

REPUBLIC OF MOLDOVA

**Final Evaluation of
UN - Republic of Moldova Partnership
Framework 2013-2017**

Final Evaluation Report (vol.2)

August 2016



Prepared for UN Moldova by:

Camelia Gheorghe (Team Leader, International Consultant)

Serghei Ostaf (national expert)

Olesea Stamate (national expert)

with contribution from two national migration consultants:

Maria Vremis

Viorica Toarta

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Annex 1 – Terms of Reference	4
Annex 2 – Primary Data Collection Methods	9
Annex 3 – Evaluation Matrix	11
Annex 4 – Primary Data Collection Tools	20
Annex 5 – Response of UN agencies to call for one-pager and questionnaire	31
Annex 6 – Documents Consulted during Evaluation	32
Annex 7 – People Consulted during Evaluation.....	37
Annex 8 – Appraisal of results indicators in UNPF	44
Annex 9 – List of policy documents supported by UN Moldova 2013-2016	67
Annex 10 – Case Study	70
Annex 11 – UNPF planned and spent budget	75

Annex 1 – Terms of Reference

Job title: *External consultant for the final evaluation of the UN-Republic of Moldova Partnership Framework 2013-2017 (UNPF) and conduct of the Common Country Assessment (CCA)*

Duty station: Chisinau, Moldova

Reference to the project: UN Country Office

Contract type: IC

Duration of assignment: 35 working days (25 days evaluation; 10 days CCA)

Starting date: March 2016

Background

The United Nations–Republic of Moldova Partnership Framework 2013–2017 (UNPF) voices the collective determination of the United Nations to support Moldova in tackling major development challenges as it implements its vision to be a prosperous and modern European country.

The five year UNPF was developed collectively by the UN Country Team (UNCT) and the Government of Moldova and through extensive consultation with other partners. It provides focus and direction to the UN development system in Moldova in setting its operational priorities. It was designed with a view to supporting Moldova's efforts to achieve the Millennium Development Goals, as well as its European integration ambitions.

The five programming principles of a human rights-based approach, gender equality, environmental sustainability, results-based management and capacity development underpin the UNPF. The expected results are organized by three thematic pillars: democratic governance, justice, equality and human rights; human development and social inclusion; environment, climate change and disaster risk management.

The UNCT in the Republic of Moldova consists of 11 agencies: FAO, ILO, IOM, OHCHR, UNAIDS, UNDP, UNFPA, UNHCR, UNICEF, UN Women, and WHO. The non-resident agencies are IAEA, ITC, UNCITRAL, UNCTAD, UNECE, UNEP, UNESCO, UNIDO and UNODC.

Objective

The objective of the current assignment is two-fold:

1. Perform the final evaluation of the 2013-2017 UNPF with the scope of gathering key findings and lessons learned to inform the next UNDAF planning cycle, including the CCA;
2. Conduct the CCA;

Scope of work and expected output

1. *Final evaluation of the 2013-2017 UNPF (25 days, of which up to 10 days in Moldova and the remainder home based)*

UNCT Moldova is currently in the process of preparing the final evaluation of the 2013-2017 UNPF, which is mandatory in the penultimate year of the UNDAF cycle and should serve as a major input for the planning process of next UNDAF cycle. This is a programmatic evaluation which will assess performance against the 2013-2017 UNPF results framework, its strategic intent and objectives.

The main objective of the UNPF evaluation is to assess the contribution of UN system to national development targets and priorities through the UNPF outcomes. It will assess the effectiveness and efficiency by which UNPF outcomes are being achieved, their sustainability and relevance to national priorities and goals;

The evaluation will use standard OECD/DAC criteria (*role, relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability of results*) as well as key issues of *design, focus* and *comparative advantage* of the UN system, as basis for its methodology. The evaluation will be informed by existing analytical work of the Government, UN Moldova and other partners. In addition, the UNPF evaluation will address how the intervention sought to mainstream the five programming principles: human rights-based approach, gender equality, environmental sustainability, results-based management, and capacity development.

Given that (1) outcomes are, by definition, the work of a number of partners, and (2) UNDAF outcomes are set at a very high level, attribution of development change to the UNCT (in the sense of establishing a causal linkage between human rights and development interventions and observed results) may be extremely difficult and in many cases infeasible. To make the assessment, first, the evaluator will examine the stated UNPF outcome; identify the change over the period being evaluated on the basis of available baseline information; and observe the national strategy/strategies and actions in support of that change. Second, the evaluator will examine the implementation of UNPF strategy and actions in support of national efforts.

The findings of the evaluation will be used for improving accountability and for learning what has worked, what has not and why. The evaluation of the 2013-2017 UNPF is foreseen to provide important information for the strengthening of programming and results at the country level, specifically informing the planning and decision-making for the next UNDAF cycle (2018-2022) and for further improving UN coordination and coherence at the country level. The evaluation report will be an important document to inform and guide both the CCA and the next UNDAF cycle.

The evaluation is to be carried out in cooperation with the UNCT. The overall approach is participatory and orientated towards learning how to jointly enhance development effectiveness at the national level. National authorities, development partners and civil society will be key partners in the evaluation, contributing both through data from national systems and validation of UNPF evaluation results. The main beneficiaries of the UNPF evaluation will be the UNCT, the Government, development partners and civil society.

Data collection methods and process should consider gender sensitivity and diversity.

The consultant will bear the main responsibility for the conduct of the evaluation. This entails, among other responsibilities, designing the evaluation according to this terms of reference; gathering data from different sources of information; analyzing, organizing and triangulating the information; identifying patterns and causal linkages that explain UNPF performance and impact; drafting evaluation reports at different stages (inception, draft, final); responding to comments and factual corrections from stakeholders and incorporating them, as appropriate, in subsequent versions; and making briefs and presentations ensuring the evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendations are communicated in a coherent, clear and understandable manner once the report is completed.

The evaluation process is expected to contain the following three phases:

- Inception phase (3 days) - the consultant will review documentation, agree on the meeting schedule with the UN Resident Coordinator's Office (RCO), and produce an evaluation inception report;
- Data collection and field visit (10 days) – the consultant will gather data through group and individual interviews, questionnaires and visits, if needed; at the end of the mission, presentation with preliminary findings and recommendations will be presented to UNCT;
- Analysis and reporting (12 days) – the consultant will prepare the draft evaluation report based on the analysis of findings, including triangulation, and will include recommendations for the new UNDAF cycle. He/she will submit the report to the UNCT for factual review and comments. Opportunity to comment on the draft report will be open to the group for a maximum of ten working days. After this process ends, the consultant will proceed with production of the final evaluation report.

2. CCA (10 days, of which up to 5 days in Moldova and the remainder home-based)

The CCA will inform the development and strategic prioritization of the next UNDAF. Building on existing analytical work by the Government, UN Moldova and other partners, the main objectives of the CCA are to:

- Help identify development challenges and national priorities;
- Further contribute to mapping UNDS work in the country and determine its comparative advantages vis-à-vis the identified challenges and priorities, as well as other development partners.

The CCA will focus on:

- Assess the situation of the country with respect to the SDGs and other internationally agreed development goals and treaty obligations;
- Identify patterns of discrimination, inequality and exclusion, and define vulnerable groups and geographical pockets of deprivation;
- Assess capacity assets and gaps at different levels;
- Assess the risks of conflict and natural disasters, as well as the readiness of the country to respond.

Deliverables

Deliverable/milestone		Estimated date
UNPF evaluation		
1.	Inception report will include proposed methods; proposed sources of data; and data collection procedures. The inception report should include a proposed schedule of tasks, activities and deliverables.	by March 25 th , 2016
2.	Presentation of initial findings and provisional recommendations to the UNCT (upon in country mission scheduled for April 18 th - 27 th)	by May 5 th . 2016

3.	Draft UNPF evaluation report	by May 20 th , 2016
4.	Final UNPF evaluation report	by May 31 st , 2016
CCA		
5.	CCA report produced	by July 8 th , 2016

Timeframe and institutional arrangements

The timeframe for the assignment of the consultant is planned tentatively for March-June 2016. The RCO and the UNCT will support the consultant with the following:

- Secure two independent national consultants who will provide general support to the international consultant for the duration of the evaluation process and one national consultant for the CCA;
- Secure two independent national consultants who will provide expert-support to the international consultant in the thematic field of migration for the duration of the UNDAF evaluation and CCA process;
- Provide relevant background documentation required for assignment;
- Provide lists of contacts in advance and supplements upon request;
- Provide vehicle and driver for field visits;
- Organize consultative meetings, briefing and debriefing sessions;
- Provide office/working space during the assignment. The consultant will however have to use her/his own computer/laptop.

Management arrangements

The consultant will work in close collaboration with UNCT and UNPF Results Groups. The consultant will report to the UN Resident Coordinator/UNDP Resident Representative and the RC Coordination Specialist. Day-to-day evaluation management will be ensured through the RCO.

Financial arrangements

All candidates will be required to submit an aggregated financial offer ("aggregated financial offer" is the total sum of all financial claims of the candidate for accomplishment of the task). Payment will be disbursed in several instalments upon submission and approval of deliverables and certification by the UN Resident Coordinator/UNDP Resident Representative that the services have been satisfactorily performed.

Qualifications and skills required

Qualifications

- Advanced university degree in international development, economics, evaluation, social sciences or related field.

Experience and knowledge

- A minimum of 7 years of professional experience specifically in the area of evaluation of international development initiatives and development organizations;
- Extensive knowledge of, and experience in applying, qualitative and quantitative evaluation methods and in a wide range of evaluation approaches;
- Technical competence in undertaking complex evaluations which involve use of mixed methods;
- Knowledge of UN role, UN reform process and UN programming at the country level, particularly UNDAF;
- Strong experience and knowledge in the five UNDAF programming principles: human rights (the human rights based approach to programming, human rights analysis and related mandates within the UN system) gender equality (especially gender analysis), environmental sustainability, results based management, and capacity development;
- Understanding of the development context and working experience in Moldova and the region is an asset.

Abilities

- Fluency in English, knowledge of Romanian and/or Russian will be a strong asset.

Skills

- Computer literacy and ability to effectively use office technology equipment, IT tools.

Documents to be included when submitting the proposals

Interested individual consultants must submit the following documents/information to demonstrate their qualifications:

1. Financial proposal;

The financial proposal shall specify a total lump sum amount, and payment terms around specific and measurable (qualitative and quantitative) deliverables (i.e. whether payments fall in installments or upon completion of the entire contract). Payments are based upon output, i.e. upon delivery of the services specified in the TOR. In order to assist the requesting unit in the comparison of financial proposals, the financial proposal will include a breakdown of this lump sum amount (including travel, per diems, and number of anticipated working days).

Travel

All envisaged travel costs must be included in the financial proposal. This includes all travel to join duty station/repatriation travel. In general, UNDP does not accept travel costs exceeding those of an economy class ticket. Should the IC wish to travel on a higher class he/she should do so using their own resources.

In the case of unforeseeable travel, payment of travel costs including tickets, lodging and terminal expenses should be agreed upon, between UNDP Moldova and the Consultant, prior to travel and will be reimbursed.

2. Personal CV/P11 form including past experience in similar projects and contacts for at least three reference persons.

EVALUATION

Minimum qualification criteria:

- Advanced university degree in international development, economics, evaluation, social sciences or related field;
- A minimum of 7 years of professional experience specifically in the area of evaluation of international development initiatives and development organizations

The individual consultants will be evaluated based on the following methodology:

Cumulative analysis

The award of the contract shall be made to the individual consultant whose offer has been evaluated and determined as:

a) responsive/compliant/acceptable, and

b) having received the highest score out of a pre-determined set of weighted technical and financial criteria specific to the solicitation.

* Technical Criteria weight – 60% (300 pts);

* Financial Criteria weight – 40% (200 pts).

Only candidates obtaining a minimum of 210 points would be considered for the Financial Evaluation.

Criteria	Scoring	Maximum Points Obtainable
Technical		
Advanced university degree in international development, economics, evaluation, social sciences or related field	(MSc-20 pts; PhD-30 pts)	30
A minimum of 7 years of professional experience specifically in the area of evaluation of international development initiatives and development organizations	(7 years – 60 pts; >7 years – 2 pts for each additional year up to max additional 10 pts)	70
Experience in applying, qualitative and quantitative evaluation methods and in a wide range of evaluation approaches	(up to 7 years - 30 pts; >7 years - 40 pts)	40

Technical competence in undertaking complex evaluations which involve use of mixed methods (links to the documents to be provided)	(to some extent - 20 pts, strong yes - 40 pts)	40
Knowledge of UN role, UN reform process and UN programming at the country level, particularly UNDAF	(to some extent - 20 pts, strong yes - 30 pts)	30
Strong experience and knowledge in the five UNDAF programming principles: human rights (the human rights based approach to programming, human rights analysis and related mandates within the UN system) gender equality (especially gender analysis), environmental sustainability, results based management, and capacity development	(to some extent - 20 pts, strong yes - 40 pts)	40
Previous working experience in Moldova and/or the region is an asset	(to some extent - 10 pts, strong yes - 20 pts)	20
Fluency in English, knowledge of Romanian and/or Russian will be a strong asset	English – 25 pts, Romanian and/or Russian – additional max 5 pts)	30
Maximum Total Technical Scoring		300
Financial		
Evaluation of submitted financial offers will be done based on the following formula: S = Fmin / F * 200 S – score received on financial evaluation; Fmin – the lowest financial offer out of all the submitted offers qualified over the technical evaluation round; F – financial offer under consideration.		200

Winning candidate

The winning candidate will be the candidate, who has accumulated the highest aggregated score (technical scoring + financial scoring).

Annex 2 – Primary Data Collection Methods

Key informants	Method	Tool	Brief description/Notes
UNCT, senior programme and operations staff from UN system agencies, members of results and outcome groups, operations management team and communication team	Self-assessment of institutional performance	One-pager template	Brief overview of institutional priorities, achievements, challenges and ways forward (both resident and non-resident UN agencies)
	Institutional self-completed semi-structured interview	Questionnaire	Questionnaire developed around several key EQs for assessing the OECD/DAC criteria (both resident and non-resident UN agencies)
	Face-to-face in-depth interview	Interview guide	Face-to-face individual interviews with resident UN agencies needed to get further insight into certain key issues depicted via the questionnaire or additional ones, as the case
Former UN senior staff	Phone/Skype interview	Interview guide	Aimed to mitigate staff turnover and possible loss of institutional memory
Senior Government officials and technical staff, relevant members of the Parliament, Ombudsman, Equality Council, Central Electoral Commission	Face-to-face in-depth interview	Interview guide	Individual or small-group interviews, as the case
Donors, international development partners, IFIs	Thematic round table	Round table guide	Thematic (UNPF pillar-based) discussion in groups of around 8-10 participants. Round tables followed by individual, face-to-face interviews, as needed.
CSOs, private sector and media representatives	Focus group	Focus group guide	Groups of 6-8 participants for thematic (UNPF pillar-based) discussion.

Project management team and final beneficiaries (to the extent possible) of 2 UN projects selected by UNCT	Case study	Case study template	"Women in politics" project selected by UNCT based on its learning potential in terms of convergence of UN actions to increase efficiency and impact (<i>Deliver as One</i> perspective)
	Face-to-face in-depth interview	Interview guide	Interviews with the project management team and final beneficiaries of "Women in politics" project
	Focus group	Focus group guide	Group of 6-8 final beneficiaries of "Confidence Building Measures" project

Annex 3 – Evaluation Matrix

Evaluation Questions (EQ)		Indicators/Descriptors	Data Collection Methods	Sources of information
DESIGN AND FOCUS OF UNPF: mainstreaming of UNDG programming principles in the UNPF results chain				
EQ1	To what extent did the UNPF promote and apply a HRBA and gender equality standards and principles to achieve outputs and contribute to the UNPF outcomes?	<p>UNPF strategies, results and indicators address the standards of ratified human rights treaties by Moldova and major recommendations of treaty body reports</p> <p>UNPF strategies, results and indicators are informed by key human rights principles of non-discrimination and equality, participation and inclusion, accountability and the rule of law.</p> <p>UNPF strategies, results and indicators have been informed by gender and migration analysis</p> <p>Main UNPF indicators are disaggregated by gender, and there where it is relevant by migration</p> <p>Stakeholders at both the strategic and programmatic levels are able to provide examples of how HRBA (including migration issues), was applied during the programming process</p>	<p>Documentary review focused on the overall UNPF design, annual work plans, programme reviews and progress reports</p> <p>Questionnaire</p> <p>Interviews with key informants</p>	<p>Reference materials for evaluation</p> <p>UNCT</p> <p>UNCT</p> <p>UN Chairs of Results Groups</p> <p>UN Outcome Coordinators</p>
EQ2	To what extent did the UNPF effectively use the principles of environmental sustainability to achieve outputs and contribute to the UNPF outcomes?	<p>Evidence that the UNPF was informed by an understanding of the linkages between environment and development, including screening for environmental issues and review of draft UNPF results</p> <p>Evidence of the use of key environmental sustainability principles for the formulation of the UNPF: Integration and Interdependence; Transparency, Public Participation and Access to Information and Remedies; Precaution; Polluter-Pays; Responsibility for trans-boundary Harm</p> <p>Stakeholders are able to provide examples about how UNPF strategy and delivery was informed and adapted to address environmental sustainability concerns</p>	<p>Documentary review focused on the overall UNPF design, annual work plans, programme reviews and progress reports</p> <p>Questionnaire</p> <p>Interviews with key informants</p>	<p>Reference materials for evaluation</p> <p>UNCT</p> <p>UNCT</p> <p>UN Chairs of Results Groups</p> <p>UN Outcome Coordinators</p>
EQ3	To what extent did the UNPF focus on national capacity development of government and CSOs?	Evidence that programmatic work under each outcome was informed by an understanding of the major capacity assets and constraints of implementing partners, including capacity assessments, as well with focus in migration	<p>Documentary review focused on the overall UNPF design, annual work plans, programme reviews and progress reports</p> <p>Stakeholder mapping</p>	Reference materials for evaluation

Evaluation Questions (EQ)		Indicators/Descriptors	Data Collection Methods	Sources of information
		<p>aspects)</p> <p>Evidence of specific capacity development strategies and plans, making use of national expertise and technologies contributing to each outcome (including in the area of migrants reintegration, asylum and diaspora)</p> <p>Stakeholder perceptions about the level of engagement and success in national capacity development under the UNPF</p>	<p>Interviews with key informants</p> <p>Focus groups</p>	<p>UNCT Government officials UN Chairs of Results Groups UN Outcome Coordinators</p> <p>CSOs and private sector representatives</p>
EQ4	To what extent did UNPF strengthen the capacities for data collection and analysis to ensure disaggregated data on the basis of gender, age, ethnicity, income levels, geographic location, as well where it is relevant migration status? Did the groups subject to discrimination and disadvantage benefited from priority attention?	<p>Evidence of specific UNPF results and strategies related to data collection and analysis</p> <p>Where relevant, UNPF indicators are disaggregated by gender, age, ethnicity, income levels and geographic location, as well by migration status</p> <p>Stakeholder perceptions about the availability of disaggregated data from UNPF implementation and influence on national statistical systems</p> <p>Evidence that UNPF efforts were successfully targeted to vulnerable groups, including change in disaggregated indicators, as by gender and migration</p> <p>Stakeholders at both strategic and programmatic levels are able to provide examples about how programme strategy and delivery was adapted to reach vulnerable groups, including migrant people and their families(children and elderly left behind) etc.</p>	<p>Documentary review focused on the overall UNPF design and on the target groups identified in UNPF, annual work plans, programme reviews and progress reports</p> <p>Questionnaire</p> <p>Interviews with key informants</p> <p>Focus groups</p>	<p>Reference materials for evaluation</p> <p>UNCT</p> <p>UNCT Government officials UN Chairs of Results Groups UN Outcome Coordinators UN Communications Team</p> <p>CSOs representatives</p>
EQ5	Did the UNPF adequately used RBM in its design to ensure that it is a results-oriented, realistic, focused and evaluable framework?	<p>Assessment of the UNPF Results Matrix against UNDG guidelines and SMART criteria</p> <p>The UNPF includes clearly identified outcomes and outputs which form a logical chain of results according to RBM methodology</p> <p>Intended results are realistic for the UNPF timeframe, resources and planned country interventions</p> <p>The UNPF is focused on clear thematic priorities</p> <p>The UNPF is easy to monitor and it is evaluable. SMART</p>	<p>Documentary review and structured desk analysis focused on the design of the UNPF Results Matrix and its use for annual reviews and progress reporting</p> <p>Questionnaire</p> <p>Interviews with key informants</p>	<p>Reference materials for evaluation</p> <p>UNCT</p> <p>UNCT UN Chairs of Results Groups UN Outcome Coordinators</p>

Evaluation Questions (EQ)		Indicators/Descriptors	Data Collection Methods	Sources of information
		<p>indicators are assigned to each outcome and output</p> <p>Indicators, baselines, and performance targets sufficient for assessing progress during implementation</p> <p>Evidence and stakeholder perceptions about the user-friendly nature of Results Matrix for M&E purposes</p>		
EQ6	Was UNPF Results Matrix sufficiently flexible to respond to new opportunities and challenges that arose during the UNPF lifetime?	<p>Evidence that outcome coordinators, in liaison with UN agencies, could adapt results and strategies to new situation and had flexibility to reallocate resources as required to achieve the desired outcomes</p> <p>Evidence that the UNCT and State Chancellery were open and responsive to the need/requests to adapt the UNPF design</p>	<p>Documentary review focused on the annual reviews and progress reports</p> <p>Interviews with key informants</p>	<p>Reference materials for evaluation</p> <p>UNCT Government officials UN Chairs of Results Groups UN Outcome Coordinators</p>
RELEVANCE: alignment of UNPF interventions with Moldova's national priorities and international commitments				
EQ7	To what extent was the UNPF aligned with the country priorities and addressed key development issues, their underlying causes and challenges?	<p>Evidence of consistency between the outcomes and specific interventions of UNPF <u>and</u> the national priorities and targets identified in the CCA and country policy papers and strategies ('Rethink Moldova', 2011 Government Programme, 'Moldova 2020')</p> <p>Common understanding amongst stakeholders about the expected and actual links between UNPF results and selected national priorities</p> <p>Stakeholders can identify actual or potential areas of divergence between the National Development Strategy 'Moldova 2020' and UNPF results and strategies</p>	<p>Mapping of situation and contextual analyses Documentary review focused on links between the CCA, key national strategies and UNDAF results matrix; minutes/reports of strategic planning consultation events</p> <p>One-pager</p> <p>Questionnaire</p> <p>Interviews</p> <p>Focus groups</p> <p>Round tables</p>	<p>Reference materials for evaluation</p> <p>UNCT</p> <p>UNCT</p> <p>UNCT Government officials UN Chairs of Results Groups UN Outcome coordinators</p> <p>CSO and private sector representatives</p> <p>Donors/International development partners representatives</p>
EQ8	Has UNPF been relevant in terms of European and internationally agreed goals and commitments , norms and standards guiding the work of UN system and the Government?	<p>Stakeholders confirm that UNPF was used by UN agencies and Government in planning their activities, setting goals and in cooperation</p> <p>Clear identification of specific issues and recommendations from treaty body reports, MDG reports and EU annual</p>	<p>Documentary review and structured desk analysis focused on relevant treaty body reports, concluding observations and recommendations, MDG reports, EU progress reports <u>and</u> linkages with UNPF results matrix</p>	<p>Reference materials for evaluation</p>

Evaluation Questions (EQ)		Indicators/Descriptors	Data Collection Methods	Sources of information
		<p>progress reports in UNPF results matrix and programme strategies</p> <p>Stakeholders can identify specific results, strategies from cooperation related to issues and recommendations from treaty body reports, MDG reports and EU annual progress reports</p> <p>Stakeholders can identify actual or potential areas of divergence between recommendations from treaty bodies and EU, and results and strategies of UNPF</p>	<p>One-pager</p> <p>Questionnaire</p> <p>Interviews</p> <p>Focus groups</p> <p>Round tables</p>	<p>UNCT</p> <p>UNCT</p> <p>UNCT Government officials UN Chairs of Results Groups UN Outcome coordinators</p> <p>CSO and private sector representatives</p> <p>Donors/International development partners representatives</p>
EFFECTIVENESS: contribution of UNCT to the achievement of the UNPF planned outcomes				
EQ9	What was the UN's actual contribution to the achievement or likely achievement of the UNPF outcomes ?	<p>Objective comparison of actual outputs achieved against the set targets, including consideration of annual adjustments, as well migration issues after mid-term review exercise</p> <p>The actual outputs are likely to make a significant contribution towards the expected outcomes</p> <p>There are positive trends in the outcome indicators</p> <p>Positive trends in key 'Moldova 2020' Strategy indicators and specific indicators and targets related to EU accession</p> <p>Plausible evidence that UN-supported results under the UNPF have made a contribution to national priorities and change in 'Moldova 2020' indicators, with emphasis on policies and targets related to the EU accession</p> <p>Stakeholders at both the strategic and programmatic levels can offer examples of for how institutional and/or behavioural changes resulting from UNPF have influenced concrete changes in national development situation and indicators, as well as migration and gender related issues after mid-term review exercise</p>	<p>Documentary review focused on UNPF MTR, annual reviews and progress reports; reviews of 'Moldova 2020' Strategy; contribution of UNPF results and strategies to national development priorities and indicators</p> <p>One-pager</p> <p>Questionnaire</p> <p>Interviews</p> <p>Focus groups</p> <p>Round tables</p>	<p>Reference materials for evaluation</p> <p>UNCT</p> <p>UNCT</p> <p>UNCT Government officials UN Chairs of Results Groups UN Outcome coordinators</p> <p>CSO and private sector representatives</p> <p>Donors/International development partners representatives</p>
EQ10	What were the main factors which contributed or hindered the achievement of UNPF outcomes?	Factors identified and rated as promoting or diminishing the effectiveness of the UNPF, as well those related to migration and gender issues	Mapping of factors which promoted or impeded the progress against intended results for contribution analysis	Reference materials for evaluation

Evaluation Questions (EQ)		Indicators/Descriptors	Data Collection Methods	Sources of information
		Evidence of UN agencies of making good use of facilitating factors and country context (operating space) to achieve outputs and contribute to the attainment of planned outcomes	Documentary review focused on UNPF MTR, annual reviews and progress reports, risks and assumptions, risks analyses, evaluation reports Questionnaire Interviews Focus groups Round tables	UNCT UNCT UN Chairs of Results Groups UN Outcome coordinators UN Communications Team CSO and private sector representatives International development partners representatives
EQ11	Has the implementation of UNPF produced any additional, unplanned effect (positive or negative)?	Evidence through examples of additional results/effects and their appraisal Effects (positive or negative) of identified results	Documentary review focused on mid-term reviews, progress reports and evaluation reports, third party researches, studies and assessments, data from UNPF M&E systems Questionnaire Interviews Focus groups Round tables	Reference materials for evaluation UNCT UNCT UN Chairs of Results Groups UN Outcome coordinators CSO and private sector representatives International development partners representatives
EQ12	What was the comparative advantage of the UN and how was it utilised in the Moldovan context in relation to other development actors in the country?	Evidence that the assessment of UN comparative advantages in Moldova was credible and involved perceptions and agreement of stakeholders outside the UN Stakeholder perceptions about how well the UN's comparative advantages were considered and positioned during the selection of UNPF priorities, results and strategies	Documentary review focused on the UNPF and preparatory documents and reports on UNCT comparative advantages; MTR Questionnaire Interviews	Reference materials for evaluation UNCT UNCT Government officials Chairs of Results Groups Outcome coordinators

Evaluation Questions (EQ)		Indicators/Descriptors	Data Collection Methods	Sources of information
EFFICIENCY: extent to which outcomes have been achieved at reasonably low cost and maintenance of minimum transaction costs				
EQ13	How well has the implementation of the UNPF interventions been managed ? What monitoring, evaluation and reporting systems and tools have been used and how did they contribute to the UNPF management process?	<p>Programme management arrangements (outcome and results groups) produced:</p> <p>a. Efficient joint programming processes by UN agencies and implementing partners</p> <p>b. A regular, user-friendly stream of information and data about progress against the plan</p> <p>c. Actionable lessons and good practices for consideration by the UNCT and State Chancellery ,</p> <p>Evidence of efficient management and benefits of <i>Deliver as One</i> approach (including on migration development issues)</p> <p>Timeliness and quality of outputs and use of resources</p> <p>Stakeholder perceptions about the efficiency of the overall management arrangements for UNPF progress monitoring, learning and reporting, including the roles of the UNCT and State Chancellery</p> <p>Stakeholder perceptions about the likeliness that actual outputs could have been or not delivered more efficiently by other partners or with the use of other partnership approaches</p> <p>Examples of management intervention for overcoming barriers and constraints in UNPF implementation, including those related to better addressing of migration issues</p>	<p>Document review and system analysis focused on the UNPF management, monitoring and quality assurance arrangements and responsibilities, TORs and actual performance for progress monitoring, learning and reporting</p> <p>Questionnaire</p> <p>Interviews</p> <p>Focus groups</p> <p>Round tables</p>	<p>Reference materials for evaluation</p> <p>UNCT</p> <p>UNCT</p> <p>Government officials</p> <p>UN Chairs of Results Groups</p> <p>UN outcome coordinators</p> <p>Operations Management Team</p> <p>Communications Team</p> <p>CSO and private sector representatives</p> <p>International development partners representatives</p>
EQ14	How were risks and assumptions been addressed during the implementation of UNPF-related programmes and projects?	<p>Assessment of assumptions and risks in the overall UNPF and results chain</p> <p>Evidence that assumptions and risks were considered during programme reviews and for progress reporting</p>	<p>Mapping of risks analyses and mitigation measures</p> <p>Documentary review focused on the identification of critical assumptions and risks in the overall UNPF design and their use for annual reviews and progress reporting</p> <p>Interviews</p>	<p>Reference materials for evaluation</p> <p>UNCT</p> <p>UN Chairs of Results Groups</p> <p>UN Outcome Coordinators</p>
EQ15	Have the UNPF results been achieved at reasonably low/lowest possible cost ? Were resources used	Outcome budgets are broadly in line with scale and scope of expected results	Document review focused on the UNCT budget, annual changes through work plans, financial analysis and delivery	Reference materials for evaluation

Evaluation Questions (EQ)		Indicators/Descriptors	Data Collection Methods	Sources of information
	appropriately?	<p>Expected vs. actual performance in resource mobilisation for core, non-core and Multi-Donor Trust Fund (MDTF) resources</p> <p>Perceptions about the MDTF as a vehicle for additional resource mobilisation</p> <p>UN annual work planning process is aligned with the national budget process to generate greater coherence in programme design and delivery</p> <p>Perceptions about costs vs. benefits of UNPF results and the efficiency of implementation modalities used (avoiding waste and duplication)</p> <p>Perceptions about the financial costs of UN programmatic assistance vs those of other international partners</p>	<p>rates for the 10 outcomes from programme reviews and progress reports</p> <p>Questionnaire</p> <p>Interviews</p>	<p>UNCT</p> <p>UNCT</p> <p>Government officials</p> <p>UN Chairs of Results Groups</p> <p>UN Outcome coordinators</p> <p>Operations Management Team</p>
EQ16	To what extent did the UNPF help to minimize transaction costs for the Government and for UN agencies?	<p>Evidence and perceptions about how the UNPF, as a one programme, and its management arrangements affected transaction costs for UN agencies and Government partners</p> <p>Evidence of progress to institute good practices for harmonized business operations (e.g. via Business Operations Strategy – BOS)</p> <p>Estimated cost savings from collaborative procurement</p> <p>Change in value of purchase orders raised against common long-term agreements and contracts</p> <p>Estimated savings from use of common premises</p> <p>Number of common service agreements</p> <p>Perceptions of stakeholders that harmonized business operations have improved the quality of procurement and other business services</p>	<p>Documentary review focused on the overall UNPF design, programme reviews, and progress reports; and of Operations Management Team's work plans and strategies (e.g. BOS) to harmonize business operations</p> <p>Interviews</p>	<p>Reference materials for evaluation</p> <p>UNCT</p> <p>Government officials</p> <p>UN Chairs of Results Groups</p> <p>UN Outcome coordinators</p> <p>Operations Management Team</p>
EQ17	To what extent and how has the UNPF contributed to achieving better synergies among the programmes of UN agencies and between UN agencies and Government partners?	<p>Triangulation of perceptions about the benefits of the UNPF and a 'one programme' approach for greater coherence and collaboration by UN agencies and Government partners</p>	<p>Documentary review focused on the joint annual work plans and Government sector plans and strategies, minutes of coordination meetings, reviews, progress reports and evaluations</p>	<p>Reference materials for evaluation</p>

Evaluation Questions (EQ)		Indicators/Descriptors	Data Collection Methods	Sources of information
	Has the UNPF enhanced joint programming by agencies and/or resulted in specific joint programmes?	<p>Efficiency gains achieved through synergy (concerted efforts to optimise results and avoid duplication)</p> <p>Examples of cross-practice collaboration and cross-agency harmonization and programme and policy coherence</p> <p>UNPF was used by the Government to inform sector plans and strategies (links between the UNPF results and strategies and relevant Government sector plans and strategies)</p>	<p>Stakeholder mapping</p> <p>Questionnaire</p> <p>Interviews</p> <p>Case study</p> <p>Participant observation</p>	<p>UNCT</p> <p>UNCT Government officials UN Chairs of Results Groups UN outcome coordinators</p> <p>Project management team Beneficiaries</p>
EQ18	How well did the UNCT use partnerships to improve its performance?	<p>Evidence that UNPF promoted effective partnerships and strategic alliances around its main outcome areas and national development goals (e.g. within the government, national partners, donors and other international development partners)</p> <p>Stakeholders consider partnerships established for the implementation of the UNPF to be both an essential prerequisite and modality of achieving successful results</p> <p>Stakeholders are able to provide examples of successful results obtained through partnerships(e.g. migration and development area)</p>	<p>Documentary review focused on the UNPF-related partnership agreements, donor reports, joint projects reports Stakeholder mapping</p> <p>Interviews</p> <p>Focus groups</p> <p>Round tables</p> <p>Case study</p> <p>Participant observation</p>	<p>Reference materials for evaluation</p> <p>UNCT Government officials UN Chairs of Results Groups UN outcome coordinators Operations Management Team Communications Team</p> <p>CSO and private sector representatives</p> <p>Donors/International development partners representatives</p> <p>Project management team Beneficiaries</p>
<i>SUSTAINABILITY: extent to which the obtained benefits (results) have continued, or are likely to continue, after the UNPF-related intervention has been completed</i>				
EQ19	To what extent are the results (benefits) of the UNPF sustainable or likely to be maintained over time?	<p>Evidence of:</p> <p>a. Concrete changes in national laws, policies, regulations, and plans that can sustain UNPF results and strategies</p> <p>b. Scaling-up of pilot initiatives</p> <p>c. Adoption of major lessons and good practices that led to changes in the strategic and organisational direction of the Government</p> <p>d. Additional allocations of national budget and/or other donor resources (e.g. budget sub-program for Diaspora support)</p>	<p>Document review focused on institutional measures in place or expected that will help to sustain UNPF results/benefits</p> <p>Questionnaire</p> <p>Interviews</p>	<p>Reference materials for evaluation</p> <p>UNCT</p> <p>UNCT Government officials UN Chairs of Results Groups UN outcome coordinators</p>

Evaluation Questions (EQ)		Indicators/Descriptors	Data Collection Methods	Sources of information
		<p>e. Institutional capacity in place to sustain levels of achievement or a strategy/plan exists to indicate how it will be developed and funded</p> <p>Triangulation of perceptions about the sustainability of UNPF results/benefits</p> <p>Stakeholders at both the strategic and programmatic levels can offer examples of ways the Moldovan institutions are sustaining programmatic results</p>	<p>Focus groups</p> <p>Roundtables</p>	<p>CSO and private sector representatives</p> <p>Donors/International development partners representatives</p>
EQ20	What measures has UNCT undertaken to ensure that results to which it contributed are not lost?	<p>Evidence of exit strategies and measures undertaken by UNCT to ensure sustainability of results (legal/policy, financial and institutional)</p> <p>Ensuring sustainability is a subject matter regularly discussed by the UNCT and State Chancellery</p> <p>Complementarities and collaboration fostered by the UNPF between UN agencies and their implementing partners contribute to, or are expected to contribute to, the sustainability of results</p>	<p>Documentary review focused on exit strategies, minutes of meetings between UNCT and State Chancellery, mapping of risks and systemic barriers to sustainability</p> <p>Questionnaire</p> <p>Interviews</p> <p>Focus groups</p> <p>Round tables</p>	<p>Reference materials for evaluation</p> <p>UNCT</p> <p>UNCT Government officials UN Chairs of Results Groups UN outcome coordinators</p> <p>CSO and private sector representatives</p> <p>Donors/International development partners representatives</p>

Annex 4 – Primary Data Collection Tools

TOOLS TO BE USED BEFORE THE IN-COUNTRY MISSION

Template: One-pager

(for resident and non-resident UN agencies; to be used to collect information before the in-country field mission in order to inform the interviews and facilitate a more efficient use of time of the evaluation team)

..... *(name of UN Agency)*

Major Priorities (2013-2016)

1.
2.
3. Etc.

Major Achievements (2013-2016)

1.
2.
3. Etc.

Key Challenges

1.
2.
3. Etc.

Way Forward

1.
2.
3. Etc.

QUESTIONNAIRE

This Questionnaire is aimed to collect crucial primary data and information from UNCT Moldova on a selected number of evaluation areas of UNPF 2013-2017 detailed in the Evaluation Matrix (Inception Report, Annex 3). Response to this questionnaire will facilitate a more efficient use of time during the brief in-country mission (18-27 April 2016) by allowing the evaluation team to focus the face-to-face interviews with UN resident agencies on issues which require more in-depth analysis. It will also provide a structured opportunity to non-resident UN agencies to get engaged in the evaluation process.

Your candid and frank feedback is crucial, as the aggregated data will form a key part of the evidence for the evaluation, including recommendations. All responses will be kept strictly confidential.

We very much look forward to receiving your response no later than 12 April 2016 at camelia.gheorghe@promeso.ro. Should you have any requests for clarification, please don't hesitate to contact Camelia Gheorghe, International Consultant (Team Leader) either by e-mail or phone: +40 744355455.

*
* *

Response provided by: (UN agency name)

Contact person and email:

Evaluation criteria	Question	Response
UNPF design and focus	Has a HRBA been applied during the programming process of UNPF? If yes, please motivate your answer and provide supporting examples. If not, why?	
	Do you agree with the statement: "UNPF strategy and delivery was informed and adapted to address environmental sustainability concerns"? Please motivate your answer.	
	To what extent has UNPF targeting of vulnerable groups been informed by disaggregated data? In your view, was there any lack of disaggregated data which impeded a proper targeting of UNPF interventions?	
	To what extent has UNCT used the UNPF Results Matrix for monitoring and evaluation purposes? What about your agency?	
Relevance	Were vulnerable groups involved in the planning of UNPF? If yes, how? If no, why?	
	Are there any actual or potential areas of divergence between the National Development Strategy 'Moldova 2020' and UNPF planned results and strategies? If yes, which areas?	
	Are there any actual or potential areas of divergence between recommendations from treaty bodies and EU, and results and strategies of UNPF?	
	Has UNPF been used by your agency in planning its activities, setting goals and in cooperation activities? What about the Government? Please provide details.	
Effectiveness	Have institutional and/or behavioural changes resulting from UNPF implementation influenced concrete changes in national development situation and indicators? If yes, please explain. If no, why?	
	Did UNCT make good use of facilitating factors and country context (<i>operating space</i>) to achieve UNPF outputs and contribute to the attainment of planned outcomes? What about your agency? If yes, please provide 2-3 examples.	
	Has the implementation of UNPF to date produced any unplanned results/effects (positive or negative)?	
	To what extent were UN's comparative advantages considered and positioned during the selection of UNPF priorities, results and strategies?	
Efficiency	Could you please provide examples of management intervention for overcoming barriers and constraints in UNPF implementation?	
	Has <i>Deliver as One</i> approach led to any benefits as far as UNPF implementation and results are concerned? What were the main challenges in using this approach?	
	How much has the work of your agency changed as a result of <i>Deliver as One</i> approach?	
	Do you agree with the statement: "The MDTF is a vehicle for additional resource mobilisation"?	
	Was UN annual work planning process aligned with the national budget process?	

	If yes, did this alignment generate any positive effects for programme design and delivery?	
	What efficiency gains, if any, have been achieved to date through synergy among the programmes of UN agencies and between UN agencies and Government partners?	
	Could you please provide 2-3 examples of cross-practice collaboration and cross-agency harmonization?	
Sustainability	Are the UNPF results/benefits ¹ obtained so far sustainable/likely to be so? Please motivate your answer.	
	To what extent have complementarities and collaboration fostered by the UNPF between UN agencies and their implementing partners contributed to, or are expected to contribute to, the sustainability of results?	

¹ e.g. concrete changes in national laws, policies, regulations, plans that can sustain UNPF results; scaling-up of pilot initiative; adoption of major lessons and good practices that led to changes in strategic and organisational direction of the Government; additional allocations of national budget and/or other donor resources; institutional capacity in place to sustain levels of achievement or a strategy/plan exists to indicate how it will be developed and funded.

TOOLS TO BE USED DURING IN-COUNTRY MISSION

General methodological notes:

Each interview, focus group and round table will start with the presentation of the evaluator(s) and of the evaluation objectives, followed by the presentation of the interlocutors. Whenever necessary, a brief presentation of the UNPF 2013-2017 and of its planned results will be also done.

The people who are going to be interviewed as well as the participants in the round tables and focus groups will be briefed in advance about the major topics to be discussed during the meeting. They will be also informed about the confidentiality of their feedback and how their responses will be used in the analysis. In-depth interviews will last around 1.5 hour each. The focus groups will be composed of 6-8 people, while the round tables could involve a larger number of key informants (around 8-10 people). The focus groups and round tables will last 2 hours each and will take place in Chisinau.

In line with best evaluation practices, the interviews, focus groups and round tables will be attended only by the evaluation team and the interviewed people.

Interview guides for UN agencies

RESIDENT COORDINATOR

1. To what extent have the former UNDAF recommendations been considered in the development and implementation of the current UNPF?
2. The subtitle of the UNPF is "Towards Unity in Action". In your view, has this desideratum been achieved? If yes, what are the major effects of this 'unity in action'? What challenges have been faced?
3. Considering the results of UNPF implementation to date, could you please give us three examples of achievements, at strategic level, that you are most proud of? And three lessons learnt?
4. EU membership figures high on the political agenda of the country. What have been the most significant contributions of UN since 2013 for supporting the country advance towards meeting EU accession criteria?
5. Please briefly assess the efficiency of cooperation with the non-resident UN agencies as far as implementation of UNPF is concerned.

FORMER RESIDENT COORDINATOR

1. Process of setting priorities for UNPF 2013-2017. Use of UN comparative advantages in selecting priorities and strategies. Role of the State Chancellery. Involvement of vulnerable groups in the planning process.
2. Steering Committee: membership; role in the design of UNPF and in the monitoring of its implementation.
3. What was the system used during the design by UNCT for the identification of risks and planning of mitigation strategies?
4. The subtitle of the UNPF is "Towards Unity in Action". In your view, is this desideratum likely to be achieved? If yes, what are the major effects of this 'unity in action' that you are aware of? What challenges have been faced?

5. Considering the results of UNPF implementation until you left the country, could you please give us three examples of achievements, at strategic level, that you are most proud of? And three lessons learnt?
6. EU membership figures high on the political agenda of the country. What have been the most significant contributions of UN since 2013 (until you left the country) for supporting the country advance towards meeting EU accession criteria?
7. Please briefly assess the efficiency of cooperation with the non-resident UN agencies as far as implementation of UNPF is concerned.
8. In your assessment, to what extent the existing UN institutional capacities and skill set of staff are able to cope with national stakeholders' demand for support? What are the areas in need of improvement?

UNCT MOLDOVA

1. The UNPF and its interventions do not operate in a vacuum but are embedded in broader sectoral and development strategies of the country, and their implementation is frequently dependent on the political, legal and institutional frameworks and constraints in place in the country (*the operating space*). To what extent has UNCT made good use of the available operating space in Moldova to achieve the planned UNPF results to date? What about opening up the operating space? Were the limitations of the operating space been sufficiently well anticipated when UNPF was designed?
2. What is the value added so far of adopting the "Delivering as One" approach by UNCT Moldova? How is this approach going to serve the post-2015 agenda for sustainable development in Moldova (*The Future Moldova wants*)?
3. Having in view the achievements and challenges in the implementation of the UNPF to date, what are the main lessons learnt so far?
4. In your assessment, to what extent the existing UN institutional capacities and skill set of staff are able to cope with national stakeholders' demand for support? What are the areas in need of improvement?

CHAIRS OF RESULTS GROUPS AND OUTCOME COORDINATORS

1. Please briefly describe the role of the Results Groups. Why were they set up?
2. How do you assess the value added of your Results Group? What would have been different in case the group did not exist?
3. Has your Results Group monitored the risks and assumptions in the implementation of UNPF? If yes, what measures were taken and by whom in order to prevent/mitigate risks (pls give 2-3 examples in this respect)?
4. Does your Results Group have any role in monitoring the exit strategies to make sure achieved results are not lost?
5. Following MTR, the initial Results Framework was amended. Please explain the reasons for these amendments by giving concrete examples.
6. How have you monitored the disaggregated indicators when disaggregated data were not available? (e.g. outcome 2.2 a,b,c,e)
7. Have the national stakeholders (including vulnerable groups) been engaged in the monitoring of progress towards planned results? What actions were taken in cases where progress was weak?
8. To what extent has your Results Group contributed to aligning development partners' support to national strategies and priorities?

COMMUNICATION GROUP

1. Please briefly describe the role of the Communication Group. Why was it set up?
2. How do you assess the value added of your Group? What would have been different in case the group did not exist?
3. What were the main achievements of the Communication Group since 2013? What was most challenging in your work?
4. How themes/messages for campaigns are selected?
5. How do you assess the impact of awareness raising campaigns?
6. In your opinion, to what extent the work of Communication Group contributed to behaviour change and social change?

OPERATIONS MANAGEMENT TEAM

1. Please briefly describe the role of the Operations Management Team (OMT).
2. What were the main achievements of the OMT since 2013? What was most challenging in your work?
3. Transaction costs (Evaluation Matrix)
4. Efficiency in the use of funds compared to other development partners

UN AGENCIES

1. Following the desk review of documents made available to the evaluation team, your agency has supported the Government in the design and further adoption of new policies/strategies/laws. Have these policies/strategies/laws produced any effects so far in the respective sectors / upon people's lives?
2. Your agency has been involved in various capacity building initiatives for national stakeholders. Could you please give some concrete examples of the impact of these initiatives? How have you assessed it²?
3. Please describe the system that your agency is using for monitoring risks in projects/programmes implementation. Please provide 2-3 examples of measures that you took to prevent/mitigate risks.
4. In your opinion, to what extent the results obtained so far with the support of your agency are sustainable or likely sustainable? Which measures have been taken by your agency to ensure that the obtained results are not lost?
5. To what extent has your agency managed to develop strategic alliances and partnerships around relevant UNPF outcome areas and national development goals?

Interview guides for Government of Moldova (in Romanian)

MINISTRIES AND OTHER GOVERNMENTAL AGENCIES

1. În ce măsură instituția pe care o reprezentați a participat la elaborarea CP 2013-2018 (de ex. participare la consultări, în grupuri de lucru, transmitere comentarii, etc.)?
2. În opinia dumneavoastră, în ce măsură sprijinul ONU prin intermediul acestui CP a fost relevant pentru prioritățile de dezvoltare ale Republicii Moldova, în special cele din Strategia 'Moldova 2020'? Există divergențe? Menționați, vă rugăm, câteva exemple care să ilustreze

² E.g. Political parties' awareness of gender equality improved (UNDP+UN Women), 350 persons benefitted from the Joint Information and Service Bureau services, contributing to women's economic empowerment (UN Women); UNICEF built capacity of the Parliamentary Commissions in mainstreaming child rights, equity and gender

contribuția ONU din 2013 până în prezent la rezolvarea problemelor interne cu care se confruntă Republica Moldova în domeniul în care activează instituția pe care o reprezentați.

3. Republica Moldova a ratificat o serie de tratate și convenții internaționale în domeniul drepturilor omului, Obiectivelor de Dezvoltare ale Mileniului, etc. De asemenea, a semnat Acordul de Asociere la UE în 2014. În ce măsură sprijinul ONU prin intermediul acestui CP a fost relevant pentru îndeplinirea angajamentelor internaționale ale țării ce decurg din ratificarea/semnarea acestor documente? Există divergențe? Care a fost contribuția concretă a ONU din 2013 până în prezent la îndeplinirea acestor angajamente?
4. Care credeți că este avantajul comparativ al ONU în comparație cu alți parteneri internaționali care activează în Republica Moldova? În ce măsură ONU a folosit acest avantaj comparativ pentru a sprijini țara în rezolvarea problemelor cu care se confruntă?
5. Instituția pe care o reprezentați a beneficiat de sprijin specific din partea ONU prin intermediul unor proiecte/programe. În opinia dumneavoastră, cât de utile au fost aceste proiecte/programe din punctul de vedere al dezvoltării capacității instituției? Dacă da, ce influență a avut dezvoltarea capacității instituționale asupra îmbunătățirii situației în domeniul în care activați?
6. În ce măsură au fost promovate drepturile omului și egalitatea de gen în elaborarea și implementarea proiectelor/programelor de care a beneficiat instituția dumneavoastră? Puteți da câteva exemple concrete în acest sens?
7. Ce părere aveți referitoare la eficiența sprijinului ONU din 2013 până în prezent având în vedere proiectele/programele de care a beneficiat instituția dumneavoastră? (managementul, sistemul de monitorizare, eficiența utilizării resurselor, cost-eficacitatea, sinergia cu programele guvernamentale, utilitatea parteneriatelor dezvoltate pentru implementarea programelor și proiectelor, etc.)
8. În ce măsură considerați că rezultatele obținute cu sprijinul ONU sunt durabile sau au șanse reale de a fi durabile?

STATE CHANCELLERY

1. Care a fost rolul Cancelariei de Stat în elaborarea CP 2013-2018 și a Planului de Acțiune aferent? Dar în implementarea și monitorizarea acestuia?
2. Cum apreciați gradul de flexibilitate al CP 2013-2018, în special al rezultatelor și indicatorilor planificați, din punctul de vedere al adaptării acestora la nevoile și provocările apărute în timpul implementării CP?
3. În opinia dumneavoastră, în ce măsură sprijinul ONU oferit prin intermediul CP 2013-2018 a fost/este relevant pentru prioritățile de dezvoltare ale Republicii Moldova (în special Strategia 'Moldova 2020') și îndeplinirea angajamentelor sale internaționale (tratate/ convenții în domeniul drepturilor omului, Declarația Mileniului, Acordul de Asociere la UE, etc.)? Există divergențe?
4. În opinia dumneavoastră, care sunt cele mai importante contribuții ONU din 2013 până în prezent la rezolvarea problemelor interne cu care se confruntă Republica Moldova? Dar în domeniul îndeplinirii angajamentelor internaționale?
5. Care credeți că este avantajul comparativ al ONU în comparație cu alți parteneri internaționali care activează în Republica Moldova? În ce măsură ONU a folosit acest avantaj comparativ pentru a sprijini țara în rezolvarea problemelor cu care se confruntă?
6. Cancelaria de Stat a beneficiat de sprijin specific din partea ONU prin intermediul unor proiecte/programe. În opinia dumneavoastră, cât de utile au fost acestea din punctul de vedere al dezvoltării capacității Cancelariei? Dacă da, ce efecte concrete a avut dezvoltarea capacității instituționale?

7. În ce măsură au fost promovate drepturile omului și egalitatea de gen în elaborarea și implementarea CP 2013-2017? Ce rol a avut Cancelaria de Stat în monitorizarea respectării acestora? Dacă ați identificat cazuri în care drepturile omului și egalitatea de gen nu au fost respectate, ce măsuri concrete ați întreprins?
8. Care este opinia dumneavoastră referitoare la eficiența implementării proiectelor/programelor de care a beneficiat direct Cancelaria? Dar a implementării CP 2013-2017 în ansamblu? (managementul, sistemul de monitorizare, eficiența utilizării resurselor, cost-eficacitatea, sinergia cu programele guvernamentale, utilitatea parteneriatelor dezvoltate pentru implementarea programelor /proiectelor, etc.)
9. Care sunt măsurile pe care le-ați întreprins în parteneriat cu Echipa de Țară ONU pentru asigurarea durabilității rezultatelor obținute în cadrul CP 2013-2017? În opinia dumneavoastră, în ce măsură rezultatele obținute la nivel național sunt durabile sau au șanse reale de a fi durabile?

Guides for focus groups (in Romanian)

Introducere (pentru toate focus grupurile)

- 1) Prezentarea participantilor
- 2) Scopul și regulile focus grupului:
 - scop: culegere de informații și feedback din partea reprezentanților societății civile/sectorului privat/media (*după caz*) în cadrul procesului de evaluare a CP 2013-2017 care are drept scop final formularea de recomandări care să sprijine procesul de elaborare a noului cadru de sprijin ONU 2018-2022
 - durata focus grupului: 1,5-2 ore (*după caz*)
 - nu există răspunsuri corecte sau gresite, ci doar puncte de vedere diferite
 - fiecare participant va răspunde, pe rand, la toate întrebările; răspunsul trebuie să fie scurt și la obiect;
 - opiniile, informațiile și răspunsurile participantilor sunt strict confidențiale
 - participarea în focus grup este voluntară și orice participant se poate retrage pe parcursul discuțiilor fără a fi nevoit să ofere o explicație

CIVIL SOCIETY ORGANISATIONS, MEDIA AND PRIVATE SECTOR

Întrebări/Subiecte de discuție

- 1) În ce măsură vă sunt familiare proiectele și programele ONU în Republica Moldova? Dacă da, este sprijinul ONU relevant pentru prioritățile de dezvoltare ale țării și angajamentele sale internaționale? Există discrepante? (*dacă da, cereți-le să își argumenteze răspunsul*)
- 2) Ați participat la consultările organizate în anii 2011-2012 destinate elaborării UNPF 2013-2017? (*de ex. evaluare nevoi, stabilire priorități, etc.*). În ce măsură credeți că grupurile vulnerabile au fost implicate în acest proces?
- 3) Care sunt cele mai importante realizări obținute cu sprijinul ONU din 2013 până în prezent pe care le cunoașteți? În ce măsură acestea au condus la schimbări durabile în societatea moldovenească? (*de ex. schimbări de atitudine/comportament, schimbări la nivel instituțional, etc.*)
- 4) Credeți că intervențiile ONU au avut și efecte negative? (*dacă da, cereți-le să își argumenteze răspunsul*)
- 5) Credeți că resursele de care dispune ONU sau care au fost atrase de ONU de la diversi donatori sunt folosite în mod eficient?

- 6) Care credeti ca este avantajul comparativ al ONU in comparatie cu alti parteneri de dezvoltare ce activeaza in Moldova? In ce masura au stiut agentile ONU sa valorifice acest avantaj comparativ?
- 7) In opinia dvs., in ce domenii ar trebui sa se implice ONU pe termen mediu astfel incat sa sprijine in mod eficient Republica Moldova in eforturile sale de dezvoltare si respectare a angajamentelor internationale?

BENEFICIARIES OF CONFIDENCE BUILDING MEASURES PROJECT IN TRANSNISTRIA

Intrebari/Subiecte de discutie

- 1) Va rugam sa descrieti obiectivele proiectului pe care l-ati implementat si rezultatele acestuia.
- 2) In ce masura rezultatele obtinute au fost mentinute dupa terminarea proiectului?
- 3) In ce masura echipa proiectului a fost flexibila si s-a adaptat la posibilele schimbari intervenite in timpul implementarii proiectului?
- 4) Cum ati descrie in cateva cuvinte cooperarea cu agentile ONU?
- 5) Ati alege un alt finantator pentru derularea proiectului dumneavoastra? De ce?

BENEFICIARIES OF WOMEN IN POLITICS PROJECT

Questions/Discussion topics

UN Women/UNDP project staff:

- Needs addressed by the project.
- Objectives of the project
- Main accomplishments
- Factors which facilitated the achievement of planned results
- Challenges faced and strategies used to overcome them
- Lessons learnt

Swedish Embassy (donor):

- How has the project been born? Where has the initiative come from?
- How were partners selected?
- What was the process of project formulation/priorities?
- How do estimate the progress so far? Do you consider any extension?
- Have there been any developing risks? If yes, how have they been addressed?
- What is your opinion on the sustainability of the results?

Project beneficiaries:

- How have you become part of the project?
- What activities have you been involved in?
- What were the benefits for yourself derived from the participation in the project?
- Would you participate again in a similar project? What would you change?
- Would have you been able to achieve the same electoral results if you did not participate in the project? Please motivate your answer.

Questions/Discussion topics for round tables

INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT PARTNERS

1. To what extent are you familiar with UN support to Moldova? If yes, has this support been relevant for the development priorities of Moldova and its international commitments? Any discrepancies?
2. Has your organisation been consulted by UN when the current UNPF 2013-2017 was drafted?
3. To the best of your knowledge, which are the most significant achievements of UN since 2013? In your opinion, has UN managed to influence any sustainable behavioural or institutional changes in Moldova?
4. In your view, what is the UN comparative advantage? Has UN used its comparative advantage efficiently?
5. Could you please provide any examples of successful results obtained through partnerships with UN agencies? What about less successful cooperation experiences?
6. In your opinion, what would be the areas where UN could make a difference on mid-term?

CASE STUDY

(max. 2 pages)

- template -

Title of the Project:

Duration:

Budget:

Funded by:

UN implementing agencies:

National partners:

Target groups:

Final beneficiaries:

Description&Assessment:

- 1) Brief situation analysis (1 paragraph)
- 2) Objectives of the project, aimed to address the issues identified in 1) above (1 paragraph)
- 3) Main accomplishments of the project (2 paragraphs)
- 4) Factors which facilitated the achievement of planned results (1 paragraph)
- 5) Challenges faced and strategies used to overcome them (1 paragraph)
- 6) Lessons learnt (2-3 lessons)

Annex 5 – Response of UN agencies to call for one-pager and questionnaire

UN agency	One-pager (yes/no)	Questionnaire (yes/no)
UN resident agencies	10 yes / 2 no	10 yes / 2 no
FAO	yes	yes
ILO	yes	yes
IOM*	yes	yes
OHCHR	no	yes
UNAIDS	yes	yes
UNDP	yes	yes
UNFPA	yes	yes
UNHCR	yes	no
UNICEF	yes	yes
UN Women	yes	yes
WHO	yes	yes
World Bank	no	no
UN non-resident agencies	4 yes / 6 no	1 yes / 9 no
IAEA	yes	no
ITC	no	no
UNCITRAL	no	no
UNCTAD	no	no
UNECE	yes	no
UNEP Regional Office for Europe	no	no
UNESCO	no	no
UNIDO	yes	no
IFAD	no	no
UNODC	yes	yes

* While not a UN entity, IOM participates in the work of UNCT

Annex 6 – Documents Consulted during Evaluation

- Adept (2014), “Comisia Națională de Integritate la doi ani de activitate: Așteptări și realizări”, <http://www.e-democracy.md/adept/publications/cni-2-ani/>
- Adept (2013), “Transparența decizională a APPC”, <http://www.e-democracy.md/files/td/transparența-decizională-aapc-2013.pdf>
- Antidiscrimination Council (2015), “Annual report 2015”, <http://www.egalitate.md/media/files/Raport%20general%202015.pdf>
- API (2013), “Autoevaluarea instituțiilor mass-media prin prisma dimensiunii de gen (presă scrisă și presă on-line)”, http://api.md/upload/editor/RAPORT_FINAL_autoevaluarea_institutiilor_mass-media_prin_prisma_dimensiunii_de_gen.pdf
- Berlin Economics (2015), “Trade Liberalisation in Transnistria”, http://www.berlin-economics.com/download/studien/2015.07.01_Transnistria_Import_Tariff_Impact_en.pdf
- BMA/MIA (2015), “Extended Migration Profile 2009-2014”, http://tender.gov.md/bma/raportul-analitic-pme_2009-2014.pdf
- Bucătaru, V., Sobják, A. (2015), “Aid Coordination in Moldova: Politics Killing Policy”, Policy Paper No. 39 (141), November 2015 © PISM
- CNA (2015), “Studiul privind deficiențele înregistrate în cadrul sistemului de repartizare aleatorie a dosarelor (PIGD)” <http://justice.gov.md/libview.php?l=ro&idc=4&id=2915>
- CNP/CreDO (2014), “Systemic Persistence of Transparency Deficiencies in the Decision-Making of the Moldovan Government (April 2012-October 2014)”, <http://www.credo.md/pageview?id=478?&lang=en>
- CreDO (2015), “Localizarea instituțională eficientă a funcțiilor de prevenire și de combatere a corupției”, <http://www.credo.md/pageview?id=511>
- CreDO (2016), “Practica angajării răspunderii Guvernului în fața Parlamentului contravine principiului separării puterilor în stat și subminează statul de drept”, <http://www.credo.md/pageview?id=493>
- CreDO (2015), “Why key law-enforcements institutions do not deliver?”, <http://www.credo.md/pageview?id=483>
- CreDO (2013), “Vulnerability Study. Taxonomy and possible decentralization policy implications for vulnerable groups in Moldova”, <http://www.credo.md/pageview?id=249?&lang=en>
- CRDO, CNR (2016), UPR Submission 2016: Universal Periodic Review - Republic of Moldova, 26th session <http://www.credo.md/pageview?id=577>
- CRJM (2016), “Sondaj. Percepția judecătorilor, procurorilor și avocaților privind reforma în justiție și combaterea corupției”, <http://crjm.org/category/publications/justitie/>
- CRJM (2015), “Achievements and faults in reforming the justice sector of the Republic of Moldova: 2012 - July 2014”, <http://crjm.org/category/publications/justitie/page/2/>
- CRJM (2015), “Transparența și eficiența Consiliului Superior al Magistraturii din Republica Moldova”, <http://crjm.org/category/publications/justitie/page/4/>
- Demographic Barometer (2015), “The situation of youth in Moldova”, http://ccd.ucoz.com/Id/0/37_barometru_nr_3_.pdf
- Demographic Research Centre, HelpAge International Moldova (2015), “Breaking the silence: Elder abuse in Moldova”

European Parliament Think Tank (2012), "The Transnistrian Issue: Moving beyond the Status-Quo"

European Parliament (2016), "The frozen conflicts of the EU's Eastern neighbourhood and their impact on the respect of human rights",

[http://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/STUD/2016/578001/EXPOSTU\(2016\)578001_EN.pdf](http://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/STUD/2016/578001/EXPOSTU(2016)578001_EN.pdf)

Expert-Group (2013), "Transnistria and the Deep and Comprehensive Free Trade Agreement",

http://expert-grup.org/en/biblioteca/item/download/972_ba9250542ae4085e175909b27cba6773

Government of the Republic of Moldova (2013), "The Third Millennium Development Goals Report. Republic of Moldova", Chisinau

Jaromin, K. (2015), "EU freezes funding for Moldova", www.euractiv.com/sections/europes-east/eu-freezes-fundingmoldova-316202

IMF Moldova (2016), "Bank Crises Resolution – Stress testing",

http://www.imf.md/press/3%20Moldova%20-%20IMF%20-%20FSAP_Bank%20Crisis%20Resolution-Stress%20Testing_cr1674.pdf

IMF Moldova (2016), "Corruption: Costs and Mitigating Strategies",

<http://www.imf.org/external/pubs/ft/sdn/2016/sdn1605.pdf>

Indevelop (2016), "Gender Analysis of the EU AA/DCFTA with Georgia, Moldova and Ukraine",

<http://www.sida.se/contentassets/1d7e165f86b349f7a4629d30ffdcde83/final-report---gender-analysis-of-eu-aadcfta-with-georgia-moldova-and-ukraine-29-jan-2016.pdf>

IPP (2016), "Activitatea politieneasca in Republica Moldova, perceptii interne si externe",

http://www.ipp.md/public/files/Evenimente/Raport_-_Activitatea_Politienasca_in_Moldova_ro.pdf

IPP (2016), "Barometer of Public Opinion",

<http://www.ipp.md/libview.php?l=ro&idc=156&id=773&parent=0>

IPP, Soros Moldova, SOIR Moldova (2015), "The Phenomenon of Discrimination in Moldova: Perceptions of the Population A Comparative Study", Chisinau

IPRE (2015), "Studiu privind principalele deficiente si provocari in implementarea reformelor in domeniul justitiei si de lupta contra coruptiei in procesul de asociere europeana",

<http://ipre.md/portfolio/studiu-privind-principalele-deficiente-si-provocari-ale-sistemului-justitiei-si-de-lupta-contra-coruptiei-in-procesul-de-integrare-europeana-al-republicii-moldova/>

Ministry of Economy (2015), "2014 Poverty and Policy Impact Report",

http://www.mec.gov.md/sites/default/files/raport_privind_saracia_in_republica_moldova_2014.pdf

Ministry of Justice (2015), "Annual report on the implementation of the Justice Sector Reform Strategy for 2013-16", Reporting period 2015, www.justice.gov.md

MLSPF (2015), "Annual Social Report 2014", pages 32, 69 and 70,

<http://www.mmppsf.gov.md/sites/default/files/document/attachments/rsa2014en.pdf>

MLPSF (2016). "Monitoring Report of the implementation of the National Referral System Strategy for the protection and assistance of victims and potential victims of human trafficking during 2015",

http://www.mmppsf.gov.md/sites/default/files/document/attachments/snr3223_0.pdf

National Bureau of Statistics, <http://www.statistica.md> , <http://statbank.statistica.md>

National Employment Agency/Ministry of Labour, Social Protection and Family (2016), "Activity report 2015", <http://www.anofm.md/files/elfinder/Raport%20de%20activitate%20ANOFM%202015-Final.pdf>

NEA/MLSPF (2016), "Activity report for 2015 year",

<http://www.anofm.md/files/elfinder/Raport%20de%20activitate%20ANOFM%202015-Final.pdf>

OECD (2015), "The principles of Public Administration-Moldova", <http://www.sigmaweb.org/publications/Baseline-Measurement-Moldova-2015.pdf>

OECD Stats (2015), <http://stats.oecd.org/qwids/#?x=2&y=6&f=3:51,4:1,1:1,5:3,7:1&q=3:51+4:1+1:1+5:3+7:1+2:9,66,92,114,182,185+6:2007,2008,2009,2010,2011,2012,2013,2014,2015>

OHCHR (2008), "Report on Indicators for Promoting and Monitoring the Implementation of Human Rights"

Evaluation Report UNDAF-Moldova, June 2011, <https://undg.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/03/UNDAF-Evaluation-Report-Moldova.pdf>

People's Advocate (2016), "Report on Human Rights in Moldova – 2015", http://www.ombudsman.md/sites/default/files/document/attachments/raport_2015_red.pdf

Progen (2015), "Gender Index 2015", http://www.progen.md/files/4085_ge_index_for_2015.pdf

Promolex (2016), "Respectarea Drepturilor Omului in Republica Moldova-2015", https://promolex.md/upload/publications/ro/doc_1437047545.pdf

Rojco, A., Gagauz, O. (2015), "The Quality of Life of the Elderly", Demographic Barometer, Centrul pentru Cercetări Demografice, UNFPA

State Chancellery of the Republic of Moldova (2015), "Cooperare pentru dezvoltare. Raport anual 2014 cu privire la Asistența Externă acordată Republicii Moldova", Chisinau

Stern et al (2012), "Broadening the range of designs and methods for impact evaluations", DFID, Working Paper 38

Tabirta, V. (2014), "Implementarea Strategiei Nationale de Dezvoltare Regionala", Concluzii intermediare, Chisinau, http://www.contact.md/doc/policy_implementarea%20strategiei_01.03.15.pdf

TI-Moldova (2014), "Monitorizarea conflictelor de interese in Moldova", <http://www.transparency.md/ro/cefacem/publicatii/210-monitorizarea-coi-moldova-2014>

TI-Moldova (2016), "Sistemul National de Integritate", <http://www.transparency.md/ro/cefacem/publicatii/141-sni-2014>

UNDG (2016), "Consolidated Annual Financial Report of the Administrative Agent of the Moldova Toward Unity in Action for the period 1 January to 31 December 2015", Multi-Partner Trust Fund Office, <http://mptf.undp.org/factsheet/fund/MDA00>

UNDG (2010), "Guidance Note: Application of the Programming Principles to the UNDAF"

UNDG (2009), "How to Prepare an UNDAF: Part (I) Guidelines for UN Country Teams", UN. See also: Part (II) Technical Guidance for UN Country Teams

UNDG (2009), "Mainstreaming Environmental Sustainability in Country Analysis and the UNDAF. A Guidance Note for United Nations Country Teams and Implementing Partners Teams"

UNDG (2011), "Results-Based Management Handbook. Harmonizing RBM concepts and approaches for improved development results at country level", <https://undg.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/01/UNDG-RBM-Handbook-2012.pdf>

UNDG (2008), "UNDG Capacity Assessment Methodology User Guide: for national capacity development"

UNDP (2015), "Human Development Report 2015. Work for Human Development", New York

UNDP (2015), "Optiuni pentru reorganizarea structurii administrative teritoriale in Republica Moldova", Chisinau

UNICEF Moldova (2011), "Situation Analysis of Vulnerable, Excluded and Discriminated Children in Moldova", http://www.unicef.org/moldova/ro/Raport_ENG.pdf

UN Moldova (2015), "Briefing Book from Development Partners of Moldova", http://md.one.un.org/content/dam/unct/moldova/docs/pub/strateg/brief_english.pdf

UN Moldova (2013), "Third National Report on Millennium Development Goals in Moldova: progress achieved, remaining issues and future options"

UNDP, UN Women, and UNICEF (2013), "Roma in the Republic of Moldova in areas of their compact population". Report developed within the UN Joint Programme "Strengthening the National Statistical System", Chisinau

UNECE (2014), "Environmental Performance Review", Republic of Moldova, New York and Geneva, http://www.mediugov.md/images/ECE_CEP_171_En.pdf UNICEF (2014), "Republic of Moldova. Multiple Indicator Cluster Survey 2012", Final Report, Chisinau

UNEG (2012), "Guidance on Preparing Terms of Reference for UNDAF Evaluations"

UNPF-related documentation: national legislation, strategies, action plans and programmes; Treaty Bodies' Concluding Observations for Moldova; Accession Agreement; national statistics; Country Analysis (2011); UNPF 2013-2017 and Action Plan; RC annual reports; UNPF progress report 2013; Mid-Term Evaluation of UNPF 2013-2017 (2015); minutes of UNCT meetings; minutes of the working groups which prepared the UNPF; TOR of UN Results Groups under the UNPF 2013-2017; UN Communications Strategy 2013-2017; projects portfolio; projects/programmes evaluation reports; financial data; workplans; M&E stocktaking; updates of Results Matrix

Vremis, M., Cantarji, V., Vladicescu, N., Toarta, V., Popova, N., Panzica, F., and Lipcanu, O. (2014), "Return Labour Migration and the socio-economic development of the Republic of Moldova". Report prepared for ILO, http://brd.gov.md/sites/default/files/document/attachments/06_studiu_ilo_reintoarcerea_lucratorilor_migranti_si_desvoltarea_rm_2014_rom.pdf

The World Bank country overview, <http://www.worldbank.org/en/country/moldova/overview>

The World Bank (2016), "MOLDOVA Economic Update", 7 April

Other internet resources:

http://www.mediugov.md/images/ECE_CEP_171_En.pdf

<http://fumn.eu/analiza-fumn-republica-moldova-esecul-unui-model-economic/>

<http://agora.md/analize/32/economia-nationala-pe-regiuni-nordul-mai-bogat-decat-sudul-si-economie-ce-se-invarie-in-jurul-chisinaului>

www.particip.gov.md

<http://www.aee.md/energie/biocombustibil/analiza/255-statistic-bioenergie>

www.ieconomics.com

<http://www2.compareyourcountry.org/aid-statistics?cr=302&lg=en&page=1>

www.amp.gov.md

<https://undg.org/home/guidance-policies/delivering-as-one/>

<http://date.gov.md/ckan/en/dataset/5014-clasificatia-programelor-si-subprogramelor>

http://www.ms.gov.md/sites/default/files/07.expert_itm_si_dizabilitatea.pdf

http://www.mf.gov.md/files/files/Acte%20Legislative%20si%20Normative/CBTM/2015%20-%202017/Anexa%202_2_%20Cadrul%20global%20de%20resurse%20%C8%99i%20cheltuieli%20ale%20bugetului%20public%20na%C8%9Bional%2C%202011-2017%2C%20%25%20%C3%AEn%20PIB.pdf

http://mptf.undp.org/factsheet/fund/MDA00?fund_status_month_to=&fund_status_year_to=2014

http://eeas.europa.eu/delegations/moldova/documents/more_info/pefa_assessment_2012-2014.pdf

http://ipre.md/,_239-gradul-total-de-implementare-al-planului-national-de-actiuni-pentru-implementarea-acordului-de-asociere-rm-ue-pe-2015-2016/

http://www.expert-grup.org/ro/,_activitate/comunicate-de-presa/item/1172-comunicat-euromonitor-aa&category=188

<http://www.upr-info.org/followup/index/country/moldova>

<https://promolex.md/index.php?module=news&item=1056>

Annex 7 – People Consulted during Evaluation

No.	Name	Position/Function	Institution/Organisation
United Nations			
1.	Dafina Gercheva	UN Resident Coordinator, UNDP Resident Representative	UNRCO, UNDP
2.	Nicola Harrington-Buhay	Former UN Resident Coordinator, former UNDP Resident Representative	UNRCO, UNDP
3.	Johan Dittrich Hallberg	Special Assistant to the Resident Coordinator/UN Coordination Specialist	RCO
4.	Laura Bohantova	Communications Analyst	RCO, UNDP
5.	Narine Sahakyan	Deputy Resident Representative	UNDP
6.	Evghenii Golosceapov	Justice and Human Rights Programme Analyst (Coordinator)	UNDP
7.	Ira Cebotari	Head of Operations	UNDP
8.	Cristina Turcu	Project Associate	UNDP, "Women in Politics" programme
9.	Victor Dragutan	Project Manager	UNDP, "Sustainable Confidence Building Measures" Project
10.	Alexandru Oprunenco	Policy Specialist	UNDP
11.	Silvia Pana-Carp	Energy/Environment Programme Analyst	UNDP
12.	Valeria Ieseanu	Programme Specialist/Inclusive growth Cluster Lead	UNDP
13.	Monica Moldovan	Advisor, Sustainable Development Cluster	UNDP
14.	Alla Skvortova	Programme Specialist, Governance Cluster Leader	UNDP
15.	Ala Lipciu	National Coordinator	ILO
16.	Antonio Polosa	Chief of Mission	IOM*
17.	Ion Bulgac	Migration and Development Project Assistant	IOM*
18.	Natalia Moisevici	Prevention and Protection Programme Coordinator	IOM*
19.	Viorica Olaru-Cemirtan	Migration Management Project Assistant, Gender Focal Point	IOM*
20.	Veaceslav Balan	National Human Rights Coordinator	OHCHR
21.	Violeta Fetescu	Administrative/Finance Associate	OHCHR

22.	Ulziisuren Jamsran	Country Representative	UN Women
23.	Lucretia Ciurea	M&E Officer	UN Women
24.	Marina Vata	Communication Associate	UN Women
25.	Asya Varbanova	Chief Technical Advisor	UN Women
26.	Svetlana Andries	Programme Manager	UN Women, "Women in Politics"
27.	Victoria Puiu	Communication Specialist	UN Women, "Women in Politics"
28.	Alexei Buzu	Coordinator	Centre for Partnership Development, "Women in Politics"
29.	Victoria Ignat	Coordinator	UNDP, "Women in Politics"
30.	Svetlana Plamadeala	National Officer	UNAIDS
31.	Ina Tcaci	National HIV/AIDS Officer	UNODC
32.	Natalia Cojohari	Country representative a.i.	UNFPA
33.	Eduard Mihalas	Programme Analyst	UNFPA
34.	Eugenia Berzan	Programme Analyst	UNFPA
35.	Victoria Dochitcu	Programme Associate	UNFPA
36.	Diana Selaru	Administrative/Finance Associate	UNFPA
37.	Gannalovchu	Communication Officer	UNFPA
38.	Nune Mangasaryan	Representative	UNICEF
39.	Maria Andronic	Operations Manager	UNICEF
40.	Angela Munteanu	Communication Officer	UNICEF
41.	Sergiu Rusanovschi	Child Protection Officer	UNICEF
42.	Larisa Virtosu	ECD Officer	UNICEF
43.	Elena Laur	Monitoring and Evaluation Officer	UNICEF
44.	Liudmila Lefter	Education Specialist	UNICEF
45.	Haris Hajrulahovic	Representative	WHO
46.	Silviu Ciobanu	Technical Officer	WHO
47.	Rodica Munteanu	Communication Officer	WHO
48.	Marin Dolinta	Senior Administrative/Programme Associate	UNHCR
49.	Sergiu Gaina	Assistant Protection Officer	UNHCR
50.	Liliana Pavlov	Principal Secretary	UNHCR
51.	Tatiana Timofti	Support Staff member	FAO
52.	Igor Spivacenco	M&E Specialist	IFAD

Parliament, other bodies			
53.	George Saghin	Adviser to President of Parliament	Parliament
54.	Mihaela Iachimovici	Adviser to President of Parliament	Parliament
55.	Luminita Bolohan	Secretariat of Parliament	Parliament
56.	Alina Zotea	MP/Deputy	Parliament
57.	Mihaela Spataru	MP/Deputy	Parliament
58.	Oxana Domenti	MP/Deputy	Parliament
59.	Valentina Buliga	MP/Deputy	Parliament
60.	Ian Feldman	President of the Council	Equality Council
61.	Iure Cecan	President	Central Electoral Commission
62.	Maia Banarescu	Children Ombudsman	National Human Rights Institution
63.	Dumitru Roman	Reforms Division	National Human Rights Institution
64.	Svetlana Rusu	Children Ombudsman adviser	National Human Rights Institution
Ministries, other government bodies			
65.	Ina Cretu	Consultant	State Chancellery
66.	Alexandra Popa	Head of Directorate for Policies Coordination and Strategic Planning	State Chancellery
67.	Cristina Melnic	Head of Directorate General for Legislation	Ministry of Justice
68.	Stela Braniște	Head of Directorate for International Relations and European Integration	Ministry of Justice
69.	Marin Gurin	Government Agent at EHtRC	Ministry of Justice
70.	Irina Barbaroș	Head of Section for organisational and preventive medicine from the Medical Department	Department of Prisons, Ministry of Justice
71.	Iulia Ciurea	Division of Psychological activity	Department of penitentiary institutions
72.	Irina Barbaros	Preventive Medicine Section	Department of penitentiary institutions
73.	Stela Braniste	International Relations Department	Ministry of Justice
74.	Cristina Melnic	Legislation general department	Ministry of Justice
75.	Marin Gurin	Government Agent	Ministry of Justice
76.	Ruslan Petrusenco	Deputy Head of Directorate for International Relations and External Assistance	General Police Inspectorate, Ministry of Interior
77.	Olga Poalelungi	Director	Bureau of Migration and Asylum, Ministry of Interior

78.	Olesea Cotoman	Deputy Head of Directorate for legislation, coordination and data management	Bureau of Migration and Asylum, Ministry of Interior
79.	Diana Scobioala	Director	National Institute of Justice
80.	Viorica Dumbraveanu	Deputy Minister	Ministry of Labour, Social Protection and Family
81.	Zoia Cojocari	Deputy Head of Employment Policies Directorate	Ministry of Labour, Social Protection and Family
82.	Daniela Plamadeala	Senior Consultant, Directorate for Migration and Demographic Policies	Ministry of Labour, Social Protection and Family
83.	Nadejda Zubco	Senior Consultant, Directorate for Migration and Demographic Policies	Ministry of Labour, Social Protection and Family
84.	Vasile Cușca	Head of Directorate for Social Protection Policies for Persons with Disability	Ministry of Labour, Social Protection and Family
85.	Corneliu Țăruș	Head of Directorate for Protection Policies of Family and Child Rights	Ministry of Labour, Social Protection and Family
86.	Galina Bujor	Senior Consultant, Directorate for Social Assistance Policies	Ministry of Labour, Social Protection and Family
87.	Lilia Curajos	Head of Directorate for International Relations and European Integration	Ministry of Labour, Social Protection and Family
88.	Lilia Pascal	Head of Directorate for Gender Equality Policies	Ministry of Labour, Social Protection and Family
89.	Valentina Lungu	Deputy Director	National Employment Agency
90.	Diana Toma	Senior Consultant, Budgets of Administrative-Territorial Units	Ministry of Finance
91.	Ion Iaconi	Head of Directorate Budgets of Administrative-Territorial Units	Ministry of Finance
92.	Eugen Grecu	Senior Consultant, International Cooperation Directorate	Ministry of Finance
93.	Natalia Trofaila	Head of Directorate for Operational Management and Services for Taxpayers, Fiscal Inspectorate	Ministry of Finance
94.	Ludmila Pavlov	Head of Foreign Relations and European Integration Directorate	Ministry of Education
95.	Victor Moraru	Deputy Head of Multilateral Cooperation Directorate	Ministry of Foreign Affairs and European Integration
96.	Andrei Cazacu	Head of Foreign Relations and European Integration Directorate	Ministry of Health
97.	Rodica Nicoara	Deputy Head of, Policy Analysis, Monitoring and	Ministry of Economy

		Evaluation Directorate	
98.	Silviu Neghina	Deputy Head of Department Economic Development Projects	Ministry of Economy
99.	Denis Tumuruc	Deputy Director	Energy Efficiency Agency
100.	Inga Podoroghin	State Secretary	Ministry of Environment
101.	Maria Nagornii	Head of Policy Analysis, Monitoring and Evaluation Directorate	Ministry of Environment
102.	Viorica Staver	Head of Foreign Relations and European Integration Directorate	Ministry of Environment
103.	Vadim Grecu	Specialist, Directorate for External Relations and Investment attraction	Ministry of Regional Development and Construction
104.	Ion Stratulat	Deputy Minister	Ministry of Regional Development and Construction
105.	Vasile Luca	Deputy Minister	Ministry of Agriculture and Food Industry
106.	Iulia Iordache	Principal Consultant, Foreign Relations and European Integration Directorate	Ministry of Agriculture and Food Industry
107.	Vitalie Valcov	Deputy Director General	National Bureau of Statistics
108.	Iurie Mocanu	Head of Directorate of Statistics Infrastructure	National Bureau of Statistics
109.	Elena Vatcarau	Head of Labour Statistics Directorate	National Bureau of Statistics
110.	Liuba Valcov	Deputy Director	Bureau for Relations with Diaspora
111.	Dorin Toma	Head of Directorate of Analysis and Programmes	Bureau for Relations with Diaspora
Local government			
112.	Laura Bosnea	Councilor	Riscani
113.	Varvara Dumica	Councilor	Chetrosu, Drochia
114.	Tamara Verejan	Mayor	Scorteni, Telenesti
115.	Cleopatra Cobzac	Mayor	Condreanca, Straseni
International development partners			
116.	Constantin Rusu	Governance Advisor	World Bank
117.	Henrik Huitfeldt	Deputy Head of Mission/Head of Development Cooperation	Embassy of Sweden
118.	Nina Orlova	Senior Programme Officer	Embassy of Sweden
119.	Angela Dumitrasco	National Consultant, Monitoring, Evaluation and RBM	GIZ

120.	Gina Grotelueschen	Deputy Director Novoteca Program	IREX Moldova
121.	Henno Putnik	Attache, Project Manager	EU Delegation Moldova
122.	Alexandre Darras	Project Manager	EU Delegation Moldova
123.	Constantin Mihailescu	Water and Sewage Expert	Austrian Development Agency
124.	Andrei Cantemir	Program Coordinator	Swiss Cooperation Agency
125.	Mariana Creanga	Project Management, Operations Section	EU Delegation Moldova
126.	Andreea Vesa	Senior Human Rights Adviser	OSCE Mission Chisinau
127.	Daniela Vidaicu	Programme manager	Embassy of Sweden
128.	Ghenadie Barba	Deputy Head of Office	Council of Europe
129.	Diana Cialic	Project coordinator	Council of Europe
130.	Artur Raducanu	1st secretary, Political Section	Embassy of Romania
131.	Ulrich Kleppmann	Head	GIZ, Embassy of Germany
132.	Hannes Aarma	EU High Level Adviser in the field of Aid Coordination State Chancellery	
CSOs, private sector, media			
133.	Andrei Brighidin	Director for Development, Monitoring and Evaluation	East Europe Foundation, Partner of "Women in Politics" programme
134.	Daniela Simboreanu	President/Member of the Board	CNPAC/APSCF
135.	Viorica Pelivan	Member	CNETIF
136.	Natalia Zotea	Director	CNETIF
137.	Angela Dima	Member	CNETIF
138.	Cornelia Cincilei	Director	Step by Step
139.	Petru Baranciuc	Member	Coalition "Voice of Roma"
140.	Galina Climov	Secretary	Alliance of Organisations for Persons with Disability
141.	Aurelia Salcutan	Project Manager	Chamber of Commerce in Transnistria
142.	Svetlana Lazar	President	Antrec Moldova
143.	Teodora Rebeja	Project Coordinator	Terre des hommes Moldova
144.	Andrei Cerescu	President	Public Association "Silva Millennium III"
145.	Andrei Isac	President	Public Association "EcoContact"
146.	Valentin Uncu	Director	Orhei-Vit, Causeni
147.	Victoria Siretanu	Legal consultant	StarNet

148.	Sergiu Bargan	Deputy Head of Legal Department	Gas Union Fenosa
149.	Elizaveta Foca	Advisor to the President	Banks Association
150.	Carmina Vicol	General Director	Prime Capital
151.	Elena Varta	Executive Director	Foreign Investors Association
152.	Ceslav Panico	Deputy Director	Institute for Penal Reform
153.	Cristina Peretatcu	Director	Amnesty International
154.	Ion Manole	Director	Promolex
155.	Anastasia Danilova	Director	GenderDoc-M
156.	Ilie Chirtoaca	Legal officer	Legal Resource Centre
157.	Vitalie Mester	Director	Centre of Legal Assistance for People with Disabilities
158.	Petru Baranciuc	Director	Voice of Roma
159.	Slava Tofan	Director	CIDO
160.	Liliana Barbarosie	Journalist	Europa Libera
161.	Nadin Gogu	Director	Centre for Independent Journalism
162.	Petru Macovei	Director	Association for Independent Press
163.	Anatol Caciuc	Redactor	Radio Moldova
164.	Marina Supak	Journalist	Newsmaker

Annex 8 – Appraisal of results indicators in UNPF

Pillar 1: Democratic Governance, Justice, Equality and Human Rights

Outcome 1.1 - Increased transparency, accountability and efficiency of central and LPAs

Overall comments: The choice of indicators is questionable as they are unable to adequately measure the progress intended under outcome 1.1., see detailed comments below.

Indicators	Baseline	Targets	Comments
a. Confidence in public administration institutions; Corruption Perception Index	<u>Baseline:</u> (May 2011): Government – 23%; Parliament – 19%; LPA – 47%; Corruption Perception Index: 36	<u>Target:</u> Government: 45%; Parliament: 40%; LPA: 60%; Corruption Perception Index: Improvement of the Moldova index	2 different indicators The first indicator is rather an impact indicator and progress depends on too many different factors outside the scope and influence of UNPF. The second indicator in principle correlates with the "transparency", "accountability" and "efficiency", but there are better indicators to measure the progress via collection/review of administrative data tailored for this purpose. "Transparency" could be assessed using administrative data available in the Government report on transparency of decision-making and CNP report on transparency of decision-making (on annual basis). "Accountability" could be measured by the administrative data/information on the implementation of the Government programme, Parliamentary hearings and alternative reports (on annual basis). "Efficiency" or "cost efficiency" could be measured through the implemented methodology of the ex-post evaluation regarding the core policies adopted earlier.
b. Hunter coefficient of vertical balance (the degree of fiscal dependency of local governments on resources transferred by central government)	<u>Baseline:</u> Varies between 13% and 19% (2011)	<u>Target:</u> A Hunter coefficient that is above 20% and not varying	Largely suitable indicator: a policy result indicator, measurable and correlated to "accountability" and "efficiency", although not directly
c. Public availability of data on equality, disaggregated by key/target vulnerable groups and cross-cutting dimensions (incl. territorial, inhabitants' area, etc.) to track progress towards MDGs and Moldova's long-term development goals	<u>Baseline:</u> Certain data available on gender and regional disparities but data missing on a number of key groups	<u>Target:</u> Data on target vulnerable groups (persons with disabilities, Roma, persons with stigmatized diseases, third country nationals and stateless persons) made available and used in policymaking	Not suitable indicator. It aims to "track progress towards MDGs" and not towards the planned outcome. Could be transferred to the "evidence-based" policy-making under ex-ante/ex-post impact analysis on vulnerable groups.

Output 1.1.1 - A modernized public administration system is capacitated to effectively and efficiently develop, budget, implement and monitor evidence-based policies in support of the country's national priorities and European integration objectives

Overall comments: *The indicators are largely suitable, but they seem to favour individual policy documents rather than policies and coordinated policy mix (which are different from policy documents per se) and which are better able to measure the capacity of the public administration system.*

Indicators	Baseline	Targets	Comments
a. Ex-ante policy analysis and results-based management principles mandatory for public policy development, ensuring results- oriented, rights-based, and gender-sensitive response implementation and monitoring with clear linkages to programme-based budgeting	<u>Baseline:</u> (2011) The methodology for ex-ante policy analysis (including a human rights and gender-sensitive approach) is not a mandatory step for public policy development	<u>Target:</u> Ex-ante policy analysis, including human rights- based, migration and gender-responsive methodology, is mandatory for development, implementation and monitoring of all new public policies developed after 2013	Suitable indicator. Administrative policy change. Complementary ex-post methodology might be also needed.
b. Public Expenditure Framework Assessment (PEFA) scoring on multi-year perspective in fiscal planning, expenditure policy and budgeting	<u>Baseline:</u> (2011) PEFA scoring B+	<u>Target:</u> PEFA scoring A	Suitable indicator. Administrative policy change. An additional indicator might be related to the capacity of Moldovan authorities to carry out self-evaluation against PEFA standards.
c. EU-Moldova AA signed and implemented in line with the action plan	<u>Baseline:</u> EU-Moldova AA not signed	<u>Target:</u> EU-Moldova AA signed and is being implemented in line with the action plan	Too broad indicator, much beyond the scope of output 1.1.1.
d. 2014 Population and Housing Census undertaken	<u>Baseline:</u> non-existent (last census in 2004)	<u>Target:</u> (2015) census undertaken successfully, providing reliable and credible data for policy formulation	Not entirely relevant indicator for the output

Output 1.1.2 - The Parliament and the Central Electoral Commission are better able to exercise their functions including to ensure human rights and gender equality

Overall comments: *The choice of the indicators is largely suitable. Nevertheless, they seem to cover the legislative function of the Parliament and less its oversight/parliamentary control function. This has a consequence the orientation of the technical support under UNPF towards only one of its functions, leaving aside the quality of the implementation of the policies. Two vulnerable groups are profiled: diaspora electoral rights and women political representation.*

Indicators	Baseline	Targets	Comments
a. Women's representation in decision-making positions	<u>Baseline:</u> (2011) MPs: 22%; members of the Government at Minister level: 2 (10%)	<u>Target:</u> (2015) MPs: 30%; members of the Government at Minister-level: 30%	Suitable indicator
a.1. Participation in voting of Moldovan citizens abroad [New Indicator]	<u>Baseline:</u> (2010) 64,199 Moldovan citizens from abroad; (2014) 73,311 Moldovan citizens from abroad	<u>Target:</u> Increase in Moldovans citizens from abroad participation in parliamentary elections in 2018	Suitable indicator, but progress not evaluable given unclear and unrealistic target (2018 is beyond the period of UNPF)
b. Public confidence in Parliament (sex-disaggregated)	<u>Baseline:</u> (spring 2012): – 25% report confidence in Parliament (27% of men, 22% of women)	<u>Target:</u> (2017): – 40% report confidence in Parliament (at least 40% of women)	Not suitable indicator, discussed above.

c. Human rights and gender analysis of the draft laws in the Parliament	<u>Baseline:</u> 0	<u>Target:</u> 100%	Suitable indicator. However, see discussion on 1.1.1 above on the need for ex-ante, ex-post and evidence-based human rights policy rather than policy documents.
d. OSCE/ODIHR overall assessment of the quality of the general elections	<u>Baseline:</u> 2010 parliamentary election 'met most standards'; 2011 local elections 'largely met' standards	<u>Target:</u> Steady improvement in meeting electoral standards as assessed by OSCE/ODIHR (general elections in 2014 and local elections in 2015)	Suitable indicator, yet Constitutional Court comprehensive evaluation of the elections could be added.
Output 1.1.3 – LPAs have increased capacity and resources to exercise their functions including in better planning, delivering and monitoring services in line with decentralization policies			
<i>Overall comments: Well formulated output and indicators. LPAs also co-develop and co-implement (with central authorities) local policies and therefore indicators 1.1.1a), b) and 1.1.2 c) could be extended to this output as well.</i>			
Indicators	Baseline	Targets	Comments
a. Increase in the share of local own revenues in the overall local budgets	<u>Baseline:</u> (2011) 4.0%	<u>Target:</u> Not less than 10%	Suitable indicator. Needs to be complemented with financial expenditures autonomy. Share of local revenues is about fiscal autonomy only.
b. Degree of implementation of Decentralization Strategy Action Plan	<u>Baseline:</u> Decentralization Strategy approved in 2012	<u>Target:</u> Decentralization Strategy Action Plan implemented in a timely manner at a rate of 70% of planned actions for the respective year	Suitable indicator as long as it correlated with indicators 1.1.1 a) and 1.1.2 c)
Outcome 1.2 – Justice sector actors are better able to promote access to justice and uphold rule of law in compliance with international commitments			
<i>Overall comments: The only relevant indicator is 1.2 c) but it is too narrow. The choice of indicators should try to capture the desired changes within the justice sector, for instance: institutional and functional autonomy of the law-enforcements, quality of justice services, accessibility of justice services, etc. The international commitments should be also captured, as per outcome formulation.</i>			
Indicators	Baseline	Targets	Comments
a. Level of public confidence in the justice system	<u>Baseline:</u> 24% of people trust the justice system in May 2011	<u>Target:</u> 34% of people trust the justice system by 2017	Not suitable indicator, see discussion on 1.1. a).
[b. Indicator has been deleted as it is not deemed relevant.]			Indicator is rightly removed as in practice most decisions that fall under this UNPF are the result of polices from before 2012.
c. Number of judicial instances and/or equality body recognizing and remedying discrimination in individual cases.	<u>Baseline:</u> No known cases to date of judicial recognition of discrimination on any grounds	<u>Target:</u> 100 recognition/remedy decisions by 2015; 400 recognition/remedy decisions by 2017	Suitable indicator, but its ambiguity of “and/or” should be resolved in favour of “and”. This indicator could be enriched with a wider representation of cases along several criteria or along the most pressing human rights violations.

Output 1.2.1 - Judiciary has increased capacity to render consistent, independent judgements in conformity with international law and standards

Overall comments: *The chosen indicators are weak and do not drive the change related to “capacity” and “independent (quality) judgements”.*

Indicators	Baseline	Targets	Comments
a. Training curriculum modules (introductory and continuous) on international human rights law developed and implemented by NIJ	Baseline: NIJ trains in selected European Court of Human Rights provisions, but not at all on international human rights law.	Target: By 2017, NIJ curriculum substantively amended with modules on each of the international treaties, mechanisms and instruments (International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, Convention Against Torture (CAT), ICERD, CEDAW, Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC), CRPD), including the 1951 Refugee Convention	This is a process indicator, not suitable.
b. Number of Supreme Court of Justice explanatory guidance decisions explicitly related to the implementation of international human rights law	Baseline: 4 known guidance decisions on international human rights law	Target: 7 guidance decisions or similar guidance arrangements on international human rights law issues during 2013-2017	Indicator is not suitable unless enriched by the quality of decisions. At the same time justice is mostly done by common decisions of the courts and not by explanatory decisions; therefore the indicator does not measure the progress/change measurement.

Output 1.2.2 - Law enforcement authorities are better able to secure fundamental rights of all parties in criminal proceedings

Overall comments: *The choice of the indicators drive the output in only one direction-juvenile justice improvement. None of the law enforcement bodies concerns are reflected and therefore changes are not expected. The choice of indicators is very weak and incomplete.*

Indicators	Baseline	Targets	Comments
[a. Indicator has been removed as it is not deemed relevant.]			No justification for removal.
[b. Indicator has been removed as it is not deemed relevant.]			No justification for removal.
c. Share of children in conflict with the law diverted from the judicial system	Baseline: (2011) 53.08% of children diverted from judicial system	Target: 63% of children diverted from judicial system	Suitable indicator
d. Existence of a state programme for compensation of victims of crimes	Baseline: Mechanism of asset seizure not effective in ensuring the rights of victims of crimes to compensation	Target: Human rights-based state compensation programme for victims of crimes created	Indicator pointing to a change in the policy, but at a starting point. Perhaps the future UNFP could introduce a genuine policy result indicator.

Output 1.2.3 - Individuals, including the most vulnerable, have improved access to quality procedures to resolve justice claims and secure effective remedy

Overall comments: *The choice of indicators cover only one aspect of the effective remedy linked to the quality control and non-discriminatory access to legal aid. Yet there are other aspects of the legal aid (e.g. extended affordable legal aid to a range of civil cases such as domestic violence, complex property settlements notwithstanding severe administrative sanctions, etc.). Indicators on the results of effective remedy implementation or on the justifiability of social, economic, development or participatory (transparency) rights could have provided a more comprehensive and appropriate measurement of progress.*

Indicators	Baseline	Targets	Comments
a. Quality assurance system for legal aid delivery developed and sensitive to gender and vulnerability criteria from human rights perspective*	<u>Baseline:</u> No such system existing at present; limited systemic knowledge about quality of legal assistance or gender/vulnerability status of recipients	<u>Target:</u> Existing and functional monitoring system, with qualitative gender-sensitive indicators and functioning sanctioning mechanism, for legal services; system in place for assuring quality and monitoring gender and vulnerability criteria from human rights perspective*	Suitable indicator
b. Percentage of victims who receive legal aid, disaggregated by sex, age, ethnicity, language, citizenship, criminal code, article of crime suffered	<u>Baseline:</u> 0, and no coverage by law of the victim in criminal proceedings	<u>Target:</u> Elaborated eligibility of victims for legal assistance, in particular for serious crimes	Suitable indicator, but not appropriate target. The indicator is about the beneficiaries of legal aid and not about eligibility criteria.

Output 1.2.4 - Police, prosecution, judiciary and health authorities better safeguard fundamental rights of persons in detention

Overall comments: *Assigned indicators are appropriate, but insufficient to measure the output. The choice of indicators blinds the aspects of the accessibility and availability of the independent complaints procedures while in provision, preventive and execution of sentences detention. Another omitted aspect is the functional and institutional autonomy and independence of the police disciplinary investigations and prosecutor investigations.*

Indicators	Baseline	Targets	Comments
a. Percentage of effective criminal investigations opened, in relation to number of complaints submitted, related to torture and ill treatment	<u>Baseline:</u> (2011) 11%	<u>Target:</u> Effective criminal investigation opened in 40% of complaints	Suitable indicator, which should be considered together with indicators under 1.2.3.
b. Percentage of final convictions, in relation to number of complaints submitted, related to torture and ill treatment	<u>Baseline:</u> (2011) 0.94%	<u>Target:</u> Substantial progressive increase of proportion of convictions including custodial sentences for crimes related to torture and ill treatment	Suitable indicator but not measurable given imprecise target
c. Share of people in detention who have access to medical services independent from the administration of the detention facility/system	<u>Baseline:</u> Detention medical services and medical staff are subordinated to the Department of Penitentiary Institutions of MoJ.	<u>Target:</u> 100% of people in detention have access to medical services independent from the administration of the detention facility/system	Suitable indicator. Clarity on type of detention (provisional, preventive and execution of sentences) is needed.

Outcome 1.3 - State bodies and other actors effectively promote and protect human rights, gender equality and non-discrimination, with particular attention to the marginalized and the vulnerable

Overall comments: Confusion between outcome and output indicators. Qualitative and effectiveness aspects not sufficiently covered by the assigned indicators, see comments below.

Indicators	Baseline	Targets	Comments
a. Share of international human rights recommendations, in particular Universal Periodic Review (UPR), implemented in timely manner	<u>Baseline:</u> Report of the UPR Working Group	<u>Target:</u> All UPR recommendations implemented	Suitable indicator, but it reflects only quantitative progress and no qualitative assessment.
b. Number of protection orders issued by courts for victims of domestic violence effectively implemented by police and other relevant authorities	<u>Baseline:</u> Approx. 200 protection orders issued by courts since September 2009, 0 effectively implemented	<u>Target:</u> At least 40% of protection orders effectively implemented	Rather an output indicator. Measurement of effectiveness (implied by the set target) is challenging.

Output 1.3.1 - Relevant public authorities exercise improved oversight of implementation of international human rights recommendations

Overall comments: Confusion between outcome and output indicators. Formulation of indicators is not comprehensive enough.

Indicators	Baseline	Targets	Comments
a. Mechanism for human rights oversight in place (NHRAP oversight mechanism), with representative membership and mechanism for transparency/civil society /public input, including diaspora*	<u>Baseline:</u> National Commission for NHRAP monitoring in place in the form of a meeting convened by Deputy Prime Minister for Social Affairs; civil society not effectively included	<u>Target:</u> Effective and representative oversight and coordination body for implementation of international and regional human rights recommendations meets regularly with agenda published in advance and open to public input	Indicator is too narrow. It should be expanded to include all human rights considerations and not only NHRAP.
b. Percentage of UPR recommendations implemented	<u>Baseline:</u> 0 of 122 recommendations in the first UPR cycle implemented	<u>Target:</u> 100% of UPR recommendations of the first cycle implemented	Similar to outcome indicator 1.3 a. Not qualitative dimension captured
c. Percentage of Moldova-specific UN treaty body special procedures and related relevant recommendations implemented, taking 1 December 2012 as baseline	<u>Baseline:</u> CEDAW (2006), CRC (2009), (Human Rights Committee (2009), CAT (2009), CERD (2011), Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (CESCR) (2011) aggregate, taken together with SRs on Violence against Women, Torture and Freedom of Religion or Belief, UN Senior Expert on Human Rights in Transnistria	<u>Target:</u> All 2011 CERD concluding observations, 2011 CESCR concluding observations, 2013 CEDAW concluding observations, 2012 report by the UN SR on Freedom of Religion or Belief, 2014 Report by the UN SR on Extreme Poverty and Human Rights and related relevant recommendations implemented	Similar to outcome indicator 1.3 a. Not qualitative dimension captured
d. Parliamentary Advocates, Centre for Human Rights and National Preventative Mechanism against torture (ombuds-Institution) establish	<u>Baseline:</u> Ombuds-institution not in conformity with Paris Principles (B-status accredited)	<u>Target:</u> Ombuds-institution recognized as A-status NHRI	Suitable indicator.

working methods in conformity with the Paris Principles on NHRIs

Output 1.3.2 - Relevant public authorities are able to mainstream human rights and gender equality into all key national strategies and policies and their implementation, including in budgeting

Overall comments: *Totally insufficient indicators to measure the output. Mainstreaming human rights and gender equality in strategies, policies and their implementation process is not reflected.*

Indicators	Baseline	Targets	Comments
[a. Indicator has been removed as it is not deemed relevant.]			No justification for removal.
b. Mechanism for mainstreaming gender, human rights, diaspora* in state budget in place	<u>Baseline:</u> (1) No data on human rights and gender mainstreaming in budget, across budget lines; (2) not all NHRAP activities budgeted; (3) NHRI has no ring-fenced budget item; (4) in 2014 two strategies included the diaspora dimension: strategy of culture development 2020 and Strategy of tourism development 2020	<u>Target:</u> (1) Gender and human rights-mainstreamed budget developed and applied by line ministries and Ministry of Finance; (2) all activities in NHRAP have clearly allocated budgets; (3) NHRI has ring-fenced budget; (4) all strategies for relevant sectors have allocated budget for subprogramme 'Diaspora Support'	Suitable indicator.

Output 1.3.3 - Increased capacity of women and men from vulnerable groups, including children, to claim and stand for their rights

Overall comments: *Inappropriate choice of indicators, see comments below. In addition, there are important indicators missing, notably those able to measure the progress regarding the creation of representation groups including vulnerable people and their capacity not only to submit well-founded discrimination claims but also to represent their interests in policy-making, oversight of the process, etc.*

Indicators	Baseline	Targets	Comments
a. Proportion of well-founded claims concerning discrimination received by Anti-discrimination Council receiving effective remedy	<u>Baseline:</u> 0 claims received by Anti-discrimination Council; Council not yet established	<u>Target:</u> Anti-discrimination Council establishes working practices in conformity with international and regional best practices and provides effective remedy to all well-founded complaints of discrimination on any international law grounds brought before it	Indicator is mainly about the performance of the Council rather than measuring the capacity of rights-holders to claim and stand for their rights.
b. Curriculum modules covering or substantially mainstreaming human rights, including child rights and gender equality, in mainstream education and training	<u>Baseline:</u> Human rights curriculum elements in primary and secondary education are mainly optional	<u>Target:</u> Human rights included in mainstream curriculum in primary/secondary education	Rather a process indicator, unable to measure to what extent the rights-holders have an increased capacity due to the introduction of these new modules.

Outcome 1.4 - Civil society and media better monitor and promote human rights, equality, democratic governance, and rule of law

Overall comments: Indicators for civil society are weak and push for the external profiling and engagement rather than representativeness of the vulnerable groups and capacity to act and influence.

Indicators	Baseline	Targets	Comments
a. Public trust in NGOs and media	<u>Baseline:</u> Public Opinion Barometer trust index NGOs: 26% (May 2011) Media: 63% (May 2011)	<u>Target:</u> Public Opinion Barometer trust index NGOs: 46% (2017) Media: 75% (2017)	Not suitable indicator. It depends on too many factors that are outside of the influence of UNPF.
b. Heightened quality of reporting by media on human rights, equality, rule of law, and empowerment of women	<u>Baseline:</u> Media insufficiently covers the human rights issues, with frequent infringements of ethical standards	<u>Target:</u> Qualitative increase of coverage of human rights, equality and rule of law issues in mainstream media	Suitable indicator, but the target should also cover the ethical dimension exposed by the baseline.
c. Number of entities submitting alternative reports to international review bodies, in particular UPR	<u>Baseline:</u> 24 national-level stakeholder entities involved in submissions to 2011 UPR; 13 national-level CSOs involved in submissions to May 2011 CESC review	<u>Target:</u> 100% increase in stakeholder submissions to relevant international bodies/review by 2017	Not suitable for an outcome indicator, given its exclusive quantitative nature.

Output 1.4.1 - Civil society capacity as regards human rights and equality law, democratic governance and rule of law standards, as well as its ability to act in and shape policy processes, is manifestly strengthened

Overall comments: Too long and unclear formulation of the output i.e. what does 'manifestly' exactly mean? The choice of the indicators is not covering the output well. Measurement of enabling environment to act and influence is not addressed, as the target of the second indicator is rather at the operational level.

Indicators	Baseline	Targets	Comments
a. Number of independent CSOs or other independent groups submitting alternative reports to international review bodies, in particular UPR	<u>Baseline:</u> 24 national-level stakeholder entities involved in submissions to 2011 UPR; 13 national-level CSOs involved in submissions to May 2011 CESC review; 40 national NGOs involved in the alternative CRC reporting process	<u>Target:</u> 60% increase in stakeholder submissions to all relevant international bodies/review by 2017 (including UPR, Human Rights Committee, CERD, CESC, CAT, CEDAW, CRPD, CRC and relevant Special Procedures)	Similar to outcome indicator 1.4.c
b. Legal and regulatory framework for civil society to be able to operate independently, including in capacity of service provider in place	<u>Baseline:</u> Development of framework initiated but not yet completed	<u>Target:</u> Law on social contracts in place and in conformity with best practices; law on 1% support in place	Suitable indicator.

Output 1.4.2 - Media, including social media, reports more frequently on human rights and equality concerns, adopts human rights-based approach, and has heightened human rights impact, thereby heightening journalistic ethics

Overall comments: *The choice of indicators is adequate, yet unable to capture the 'heightened human rights impact' of media reporting.*

Indicators	Baseline	Targets	Comments
a. Increase in quality of human rights and gender equality reporting by media, including social media	<u>Baseline:</u> Media cover events and issues related to human rights and gender equality, without addressing or raising the human rights aspects	<u>Target:</u> Significant increase in quality of human rights-based and gender-sensitive reporting	Suitable indicator, but the target is hardly evaluable.
b. Civil society and Press Council monitors gender and human rights quality and impact of media	<u>Baseline:</u> Sporadic monitoring	<u>Target:</u> Systematic annual monitoring	Indicator is suitable.

Pillar 2: Human Development and Social Inclusion

Outcome 2.1 - People have access to more sustainable regional development, economic opportunities - innovation and agriculture in particular - and decent work

Overall comments: *Confusion between impact and outcome indicators. Assigned indicators are unable to reflect the entire spectrum of the outcome, in particular innovation and decent work*

Indicators	Baseline	Targets	Comments
a. Level of absolute and extreme poverty (national, regional; rural areas urban areas; gender)	<u>Baseline:</u> (2010) National: 21.9% and 1.4% Rural areas: 30.3% and 2.1% Regions: North: 23.7%; Centre: 29.6%; South: 27.7% Town: 14.2% and 0.3% Cities: 7.3% and 0.4% Gender (head of household): 22.1% male and 21.6% female	<u>Target:</u> National: 19% and 1% Rural areas: 25% and 1.5% Regions: North: 21.7%; Centre: 27.6%; South: 25.7% Towns: 12.2% and 0.2% Cities: 5.3% and 0.3% Gender (head of household): 20.1% male and 19.6% female	Impact indicator, wrongly assigned to an outcome.
b. SADI, multiple deprivations by region (North; South; Centre; Autonomous Territorial Unit (ATU) Gagauzia)	<u>Baseline:</u> North: 472 South: 455 Centre: 462 Chisinau municipality: 808 ATU Gagauzia: 629	<u>Target:</u> Increased SADI indicator per region by 10%	Suitable indicator.

c. Employment rate, disaggregated by urban/rural, geographical areas, gender and age	<u>Baseline:</u> General: 39.4%; Women: 37.1%; Urban: 44.1%, Rural: 36% Regions: mun. Chisinau: 49.2%, North 37%, Centre: 37.6%, South (incl. Gagauzia): 34.7% People aged 55-64: 40.9%; Young aged 15-24: 18.9%	<u>Target:</u> General: 60.0%; Women: 62.0%; People aged 55-64: 62.0%; Youth: 10.0%	Suitable indicator. However, the target does not reflect disaggregation by urban/rural and geographical areas, as per indicator definition and baseline.
Output 2.1.1 - Government and relevant public institutions and private sector have increased capacities to support economic opportunities, and better use of Moldova's innovation and export potential			
<i>Overall comments: The MTR rightly identified the indicator as irrelevant, but did not assign a new one instead. Thus, output 2.1.1 is not evaluable.</i>			
Indicators	Baseline	Targets	Comments
[a. Indicator has been removed as it is not deemed relevant.]			The decision to remove the indicator was a correct one, but it was not replaced with a new indicator.
Output 2.1.2 – LPAs and partners in the North, Centre, South, Chisinau, ATU Gagauzia and Transnistria development regions are better able to ensure equitable access to quality services			
<i>Overall comments: Output well defined, but the selected indicators are insufficient to measure it. Quality services do not only refer to sewage and water supply, while the capital expenditures do not necessarily reflect on improved access to services.</i>			
Indicators	Baseline	Targets	Comments
[a. Indicator has been removed as it is not deemed relevant.]			The decision to remove the indicator was a correct one, however, it should have been replaced with a new indicator able to help the assessment of progress in achieving this output.
b. % of population with permanent access to sewage systems and quality water, disaggregated by urban/rural and geographical area	<u>Baseline:</u> (2011) (2011) access of population to piped water: 60.2%; urban: 90.8%; rural: 37.5%; + mun. Chisinau: 96.3%, North: 37.8%, Centre: 46.7%, South: 71.1%; access of population to public sewage system: 32.1%; urban: 72.8%; rural: 1.9%; + mun. Chisinau: 87.6, North: 22.4%, Centre: 9.7%, South: 13.2% Note: South includes ATU Gagauzia	<u>Target:</u> access of population to piped water: 65%.; urban: 92%; rural: 40%; Access of population to public sewage system: 38%; urban: 76%; rural: 5%	Suitable indicator, but the target does not reflect the disaggregation by geographical area.
c. Share of capital expenditures in the total expenditures of local budgets	<u>Baseline:</u> (2011) 13.7%;	<u>Target:</u> 17%, representing 0.5 p.p. annual increase	Indicator only partially relevant, since the increase in the share of capital expenditures in the local budget does not necessarily mean that these expenditures are used for

improving access to local services.

Output 2.1.3 - SMEs and potential entrepreneurs, including from rural areas, have increased access to business infrastructure and financial services, including agriculture and agrifood business

Overall comments: *This Output is relevant for the respective Outcome and well formulated, and the indicators assigned are appropriate. However, "access to business infrastructure" is not reflected in the indicators in any way.*

Indicators	Baseline	Targets	Comments
a. Number of SMEs per 1,000 people, disaggregated by region and by women/youth-led rural SMEs	<u>Baseline:</u> (2009) 13 SMEs per 1,000 people; North: 6; Centre: 6; South: 4; ATU Gagauzia: 8, mun. Chisinau: 37; Women-led 28% (2009), Young people 15-34 years old: 23%	<u>Target:</u> 17 SMEs per 1,000 people; North: 8; Centre: 8; South: 7; Women-led 35%; Young people 15-34 years old: 30%	Suitable indicator.
b. Share of medium- and long-term loans from the total amount of accessed loans	<u>Baseline:</u> 39% share of medium-term loans and 18% of long-term loans from the total amount of accessed loans	<u>Target:</u> 20 p.p. increase for medium-term loans share and 15 p.p. for long-term loans	While the indicator is largely suitable, it does not reflect on the situation of rural entrepreneurs as well as of those involved in agriculture and agri-food business.

Output 2.1.4 - Government and social partners are better able to promote decent work and employment opportunities, particularly for vulnerable groups

Overall comments: *Overall the output is relevant to the outcome and the assigned indicators are largely suitable. Yet, "decent work" and "vulnerable groups" are not reflected in the indicators and cannot be measured under this output.*

Indicators	Baseline	Targets	Comments
a. Number of people employed as a result of active labour market measures per year (disaggregated by sex and age)	<u>Baseline</u> (2011): 13,548 (of which women: 7,738/57%; people aged 55-64: 2,400/18%; young people aged 16-24: 3,350/24%)	<u>Target:</u> 15,580 (of which women: 9,036/58%; people aged 55-64: 2,600/17%; young people aged 16-24: 4,360/28%)	Indicator unable to reveal progress in relation to the specific problem which is aimed to address (would 15,580 employed people be enough or not?) Disaggregation insufficient to measure to what extent vulnerable groups (as per output formulation) are addressed by the active labour market measures.
b. Number of bilateral agreements on labour and social security signed between the Republic of Moldova and countries of destination for Moldovan migrants	<u>Baseline:</u> 7 agreements on social security and labour migration	<u>Target:</u> 14 agreements	Suitable indicator, but unclear how many agreements on social security and how many on labour migration (which usually go separately).
c. The share of youth aged 15-34 out of the total migrants' group	<u>Baseline:</u> (2011) 55.8%	<u>Target:</u> (2017) 52.2%	Suitable indicator

Outcome 2.2 - People enjoy equitable access to quality public health and health care services and protection against financial risks

Overall comments: *Outcome evaluability challenged by improper selection of indicators and flaws in setting baselines and targets, as detailed below.*

Indicators	Baseline	Targets	Comments
a. Life expectancy at birth, disaggregated by	<u>Baseline:</u> Total: 69.1 yrs (2010)	<u>Target:</u> Increase in total figure of 2 yrs	This is an impact indicator, wrongly assigned to an

urban/rural, sex, ethnicity, income quintiles, education, geographical area (if available)	Men: 65 (2010) Women: 73.4 (2010)	(2017); Men: increase to 69 yrs (2017); Women: increase to 75.5 yrs (2017); Reduction in the gap between the sexes of 2 yrs (2017)	outcome. Disaggregation is excessive and unusual for such indicator. Disaggregation is not reflected in the baselines and targets, less by gender.
b. Under-five mortality rate, disaggregated as per indicator (a)	<u>Baseline</u> : 13.6 per 1,000 live births; Urban: 9.6 per 1,000 live births; Rural: 14.8 per 1,000 live births (2010)	<u>Target</u> : Decrease of 10% in total figure (2017) Decrease of 15% among most disadvantaged population (2017)	This is an impact indicator, wrongly assigned to an outcome. Disaggregation is excessive and unusual for such indicator. Disaggregation is not reflected in the baselines (less by geographical area) and targets. Unclear the definition of 'most disadvantaged population' to allow accurate measurement.
c. Private households' out-of-pocket payments on health as % of total health expenditure, disaggregated as per indicator (a)	<u>Baseline</u> : 48.4%	<u>Target</u> : Decrease to 35 % by 2017	Suitable indicator, however disaggregation excessive and not reflected in the baseline and target.
d. Percentage of adults and children with HIV still alive and known to be on antiretroviral therapy at 12 months, 24 months, and 60 months after initiating treatment; disaggregated by age, sex, regimen type, first/second line drugs	<u>Baseline</u> : 12 months: 88% (2010); 24 months: 79% (2010); 60 months: 73% (2010)	<u>Target</u> : 12 months: 88% (2017); 24 months: 80% (2017); 60 months: 75% (2017)	Two indicators (one impact indicator, one outcome indicator) combined in one, thus making difficult the measurement. Disaggregation not reflected in the baselines and targets, less by duration of antiretroviral therapy.
e. Maternal mortality rate (per 100,000 live births), disaggregated as per indicator (a)	<u>Baseline</u> : 44.5 per 100,000 live births; Urban: 35% of total maternal deaths; Rural: 65% of total maternal deaths (2010)	<u>Target</u> : 13.3 per 100,000 live births (2017)	This is an impact indicator, wrongly assigned to an outcome. Disaggregation is excessive and unusual for such indicator. Disaggregation is not reflected in the baselines (less by geographical area) and target.

Output 2.2.1 - Adolescents and youth have increased aged appropriate knowledge and skills to adopt gender-sensitive healthy lifestyle behaviours

Overall comments: Suitable selection of indicators and related disaggregation

Indicators	Baseline	Targets	Comments
a. Percentage of youth 15-24 years old who benefit from YFHCs in locations where such services exist	<u>Baseline</u> : 20% Disaggregated by rural/urban, sex, age groups, regions	<u>Target</u> : 40% Disaggregated by rural/urban, sex, age groups, regions	Suitable indicator. Relevant disaggregation
b. Percentage of women and men aged 15-24 who had more than one partner in the last 12 months who used a condom during their last sexual intercourse	Baseline: Men 15-19 years old – 60.6%; Women 15-19 years old – 19.8%; Men 20-24 years old – 45.7%; Women 20-24 years old – 49.7%	Target: Men 15-19 years old – 70%; Women 15-19 years old – 70%; Men 20-24 years old – 70%; Women 20-24 years old – 70%	Suitable indicator. Relevant disaggregation
c. Number of abortions per 1,000 females aged 15-19 years old [New indicator]	<u>Baseline</u> : (2011) 13.0 per 1,000 females	<u>Target</u> : decrease by 30%	Suitable indicator.

Output 2.2.2 - National stakeholders have enhanced capacity to ensure equitable access to HIV and TB prevention, diagnosis, treatment and care of key populations

Overall comments: *Confusion between output and outcome indicators. Capacity of national stakeholders aimed to be measured by effects at higher level i.e. outcome level rather than in terms of new skills or abilities, the availability of new services etc. which define an output according to the RBM*

Indicators	Baseline	Targets	Comments
a. Treatment success rate - number and percentage of new smear-positive TB cases successfully treated [cured plus treatment completed] among the new smear-positive TB cases registered in a given year	<u>Baseline:</u> 57.3% (2011, National Tuberculosis Programme (NTP))	<u>Target:</u> 65% (2013), 69% (2014), 74% (2015 cohort)	Rather an outcome indicator.
b. Percentage of individuals belonging to key populations who have been covered by HIV prevention services in the last 12 months	<u>Baseline:</u> Coverage with harm reduction (2009-2010) (coverage data for Chisinau): injecting drug users (IDUs) – 7.4%; sex workers (SWs) – 15.3%; men who have sex with men (MSM) – 25.7%	<u>Target:</u> 60% for each population group	Rather measuring the effect of the output at a higher level, see overall comments above. Baseline refers to Chisinau only. Unclear if the set target is also Chisinau-related.
c. Mother to child HIV transmission (MTCT) rate (disaggregated by rural/urban)	<u>Baseline:</u> 2.8% (disaggregation by rural/urban TBD in 2013)	<u>Target:</u> MTCT rate under 2% (disaggregation by rural/urban TBD in 2013)	Rather an outcome indicator.
d. Percentage of young people aged 15-24 who both correctly identify ways of preventing the sexual transmission of HIV and reject major misconceptions about HIV transmission [New indicator]	<u>Baseline:</u> (2010) Total - 38.2%	<u>Target:</u> Total - at least 50%	Suitable indicator

Output 2.2.3 - Public and private sector has increased capacity to manage the NCDs and developed improved environments enabling healthy choices to address key risk factors

Overall comments: *Confusion between output, outcome and impact indicators. Capacity of public and private sector aimed to be measured by effects at higher level i.e. outcome and impact level rather than in terms of new skills or abilities, the availability of new services etc. which define an output according to the RBM.*

Indicators	Baseline	Targets	Comments
a. Premature mortality from NCDs (cardiovascular disease, cancer, diabetes and chronic respiratory diseases) in the age group 30-70 years (rate per 100,000 people disaggregated by sex and rural/urban)	<u>Baseline:</u> (2011) 591.5 (of which male 772.2; female 429.7; rural 679.9; urban 477.4)	<u>Target:</u> 10% reduction (based on annual reduction by 2%, same disaggregation will be applied by sex and rural/urban)	Impact indicator rather than an output one.

b. % of regular daily smokers in the population, age 15+ (disaggregated by rural/urban and age groups)

Baseline: (disaggregation by rural/urban and age groups TBD in 2013): Male 51% (Demographic and Health Survey (DHS) 2005), 51% (WHO European Tobacco Control Report, 2007), 47% (WHO KAP study, 2012); Female 7.1% (DHS 2005), 5% (WHO European Tobacco Control report, 2007), 6% (WHO KAP Study, 2012)

Target: (disaggregation by rural/urban and age groups TBD in 2013); Male 3% reduction annually; Female 0.5% reduction annually

Outcome indicator

Output 2.2.4 - Health care and public health service providers, particularly at primary health care level, have enhanced capacity to ensure equitable access to deliver integrated quality health services, medicines and vaccines, with a focus on vulnerable populations including reproductive health, mother & child health and immunization

Overall comments: Questionable selection of two indicators i.e. capacity of service providers, which is implied by this output, aimed to be measured by effects at higher level rather than in terms of new skills or abilities, the availability of new products and services etc. which define an output according to RBM.

Indicators	Baseline	Targets	Comments
a. Rate of coverage by doctors and nurses as primary health care level to 10,000 people	<u>Baseline:</u> nurses/doctors - Average 15.0/5.2; Highest region 22.1/6.8; Lowest region 7.8/2.6; Rural 18.2/4.3; Urban 10.7/6.7 (2011)	<u>Target:</u> nurses/doctors - Average 16.0/6.5; Highest region 22.1/7.0; Lowest region 9.0/3.5; Rural 18.5/5.0; Urban 11.5/7.0 (2017)	Suitable indicator
b. Coverage with measles, mumps and rubella (MMR) vaccine of children under 24 months	<u>Baseline:</u> (2011) 92.8% Highest district – 99.8 % Lowest district – 73.5 %	<u>Target:</u> more than 95 % Highest district – 99.8 % Lowest district – 93 %	Rather measuring the effect of output 2.2.4 at a higher level and not the output as such, see overall comments above
c. Percentage of pregnant women covered by antenatal care services starting at 12 weeks of pregnancy	<u>Baseline:</u> (2011) 78%	<u>Target:</u> 85%	Ibid
d. The share of expenditures for medicines in the total out-of-pocket payments (information to be available including for vulnerable groups and income groups)	<u>Baseline:</u> 73.1 %	<u>Target:</u> 45 %	Suitable indicator, but disaggregation by vulnerability and income groups not incorporated in the baseline and target.

Output 2.2.5 – People, including those most marginalized, are able to claim and exercise their rights to health, seek health services and benefit from them

Overall comments: Good selection of indicators; however the disaggregation does not necessarily reflect the most marginalised people, as per output formulation

Indicators	Baseline	Targets	Comments
a. Percentage of people who did not seek health care when they felt it was justified	<u>Baseline:</u> Men 17.6 % Women 20.7 % Rural 18.4 % Urban 20.3 %	<u>Target:</u> Information to be available including for vulnerable groups and income groups Men: less than 15% Women: less than 16% Rural: less than 15% Urban: less than 16%	Suitable indicator, but insufficient disaggregation to depict the most marginalized.
b. Percentage of children of one year of age benefiting from health care supervision according to national health care standards	<u>Baseline:</u> 74 %	<u>Target:</u> 90%	Suitable indicator, but no disaggregation to capture vulnerability

Outcome 2.3 – All children and youth enjoy equitable and continuous access to a quality and relevant education system

Overall comments: Selected indicators are suitable but insufficient to measure the outcome given lack of disability and ethnicity in the disaggregation and absence of some key dimensions of evaluability.

Indicators	Baseline	Targets	Comments
a. Gross enrolment rates in pre-school, primary and lower secondary education (disaggregated by urban/rural, girls/boys, children, quintile for pre- and primary school)	<u>Baseline:</u> (2010) Pre-school: 77.1% Pre-school rural/urban: 67.1%/94.5% Pre-school boys/girls: 77.4%/76.9% Pre-school by quintile: 75.93%/102.37% Primary: 93.6% Primary rural/urban: 88%/104% Primary boys/girls: 94%/93.2% Primary by quintile: 103.52%/108.77% Lower secondary: 88.1% Lower secondary rural/urban: 84.3%/95.6% Lower secondary boys/girls: 88.4%/87.8% Enrolment rate of refugee children: 100%	<u>Target:</u> Increase by 10% the overall enrolment rates in pre-school and lower secondary and by 5% in primary Increase by 15% the enrolment rates in pre-school and lower secondary and by 8% in primary of the most disadvantaged groups	Suitable indicator. However, disaggregation is insufficient as it does not include disability and ethnicity, which are important variables for inclusiveness and equitable access. Disaggregation not reflected in the targets, apart by education level. Unclear the meaning of 'the most disadvantaged groups', thus impeding accurate measurement. Completion rate would have enhanced the evaluability of the outcome.

b. Percentage of educators and teachers applying child-centred methodologies	<u>Baseline</u> : Less than 1 per cent	<u>Target</u> : Increase by 10 percentage points annually	Suitable indicator; however, disaggregation by education level (pre-school, primary, secondary), geographical area (urban/rural) and children with special education needs would have been useful to measure 'equitable' access to 'quality' education, as per outcome formulation
[c. Indicator has been removed as it is not deemed relevant.]			Decision shared by the evaluation team

Output 2.3.1 - The government at all levels, stakeholders and caregivers increase inclusion, enrolment and retention of all children and adolescents, especially vulnerable ones, in mainstream pre-schools and schools

Overall comments: Confusion between outcome and output indicators. The various accountability angles at the level of duty-bearers included in the formulation of the output not clearly reflected in indicators.

Indicators	Baseline	Targets	Comments
a. Percentage of children with disabilities enrolled in mainstream pre-school institutions and schools (grades 1-9) disaggregated by age and sex	<u>Baseline</u> : For school (grade 1-9) estimation on existing data is 17.6% For preschool: 5%	<u>Target</u> : 50% for schools 30% for pre-schools	This is an outcome rather than output indicator. Disaggregation by ethnicity (an essential exclusion factor) missing. Indicator d) is insufficient to cover the ethnicity dimension.
b. Completion rate by sex	<u>Baseline</u> : (2011) Primary education total-91.1%; boys-92.0%, girls-90.2%	<u>Target</u> : 94% in total, for boys and girls	This is an outcome rather than output indicator. Insufficient disaggregation in the formulation of indicator and set target.
[c. Indicator has been removed as it is not deemed relevant.]			Decision not shared by the evaluation team. The removed indicator was among the very few relevant quality indicators present in the Results Matrix. Roma inclusion strategies are aimed to bring about social change which is often based on subjective criteria of justice and equity. Collection and monitoring of qualitative data is of paramount importance, hence the need to be budgeted and included in the M&E frameworks.
d. The number of communities that have Roma segregated schools or classes	<u>Baseline</u> : 3	<u>Target</u> : 0	Suitable indicator, but unclear which education level is considered and which is the proportion of the total number of communities with segregated schools/classes.

Output 2.3.2 - Education authorities at all levels apply new quality education standards and mechanisms for improved teaching skills, learning environment and learning outcomes in ways which reduce disparities

Overall comments: Confusion between process, output and outcome indicators, resulting in improper assignment of indicators to measure various results in the logic chain.

Indicators	Baseline	Targets	Comments
a. Percentage of educators and teachers trained on child-centred methodology or inclusive education	<u>Baseline</u> : (2012) for teachers 10% for educators 35%	<u>Target</u> for teachers: 60% <u>Target</u> for educators: over 80%	This is a process indicator. An output indicator would have been the percentage of teachers who successfully completed the training course. Unclear if the baselines and

			targets refer to child-centred methodology or inclusive education (two different concepts).
b. Percentage of children who meet early learning development standards (ELDS).	<u>Baseline</u> : Baseline 80% (2014).	<u>Target</u> : 82%	Rather an outcome indicator.
b.1. Percentage of educators who apply professional standards [New indicator]	<u>Baseline</u> : 79 % (2014)	<u>Target</u> : 82%	Suitable indicator
c. Percentage of children ready for school disaggregated by sex, rural/urban	<u>Baseline</u> : 97.5% (2012)	<u>Target</u> : 97.5% (to maintain the same high level)	Suitable indicator. However, disaggregation not reflected in the baseline and target and missing the ethnicity and disability/special educational needs dimensions (which are frequently creating inequalities).
d. Percentage of pupils competent in reading, mathematics and sciences (Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA) report)	<u>Baseline</u> : (results of PISA 2009+, published in 2012) 43% of pupils are competent in reading; 39% in mathematics; 53% in sciences	<u>Target</u> : (2017 results of PISA 2015): 10 percentage points increase in each of the three domains	This is an outcome indicator rather than an output indicator.
[e. Indicator has been removed as it is not deemed relevant.]			Decision shared by the evaluation team.

Outcome 2.4 – People enjoy equitable access to an improved social protection system

Overall comments: Only two out of five indicators are suitable; still, their disaggregation level is insufficient. The other three indicators are unable to measure progress or are unclear. Evaluability of the outcome would have been strengthened by the use of additional and more appropriate indicators, as suggested below.

Indicators	Baseline	Targets	Comments
a. Percentage of the poorest quintile covered by social aid	<u>Baseline</u> : 9.7% in 2010	<u>Target</u> : 20% by 2017	Suitable indicator. It would have been useful to disaggregate the indicator by gender, geographical area (urban/rural), age to enable better measurement of equity of the social aid system. Also useful would have been indicators about the coverage rate of eligible people, exclusion errors, etc. In case of missing information, data generation activities should have been planned, financed and implemented.
b. Rate of children (under the age of 18) living in formal care by the end of the year per 100,000 children, disaggregated by the rate in family-based care and rate in institutional care	<u>Baseline</u> : Baseline recalculated/ adjusted: (2010) 1,885 per 100,000, including 908 per 100,000, in residential care and 977 per 100,000, in family-based care	<u>Target</u> : 1,900 per 100,000 children, including 500 in residential care and 1,400 in family-based care	Suitable indicator. It would have been useful to disaggregate the indicator by gender, age, disability and ethnicity to enable better measurement of access to improved social protection system, as per outcome formulation.
c. Number of beneficiaries of social home care (outreach services)	<u>Baseline</u> : (2010) 25,403 persons	<u>Target</u> : 27,000 persons	This indicator is unable to reveal progress in relation to the specific problem which is aimed to be addressed. Would

			27,000 people be enough? Why not 30,000 people? The indicator could not measure to what extent people in need of social home care are actually benefitting of such services and further of 'improved social protection system' as per outcome formulation.
d. Number of adults/families benefited from specialized social services for persons with disabilities	<u>Baseline</u> : 5,240	<u>Target</u> : 7,500	Ibid.
e. Population with health insurance to ensure access to care (including to primary health care), disaggregated by urban/rural, sex, income quintile, education, geographical area (if available)	Baseline: 74% (2011) Rural 68% (2011) Urban: 83% (2011) Roma: 23%	<u>Target</u> : Increase to 100 % by 2017	Unclear formulation: 'Population (...) to ensure access to care'? Disaggregation not fully reflected in the baselines and target.

Output 2.4.1 - Social protection system has functional continuum of services, with special attention to individuals and groups facing difficulties in exercising fundamental rights, and prevents and addresses violence, exploitation and family separation

Overall comments: Too long and detailed formulation of the output (details could have been captured in the formulation of indicators). The output is not evaluable (see below).

Indicators	Baseline	Targets	Comments
[a. Indicator has been removed as it is not deemed relevant.]			Decision not shared by the evaluation team. By removing the initial indicator from the Results Matrix, output 2.4.1 has become not evaluable. The newly-introduced indicator is totally insufficient.
a.1. Number of districts with functional Common BCIS and SYSLAB providing services [New indicator]	Baseline: (2013) 28 BCIS 1 SYSLAB centre in Chisinau	Target: Functional BCIS in 32 districts, 2 municipalities, Gagauzia; 5 SYSLAB centres	See above.

Output 2.4.2 Right holders from vulnerable or socially excluded groups have increased access to social protection, including services and insurance necessary for realization of social rights

Overall comments: This is an outcome (not an output) aimed to be measured by a number of output and process indicators, which is incorrect. Full revision of indicators is needed.

Indicators	Baseline	Targets	Comments
[a. Indicator has been removed as it is not deemed relevant.]			
a.1. Status of assessment of resilience of the social protection system to respond to the needs of the vulnerable, families, including children, facing shocks, disasters, and crises [New indicator]	<u>Baseline</u> : No data on resilience (2014)	<u>Target</u> : Resilience component assessed and recommendations provided to improve social protection system (2017)	This is rather a process indicator and not in line with the set target which goes beyond the assessment of resilience.
b. Extent of regular reporting on the effectiveness of the social protection response	<u>Baseline</u> : Evidence partially available, effectiveness of social	<u>Target</u> : Evidence available and included in regular government reports	This is rather a process indicator. A more useful indicator for the output would have been one measuring the extent

to the needs of the most vulnerable established, with focus on child poverty [New indicator]	protection response to child poverty is not properly addressed in regular reporting (2014)	disseminated annually	to which evidence generation and evidence-based reporting influenced a social protection response to address child poverty.
c. Policy recommendations in place to improve adequacy and coverage with minimum income security, notably of excluded groups [New indicator]	<u>Baseline:</u> 1) lack of policy options to revise the current pension formula, which does not allow for income re-evaluation and maintenance of real value of future pensions; 2) lack of policy recommendations to enhance farmers' coverage by social security; 3) lack of methodology to implement risk-based social security with differentiated contribution rates by industry	<u>Target:</u> The policy options submitted for consideration	Suitable indicator. However, the set target is inappropriate as it does not measure the fact that policy recommendations are 'in place', but rather the provision of policy options

Pillar 3: Environment, Climate Change and Disaster Risk Management

Outcome 3.1 - Improved environmental management in significantly increased compliance with international and regional standards

Overall comments: *The Outcome formulation is unclear, thus raising difficulties in identifying the right set of indicators i.e. should the indicators measure "improved" management or "increased" compliance?*

Indicators	Baseline	Targets	Comments
a. Institutional reform increases capacities for environmental policy implementation	<u>Baseline:</u> Programme and action plan of the government for 2011-2014, draft National Environmental Strategy 2012-2022 and draft Law on Environment Protection foresee creation of an Environment Protection Agency (EPA); capacities for implementation and enforcement are weak	<u>Target:</u> EPA established and fully functional by end of 2013 2017 (according to the Government Programme 2015-2018); institutional reform provides for an effective and efficient system of environmental policy implementation and enforcement	Rather a process indicator which does not help measure the progress towards the outcome. While the first target is suitable, the second is too general and progress cannot be effectively measured.
b. Surface of protected areas (% of territory) managed in compliance with international requirements	<u>Baseline:</u> 4.65% (2011); currently not managed in compliance with international standards	<u>Target:</u> 7% of the territory (National Environmental Strategy (NES) – 8% in 2023); management plans developed and implemented for all sites	Apparently suitable indicator (but see overall comments above)
c. Environmental considerations integrated into sectoral policies or sector-specific environment action plans/policy documents in place	<u>Baseline:</u> Integration of environmental requirements into the sectoral policies and strategies	<u>Target:</u> Sectoral policies and strategies integrate sectoral environmental objectives, actions and indicators	Apparently suitable indicator (but see overall comments above)

	foreseen by draft National Environmental Strategy 2012-2022 and draft Law on Environment Protection; current policies integrating environmental considerations: Environment and Health Action Plan, Concept of Ecological Agriculture; Transport		
Output 3.1.1 – National institutions are able to apply their regulatory, organizational, and technical capacity to mainstream environment and natural resource management into norms, policies, programmes and budgets			
<i>Overall comments: The Output is relevant for the outcome and the assigned indicators are appropriate, less several targets (see comments below).</i>			
Indicators	Baseline	Targets	Comments
a. Number of public policies, plans and normative acts at central and local levels that integrate environment and/or undergo SEA	<u>Baseline</u> : Existing policies did not undergo environmental assessment, environment is not mainstreamed into sector policies; ex-ante impact assessment for policies, including environmental impacts, is at the piloting stage (30 public policy proposals assessed as of June 2012)	<u>Target</u> : Legal framework for environmental assessment of policies, plans and legal acts is in place; all newly developed policies (at least 5 key sectoral development policies) are screened and assessed according to the SEA Law and legal acts are submitted to ecological expertise	Suitable indicator. However, first target including "in place" leaves space for interpretation i.e. developed, adopted, enforced? The second target does not capture the 'local level' included in the formulation of the indicator.
b. Environmental expenditures at national and local levels in relation to state budget, including allocations in other sectors (%)	<u>Baseline</u> : (2011) 0.69%	<u>Target</u> : By 2017 the share of environmental expenditures not lower than the average in new EU member states /accession countries in Central and Eastern Europe	Suitable indicator, but the target is not specific enough (and possibly not realistic having in view the development gap between Moldova and the new EU member states, on average)
Output 3.1.2 - Environmental authorities, private sector and civil society are better able to develop, implement and comply with environmental legislation, policies, programmes/budgets in an accountable, transparent and participatory manner			
<i>Overall comments: While the output formulation is suitable, the chosen indicators are confusing. There is a mix of process, output and outcome indicators, which creates significant evaluability challenges. At the same time, there is no indicator to assess the progress in relation to private sector and civil society capacity.</i>			
Indicators	Baseline	Targets	Comments
a. Degree of implementation of the 'Environment' chapter of the EU-Moldova AA in line with the action plan	<u>Baseline</u> : AA is expected to be signed in 2013	<u>Target</u> : Policy development and Legal Approximation commitments implemented in line with the Action Plan	Suitable indicator, although too far away of UN influence.

b. The National Ecological Fund has improved regulation and transparent programme and project cycle management in line with sectoral and national priorities; number of financing strategies/budget programmes for programmes/subprogrammes of the Strategy for Environmental Expenditures in place	<u>Baseline</u> : The regulation of the NEF was developed and approved in the 1998 with several changes up to 2010 and does not correspond to good international practices; projects from the NEF are not selected based on competition/tenders; currently only one subprogramme (Water Sector) has a Financing Strategy in place	<u>Target</u> : New regulation, spending strategies and project cycle management procedures of the NEF in place in line with good international practice; at least 2 additional subprogrammes have financing strategies/budget programmes in place.	Indicator formulated like an output. Same comment as above concerning the syntagm 'in place'
c. Surface of natural protected areas (in % of national territory); number of natural protected areas managed in line with international requirements; National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (NBSAP) updated and implemented	<u>Baseline</u> : (2011) 4.65%; none fully managed in line with international requirements; NBSAP expired	<u>Target</u> : at least 7%; all protected areas managed in line with international standards; NBSAP fully implemented	3 different indicators The first two on protected areas are similar to the outcome indicator 3.1 b. An output indicator should have measured, for instance, the capacity to expand the surface and manage it in line with international requirements. The last indicator on NBSAP is not evaluable, the target actually copying the indicator i.e. "(...) Strategy (...) ...implemented" with target "fully implemented". The target should have operationalised the meaning of full implementation.
d. Quantity of highly hazardous pesticides (HHPs) present in the country; number of pilot projects with alternative integrated pest management	<u>Baseline</u> : 1,500 tons of obsolete pesticides in 23 locations (baseline data source: FAO)	<u>Target</u> : at least 10% of existing HHPs sent for disposal plus 1 major high-risk site safeguarded; 5 pilot projects on integrated pest management developed	2 different indicators A mixture between outcome and a process indicator. The baseline does not reflect the second indicator on pilot projects.

Outcome 3.2 – Strengthened national policies and capacities enable climate and disaster resilient, low-emission economic development and sustainable consumption

Overall comments: *The definition of the outcome is inappropriate as it combines an output (strengthened policies and capacities) with the ultimate goal of resilience, economic development and consumption (a higher level result). The assigned indicators reflect this shortcoming.*

Indicators	Baseline	Targets	Comments
a. Number of communities that implement climate and disaster risk reduction measures in line with National Disaster Risk Management Strategy and Climate Change Adaptation Strategy and international treaties	<u>Baseline</u> : 0% of 1,681 communities	<u>Target</u> : 10% of communities implement disaster risk management and climate change adaptation measures in line with the national strategies	Rather an output indicator.
b. Energy and resource intensity	<u>Baseline</u> : Energy Intensity 31.7 MJ/US \$ (2006); currently	<u>Target</u> : Energy intensity: reduce by 7% until 2017 in comparison with 2010	2-in-1 indicator (energy and resource). Suitable for the second part (ultimate goal) of the outcome (see overall

	Resource Efficient and Cleaner Production (RCEP) applications are underestimated by both public utilities and the private sector; inefficient use/consumption of natural resources (water, materials and energy) by enterprises and other organizations and implementation of environmentally sound technologies lagging behind; limited incentives for sustainable consumption	(minus 1% annually on average); resource intensity concept implemented at 100 companies	comments above)
c. Share of renewable energy in gross domestic consumption	<u>Baseline</u> : 5%	<u>Target</u> : 15% by 2017 or increase of minimum 2% annually (20% by 2020)	Suitable indicator for the second part (ultimate goal) of the outcome (see overall comments above)
Output 3.2.1 - Public and private sector and individual consumers change production and consumption patterns towards increased energy and resource efficiency, and use of renewable energy			
Overall comments: This is an outcome as it indicates changes in the institutional performance and behaviours, as per RBM definition. Confusion between outcome and output indicators and shortcomings in the definition of targets.			
Indicators	Baseline	Targets	Comments
a. Energy intensity; number of NAMAs developed and submitted for funding to the UNFCCC; HCFC consumption	<u>Baseline</u> : (2009) 14,170 total primary energy consumption per dollar of GDP (Btu per Year 2005, US \$ (purchasing power parity); no NAMAs developed at the moment; 2.3 ozone-depleting potential (ODP) tons of HCFCs (2009)	<u>Target</u> : - 5% by 2017 (TBC in 2013); at least 4-6 NAMAs developed and registered with the UNFCCC by 2015 and relevant measurement, reporting and verification system in place for NAMA implementation; 10% reduction by 2015 compared to the basic consumption level	3 different indicators The first similar with outcome indicator 3.2 b. The other two are suitable. Set targets do not reflect baselines and measurement units (nominal value 14,170 vs 5% of what?)
b. Percentage of renewable energy in total gross domestic energy consumption; number of biomass heating installations in public buildings/private households; number of biomass fuel producers	<u>Baseline</u> : 5%; 90/fewer than 100, 50 (2012)	<u>Target</u> : 15%; 280/700; 140	3 different indicators The first similar with outcome indicator 3.2 c. The other two are suitable.
c. Resource and energy efficiency and pollution intensity at the level of enterprises/organizations; role of resource efficient and cleaner production (RECP) in relevant policies implemented at different administrative levels	<u>Baseline</u> : 5 enterprises implemented RECP from 2010 and achieved reductions in usage of materials, energy and water and reduction of waste and pollutants	<u>Target</u> : At least 90 additional companies implement RECP practices and techniques, resulting in increased resource productivity (through saving water, materials and/ or energy) and decreased pollution intensity (through	3 different indicators The first is actually a 3-in-1 indicator (resource efficiency, energy efficiency, pollution intensity) and is partially similar with outcome indicator 3.2 b. The second is not exactly an indicator. Target going much beyond the baseline and progress difficult

reduction of waste and emissions) by 2017; government has adopted policy measures that encourage enterprises to implement RECP techniques and practices to be measured as a consequence

Output 3.2.2 - Policies, mechanisms and capacities strengthened at all levels for disaster risk management and climate change adaptation

Overall comments: The output is appropriate, but there are many flaws in the selection and evaluability of indicators.

Indicators	Baseline	Targets	Comments
a. Disaster risk management/ climate change strategies in place; climate/disaster risk management screening for sector policies implemented; number of local policies/plans adopted/revised with climate change and disaster risk management mainstreamed, incl. number of child-focused and agriculture-focused plans	<u>Baseline:</u> No disaster risk management/climate change strategies in place; no climate/ disaster risk management screening methodology for sector policies in place (foreseen in the draft National Climate Change Adaptation Strategy); fewer than 20 local plans in place that fully integrate climate change and disaster risk management, none of which is child-focused, number of agriculture-focused plans TBD in 2013	<u>Target:</u> National disaster risk management/climate change strategies adopted; climate and disaster risk management screening framework for sector policies adopted and implemented; 100 local development plans with climate change/ disaster risk management mainstreamed, incl. at least 3 child-focused plans, % of the provisions implemented dedicated to disaster risk management and climate change within the action plan for the implementation of the Agriculture Strategy	3-in-1 indicator. The target related to agriculture not evaluable.
b. Share of health facilities with an increased level of resilience to disasters and with health personnel having skills in public health and emergency management and disaster response planning and preparedness in place	<u>Baseline:</u> the levels of resilience in public hospitals are distributed as follows: 25% - high, 76% - average and 8% - low; number of skilled health personnel - 340	<u>Target:</u> 50%:50%:0%; 480 additional personnel have acquired skills	2-in-1 indicator. The second is unable to measure if progress has reached a critical mass as it has no reference to the size of the problem i.e. the overall number of personnel who would require improved skills (would 480 be enough or not?)
c. Number of Actions implemented from the National IHR Action Plan	<u>Baseline:</u> 17 actions out of 31 implemented	<u>Target:</u> all actions fully implemented	Rather a process indicator

Annex 9 – List of policy documents supported by UN Moldova 2013-2016

Title of document	Type*	Type of UN support	UN agency
Justice			
Strategy on Prosecution System Reform	PD	advice/inputs for development	UNDP
Methodology for court optimization	O	advice/inputs for development	UNDP
Health			
Strategy on Safe Sexual Behaviour	PD	advice/inputs for development	UNFPA, UNICEF
Sexual and Reproductive Health Programme 2020	P	advice/inputs for development	UNFPA
Government Decision to take over the procurement of contraceptives for vulnerable groups and set up a system to track procurement methods and facilitate universal access for targeted groups	L	advice/inputs for development	UNFPA
Guidelines for service providers on HIV counselling and testing of adolescents	O	advice/inputs for development	UNICEF
National protocols for HIV treatment and care for adults, children and those with opportunistic infections	O	advice/inputs for development	WHO
HIV Harm reduction strategy	PD	critical review/ evaluation; evidence demonstrating the need for adopting a dedicated strategy	UNAIDS
National Programme of HIV Prevention and Control 2016-2020 (draft)	P	advice/inputs for development	UNAIDS
Methadone Substitution Treatment Programme to prevent the spread of HIV among injection drug users.	P	technical assistance for scaling up	UNODC
National Clinical Protocol on Methadone Substitution Treatment and Psychosocial Regulation	O, L	technical assistance for adoption, respectively revision	UNODC
Prison current HIV policy frameworks	PD	technical assistance for revision and updating	UNODC
National Cancer Control Programme and Action Plan	P	advice/inputs for development	WHO
NCD control legislation	L	advice/inputs for development and advocacy for enforcement	WHO
Action Plan on Cervical Screening	P	advice/inputs for development	UNFPA, WHO
Strategy for child and adolescent health	PD	advice/inputs for development	WHO
e-Health Strategy	PD	advice/inputs for development	WHO
Legal framework on Youth Friendly Health Centre	L	advice/inputs for development	UNICEF
Perinatal care and immunization programmes in the Transnistrian region	P	technical assistance for improvement	UNICEF, WHO
National Public Health Strategy 2014-2020	PD	advice/inputs for development	WHO
National Programme on Food and Nutrition 2014-2020 and Action Plan	P	advice/inputs for development	WHO
National TB Control Programme 2016-2020 (draft)	P	advice/inputs for development	WHO
National Immunization Program 2016-2020 (draft)	P	advice/inputs for development	WHO
National guidelines for Local Health Profiles	O	advice/inputs for development	WHO
Oversight mechanism for human rights in psychiatric institutions	O	advice/inputs for development	OHCHR
Education			
Code of Education	L	inputs on the draft	UNICEF
National Strategy "Education 2020"	PD	advice/inputs for development	UNICEF
Programme and Plan of Action for School Dropout Prevention	P	advice/inputs for development	UNICEF
Legal framework regulating children's social inclusion	L	technical assistance for revision	UNICEF
Education Decentralization Strategy	PD	inputs on the draft	UNICEF
Quality education standards in line with the Child-Friendly Schools concept	O	advice/inputs for development	UNICEF
Strategy on parenting	PD	advice/inputs for development	UNICEF
Social protection, child protection			
Foster care regulations and minimum standards	L, O	evidence demonstrating the need for revision	UNICEF
Government decision setting the inter-sector referral mechanism on violence, neglect, exploitation and trafficking of children	L	advice/inputs for development; participation in working groups and consultations; advocacy for adoption	UNICEF, IOM
Road map for adopting the International Classification of Functioning, Disability and Health for Children and Youth to assess child disability	O	technical assistance and advocacy for adoption	UNICEF
Law on Special Protection for Children at Risk	L	advice/inputs for development; participation in working groups and consultations	UNICEF, IOM
National Strategy for Child Protection 2014-2020	PD	advice/inputs for development	UNICEF
Action Plan for the implementation of the National Strategy	P	advice/inputs for development;	UNICEF

for Child Protection 2014-2020 <i>(draft)</i>		participation in working groups and consultations	
Law on social welfare	L	advice/inputs for development	UNICEF
Law on amending and supplementing certain acts in preventing and combating domestic violence	L	technical assistance for revision; participation in working groups and consultations	UNICEF, IOM
Law on rehabilitation of victims of crime (including of Trafficking of Human Beings) <i>(draft)</i>	L	advice/inputs for development; participation in working groups and consultations; advocacy for adoption	UNDP/IOM
Regulation and Minimum Quality Standards for the Crisis Service	L, O	technical assistance for revision/ updating	IOM
Migration Management			
Regulation on procedures of return, expulsion and readmission of the foreigners from territory of the Republic of Moldova	L	technical assistance for revision	IOM
National Strategy for Integrated Border Management for 2014-2017 and its Action Plan	PD	advice/inputs for development, advocacy for adoption	IOM
Contravention Code	L	technical assistance for revision	IOM
Law on foreigners status	L	technical assistance for revision	IOM
Law on the state border of the Republic of Moldova	L	technical assistance for revision	IOM
Law of border police of the Republic of Moldova	L	technical assistance for revision	IOM
Plan for state border infrastructure development 2015-2016	P	advice/inputs for development; advocacy for adoption	IOM
Strategic development plan of border police	PD	Advice/inputs for development; advocacy for adoption	IOM
National Action Plan for prevention and combating the trafficking of human beings 2014-2016	P	technical assistance for revision/ updating; advice/inputs for development; advocacy for adoption	IOM
Regulation of activity of multidisciplinary territorial teams within National Referral System	L	advice and assistance for development; advocacy for adoption	IOM
Regulation on the organization and functioning of services for assistance and protection of the victims of trafficking of human beings and their quality standards	L,O	advice/inputs for development; advocacy for adoption	IOM
National Strategy Diaspora 2025	PD	advice/inputs for development; advocacy for adoption	IOM
Action Plan 2016-2020 of the Strategy on Migration and Asylum 2011-2020	P	advice/inputs for development; advocacy for adoption	IOM
Action Plan 2014-2016 for supporting the integration of Moldovan citizens returned from abroad	P	advice/inputs for development; advocacy for adoption	IOM
Law on employment and protection of job seekers	L	technical assistance for revision	ILO
Government decision on the commencement of negotiations on the draft agreement between the Moldovan and Russian governments on cooperation in the repatriation of victims of human trafficking, child trafficking, smuggling of migrants, unaccompanied children and stranded migrants	L	advice/inputs for development; advocacy for adoption	IOM
Regulation on the procedure of repatriation of children and adults - victims of human trafficking, smuggling of migrants and unaccompanied children <i>(draft)</i>	L	technical assistance for revision	IOM
Agreement between the Moldovan Government and the Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine on cooperation in the protection and repatriation of victims of trafficking (adults and children), unaccompanied children and stranded migrants <i>(draft)</i>	L	advice/inputs for development; advocacy for adoption	IOM
Law amending and supplementing certain acts (addresses provisions related to Trafficking of Human Beings and related crimes)	L	technical assistance for revision/ updating	IOM
Protocol of Cooperation on protection of migrant workers' rights, between Trade Unions of Moldova, Ukraine and Italy	L	technical assistance for development	ILO
Decentralization and Local Development			
Draft Law on Inter-Municipal Cooperation	L	technical assistance for development	UNDP
Small Areas Deprivation Index	O	advice/inputs for development for revision	UNDP
Law on local public finances	L	technical assistance for revision and advocacy for adoption	UNDP
Sectoral decentralization strategies	P	technical assistance for development	UNDP
New system of local public finances	O	supported the piloting in 4 districts	UNDP
Options for territorial-administrative reform	PD	technical assistance for development	UNDP
Methodology for assessing the implementation of the National Decentralization Strategy	O	technical assistance for development	UNDP
Environment, Energy			
Resource Efficient and Cleaner Production Roadmap for Moldova	O	technical assistance for development	UNIDO
Reform proposals for the pollution charging system	PD	technical assistance for development	UNDP

New Regulation and Operational Manual for the National Environmental Fund	L	advice/inputs for development; advocacy for adoption	UNDP
Expenditures' strategy of the Ministry of Environment within MTEF	PD	advice/inputs for development	UNDP
Agriculture and food safety			
National Strategy for Agricultural and Rural Development and Action Plan	L	technical assistance for development	FAO
Guides on good practices on hygiene and risk evaluation in food safety	O	support for development	FAO
Labour			
Amicable Labour Disputes Resolution mechanisms	O	technical assistance for establishment	ILO
Social Security Agreements with Hungary and Lithuania	L	technical assistance for development	ILO
Other			
Law on gender equality	L	advice/inputs for development; participation in working groups and consultations; advocacy for adoption	UNWomen
Law providing free legal aid to the asylum seekers	L	advice/inputs for development, advocacy for adoption	UNHCR
Amendments to legal framework on introduction of free medical insurance policies for refugees	L	technical assistance for revision	UNHCR
National Youth Strategy 2020	PD	advice/inputs for development	UNFPA
CEC rules on rights of voters from diaspora	O	technical assistance for revision	UNDP

*PD=policy document; L=law, by-law, regulation, etc.; P=Plan/Programme; O=other (guidelines, standards, protocols)

CASE STUDY

“Enhancing Women’s Political Representation through improved capacity and enhanced support in Moldova” (Women in Politics) Project

Duration:	June 2014 – December 2016 (30 months)
Budget:	2,934,979 USD,
Funded by:	Swedish Embassy
UN Implementing Agencies:	UN Women (lead), UNDP
National partners:	East Europe Foundation, Centre Partnership for Development
Target group:	women politicians elected locally and parliamentarians

Methodological note: The methodology of the case study included a structured documentary review of project documentation, a review of the situation analyses available from various sources (including local, national and international sources) and collection of primary data through interviews of key stakeholders (project management team, project partners, final beneficiaries, donor), followed by data analysis based on specific models which are applicable to projects of such nature, i.e.: a) cause-effect analysis, identifying all underlying causes and the ones selected by the project to address, hence useful to draw conclusions on the choice of causes upon which the project intervened, and the effect of choosing not to intervene upon the other causes as against the outcomes to be achieved; b) change theory analysis, identifying factors of national ownership and sustainability, hence useful to draw conclusions on the sustainability of change brought about by the project; and c) political change theory (Kingstone window of opportunity for the adoption of a policy), to analyse to what extent the underlying conditions of change are addressed adequately, consciously and effectively, and draw conclusions on each of the action lines. The structure of the case study has been presented in the Inception Report of the evaluation.

Overall assessment:

The project is highly relevant for the needs of the country and based on an excellent understanding of the problem cause-effect relationship. The results achieved in terms of empowering the locally-elected women are solid, with important sustainability prospects. The skills acquired by the elected women parliamentarians have been useful to advance the gender equality agenda and adoption of Law 71/2016 on gender equality. The highly volatile political environment has required several adaptations to keep the project relevant and beneficial for the target groups.

Key findings and conclusions:

Women participation in central level politics and in political parties is limited in Moldova. Politics is very much driven by financial resources as parties are dominated by important economic centres and closed business circles. Without a particular bias against women, there are fewer women ascending and effectively competing on political arena and from within the political parties. Administrative data show that women represent 21% of the Members of Parliament (MPs), 20.6% of mayors, 30.04% of local and 18.55% of district councillors³, far below international standards and the country’s commitments under nationally and internationally agreed goals (30% target)⁴. Locally elected women in a seat of mayor or local councillor enjoy a better image as many locally elected people come from liberal professions where women are better represented.

The problem - the inadequate representation of women in Parliament, central authorities and in locally-elected authorities - is generally considered to be caused by: a) political party structure (central and local level) that is male-dominated and economic power-based; b) poorer set of competing skills and confidence to compete within the party for Parliament positions and for local positions; c) societal

³ Embassy of Sweden/UNDP (2015) “Auditul de gen in cadrul Parlamentului Republicii Moldova”, www.md.undp.org, accessed on 28.05.2016, CEC (2015), “Raportul privind alegerile locale generale”

⁴ Progen (2015), “Gender Index 2015”, http://www.progen.md/files/4085_ge_index_for_2015.pdf, accessed on 28.05.2016

perception that partially disfavours women electability particularly in Parliament; d) competition for scarce economic resources, with women having an overall weaker economic position. The first two causes are on the supply side and can open opportunities in case properly addressed on a short-term (3-4 years) or at worst on a mid-term (6-7 years) perspective. Analysis shows that election in the Parliament on short and mid-term perspective could be only possible through the adoption of special affirmative measures of gender quota, while for the local elections this could be solely overcome by improving women confidence and skills. On the demand side, the overall societal attitude is not that much against the electability of women, therefore some mid-term campaign might have created satisfactory acceptability of the voters. Finally, the economic power weaknesses of women's professions and less representation in business yet represent a disadvantage on mid to long-term perspective.

The project strategy was to mainly focus on two of the four underlying causes mentioned above (societal perception, and competing skills and confidence) leaving the economic empowerment of women to be addressed by another UN Women/SIDA/ASDI initiative (considered in principle to be complementary), and the political party structure to be addressed by other partners (such as the National Democratic Institute – NDI and International Republican Institute – IRI). The change theory presumes the project intervention directly upon the causes of the problem, gradually removing or reducing their influence. Each line of intervention should lead to solutions which are contextually sound and which are part of societal ownership to ensure that they influence the identified causes in a sustainable manner. The choice of interventions implemented by the project has been generally adequate, with some potential to increase the results ownership.

To get *women elected in the parliament* there was a need to address central and local party structure since the majoritarian electoral system does not leave any chance to women from outside the main party system. The solution obviously was two-fold: to make the party system more inclusive for women and therefore get more and higher on the party list; and to regulate gender quota for the party list. As the project conceived by UN Women became operational only in summer 2014 with parliamentary elections scheduled for November 2014, the project has initially focused on advocating for the change of the law (*demand side*) to require party list gender equality, given that the other actors NDI/IRI have worked for a longer period of time on the party structure and better women representation areas. The legal solution has been embedded in the draft law 180 (i.e. draft law 71 as changed in the Parliament) submitted by the Government for adoption in the Parliament. The text of the law was drafted in the framework of another UN Women initiative. The project which is the subject of the case study has mainly worked to improve the skills and build the confidence of the women candidates for November parliamentary elections (supply side). Later on, trainings have been carried out, based on prior needs assessment, to form some core skills and build confidence of a number of elected women MPs. Those parties that agreed to participate in the targeted training activities have recalled the improved standing to compete within the party structure and overall in the competition with other political parties. Given political volatility, not all parties agreed to be part of the deputies' skills development trainings. Effectiveness of the transferred skills in support of their practice is still to be assessed.

On the *legal framework side (demand side)*, even though the draft law ensuring better gender equality was agreed by the Government, the demand for it and political will for the adoption in the Parliament was not that strong. To make this happen, as the theory of political decision and experience show, three conditions should have been simultaneously satisfied: 1) strong demand generated in the influential part of the society – which has yet to be ensured authentically by a large civil society coalition, 2) availability of a sound draft law to address the political gender equality – which has been

available⁵, and 3) political willingness to adopt the law – that was just partly present. The project has worked on all three conditions by supporting the creation of the Gender Equality Platform (condition 1) which exerted pressure on the decision-makers, yet to be further strengthened and provided sufficient resources to continue to act and get involved as the major advocacy entity for future changes. The draft law (condition 2), adopted with advocacy contribution from the project, has been largely agreed by most actors from both the civil society and Government side and there was political willingness to take it further for adoption (condition 3). The Platform members and other organizations have played an important role in satisfying the third condition by keeping the subject high on the political agenda and working continuously, both formally and informally, with the key MPs in the Parliament factions. The platform has managed to become a vocal supporter for women political participation in Moldova.

Better women representation in local administration has been addressed by the project through developing skills and confidence (*supply side*) and increased networking of the local candidate women among themselves. The trainings have taken place over a period of 8-9 months prior to local elections in June 2015 which was partly adequate. The beneficiaries found the skills building activities useful (particularly due to the combination of trainings with mentoring and coaching), yet, they did not yield conclusive evidence of better women representation. Some observers claimed that the project effort has secured a slight increase in the representation of women. The project focus on Roma and other marginalised groups helped the election of two Roma councillors. However, the project is yet to come up with evidence on the first time elected and trained women by the project. Trainings were complemented by periodic forums where women across various political movements were able to extend their network and increase confidence. The after-the-election support provided to locally-elected women through the small grants facility for initiatives in their communities was useful. The economic disempowerment faced by some potential women political leaders or elected women still remains a challenge to be addressed in the future; often such disempowerment made them abandon the political race, respectively quit the elective office as the pay-off is small in this position. In case of other women, they left the elective office due to the incompatibilities brought about by the recently adopted law on public finances. The local party structure should be also addressed in the future along with the current activities. Local contextual ownership has not been enough profiled as local civil society organizations have not been sufficiently involved in supporting the objective of the project.

On the *societal perception and demand side* for the women to be better represented in politics, the project chose to promote HeForShe campaign and undertake other types of information and awareness activities. These actions seem to be needed, yet their impact on perceptions and attitudes change is still to be assessed (for instance, as part of the final evaluation of the project). The societal and political environment of the project has substantially evolved in the course of 2014-2016. New political parties emerged that have high society recognition and got higher support after the local elections in 2015, while initially project-chosen political parties showed substantial decline in popularity and chances in the future political contests. These emerging developments, posing risks upon the relevance of the selected target group, should have been identified from the outset and properly addressed, once unfolding, on the basis of a risks mitigation strategy.

⁵ Draft Law 180 (adopted in 2016 as Law 71, <http://lex.justice.md/md/365019/>) including mandatory 40% gender quota on party electoral lists with sanctions for non-observance, paternity leave of 14 days and other important gender equality-related provisions. The gender quota provision does not however require gender alternation for each position in the list or the ensurance of gender equality for each decile of the list; therefore one possible risk is to have women located at the end of the list, thus not compliant with the spirit of the law. A thorough analysis of the draft law depicts another problematic aspect: while already in the Parliament, the draft law was changed between the readings upon the initiative of some MPs by including the paid leave, which involves, based on early estimations, a budget impact of around 400 million MDL. The estimated budget impact lacked the Government mandatory consent (required by the law on parliamentary regulation) at that stage of the adoption in the Parliament. The adopted law could be easily attacked in the Constitutional Court, rendering some provisions of the law unconstitutional on the basis of the existing Constitutional Court's jurisprudence.

Overall, the project has managed to keep the gender representation in the Parliament at the same level (see comparison of 2010 and 2014 elections in Table 1) even though risks existed given new political parties which usually pay less attention to this issue when first elected.

Table 1. Parliamentary elections

Election Year	1990	1994	1998	2001	2005	2009	2010	2014
Women in Parliament	12 (380)	5 (101)	9 (101)	16 (101)	21 (101)	26 (101)	21 (101)	21 (101)
<i>Percentage</i>	3.8%	4.9%	8.9%	15.8%	20.9%	25.7%	18.8%	18.8%
Women party lists		15	18	32	28	28	29	29
<i>Percentage</i>		15.7%	18.1%	29.0%	27.7%	28.5%	28.1%	28.1%

There was even a slight increase in 2015 elections as compared to 2011 local elections in the number of women councillors and mayors that the project made a contribution to (Table 2).

Table 2. Local Elections⁶

Election Year	1999	2003	2007	2011	2015
Women mayors	93 (851)	138 (898)	163 (898)	166 (896)	185 (898)
<i>Percentage</i>	15,8%	20,9%	25,7%	18,5%	20,6%
Women local councillors			3,113 (10,564)	3,131 (10,564)	3,173 (10,564)
<i>Percentage</i>			26.5%	28.6%	30.04%
Women rayon councillors			103 (1,106)	200 (1,106)	207 (1,106)
<i>Percentage</i>			13.2%	17.46%	20.6%

To conclude, the project improved the awareness on the role of the women in politics, strengthened the skills of candidate and elected women prior, respectively after the local elections and partly contributed to the adoption of what has become Law 71. Improvements of the skills of women parliamentarians have been achieved after the parliamentary elections and a functional network of women at central and local level has been set up. The Gender Equality Platform has been created, being the most able entity to continue the advocacy work in the future. Moldova is profiled consistently high in the ranking of women in top business positions (9th or 10th in Europe of the top managerial positions)^{7, 8}; there is a clear potential to improve top political representation of women would all the causes be addressed in a consistent manner.

The way forward:

It appears that the effectiveness level of the project would have been higher in case the following support areas and concerns were better reflected in the approach used for implementation:

- planning the support for women political engagement at a higher level, having in view the structure of the local branches of political parties and not only the individual women politicians;
- a much better targeting of needs and on-going support for the locally-elected women and women candidates for parliamentary elections;

⁶ http://www.cec.md/files/files/studii_analiza/participareafemeilorinalegerilelocalegenerale2015_1909120.pdf

⁷ <http://www.worldatlas.com/articles/countries-with-the-most-opportunity-for-female-business-management.html>

⁸ http://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---dgreports/---dcomm/---publ/documents/publication/wcms_334882.pdf

- increased priority for the support of the Gender Equality Platform with the participation of the members with distinguished capabilities and authority in the society to generate pressure and engagement with the party structures;
- planning of interventions to address several structural problems, notably economic empowerment of women at central and local level as key factor for better political empowerment, gender sensitivity of the political party state funding and gender-sensitive policy formulation;
- starting the support intervention at least 2 years before the parliamentary elections and employment of a more hands on approach to work with the party local and central leadership, including men, and internal decision-making process;
- ensuring better relevance of the project in time i.e. keeping pace with the rapid changes and evolutions on the political scene in Moldova where new political actors emerge, including the appearance of new parties with the dominant position in the polls in the course of 2016;
- better (all relevant political actors) coverage of the political parties engaged in the project, at both central and local level, by engaging more representative civil society partners, with substantial influence and visibility in the society; this would have also contributed to higher ownership and sustainability of the results, but also more legitimacy of the project;
- providing support for gender-sensitive research followed by policy formulation and promotion in partnership with strong civil society organizations and as part of an active gender-sensitive policy network;
- explicit strategy to synergise the project with other efforts aimed at women economic empowerment.

Annex 11 – UNPF planned and spent budget

One Budgetary Framework 2013-2017

Pillar	Indicative Amount Spent 2013 in USD	Indicative Amount Spent 2014 in USD	Indicative Amount Spent 2015 in USD	Indicative Budget 2016 in USD		Indicative Budget 2017 in USD		Indicative Budget 2013-2017 in USD	
	Amount	Amount	Amount	Amount	Funding Gap	Amount	Funding Gap	Amount	Funding Gap
1	13,399,156	13,257,933	14,822,256	12,968,733	2,544,037	9,110,653	4,266,716	63,558,730	6,810,753
2	26,866,032	19,892,166	15,657,679	23,229,903	5,569,578	16,067,648	6,350,824	101,713,428	11,920,402
3	8,816,680	6,365,371	7,390,421	5,433,669	80,000	2,501,381	80,000	30,507,522	160,000
Total	49,081,867	39,515,471	37,870,355	41,632,304	8,193,615	27,679,682	10,697,540	195,779,680	18,891,155