ENI/2018/398-120
- Technical Offer ENI/2018/398-120 (December 2017)
- Budget Breakdown EuropeAid/138640/DH/SER/MD
- Addendum No1 ENI/2018/398-120 (June 2019)
- Addendum No2 ENI/2018/398-120 (June 2020)
- Budget Breakdown 2018/398-120
- Annex I General Conditions 2018/398-120
- Progress Report EuropeAid/138640/DH/SER/MD (July/August 2019)
- Progress Report 23rd July 2019 – 22nd January 2020 EuropeAid/138640/DH/SER/MD (January/February 2020)
- Service Contract ENPI/2018/398-120

3989322018  Support to the professional capacity development and motivation of the Public Administration employees in the Republic of Moldova
- Addendum No1 to Service Contract No ENI/2018/398-932
- Addendum No2 to Service Contract No ENI/2018/398-932
- Budget ENI/2018/398-932
- General Conditions ENI/2018/398-932
- Service Contract No ENI/2018/398-932 (July 2018)
- Terms of Reference ENI/2018/398-932

**3989772018 Reform of the initial and continuous training of the police system in the Republic of Moldova**

- Amendment No1 to Grant Contract ENPI 2018/398-977 (December 2018)
- Budget of the Action ENI/2018/398-932
- Annex A1 Description of the action ENI/2018/398-932
- Annex A2 General Conditions ENI/2018/398-932
- Annex A Twinning Grant Contract – Special Conditions

**3992122018 Support to public administration reform processes**

- Addendum No1 to Service Contract No 2018/399-212
- Addendum No2 to Service Contract No 2018/399-212
- Addendum No3 to Service Contract No 2018/399-212
- Addendum No4 to Service Contract No 2018/399-212
- Addendum No5 to Service Contract No 2018/399-212
- Service Contract No 2018/399-212
- Annex I General Conditions No 2018/399-212
- First Interim Report No 2018/399-212 (April 2019)
- Second Interim Report No 2018/399-212 (October 2019)
- Third Interim Report No 2018/399-212 (April 2020)

**3993472018 Strengthening of the policy development process in the context of the implementation of the Association Agreement**

- Addendum No1 No ENI 2018/399-347 (February 2020)
- Contract No ENI 2018/399-347
- Annex I General Conditions 2018/399-347
- Progress Report 1 2018/399-347 (April 2019)
- Progress Report 2 2018/399-347 (October 2019)
- Terms of Reference 2018/399-347

**3993962018 Supply of equipment for the National Bureau of Statistics of the Republic of Moldova**

- Supply Contract ENI/2018/399-396 (September 2018)
- Annex 1 General Conditions ENI/2018/399-396
- Special Conditions ENI/2018/399-396

**3994952018 Twinning: Support to the strengthening of the system for anti-money laundering in the Republic of Moldova**

- Annex A Twinning Grant Contract ENPI 2018/399-495 (September 2018)
- Annex A2 General Conditions ENI/2018/399-396
- Twinning Interim Quarterly Report 1 MD 16 ENI JH 01 18 (MD/33) (December 2018)
- Twinning Interim Quarterly Report 2 MD 16 ENI JH 01 18 (MD/33) (April 2019)
- Twinning Interim Quarterly Report 3 MD 16 ENI JH 01 18 (MD/33) (July 2019)
- Twinning Interim Quarterly Report 4 MD 16 ENI JH 01 18 (MD/33) (October 2019)

**4003082018**  Support to the police reform in the Republic of Moldova

- Addendum No1 to Service Contract No 2018/400-308 (July 2020)
- Financial Offer – EuropeAid/138631/DH/SER/MD
- General Conditions ENI/2018/400-308
- Inception Report ENI/2018/400-308 (December 2018)
- Annex 1 Logframe ENI/2018/400-308
- Six Months Report ENI/2018/400-308 (October 2019)
- Service Contract ENI/2018/400-308
- Terms of Reference ENI/2015/038-144

**4003112018**  Moldova-Romania Interconnection Phase I

- Addendum No1 to the Delegation Agreement No ENI 2018/400-311
- EU Delegation Agreement ENI/2018/400-311

**4005662018**  Support to the implementation of the European Union High Level Advisors’ mission to the Republic of Moldova 2019-2021

- Service Contract No ENI 2018/400-566
- Annex I General Conditions ENI 2018/400-566
- Annex II Terms of Reference ENI 2018/400-566

**4006302018**  Support to the reform of the Transport Sector in the Republic of Moldova

- General Conditions 2015/038-136
- Service Contract No 2018/400-630
- Annex II Terms of Reference 2018/400-630

**4026742018**  Citizens’ Empowerment in the Republic of Moldova

- Addendum No1 ENI/2018/402-674
- Budget ENI/2018/402-674
- Annex I Description of the Action ENI/2018/402-674
- Specific Contract ENI/2018/402-674

**4039532018**  Advancing Human Rights Based-Policing in Moldova

- Annex III Budget for the Action 2018/403-953
- Annex A.2 Full Application form ENI/2018/403-953
- Annex II General Conditions ENI/2018/403-953
- Grant Contract ENI/2018/403-953

**4040432018**  Civic monitoring of the Police Reform in Moldova

- Annex III Budget 2018/404-043
- Description of the Action 2018/404-043
- Annex II General Conditions 2018/404-043
- Annex VI Interim Narrative Report 2018/404-043
- Grant Contract 2018/404-043 (December 2018)
Visibility of EU and EU assistance in the Republic of Moldova in 2019
- Specific Contract No 2018/404145 (December 2018)
- Final Report Month 1-12 No 2018/404145
- Specific Terms of Reference No 2018/404145

Strategic communication and support to mass-media
- Addendum No1 to Service Contract 2018/404-161
- Financial Offer 2018/404-161
- Annex I General Conditions 2018/404-161
- Service Contract 2018/404-161
- Annex II Terms of Reference 2018/404-161

Information campaign in Moldova's regions about the democratic situation and EU assistance for the country's development
- Eastern Partnership Civil Society Facility 2017 Rapid Response Mechanism Full Application (November 2018)
- Annex II General Conditions
- Grant Contract ENI/2018/404-243 (December 2018)

European Union confidence Building Measures Programme V (2019-2022)
- Annex III. Budget of the Action (CBM V 2019-2022) - Cris n. 404309
- Description of the Action Cris n. 404319
- Annex II General Conditions
- Contract number ENI 2018/404-319 1 January 2019 – 31 October 2019

Assessment of CSOs' and citizens' engagement in public budgetary process at national and local level in the Republic of Moldova
- Specific Contract No 2018/404401 (December 2018)
- Specific Terms of Reference 2018/404401

Inform, Empower, Act. Civil Society for good budgetary governance in Moldova
- Annex III Budget for the Action Contract No 2018/404-600
- Annex I Description of the Action 2018/404-600
- Annex II General Conditions 2018/404-600
- Grant Contract No 2018/404-600

AGREED - Activating Governance Reform for Enhancing Development
- Annex 1 Description of the Action 2018/404-612
- Annex II General Conditions
- Grant Contract 2018/404-612

Civil society engagement in improving the rural development processes and promotion of efficient models for sustainable local development
- Addendum No1 to Grant Contract No 2018/404-643 (September 2019)
- Budget for the Action No 2018/404-643
- Annex I Description of the Action No 2018/404-643
- Evaluation Study No 2018/404-643 (February 2019)
- Final report 01.03.2017 – 28.02/2019 2017/383-396
- Budget for the action 2017/383-396
- Annex II General Conditions
- Progress Report 1 01.03.2017-31.08.2017 2017/383-396
- Grant Contract 2018/404-643 (December 2018)
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4048302019  Twinning Enhancing the quality and effectiveness of the Vocational Education and Training (VET) system
- Addendum No1 to Twinning Grant Contract ENI/2019/404-830 (July 2019)
- Addendum No2 to Twinning Grant Contract ENI/2019/404-830
- Budget ENI/2019/404-830
- Twinning Grant Contract ENI/2019/404-830
- Annex A2 General Conditions ENI/2019/404-830
- Annex C4 Twinning Interim Quarterly Report 1 ENI/2019/404-830 (July 2019)
- Minutes of First Steering Committee Meeting (15/04/2019)
- Annex: Structure for Methodology for development of qualification standards

4061972019  EUBAM Moldova/Ukraine Phase 12 (European Union Border Assistance Mission)
- Annex III Addendum to contract 2018/3970114 Budget for the Action
- Addendum Description of the Action Annex I 2019/406-197

4062622019  Technical Assistance to support the National Bureau of Statistics of the Republic of Moldova
- Annex V Budget 2019/406-262
- Contract ENI/2019/406-262
- First Interim Report EuropeAid/138242/DH/SER/MD 2019/406-262
- Report for an Expenditure Verification of a Service Contract ENI/2019/406-262
- Annex I General Conditions 2019/406-262
- Inception Report EuropeAid/138242/DH/SER/MD (October 2019)

4068582019  Communication and visibility of EU assistance under the Annual Action Programme 2016
- Annex I General Conditions
- Service Contract No 2019/406-858
- Annex II Terms of Reference 2019/406-858

4073232019  Improvement of medico-social care services for people with long-term care needs on both sides of the Nistru River
- Budget for the Action ENI 2019/407-323
- Contribution Agreement ENI 2019/407-323
- Annex II General Conditions ENI 2019/407-323

4086942019 Technical assistance to the Court of Accounts of the Republic of Moldova in institutional development and improvement of audit process
- Budget for the Action 2019/408694-1
- Specific Contract No 2019/408694 (October 2019)
- Specific Terms of Reference 2019/408694

4090792019 Technical assistance on developing e-procurement system in the Republic of Moldova
- Service Contract No ENI/2019/409-079
- Annex I General Conditions (September 2019)
- Annex II Terms of Reference ENI/2019/409-079
- Technical Specifications for the development of e-Procurement Information System ENI/2019/409-079

4102422019 Strengthen the rule of law and anti-corruption mechanisms in the Republic of Moldova
- Budget 2019/410-242
- Contribution Agreement No 2019/410-242
- Annex I Description of the Action CRIS No. 2019/410-242
- Annex II General Conditions 2019/410-242

4104432019 Support to the development and implementation of justice policies in the Republic of Moldova
- Project Factsheet ENI/2019/410-443
- Addendum No 1 2019/410-443
- Annex 3 Budget 2019/410-443
- Specific Contract 2019/410-443
- Description of the Action 2019/410-443
- Eastern Partnership Civil Society Facility Full Application 2018 RRP DELMD/RRM/ 2019/410-443

4104702019 EU4Moldova: focal regions
- Annex III Budget for the Action ENI/2019/410-470
- Contribution Agreement ENI/2019/410-470
- Annex I Description of the Action ENI/2019/410-470
- Annex II General Conditions for the Contribution Agreement ENI/2019/410-470

4115362019 Moldova against all discrimination
- Grant Contract 2019/411-536
- Annex II General Conditions 2019/411-536

4115532019 Advocacy for better protection against discrimination
- Annex II General Conditions 2019/411-553
- Grant Contract 2019/411-553

4116522019 EU4MOLDOVA: Clean Water for Cahul
- Budget for the Action 2019/411-652
- Contribution Agreement 2019/411-652
- Annex I Description of the Action 2019/411-652
- Annex II General Conditions 2019/411-652

4129702019 Visibility of EU and EU assistance in the Republic of Moldova in 2020
- Specific Contract Nr 2019/412970 (December 2019)
- Specific Terms of Reference 2019/411-652

4136992019 Supply of laboratory diagnostic kits to the National Reference Laboratory of the National Food Safety Agency (ANSA)
- Supply Contract No 2019/413-699
- General Conditions No 2019/413-699
- Technical Specifications No 2019/413-699

4139892019 Strengthened Gender Action in Cahul and Ungheni districts
- Budget for the Action 2019/413-989
- Contribution Agreement ENI 2019/413-989 (December 2019)
- Annex I Description of the Action 2020-2022 2019/413-989
- Annex II General Conditions 2019/413-989

4142982019 EU 4 Border Security
- Budget for the Action 2019/414-298
- Annex I Description of the Action 2019/414-298
- Annex II General Conditions 2019/414-298
- Contribution Agreement ENI/2019/414-298

4142892020 LEADER approach for rural prosperity in Moldova
- Grant Contract 2019/414-289 (January 2020)
- Annex I Grant Application Form 2019/414-289 (June 2019)
- Terms of Reference 2019/414-289

4150972020 Support for structured policy dialogue, coordination of the implementation of the Association Agreement and enhancement of the legal approximation process
- Budget Breakdown ENI 2020/415-097
- Service Contract ENI 2020/415-097
- Annex I General Conditions ENI 2020/415-097
- Annex II Contract ENI 2020/415-097

4166302020 TWG Improving Spatial Data Services in the Republic of Moldova following EU standards (MD 16 ENI OT 01 19 (MD/35))
- Annex A Twinning grant Contract 2020/416-630
- Annex A1 Description of the action 2020/416-630
- Annex A2 General Conditions 2020/416-630
- Annex A6 Terms of Reference 2020/416-630

4166562020 TWG Further support to agriculture, rural development and food safety in the Republic of Moldova (MD 16 ENI AG 01 19 (MD/37))
- Annex A1 Description of the Action 2020/416-656
- Twinning grant Contract 2020/416-656
- Annex C1 Twinning Fiche 2020/416-656
Annex 5: Sampling Approach and sample interventions
Introduction

The evaluation sampled a set of interventions (each intervention including a core programme and a set of complementary programmes) which are both important and representative of the portfolio. The sample of interventions form the keystone of this evaluation: by providing stories of changes which confirm or inform the reconstruction of the intervention logic.

The sampling criteria was based on:

1. **One to three interventions per sector** (sectors are defined by Evaluation Questions 4 to 10) depending on the breadth of the sector (e.g. governance will have more sampled interventions than Transnistria);

2. **Volume of funding**: this criterion will point to a few key interventions, which must be included in the sample (for instance, in the agriculture and rural development sector, ENPARD has to be covered because the volume of funding exceeds that of most programmes in the portfolio.) For instance, the projects included in the top 10% most expensive will be included in the sample. The cut-off amount for this criterion will be determined during the desk phase, because at present the evaluation portfolio is not validated yet, and it is therefore not possible to generate reliable intervals of typical funding volumes.

3. **Strategic value of the core programme**: this will be determined by a review of DoAs for the portfolio, linked with strategic documents primarily the SSF. Inception interviews have provided precious indications already.

4. Interventions should be diversified if possible, to be representative of cooperation in each sector.

5. In case of budget support (BS) programmes, the whole group of complementary measures is seen together with the BS, unless they are too recent to be evaluated.

6. Programmes which have been ROM-ed and evaluated will be favoured, so as to achieve economies of scale and higher efficiency.

7. Programmes on which data gaps are signalled by the EUD will be discarded from the sampling.

Based on seven sampling criteria ensuring both feasibility and representativeness of the sampled interventions, the evaluation team sampled 54 interventions (including budget support, blending operations, technical assistance projects, twinning projects, grants to civil society organisations, and contribution agreements with international organisations). However, during the answering process of JC and indicators it showed that it was not sufficient to analyze the sampled projects and programmes. Thus experts had to analyze almost all interventions at national and regional level.

Table 1: Sampling approach

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EQ</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Intervention expected result</th>
<th>Intervention components selected (final sample)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Rural and Economic Development</td>
<td>Economic diversification, social and economic infrastructure, inclusive economic development</td>
<td>Core programme: Budget support ENPARD including complementary measures (AT + CBM); AAP 2016 Development of Rural Areas; + AAP 2018 Focal regions programme</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 5 | Law enforcement | Structure, processes, independence | Core programme: Police Budget support.  
Complementary programmes:  
2018 ENI 400.308 Support to police reform TA  
2018 403.953 CSO human rights-based police monitoring (Soros)  
2018 404.043 Promolex Police Reform Monitoring grant |
|---|---|---|---|
| Anti-corruption | | | 2018 399.495 Twinning on AML;  
Added: 2019 410.242 GIZ strengthen RoL and anti-corruption mechanisms; 2017/381.731 CoE CLEP |
| Justice | Judicial bodies and Court management | Core programmes: ENPI 2014 349.066 “ATRECO” GIZ Courts; PGG 2349 CEPEJ.  
| Human Rights | Fight against torture and ill treatment | Core programme: NEAR TS 2017 388.469 Grant Institute for Dem (Let us all say no to torture).  
Complementary programme: 2016 375.231 Advancing and monitoring the rights of people with mental disabilities in neuro-psychiatric residential institutions. |
| Public Finance Management and PAR | Economic stability  
Efficient public administration | Macro financial assistance +  
Core programme: Support to Public Finance Policy Reform SBS ME 33. Complementary programmes: CS TA Public Finance Policy/PFM; 2 Twinning’s External Public Audit/ Internal Control  
Added: TAs 2018/399932 Prof Capacity Dvt and Motivation of PA Employees; TA 2018/399347 Strengthening Policy Dvt |
| 6 | Infrastructure | Strengthened infrastructure  
(geographic sampling: Cahul) | Four core programmes:  
• Clean water Cahul;  
• Moldovan Railways Restructuring Project  
• Moldova road rehabilitation project Phase IV (Bahmut Bypass)  
• Construction of water supply and sanitation infrastructure as well as energy efficiency in public buildings |
| 7 | VET and mobility | VET skills are better matched with labour market needs  
Increased mobility through investments in higher education, research, innovation and visa liberalisation | Core programme: SPSP in VET sector “Support to the implementation of the VET reform in Moldova” (ENPI/2013/024-404). Complementary programmes: TA (ENPI/2012/023-419) and twinning (MD 15 ENI SO 01 18 (MD/34))  
ERASMUS +  
HORIZON 2020  
VLAP |
|---|---|---|---|
| 8 | Business environment | Strengthened entrepreneurship (geographic sampling: Cahul) | Core programme: “EU4MOLDOVA: Startup City Cahul  
Different interventions financed under the TCF Regional Blending Operations: Deep and Comprehensive Free Trade Area (DCFTA) Initiative East  
Support SMEs in Rural Areas (ODIMM)  
LEADER Approach for rural prosperity  
Some action of the DCFTA BS related to the strengthening of business environment also considered. |
| 9 | Transnistria | Rapprochement through health, culture and media sectors | Two core programmes: CBM IV and CBM V  
Complementary programme - Twinning project “Support to promote the cultural heritage in Moldova” |
| 10 | Civil society | Capacity development, collaboration, good governance, partnerships for social and economic development, monitoring | Core programme: Civil Society Facility ENI/2015/038-137  
Complementary programme: ENI/ 402-674: Citizens’ Empowerment |
Annex 6: Portfolio overview and intervention logic
Overview of EU intervention in Moldova

Overview of political, institutional and technical frameworks

The relationship between Moldova and the EU has been guided by a succession of strategic documents, which follow and complement each other. These documents are summarised here but are further analysed as a part of the intervention logic of EU–Moldova cooperation.

> **Partnership and Cooperation Agreement**

Signed in 1994, the Partnership and Cooperation Agreement (PCA) replaced the agreement between the European Economic Community, the European Atomic Energy Community and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on trade and economic and commercial cooperation signed in Brussels in 1989. The PCA established the legal framework for bilateral relations between Moldova and the EU in political, commercial, economic, legal, cultural and scientific fields and aimed to support Moldova in strengthening democracy and the rule of law, respecting human and minority rights by providing the appropriate framework political dialogue, sustainable development of the economy and completion of the transition to the market economy by promoting trade, investment and harmonious economic relations.

> **European Neighbourhood Policy**

Launched in 2004, The European Neighbourhood Policy (ENP) was set as a framework to govern the EU’s relations with 16 of the EU’s eastern and southern neighbours to achieve the closest possible political association and the greatest possible degree of economic integration. The ENP was revised in November 2015 to build more effective partnerships between the EU and its neighbours towards a more stable EU neighbourhood, in political, socio-economic and security terms. The key principles of the revised ENP are differentiation among partner countries, flexibility, joint ownership, greater involvement of the EU Member States, and shared responsibility. While continuing to preserve EU values, the revised ENP also engaged partners in increased cooperation on security matters. The Eastern Partnership (EaP) (which serves the ENP) is a joint initiative involving the EU, its Member States and six eastern European partners: Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Georgia, the Republic of Moldova and Ukraine. In March 2020, the Joint Communication on the ‘Eastern partnership policy beyond 2020: reinforcing resilience – an Eastern Partnership that delivers for all’ was published, outlining the long-term policy objectives for future cooperation.

The EU–Moldova Action Plan (adopted in February 2005) laid out the strategic objectives of the cooperation between Moldova and the EU, within the framework of the ENP. It aimed to help Moldova fulfil the provisions of the PCA and encourage and support Moldova’s objective of further integration into European economic and social structures.

> **Association Agreement (including a DCFTA) and the Association Agenda**

The Association Agreement (AA) which was signed in 2014 and fully entered into force in July 2016 replaced the PCA. The AA constitutes the legal framework for the development of bilateral cooperation between the EU and Moldova. It aims to deepen political and economic relations between Moldova and the EU, and to gradually integrate Moldova into the EU internal market with a view to economic integration of Moldova and the EU. The AA provides a long-term foundation for future EU–Moldova relations without excluding any possible future developments in line with the Treaty on European Union. The AA contains binding, rule-based provisions and is wide-ranging, covering all areas of interest. The AA includes provisions for setting up a Deep and Comprehensive Free Trade Area (DCFTA) and foresees economic and governance reforms and sectoral cooperation in 28 areas.
The main tool for the implementation of the AA is the Association Agenda, which replaced the European Neighbourhood Policy Action Plan. The agenda outlines the priorities for reform in Moldova and is based on the commitments included in the AA. In 2017, the new Association Agenda was endorsed for the period 2017-2019, including short and medium-term priorities for the EU–Moldova cooperation and the National Implementation Plan of the EU-Moldova Association Agreement. Council conclusions of both February 2016 and 2018 stressed that EU assistance to Moldova should be based on strict conditionality and linked to satisfactory progress in reforms. The Association Agenda also outlines the provisions for steering and dialogue.

> **European Neighbourhood Instrument – Single Support Framework**

The SSF is a multiannual programming document which provides a summary of developments in Moldova–EU relations and outlines priority sectors of intervention to be financed through the national envelope, followed by the financial overview – a breakdown of indicative allocation. The SSF for EU support to Moldova in 2014-2017 was adopted in 2014. Another SSF for EU support to Moldova in 2017-2020 was adopted in 2017. The priorities and indicative allocations for financial assistance included in the SSF are connected to the priority actions set out by the Association Agenda.

> **Annual action programmes**

Annual action programmes (AAPs) are financing decisions adopted by the European Commission, to reserve funds for regional and country-based external cooperation programmes and for the implementation of thematic programmes. AAPs specify the objectives pursued, the fields of intervention, the expected results, the management procedures and total amount of financing planned. In addition, AAPs contain a description of the operations to be financed, an indication of the amounts allocated for each operation and an indicative implementation timetable. They provide the guidance to European Commission Implementing Decisions, and corresponding Action documents, which translate strategy into actions and contracts.

> **Policy dialogue**

Policy dialogue over the period under review has been informed by extensive consultations with the government, CSOs, multilateral and bilateral donors, EU Member States, international financial institutions (IFIs) and other international organisations, as well as the joint programming process.

In its cooperation with Moldova, the European External Action Service (EEAS) and the Commission are engaged in policy dialogue: (a) at bilateral level, in the framework of the Association Agreement; (b) at regional level in the framework of the Eastern Partnership; and (c) as part of the programming process of ENPI/ENP assistance, setting specific objectives and priorities for support in SSFs, AAPs, and budget support programmes.

The **EU–Moldova Association Council** was established to supervise and monitor the application and implementation of the AA. It consists of members of the Council of the EU, of the European Commission and of the Government of Moldova. The Association Council adopts decisions and recommendations towards implementation of the AA. It had five sessions since its inception. The last (fifth) Association Council meeting was in September 2019.

Efforts to arrive at a settlement of the Transnistrian conflict have several dimensions, in parallel with other policy and political dialogue areas. At the political level, Chisinau and Tiraspol, assisted by three international mediators, are working on a possible settlement of the conflict (under the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE) Chairmanship). At technical level the interaction on identification of solutions to different issues is taking place in the framework of expert working groups. This evaluation will consider political dialogue as a background to programming and delivery of cooperation, but will not evaluate it per se.
**Portfolio overview**

In total, over the period, the EC has developed complex programmes worth over EUR 1 billion (EUR 1,039,557,431)\(^{41}\) which equates to over EUR 387 per capita not including Transnistria.\(^{42}\) The EU has used four types of modalities, blending, budget support, project and macro-financial assistance. This composition has evolved over time.

Figure 16: EC planned amounts by action type\(^{43}\) (2014-2017)

![Chart showing EC planned amounts by action type](image)

Table 1: EC planned amounts of expenditure (2014-2017)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action type</th>
<th>EC planned amounts €</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blending</td>
<td>95,505,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget support</td>
<td>347,611,561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project</td>
<td>536,440,470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macro-financial assistance</td>
<td>60,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td>1,039,557,431</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 17: Planned amounts by types 2014-2017 (including bilateral, regional, cross-border) – according to portfolio list

\(^{41}\) In the entire section below: Sources: portfolio overview, based on Clinical Record Interactive Search (CRIS) data communicated by EUD + data communicated by geo desk on regional and cross-border cooperation programmes + public data on macro-financial assistance. SSFs, AAPs. We note that there is a discrepancy between the total planned amounts of spending in the ET’s consolidated portfolio list, and the indicative allocation range of planned amounts stated in the SSFs. Our understanding of this discrepancy is that the data received from different sources, at different stages of the evaluation, do not completely align despite the best efforts of the ET. Thus, the data on planned amounts from the ET’s consolidated portfolio list must be understood as indicative figures only, to provide some reflection on the relative proportionality of planned amounts to the different types of actions.

For the projects ‘Partnership for Good Governance with the Council of Europe I (PGG I) (2015-2018)’ and ‘Partnership for Good Governance with the Council of Europe II (PGG II) (2019-2021)’. The figures used to indicate EC planned contribution were received from Council of Europe and are approximate indicative amounts, calculated by pro rata, and cannot be used for auditing purposes.

Not included in the data is the ‘Fruit Garden of Moldova’ project, the EIB’s EUR 120million long-term loan accompanied by a EUR 6 million NIF grant to fund partial loan guarantees to enable local banks to extend loans to underserved agricultural SMEs. The Evaluation team is aware of this project and its important contribution in the sector. However, there was limited official information shared on this project and has not been included in the scope of this data set.


\(^{43}\) Source: CRIS.
The vast majority of the EU’s cooperation was planned as bilateral (EU–Moldova) actions, amounting (according to the SSFs and Special Measures) to about EUR 740,000,000. Regional actions targeting Moldova were planned to be EUR 195,273,904, whereas cross-border actions targeting Moldova were planned for an amount of EUR 103,621,572.

The annual action programmes from 2017 to 2020 and special measures, anticipated EUR 471,090,000 worth of bilateral cooperation. As noted above, the comparison of planned vs paid amounts is challenging, due to incomplete information on paid amounts. There is no authoritative public source on the total
amounts effectively disbursed at a given time. Based on the data made available regarding the evaluation’s portfolio by the EUD and the Geographic Desk in October 2020, altogether close to EUR 429,000,000 was paid from the planned amounts, from the bilateral, cross-border cooperation and regional programmes, plus EUR 60,000,000 macro-financial assistance, amounting to roughly EUR 489,000,000 of support disbursed. This figure does not consider amounts disbursed between 2014 and 2020 from programmes planned before the SSF 2014–2017, and it should be noted that some amounts planned during 2014–2020 may still be disbursed beyond 2020 (due to ongoing programmes).

Based on the available information for the evaluation’s portfolio, the paid amounts have decreased over the years, and the difference between planned and disbursed amounts has grown over the evaluated period, with a peak difference in 2018, in great part due to the interruption of budget support.

Figure 20: EC Moldova Planned versus Paid amounts 2014-2020

The review of cooperation by sectors is imprecise because there is no uniform categorisation of sectors. There are differences and overlaps between:

Sectors as defined in the Clinical Record Interactive Search (CRIS) database. These correspond to the Development Assistance Committee (DAC) sector coding and include: agriculture, banking and financial services, communications, conflict, peace and security, education (level unspecified), secondary education, energy distribution, energy generation and non-renewable sources, energy generation and renewable sources, energy policy, government and civil society, health, industry, other multisector, other social infrastructure and services, trade policies and regulations, transport and storage, water supply and sanitation, unallocated/unspecified, unknown. Even when grouped, they only approximate the other categorisations.

Sectors as defined under the SSF 2014-2017. These include public administration reform, agriculture and rural development, police reform and border management, complementary support for capacity development and institution building, and complementary support for civil society development.

Sectors as defined under the SSF 2017-2020. These include economic development and market opportunities (including sustainable and inclusive economic growth); strengthening institutions and good governance, including the rule of law and security; connectivity, energy efficiency, environment and climate change; mobility and people-to-people contacts (including support to the continuous

---

44 The lower graph line excludes Partnership for Good Governance (PGG) with the Council of Europe I (PGG I) (2015-2018) (EUR 30,400,000) and PGG with the Council of Europe II (PGG II) (2019-2021) (EUR 2,025,654). It also excludes the action ‘Sector budget support to the Justice Sector Reforms’ which did not have an assigned contract year in the data used (planned amount of EUR 28,000,000).
fulfilment of the Visa Liberalisation Action Plan benchmarks and to education, training and research); complementary support for capacity development and institution building, complementary support for civil society development; complementary support for strategic communication.

Sectors as defined by the evaluation questions. These include agriculture and rural development; governance (including public administration reform, good governance and rule of law); energy, infrastructure, environment, biomass and climate change; education and people-to-people contacts; business environment and SMEs; Transnistria; civil society.

At the bilateral level, the AAPs show the importance of agricultural development, business environment and infrastructure in the EU’s priority, but also of the governance sector: added together (police reform, border management, public administration reform, capacity development and institution building, good governance) amount to EUR 150.6 million, by far the most important sector in bilateral assistance.

Figure 21: EU budget allocation (bilateral only) by sector in million euros, based on annual action programmes

![EU budget allocation by sector, 2014-2020](chart.png)

The evaluation portfolio review according to the EQs enables one to identify key interventions and compare the planned and paid amounts for these key interventions. It shows very diverse levels of absorption depending on the sector, which tends to reduce the prominence of sectors related to development support, particularly infrastructure. However, it should be noted that the key interventions identified include a number of ongoing programmes, meaning that spent amounts are likely to continue evolving quickly after 2020.

Table 2: Distribution of planned and paid amounts per evaluation-defined sectors, based on identified key interventions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sectors</th>
<th>Amounts planned (€)</th>
<th>Amounts paid (€)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Key interventions agriculture and local development</td>
<td>104,600,000</td>
<td>60,378,957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key interventions good governance and public administration</td>
<td>89,681,952</td>
<td>54,533,611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key interventions rule of law</td>
<td>29,096,414</td>
<td>20,431,364</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The ET had to rely on partial data regarding paid amounts. The graph is based on the available information regarding the key interventions under each of the evaluation’s sectors, defined by the EQs. Key interventions were identified in consultation with the Interservice Steering Group (ISG), in view of the EU’s intervention logic, broken down into sector-specific intervention logics, and validated by the ISG.
EU–Moldova cooperation has evolved over time and during the temporal scope of the evaluation. This evolution reflects several important factors, which are captured in the intervention logic:

The development of the EU’s regional approach and policy, embodied by the ENPI and ENP;

The evolution of the strategic agreements between Moldova, with a long transition between the CPA and the AA (signed in 2014 but ratified in 2016);

The multiple, and sometimes drastic changes in the political environment of Moldova, as witnessed by the succession of governments with sometimes very different logics. This relative political instability has weighed on the definition of a constant strategic framework for EU–Moldova cooperation, as well as on the programming under this cooperation;

The bank fraud of 2014, which had a profound influence on the strategic planning and programming, in terms of content of the cooperation (thematic priorities), and even more so as regards the cooperation modalities.

**Intervention logic until signature of the Association Agreement**

The intervention logic which still prevailed during the first year covered by this evaluation (2014) is inherited from the CPA framework, influenced by the ENI: the bulk of programmes implemented belonged to the pre-AA programming. It focused chiefly on development-related thematic areas: agriculture and rural development and core governance functions. The core external assumption was that there was high development potential and strong political and societal will. But, as a core problem to be addressed, this potential and this will were hampered by a lack of capacity and of base capital (human, material, financial). This problem, according to the initial intervention logic, required capacity support and investment, backed by a results-oriented approach. Now, and for the purpose of future decision-making, this intervention logic is no longer relevant. EU–Moldova cooperation has gone a long way since the CPA, and the strategic framework has greatly evolved. Therefore, this evaluation will not assess the validity of the CPA-related intervention logic, as it will focus on the performance and learning to be drawn from the intervention logic pertaining to the AA.

**Intervention logic of the AA and the 2014–2017 SSF**

The intervention logic channelled through this SSF was slightly different from the previous approach: its core external assumption regarding high development potential and political will was identical, but the core problem to be addressed was articulated more finely: in addition to a lack of capital, and shortcomings in the capacity of the actors of development (government, civil society, private actors), the

---

46 In 2014, USD 1 billion disappeared from three Moldovan banks in what appeared to be a coordinated criminal effort of embezzlement surrounded with various associated economic crimes. The total loss was equivalent to 12% of Moldova’s GDP. The Moldovan Government bailed out these banks, which in turn dug the country’s public finance deficit. An investigative report commissioned by the Moldovan Central Bank in January 2015 became public in May the same year, leading to a political scandal, strained relations with international donors, and a chain of judicial processes.
intervention logic identified inadequate public policy planning, management and administration processes (policy planning and steering) as key hampering factors.

According to this intervention logic, along with continued development support, policy support and capacity building were therefore viewed as transversal work. This work was trying to build know-how of the government as a precondition for addressing the hampering factors: it places a great emphasis on governance overall. However, the intervention logic of the time does not clearly articulate an overall governance strategy. It addresses policy-making and implementation of national objectives in all sectors without high granularity in the analysis of the state of advancement of the strategic planning of reforms in these respective sectors. There is limited differentiation between core governance sectors (such as sectors pertaining to the rule of law or democracy) and thematic sectors (such as agriculture, trade, education or infrastructure). This logic is characterised with intense recourse to budget support and blending, complemented by technical assistance, and to some extent Twinning. Civil society grants, contribution agreements with international/regional organisations, remain limited. Analysis of the indicators reveals a result-oriented logic, but somewhat parcelled strategic vision (programming does not foresee a lot of interaction among sectors). The political dialogue was envisaged as going hand-in-hand with these efforts, working to align Moldovan reform objectives and EU strategic objectives.

Therefore, for the 2014-2017 SSF, the intervention logic could be summarised as follows: If EU–Moldova cooperation supports public administration, rural and agricultural development and police reform/border management with a mixed approach of political dialogue/cooperation in the field of foreign and security policy, access to finance (blending and budget support), as well as expertise and advice (technical assistance and Twinning), then these sectors will be better financed and they will benefit from stronger know-how of the government, civil society and private actors, and they will build on stronger planning and steering of policies; then Moldova will become more strongly politically associated with the EU and more stable within the regional and international peace and security frameworks (political dialogue and reform, cooperation in the field of foreign and security policy), will become more closely integrated economically with the EU (trade and trade-related matters, financial assistance and anti-fraud/control provisions), will evolve as a society enjoying more freedom, security and justice i.e. a society governed by the rule of law (freedom, security and justice), and will develop as an economically and socially prosperous country (economic and other sectoral cooperation).
In **November 2014**, the bank fraud created a backlash of the entire intervention portfolio against the background of limited progress in the rule of law sector, including judicial and police reform. The EU had to quickly react, along with its Member States and international partners. New fundamental **external assumptions** emerged, this time concerning the **integrity** of the actors and process of reforms. Corresponding risks were reassessed. In reaction, the **EU adapted its choice of implementation modalities**: budget support was put on hold and no new budget support was approved between 2015 and 2020. This contributed to a sharp decrease 2014/2015 in development-oriented areas such as agriculture and rural development. Instead, more technical assistance, whose management is easier to control, tended to most priorities. All activities and funding **continued to focus on governance**, especially anti-corruption, as well as justice reform and law enforcement: these were expected to help guarantee the integrity of the reform efforts, and the accountability of the actors involved in their implementation. Local and national agents of change such as the civil society, the media or local governance bodies became more important implementation partners as well as beneficiaries of assistance, which the EU sought to involve, as much as possible, in all areas of work. For instance, through the Civil Society Facility (2015) the facility acted as a channel for initiatives which mainstreamed civil society involvement throughout the sectors. Furthermore, the EU increased its level of coordination and cooperation with other development partners and especially EU Member States. The importance of Twinning increased, as well as blending operations implemented by international financial institutions.

The implementation of this SSF picked up in 2015. Because the approach was generally less costly than core development investments and budget support was sharply reduced, the overall volume of funding also decreased. During this period, cooperation activities supported the political dialogue, which was rendered more difficult by these circumstances.

**Intervention logic flowing from the AA and the 2017-2020 SSF**

With the new SSF 2017-2020 some important lessons were learned from the previous cycle and the bank fraud. This SSF, breaking up with a traditional development approach, adopted a **more long-term perspective**, with a **more precise vision beyond result, towards impacts**. The intervention logic rested increasingly upon **agents of change**, in all sectors, among the state actors but also within the civil society and media, as well as in the private sector. The intervention logic further **diversified the cooperation portfolio**, with more intensive intervention in the sectors of education, mobility, and human rights. **Governance** is no longer presented just as a cross-cutting issue and a precondition for development and

---

47 The COVID-19 Resilience Contract was approved at the end of 2020 and the Financing Agreement was signed in February 2021.
stabilisation, but also as a large thematic area with high leverage. Under governance, more elaborate programming took place, with more structured interventions around the justice and law enforcement systems, but also core democratic institutions such as the Parliament. Public administration reform more clearly delineates public finance management, and decentralisation. Throughout the sectors, the intervention logic also diversified the portfolio of counterparts: increased attention is put on local self-governance bodies, and especially civil society. Civil society organisations are involved both in civil society specific programmes, and through sector-specific programmes strengthening CSOs' role in contributing to decision-making, and in monitoring the Executive and the Justice. This SSF also launched various initiatives with direct reach to citizens, in particular with a range of local initiatives in the rural development, SME support, or human rights areas, and with the emergence of the strategic communication programme. The intention is to elicit mutual communication and recognition between the EU and the Moldovan citizens, addressing the dilution of EU effort which may have prevailed until then.48

**Summary of the intervention logic of the 2017-2020 SSF**

If EU–Moldova cooperation supports economic development and market opportunities (including sustainable and inclusive economic growth), institutions and good governance (including rule of law and security), connectivity, energy efficiency, environment and climate change, and mobility and people-to-people contacts (including visa liberalisation action plans and education, training and research) with a mixed approach of political dialogue/cooperation in the field of foreign and security policy, access to finance (especially blending), expertise and advice (technical assistance and Twinning), and new opportunities for change agents especially in the civil society and the media, then these sectors will be better financed and they will benefit from stronger know-how of the government, civil society and private actors, and they will build on stronger planning and steering of policies, and the reforms will be invigorated by change agents; then Moldova will become more strongly politically associated with the EU and more stable within the regional and international peace and security frameworks (political dialogue and reform, cooperation in the field of foreign and security policy), will become more closely integrated economically with the EU (trade and trade-related matters, financial assistance and anti-fraud/control provisions), will evolve as a society enjoying more freedom, security and justice, that is, a society governed by the rule of law (freedom, security and justice), and will develop as an economically and socially prosperous country (economic and other sectoral cooperation).

---

48 ENI/2017/040-490 Terms of Reference, p. 3.
Synthesis

In conclusion, the evolution of the intervention logic of the EU’s cooperation with Moldova does not concern so much the list of priorities and objectives (which are relatively stable during the period despite varying formulations and groupings) but rather their relative importance, and the intervention modalities which were selected to achieve these objectives. The reconstructed intervention logic flowchart (Figure 9) synthesises the two intervention logics of the EU in Moldova. While it does not show the evolution from one intervention logic to another, it clearly shows the chain of interventions and changes which were expected to occur in various priority areas under the respective SSFs.

External assumptions are external factors that were necessary for the chain of changes to occur:

Purpose level (external factors enabling impact to feed into the purpose of EU–Moldova cooperation):
Strong political will, internal political stability; global and regional economic, security and sanitary stability; EU internal stability.
Impact level (external factors enabling outputs to provoke changes at impact level): National sectoral policies and strategies and EU strategic objectives are aligned; Gradual reduction of political interference into functionally independent public bodies (coherent with national policies and EU support); progressively less collusion of political and business interest.

Outcome level (external factors enabling interventions’ outputs to provoke changes at outcome level): Sufficient resources (human and financial) allocated by Moldova to its reform process; government/civil society dialogue; existence of champions of change in all sectors among state/civil society/private actors.

The graph below (Figure 10) shows the evolution of the EU’s cooperation with Moldova in its political context, particularly the evolution of the EU’s mix of modalities (‘tool box’):
**Figure 25: Timeline of main EU interventions and political context**

### MAIN EU INTERVENTIONS DURING 2014–2020 (AAP implementing decisions, special measures and blending budgets)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contracts prior to 2014 to be considered in priority:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VET Sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justice Sector Reform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Toolbox</th>
<th>Planned Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Support to DCFTA implementation (umbrella programme) – 30 M€ (25 M€ BS)</td>
<td>131 M€ + 34 M€ blending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support to DCFTA implementation (umbrella programme) – 30 M€ (25 M€ BS)</td>
<td>90 M€ + 20,4 M€ blending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support to DCFTA implementation (umbrella programme) – 30 M€ (25 M€ BS)</td>
<td>89 M€</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support to DCFTA implementation (umbrella programme) – 30 M€ (25 M€ BS)</td>
<td>10 M€ + 46 M€ NIF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support to DCFTA implementation (umbrella programme) – 30 M€ (25 M€ BS)</td>
<td>50,75 M€ + 40,75 M€ blending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support to DCFTA implementation (umbrella programme) – 30 M€ (25 M€ BS)</td>
<td>114,48€ (54M€ BS) + 60M€NIF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support to DCFTA implementation (umbrella programme) – 30 M€ (25 M€ BS)</td>
<td>58M€ + 87M€ (Covid 19)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|----------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|

**EUROPEAN NEIGHBOURHOOD INSTRUMENT 2014 - 2020**

**Focus: PAR, Agriculture and Rural Development, Police Reform, Border Management**

**Focus: Economic Development, Good Governance, Connectivity, Mobility**

*AA/DCFTA ratified, bank fraud committed*

*Bank fraud revealed, start of political crisis*

*AA/DCFTA entered into force*

*100 M€ MFA scheduled for 2018*

*MFA cancelled*

*30 M€ MFA disbursed along with 54 M€ budget support*

*COVID-19 crisis, 87 M€ assistance pledged and 30 M€ last MFA approved*
The evolution of the allocations per sector, based on the AAPs, shows the evolution of the intervention logic, at least at bilateral level.

Figure 26: Evolution of planned amounts per sector, within bilateral cooperation (AAPs)

In addition to the above, following the outbreak of the COVID-19 pandemic, the EU mobilised a EUR 127 million package, combining existing and new funds to deliver, among others: material support, partly in cooperation with World Health Organization (WHO) (e.g. masks and other equipment, facilitation of treatment across both banks of the river in Transnistria); Budget support (EUR 15 million) COVID-19 Resilience contract, adopted in December 2020; Emergency grants; SME innovation and resilience programme; Health sector resilience support – loans with European Bank for Reconstruction and Development (EBRD) and European Investment Bank (EIB).

In addition, EUR 21.4 million unspent funds under the ongoing budget support programme for police reform have been mobilised to combat the pandemic in the law enforcement sector.
Further to the COVID-19 response package, an emergency COVID-19 macro-financial assistance, worth EUR 100 million in loans on highly favourable terms, was adopted in April 2020. The first instalment of EUR 50 million was disbursed in November 2020. The second tranche is set to be disbursed in 2021, if the relevant conditions are met.

This COVID-related support, which was mostly mobilised after the evaluation’s cut-off date for including newly launched actions (February 2020) is not covered directly by this evaluation.

**Sector intervention logics**

**Agriculture and rural development**

The intervention logic of the agriculture and rural development sector was aligned to the evolution of broader ENP objectives and the Agricultural Agreement. In line with the AA, the development of agriculture and rural areas has been a priority for EU–Moldova cooperation. The National Action Plans for the implementation of the AA envisaged cooperation of the EU with Moldova to promote agricultural and rural development, in particular through the progressive convergence of policies and legislation. This was incorporated in the logic of EU–Moldova cooperation and reinforced national strategies and programmes in the sector. Analysis of EU programming documents show that agriculture and rural development support was considered a long-term impact to be achieved by the cooperation, and special emphasis was put on harmonisation of policies legislation.

The EU’s intervention logic in agriculture and rural development could be summarised as follows: if policy, legal and institutional framework is strengthened and approximation with the EU occurs, and if support services to the industry are enhanced and if investments occur in modernising agri-food value chains and rural infrastructure improves then this will improve the general business environment, enhance sectoral competitiveness and allow Moldovan producers to benefit from the EU market and contribute to economic development.

**Governance and rule of law**

The EU’s intervention logic in public administration reform can be summarised as follows: if political leadership is legitimate and capacitated to strategise and plan finances accordingly, with integrity, at all levels of governance, and if Moldova’s financial balance reaches the basic standards, and if civil servants are ready, willing and able to discharge their duties efficiently and with integrity, then sound policies supported by budget planning will be efficiently cascaded down through all levels of democratic representation and civil service from national to territorial level, then Moldova will have strong democratic institutions, therefore it will become a stable democracy based common values with the EU.

The intervention logic of the EU in the rule of law area can be summarised as follows: if the law enforcement agencies and the justice system are capacitated in terms of policy-making, structure, processes, human and material resources, and if their functional (law enforcement, magistrates) and constitutional (judicial institutions) independence is protected in the legal order, and if they are monitored internally and externally, then they will become effective, efficient, independent, accountable and transparent. Then, they will prevent and respond to all crimes and violations as a service to the legal order and to the citizens. Then rule of law and respect for rights and freedoms will be better guaranteed, therefore Moldova will become a stable democracy based common values with the EU.

The intervention logic of anti-corruption interventions can be summarised as follows: if the law enforcement and justice system have the capacity to identify and prosecute corruption, and if public finance and key institutions become more transparent, and if the civil society monitors public finances, then public administration will be free from corruption then Moldova will have strong democratic institutions, therefore it will become a stable democracy based common values with the EU.
Energy, environment and infrastructure

The EU’s intervention in this sector has used different instruments including blending operations as an investment booster and a vehicle to accelerate Moldova’s integration to the European energy and transport networks, reduce dependency upon energy imports (Moldova has historically depended upon energy imports from Russia) in parallel with legislative, regulatory and institutional capacity support to facilitate Moldova to correspond to commitments made under DCFTA.

The EU’s intervention in this sector was the following: if investments in the energy sector are made and if this is combined with an increased production of energy of renewable resources and increased energy efficiency (especially in public buildings) then Moldova’s dependency on imports will decrease, energy security will increase and Moldova will integrate more with countries of the EU. If investments in the transport sector are made, then Moldova’s integration in the European transport networks will be accelerated and will benefit mobility and increase exchange of products. If additional support is provided through technical assistance and Twinning then Moldova’s institutions will be strengthened and will promote legislative, regulatory reforms to respond to commitments under the DCFTA.

The intervention for the environment sector can be summarised as follows: if energy efficiency (public buildings, buses, locomotives) and the promotion of renewable energy (i.e. biomass, waste) is successfully implemented then there will be positive effects on the environment. If investments in water and waste-water sectors are made then this will not only booster local development but will also promote the environment.

Private sector and small and medium enterprises

The EU’s intervention logic in this sector was the following: if Moldova and the EU sign a DCFTA, if the business environment in Moldova improves and if technical support and financing opportunities are provided to the private sector and especially SMEs (to modernise their production, adapt to export requirements), then Moldovan enterprises will increase, diversify and improve production of products; this will lead to increase of economic relations with EU.

Education

The intervention logic of VET was the following: if VET governance, financing mechanism, institutional network, curricula and teaching methods are re-conceptualised and social dialogue enhanced then VET will be more attractive to potential students and will better respond to labour market demand and limit the brain drain.

The Erasmus+ intervention logic can be represented as follows: if teachers, students and researchers from Moldova and EU benefit from learning exchanges and credit mobility and government will be supported in reforming higher education, then individual, institutional and system-level capacity will be strengthened, leading to increased quality of higher education and better learning outcomes.

The intervention logic of Horizon 2020 may be summarised as follows: if the EU provides financing for Moldovan participation in Horizon 2020 and supports the establishment and capacitation of research and innovation (R&I) managing institutions then R&I policy design and implementation will be enhanced leading to greater and more successful participation of researchers in national and international projects and better R&I outcomes.

Transnistria and confidence building

While support to the 5+2 negotiation process is key to the long-term settlement of the Transnistria conflict, this is beyond the scope of the current evaluation, which is dealing only with the confidence-building measures. The intervention logic of CBM could be summarised as follows: if EU–Moldova cooperation supports the economic, social and sectoral rapprochement of the two banks of the Nistru river, through more intensive cross-river cooperation of various key actors (business companies, chambers of commerce, central institutions, local authorities, CSOs, healthcare and cultural institutions, media, etc.)
and the general population, they will come to know each other better, their mutual trust will be increased
and they will benefit from exchange of information, access to knowledge and best practices, stronger
capacity and know-how, and this will reduce the gap in the social, economic and sectoral development
of the two banks. Mistrust will be overcome, more equal access will be ensured to the opportunities
provided by the AA and its DCFTA, and integration between the two banks of the Nistru river will be
facilitated. Then the disparity between the districts from the right bank of the Nistru river and the
Transnistrian region will be reduced and Transnistria could be included in Moldovan-wide development
initiatives to facilitate future reintegration, thus creating solid conditions for future conflict resolution based
on increased mutual trust and understanding.