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ANNEX 1. TERMS OF REFERENCE

INTRODUCTION

The Independent Evaluation Office (IEO) of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) conducts independent country programme evaluations (ICPEs) to capture and demonstrate evaluative evidence of UNDP’s contributions to national development priorities, as well as the effectiveness of UNDP’s strategy in facilitating and leveraging national efforts for achieving development results. The purpose of an ICPE is to:

- Support the development of the next UNDP Country Programme Document
- Strengthen accountability of UNDP to national stakeholders
- Strengthen accountability of UNDP to the Executive Board

ICPEs are independent evaluations carried out within the overall provisions contained in the UNDP Evaluation Policy. 1 The IEO is independent of UNDP management and is headed by a Director who reports to the UNDP Executive Board. The responsibility of IEO is two-fold: (i) provide the Executive Board with valid and credible information from evaluations for corporate accountability, decision-making and improvement; and (ii) enhance the independence, credibility and utility of the evaluation function and its coherence, harmonization and alignment in support of United Nations reform and national ownership. Based on the principle of national ownership, IEO seeks to conduct ICPEs in collaboration with the national authorities where the country programme is implemented.

The Global COVID-19 pandemic has presented UNDP with considerable challenges in implementing its ongoing programme of work in line with the CPD. Even more so than usual, UNDP has been required to be adaptable, refocusing and restructuring its development work to meet the challenges of the pandemic and Country’s need to effectively prepare, respond and recover from the wider COVID-19 crisis, including its socio-economic consequences. This ICPE will also consider the level to which UNDP was able to adapt to the crisis and support country’s preparedness, response to the pandemic and its ability to recovery meeting the new development challenges that the pandemic has highlighted, or which may have emerged.

This is the second ICPE for Moldova, with the previous one conducted in 2012. The evaluation will be conducted in 2021 towards the end of the current UNDP programme cycle (2018-2022), with a view to contributing to the preparation of UNDP’s new programme starting from 2023. The ICPE will be conducted in close collaboration with the Government of Moldova and UNDP Regional Bureau for Europe and the CIS.

NATIONAL CONTEXT

The Republic of Moldova, hereinafter referred to as Moldova, is a landlocked low middle-income country with unstable economic performance but with good progress in human development. Over the years Moldova has seen a decline in its population (of 10.73% since 1992) and stand at 2.68 million (NBS, 2020). Moldova’s GDP growth rate pattern has also been relatively unstable, falling from 7.5% in 2005 to 3.58% in 2019 with at least three instances of negative growth rates in the same period.

Despite overall weak economic performance, the well-being of Moldavians has shown improvement over the recent years. Poverty decreased from 73.9% in 2005 to 12.8% in 2018 at a 5.5 USD per day (2011 PPP)

---

poverty line threshold. Similarly, income inequality has declined, with the Gini coefficient decreasing from 0.36 in 2000 to 0.25 in 2018. Unfortunately, the COVID-19 crisis is reversing some of these recent positive trends. The recent UNDP/UNFPA Socio-economic Impact assessment of COVID-19 reveals the triple hit of the pandemic on the economic status, including the devastating impact on poor and vulnerable groups, health and education spheres. Moldova is in the high human development category, with its human development index (HDI) increasing from 0.643 in 2000 to 0.75 in 2019, ranking the country 90th over 189 countries.

Moldova has made significant legislative progress in governance, human rights, and gender equality, but implementation is still lagging. Several laws have been enacted in the past three years in the area of public administration and justice including the 2021-2024 Strategy on ‘Ensuring Independence and Integrity of the Justice Sector (Nov 2020), however, slow implementation of reforms continues to affect the performance of the judicial system. In 2018, Moldova ranked 132 out of 140 countries in the 2019 Global Competitiveness Report of the World Economic Forum regarding the judicial system's independence from the Government.

Women’s political empowerment in the country remains weak. According to the WEF global gender gap index, there is nearly a 75% gap in ensuring female representation in decision-making positions. The 2019 parliamentary election has seen political parties' general compliance with the 40% gender quota requirement, however, only 19% of women registered on the national list were in top ten positions. A legal amendment was adopted in 2019 to bolster women’s representation to about 40% in the next parliamentary and local elections.

Moldova is carbon and energy-intensive economy. Total energy consumption is twice the European Union average, most of which is imported, posing a significant energy security risk. There is, however, a national commitment to greening the energy sector. The country has adopted a new law transposing the EU Energy Efficiency Directive and set up the Energy Efficiency Agency. Also, the national energy regulatory agency continues to strengthen its functional and financial independence. The country has weak environmental governance and progress in recent years has been limited at legislative and institutional levels. Moldova has considerably advanced in waste management policy and legislation development, however implementation is lagging behind.

Moldova has good progress in setting and updating of GHG emission targets and improving national capacities on climate action. In 2020 the country submitted its second NDC and initiated a national adaptation planning process. It has signed the Paris Agreement and has made legislative progress through the low emissions development strategy until 2030. However, despite being a significant risk for Moldova climate change mainstreaming in all policy-making areas remain a challenge.

---

6 IEA, Moldova Energy Profile, 2020, See: [https://www.iea.org/reports/moldova-energy-profile](https://www.iea.org/reports/moldova-energy-profile)
UNDP PROGRAMME IN MOLDOVA

UNDP began its operations in Moldova in October 1992 and since has worked closely with the Government of Moldova and its development partners to promote human development. Moldova has gone through a series of complex political, social and economic challenges in the past three decades, including debilitating natural disasters that have adversely affected people’s lives in recent years. With its strong interest in joining the European Union, the Government has launched rigorous public administration reforms to strengthen its ability to address national challenges.

The current UNDP country programme in Moldova is aligned with the Government’s National Development Strategy 2020 and vision Moldova 2030, and contributes to the United Nations Partnership Framework for Sustainable Development (UNPFSD 2018-2022). It is focused around three key pillars/ outcome areas: governance, human rights and gender equality (outcome 1); sustainable and inclusive growth (outcome 2); and climate change, energy and environment (outcome 3).

**Governance, human rights and gender equality:** UNDPs work within this pillar contributes to SDGs 5, 10 and 16 and focuses in supporting the country’s reform agenda on public administration and sectoral reforms to enhance institutional integrity and transparency and strengthening the capacity of the government, the parliament and local representative bodies to enable them to address the needs of those underrepresented in decision-making, such as women, youth, persons with disabilities and ethnic minorities to ensure their voices are heard. It has focussed on promoting ICT, innovation, business process re-engineering and data-informed policymaking to strengthen the foundations for effective and accessible public service delivery. Through its partnerships with the government, development partners and CSOs, UNDP works on mainstreaming gender equality and promoting women participation in decision-making and focuses on strengthening the rule of law, promoting human rights and expanding public participation in policy development, implementation and service delivery.10

**Sustainable and inclusive growth:** Contributing to SDGs 1, 4, 5, 8, 9, 10, 11 and 16, UNDP work under this pillar focuses on sustainable growth, promoting inclusive and green jobs, integrity-based business development and accountable, efficient and inclusive service provision and above all equal and equitable access to economic opportunities. It has worked on strengthening policies for inclusion of vulnerable groups and promoting women's access to entrepreneurship support schemes. In order to enhance accessibility of affordable local public services UNDPs work focuses on strengthening local government capacities to engage targeted groups and community members in the planning, delivery and monitoring of services.

**Climate change, environment and energy:** UNDP interventions under this pillar address SDGs 5, 8, 11, 12, 13, 15 and 16 and focus on advancing low-carbon and climate-resilient, risk-informed development by building up institutional, legal and individual capacities to respond to climate-related and human-made disasters in line with Paris Agreement commitments. Through targeted interventions in waste, medical and chemical management, UNDP supports public institutions to meet international standards for hazardous waste management. Another key area of UNDPs programme in the country explores the mitigation potential through promotion of renewable energy solutions, energy efficiency measures and supporting the reform and modernization of environmental management systems in line with EU standards and at the same time contributing to sustainable growth and job creation.11

10 UNDP Moldova CPD (2018-2022) and UNDP ATLAS project portfolio (22 Jan 2021)
11 UNDP Moldova CPD (2018-2022) and UNDP ATLAS project portfolio (22 Jan 2021)
The UNPFSD and UNDP country programme outputs and indicative resources against these three pillars are summarized in Table 1 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 1: The people of Moldova, especially most vulnerable, demand and benefit from democratic, transparent and accountable governance, gender-sensitive, human rights- and evidence-based public policies, equitable services, and efficient, effective and responsive public institutions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output 1.1: Enhanced legislative, oversight &amp; representation functions of Parliament responsive to the needs of the underrepresented and marginalized groups through the meaningful engagement of the latest</td>
<td>Regular: 0.9</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>23.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other: 25.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output 1.2: Responsive, evidence-based, human rights- and gender-mainstreamed policies and transparent, high-integrity institutions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output 1.3: Enhanced representation of women in decision making positions, with focus on Roma21 and young women Output 1.4: Women and men, including from minority and marginalized groups, are enjoying rule of Law and protection of human rights ensured by inclusive institutions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total outcome 1</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>23.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 2: The people of Moldova, especially most vulnerable, have access to enhanced livelihood opportunities, decent work and productive employment, generated by sustainable, inclusive and equitable economic growth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output 2.1: Public institutions and private entities have improved capacities to design and implement innovative policies for inclusive, resilient economic growth</td>
<td>Regular: 1.0</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>21.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other: 32.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output 2.2: Women, youth and people from regions with special status benefit from better skills, access to resources and sustainable jobs and livelihoods Output 2.3: Improved local public services and upgraded infrastructure to enhance accessibility to and boost resilient local economic development, including in regions with special status and across the conflict divide</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total outcome 2</td>
<td>33.8</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>21.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 3: The people of Moldova, especially most vulnerable, benefit from enhanced environmental governance, energy security, sustainable management of natural resources, and climate and disaster resilient development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output 3.1: Enhanced use of renewables and advanced energy efficiency</td>
<td>Regular: 0.85</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other: 40.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output 3.2: Improved national capacities for environmentally sound management practices in ecosystems, waste and chemicals Output 3.3: National and sub-national governments have improved capacities to integrate resilience to climate change and disasters into development plans and practices to reduce population’s vulnerability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total outcome 3</td>
<td>41.35</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td>101.65</td>
<td>60.24</td>
<td>50.18*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Main donors contributing to the UNDP programme in the country are the European Commission (36% of programme expenditure), the Government of Moldova (22%), Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation (9%) and the Swedish International Development Cooperation (8%). Other key donors contributing to programme expenditure to date include the US Bureau of International Narcotics and Law Enforcement Affairs, UNDP, Global Environmental Fund, USAID, Government of Norway, ADA and the private sector.

**SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION**

ICPEs are conducted in the penultimate year of the ongoing UNDP country programme in order to feed into the process of developing the new country programme. The ICPE will focus on the present programme cycle (2018-2022) while taking into account interventions which may have started in the previous programme cycle (2013-2017) but continued or concluded in the current programme cycle. As a country-level evaluation of UNDP, the ICPE will focus on the formal UNDP country programme approved by the Executive Board but will also consider any changes from the initial CPD during the period under review. The scope of the ICPE will include the entirety of UNDPs activities in the country and will therefore cover interventions funded by all sources, including core UNDP resources, donor funds, government funds, joint funds etc. Efforts will also be made to capture the role and contribution of UNV, UNCDF, if any, through undertaking joint work with UNDP.

**KEY EVALUATION QUESTIONS AND GUIDING PRINCIPLES**

The evaluation methodology will adhere to the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) Norms & Standards. The ICPE will address the following four main evaluation questions. These questions will also guide the presentation of the evaluation findings in the report.

1. What did the UNDP country programme intend to achieve during the period under review?
2. To what extent has the programme achieved (or is likely to achieve) its intended objectives?
3. To what extent has UNDP been able to adapt to the COVID-19 pandemic and support country’s preparedness, response and recovery process?
4. What factors contributed to or hindered UNDP's performance and eventually, to the sustainability of results?

ICPEs are conducted at the outcome level. To address question 1, a Theory of Change (ToC) approach will be used in consultation with stakeholders, as appropriate, to better understand how and under what conditions UNDP’s interventions are expected to lead to good governance, poverty reduction and sustainable human development in the country. Discussions of the ToC will focus on mapping the assumptions behind the programme's desired change(s) and the causal linkages between the intervention(s) and the intended country programme outcomes. As part of this analysis, the progression of the programme over the review period will also be examined. In assessing the CPD's progression, UNDP's capacity to adapt to the changing context in Moldova and respond to national development needs and priorities will also be looked at.

The effectiveness of UNDP's country programme will be analysed in response to evaluation question 2. This will include an assessment of the achieved results and the extent to which these results have contributed to

---

the intended CPD objectives. In this process, both positive and negative, direct and indirect as well as unintended results will be identified.

Evaluation question 3 will examine UNDPs support to COVID-19 preparedness, response and recovery at the Country level. This will include an assessment of the relevance and effectiveness of the support to the needs of partner countries; its alignment with national government plans as well as support from other UN Agencies, Donors and NGOs/CSOs; and its effectiveness in preventing loss of lives and livelihoods and protecting longer-term social and economic development. The analysis will also explore the extent to which UNDP’s funding decisions were informed by evidence, needs and risk analysis and dialogue with partners, the efficient use of resources and how the support has contributed to the development of social, economic and health systems that are equitable, resilient and sustainable.

To better understand UNDP’s performance, the specific factors that influenced - positively or negatively - UNDP’s performance and eventually, the sustainability of overall results in the country will be examined in response to evaluation question 4. They will be examined in alignment with the engagement principles, drivers of development and alignment parameters of the Strategic Plan,\textsuperscript{13} as well as the utilization of resources to deliver results and how managerial practices impacted achievement of programmatic goals. Special attention will be given to the integration of gender equality and women's empowerment in the design and implementation of the CPD.

Among the three key CPD Outcomes which will be reviewed as planned, to the extent possible, the evaluation team will assess UNDP efforts towards strengthening the environment for civic engagement and poverty reduction in Moldova.

**APPROACH AND METHODOLOGY**

**Assessment of existing data and data collection constraints:** The assessment indicates that there were 6 decentralized project evaluations undertaken during the CPD since 2018. The CO is currently undertaking three outcome evaluations which will be completed in the first quarter of 2021. All these decentralized evaluations will serve as important inputs into the ICPE. In addition, all project documentation, progress reports, annual reports and self-reported assessment will be taken into consideration.

With respect to indicators, the four CPD outcomes are supported by 14 outcome indicators and 10 outputs supported by 28 output indicators most of them accompanied with baselines and targets. To the extent possible, the ICPE will seek to use these indicators to better understand the intention of the UNDP programme and to measure or assess progress towards the outcomes. The data sources of the indicators are not always clearly identified and, in many cases, the evaluation’s ability to measure progress against these indicators will depend on national statistics.

It is also important to note that UNDP projects that contribute to different outcomes are at different stages of implementation, and therefore it may not always be possible to determine the projects' contribution to results. In cases where the projects/initiatives are still in their initial stages, the evaluation will document observable progress and seek to ascertain the possibility of achieving the outcome given the programme design and measures already put in place.

\textsuperscript{13} These principles include national ownership and capacity; human rights-based approach; sustainable human development; gender equality and women’s empowerment; voice and participation; South-South and triangular cooperation; active role as global citizens; and universality.
Data collection methods: The evaluation will use data from primary and secondary sources, including desk review of documentation and information and interviews with key informants, including beneficiaries, partners and managers. An advance questionnaire will be administered to the country office before the data collection mission in the country. A multi-stakeholder approach will be followed, and interviews will include government representatives, civil-society organizations, private-sector representatives, UN agencies, multilateral organizations, bilateral donors, and beneficiaries of the programme. Focus group discussions will be used to consult some groups of beneficiaries as appropriate.

The evaluation team will also undertake field visits to selected project sites to observe the projects first-hand. It is expected that regions where UNDP has a concentration of field projects (in more than one outcome area), as well as those where critical projects are being implemented will be considered. The ICPE will cover all outcome areas. The coverage will include a sample, as relevant, of both successful projects and projects reporting difficulties where lessons can be learned, both larger and smaller pilot projects, as well as both completed and active projects.

If the travel restrictions imposed by COVID continue, the stakeholder interviews and field missions will be conducted virtually, including with the help of national level consultants or institutions. The evaluation team will undertake an extensive review of documents. IEO and the country office will identify an initial list of background and programme-related documents which will be posted on an ICPE SharePoint website. The document review will include, among others: background documents on the national context, documents prepared by international partners during the period under review and documents prepared by UN system agencies; programme plans and frameworks; progress reports; monitoring self-assessments such as the yearly UNDP Results Oriented Annual Reports; and evaluations conducted by the country office and partners.

In line with UNDP's gender mainstreaming strategy, the ICPE will examine the level of gender mainstreaming across all of UNDP Moldova programmes and operations. The level of sustainability of the high gender standards achieved and confirmed by the Office’s certification with the Gold Gender Equality Seal in 2017 will be assessed. Gender disaggregated data will be collected, where available, and assessed against its programme outcomes.

Special attention will be given to integrate a gender-responsive evaluation approach to data collection methods. To assess gender, the evaluation will consider the gender marker\(^{14}\) in the portfolio analyses by outcome area and the gender results effectiveness scale (GRES) when assessing results. The GRES classifies gender results into five categories: gender negative, gender blind, gender targeted, gender responsive, gender transformative (see figure below). In addition, gender-related questions will be incorporated in the data collection methods and tools, such as the pre-mission questionnaire and interview questionnaire, and reporting.

---

14 A corporate tool to sensitize programme managers in advancing GEWE by assigning ratings to projects during their design phase to indicate the level of expected contribution to GEWE. It can also be used to track planned programme expenditures on GEWE (not actual expenditures).
**Validation:** The evaluation will triangulate information collected from different sources and/or by different methods to enhance the validity of findings.

**Stakeholder involvement:** A participatory and transparent process will be followed to engage with multiple stakeholders at all stages of the evaluation process. During the initial phase a stakeholder analysis will be conducted to identify all relevant UNDP partners, including those that may have not worked with UNDP but play a key role in the outcomes to which UNDP contributes. This stakeholder analysis will serve to identify key informants for interviews during the main data collection phase of the evaluation, and to examine any potential partnerships that could further improve UNDP’s contribution to the country.

**ICPE rating system:** Based on the rating system piloted by IEO under its Independent Country Programme Review (ICPR) model and the lessons learned from its application, IEO is currently developing a rating system for ICPEs which will be applied on a pilot basis to the ICPEs in 2021. Ratings will be applied to CPD Outputs and Outcomes, where ‘Outputs’ will be rated against UNDP country programme’s progress/achievement towards each of the planned outputs and ‘Outcomes’ will be rated against UNDPs contribution to CPD Outcome/UNSDCF outcome goals.

**MANAGEMENT ARRANGEMENTS**

**Independent Evaluation Office of UNDP:** The UNDP IEO will conduct the ICPE in consultation with the UNDP Moldova Country Office, the Regional Bureau for Europe and the CIS and the Government of Moldova. IEO Lead Evaluator will lead the evaluation and coordinate the evaluation team. IEO will meet all costs directly related to the conduct of the ICPE.

**UNDP Country Office in Moldova:** The country office will support the evaluation team to liaise with key partners and other stakeholders and ensure that all necessary information regarding UNDP’s programmes, projects and activities in the country is available to the team and provide factual verifications of the draft report on a timely basis. The country office will provide the evaluation team in-kind organizational support (e.g. arranging meetings with project staff, stakeholders, beneficiaries; assistance for project site visits). If travel is not possible due to COVID pandemic, the CO will support IEO to coordinate these virtually. To ensure the independence of the views expressed, country office staff will not participate in interviews and meetings with stakeholders held for data collection purposes. The country office will jointly organize the final
stakeholder meeting, ensuring participation of key government counterparts, through a videoconference with the IEO, where findings and results of the evaluation will be presented. Additionally, the country office will support the use and dissemination of the final outputs of the ICPE process.

**UNDP Regional Bureau for Europe and the CIS (RBEC):** RBEC will support the evaluation through information sharing and will also participate in discussions on emerging conclusions and recommendations.

**Evaluation Team:** The IEO will constitute an evaluation team to undertake the ICPE. The IEO will ensure gender balance in the team which will include the following members:

- **Lead Evaluator (LE):** IEO staff member with overall responsibility for managing the ICPE, including preparing for and designing the evaluation as well as selecting the evaluation team and providing methodological guidance. The LE will be responsible for the synthesis process and the preparation of the draft and final evaluation reports. The LE will be backstopped by another evaluator also from the IEO.

- **Consultant(s)/ national research institution/ think tanks:** IEO will recruit one international and one national consultant and also explore the possibility of engaging with a national research institution/think tank who will support the ICPE and be responsible for their designated outcome areas. Under the guidance of LE, they will conduct preliminary research and data collection activities, prepare outcome analysis papers, and contribute to the preparation of the final ICPE report.

- **Research Analyst:** An IEO research analyst will provide background research and will support the portfolio analysis.

**EVALUATION PROCESS**

The evaluation will be conducted according to the approved IEO process. The following represents a summary of the five key phases of the process, which constitute the framework for conducting the evaluation.

**Phase 1: Preparatory work.** The IEO prepares the ToR and the evaluation design. Once the TOR is approved, additional evaluation team members, comprising international and/or national development professionals will be recruited. The IEO starts collecting data and documentation internally first and then filling data gaps with help from the UNDP country office.

**Phase 2: Desk analysis.** Evaluation team members will conduct desk review of reference material, and identify specific evaluation questions, and issues in a detailed evaluation design matrix. Further in-depth data collection will be conducted, by administering an advance questionnaire and interviews (via phone, Skype, etc.) with key stakeholders, including country office staff. Based on this, detailed evaluation questions, gaps and issues that require validation during the field-based phase of the data collection will be identified.

**Phase 3: Data collection.** During this phase, the evaluation team will engage in data collection activities. Given the current travel limitations due to COVID most of the data collections and interviews will be undertaken virtually. The evaluation team will liaise with CO staff and management, key government stakeholders and other partners and beneficiaries during this stage. To supplement the virtual data collection, the ICPE team will include a national consultant and also explore the possibility of engaging with a national research institution/think tank to support the support the ICPE.
Phase 4: Analysis, report writing, quality review and debrief. Based on the analysis of data collected and triangulated, the LE will undertake a synthesis process to write the ICPE report. The draft will first be subject to peer review by IEO and its external reviewers. Once the draft is quality cleared, it will be circulated to the country office and the UNDP Regional Bureau for Europe and the CIS for factual corrections. The second draft, which takes into account any factual corrections, will be shared with national stakeholders for further comments. Any necessary additional corrections will be made, and the UNDP Moldova country office will prepare the management response to the ICPE, under the overall oversight of the regional bureau. The report will then be shared at a final debriefing where the results of the evaluation are presented to key national stakeholders. The way forward will be discussed with a view to creating greater ownership by national stakeholders with respect to the recommendations as well as to strengthening accountability of UNDP to national stakeholders. Taking into account the discussion at the stakeholder event, the evaluation report will be finalized and published.

Phase 5: Publication and dissemination. The ICPE report will be written in English. It will follow the standard IEO publication guidelines. The ICPE report will be widely distributed in both hard and electronic versions. The evaluation report will be made available to UNDP Executive Board by the time of approving a new Country Programme Document. It will be widely distributed by the IEO within UNDP as well as to the evaluation units of other international organizations, evaluation societies/networks and research institutions in the region. The Moldova country office and the Government of Moldova will disseminate to stakeholders in the country. The report and the management response will be published on the UNDP website as well as in the Evaluation Resource Centre. The Regional Bureau for Europe and the CIS will be responsible for monitoring and overseeing the implementation of follow-up actions in the Evaluation Resource Centre.

TIMEFRAME FOR THE ICPE PROCESS
The timeframe and responsibilities for the evaluation process are tentatively as follows in Table 3:

---

16 [web.undp.org/evaluation](http://web.undp.org/evaluation)
17 [erc.undp.org](http://erc.undp.org)
18 The timeframe, indicative of process and deadlines, does not imply full-time engagement of evaluation team during the period.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Responsible party</th>
<th>Proposed timeframe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phase 1: Preparatory work</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOR completed and approved by IEO Deputy Director</td>
<td>LE/ALE</td>
<td>Jan 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selection of consultant team members</td>
<td>LE/ALE</td>
<td>Feb 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phase 2: Desk analysis</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advance questionnaires to the CO</td>
<td>LE/ALE/CO</td>
<td>Feb-Mar 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary desk review of reference material</td>
<td>Evaluation team</td>
<td>Feb-Apr 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary country analysis paper</td>
<td>Consultants</td>
<td>May 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phase 3: Data collection</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation data collection, stakeholder interviews, field visits, etc.</td>
<td>LE/ALE/Consultant(s)</td>
<td>May-Jun 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phase 4: Analysis, report writing, quality review and debrief</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of data and submission of final Outcome Analysis Papers</td>
<td>LE/ALE/Consultant(s)</td>
<td>Jun-Jul 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synthesis and report writing</td>
<td>LE/ALE/Consultant(s)</td>
<td>July-Aug 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Validation mission in case of virtual field mission (optional, if needed) and CO preliminary de-brief</td>
<td>LE/ALE/Consultant(s)</td>
<td>Aug-Sep 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zero draft for internal IOE clearance/IEAP comments</td>
<td>LE/ALE</td>
<td>Aug-Sep 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First draft to CO/RBEC for comments</td>
<td>LE/ALE/CO/RBEC</td>
<td>Sep 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second draft shared with the Government and national stakeholders</td>
<td>LE/ALE/CO/GOV</td>
<td>Oct 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft management response</td>
<td>CO</td>
<td>Oct 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder workshop via videoconference</td>
<td>IEO/CO/RBEC</td>
<td>Nov-Dec 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phase 5: Publication and dissemination</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editing and formatting</td>
<td>IEO</td>
<td>Jan 2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final report and evaluation brief</td>
<td>IEO</td>
<td>Jan-Feb 2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissemination of the final report</td>
<td>IEO</td>
<td>Feb 2022</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# ANNEX 2. EVALUATION FRAMEWORK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Evaluation Questions</th>
<th>Sub-questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EQ 1. What did the UNDP country programme intend to achieve during the period under review?</td>
<td>1.1 What are UNDP’s outcomes as defined in the CPD?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.2 If there have been any changes to the programme design and implementation from the initial CPD, what were they, and why were the changes made?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQ 2. To what extent has the programme achieved (or is likely to achieve) its intended objectives?</td>
<td>2.1 To what extent and with which results did UNDP achieve its specific objectives (CP outputs) as defined in the CPD and other strategies (if different)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.2 To what extent did the achieved results contribute to the outcome?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQ 3. To what extent has UNDP been able to adapt to the COVID-19 pandemic and support country’s preparedness, response, and recovery process?</td>
<td>3.1 - To what extent has the support of UNDP been relevant to the needs of Country?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.2 How has UNDP response aligned with the government plans, as well as with the support of other agencies of the United Nations, donors and NGO/CSO?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.3 How well has UNDP supported the government to develop answers that reduce the loss of lives and protect social &amp; economic development in the long term?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.4 To what extent were UNDP funding decisions informed by policies, needs analysis, risk analysis and dialogue with members, and did they support an efficient use of resources?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.5 Has the support contributed to the development of social, economic and health systems in Moldova that are equitable, resilient, and sustainable?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQ 4. What factors contributed to or hindered UNDP’s performance and eventually, to the sustainability of results?</td>
<td>4.1 What programme design and implementation-related factors have contributed to or hindered results?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.2 How have the key principles of the Strategic Plan been applied to the country programme design?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.3 What mechanisms were put in place at the design and implementation stage to ensure the sustainability of results, given the identifiable risks?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

19 Key issues include: (1) ‘Working in partnership’: i) Within UN System; and ii)Outside UNS (South-South; civil society; private sector; and IFIs); (2) ‘Helping to achieve the 2030 Agenda’; (3) ‘6 Signature Solutions’: i) Keeping people out of poverty; ii) Strengthen effective, accountable, inclusive governance; iii) enhance prevention and recovery for resilient society; iv) promote nature-based solutions for sustainable plant; v) close the energy gap; and vi) strengthen gender equality; (4) ‘Improved business models (Performance; and Innovation)
ANNEX 3. PEOPLE CONSULTED

Government of Moldova

AMBROS Alexandru, Mayor of Ungheni, LPA
ANDROS Dorin, Ex-State Secretary for Regional Development, MARDE
ARDELEANU Vadim, Head of Project Management (PM) Division
BELIBOV Lilian
BESLEAGA Victor, Parliament of RM
BOGUTCAIA Valentina, Min Specialist, Customs Service
BORDEIANU Doina, Director, Centre for Continuous Electoral Training
CAPATINA Elena, Parliament of RM
CARASTAN Valentina, Mayor of Slobozia Mare village, Cahul District, LPA
CATARAGA Olga, Director National Center for Judicial Expertise
CECAN Valerian, Mayor of Mihaileni village, Riscani district LPA
CHIRONDA Victor, Deputy Mayor of Chisinau, Chisinau municipality
CHIRUTA Sergiu, Coordinator Chisinau Territorial Office, NLAC
CIUDIN Alexandru, Head of the Agency, Energy Efficiency Agency
CICATI Svetlana, Deputy Head of Legal Department, Parliament of RM
COLUM Valerian, Head of Project Financing, Energy Efficiency Agency
COSLET Mihail, Deputy Head, Police Forensic Center
CREANGA Ion, Head of Legal Department Parliament of RM
DANDIS Nicolae, Mayor of Cahul, LPA
DOGARU Raisa, Director National Employment Agency
ERHAN Ianus, General State Secretary, Mol, General Police Inspectorate
ERMURACHI Adrian, Deputy Secretary General, State Chancellery
ESIR Mihail, Mayor of Congaz village, ATU Gagauz Yeri, LPA
GHERGANOVA Anna, Head of Department, MHLSP, Employment & Migration Department
GORCEAG Gheorghe, MHSLP
GUTU Maia, Specialist Climate Change Unit, MARDE
GVIDIANI Alin, Head of Policies, Bureau for Reintegration
JACOT Victoria, Head of Climate Change Unit, MARDE
KISSA Vladimir, Chairman, Gagauz People’s Assembly
LEBEDINSCHI Maxim, Secretary Central Electoral Commission
LELIC Vadim, Mayor of Telenesti town LPA
LOZOVOI Mihail, Mayor of Sarata Galbena, Hancesti District LPA
MALAI, Tatiana Head of Public Law Department Parliament of RM
NEGURA Vladimir, Head of International Relations & PM Directorate
NISTOR Ludmila, Mayor of Parlit village, Ungheni District LPA
NAMOLOVAN Aliona, Chief Inspector, Customs Service/Customs Cooperation Section
PALII Lilia, Secretary General, MEI
PASLARAS Mihail, Head of the Policy and Assistance Projects, Border Police
PETRIOGLO Victor, Mayor of Vulcanesti town LPA
POSTICA Ruslan
PRIDA Igor, Mayor of Sarateni village, Leova District LPA
PRODAN Raisa, Main Specialist, Territorial Employment Division
ROMAN Dumitru, Head of Monitoring and Reporting Division Ombudsperson Office
SAPUNJI Serghei, Mayor of Chirsova village, ATU Gagauz Yeri, LPA
SARPE Vasile, Director, Center for Legal Medicine
SAVITCHI Elena, Mayor of Borogani village, Leova district LPA
SCOBIOALA Diana, Director National Institute for Justice
SIRKELI Maria, Head of Division, GPA Administration
SPATARU Aurelia, Deputy Director NBS
STIRBET Silvia, Mayor of Valeni, Cahul district LPA
STURZA Eduard, Mayor of Geamana village, Anenii Noi District LPA
SVET Vladislav, Head of directorate, Customs Service/Directorate for the organization of customs control and trade facilitation
TANASOGLO Olesea, Deputy Guvernor, ATU Gagauz Yeri
TAPIS Valentina, State Secretary, MARDE
TARNAVSCHI Aleksandr, Deputy Chairman, Gagauz People’s Assembly
TUMURUC Denis, Deputy Head of the Energy Policies, MEI
VACARCIUC Olga, Secretary General Ombudsperson Office
ZADNIPRU Rodica, Head of Strategic Assistance and Development Department, Parliament of RM
ZAHARIA Victor, Director, NLAC
ZUBCO Nadejda, Head of Bureau, Bureau for Relations with Diaspora
UNDP

ALBU Viorel, Project Manager
AL-KHATIB, Dima, Resident Representative
BELOUSIUJ Mihail, Programme Associate/Effective Governance
BERZOI Simion, former Project Officer
BOHANTOVA Laura, Communications Analyst
BOUNEGRU, Eva Project Manager
BUGAI, Veaceslav, Project Manager
BULAT Veaceslav, UNDP
CABAC Elena, Senior Project Officer
CASU Oxana, UNDP
CATIREV Nina, Ex-Project Technical Coordinator
CHELARU Nadejda
COCIRTA Alexandru, Programme Analyst/Effective Governance
CORINA Oprea, Operations Manager
CRACIUN Tatiana, UNDP
CRIVOLIUBIC Olga, Project Manager
CUZYOVA, Andrea Deputy Resident Representative
DARIE Andrei, Programme Specialist/Cluster Lead/Inclusive Growth
DARII Elena Programme Associate/Inclusive Growth
FREACAUTEANU Vitalie, Gender Focal Point
GAVRILITA Pavel, Project Manager
IESEANU, Valeria, Planning and Partnership Development Specialist
IVANCIOGLO Victoria
LOPOTENCO Veronica, Project Manager
MANOLE Ana-Maria
MILIMO Ian, UNDP, IRH
MUNTEAN Victoria Project Manager
NOVOHRADSKA Dagmar, Senior Project Specialist
OLARI Marcel, Project Manager
OLARU Elena, Programme Associate/Energy & Environment
OLOFYNSKAYA Natalia, Regional Technical Specialist, CC and DRR, UNDP, IRH
PANA-CARP Silvia, Programme Analyst/Energy & Environment
PARFENTIEV Dimitri, UNDP
PELIVAN Alexandru, Project Manager
PERCIUN Irina, Media Support Officer
PODOROGHIN Inga, Programme Specialist/Cluster Lead/Energy & Environment
ROTARI Ion, Head of Finance Unit
ROTARU Alexandru, Project Manager
ROSCA Valentin, NJ Project Manager
SKVORTOVA Alla, Ex-Cluster Lead/Effective Governance
STRATULAT, Alexandru Project Manager
SUSCHEVICI Denis, Head of Procurement & Operational Support Unit
TARIGRADEAN Maria, Project Manager
TERZI Anatolie, Programme Manager
TOMA Dorin, Ex-Project Officer
UDREA Dumitru, Project Manager
VASILACHI Andrei, Project Manager
VASILESCU Dumitru, Policy & Innovations Specialist
VIERU Vitalie, UNDP
ZINAIDA Adam, Programme Officer/Inclusive Growth

**UN Agencies**

ABASZADE Nigina, Resident Representative, UNFPA
ABRAMOVA, Iuliana OHCHR
ANDRIES, Svetlana Programme Specialist, UN Women
FERENCI Bea, OHCHR
FIOROTTO Laura, RCO Team Leader
GARAM Iuliana, WHO
MOISEVICI Natalia, IOM
PLAMADEALA Svetlana, UNAIDS
PAREA Denis, GEF SGP Coordinator
ROBU Tudor, Representative, FAO
ROSCA Victor, Director, UCIP IFAD
SPRINGETT Simion, UN Resident Coordinator
STOJANOVSKA Dominika, Representative UN Women
TCACI Ina, UNODC
TURCANU Traian, UNICEF

**Civil Society Organizations**
Bodrug-Lungu Valentina, Gender Expert Gender Center
Bostan Galina, Executive Director Centre for Analysis and Prevention of Corruption
Buzu Alexei, Gender Consultant, Development Partnership Center
Chiriac, Liubomir Executive Director IDIS Viitorul
Emelyanova Zinaida, Executive Director, IDEA
Feldman Yan, Head of Council, Equality Council
Ganchean Alexandru, Executive Director, Resonance Center
Gribincea Vladislav, Executive Director, LRCM
Indoitu Ana, President, INVENTO
Iulian, Groza Executive Director Institute for European Policies and Reforms
FEDOTOVA Ludmila, President/ Comrat Ecological Movement of Moldova NGO
Kulminski Vlad, Executive Director Institute for Strategic Initiatives
Lupusor, Adrian Executive Director Expert Grup
Mester, Vitalie Executive Director, Center for the Rights of People with Disabilities
Nastas Nicolae, Executive Director, HTA Telenesti
Nastas, Diana Member, HTA Telenesti
Panico Ceslav, Vice-Director Institute for Penal Reform
Parlicov Victor, Executive Director, Green City Lab
Popescul Veaceslav, Cross River Platform Leader Platform on Health
Postica, Pavel Lawyer, Promo-Lex
ROSCA Ion, President/ Dendrological Progress NGO
Raileanu, Sofia Executive Director, HTA Borogani, Leova
Trancalan Natalia, Executive Director, HTA Mihaileni, Rascani
Ursachi, Viorica Director Women Law Center
Victor, Koroli Executive Director, INFONET Alliance
Vrinceanu Veronica, Member HTA Sireti, Straseni

**SMEs and Business Associations**

Bilba Mihail, Vice President Chamber of Commerce and Industry of RM
Buzadji Ivan, Administrator IMC Congaz
Calenic Natalia, Member
Croitoru Vitalie, Small Business Owner, Geamana village, SME
Dudus Veaceslav, Director, Augusto LTD
Fala Iurie, Executive Director Moldova Fruct
Ganin, Yuri President Chamber of Commerce from Transnistrian region
Pascal Ludmila, Member Moldova Fruct
Pascual Jose Luis Gomez, CEO Premier Energy
Statova Ana, Director Gagauz Sofrasi
Surugiu Olga, CEO, Orange Moldova

**International organizations and donors**

AKHALKATSI, Anna Manager, WB
AMBERG Adam, Head of Development Cooperation, Embassy of Sweden
BALLARO Christian, EU Delegation
BARTALIS Zoltan, European Space Agency, European Space Agency
BILICI Virginia, Programme Officer, Embassy of Sweden
BURDELNII Eugeniu, Governance Advisor, UK Embassy
CARLEI, Alberto Head of the Bank European Investment Bank – Moldova
CELAC, Diana Programme Manager ADA
CHAWANI Rodgers, Resident Representative to RM IMF
CRETU, Viorica Deputy Director SDC
GELLIS, Victoria Team Lead, Democracy and Governance Programs USAID
GONCHAROVA, Olga Head of Development Cooperation, Embassy of Estonia
GULLETTE, David Human Rights OSCE
MOLCEAN Alexandru, Senior Program Manager, US Embassy/INL
NEUKIRC Claus, Head of Mission OSCE
PAGLIONE, Giuseppe EU Delegation
PAIERLE Oxana, Programme Officer, Embassy of Sweden
PERKINS Chris, Head of Programmes UK Embassy
PURICI, Roman Project Management Specialist Democracy and Governance Programs, USAID
VIDAICU Daniela, Programme Officer, Embassy of Sweden
TIIK Simmu, Charge d’Affaires, Embassy of Estonia
TULIN Volodimir, Ex- Resident Representative to RM IMF
ANNEX 4. DOCUMENTS CONSULTED

In addition to the documents named below, the evaluation team reviewed all provided UNDP Project level documentation that included but was not limited to project proposals, project progress and audit reports, mid-term and final evaluation reports, contracts and other available project level documentation. The evaluation team also consulted many websites, including of the Government of Moldova and its international partners and international development agencies.

2. EU, 2020, EU Roadmap for Engagement with Civil Society in the Republic of Moldova, 2018-2020
3. East European Foundation, 2019, Unequal Moldova Analysis of the most relevant inequalities in The Republic of Moldova
4. FHI, 2020, 2019 Civil Society Organization Sustainability Index for Moldova
5. ILO, Effective COVID-19 response in Moldova: Social dialogue for local job creation through Local Employment Partnerships
7. OHCHR, 2020, Asigurarea Drepturilor Omului în Republica Moldova în contextul pandemiei cu COVID-19
8. OECD, Republic of Moldova: Fostering small and medium sized company development
9. OECD, 2020, Promoting Exports and Supply-Chain Linkages in the Food Industry in the Republic of Moldova
10. OSCE, 2019, OSCE Led Survey on Violence against women, Well-being and safety of women, Moldova Report
14. Republic of Moldova, National Strategy Diaspora 2025
16. Republic of Moldova, National Integrity and Anti-Corruption Strategy for the years 2017-2020
17. Republic of Moldova, National Environmental Strategy (2014-2023)
19. Republic of Moldova, Republic of Moldova’s Intended National Determined Contribution
31. UN General Assembly, 2018, Resolution “Complete and unconditional withdrawal of foreign military forces from the territory of the Republic of Moldova” (document A/72/L.58)
32. UNCTAD stat, General Profile of Republic of Moldova
33. UN Moldova, 2020, COVID-19 Socio-Economic Response and Recovery Plan
34. UN Moldova, Moldova Social Cohesion and Reconciliation Index, 2018
35. UN Moldova, 2020, UN Country Common Assessment for Moldova
36. UN Resident Coordinator’s Office, 2020, Survey measuring the impact of COVID-19 on social cohesion in Moldova
37. UN Communication Strategy (2018-2020) and major communication briefs and infographics
39. UNDP, A Guide to the Application of Theories of Change to UNDP Programmes and Projects
40. UNDP, 2021, Leaving No One Behind: Impact of COVID-19 on the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs)
42. UNDP Moldova, Assessment of COVID -19 impact on gender roles
43. UNDP Moldova, 2020, What is the impact of COVID-19 on remittances in Republic of Moldova?
45. UNDP Moldova, Republic of Moldova, country programme performance summary, Reporting period: 2013-2017
46. UNDP Moldova Resident Representative Strategy Notes 2018
47. UNDP Moldova Resident Representative Strategy Notes 2019
48. UNDP Moldova Resident Representative Strategy Notes 2020
49. UNDP Moldova Resident Representative Strategy Notes 2021
50. UNDP Moldova, Donor Mapping and Resource Mobilization Action 2018-2021
52. UNDP Moldova, Rolling Partnership and Resource Mobilization Implementation Plan, 2019-2020
53. UNDP Moldova, Rolling Partnership and Resource Mobilization Implementation Plan, 2019-2020
54. UNDP Moldova, Addressing violence against women in the Republic of Moldova: exploring and learning from local solutions
55. UNDP Moldova, 2018, Results Oriented Annual Report 2018
56. UNDP Moldova, 2019, Results Oriented Annual Report 2019
57. UNDP Moldova, 2020, Results Oriented Annual Report 2020
58. UNDP Moldova Country Results Reports 2018
59. UNDP Moldova Country Results Reports 2019
60. UNDP Moldova Joint Work Plan 2018
61. UNDP Moldova Joint Work Plan 2019
62. UNDP Moldova Joint Work Plan 2020
63. UNDP Moldova Joint Work Plan 2021
64. UNDP Moldova Organigramme 2018
65. UNDP Moldova Organigramme 2019
66. UNDP Moldova Organigramme 2020
67. UNDP Moldova Organigramme 2021
68. UNDP Moldova, 2019, Realignment Advisory Mission Report
69. UNDP Moldova, Evaluation of UNDP Strategic Plan (2018-2021)
70. UNDP Moldova, National Integrity and Anti-corruption Strategy Impact Monitoring Survey - Moldova 2019
71. UNDP and UNFPA, Impact of COVID-19 on children and youth.
72. UNHCR, Assessment of the impact of COVID-19 on refugees, asylum-seekers and stateless persons in the Republic of Moldova
73. UNDP, 2017, Gender Equality Seal, Certificate Report
74. UN Women, The impact of COVID-19 on women’s and men’s lives and livelihoods in Europe and Central Asia: Preliminary Results from a Rapid Gender Assessment
75. UN Women, Assessment of COVID-19 impact on gender roles
76. USAID, 2020, 2019 Civil Society Organization Sustainability index, Central and Eastern Europe and Eurasia 23rd edition
77. World Bank – Republic of Moldova: 20 years of Partnership
78. World Bank, 2018, Moldova: Improving Access to Justice: From Resources to Results A Justice Sector Public Expenditure and Institutional Review
79. World Bank, 2016, Republic of Moldova Climate Adaptation Investment Planning Technical Assistance
# ANNEX 5. PROJECT LIST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CPD Output</th>
<th>Project ID</th>
<th>Project title</th>
<th>Output ID</th>
<th>Output Description</th>
<th>Start date</th>
<th>End date</th>
<th>Gender Marker</th>
<th>Implementation modality</th>
<th>Implementation partner</th>
<th>Budget Total</th>
<th>Expenditure Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcome 1: The people of Moldova, especially most vulnerable, demand and benefit from democratic, transparent and accountable governance, gender-sensitive, human rights- and evidence- based public policies, equitable services, and efficient, effective and responsive public institutions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output 1.1</td>
<td>00126070</td>
<td>Enhancing gender equality in the Parliament</td>
<td>00120231</td>
<td>Initiation Women Caucus</td>
<td>8/1/2020</td>
<td>1/31/2021</td>
<td>GEN3</td>
<td>NIM</td>
<td>Parliament of Moldova</td>
<td>$53,000</td>
<td>$25,096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output 1.2</td>
<td>00094503</td>
<td>Electoral Support Phase III</td>
<td>00098623</td>
<td>Elections capacity building</td>
<td>7/1/2017</td>
<td>12/31/2023</td>
<td>GEN2</td>
<td>NIM</td>
<td>Central Electoral Commission</td>
<td>$3,040,146</td>
<td>$2,899,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output 1.2</td>
<td>00101965</td>
<td>Support Services MoH</td>
<td>00104204</td>
<td>Procurement Supp.Serv. MoH</td>
<td>1/1/2017</td>
<td>1/31/2020</td>
<td>GEN2</td>
<td>NIM</td>
<td>GOVERNMENT</td>
<td>$2,352,050</td>
<td>$2,268,492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output 1.2</td>
<td>00109897</td>
<td>Support to Security Sector Reform</td>
<td>00109042</td>
<td>Support to Security Sector Ref</td>
<td>4/1/2018</td>
<td>3/31/2021</td>
<td>GEN2</td>
<td>NIM</td>
<td>GOVERNMENT</td>
<td>$2,407,066</td>
<td>$2,044,322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output 1.4</td>
<td>00062264</td>
<td>Support to Justice Sector Reform in Moldova</td>
<td>00088321</td>
<td>Support to Justice Reform</td>
<td>12/1/2013</td>
<td>3/31/2021</td>
<td>GEN1</td>
<td>NIM</td>
<td>Nat.Centre for Judicial Expert</td>
<td>$1,414,427</td>
<td>$1,161,287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total budget Outcome 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$30,860,627</td>
<td>$24,351,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcome 2: The people of Moldova, especially most vulnerable, have access to enhanced livelihood opportunities, decent work and productive employment, generated by sustainable, inclusive and equitable economic growth</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPD Output</td>
<td>Project ID</td>
<td>Project title</td>
<td>Output ID</td>
<td>Output Description</td>
<td>Start date</td>
<td>End date</td>
<td>Gender Marker</td>
<td>Implementation modality</td>
<td>Implementation partner</td>
<td>B-Total</td>
<td>E-Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output 2.1</td>
<td>00081246</td>
<td>Support to Confidence Building Measures Programme IV</td>
<td>00090592</td>
<td>Business Development</td>
<td>3/15/2015</td>
<td>12/31/2021</td>
<td>GEN2</td>
<td>DIM</td>
<td>UNDP</td>
<td>$30,495</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>00120492</td>
<td>Moldova Innovation Lab (MiLab)</td>
<td>00116684</td>
<td>Innovation LAB</td>
<td>6/1/2019</td>
<td>12/31/2023</td>
<td>GEN2</td>
<td>DIM</td>
<td>UNDP</td>
<td>$342,314</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>00120492</td>
<td>Moldova Innovation Lab (MiLab)</td>
<td>00116684</td>
<td>Innovation LAB</td>
<td>6/1/2019</td>
<td>12/31/2023</td>
<td>GEN2</td>
<td>DIM</td>
<td>UNDP</td>
<td>$288,017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output 2.2</td>
<td>00101999</td>
<td>Confidence Building Measures Programme V (CBM V)</td>
<td>00104226</td>
<td>Confidence Building Measures</td>
<td>1/1/2019</td>
<td>12/31/2021</td>
<td>GEN2</td>
<td>DIM</td>
<td>UNDP</td>
<td>$10,575,096</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>00101999</td>
<td>Confidence Building Measures Programme V (CBM V)</td>
<td>00104226</td>
<td>Confidence Building Measures</td>
<td>1/1/2019</td>
<td>12/31/2021</td>
<td>GEN2</td>
<td>DIM</td>
<td>UNDP</td>
<td>$4,241,471</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output 2.2</td>
<td>00110795</td>
<td>Transnistrian Dialogues</td>
<td>00110006</td>
<td>Transnistrian Dialogues</td>
<td>4/19/2018</td>
<td>4/18/2019</td>
<td>GEN2</td>
<td>DIM</td>
<td>UNDP</td>
<td>$321,600</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>00110795</td>
<td>Transnistrian Dialogues</td>
<td>00110006</td>
<td>Transnistrian Dialogues</td>
<td>4/19/2018</td>
<td>4/18/2019</td>
<td>GEN2</td>
<td>DIM</td>
<td>UNDP</td>
<td>$271,361</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output 2.3</td>
<td>00087156</td>
<td>Migration and Local Development</td>
<td>00094265</td>
<td>Migration and Developmen</td>
<td>7/1/2015</td>
<td>3/31/2019</td>
<td>GEN2</td>
<td>NIM</td>
<td>State Chancellery of RM</td>
<td>$1,340,845</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>00087156</td>
<td>Migration and Local Development</td>
<td>00094265</td>
<td>Migration and Developmen</td>
<td>7/1/2015</td>
<td>3/31/2019</td>
<td>GEN2</td>
<td>NIM</td>
<td>State Chancellery of RM</td>
<td>$1,294,843</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output 2.3</td>
<td>00089235</td>
<td>Support Local Development</td>
<td>00097628</td>
<td>Gagauzia Rural Developmen</td>
<td>12/29/2015</td>
<td>2/28/2019</td>
<td>GEN2</td>
<td>DIM</td>
<td>UNDP</td>
<td>$5,348,494</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output 2.3</td>
<td>00104937</td>
<td>EU4Moldova: Focal regions</td>
<td>00106290</td>
<td>Focal regions</td>
<td>11/20/2019</td>
<td>11/20/2024</td>
<td>GEN2</td>
<td>DIM</td>
<td>UNDP</td>
<td>$11,068,577</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>00104937</td>
<td>EU4Moldova: Focal regions</td>
<td>00106290</td>
<td>Focal regions</td>
<td>11/20/2019</td>
<td>11/20/2024</td>
<td>GEN2</td>
<td>DIM</td>
<td>UNDP</td>
<td>$2,970,118</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output 2.3</td>
<td>00111667</td>
<td>Migration and Local Development (MIDL II)</td>
<td>00110562</td>
<td>Migration and Local Developmen</td>
<td>1/1/2019</td>
<td>12/31/2021</td>
<td>GEN2</td>
<td>NIM</td>
<td>State Chancellery of RM</td>
<td>$5,569,416</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>00111667</td>
<td>Migration and Local Development (MIDL II)</td>
<td>00110562</td>
<td>Migration and Local Developmen</td>
<td>1/1/2019</td>
<td>12/31/2021</td>
<td>GEN2</td>
<td>NIM</td>
<td>State Chancellery of RM</td>
<td>$3,849,181</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total budget Outcome 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Outcome 3**

The people of Moldova, especially most vulnerable, benefit from enhanced environmental governance, energy security, sustainable management of natural resources, and climate and disaster resilient development.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Output 3.1</th>
<th>00061146</th>
<th>Moldova Energy and Biomass Project</th>
<th>00093336</th>
<th>Municipal Biomass Heating</th>
<th>1/1/2015</th>
<th>12/31/2018</th>
<th>GEN2</th>
<th>NIM</th>
<th>Ministry of Economy</th>
<th>$2,419,319</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>00061146</td>
<td>Moldova Energy and Biomass Project</td>
<td>00093336</td>
<td>Municipal Biomass Heating</td>
<td>1/1/2015</td>
<td>12/31/2018</td>
<td>GEN2</td>
<td>NIM</td>
<td>Ministry of Economy</td>
<td>$2,158,345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output 3.2</td>
<td>00081126</td>
<td>Biodiversity Conservation Mainstreaming</td>
<td>00090554</td>
<td>Biodiversity Conservation Main</td>
<td>3/10/2015</td>
<td>12/31/2018</td>
<td>GEN2</td>
<td>NIM</td>
<td>MARDE</td>
<td>$172,474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output 3.3</td>
<td>00104945</td>
<td>NAP-2</td>
<td>00106296</td>
<td>CC Adaptation Plan</td>
<td>3/23/2020</td>
<td>3/23/2024</td>
<td>GEN2</td>
<td>DIM</td>
<td>UNDP</td>
<td>$950,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output 3.3</td>
<td>00109975</td>
<td>Dniester Impact Study</td>
<td>00109119</td>
<td>Dniester - Impact study</td>
<td>9/1/2018</td>
<td>6/30/2021</td>
<td>GEN1</td>
<td>NIM</td>
<td>MARDE</td>
<td>$921,690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output 3.3</td>
<td>0011725</td>
<td>CC and DRR in water sector</td>
<td>00110585</td>
<td>CC and DRR in water sector</td>
<td>9/1/2018</td>
<td>11/30/2021</td>
<td>GEN2</td>
<td>NIM</td>
<td>Civil Protection Service Moldova</td>
<td>$1,765,164</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total budget Outcome 3**

$10,966,973 $4,559,932

**Grand total**

$83,159,734 $51,806,087

*Source: Data from UNDP Atlas 21 July 2021*
# ANNEX 6. STATUS OF COUNTRY PROGRAMME DOCUMENT (CPD) OUTCOME & OUTPUT INDICATORS MATRIX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome Indicator</th>
<th>Outcome Baseline</th>
<th>Outcome Target: 2022</th>
<th>Outcome Indicator Status/Progress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcome 1: The people of Moldova, especially most vulnerable, demand and benefit from democratic, transparent and accountable governance, gender-sensitive, human rights- and evidence-based public policies, equitable services, and efficient, effective and responsive public institutions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>29.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator 1.1 % of people who trust in governance institutions (parliament, government, justice) by sex urban/rural status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Parliament total</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Government rural</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>23.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Justice (total)</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4 Justice (men)</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5 Justice (women)</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6 Justice Urban</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7 Justice rural</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.8 Parliament men</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.9 Parliament women</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.10 Parliament rural</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>22.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.11 Parliament urban</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.12 Government total</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.13 Government men</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.14 Government women</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.15 Government urban</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Households and businesses facing corruption in the last 12 months, % of the interviewed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.1 Households</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>Proportion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.2 Business</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Proportion of women and men elected/appointed in the Parliament, Government cabinet and local public authorities (LPAs)</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>24.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3.1 Members of Parliament (Women)</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3.10 LPA district councillors (Men)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3.2 Members of Parliament (Men)</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3.3 Government Cabinet (Women)</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>16.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3.4 Government Cabinet (Men)</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3.5 LPA mayors (Women)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3.6 LPA mayors (Men)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3.7 LPA local councillors (Women)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>36.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3.8 LPA local councillors (Men)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3.9 LPA district councillors (Women)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**OUTCOME 2:** The people of Moldova, especially most vulnerable, have access to enhanced livelihood opportunities, decent work and productive employment, generated by sustainable, inclusive and equitable economic growth.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator 2.1 : Employment rate by sex, age, urban/rural</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Proportion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Employment rate, by sex, age, urban/rural</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>44.1</td>
<td>40.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.1 Total employment</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.10 15 - 24 years old</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19.90</td>
<td>21.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.11 25 - 34 years old</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>53.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.12 35 - 44 years old</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>60.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.13 45 - 54 years old</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.14 55 - 64 years old</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.2 Urban</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.3 Rural</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.4 Women (Total)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.1.5 Women (Urban) | 0 | 43 | 42 | 39
2.1.6 Women (Rural) | 0 | 41 | 33 | 31
2.1.7 Men (Total) | 0 | 45 | 44 | 43
2.1.8 Men (Urban) | 0 | 43 | 39 | 38
2.1.9 Men (Rural) | 0 | 29 | 27 | 29
2.2 Proportion of young people, aged 15-29, not in employment, education or training (NEETs)
2.2.1 Total | 0 | 26 | 27 | 27
2.2.2 Men | 0 | 21 | 21 | 19
2.2.3 Women | 0 | 32 | 32 | 35
2.2.4 Urban | 0 | 24 | 26 | 24
2.2.5 Rural | 0 | 29 | 27 | 29
2.3 Small Area Deprivation Index (SADI) as average of SADI ranks for communities from the 1st quintile, by regions and SADI components (economic, environment, infrastructure)
2.3.1 SADI Total: North | 0 | 85 | 85 | 85
2.3.10 SADI: Environment Deprivation - North | 0 | 85 | 102 | 102
2.3.11 SADI: Environment Deprivation - Center | 0 | 85 | 74 | 74
2.3.12 SADI: Environment Deprivation - South | 0 | 85 | 81 | 81
2.3.13 SADI: Environment Deprivation - Gagauzia | 0 | 85 | 101 | 101
2.3.14 SADI: Infrastructure Deprivation - North | 0 | 85 | 77 | 77
2.3.15 SADI: Infrastructure Deprivation - Center | 0 | 85 | 91 | 91
2.3.16 SADI: Infrastructure Deprivation - South | 0 | 85 | 99 | 99
2.3.2 SADI Total: Center | 0 | 85 | 82 | 82
2.3.3 SADI Total: South | 0 | 85 | 105 | 105
2.3.4 SADI Total: Gagauzia | 0 | 85 | 140 | 140
2.3.5 SADI: Economic Deprivation - North | 0 | 85 | 105 | 105
2.3.6 SADI: Economic Deprivation - Center | 0 | 85 | 76 | 76
| 2.3.8 SADI: Economic Deprivation - Gagauzia | 0 | 86 | 68 | 68 |
| 2.3.9 SADI: Economic Deprivation - Chisinau | 0 | 85 | 101 | 101 |
| 2.4.7 SADI: Economic Deprivation - South | 0 | 85 | 103 | 103 |
| 2.4 Global Competitiveness Index (GCI) | 0 | 4.04 | 5.6 | 5.6 |

**Outcome 3** The people of Moldova, especially most vulnerable, benefit from enhanced environmental governance, energy security, sustainable management of natural resources, and climate and disaster resilient development

| 3.1 Greenhouse gas emissions by energy sector | 8.4 | 6.72 | 9.9 | 8.4 |
| 3.1.1 Greenhouse gas emissions by energy sector | 0 | 29.7 | 27.6 | 27.6 |
| 3.2 Share of renewables in the gross final energy consumption | 0 | 30,000 | 24,000 | 24,000 |
| 3.2.1 Share of renewables in the gross final energy consumption | 0 | 14,430 | 11,520 | 11,520 |
| 3.4 Number of people in rural areas benefiting from sustainable natural resource practices, by sex | 0 | 27 | 19.65 | 19.65 |
| 3.4.1 Number of people in rural areas benefiting from sustainable natural resource practices, by sex (Total) | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 3.4.2 Number of people in rural areas benefiting from sustainable natural resource practices, by sex (Men) | 0 | NA | NA | NA |
| 3.4.3 Number of people in rural areas benefiting from sustainable natural resource practices, by sex (Women) | 0 | NA | NA | NA |
| 3.5 Proportion of districts applying climate resilient practices | 0 | NA | NA | NA |
| 3.5.1 Proportion of districts applying climate resilient practices | 0 | NA | NA | NA |
| 3.6 Extent to which special climate finance is accessed by Moldova | 0 | NA | NA | NA |
| 3.6.1 Extent to which special climate finance is accessed by Moldova | 0 | NA | NA | NA |

**Source:** UNDP Corporate Planning System