



# MOLDOVA EVALUATION REPORT

Draft for participants of the presentation on  
25 September 2019

„EVALUATION OF THE CZECH DEVELOPMENT COOPERATION PROGRAMME  
TEMPORARY EXPERT ASSIGNMENTS IN 2016 – 2018“

Public Tender: NIZEZ 79998000-6 Services of Professional Advisors

September 2019



Evaluation team: 4G eval s.r.o.

Main Evaluator: Inka Bartošová

Experts: Vitalie Iovita, Marie Körner, Jan Lehejček, Jan Náplava, Oto Potluka



# CONTENT

1	Summary .....	4
2	Introduction .....	5
2.1	Country context.....	5
2.2	Temporary Expert Assignments Programme .....	6
2.3	Overview of the programme in Moldova.....	6
2.4	Purpose of the evaluation .....	7
2.5	Key stakeholders in Moldova.....	8
2.6	Key programme assumptions and risks in Moldova .....	9
3	Evaluation findings .....	9
3.1	Relevance .....	9
3.2	Efficiency (Economy) .....	11
3.3	Effectiveness (Purpose).....	12
3.4	Impacts .....	13
3.5	Sustainability.....	14
3.6	Cross-cutting principles .....	14
3.7	External presentation (Visibility) .....	15
4	Conclusions .....	15
5	Recommendations.....	17
6	ANNEX I – Case studies .....	18
6.1	Case study – Wine.....	18
6.2	Case Study – Drugs.....	22
6.3	Case study – Protected Areas .....	27
7	ANNEX II – Others .....	31
7.1	List of informants (interviews and phone discussions) .....	31
7.2	Templates for semi-structured interviews in Moldova .....	33
7.3	Overview of visibility.....	37
7.4	Overview of follow-up projects (sustainability).....	38
7.5	List of Moldovan national strategies categorized according to the SDGs .....	40
7.6	List of reviewed documents and on-line sources.....	43

## Tables

Table 1: Overview of projects .....	6
Table 2: Key programme stakeholders.....	8
Table 3: Risks and mitigation measures.....	9
Table 4: Emerging needs according to interviews in the field .....	11
Table 5: Impacts of projects.....	13

## Boxes

Box 1: Evidence on relevance from 3 CS (Wine, Drugs, Protected Areas) .....	10
Box 2: Two examples of complementarity.....	10
Box 3: An example of involvement of a partner organisation .....	15

## List of Abbreviations and Acronyms

<b>ANSA</b>	National Food Safety Agency
<b>CISTA</b>	Central Institute for Supervising and Testing in Agriculture
<b>CMAC</b>	Center for Applied Metrology and Certification
<b>CNVCPA</b>	National Center for Quality Testing of Alcoholic Beverages
<b>CS</b>	Case study
<b>CUP</b>	Czech-UNDP Partnership
<b>CZDA</b>	Czech Development Agency
<b>CZK</b>	Czech koruna
<b>DCFTA</b>	Deep and Comprehensive Free Trade Area
<b>DEA</b>	Drug Enforcement Administration
<b>DSQCWABPAP</b>	Directorate of the Safety and Quality Control of Vitivinic Products, Ethyl Alcohol, Beer and Alcohol Production of the National Agency for Food Safety
<b>EBRD</b>	European Bank for Reconstruction and Development
<b>EC</b>	European Commission
<b>EU</b>	European Union
<b>GDP</b>	Gross Domestic Product
<b>GIS</b>	Geographic information system
<b>GIZ</b>	German Society for International Cooperation
<b>GPI AD</b>	The General Police Inspectorate Antidrug Directorate
<b>ILEA</b>	International Law Enforcement Academy
<b>LPA</b>	Local Public Authority
<b>LPTP</b>	Human Rights and Transition Programme
<b>MARDE</b>	Ministry of Agriculture, Regional Development and Environment
<b>MCP</b>	Moldova Competitiveness Project
<b>MEI</b>	Ministry of Economy and Infrastructure of Moldova
<b>MFA</b>	Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Czech Republic
<b>MHLSP</b>	Ministry of Health, Labour and Social Protection
<b>MLSP</b>	Ministry of Labour and Social Protection of Population
<b>MoU</b>	Memorandum of Understanding
<b>MRDC</b>	Ministry of Regional Development and Construction of the Republic of Moldova
<b>MSU FS</b>	Moldova State University, Faculty of Sociology and Social Work
<b>NAPIAA</b>	National Action Plan on the implementation of the EU-Moldova Association Agreement
<b>NGO</b>	Non-Governmental Organisation
<b>NOVW</b>	National Office of Vine and Wine of the Republic of Moldova
<b>ODA</b>	Official Development Assistance
<b>OIV</b>	International Organisation of Vine and Wine
<b>QCA</b>	Quantitative Comparative Analysis
<b>SDGs</b>	Sustainable Development Goals
<b>SME</b>	Small and Middle Enterprise
<b>TOR</b>	Terms of Reference
<b>UN</b>	United Nations
<b>UNDP</b>	United Nations Development Programme
<b>UNFPA</b>	United Nations Population Fund
<b>USAID</b>	United States Agency for International Development
<b>VWR</b>	Vine and Wine Register

*The evaluators would like to express deep gratitude to all who have contributed to this evaluation report. The report is a part of the programme evaluation specified below, whereby views expressed are of the evaluators, not the contractor, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Czech Republic.*

## 1 SUMMARY

This report is related to the evaluation of the Temporary Expert Assignments Programme implemented in 2016 – 2018. As an Annex to the overall evaluation report (available in Czech language with English summary at [www.mzv.cz](http://www.mzv.cz)), it highlights key findings and conclusions from the field mission to Moldova, as well as from desk study and surveys conducted with partners, experts and the Czech Embassy in Moldova. Three project case studies are attached to the report based on interviews with key informants in Moldova and based on the available feedback from Czech experts describing in detail the cooperation and its results. The report also presents evaluation findings and recommendations for the future implementation of the programme in Moldova, including complementarity, follow-up and the programme's setting.

The relevance is assessed as **high** because it addresses the specific needs of Moldovan partners and is in line with the national strategic documents. The efficiency (economy) is rated as **rather high**, because of the value of money. The effectiveness (purpose) is rated as **rather high** considering many new fostered initiatives and the positive outlook on building new partnerships in the future. The impact is **high** with positive influence on outcome variables (further use of outputs, at least one objective achieved). The programme setting is **rather low** with improvements needed in partner participation throughout all phases of the project cycle. The sustainability is **rather high**, however without increased capacities or ex-post evaluations the positive outcomes can be only assumed. The visibility is **rather low**.

Recommendations derived from findings and conclusions are listed below:

#	Recommendation	Main Addressee	Degree of Importance <sup>1</sup>
1	Involve Moldovan partners in the project cycle from the initial phase (need assessment, scope of work, division of responsibilities) till the end phase (feedback, evaluation).	MFA CZ	1
2	Assess legal options and change the current contractual agreement between Czech and Moldovan institutions.	MFA CZ	1
3	Tailor the budget and work plan including no. of mission days (and no. of missions) to each project and to the partner's capacities.	MFA CZ	1
4	Prepare a written agreement (such as a MoU) between the MFA (as the future administrator of the programme) and the partner institution describing the scope of implementation and responsibilities, with details on the budget and TOR attached.	MFA CZ	1
5	With every project, identify at least one Moldovan expert counterpart, a subject matter specialist who, will pair with the Czech expert.	MFA CZ	1
6	Conduct risk assessment and assumption analysis before project approval.	MFA CZ	2
7	Identify experts in public calls, do not limit the programme to public employees only.	MFA CZ	2
8	Publish information about the programme on the Embassy's website and regularly inform Moldovan partners about the programme using relevant visibility materials.	Embassy, CZDA	1
9	Conduct regular post-monitoring activities, including ex-post evaluations.	Embassy, MFA CZ	2
10	In case the expert assignment is a part of a bigger intervention to be funded from another budget (CZDA's or other's), ensure the financial allocation is confirmed before deploying an expert.	MFA CZ	2

<sup>1</sup> Rating of seriousness / importance: 1 - most serious, 2 - serious, 3 - least serious.

## 2 INTRODUCTION

### 2.1 Country context

#### **Moldova, a country in transition**

In accordance with World Bank overview (2018<sup>i</sup>), Moldova is a small lower-middle-income economy, being the poorest country in Europe. However, Moldova has made significant progress in reducing poverty and promoting inclusive growth since the early 2000s. The economy has expanded by an average of 5 percent annually, driven mainly by consumption and fuelled by remittances, which account for a quarter of GDP, among the highest share in the world. Some of the biggest concerns in Moldova relate to reduced transparency, accountability, and corruption. Moldova's large-scale out-migration, combined with decreasing fertility rates, has led to an alarming decline in the population and increased share of elderly people. This puts pressure on the pension system and limits the country's long-term competitiveness.

Moldova is a partner country of the Eastern Partnership within the European Neighbourhood Policy. The Association Agreement between the European Union and the Republic of Moldova was signed in June 2014 and has been in full effect since July 2016. In accordance with the Agreement's provisional application since September 2014, Moldova has benefitted from a (DCFTA) with the EU. The Agreement provides for stronger political association and economic integration between the EU and Moldova. This preferential trade system has allowed Moldova to benefit from reduced or eliminated tariffs for its goods, an increased services market and better investment conditions (2018<sup>iii</sup>). The revised Association Agenda, the main guiding document for the implementation of the Association Agreement, was agreed in August 2017. The Agenda sets 13 key priorities for reform actions for 2017 – 2019. These include strengthening independence of the judiciary, prevention of and fight against corruption, increasing energy security and energy efficiency, trade-related reforms and a number of other measures (2018<sup>iv</sup>).

According to a recent monitoring report of the National Action Plan on the implementation of the EU-Moldova Association Agreement (NAPIAA) for 2018, a general pace of implementation of the NAPIAA II at the end of 2018 is evaluated at 31.9%<sup>v</sup>. The authors of the Report underline that *“by the end of 2018, out of the 877 evaluated measures of the NAPIAA II (2017-2019), 465 actions were implemented, and 348 actions are in course of implementation. At the same time, 140 actions have not been implemented or have not been initiated. Therefore, until the end of 2019 the authorities must significantly increase their effort to ensure the accomplishment of the remaining 969 actions set out in the NAPIAA II.”*

It is important to mention in the context of the Temporary Expert Assignment Programme that on September 2015, the Republic of Moldova, along with other 192 members of the UN, committed to the implementation of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, by adopting the Declaration of the Summit on Sustainable Development, held in New York.

#### **Central Government Reform**

One of the important reforms that have been implemented (and related to this report) was the Central Government Reform, as a result of which, the number of ministries was reduced from 16 to 9. Further, many Central institutions/ agencies reorganised. A report launched in 2018<sup>vi</sup> revealed that *“Ministerial reorganisations made in the first stage of implementing the reform have not yet delivered the expected effect and have no expected impact on the other planned strategy actions. Thus, in the reorganisation and merging of ministries, some areas with counterbalance competencies (e.g. agriculture and the environment, medicine and social protection) have come to be managed by a single ministry, which generated conflicting functions/attributions.”*

The new government of Moldova, made up by the pro-European ACUM group and the pro-Russia Socialist Party, was formed in June 2019. The new Prime Minister, Maia Sandu, has pledged that improving ties with the EU is her government's priority, and that she will promote a programme to tackle corruption and reform the country. EU committed to support Moldova<sup>vii</sup> based on the implementation of reforms under the Association Agreement. The package includes also the release of macro financial assistance that has been put on hold.

#### **Czech Development Cooperation with Moldova**

Development partners are supporting Moldova to accelerate the country's development and implementation of the reforms including those set out in the Association Agenda to move closer to the EU.

Within development cooperation, the Czech Republic has had significant presence in Moldova since 2001<sup>viii</sup>. Since 2005, it has been a priority country of the Czech development cooperation<sup>ix</sup>, receiving about 15-20% of the Czech budget (largest amount) for bilateral development cooperation projects<sup>x,xi</sup>.

The main focus of the Czech Republic's development cooperation for 2010-2017 was on the following sectors: social infrastructure and services; water supply and sanitation – including waste management; environmental protection; agriculture; government and civil society.

The main priorities of the 2018-2023 Development Cooperation Programme of the Czech Republic for Moldova are: sustainable management of natural resources (water and sanitation in particular), inclusive social development (focusing on vulnerable groups), good democratic governance (participatory decision making) and agriculture and rural development.

## 2.2 Temporary Expert Assignments Programme

The Temporary Expert Assignments Programme<sup>xii</sup> (further as Programme) was launched in 2015 by the Czech Development Agency. By 2018, it has been implemented in Afghanistan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Ethiopia, Georgia, Kosovo, Moldova, Mongolia, Serbia, and Ukraine, whereby Moldova accounted for the highest proportion of expenses (23%) out of the total 12 mil. CZK.

The programme objective is to share the Czech transition experience, i.e. knowledge and experience gained during the transition period, i.e. the transition of the state from a centrally planned economy to a market economy operating in a democratic system. These transition experiences are seen in the EU context as a comparative advantage of the new EU Member States. The programme aims to pass on this specific experience to partner countries, especially those with similar political developments, in the form of expert assistance.

The programme indirect objective is to increase the competitiveness of Czech experts in the field of development cooperation and the possibility of their involvement in projects financed by other donors (EC, EBRD, World Bank, etc.). Further details are available in programme Guidelines<sup>xiii</sup>.

The programme theory of change has been revised for the purpose of this evaluation as follows:

- Programme overall objective: Ensure development of mutually responsible and transparent public, non-profit and private sector partnerships in priority countries of the Czech bilateral development cooperation.
  - Outcome 1: Promoting sustainable institutions, an enforceable legislative framework and good governance in partner countries.
  - Outcome 2: Use of the Czech transition experience in bilateral and multilateral development cooperation.
  - Outcome 3: Creating partnerships with public, private and non-profit sectors with an overlap with multilateral development cooperation of the Czech Republic.

## 2.3 Overview of the programme in Moldova

This report focuses on the Temporary Expert Assignments Programme implemented in Moldova for the period of 2016 – 2018 years and is an Annex to the overall programme evaluation report submitted by 4G eval s.r.o. The overall budget spent for the Temporary Expert Assignments Programme during 2016 – 2018 in Moldova constituted 2,715 mil. CZK. Following projects, implemented in the period of 2016 to 2018, were covered by the evaluation:

**Table 1: Overview of projects**

No <sup>2</sup> .	Project name in EN / Short name for the purpose of the report	Period of implementation	Status	Expenses in CZK	Requesting org. / Main implementer	Notes/ Comments
3	Identification of weaknesses and needs in protected areas management in the Republic of Moldova ( <b>“Protected Areas”</b> )	2016	Completed	272,326	Ministry of Environment of the Republic of Moldova <i>Local partners</i> Agency „Moldsilva“ Academy of Science of Moldova Administration of the scientific reserve „Codrii“ Administration of the scientific reserve „Plaiul Fagului“	The Ministry of Environment was reorganised within the Central Government Reform. Currently: Ministry of Agriculture, Regional Development and Environment
4	Support on elaboration of national report for UN Habitat III conference ( <b>“UN Habitat”</b> )	2016	Completed	348,106	Ministry of Regional Development and Construction of the Republic of Moldova	Ministry of Regional Development and Construction of the Republic of Moldova was reorganised Currently: Ministry of

<sup>2</sup> This number refers to the project database established for the purpose of the evaluation.



					Economy and Infrastructure	
14	Elaboration of analyses and recommendations for the office of the prime minister of the Republic of Moldova (" <b>State Chancellery</b> ")	2017	Completed	278,955	The State Chancellery of the Republic of Moldova	
18	New challenges in the field of combating drug crimes in Moldova (" <b>Drugs</b> ")	2017-2018	Completed	806,736	The General Police Inspectorate of the Ministry of Internal Affairs of the Republic of the Moldova	
22	Survey of population climate in the Republic of Moldova (" <b>Population Climate</b> ")	2017–2019	final report provided in July 2019	611,163	National Commission for Population and Development, Ministry of Labour (data differed across documents)	The implementation of the project was mainly coordinated with the Ministry of Health, Labour and Social Protection
23	Identification of weaknesses and needs of the control system of the wine sector in Moldova (" <b>Wine</b> ")	2018-2019	in implementation	397,875	National Office of Vine and Wine of the Republic of Moldova (NOVW)	
29	Surveillance of the "Remediation of oil contaminated sites in the municipalities of Lunga and Marculesti in the Republic of Moldova" (" <b>Contaminated Sites</b> ")	Project request: 2016	not approved by the CZDA	0	Agency of Geology and Mineral Resources	
38	Public lighting project (" <b>Public Lighting</b> ")	Project request: 2017	not approved by the CZDA	0	Energy Efficiency Fund	

In addition to the implemented projects, two more applications were taken into consideration, but were not approved by the CZDA (Contaminated Sites and Public Lighting projects). Projects approved at the end of 2018 with implementation commencing in January 2019 or later were not included.

## 2.4 Purpose of the evaluation

The main purpose of the programme evaluation was to obtain independent, objectively substantiated and consistent conclusions, findings and recommendations applicable in the decision-making of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MFA) of the Czech Republic in cooperation with the Czech Development Agency (CZDA) and other actors on the future focus and implementation of the Czech Development Cooperation (Official Development Assistance - ODA), taking into account Agenda 2030 for Sustainable Development and the Czech Development Strategy 2018–2030.

An important objective was to obtain an independent evaluation of the processes associated with the implementation of the evaluated programme with an emphasis on the possibilities of increasing its effectiveness and efficiency, but also in terms of increasing the quality and effectiveness of the provided support.

In addition to collecting data in the Czech Republic (via desk study, interviews and surveys among partners / experts / embassies), one member of the evaluation team conducted field research in Moldova. Aside of the programme evaluation<sup>3</sup>, the mission in Moldova explored detailed context of three projects attached as case studies via on-line surveys, interviews and desk research. The findings from Moldova cannot be generalized to the whole programme (implemented in 8 other countries) - they allow understanding better the functioning of the programme and highlight the factors that have a positive and negative impact on it.

<sup>3</sup> The experts' response rate was 69 %, i.e. 11 out of 16 experts answered the survey. The partners' response rate was 83%, i.e. 7 key partners from 5 out of 6 implemented projects answered the survey.

## 2.5 Key stakeholders in Moldova

An overview of key stakeholders is provided in the Table no. 2 below.

**Table 2: Key programme stakeholders**

Category	Stakeholder
<b>Programming</b>	Embassy of the Czech Republic in Chisinau, Moldova
<b>Assigned Experts</b>	16 Czech Experts and 3 Moldovan experts
<b>Moldavian main partners</b>	<p><u>Main partners whose requests were accepted:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ministry of Environment of the Republic of Moldova, the original applicant, currently named as Ministry of Agriculture, Regional Development and Environment (MARDE)</li> <li>Ministry of Regional Development and Construction of the Republic of Moldova (MRDC), the original applicant, currently named as Ministry of Economy and Infrastructure of Moldova (MEI)</li> <li>The State Chancellery of the Republic of Moldova</li> <li>The General Police Inspectorate (GPI) of the Ministry of Internal Affairs of the Republic of Moldova</li> <li>National Commission for Population and Development (main applicant as per original request), Ministry of Labour and Social Protection of Population (MLSPP, main applicant as per work plan), currently named as Ministry of Health, Labour and Social Protection (MHLSP)</li> <li>National Office of Vine and Wine of the Republic of Moldova (NOVW)</li> </ul> <p><u>Main partners whose requests were rejected:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agency of Geology and Mineral Resources</li> <li>Energy Efficiency Fund</li> </ul>
<b>Other Moldavian partners</b>	<p><u>Local institutions benefitting from the Program</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Academy of Science of Moldova</li> <li>Administration of the scientific reserve „Codrii“</li> <li>Administration of the scientific reserve „Plaiul Fagului“</li> <li>Administration of the scientific reserve „Pădurea Domnească“</li> <li>Administration of the scientific reserve „Prutul de Jos“</li> <li>State Enterprise “Forestry company from Orhei”</li> <li>State Enterprise “Institute of Forestry Research and Development”</li> <li>National Investigation Inspectorate (Ministry of Internal Affairs)</li> <li>Moldova State University, Faculty of Sociology and Social Work (MSU FS)</li> <li>Directorate of the safety and quality control of vitivinic products, ethyl alcohol, beer and alcohol production of the National Agency for Food Safety (DSQCWABPAP ANSA)</li> <li>State Enterprise “National Center for Quality Testing of Alcoholic Beverages” (CNVCPA ANSA)</li> <li>Agency for Consumer Protection and Market Surveillance</li> <li>Public Health Surveillance Authority</li> <li>State Enterprise „Center for Applied Metrology and Certification” (CMAC)</li> <li>State Enterprise „National Center of Alcoholic Beverages Testing”</li> <li>National Public Health Agency of the Ministry of Health, Labour and Social Protection</li> <li>Directorate for Supervision over Market, Public Catering and Consumers Protection of the National Agency for Food Safety (ANSA)</li> <li>Technical University of Moldova. Department of oenology</li> <li>Free International University of Moldova (Department of Biomedicine and Ecology)</li> <li>Nature Conservation Foundation (NGO)</li> <li>Public Association “Fagus” (NGO)</li> <li>Public Association “Verde e Moldova” (NGO)</li> <li>Public Association “BIOTICA Ecological Society” (NGO)</li> </ul>
<b>Donors of similar programmes, others</b>	<p><u>Other similar programmes:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Programme Expert on Demand at the Czech-UNDP Partnership for Sustainable Development Goals (CUP)</li> <li>TRANS programme of the department for human rights and transformation (LPTP) at the MFA CR</li> <li>UNDP Moldova<sup>xiv</sup> (focusing on three major focus areas: Inclusive growth; Effective governance; Climate change, environment and energy)</li> <li>The Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ) GmbH Projects and Programmes in Moldova<sup>xv</sup> (priority areas: Sustainable economic development, Good governance)</li> <li>USAID Projects and Programmes for Moldova<sup>xvi</sup> (priority areas: strengthen economic growth and democratic governance)</li> <li>World bank projects for Moldova<sup>xvii</sup> (priority areas: economic governance, fight corruption, modernize services, enhance the business environment, and invest in employable skills)</li> </ul>



Category	Stakeholder
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- EU projects for Moldova, coordinated by Delegation of the European Union to the Republic of Moldova<sup>xviii</sup></li> <li>- EBRD Moldova<sup>xix</sup> (priority areas: private sector development, European standards and regional integration, sustainability of municipal enterprises)</li> <li>- Swiss Cooperation Office in Moldova<sup>xx</sup> (3 main sectors supported: Local Governance, Health, Economic Development &amp; Employment)</li> </ul>

## 2.6 Key programme assumptions and risks in Moldova

Identified assumptions:

- Moldavian partners are informed about the Programme
- Moldavian partners are interested in receiving Czech experts with transition experience
- Moldavian partners have sufficient absorption capacity to fully utilize the provided expertise
- Common understanding about the Expert's tasks/Partner's expectations, rights and obligations

**Table 3: Risks and mitigation measures**

Risk	Importance	Probability	Mitigation measures taken
1. Provided Experts do not meet the required qualifications	High	Low	Experts from across different sectors (public, private, academic) were selected. Interpreting if needed.
2. Experts with required qualifications are not available	High	Low	Public calls were launched and finally experts for all projects found.
3. Central Public Administration Reform in Moldova	High	High	Experts continued collaboration with relevant stakeholders/counterparts under new "restructured" institutions.

## 3 EVALUATION FINDINGS

### 3.1 Relevance

#### Relevance to the Moldovan strategic documents

All the projects implemented within the evaluated programme reflect priorities set in the Moldovan strategic documents. Where possible/applicable they helped fulfil the National Action Plan on EU-Moldova Association Agreement (see annexed List of National strategies per Sustainable Development Goals), particularly regarding the approximation to EU legislation (Association Agreement's commitments), i.e. in conducting the governmental reform, addressing the decline of biodiversity etc. Moldovan stakeholders reported that the implemented projects and the expertise received were closely linked and helped them indeed implement the individual Action Plans aimed at the approximation with the EU legislation and practices. One interviewee recommended increasing the relevancy of proposed policy measures related to one of 6 implemented projects.

#### Relevance to the Moldovan partners

In overall, 5 out of 7 assignments were partially or significantly changed comparing to initial Moldovan requests. Nevertheless, based on the on-line survey and the face-to-face interviews, representatives of 5 out of 6 implemented projects were satisfied with the expert services provided (high satisfaction rate was also confirmed by the Embassy). The questionnaires reveal that most of the assigned experts demonstrated very high competences and knowledge with relation to the requested expertise and in some cases (Wine, Drugs projects) the representatives from the Czech state institutions bore a very high degree of responsibility for successful implementation.

The Embassy confirmed that the programme was highly relevant to Moldova, especially thanks to the short period of time from submission of request to its approval (flexibility) and the possibility to apply throughout the year (no deadlines). According to the Embassy, "several" institutions have reached out to gain information about it (See Visibility section). The reason why potential partner organisations have not applied might be, according to the Embassy, their lack of capacity.

### **Box 1: Evidence on relevance from 3 CS (Wine, Drugs, Protected Areas)**

**The National Office of Vine and Wine (NOVW)** finds the project highly relevant and has a clear idea of a follow up project: Interconnection with the National Center for Quality Testing of Alcoholic Beverages (CNVCPA ANSA) for triangulation and better quality of data; and development of a new module in the Vine and Wine Register (VWR) to include the „Control of Vine and Wine” products. The relevance of the project was also confirmed by the USAID (see CS Wine).

**The General Police Inspectorate (GPI), National Inspectorate of Investigation, Republic of Moldova** informed that their priority was to have balanced policies based on the experience of the European Union regarding the implementation of alternative concepts of incarceration for drug users. Once the legal framework is amended, the police will have more time to document the drug cases. The project addressed very well the priorities of the partner institution and the provided experts were found relevant to their needs. Relevance has been assessed by him as very high (see CS Drugs).

**The Protected Areas project** was not considered relevant in the way it was implemented: It did not fully reflect the initial expectations of the implementing partners and the outputs have not been utilized. According to the Ministry's representative, the intention was to start cooperation with the Czech Embassy / CZDA on a bigger project. The partner organization needed to develop a management plan for at least two scientific reservations, whereas the expert delivered an overview of the situation in Moldova related to protected areas. Specific activities from the Action Plan (drafted by a UNDP project) were not met (see CS Protected Areas).

In addition, the representatives of the partner organisations stated that the programme was relevant to them also because they wish to engage in a more substantial cooperation with the Czech Embassy / Czech Development Agency (5 out of 7) and also because 5 out of 7 had previous experience with the Czech counterparts. In 2 out of 7 cases there was a clear expectation of a follow-up support.

#### **Relevance to the Czech strategic documents**

Moldova was a Programme country of the Czech Development Cooperation (ODA) Programme country until 2017 and has been a Priority country from 2018. It has been also a Priority country of the TRANS programme. The Development Cooperation Strategy of the Czech Republic 2010 – 2017<sup>xxi</sup> and the Czech Development Cooperation Programme with Moldova 2011 – 2017<sup>xxii</sup> covered the following main priority sectors: environment, agriculture, economic development, promotion of democracy, human rights and social transformation. The projects implemented under the evaluated programme focused on biodiversity (protected areas), development of urbanism, development of public administration, drug control, population policy and development of viticulture. Thereby they covered all the priority sectors of the Czech bilateral ODA, as confirmed by the Embassy. The project reflected the SDGs 1, 3, 8, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16 and 17.

#### **Relevance to the Czech experts**

On the part of the Czech experts, although the main motivation varied, the most prominent one was to share knowledge (8 out of 11), and to gain knowledge (4 out of 11).

#### **Complementarity to other similar programmes**

There are other programmes involving expert deployment as part of a technical assistance, such as the Czech TRANS Transition Promotion Programme (which is focused in Moldova mainly on human rights and media-freedom according to the Embassy). According to the interview with a USAID representative, the technical assistance in Moldova was synchronized and coherent and it was noted that USAID has its own expert deployment programme called “Moldova Competitiveness Project”, funded by USAID and Sweden. There is also the Czech-UNDP Partnership for Sustainable Development Goals which includes Expertise on Demand and according to the new strategy of cooperation (2018-2022)<sup>xxiii</sup>, it is now geographically focused on three countries: Bosnia and Herzegovina, Georgia and Moldova. Similarly, the European instruments, namely TAIEX, Twinning (the Czech Ministry of Finance is the national contact point for both programmes) and SOCIEUX+ (the Czech Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs is the national contact point) include also short-term expert assignments. They have had deployed experts to Moldova, with no further details available.

### **Box 2: Two examples of complementarity**

(1) **Drugs project:** Following the training by the Czech experts, the GPI Antidrug Directorate (GPI AD) received complementary and in-depth trainings from other organizations such as the International Law Enforcement Academy (ILEA) - Hungary and from the US Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA). These trainings were focused on human trafficking and cybercrime. (Sources: CS Drugs)

(2) **Wine project:** Interviews in the field confirmed that NOVW, has experience with collaboration with the USAID Moldova competitiveness project that co-financed the Vine and Wine Register. USAID also helped to design and print of brochures. NOVW worked with GIZ on a workforce analysis, and with the European Bank for Investments on the Wine Sector Restructuring Programme called "Filliere du Vin". TAIEX was also involved conducting two projects on promotion of products with geographic indications and name of origin. (Source: Interview with NOVW)

#### **Emerging needs**

Based on the interviews conducted in Moldova, a few areas of potential cooperation in the future have emerged, where the partners indicated a clear interest / priority.

**Table 4: Emerging needs according to interviews in the field**

Moldovan institution	Their needs and priorities
General Inspectorate of Police, National Inspectorate of Investigation, Head of Directorate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Clandestine drug production laboratories.</li> <li>- The evaluation of the previous National Antidrug Strategy 2011-2018 and development of a new one.</li> <li>- Methods of documentation of new drugs.</li> <li>- Assistance to modernise forensic laboratories.</li> <li>- Provision of training to police officers dealing with drug expertise.</li> </ul>
Ministry of Agriculture, Regional Development and Environment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Development of management plan for at least 2 scientific reservations.</li> <li>- Assistance to develop management (conservation) plan of endangered and vulnerable species from two scientific reservations.</li> <li>- Assistance to establish performance indicators for sustainable management of protected areas.</li> </ul>
(A request via the Czech Embassy in Moldova)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <i>General: Specific:</i> Request for expertise on how to organize the next Census of Population in Moldova in 2021.</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Various areas, including SME development, quality standards, legislation, marketing, sales</li> </ul>
National Office of Vine and Wine of the Republic of Moldova	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Promotion of vine and wine products.</li> <li>- Interconnection with the CNVCPA ANSA in order to have better quality of data and compare the data from CNVCPA ANSA and the NOVW.</li> <li>- Development of a new module in the VWR to include the „Control of Vine and Wine” products.</li> </ul>

### 3.2 Efficiency (Economy)

#### Cost-effectiveness of the programme

The representative of the Czech Embassy stated that the outputs/inputs ratio was appropriate (“*The budget is reasonable. The beneficiaries are satisfied with the assistance/outputs*”) On the other hand, the two case studies (CS Drugs, CS Wine), have shown that the beneficiaries were not disclosed the budget including total expert working days, thus could not provide their views on cost-efficiency. Data related to the CS Protected Areas were unavailable. All Moldovan partners would wish to be a part of the “negotiation on the detailed work plan” in the future – see more in Programme setting/Good Governance section.

As for the length of the mission and the overall assignment, the current setting (8 month-long assignment with maximum of 25 W/D), was commented upon as follows:

- 3 out of 11 Czech experts would prolong the mission duration to 3 weeks/1 months (one of them would divide it into shorter missions); out of which 2 experts would furthermore prolong the duration of the assignment up to 1 year.
- 1 interviewed Moldovan partner recommended prolonging the mission to 25 days per expert; 1 counterpart recommended in the questionnaire to prolong the preparation time (analysis of the situation); and another one mentioned the short duration of the assignment as a reason for not reaching objectives completely.

Value for Money with respect to cost-effectiveness and partnerships has been evaluated as follows:

- The total expenses for projects with reported use of outputs, namely no. 14, 18 and 23, were 1,484 mil CZK in 2016 – 2018, which was equal to min. **55 %** of total expenses for projects implemented in Moldova in this period.
- The total expenses for projects which reported further cooperation with Czech entities were 2,164 mil. CZK in 2016 – 2018, which was equal to min. **80%** of total expenses for projects implemented in Moldova in this period.
- The main partners of projects no. 18, 22 and 23 also confirmed further engagement in the Czech development cooperation, whereby their total project expenses were 1,816 mil. CZK in 2016 - 2018, i.e. **67 %** of total expenses for projects implemented in Moldova in this period.

#### Barriers / Facilitators in terms of process

In total, 10 out of 11 Czech experts stated that the assignments were well planned (“definitely yes” or “rather yes”) and they were also positive on getting enough support from the CZDA (also 10 out of 11).

Specific recommendations relate to improvements mainly at the beginning of the project cycle:

- better need assessment and situation in the country,
- improved identification of key partners,
- consultations with experts before the mission,
- better organization on the side of the CZDA (in terms of participatory processes, where the CZDA’s input was needed),
- better communication with the partner side and

- (lowering of) administration requirements for experts.

The Moldovan counterparts were asked on what would they keep in the programme process-wise and the answers reveal the following:

- 5 out of 7 would keep the Czech Embassy as the main focal point for communication on expert requests
- 4 out of 7 would keep the option to apply any time
- 1 out of 7 would keep the allocated budget

### **Barriers/Facilitators in terms of content**

At least two partners mentioned that they had previous experience of collaboration with the assigned experts and that this was helpful. The language barrier was not an issue, as in most cases experts had hired translators (contact was provided by the CZDA). For some projects (e.g. State Chancellery), the English as the communication language was sufficient.

The following areas for improvements were mentioned:

- The field mission was too short (3 out of 11), 2 experts recommended to tailor the length of the mission to the needs/sector.
- The overall cooperation was too short (2 out of 11), should be up to a year.
- The budget was too low (3 out of 11), one partner mentioned that they could have contributed in kind to allow for more allocation of the expert work.
- The expert fee was too low (2 out of 11).

According to the Deputy Chief of Party of the USAID Moldova Competitiveness Project (MCP), their expert assignments are not limited in their duration, but are usually short, not exceeding the limit of 180 days per annum.

### **Programme criteria**

The representative of the Czech Embassy found it appropriate that the programme supports sharing the Czech expertise with Moldovan public authorities. For other types of beneficiaries (e.g. Moldovan NGOs) should be other forms of financial support. The Embassy also mentioned that it should not be obligatory to select Czech experts only from public institutions – experts should be selected based on their qualifications.

All the Czech experts assigned were public servants at the time of their deployment. Two out of 11 reported problems with their temporary release from duties. They had to take unpaid leave or days off. One reported experiencing difficulties in reaching a contractual agreement. The evidence from the evaluation supports that this was a common occurrence.

## **3.3 Effectiveness (Purpose)**

The Embassy assessed an overall effectiveness of the programme as high (9 out of 10 points where 1 is completely ineffective and 10 is completely effective).

### **To what extent does the programme foster Czech-Moldovan expert partnerships?**

At the time of filling in the survey, in total 6 out of 7 Moldovan representatives were in touch with their Czech counterparts, at least informally. The main partners of the Drugs, Wine and Population Climate projects confirmed they continued cooperation with at least one of the assigned experts. The continuing cooperation was related to legal framework and information exchange (Drugs); development of a study on “Reproductive behaviour of women in the Republic of Moldova” and a proposed project by the Charles University called "Integrated support for the development of demographic statistics" (Population Climate); and a cooperation on isotopic analyses of wine and fraud control (Wine). Multiple other follow-up projects have started both within and outside the framework of the CZDA and there was some form of a follow-up related to all but one project (State Chancellery). A comprehensive overview of the follow-up projects in Moldova is annexed to the report.

### **To what extent does the programme assist the further involvement of Czech experts in EU development cooperation, the UN and other donor institutions?**

The programme’s indirect objective was to increase competitiveness of Czech experts in the field of development cooperation and the possibility of their involvement in projects financed by other donors (EC, EBRD, World Bank, etc.). Out of 11 experts, who responded to the survey conducted by evaluators in June – July 2019, 6 have been working for an international organisation in the field of development cooperation in the last 5 years. All of them have been already involved in this cooperation at least 2 years before they were engaged in the evaluated programme (specifically with the EU, EBRD, UNFPA and the International Organisation of Vine and Wine - OIV). After their temporary expert assignment, in fact only 4 of these experts reported working for an international organisation (UNDP, EU, EBRD, OIV). The UNDP was the only new organisation which one expert reported to have started cooperating with after the assignment. All the experts expressed an interest in being further involved in the development cooperation (Czech or international).

### Are long-term project results sufficiently specified / documented?

In total, 4 out of 7 key partners do not know or do not have information on how outputs were documented / long-term results specified. Similarly, 7 out of 11 Czech experts know only partially or not at all on how their outputs were utilized. The two case studies on Wine and Drugs provided documented results that both sides keep a track of. The data were not available for the Report on UN Habitat, as the evaluator team was unable to reach the Moldovan counterparts (communication is available upon request). The Embassy reported not having sufficient capacity for a follow-up monitoring of all the projects after the expert assignment is completed.

## 3.4 Impacts

### What are the main development impacts of the program?

According to the Quantitative Comparative Analysis (QCA) performed as a part of the evaluation, the expert programme implemented in Moldova has had a positive influence on outcome variables (further use of outputs, at least one objective achieved). There are several categories of impacts in Moldova based on the analyzed data:

- (i) improved capacities of staff/institution (incl. improved internal processes),
- (ii) strengthened international cooperation,
- (iii) dissemination of results in Moldova,
- (iv) legislation changes,
- (v) preparation for implementation of follow-up projects.

There were no (unintended) negative impacts mentioned in the questionnaires. The evaluation team also attempted to track changes at the level of institutions and beneficiaries in the two cases, where expert assignment was not approved. There is, however, no information on the status.

**Table 5: Impacts of projects**

Project name (short version)	Impacts
Protected Areas	None mentioned nor documented.
Report for UN Habitat	None mentioned nor documented.
State Chancellery	According to the expert, outputs were reflected in the state public reform, but not documented.
Drugs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The capacities of the Antidrug Directorate have been improved.</li> <li>- Based on the expertise received we are in the process of modification of the Government decision regarding the list of narcotic, psychotropic substances, and plants containing such substances found in illicit traffic, as well as their quantities – in accordance with Czech experience.</li> <li>- In terms of bilateral operational cooperation there have been organized joint investigations.</li> <li>- Technical equipment was handed over to the units dealing with cybercrimes.</li> <li>- Further trainings of Moldovan security forces were conducted. The trainings on using cryptocurrencies and Darknetxxiv helped to make investigations, criminal prosecution actions which led to the detention of organized criminal groups.</li> <li>- Introduction of new elements (in the process of investigation, interpretation by evaluators), for example: Collecting information from open resources and using applications / software, monitoring the flow of electronic money</li> </ul>
Population Climate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- A new methodology of research on the reproductive behaviour of women in the Republic of Moldova (method, sample, instrument).</li> <li>- Development of demographic policies focused on the new realities of the population movement.</li> </ul>
Wine	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The report is being implemented, improved planned (unannounced) controls are already in place.</li> <li>- Moldova became a part of Wine Zone C.</li> <li>- Improved laboratory analysis, improved controls during transportation, better cooperation between market control and producers.</li> <li>- Legislation changes prepared, establishment of a database of wines, wine register.</li> <li>- Increased monitoring of wine exports from Moldova, especially of bulk wines.</li> <li>- Joint control implemented by two units of the National Agency for Food Safety, namely the Direction of supervision and control of the production and wholesale trade and the Direction of supervision of the retail commercial units.</li> </ul>



## Factors influencing the transfer of know-how

The factors influencing the transfer of know-how mentioned in the on-line surveys included:

### Contributing factors:

- professional expertise and preparation before the mission
- focused approach of the Moldovan counterparts
- personal contact
- provided equipment
- selected methods of sharing information (practical exercise, open discussions following each workshop, final discussion)
- interpreter working alongside the experts
- relevancy of Czech know-how
- material support (hardware, software)

### Limiting factors:

- political and administrative instability (reforms, changes)
- the CZDA's underestimation of preparation of the mission in terms of identification of key contacts in Moldova
- no follow-up activities after the project
- not ambitious project goals
- lack of communication/inappropriate level of communication with the local partner
- time (need time to apply changes)
- lack of awareness of the project among participating institutions
- short period of implementation
- lack of experts causing delay in addressing a demand
- limited budget
- limitations given by current legal provisions and changes in legislation

In terms of other simultaneous project(s) that had similar objectives and could have led to the same results (or contributed to), the Drugs project mentioned a training provided by the USA - Drug Enforcement Administration and Hungary - The International Law Enforcement Academy (ILEA). No further details are available. As for the Wine project, a complementary bilateral Czech ODA project on "Elaboration and implementation of the Vine and Wine Register in the Republic of Moldova", funded by the Czech Development Agency and the USAID was mentioned, whereby duplication was not found.

## 3.5 Sustainability

### Which programme parameters are key to its sustainability?

Overview of sustained results is available in the impact chapter, Table 5. The key parameters mentioned by the interviewees or are based on the findings from case studies and are as follows:

- 1) There is a follow-up activity to sustain results.
- 2) Presence of a counterpart expert institution on the Moldovan side.
- 3) Provided interpreters.
- 4) Corresponding qualification of Czech experts.
- 5) Ability to transfer practical knowledge (by using appropriate methods of learning).
- 6) History of previous cooperation.

● ● ●

*"We had cooperated previously with the Central Institute for Supervising and Testing in Agriculture (CISTA) and wanted specific expertise from them, because they know best the situation in Moldova (on nonconformities) and can provide specific recommendations or expertise."* Moldovan Partner

● ● ●

## 3.6 Cross-cutting principles

### Programme setting / Good governance

In terms of the process and overall programme setting, the Embassy receives the project proposal, which is further sent to CZDA, and CZDA informs periodically on the implementation stages. The Embassy would prefer to receive regular updates by CZDA on project implementation (although it has limited capacity to monitor the projects). The experts are selected by the CZDA. According to the three interviewed stakeholders in Moldova, a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) would present an additional administrative burden. Nevertheless, one of the experts highlighted that a MoU or another form of a written agreement is crucial to ensure commitments of the Moldovan partner/s. In his/her case, there was no written agreement and the main partner who was



expected to cooperate on data collection resigned one day before the mission of the expert. An example of partner involvement in expert assignment follows:

### **Box 3: An example of involvement of a partner organisation**

The Head of the GPI AD informed that he has been personally involved in the planning and implementation of the project including: preparing the Expert Request Form; preliminary dialogue with the experts; planning of the experts' assignments; composition of the group of trainees; participation at opening of the training event; issuing training certificates and participation at the stage of transmittal acceptance of equipment. The GPI AD was not involved in expert selection. (See annexed CS Drugs)

According to responses in the on-line survey, Moldovan partners indicated their interest to be more involved in all stages of the project cycle:

- Selection of the experts (5 out of 7)
- Negotiation on the detailed work plan (7 out of 7)
- Negotiation on the budget (3 out of 7)
- Setting the roles and responsibilities of the expert(s) and your institution (7 out of 7)
- Providing feedback on reports (6 out of 7)
- Promotion of the programme (6 out of 7)

Other cross-cutting principles, such as protection of environment and climate, respect for human rights including gender equality are not included in the report due to lack of relevant data.

### **3.7 External presentation (Visibility)**

A comprehensive overview of the visibility of the programme in Moldova is annexed to the report. The Moldovan institutions promoted the cooperation through PR articles on websites, on social media pages, in their quarterly and annual reports. The level of promotion was different from project to project. In total, two partners learned about the programme from the Czech Embassy, two from CZDA, two learnt about it from an expert, who was later allocated to the project, and one of them from the partner Ministry in the Czech Republic. The Czech Embassy promoted the programme during meetings, conferences and round tables. The Embassy representative mentioned that public authorities generally know about the Czech Development Cooperation, but they might still not know about the particular temporary expert assignments programme. According to one Moldovan partner, the visibility of the Programme was limited to partner institutions and relevant cooperating or potential stakeholders. The information about the programme was not available on the Embassy's website. During the evaluated period, the information brochure was distributed to the Embassy by the CZDA, but the brochure was not available during the evaluation visit. Finally, 4 out of 7 of Moldovan partners would "definitely" recommend the programme, and 3 out of 7 would "probably" recommend it to other institutions ("We suggested the Cybercrime department to apply for a similar project.", "We could recommend the programme to other domains, practically all from the wine sector know about the Programme.").

## **4 CONCLUSIONS**

*Conclusions drawn from the evaluation findings follow.*

*Scale:*

- *High - the procedures, results and assumptions fully meet the needs and objectives set, respectively. Examples of good practice.*
- *Rather high - in the particular context of intervention, it fulfilled the maximum requirements, but there are limitations at the level of external factors or minor deficiencies related to implementation*
- *Rather Low - Significant Deficiencies in Intervention Setup or Applied Procedures and / or Serious External Factor Issues*
- *Low - the procedures or results of the intervention do not meet the objectives set and / or there are critical issues at the level of external factors*

### **Relevance**

The objectives of the implemented projects reflected the needs of concerned Moldovan institutions (apart from the Protected Areas project) and were in line with the Moldovan strategic documents and Action Plans. The know-how of Czech experts was highly relevant. The relevance to the Czech Development Cooperation Programme in Moldova was high, as all the priority sectors have been covered. Furthermore, the projects were directly related to specific SDGs. The programme was also seen a springboard for continuous cooperation with the CZDA/Embassy. It can be concluded that previous history of cooperation with Czech partners adds to relevance as the partners have clear expectations. The programme is relevant thanks to its flexibility as well (possibility to apply any time). For Czech experts, it was an opportunity to learn, not only share knowledge. The programme is complementary to other similar programmes; however, it needs to increase synergy with the UNDP's programme "Expert on Demand" which according to new strategy of cooperation operates in three countries only, one of which is Moldova. The relevance of the programme in Moldova is assessed as **high**.

### **Efficiency (Economy)**

The Value for Money related to cost-effectiveness is rather high. As for the budget and duration of the assignments, some projects seem to have been underfunded. In these cases, it likely resulted in reduced number of results and/ or extension of time of project delivery. Both the budget and work plan need to be tailored to the projects (including considering multiple shorter missions). Further, partners are not sufficiently involved in any phase of the project cycle and were not disclosed key contractual annexes, namely the budget and the work plan. The current contractual regime needs improvement, as experts need to take holidays/unpaid leave to take on the assignment. The Embassy being the main contact point is practical due to fact that it is familiar with both the demand and supply side of the expertise. Despite shortcomings in the programme setting, the efficiency is rated as **rather high**, because of the Value for Money.

### **Effectiveness (Purpose)**

Regarding the building of new partnerships, multiples new projects have started both within and outside the framework of the Czech ODA. Many of the paired institutions have a history of previous cooperation, therefore it is difficult to evaluate to what extent the programme has contributed to fostering their partnerships. As for another declared purpose of the programme, it had no (if negative) effect on involvement of Czech experts with international organisations in the field of development cooperation (UNDP was mentioned as the only organization, where a new cooperation was established as a result of the programme, in absolute numbers the involvement has declined). The results were insufficiently documented, except for projects where the partnerships and regular lines of communication with a partner institution are already established. In overall, considering the current new initiatives and the likelihood of future positive effects on the scope of Czech – Moldovan partnerships, the programme effectiveness is rated as **rather high**.

### **Impact**

The impacts of the programme varied from improved capacities of the staff/institution (incl. improved internal processes), strengthened international cooperation, dissemination of results, legislation changes, and preparation for implementation of follow-up projects. The experts' outputs resulted in positive changes mainly because of their relevance (past and current), competence of the experts, presence of interpreters, interest of the partner institution, and follow up by the experts on individual activities to ensure results. The two case studies addressing the wine sector and drug crimes concluded that the programme has significantly contributed to positive impacts (no other parallel activities were identified). Furthermore, no unintended negative impacts have been found. The Protected Areas project was not impactful due to irrelevant outputs. To evaluate the impact of the UN Habitat project and the Contaminated Sites project there is not enough data due to the fluctuation of staff. There were also certain limitations to gaining information on the Protected Areas project as the agenda moved to another Ministry. The overall impact is rated as **rather high**.

### **Sustainability**

The sustainability was assessed mainly against the information from case studies, however without increased capacities or ex-post evaluations, sustainability of positive outcomes can only be assumed. Given the existence of a complementary project the Wine project has shown sustained results. In the case of the Drugs project, the sustainability was supported by involvement of the partners in the project cycle. Both projects had a counterpart expert institution which increased sustainability (finding solutions to similar expert issues). Sustainability is rated as **rather high**.

### **Programme setting/Good governance**

While local partners are involved in developing the request and in project implementation, improvements are needed in partner participation throughout all phases of the project cycle, from communication on expert selection, to work plan and budget, to project outputs and evaluation. While MoU does not seem to be a preferred tool, contractual obligations and division of responsibilities need to be clearly set for all parties. Programme setting/good governance is rated as **rather low**.

### **Visibility**

The promotion of the programme remains limited to relevant institutions/expert and potential stakeholders. To certain extent, the programme was promoted also in mainstream and social media, yet according to available information this has not generated new applications or new collaborations. The Embassy created a leaflet about the programme in the past (the leaflet was not available during the evaluation visit) and the information about the programme is not published on the Embassy's website. The visibility of Czech Development Cooperation and programme promotion are **rather low**.

## 5 RECOMMENDATIONS

#	Recommendation	Justification	Main Addressee	Degree of Importance <sup>4</sup>
1	Involve Moldovan partners in the project cycle from the initial phase (need assessment, scope of work, division of responsibilities) till the end phase (feedback, evaluation).	To increase relevance, effectiveness, impact and sustainability.	MFA CZ	1
2	Assess legal options and change the current contractual agreement between Czech and Moldovan institutions.	The current contractual regime is not systemic and significantly decreases the pool of potential experts.	MFA CZ	1
3	Tailor the budget and work plan including no. of mission days (and no. of missions) to each project and to the partner's capacities.	To increase efficiency and effectiveness of the programme.	MFA CZ	1
4	Prepare a written agreement (such as a MoU) between the MFA (as the future administrator of the programme) and the partner institution describing the scope of implementation and responsibilities, with details on the budget and TOR attached.	To increase accountability, transparency as well as relevance.	MFA CZ	1
5	With every project, identify at least one Moldovan expert counterpart, a subject matter specialist, who will pair with the Czech expert.	To address high fluctuation and changes in the Moldovan administration. To ensure transfer of know-how and dissemination. To have a relevant contact person of the project.	MFA CZ	1
6	Conduct risk assessment and assumption analysis before project approval.	To increase cost-effectiveness of the programme by eliminating projects with high risks / unfulfilled assumptions.	MFA CZ	2
7	Identify experts in public calls, do not limit the programme to public employees only.	To address lack of qualified (and available) experts in the public sector. To increase the flexibility of the programme. To ensure deploying the best expertise available.	MFA CZ	2
8	Publish information about the programme on the Embassy's website and regularly inform Moldovan partners about the programme using relevant visibility materials.	To increase visibility of the programme and applications.	Embassy, CZDA	1
9	Conduct regular post-monitoring activities, including ex-post evaluations.	To monitor project outcomes and evaluate the programme	Embassy, MFA CZ	2
10	In case the expert assignment is a part of a bigger intervention to be funded from another budget (CZDA's or other's), ensure the financial allocation is confirmed before deploying an expert.	To increase effectiveness of the programme.	MFA CZ	2

<sup>4</sup> Rating of seriousness / importance: 1 - most serious, 2 - serious, 3 - least serious.

## 6 ANNEX I – CASE STUDIES

### 6.1 Case study – Wine

<i>Project name</i>	<b>Identification of weaknesses and needs of the control system of the wine sector in Moldova</b>	
<i>Project Duration</i>	2018 – 2019	
<i>Requested by</i>	National Office of Vine and Wine, Public institution, Republic of Moldova on 29 May 2017	
<i>Funding</i>	CZDA	Allocation: 749,280 CZK (597,000 MDL). Actual expenditure not available to the evaluators, total expenses were around 97% according to the experts.
<i>Key project partners (Moldovan)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>National Office of Vine and Wine of the Republic of Moldova (NOVW)</i>: Requesting and implementing institution. Responsible for the Vine and Wine Register, ensuring the quality and conformity of the wine products.</li> <li>• <i>National Agency for Food Safety (ANSA)</i> is, inter alia, responsible for following areas: sanitary-veterinary area and animal production; plant health and protection; food safety and quality; production and marketing of wine and spirit drinks; consumers' protection in the food sector <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Directorate for Safety and Quality Control of Wine, Alcohol, Beer and Alcohol Production (DSQCWABPAP ANSA)</li> <li>• Directorate for Supervision over Market, Public Catering and Consumers Protection (DSMPCCP ANSA) also responsible for inspection of wine products</li> <li>• State Enterprise „National Quality Control Center for Alcoholic Beverages” (CNVCPA ANSA) perform analyses of official samples of wine products</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <i>The National Agency for Public Health (NAPH)</i> approves production technologies</li> </ul>	
<i>Key project partners (Czech)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Central Institute for Supervising and Testing in Agriculture (CISTA), Czech Republic</i>: Implements the CZDA component of the Vine and Wine Register project. Responsible for SW and HW for the and for capacity building of Moldovan partners</li> </ul>	
<i>Experts provided:</i>	Three Experts provided by the Czech Agriculture and Food Inspection Authority (SZPI, CAFIA), (also partner in the project <i>Elaboration and implementation of the Vine and Wine Register in the Republic of Moldova</i> )	
<i>CZDA Related projects and interventions</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Elaboration and implementation of the Vine and Wine Register in the Republic of Moldova, 2014 – 2019</i>. Total budget: 20,792,000 CZK: 11,676,000 CZK by the CZDA + 9,116,000 CZK by the USAID.</li> <li>• <i>Evaluation of the Project “Elaboration and implementation of the Vine and Wine Register in the Republic of Moldova”, August 2019</i></li> </ul>	
<i>Other related projects and interventions</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Elaboration and implementation of the Vine and Wine Register in the Republic of Moldova (EIVWR)</i> co-funded by USAID, March 2014 to May 2019.</li> <li>• <i>Moldova Competitiveness Project, funded by USAID and Sweden</i>, is providing technical assistance via expert assignments to the beneficiaries, including Office for Vine and Wine and other associations in the wine industry.</li> <li>• <i>The European Investment Bank</i> supports the Wine Sector Restructuring Program "Filliere du Vin" and Technical Assistance and Information Exchange TAIEX - two projects on promotion of products with geographic indications and designation of origin, best practices of traceability of wine and vine products with geographic indications and designation of origin.</li> </ul>	

#### CONTEXT

Since 2012, the Moldovan wine sector has been undergoing a profound reform aiming at promoting the inflow of foreign investments, opening the European market to Moldovan winemakers and enhancing their competitiveness on domestic and external markets. This encompasses setting up an Automated Information System Vine and Wine Register (VWR) where Moldovan vine and wine units can register. The VWR is a coherent traceability system to ensure the transparency of the entire technological process, beginning with saleable grapes and ending with the distribution of the finished product, making possible the identification of products based on must and wine, especially of those with protected geographical indication and protected origin designation. The software programme for VWR has been developed, introduced and updated with support from the Czech Development Cooperation as a part of the bigger project *Elaboration and implementation of the Vine and Wine Register in the Republic of Moldova*, co-financed by the USAID. An evaluation of the project with focus on the VWR component, contracted by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in 2019,<sup>xv</sup> recommended among others the elaboration of an alternative system of data collection and verification from vine-growers without the involvement of the National Agency for Rural Development, or at least passing the responsibility for data verification on state administration.

According to the National Office of Vine and Wine (NOVW), a public institution mandated with the promotion of Moldovan quality wine, numerous cases of falsification of the wine products originating from Moldova have been identified in recent years, impacting negatively on the image and ultimately on the competitiveness of the vine and wine sector, one of the major sources of income for the Moldavian economy. The NOVW attributes this not

only to the producers but also to the overall quality control system. Thus it decided to initiate an external audit of the control system to improve its efficiency in identification of infringements and application of sanctions.

## **PROJECT**

It is against this background that the NOVW requested in mid-2017 an external expert under the *Czech Temporary Expert Assignments Programme* to assist with the *Organisation of a professional and unbiased audit of the control system of the wine sector from the Republic of Moldova*, to play a key role in identification of the “weak link/s” that make/s the local control inefficient and of measures to be taken. Following expertise was requested: certification, control and audit in the wine sector; winemaking, preferably certified for performing audits. The expert has been requested for 21 days between July – December 2017.

The Experts were fielded the first time from 24 September 2018, one year after the request was submitted. According to a respondent, the delay was caused by unavailability of suitable experts on the Czech side as well as by lengthy identification of key counterparts on the Moldovan side.

### **Anticipated impact**

Decrease in the number cases of falsification of the wine products originating from Moldova contributes to increasing the credibility of the control system of the Moldovan wine sector to local and foreign partners.

### **Outcome**

Improved identification of infringements and application of sanctions

### **Outputs:**

- Description of current state of the control system of the wine sector in Moldova – legal framework and system of official control (technical and expert details, institutional distribution)
- Weak points and the areas for improvement of the control system identified Weak points of the control system defined
- Practical recommendations on improving the efficiency of the control system of the wine sector

### **Deliverables**

- Report for 2018 describing the current state and identified weak points (final and validated version submitted the Partner Institutions, Cooperating Institutions and related Ministries in November 2018)
- A practical document (report) with recommendations on improving the efficiency of the control system submitted to NOVW for validation in an electronic way by 30 June 2019
- Report for 2019 (final and validated version of the report available to Partner Institutions, Cooperating Institutions and related Ministries until 31 July 2019).

### **Inputs**

87 expert days of which 42 in Moldova divided among 3 experts during the period of 2018-2019

### **Budget**

749,280 CZK (597,000 MDL)

The request has been approved and a team of three experts from the Czech Agriculture and Food Inspection Authority (CAFIA) was assigned to perform the tasks. The first part of the audit was carried out by these three experts from 24<sup>th</sup> to 29<sup>th</sup> September 2018, the second part from 13<sup>th</sup> to 18<sup>th</sup> May 2019. Project Report for the first part has been submitted on 19 November 2018. The project has been completed in July 2019.

## **EVALUATION FINDINGS**

### **Relevance**

The requesting partner institution NOVW finds the project highly relevant and has a clear perception of follow up on the project: Interconnection with the National Quality Control Center for Alcoholic Beverages for triangulation and better quality of data; Development of a new module in the Vine and Wine Register (VWR) to include the „Control of Vine and Wine” products. The relevance was confirmed also by the USAID.

### **Complementarity of both projects**

The control system and the VWR are closely related. The project provides recommendations on how to link control process with and integrate it in to the existing VWR software. The NOVW realized that to develop new module, they needed additional expertise (for physical chemical and organoleptic analysis, sampling, or control within vine and wine units). Their preference was for Czech expertise because the Czech Republic is an important market and previous good experience from cooperation with CISTA as for the implementation of the

*Representative from NOVW*

*“The Czech market is one of the most important for Moldova. Nonconformities were detected on the Czech market. We had previously a cooperation with the Central Institute for Supervising and Testing in Agriculture (CISTA) and wanted specific expertise from them, because they know the best the situation form Moldova (specific nonconformities) and can provide specific recommendations.”*



VWR.

The Czech Embassy considers complementarity with Czech development cooperation projects as potentially beneficial, particularly when experts are already familiar with the situation in Moldova. The project could also provide basis for further cooperation.

### **Effectiveness, Impacts and sustainability**

While working on the control process and the linkage with the VWR, NOVW cooperates closely with the ANSA, particularly the National Quality Control Center for Alcoholic Beverages and the Directorate for Safety and Quality Control of Wine, Alcohol, Beer and Alcohol Production who also benefit from the experts' work. The Czech Embassy confirmed that the NOVW cooperated with Czech institutions beyond the Expert Assignment (within the Czech Bilateral Development Cooperation).

All three assigned experts confirmed that NOVW is using the project outputs. The experts identified several major shortcomings - weaknesses, such as: not fully functional VWR, no control mechanism to identify wines on the market or exported wines from Moldova, unsatisfactory number of inspectors, too benevolent limit for increasing the natural alcohol volume in wine (enrichment) regarding the geographical and climatic conditions of the country, carrying out announced inspections only or ineffectively and uneconomically established system for analysis of pesticides in grapes. Some fundamental recommendations have also been formulated, such as: establishing an official database of analytical values of authentic wine samples, changes in analytical methods towards detection of wine adulteration and authenticity, connection of VWR with the information systems of official laboratories, computerization of the system of documents from official controls or changes in sampling procedures. The weak points and recommendations from audit were discussed with NOVW and related Project partners in 2018 and 2019.

Some points from the 2018 report have already been fulfilled in 2019, such as introducing unannounced inspections, future involving Moldova in wine zone C, improving laboratory tests, better cooperation between the official control at the retail, and at producing sites, as well as assuring wine quality control during transport. Some recommendations require changes in legislation, which takes more time. Experts mentioned that some recommendations can be a part of a follow-up project, e.g. the development of official Moldovan Wine Databank, the check of the conformity of wines placed on the market with classified ones, introduction of ANSA online control and laboratory system etc.

CISTA mentioned some key changes in the VWR project based on the Expert's outputs: Implemented improved planned control; Increased monitoring of wine exports from Moldova, especially of bulk wines; Joint control implemented by two units of the National Agency for Food Safety, namely the Directorate for supervision and control of the production and wholesale trade (DSQCWABPAP) and the Directorate for supervision over the retail commercial units (DSMPCCP ANSA).

Whether all recommendations from the 2019 report can be implemented will become clearer after feedback on the 2019 report (due by the end of July). The NOVW plans to discuss follow up on this Expert Assignment after receiving and reviewing the second and final report and mentioned that further assistance may be needed for the implementation of Isotopic analyses of wine and fraud control. According to the NOVW, the project has been implemented as planned, with no significant challenges. CZDA provided the contact to an official translator to assist with interpretation from Czech to Romanian because of specific terminology.

Changes in legislation (new ones to be enacted and some laws yet to be fully implemented) have been identified as the main impediment to implementation of recommendations NOVW informed that proposals had been drafted for review and consideration, but the process has been delayed by the current political instability. Political instability, political will, "comfort zone", difficulties with software interconnection (interoperability) – i.e. geospatial data were also mentioned as key barriers.

Other limiting factors identified by the Experts included: lack of awareness about the project and willingness to support the control system among cooperating institutions, the ongoing/transitory reform of the state food control system and unstable political situation.

Contributing factors identified by the Experts included: Personal contacts and experience of the team of experts - they were recognized by the Moldovan partners as experts who have valuable experience to share, mutual openness and professionalism (of the implementer and the experts), compilation of a detailed study of the local legislation, some parts of which even the local partners were not familiar with, during the preparatory phase.

### **Programme setting / Good Governance**

The NOVW learned about the Programme from the Czech Embassy. The initial meeting between the Director of NOVW with the Embassy representative was followed by active phone and email communication. The NOVW has prepared the Expert Request Form for this project in cooperation

*"The delegated experts are very good, exactly what was needed."*  
Representative from NOVW



with the experts. One and the same person has been responsible and closely involved in the preparation, implementation and review/discussion of deliverables.

The project including expected contributions from the partner institution and other cooperating institutions is consistent with the Expert Request Form and described in detail in Annex 4 to the Experts' Contract. The Report is well structured, addresses the specific issues in a consistent and clear manner and reflects the detailed work plan prepared in March 2018 and annexed to the contract.

The Embassy would welcome regular and timely updates on the projects implementation and next stages. However, it does not have sufficient capacity for follow-up monitoring of all the projects after the expert assignment is completed. Without increased capacities or ex-post evaluations, sustainability of positive outcomes can only be assumed.

The NOVW considers the duration of the assignment (15 days per expert in the Czech republic and 14 days in Moldova over 2 years) as too short for a detailed, in-depth analysis of sometimes sensitive issues and for a review of the comprehensive relevant legislation. The ideal length of stay in Moldova and home office work has, however, not been specified with the reasoning that the assignment was at the time of the evaluation still ongoing. The Embassy considers 25 days in the field as generally sufficient, though it depends on the project.

The NOVW does not see a need for a MoU for such a short project. The Embassy views this in relation to the evaluated Programme: in most cases the projects are short, cover only the remuneration of experts and an MoU would mean an additional administrative burden.

Two Experts pointed out that the remuneration was too low, with 120 EUR/expert day (3,200 CZK per day), because the budget had to be split among three Experts. The NOVW reportedly does not have information about the budget.

Involvement of additional relevant stakeholders including Customs, National Quality Control Center for Alcoholic Beverages or Food Safety Agency in the implementation has been suggested by NOVW to augment political will needed to implement some of the proposed solutions.

### **Comparison to other programmes (of the Czech Republic and other donors)**

The Moldova Competitiveness Project co-finances the VWR. According to the Deputy Chief of Party of the USAID Moldova Competitiveness Project (MCP), expert assignments are not limited in their duration but are usually short, not exceeding the limit of 180 days per annum. Wages are based on factors such as methodology, previous experiences, salary history, level of expertise or the type of assignment. The experts are allocated to existing projects or deliver independent, small scale assignments in various areas including Small and Medium Enterprises (SME) development, quality standards, legislation, marketing and others. The Project is open to cooperation with the evaluated Programme for effort merging for a more impactful activity.

NOVW considers the Temporary Expert Assignment Programme as unique with no recommendations on what it could learn from other cooperation programs. Appreciated is the close collaboration with the Czech Embassy. The Embassy appreciates the Programme for its flexibility to provide Czech Expertise in different fields, quick response to needs, accessibility, and complementarity to bilateral cooperation. Superior Consultant, Policy and Biodiversity Department of the Ministry of Agriculture, Regional Development and Environment agreed that a clear advantage and uniqueness of the Programme is in the possibility to request experts at any time. The possibility to request an expert at any point of time (not by a given deadline) has also been pointed out by CISTA.

### **Visibility / Promotion of the Programme**

The Moldovan Wine sector enjoys large publicity on the web, through conferences and meetings and is widely promoted by the Moldovan Investment Promotion Agency. Information about the Temporary Expert Assignments programme can be found only on the websites of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the CZDA. Report by ANSA from meeting with Czech Experts mentions the *Identification of weaknesses and needs of the control system of the wine sector in Moldova*<sup>xxvi</sup>. The evaluators are not aware of any media publicity other than by the Czech Embassy and NOVW at various meetings and discussion.

## **CONCLUSIONS**

### **Relevance**

The project is highly relevant because of its anticipated contribution to increasing the credibility of the control system of the Moldovan wine sector to local and foreign partners. The purpose of the project *Identification of Weaknesses and Needs of the Control System of the Wine Sector in Moldova* was in consistency with the request from NOVW, to organize a professional and unbiased audit of the control system of the wine sector in Moldova.

### **Complementarity of both projects**

The two projects are very closely linked through cooperation between the NOVW and the National Quality Control Center for Alcoholic Beverages on control of vine and Wine products in general and the development of a new module in the VWR to include the „Control of Vine and Wine” products in particular.

### Effectiveness, impacts and sustainability

In spite of some adverse conditions, the first phase of the project has verifiable positive effects on cooperation of key stakeholders, transfer of know-how and the introduction of some measures for improved control. At this stage, their long-term impacts and sustainability cannot be assessed. Assumptions for sustainability include adjustments in legal framework, political commitment and will of decision makers, cooperation of key partners as well as availability of funding for follow-up activities.

### Programme setting / Good Governance

While there is a close dialogue and transparency between the Implementing Institution, the Czech Embassy, and the experts, involvement of additional key stakeholders and sharing information about the project would further improve accountability. This dialogue and continuity, in view of the evaluators, significantly contributed to relevance and effectiveness of the Experts' work.

### Comparison to other programmes (of the Czech Republic and other donors)

Some features of the Programme including flexibility of timing for requests, communication through the Embassy or flexibility to respond to requests from different fields are appreciated and considered unique. Main limitations identified during the evaluation include limit on time and budget.

### Visibility / Promotion of the Programme

Visibility of the Programme is limited to partner institutions and relevant cooperating or potential stakeholders.

### Sources mentioned in the text:

## 6.2 Case Study - Drugs

<i>Project name</i>	New Challenges in the Field of Combating Drug Crimes in Moldova
<i>Project Duration</i>	2017 – 2018
<i>Requested by</i>	The General Police Inspectorate of the Ministry of Internal Affairs of the Republic of Moldova
<i>Funding</i>	CZDA Allocation: 999,850 CZK (760,186 MDL). Actual expenditure: 806,736 CZK (642,500 MDL <sup>xxvii</sup> )
<i>Key project partners</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>The General Police Inspectorate (GPI) of the Ministry of Internal Affairs of the Republic of the Moldova, Antidrug Directorate (GPI AD) responsible for the investigation and discovering of criminal acts in the field of illicit traffic of drugs, psychotropic substances and their analogues at the national level.</i></li> <li>• <i>Police of the Czech Republic, National Drug Headquarters (NDH). NDH is active in the field of establishing and implementation national drug enforcement policy. It cooperates with other law enforcement bodies and works closely with foreign counterparts from the EU as well as from non EU countries. NDH is very active in the field of establishing and implementation national drug enforcement policy as well as in providing methodical support for territorial antidrug units.</i></li> </ul>
<i>Experts provided:</i>	Three experts provided by Police of the Czech Republic, National Drug Headquarters
<i>CZDA Related projects and interventions</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Related to Developing Sustainable Research and Dissemination Capacity in the Field of Addictology in Georgia (2014 – 2016)</i></li> </ul>
<i>Other related projects and interventions</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Training course supported by TALEX "Combating illicit drug trafficking" where representatives of Sweden, Spain and Romania shared their experience in combating illicit drug trafficking (29 February - 1 March 2016)</i></li> </ul>

## CONTEXT

Illicit drug trafficking has been a major public health as well as social problem. New psychoactive substances (NPS) could not be easily detected and identified. The legal framework covered only known drugs thus obstructing an effective reaction from law enforcement authorities. The General Police Inspectorate (GPI) learned about the Temporary Experts Assignment Programme from one of the assigned Experts with whom they have had previous experience. They submitted the Expert Request Form for a two - week project to be implemented between May and September 2017 to develop the capacity of the Antidrug Directorate of the GPI (GPI AD) in dealing with the issue. The only related activity in Moldova till then was a 2-day training course on

"Combating illicit drug trafficking" organized by TAIEX where representatives of Sweden, Spain and Romania shared their experience in combating illicit drug trafficking.

## PROJECT

### The project

The purpose of the project as stipulated in the *Expert Request Form* was to help the employees of the Antidrug Directorate to acquire the best experience and good practices in combating crimes related to the new psychoactive substances based on international legislation and to familiarize them with the best methods of preventing drug consumption using information technology.

As a result of the project, The GPI expected in summary:

- Improved and enhanced capacities of Anti-Drug Directorate of the General Police Inspectorate concerning the new psychoactive substances
- Improved exchange of information on the assessment and control of the new synthetic drugs
- Improved relations between agencies responsible for combating drug addiction
- Proper implementation of the EU Association Agreement

**Outcomes** (as defined in the *Work Plan – Annex 4 to the Contract between the CZDA and NDH*<sup>5</sup>)

2017

- Analysis of specific needs of the applicant in order to prepare most suitable type and content of seminars and training, including report on the overall situation

2018

- Delivering seminar and training according to these needs aimed especially at following issues:
  - Seminar tackling NPS situation
  - Seminar focused on new EU legislative trends in the field of drug crime
  - Seminar aimed at exploitation of the Internet for drug trafficking
  - Practical training in detection and investigation of drug crime by using TOR and internet
  - Cryptocurrencies and crypto transactions – practical training
- Handover of 10 sets of laptops in order to enhance capacity of Moldavian experts in the area of combating illicit activities on the internet according to the specification in the Annex 5 to the Contract between the CZDA and NDH.
- Final expert report
- Training (as stated above) and final evaluation of delivered activities based on feedback provided by participants with the scope on agreement with Czech development Agency
- Establishment of the closer cooperation between Czech and Moldavian law enforcement authorities.

### Activities

October 2017 – Preliminary meeting in Chisinau

- to meet partners' key officials;
- to identify needs of the applicant;
- to get familiar with current situation in Moldova in the field of NPS, current legislation and current means of combating these phenomena;
- to analyze contemporary situation on the spot;
- to find out activities of other involved countries in Moldova, if any;
- purchase of 10 sets of laptops in order to enhance capacity of Moldavian experts in the area of combating illicit activities on the internet;
- 2 days in the field (at least 8 hours per day) per team (3 experts).

March 2018 – Seminar and training – main project activity aimed at:

- providing information about Czech and EU legislation in the field of drug crimes, especially NPS incl. presentation of actual situation in the EU/world;
- getting familiar with most common means of committing drug crimes on the hidden parts of the Internet;

---

<sup>5</sup> The project logical frameworks were inconsistent as demonstrated by this case, where outcomes in fact refers to an output.

- delivering presentations of current problems with cryptocurrencies (BTC and altcoins), basic principles cryptocurrencies;
- introducing possibilities of law enforcement authorities to deal with this new threat;
- providing participants with an opportunity to make real time altcoins transactions during the training in order to get more familiar with cryptocurrencies and to arouse their interest in this area;
- 3 days in the field (at least 8 hours per day) per team (3 experts);
- detailed agenda will be specified according to outcomes of 1st part.

June 2018 – Evaluation seminar

- Additional consultations and final summarization of previous activities
- 2 days in the field (at least 8 hours per day) per team (3 experts)

### Inputs

The CZDA provided a team of three Experts from the Police of the Czech Republic National Drug Headquarters. The duration of their input as per the Annex 4 to the Contract and the actual duration of their input are shown below:

Person/days	Home office	Field	Total	
Planned	60	21	81	3 experts with 7 days in Moldova and 20 days at home each
Actual	60	24	84	3 experts with 8 days in Moldova and 20 days at home each
Difference	0	3	3	

## EVALUATION FINDINGS

### Relevance

The Head of Antidrug Directorate, General Inspectorate of Police, National Inspectorate of Investigation, Republic of Moldova (GPI AD) informed that their current priority is to have balanced policies based on the experience of the European Union regarding the implementation of alternative concepts of incarceration for drug users. He explained that there are many working groups to study the legislation. Once the legal framework is amended, the police will have more time to document the drug cases. He also mentioned that the Czech Republic can cooperate (by providing relevant experts or using other instruments) in the following areas:

- Clandestine drug production laboratories
- Evaluation of the first strategy developed with the support of Czech experts and developing a new one
- Methods of documentation of new drugs
- Assistance to modernize forensic laboratories
- Training police officers dealing with drug expertise

### Programme setting / Good Governance

#### *Involvement of the partner institution*

The Head of the GPI AD informed that he has been personally involved in the planning and implementation of the project including: preparing the Expert Request Form; preliminary dialogue with the experts; planning of the experts' assignments; composition of the group of trainees; participation at opening of the training event; issuing training certificates and participation at the stage of transmittal acceptance of equipment. The GPI AD was not involved in expert selection.

According to responses in the anonymous on-line survey more involvement in the project preparation and formulation would be welcome, including: selection of experts; negotiation on the detailed work plan; setting the roles and responsibilities of the expert(s) and his institution; commenting on interim reports; commenting on final reports; and promoting the Programme.

Obtaining a decision of the approval of the Expert Request Form took about three months, which is acceptable to the GPI AD.

#### *Communication among key stakeholders and Memorandum of Understanding (MoU)*

After the GPI AD has been informed that their request was accepted, the CZDA started the process of selection of experts. After the experts were contracted, the GPI AD representative met with them at the Czech Embassy during their first mission. The numbers of trainees and the training premises were discussed with the CZDA who covered the rental expenses.

In the view of the Head, GPI AD, a MoU is in general not needed. A partner representative mentioned in the on-line survey that the original request has been partially modified. A suggestion for improvement in communication

included communication and coordination of tasks and objectives (stated in Annex 4 – Work Plan) and of the budget, as these two documents have reportedly not been shared with the GPI AD. With respect to the budget, the CZDA covered the cost of the training room in a hotel. The GPI AD could provide the conference room and facilities and make savings of the budget that could be used for training more investigation police officers. Respondent to the anonymous online survey for main partners mentioned in the online interview that the original request has been partially modified and the requested outputs have been only partially delivered.

#### *Length of stay and budget*

Two Experts who completed the online survey confirmed that the budget and the length of field mission (8 days/expert) and overall cooperation (28 days/expert) sufficient. The time spent by the Experts at the home office has reportedly not been shared with the Directorate and the GPI AD proposed a longer field mission of 25 days/expert. As stated above, the budget was also not share. Respondent to the anonymous online survey for main partners mentioned Directorate representative suggested increasing the budget to purchase specific equipment for investigation.

#### *Challenges*

The Head of the GPI AD told that there have not been any major challenges during the project implementation. The Experts' Final Report has reportedly not been shared with the partner institution thus they did not have the opportunity to comment on it. They have however seen PowerPoint presentations during trainings, participated in the project's activities and expressed satisfaction with the outputs that are considered contemporary and tailored to the Moldovan context.

Representative of the GPI AD

*Transfer of know how was helped by Practical experience of the Experts (they are practitioners not theoreticians). We could communicate with the same language. They knew how to answer specific questions related to the training subject and beyond.*

#### **Effectiveness, impacts and sustainability**

The Head of the GPI AD stated Experts were very good and he was fully satisfied with their performance. He also stated that objectives were mostly met, but some have been delayed due to delays in amending legislation.

The Head of GPI AD described that the most significant change the project contributed to was the introduction of practical improvements. He mentioned following examples how it utilized the Experts' outputs in practice:

- Several cases (*of drugs related offenses, interpretation by the evaluators*) have been documented.
- Introduction of new elements (*in the process of investigation, interpretation by evaluators*), for example: Collecting information from open resources and using applications / software, monitoring the flow of electronic money.
- Equipment received under the project has helped with investigations.
- The trainings on using cryptocurrencies and Darknet<sup>xxviii</sup> helped to make investigations, criminal prosecution actions which led to the detention of organized criminal groups.

One of the Experts fielded under this project also confirmed that the outputs of the project are used for further training within the Moldovan security forces (police) and in applying the theory in practice. Continued use of the outputs after the project completion and improved capacities of the Antidrug Directorate has also been confirmed in the on-line survey among partners.

The project also led to the initiation of changes at the policy level:

- Based on the expertise received and the Czech experience, the GPI AD reported starting a process of modifying the Government decision regarding List of narcotic, psychotropic substances and plants containing such substances found in illicit traffic, as well as their quantities.
- Working groups have been formed to discuss improvements to the cybersecurity legislation.

In the on-line survey, the partner indicated that the requested outputs have been delivered partially and objectives have been met mostly, due to the short period of implementation and the limited budget. The respondent suggested extension of the project to focus on implementation of the provision of the National Antidrug Strategy. The GPI AD also considers applying for a continuation support under the Temporary Expert Assignments Program with focus on clandestine laboratories for drugs production.

*The transfer of knowhow has been influenced by several factors:*

The Head, GPI AD mentioned as most significant the experience of the Czech Experts that greatly contributed to these changes. Outputs of their work are still

Representative of the GPI AD

*Transfer of know how was helped by practical experience of the Experts (they are practitioners not theoreticians). We could communicate with the same language. They knew how to answer specific questions within and outside of the course topics.*



relevant; the GPI AD has been using the received knowledge in their day to day activities.

According to the Head of GPI AD, transfer of know how has been facilitated by a translator working alongside the Experts in Moldova and the fact the Experts were experienced professionals.

The Experts fielded under this project mentioned several factors that contributed to utilization of the transferred know-how:

- The local partner had the right approach, participants came to the seminars on time, paid attention and were active.
- Hands-on practice was included in training workshops. Each was followed by an open discussion.
- Final discussions 3 months after the completion of the course on how the theoretical knowledge and skills acquired was applied to solve specific problems.

One of the Experts informed that he continues cooperation with the Directorate. This has been confirmed by the main partner, who mentioned exchange of information expertise in the field of legal framework.

### **Comparison to expert assignment programmes of the Czech Republic and of other donors**

Following the training by the Czech experts, the GPI AD received complementary and in-depth trainings from other organizations such as the International Law Enforcement Academy (ILEA) - Hungary and from the US Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA). These training were focused on human trafficking and cybercrime.

Respondent to the anonymous online survey for main partners mentioned continued cooperation with the CZDA, yet details have not been provided either by the partner or CZDA.

### **Visibility / Promotion of the Programme**

The GPI AD reported promoting the results, sharing best practices with territorial police inspectorates or with services of fraud investigations across Moldova.

Several articles have been reportedly published in the press as well as on the web. For example, the article published on 31 October 2017 on the website of Moldovan GPI<sup>xxix</sup> mentions initial discussions between the Experts and the then Head of the GPI on counteracting the phenomenon of illicit drug trafficking, identifying NPS and on cybercrimes. During the project implementation, an article has been published in Moldovan electronic media (see textbox).

In the anonymous online survey, the partner mentioned that he would definitely recommend the Programme to other institutions. Besides considering a new request, the GPI AD suggested to the Cybercrime Department to also apply for a similar project under the Temporary Expert Assignments Program.

“The purpose of the workshop is to improve and strengthen the capacities of the employees of the National Inspectorate of Investigations and of the Police Department of Chisinau by acquainting with the European Union legislation and taking over the best practices regarding the new psychoactive and psychotropic substances. I would like to mention that the training carried out by the experts in the field of drugs will help to assume good practices in order to combat this phenomenon, will improve the capacities of the police employees in investigating the cases of drug trafficking, prevent their consumption among the society and ensure the study of the known methods of trade, or transport of narcotic substances”

*Deputy Head of the GPI Mr. Cavcaliuc Gheorghe “The training carried out by the experts in the field of drugs will help to implement good practices” published in the e-new “Oficial.md”, 13 June 2018, accessed on 12 June 2019, <http://oficial.md/social/gheorghe-cavcaliuc-instruirea-realizata-de-expertii-in-domeniul-antidrog-va-contribui-la-asumarea-bunelor-practici>.*

## **CONCLUSIONS**

### **Relevance**

The project addressed very well the priorities of the partner institution and the provided experts were found relevant to their needs. **Relevance has been assessed as very high.**

### **Good Governance**

While the local partner has been involved in developing request and in project implementation, improvements are needed in partner participation throughout all phases of the project cycle, from communication on expert selection, to work plan and budget, to project outputs and evaluation. **Good governance has been assessed as rather low.**

### **Effectiveness, impacts and sustainability**

The Experts' outputs have been well utilized and resulted in positive changes mainly because of their relevance (past and current), competence and relevant qualifications of the Experts, interest and pro-active cooperation of the partner institution, follow up by the Experts on individual activities to ensure results, and the presence of an interpreter during the Experts' work in Moldova. Changes due to the project have been sustained, know-how



disseminated to other key partners, there are plans for follow up and built upon the project achievements. **Impacts and sustainability have been assessed as very high.**

#### Comparison to other programmes (of the Czech Republic and other donors)

The evaluators are not aware of/have not receive any information about similar programs addressing the same issues.

#### Visibility / Promotion of the Programme

The **visibility** and promotion of the project **has been rather high**. The promotion of the Programme remains limited to relevant institutions.

### 6.3 Case study – Protected Areas

<i>Project name</i>	Identification of Weaknesses and Needs in Protected Areas Management in the Republic of Moldova
<i>Project Duration</i>	March – October 2016
<i>Requested by</i>	Ministry of Environment, Republic of Moldova (now Ministry of Agriculture, Regional Development and Environment (MADRM) on 02 July 2015
<i>Funding</i>	CZDA   Allocation: 299,600 CZK (228,492 MDL). Actual expenditure: 272,326 CZK (207,691 MDL)
<i>Key project partners</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Ministry of Environment of the Republic of Moldova</i>: Requesting Institution. After the recent Central Government Reform: <i>Ministry of Agriculture, Regional Development and Environment (MADRM)</i>: Implementing institution</li> <li>• <i>Agency „Moldsilva“</i>: Responsible for operational management of four out of five scientific reserves (Codrii, Plaiul Fagului, Padurea Domneasca and Prutul de Jos)</li> <li>• <i>Academy of Science of Moldova (Institutes of: Zoology, Botanical Garden, Ecology and Geography)</i></li> <li>• <i>Administration of the scientific reserve “Codrii”</i></li> <li>• <i>Administration of the scientific reserve “Plaiul Fagului” (Beech land)</i></li> </ul>
<i>Experts provided:</i>	Jindřich Chlapek, Eva Knižátková Nature Conservation Agency of the Czech Republic (NCA)
<i>Related projects and interventions</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• UNDP/GEF: <i>Mainstreaming biodiversity conservation into Moldova’s territorial planning policies and land use practices (2015-2019)</i> and The GEF Small Grants Programme: <i>Building Stakeholder Capacity – Key Element for the Environmental Governance of the Lower Prut Region 2015-2016</i></li> <li>• EU: <i>Clima East: Sustainable management of pastures and community forests in Moldova’s first National Park Orhei to demonstrate climate change mitigation and adaptation benefits and dividends for local communities (2013-2017)</i></li> <li>• The Rufford Foundation: <i>The Codru Quest: Economic Valuation of the Ecosystem Services of the Codru Protected Area by Using Gamification (2016-2017)</i></li> <li>• The GEF Small Grants Programme: <i>Conservation of biodiversity of the Dniester River. Measures to increase the number of members of rare species of river fish and improve river habitat (2016-2017)</i></li> </ul>

#### CONTEXT

Protected areas management in Moldova has not yet been properly developed and does not meet the EU legal requirements and international conventions on biodiversity. Management plans (MP) have been developed for some 30% of the 180 ha of protected areas. An Initial Project Proposal has been submitted for assistance with capacity building for the management of two protected areas: Codrii and Plaiul Fagului. The project is consistent with the Biodiversity Strategy of the Republic of Moldova for 2015 – 2020 and its Action Plan (GD no. 274 of 18 May 2015). (Initial Project Proposal from the Ministry of Environment, Republic of Moldova, 02 July 2015).

#### PROJECT

##### Scope

The Initial Project Proposal was for a 2-year project covering: Assessment of ecosystems in the two protected areas, training specialists, developing management plans, developing plans for the conservation of rare/endorsed species, purchase of equipment for monitoring of migratory species and institutional capacity building of the two protected areas administrations. The Czech Embassy assessed the Initial Project Proposal, concluded that the scope was defined too widely and requires an initial analysis. This has been communicated in a memo to the CZDA Director. The Embassy therefore recommended implementation under the Temporary Experts Assignment Programme.

The Detailed Work plan attached to the Contract between the CZDA and the experts for Temporary Experts Assignment foresaw 78 person days focused on areas which can be covered by the expertise of the NCA employees within a short-term consultancy. The Work plan includes among others the identification of areas for

possible future development assistance. The allocated budget was 299,600 CZK, the actual expenses equaled 91% of the budget.

Evidence of an agreement on this modification is not available, adjusted Expert Request Form was not available.

### **Expected outcomes and results**

The outcomes and results of the project detailed in Annex 4 to the Contract between the CZDA and the experts are summarized below:

- Assessment of the current state of protected areas (management and governance, management plans, monitoring biodiversity data and options/tools for conservation of endangered species), with focus on Codrii and Plaiul Fagului.
- Proposed solutions for identified weaknesses and problems (transfer of Czech know-how)
- Identification of areas for possible further development assistance
- Two training sessions covering: (i) Legislation, system of protected areas, harmonization with EU directives, monitoring. (ii) Monitoring methods, development of management plans, forest management.
- Final Report with summary in Romanian

### **EVALUATION FINDINGS**

The requesting Ministry has recently undergone organizational and personnel changes. The signatory of the Initial Project Proposal (IPP) is no longer available. One of the Ministry staff who has participated in the preparation of the Proposal left the Ministry shortly thereafter and has returned only recently, after the project completion. A representative of the reserve Prutul de Jos could not recall any Czech experts or project although the team visited and had some meetings with this organisation. In the Agency Moldsilva, the management identified a former employee who was aware of the project, who was involved in the organisation of trainings and other logistical issues with the Czech Experts, but who did not have detailed knowledge of the implementation and conclusion of the project.

Findings are based on a phone conversation with the representative from Agency Moldsilva, reserve Prutul de Jos, and the recently re-appointed Ministry staff, report and on-line interview with fielded Experts, anonymous questionnaire filled in by one partner, and from interview with and debriefing at the Czech Embassy, where the Ministry representative was also present.

#### **Relevance**

According to the Ministry's representative, the intention was to start cooperation with the Czech Embassy / CZDA on a bigger project (explained above). The Final Report did not meet the objectives of the initial request (see also quote).

#### *Representative of the MADRM*

When we wrote the application form, we wanted something else. What the experts did is an evaluation report of the current situation related to protected areas in Moldova. The Ministry and Moldsilva Agency, in cooperation with other donor organizations have done such analyses before. There was a UNDP project which also did analysis and the Strategy on Biodiversity for 2015-2020 and included analysis, stages of implementation and Action Plan. The Strategy was drafted to achieve progress and implement Association Agreement clauses. So, the Ministry really needed expertise to implement specific activities from the Action plan, particularly develop Protected areas management action plans and plans for protection of rare/endangered species (at least one or two plans).

#### **Current priorities**

Both the Ministry and Moldsilva hope for future cooperation with the Czech Embassy and Czech Development Agency (CZDA). The Ministry representative explained that the current priority is a follow-up on the project to attain the objectives requested in the Initial Project Proposal, particularly:

- Development of management plan for at least 2 scientific reservations.
- Assistance to develop management (conservation) plan of endangered and vulnerable species from two scientific reservations.
- Assistance to establish performance indicators for sustainable management of protected areas.

#### **Programme setting / Good Governance**

The Ministry and Moldsilva learned about the Programme from the Czech Embassy and had previous experience with at least one of the Experts.

The IPP has been significantly modified and the project deliverables provided by the experts (in accordance with the internal memo of the CZDA and the contract between CZDA and the experts under the Temporary Expert Assignments Programme) did not fully reflect the requirements of the IPP and the expectations of the project partners. At the time of the evaluation, it was not possible to clarify whether these modifications had been

discussed and agreed with the implementing partners and if not, why. The Experts' Final Report mentions a debriefing after the first mission with CZDA and follow up communication with the project partners. It also mentions that the implementing partners and other key stakeholders were consulted during implementation. It does not however mention whether the Final Report, delivered to the CZDA and the partners has also been discussed and with whom. The handover protocol related to the Final Report is signed only by Experts and a CZDA representative.

While in the anonymous questionnaire it was expressed the need for future close involvement in all aspects and phases of the Expert assignment, proper reporting and coordination has been prevented by personnel changes, as pointed out by the Ministry representative and evident from the difficulties the evaluators faced while trying to locate a person from the partner institutions who is familiar with the project.

No specific proposal was made how to involve partners more closely in future. The Embassy felt that in most cases projects under the evaluated programme are short, cover only the remuneration of experts and a MoU would place an additional administrative burden.

Both experts confirmed to have received adequate support from the Czech Development Agency. The duration of the field work in Moldova (in relation to their actual assignment) has been described as too short by both Experts, with 3-4 weeks considered sufficient instead of 2 weeks (14 days per expert including travel time). Moreover, one expert mentioned that an optimal period for cooperation (in the field and home-based) would have been 1 year instead of 8 months.

The Embassy would welcome regular and timely updates on the projects implementation and next stages. It does however not have sufficient capacity for follow-up monitoring of all the projects after the expert assignment is completed. Without increased capacities or ex-post evaluations, sustainability of positive outcomes can only be assumed.

### **Effects, impacts and sustainability**

Neither the Ministry nor the Moldsilva representatives mentioned any changes introduced based on the Experts outputs. One Expert mentioned in the online questionnaire subsequent negotiations about further cooperation, while the other identified no follow-up activities after the project ended. This was seen as a factor limiting the transfer of knowhow.

As outlined in the 2015 IPP and reiterated by the Ministry and the Agency Moldsilva representatives, Czech support is still needed with respect to a larger project focused on management plans with performance monitoring indicators and endangered species protection plan for two protected reserves. This is consistent with the Experts' proposal to concentrate the future cooperation on development of pilot management plans and outlines the procedure for action plan for protection of endangered species (Experts' Final Report). During the debriefing session, the Embassy representative mentioned that the Ministry could apply for a follow-up funding under the evaluated Programme or via another Czech Development Cooperation instrument. This funding would be used for fielding specific expertise in development of protected areas action plans or for a training of Moldovan specialist in the Czech Republic who would then assist Moldsilva and the Ministry with preparing such plans.

CZDA informed that similar projects have been implemented in 2016 and later in Georgia – Preparation of Management Plan for Tusheti Protected Landscape and Increased Efficiency of Management of Imereti Caves Protected Areas II. It is not clear if these included any transfer of know how or any other link with the Moldovan request.

### **Visibility / Promotion of the Programme**

The evaluator recalls that there was an article published in the magazine and on the website of the Nature Conservation Agency of the Czech Republic, and some online information during the project implementation.

The implementing partners have not been in touch with the Nature Conservation Agency of the Czech Republic or with the Experts since the assignment ended. According to their own statement, they would probably recommend other institutions to request an expert within the framework of the Czech Temporary Experts Assignment Programme.

## **CONCLUSIONS**

### **Relevance**

The relevance of the project is considered low: It did not fully reflect the expectations of the implementing partners and the outputs have not been utilized. The experts' deployment (as per contract) was defined as a de facto formulation mission, but without confirmed financial allocation/a clear mandate for a follow-up project. The experts declared their readiness to be engaged in a follow-up project to pilot plans for management of protected areas including implementation of required measures.

### **Effects, impacts and sustainability**

Effects, impacts and sustainability are considered low. There has not been any follow up on the Final Report including on recommendations related to protected areas management plans - the past and current priorities of the implementing partners. The CZDA/MFA could consider supporting a follow-up project/expert deployment to increase impact of the commenced activities.

**Programme setting / Good Governance**

Dialogue, accountability and transparency among the implementing institutions, the Embassy and the Experts have been limited, at least partly due to organizational and personnel changes in the Moldovan institutions. The project has been “anchored” in specific persons. The lack of personnel continuity and institutional memory contributed to the low relevance and impacts. There is an issue with distinction between the Program and regular bilateral cooperation.

**Visibility / Promotion of the Programme**

Visibility of the Programme is limited to partner institutions.

## 7 ANNEX II – OTHERS

### 7.1 List of informants (interviews and phone discussions)

No.	Type	Organisation	Person	Role	Date
	<b>Czech Embassy, Monitoring in Moldova</b>	Embassy of the Czech Republic in Chisinau	Jan Husák	Counsellor / Development and Economic Affairs	24/06/2019 (in-depth face-to-face interview / briefing) 16/07/2019
18	<b>Partner</b>	General Inspectorate of Police, National Inspectorate of Investigation	Ion Țurcanu	Head of Directorate	24/06/2019 (in-depth face-to-face interview)
23	<b>Partner</b>	National Office of Vine and Wine of the Republic of Moldova	Ștefan Iamandi	Specialist responsible for the Wine Register, Directorate Assurance of the quality and conformity of the wine products	25/06/2019 (in-depth face-to-face interview)
3	<b>Partner</b>	Ministry of Agriculture, Regional Development and Environment	Ala Rotaru	Superior consultant, Policy Directorate in the field of biodiversity	25/06/2019 27/06/2019 (phone interview) 16/07/2019
22	<b>Co-partner</b>	Moldova State University, Faculty of Sociology and Social Work	Oleg Bulgaru	Lecturer at the Department of Sociology	
3	<b>Co-partner</b>	Scientific Reservation „Prutul de Jos”	Veronica Paladi	Head of Science department	26/06/2019
3	<b>Co-partner</b>	Agency „Moldsilva”	Ghenadie Grubii	Main specialist, Directorate of the Forestry Fund and Protected Areas	26/06/2019
3	<b>Co-partner</b>	Agency „Moldsilva”	Victoria Covali	Consultant, Directorate of the Forestry Fund and Protected Areas	27/06/2019
3	<b>Other implementer</b>	State Enterprise “Institute of Forestry Research and Development	Valeriu Caisin	Deputy Scientific Director	27/06/2019
29	<b>Partner</b>	Agency of Geology and Mineral Resources	Daniela Raducan	Head of Directorate of Geology	18/07/2019
22	<b>Partner</b>	Ministry of Health, Labour and Social Protection	Boris Gîlcă	State Secretary	23/07/2019

Debriefing was held at the Czech Embassy on 16/07/2019.

Data triangulation for each project is specified below:

No.	Project name in EN	Main partner in Moldova	On-line survey among experts	On-line survey among Moldovan partners	Interview status
3	Identification of weaknesses and needs in protected areas management in the Republic of Moldova	Ministry of Agriculture, Regional Development and Environment	Yes (2)	Yes (1) in Romanian	Phone interview
4	Support on elaboration of national report for UN Habitat III conference	Ministry of Economy and Infrastructure	Yes (1)	No	-
14	Elaboration of analyzes and recommendations for the office of the prime minister of the Republic of Moldova	State Chancellery	Yes (1)	Yes (1)	-
18	New challenges in the field of combating drug crimes in Moldova	The General Police Inspectorate of the Ministry of Internal Affairs of the Republic of the Moldova	Yes (1)	Yes (1)	Face-to-face interview in 24 June
22	Survey of population climate in the Republic of Moldova	National Commission for Population and Development	No	Yes (1) in Romanian	-
23	Identification of weaknesses and needs of the control system of the wine sector in Moldova	National Office of Vine and Wine of the Republic of Moldova	Yes (2)	Yes (1)	Face-to-face interview in 25 June
29	Surveillance of the "Remediation of oil contaminated sites in the municipalities of Lunga and Marculesti in the Republic of Moldova" project (Hydrogeology and remedial technologies – Russian speaking)	Agency of Geology and Mineral Resources	Not applicable	Yes (1)	-
38	Public lighting project	Energy Efficiency Fund	Not applicable	No	-



## 7.2 Templates for semi-structured interviews in Moldova

### Partners - Interview Guidelines

Partner:

Project:

#### Preparation before the interview

- see project documentation and survey responses
- Have basic info about the Expert Assignment ready:

Project details:

Budget:

Delivered outputs:

Outcomes:

- Have the project outputs ready for the informant to be reminded what the output was

#### During the interview

##### Introduction

- of the evaluator and of the informants (*please note their names, positions and contact details in case we need further information*)
- of the evaluation purpose: to learn how to increase programme effectiveness, efficiency and quality of the provided support and provide directions for the program in future, as its management will be shifted from the Czech Development Agency to the Ministry Of Foreign Affairs, Department of Development Cooperation. Also to provide systemic and procedural recommendations related to Development Cooperation of the Czech Republic in Moldova and elsewhere
- we will keep the answers confidential, upon agreement we can use a quote in the evaluation report, the informants can join the debriefing at the Embassy (date and time?) to find out about preliminary findings and conclusions personally and will receive the draft mission report – comments and corrections will be much appreciated.

##### Relevance

- What is your role in this institution?
- What are your current priorities?
- In which areas do you think the Czech Republic can cooperate on (by providing relevant experts or elsehow)?

##### Programme setting / Good Governance

- How have you been personally involved in the Expert Assignment in question? (*some questions may be skipped, if the person joined at a later stage and does not know answers to these questions*)
- How have you been informed about the implementation of the expert assignments under the Programme?
  - What did the Embassy communicated to you during the initial phase (and implementation)?
  - What did the Czech Development Agency communicated to you during preparation, implementation and reporting?
  - Would you suggest any changes in the communication? (e.g. would you like to be more informed? About what?)
- As for preparations of the Expert Assignment:
  - How have you been involved in expert(s) selection, if at all?
  - Are you satisfied with this level of your involvement?

- Would you make any changes in the process of expert selection and preparation of the assignment?
  - How have you been satisfied with the allocated expert?
  - Do you see it as an issue that no MoU was signed with your institution? (e.g. with the original request, the detailed work plan and budget proposed by the expert and signed by the Czech Development Agency)
  - Would you welcome signing such an MoU, even if it may delay the start of the expert assignment (we guess around a month, depending on the procedures at the Czech Ministry and your institution)?
  - What advantages and disadvantages do you see in having the MoU signed?
  - How much time did it take from request submission to the expert appointment? Was this time acceptable?
- What would you like to change in any way how you were engaged in the programme?
- Looking at the budget and the delivered outputs:
    - Do you find the budget reasonable? If not, what would you recommend?
    - Do you find the time period spend by experts in Moldova (max. 25 days a year) reasonable? If not, what would have been the ideal length of stay in your case?
    - Do you find the time period spend by experts working from home reasonable? If not, what would you recommend?
- Have any challenges appeared during the project implementation?
    - If so, what were they?
    - How have you managed to tackle them?
    - How has the Czech Development Agency helped you to tackle them?
    - Has the expert consulted you on the outputs, prepared by the expert(s)?
    - How are you satisfied with the quality of the outputs? (*show outputs at least electronically in case the informants do not have them at hand*)
    - To what extent are these outputs tailored to the Moldovan context?
    - What has helped to transfer the Czech know-how?
    - What has limited the transfer the Czech know-how?
    - Has the expert consulted you on the final report, submitted to the Czech Development Agency?

### **Impacts and sustainability**

- Can you please describe in detail how the experts' outputs were used at your institution or elsewhere?
- What most significant changes has this brought? (on policy level, in practice – at partner institutions, elsewhere)
- What do you think has helped to achieve these (positive) changes? (any contextual factors)
- What has hindered the use of outputs and achievement of changes in policies or practices?
- Are the outputs still relevant now? (or are they already outdated?)
- Have you had a simultaneous (or previous or subsequent) project tackling the same or similar issues?
  - If yes, what was the project name, budget, donor, focus?
  - How was the Czech Expert Assignment complementary to your other project?
- Have you been personally engaged in any follow-up on the expert assignment, e.g. by discussing further cooperation, promotion of the outputs etc.?
  - If so, can you tell me more about further cooperation? (what, with whom, funded by whom etc.)

### **Comparison to other programmes (of the Czech Republic and other donors)**

- Do you have other experiences with cooperation with partner institutions or experts from the Czech Republic or other countries (e.g. USAID) or multilateral donors (e.g. UNDP)?
  - If so, how would you compare your experience with the Czech Temporary Expert Assignments programme to other types of cooperation you have had?
  - Is the Czech Temporary Expert Assignments in a way unique?
  - What could the Czech Temporary Expert Assignments programme learn from other programmes for cooperation?

### **Visibility / Promotion of the Programme**

- Have you promoted somewhere the financial contribution of the Czech Temporary Expert Assignments programme? (e.g. in the project outputs, in your annual report, on an office wall etc.)
- Are you aware of any article / video in media, that would mention the involvement of Czech experts in your project?
- Have you mentioned the Czech Temporary Expert Assignments programme to any other institution?
- Do you consider requesting again an expert within the framework of the Czech Temporary Expert Assignments programme? If so, on what topic?

### **Other Donors – Interview Guidelines**

#### **Introduction**

- of the evaluator
- of the evaluation purpose: to learn how to increase programme effectiveness, efficiency and quality of the provided support and provide directions for the program in future, as its management will be shifted from the Czech Development Agency to the Ministry Of Foreign Affairs, Department of Development Cooperation. Also to provide systemic and procedural recommendations related to Development Cooperation of the Czech Republic in Moldova and elsewhere
- we will keep the answers confidential, upon agreement we can use a quote in the evaluation report, the informant may join the debriefing at the Embassy and will receive the draft evaluation report including findings from Moldova – comments will be much appreciated.

#### **Relevance**

- How long have you been working in Moldova? (not only at your current position)
- What support in your experience do the Moldovan public institutions need most currently? (approximation to EU legislation, decentralisation, privatisations, other areas of good governance, environment, climate, human rights etc.)
- Do you know of the Czech Temporary Expert Assignments Programme?
- In which of these areas do you think the Czech Republic can offer relevant experts?
- Do you have an expert assignment programme?
  - If so, where can we learn more (on-line)?
  - Is there a high demand for foreign experts in Moldova? Which fields of expertise?
  - Which institutions can request an expert?
  - How does the expert assignments work (from initial request to handover)?
  - What is the minimum and maximum budget for an expert assignment?

- Are there any limitations in the length of experts' stay in Moldova? If so, how many days?
  - To what extent are your experts assignments linked to other projects supported by your agency? Is the link necessary or can they be independent, small scale assignments too?
  - What has been the feedback from the Moldovan institutions to your programme?
  - Do you have any evaluation of your expert assignment programme? Can we have the evaluation report? (We will be happy to share ours once it is public)
  - Do you know the Czech Temporary Expert Assignments Programme? How would you compare it to your programme?
  - Where do you see possibilities of cooperation between your and the Czech Temporary Expert Assignments Programme?
  - Do you have any other comments relevant for the Czech Development Cooperation?
- USAID - Complementarity of the wine control system and wine register projects** *(details to be shared with the informant)*
- Are you aware of the Czech Temporary Expert Assignment focusing on the Identification of weaknesses and needs of the control system of the wine sector in Moldova?
    - If yes, can you tell us details?
    - What do you think of the outputs produced so far?
    - How do you see complementarity with the the Vine and Wine Register in the Republic of Moldova, that you have co-funded and cooperated on with the Czech Development Agency?
    - If not, would you like more details? What do you think about this initiative?

## 7.3 Overview of visibility

### Visibility Promotion of the programme

No.	Project name	Promotion	Score	Reason	Outputs available online	Premises	Experts reports (CZDA logo)	Moldovan Newsletter, Newspaper Magazine	Czech experts mentioned on partner Website or FB	CZDA mentioned on partner Website or Facebook	CZDA own press releases	Photos
3	Identification of weaknesses and needs in protected areas management in the Republic of Moldova	Rather low (several articles published)	2	Two articles were issued in Moldova, during the implementation of the project A brief report (mentioning CzDA assistance) was also published in Czech language on the website of the Nature Conservation Agency of the Czech Republic	No evidence, Brief report on NCA website <sup>xxx</sup>	No evidence	Yes	No evidence	Yes	Yes <sup>xxxii</sup>		Yes, see links with photo & photos from the experts report
4	Support on elaboration of national report for UN Habitat III conference	Rather high	2	There was certain coverage of the project in Moldova. The final UN Habitat III report for Moldova available online is mentioning the assistance provided with the support of CzDA.	Yes <sup>xxxii</sup> , UN Habitat report available online on international website	No evidence	Expert report NO PPT - yes	Yes <sup>xxxiii</sup>	Yes	Yes		Yes see link with photo
14	Elaboration of analyzes and recommendations for the office of the prime minister of the Republic of Moldova	Rather Low	2	There was certain coverage of the project in Moldova (both websites & Facebook)	No evidence	No evidence	Yes	No evidence	Yes	Yes <sup>xxxiv</sup>	Yes <sup>xxxv</sup>	Yes see links with photos
18	New challenges in the field of combating drug crimes in Moldova	High	4	High coverage of the project in mass media and reports mentioning CzDA assistance	No evidence	No evidence	Yes	No evidence	Yes	Yes <sup>xxxvi</sup>	Yes <sup>xxxvii</sup>	Yes, see links with photos & photos from the experts report
22	Survey of population climate in the Republic of Moldova	Low	1	No mass media coverage for the Expert programme	No	No	No	No	No But there are other articles with expert on other project assignments	No But there are other articles with expert on other project assignments		No But there are other articles/ photos with expert on other project assignments
23	Identification of weaknesses and needs of the control system of the wine sector in Moldova	Low	2	There was little visibility, One communication material on ANSA Web site about the project	No evidence	No evidence	Yes	No evidence	Yes	Yes <sup>xxxviii</sup>		Yes, see link with photo
29	Surveillance of the "Remediation of oil contaminated sites in the municipalities of Lunga and Marculesti in the Republic of Moldova" project		n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		n/a
37	Public lighting project	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		n/a
	<b>Average</b>	<b>Rather low</b>	<b>2</b>									



## 7.4 Overview of follow-up projects (sustainability)

ProjNo.	Project name in EN	Country	Connected to previous cooperation / simultaneous projects within the Czech ODA	Name of the related Czech bilateral ODA project (activity) <sup>6</sup>	Connected to follow-up cooperation / any follow-up projects within the Czech ODA	Name of the subsequent Czech bilateral ODA project (activity)	Connected to follow-up cooperation of Czech actors beyond the Czech ODA	Details of the follow-up cooperation beyond the Czech ODA
	<i>Text</i>	<i>Text</i>	<i>1 - Yes, 0 - No</i>	<i>Text</i>	<i>1 - Yes, 0 - No</i>	<i>Text</i>	<i>1 - Yes, 0 - No</i>	<i>Text</i>
3	Identification of weaknesses and needs in protected areas management in the Republic of Moldova	Moldova	1	At least one attempt reported for replication of practice with protected areas in Georgia, supported by the CZDA: Yes – in Georgia: Preparation of Management Plan for Tusheti Protected Landscape; Increased Efficiency of Management of Imereti Caves Protected Areas II	0		?	
4	Support on elaboration of national report for UN Habitat III conference	Moldova	1	An urban planning project supported by the CZDA was reported	0		0	
14	Elaboration of analysis and recommendations for the office of the prime minister of the Republic of Moldova	Moldova	0		0		0	
18	New challenges in the field of combating drug crimes in Moldova	Moldova	1	Related to Developing Sustainable Research and Dissemination Capacity in the Field of Addictology in Georgia (2014 – 2016)	0		1	Further exchange with expert(s) in the field of legal framework and exchange of information
22	Survey of population climate in the Republic of Moldova	Moldova	1	Comprehensive support of population statistics and	1	Feasibility study of a population census in the	1	Collaboration with expert on research titled "Reproductive

<sup>6</sup> Note: Project description at [www.czda.cz](http://www.czda.cz) contains original plans and provided resources, not final reports or a summary of achievements. The evaluation team has not evaluated in-depth each related project to assess any duplications / synergies as this was beyond the scope of the evaluation. The only exception is the study on wine sector in Moldova attached to the evaluation report.

ProjNo.	Project name in EN	Country	Connected to previous cooperation / simultaneous projects within the Czech ODA	Name of the related Czech bilateral ODA project (activity) <sup>6</sup>	Connected to follow-up cooperation / any follow-up projects within the Czech ODA	Name of the subsequent Czech bilateral ODA project (activity)	Connected to follow-up cooperation of Czech actors beyond the Czech ODA	Details of the follow-up cooperation beyond the Czech ODA
				demography developments in Moldova (2013 – 2016)		Republic of Moldova (2019, under this programme, contract is expected to be signed in August 2019)		behavior of women in the Republic of Moldova" (2017) <sup>7</sup> , The "PostDemo" project proposed by The Charles University
23	Identification of weaknesses and needs of the control system of the wine sector in Moldova	Moldova	1	Elaboration and implementation of the Vine and Wine Register in the Republic of Moldova (2014-2017)	1	Delegated cooperation of the CZDA with UNDP in 2019 in Bosnia and Herzegovina focusing on wine sector	1	Národní úřad pro víno a vinohradnictví (CR) – cooperation on isotopic analyses of wine and fraud control
Projects that were not selected for implementation								
29	Surveillance of the "Remediation of oil contaminated sites in the municipalities of Lunga and Mirculegti in the Republic of Moldova" project	Moldova	1	Research and Remediation of Sites Contaminated by Oil Products in Municipalities Lunga and Mărculești in Moldova (2010 – 2012) Decontamination of sites polluted by oil products in Lunga and Marculesti II. (2013 – 2015)	1	Remediation of Oil Contamination in the Villages of Lunga and Mărculești in Moldova III (2016 – 2018)	?	
39	Public lighting project	Moldova	0		0		?	

<sup>7</sup> Reproductive behavior of women in the Republic of Moldova" (2017) , accessed on 5 August 2019 at <http://www.crras.usm.md/CRRAS/manualepdf/compceprod2018.pdf>

## 7.5 List of Moldovan national strategies categorized according to the SDGs

### **Goal 1: End poverty in all its forms everywhere**

National Development Strategy "Moldova 2020"  
National Development Strategy "Moldova 2030"  
Strategy for the Development of Rural Extension Services 2012-2022  
National Strategy for Regional Development 2016-2020  
National Strategic Programme on Demographic Security of the Republic of Moldova 2011-2025  
Strategy for Water Supply and Sanitation 2014-2028  
National Programme for the Implementation of the Protocol on Water and Health 2016-2020  
Environmental Strategy 2014-2024  
National Strategy for Employment 2017–2021

### **Goal 2: End hunger, achieve food security and improved nutrition and promote sustainable agriculture**

National Strategy for Agricultural and Rural Development 2014 - 2020  
National Programme for Monitoring the Pesticide Residues and Nitrate Content in Foods of Vegetal Origin 2015-2020  
National Programme on Alimentation and Nutrition 2014-2020  
National Programme for Sexual and Reproductive Health and Rights 2018-2022  
Innovation Strategy of the Republic of Moldova "Innovation for Competitiveness" 2013-2020  
Strategy of Development of Rural Extension Services 2012-2020  
Strategy for the Development of Domestic Trade 2014-2020  
Programme for Conservation and Increase of Soil Fertility (2011-2020)  
Programme for Resettlement and Development of Viticulture and Winemaking 2002-2020  
Environmental Strategy 2014-2023  
Strategy for Biological Diversity of Moldova 2015-2020  
National Programme for the Establishment of the National Ecological Network for 2011-2018  
National Programme for Regeneration and Afforestation of the Forest Fund 2003-2020

### **Goal 3: Ensure healthy lives and promote well-being for all at all ages**

Strategy for the Development of Health System 2007-2017  
National Strategic Programme for Demographic Security of the Republic of Moldova 2011-2025  
National Immunization Programme for 2016-2020  
National Programme for Sexual and Reproductive Health and Rights 2018-2022  
National Strategy for Public Health 2014-2020  
National Health Policy 2007-2021  
National Programme to combat hepatitis B, C and D 2017-2021  
National Programme for Prevention and Control of HIV/AIDS and STD 2016-2020  
National Programme for Control of Tuberculosis  
National Programme for the Implementation of the Protocol on Water and Health 2016-2025  
National Programme for Prevention and Control of Cardiovascular Diseases 2014-2020  
National Strategy for Prevention and Control of Non-Communicable Diseases 2012-2020  
National Programme for Mental Health 2012-2016  
National Programme on Alimentation and Nutrition 2014-2020  
National Programme for the Alcohol Control 2012-2020  
National Programme for Tobacco Control 2012-2016  
National Anti-Drug Strategy 2011-2018  
National Road Safety Strategy  
Strategy for Transport and Logistics 2013-2022  
State Policy in the Field of Medication  
Strategy for Water Supply and Sanitation 2014-2028  
National Programme on Sustainable Management of Chemicals  
Waste Management Strategy for Moldova 2013-2027  
Cross-sectoral Strategy on Developing Parental Abilities and Competencies, 2016-2022  
National Strategy for Youth Sector Development 2020  
Environmental Strategy 2014-2023

### **Goal 4: Ensure inclusive and equitable quality education and promote lifelong learning opportunities for all**

National Development Strategy "Moldova 2020"  
National Development Strategy "Moldova 2030"

Strategy for the Development of Education for 2014-2020 "Education 2020"  
National Strategy for Development of Youth Sector 2020  
National Employment Strategy 2017–2021  
Programme for the Development of Inclusive Education in Moldova 2011-2020  
Environmental Strategy 2014-2023  
Strategy for the Development of Technical Vocational Education 2013-2020  
Strategy for equality between women and men 2017-2021  
National Action Plan on Human Rights 2018–2022  
Programme for the Development of Medical and Pharmaceutical Education for 2011-2020  
Strategy for the Development of Human Resources in Healthcare System for 2016-2025

**Goal 5: Achieve gender equality and empower all women and girls**

Strategy to Ensure the Equality between Women and Men 2017-2021  
National action plan on human rights 2018–2022  
Strategy for SMEs sector development 2012-2020  
Roadmap on mainstreaming ageing in policies and Action Plan on implementation of Roadmap on mainstreaming ageing in policies 2014-2016  
National Strategy to Prevent and Stop Human Trafficking for 2018-2023  
National Strategy on Employment 2017–2021  
Child Protection Strategy (2014-2020) and its Action Plan (2016-2020)  
National Programme on Sexual and Reproductive Health and Rights 2018-2022  
National Strategy to Prevent and Stop Violence against Women and Family Violence for 2018-2023

**Goal 6: Ensure availability and sustainable management of water and sanitation for all**

National Development Strategy "Moldova 2020"  
National Development Strategy "Moldova 2030"  
Strategy for water provision and sanitation for 2014-2028  
Environmental strategy for 2014-2023 and related Plan of Actions  
Waste management strategy for 2013-2027  
Programme for development of water sector management and hydroamelioration for 2011-2020 in the Republic of Moldova for the years 2011-2020  
Strategy regarding biological diversity of Republic of Moldova for the years 2015-2020 and the related Plan of Actions  
National Regional Development Strategy 2016-2020

**Goal 7. Ensure access to affordable, reliable, sustainable and modern energy for all**

National Development Strategy "Moldova 2020"  
National Development Strategy "Moldova 2030"  
Energy strategy of Moldova for up to 2030  
National Programme for Energy Efficiency for 2011-2020

**Goal 8: Promote inclusive and sustainable economic growth, employment and decent work for all**

National Development Strategy "Moldova 2020"  
National Development Strategy "Moldova 2030"  
Competitiveness Enhancement Roadmap of the Republic of Moldova  
SME Sector Development Strategy for 2012-2020  
Business Regulatory Reform Strategy for 2013-2020  
Innovation Strategy for 2013-2020 "Innovations for Competitiveness"  
Environmental Strategy for 2014-2023  
National Employment Strategy for 2017-2021  
Youth Sector National Development Strategy 2020  
Inclusive Education National Development Programme for 2011-2020  
VET Development Strategy for 2013-2020  
National Plan for Prevention and Counteraction of Human Trafficking for 2018-2023  
Child Protection Strategy for 2014-2020  
Tourism Development Strategy "Tourism 2020"

**Goal 9. Build resilient infrastructure, promote inclusive and sustainable industrialization and foster innovation**

National Development Strategy "Moldova 2020"  
National Development Strategy "Moldova 2030"  
Investment Attraction and Export Promotion Strategy for 2016-2020

SME Sector Development Strategy for 2012-2020  
Research and Development Strategy until 2020  
Innovation Strategy for 2013-2020 "Innovations for Competitiveness"  
Environmental Strategy for 2014-2023  
Concept for Cluster Development of the Industrial Sector of the Republic of Moldova  
National Strategy for the development of information society „Digital Moldova 2020”

**Goal 10. Reduce inequality within and among countries**

Roadmap for Competitiveness Improvement (2014-2021)  
Strategy to Develop Rural Extension Services (2012-2022)  
National Strategy on Agriculture and Rural Development (2014-2020)  
National Strategy for Regional Development 2016-2020  
National Strategy for Informational Society Development „Digital Moldova 2020”  
National Programme for Improving the Quality of Romanian Learning Process in Educational Institutions with Instruction in Minority Languages and Action Plan for its implementation (2016-2020)  
Inclusive Education Development Programme (2011-2020)  
National Strategy for the Development of Youth Sector 2020  
Strategy to Ensure the Equality between Women and Men (2017-2021)  
Road map on Mainstreaming Ageing in Policies and Action Plan on Implementation of Road map  
Mainstreaming Ageing in Policies (2014-2016)  
National Strategy on Migration and Asylum (2011-2020) and Plan (2016-2020)  
National Strategic Programme in Demographic Security Domain (2011-2025)  
National Strategy “Diaspora 2025” and Action Plan for 2016-2018 for its implementation  
Strategy for the Development of Education for 2014-2020 “Education 2020”  
Action Plan to Support Roma Population (2016-2020)  
National Action Plan on Human Rights 2018–2022

**Goal 11. Make cities and human settlements inclusive, safe, resilient and sustainable**

National Development Strategy “Moldova 2020”  
National Development Strategy “Moldova 2030”  
Regional Development Strategy 2016-2020  
Transport and Logistics Strategy for 2013-2022  
Strategy for Tourism Development "Tourism 2020"  
Environmental Strategy for the years 2014-2023

**Goal 12. Ensure sustainable consumption and production patterns**

National Development Strategy “Moldova 2020”  
National Development Strategy “Moldova 2030”  
Environmental Strategy for the years 2014-2023  
National Waste Management Strategy of the Republic of Moldova for 2013-2027  
National Action Plan for the Implementation of Sustainable Public Procurements in the Republic of Moldova

**Goal 13. Take urgent action to combat climate change and its impacts**

National Development Strategy “Moldova 2020”  
National Development Strategy “Moldova 2030”  
Climate Change Adaptation Strategy of the Republic of Moldova until 2020

**Goal 14. Conserve and sustainably use the oceans, seas and marine resources for sustainable development**

National Development Strategy “Moldova 2020”  
National Development Strategy “Moldova 2030”  
Strategy regarding biological diversity of Republic of Moldova for the years 2015-2020 and the related Plan of Actions  
Environmental strategy for 2014-2023 and related Plan of Actions

**Goal 15. Protect, restore and promote sustainable use of terrestrial ecosystems, sustainably manage forests, combat desertification, and halt and reverse land degradation and halt biodiversity loss**

National Development Strategy “Moldova 2020”  
National Development Strategy “Moldova 2030”  
Environmental strategy for 2014-2023 and related Plan of Actions  
Strategy regarding biological diversity of Republic of Moldova for the years 2015-2020 and the related Plan of Actions



National Programme for extension of the areas covered with forest vegetation for the years 2014-2018  
Programme for soils conservation and increasing soils fertility for the years 2011-2020

**Goal 16. Promote peaceful and inclusive societies for sustainable development, provide access to justice for all and build effective, accountable and inclusive institutions at all levels**

National Action Plan on Human Rights 2018–2022

Strategy for Child Protection (2014-2020) and its Action Plan for 2016-2020

National Plan for Prevention and Fighting the Human Trafficking (2014-2016)

Strategy of Justice Sector Reform (2011-2016)

National Strategy to Prevent and Combat Money Laundering and Financing of Terrorism (2013-2017)

National Strategy to Prevent and Combat Organized Crime (2011-2019)

National Anticorruption Strategy for 2017-2020

Public Administration Reform Strategy (2016-2020)

Action Plan to Support Roma Population (2016-2020)

National Strategy for the Development of Youth Sector 2020

National Strategy for Informational Society Development „Digital Moldova 2020”

**Goal 17. Strengthen the means of implementation and revitalize the global partnership for sustainable development**

Strategy on public finance management development 2013-2020

Strategy to develop national statistics system 2016-2020

Strategy on Civil Society Development 2018–2020

## **7.6 List of reviewed documents and on-line sources**

### **3. Identification of weaknesses and needs in protected areas management in the Republic of Moldova**

List of Participants

AOPK: Nature Conservation Agency of the Czech Republic

CZDA: Mission report from field visit I – May

CZDA: The agenda of workshop; Protected areas management: Could the Czech experience be useful to Moldova?, 20.9. 2016

AOPK: Management planning in protected areas, 20. 9. 2016

AOPK: Management Plan for the Tusheti Protected Landscape (2014-2019)

AOPK: Forest Management in Protected Areas in the Czech Republic - Source of Inspiration and Good Experience

List of participants at the workshop: Could the Czech experience be useful to Moldova?, 20.9. 2016

Photo of the participants from the workshop: Could the Czech experience be useful to Moldova?, 20.9. 2016

CZDA: Mission report from field visit II - September

### **4. Support on elaboration of National Report for UN Habitat III conference**

Luděk Sýkora, Charles University of Prague: Comments and recommendations to the Habitat III National report for Republic of Moldova

Luděk Sýkora, Charles University of Prague: Support on the elaboration of national report for UN Habitat III conference in the Republic of Moldova, 25.2.2016

Luděk Sýkora, Charles University of Prague: Expert report on the preparation of the National report of the Republic of Moldova for the Third United Nations Conference on Housing and Sustainable Urban Development (Habitat III), 2016

Luděk Sýkora, Charles University of Prague: Habitat III National Report for Moldova: assistance from the Czech Development Agency for the Ministry of Regional Development and Constructions of Republic of Moldova, 2016

National commission for elaboration of National Report for United Nations Conference on Housing and Sustainable Urban Development: National report of United Nations Conference on Housing and Sustainable Urban Development, 2016, (ENG, ROM version)

### **14. Elaboration of Analyzes and Recommendations for the Office of the Prime Minister of the Republic of Moldova**

MEPCO: Elaboration of Analysis and Recommendations for the Office of the Prime Minister of the Republic of Moldova, October 2017

MEPCO: Elaboration of Analysis and Recommendations for the Office of the Prime Minister of the Republic of Moldova, PP presentation - Chisinau, 28.9. 2017

State Chancellery of the Republic of Moldova: Expert Request form, 28.7.2016

Městský soud v Praze: Výpis z obchodního rejstříku, oddíl C, vložka 99572

### **18. New challenges in the field of combating drug crimes in Moldova**

Králíček, Kunetek: New challenges in the field of combating drug crimes in Moldova, September 2017  
The General Police Inspectorate of the Ministry of Internal Affairs of the Republic of Moldova: Expert Request, 2017

CZDA: Vyhodnocení nabídek dle technických specifikací přílohy č. 5, smlouvy 280945/2017-ČRA, 12.10.2017  
Technical components, 6 invoices, 2017

Králíček, Kunetek, Omasta: New challenges in the field of combating drug crimes in Moldova–report, 13.9.2017

Králíček, Kunetek, Omasta: New challenges in the field of combating drug crimes in Moldova–report,12.11.2017

### **22. Survey of Population Climate in the Republic of Moldova**

National cCommission for Population and Development: Expert request form, 24.10.2016

Карлов университет, Природоведческий факультет:Репродуктивное поведение женщин в Республике Молдова, Июнь 2019

Survey of Population Climate in the Republic of Moldova

Report Agreement on new deadline, 2019

Kučera: Workplan - Survey of Population Climate in the Republic of Moldova, August 2017

### **23. Identification of weaknesses and needs of the control system of the wine sector in Moldova**

Mikeš et all: Identification of weaknesses and needs of the control system of the wine sector in Moldova, 31.3.2018

National Office of Vine and Wine, Public institution, Republic of Moldova: Expert request form, 29.3.2017

Annex No.1: Filled questionnaire by the involved institutions of the Project

Annex No.2: Legislative acts in viti-vinicultural sector in Moldova (in Romanian language) being officially translated to Czech language

Annex No. 3: Programme of the visit in 2018 and participants of the audit, 30.9.2018

National Office of Vine and Wine, Public institution, Republic of Moldova: Organigrama-Agenției Naționale pentru Siguranța Alimentelor, 27.6.2018

Mikeš et all.: Project report - Identification of weaknesses and needs of the control system of the wine sector in Moldova (Part 2018), 19.11.2018

GOVLAB: Final evaluation report, May 2019

GOVLAB: Final evaluation report (List of Annexes), May 2019

GOVLAB: Final evaluation report (English summary), May 2019

GOVLAB: Final evaluation report (Logframe), May 2019

### **29. Surveillance of the "Remediation of oil contaminated sites in the municipalities of Lunga and Marculesti in the Republic of Moldova"**

Survey RO Moldovan Partners-Questionnaire, 2019

Agency of Geology and Mineral Resources: Expert Request form

## On-line sources referred in the report:

- <sup>i</sup> Association Implementation Report on Moldova, accessed on 16 July 2019, [https://eeas.europa.eu/sites/eeas/files/association\\_implementation\\_report\\_on\\_moldova.pdf](https://eeas.europa.eu/sites/eeas/files/association_implementation_report_on_moldova.pdf)
- <sup>ii</sup> World bank Moldova, Country context, accessed on 16 July 2019, <https://www.worldbank.org/en/country/moldova/overview#1>
- <sup>iii</sup> European Commission, Countries, Moldova, accessed on 16 July 2019, <http://ec.europa.eu/trade/policy/countries-and-regions/countries/moldova/>
- <sup>iv</sup> European Commission, Association Implementation Report on Moldova, accessed on 16 July 2019, [https://eeas.europa.eu/sites/eeas/files/association\\_implementation\\_report\\_on\\_moldova.pdf](https://eeas.europa.eu/sites/eeas/files/association_implementation_report_on_moldova.pdf)
- <sup>v</sup> Due to limited progress in the implementation of the EU-Moldova Association Agreement, the Government will have to still implement almost two-thirds of measures until the end of 2019, accessed on 16 July 2019, <https://ipre.md/2019/03/12/7842/?lang=en>
- <sup>vi</sup> Transparency International Moldova, Press release: Monitoring the implementation of the public administration reform and resource distribution, accessed on 16 July 2019, <http://www.transparency.md/2018/07/18/press-release-monitoring-the-implementation-of-the-public-administration-reform-and-resource-distribution/>
- <sup>vii</sup> Speech by High Representative/Vice-President Federica Mogherini at the plenary session of the European Parliament on the situation in the Republic of Moldova, accessed on 16 July 2019, [https://eeas.europa.eu/headquarters/headquarters-homepage/65556/speech-high-representativevice-president-federica-mogherini-plenary-session-european\\_fa](https://eeas.europa.eu/headquarters/headquarters-homepage/65556/speech-high-representativevice-president-federica-mogherini-plenary-session-european_fa)
- <sup>viii</sup> Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Czech Republic, Bilateral development, Priority countries, 2010–2017, Moldova, accessed on 16 July 2019, [https://www.mzv.cz/jnp/en/foreign\\_relations/development\\_cooperation\\_and\\_humanitarian/bilateral\\_development\\_cooperation/priority\\_countries/x2010\\_2017/moldova\\_1/index.html](https://www.mzv.cz/jnp/en/foreign_relations/development_cooperation_and_humanitarian/bilateral_development_cooperation/priority_countries/x2010_2017/moldova_1/index.html)
- <sup>ix</sup> Czech development cooperation priority countries, accessed on 16 July 2019, [https://www.mzv.cz/jnp/en/foreign\\_relations/development\\_cooperation\\_and\\_humanitarian/bilateral\\_development\\_cooperation/priority\\_countries/index.html](https://www.mzv.cz/jnp/en/foreign_relations/development_cooperation_and_humanitarian/bilateral_development_cooperation/priority_countries/index.html)
- <sup>x</sup> Official development assistance of the Czech Republic, accessed on 16 July 2019, [https://www.mzv.cz/public/70/dc/89/3515407\\_2158216\\_ODA\\_CR\\_2017\\_ENG.pdf](https://www.mzv.cz/public/70/dc/89/3515407_2158216_ODA_CR_2017_ENG.pdf)
- <sup>xi</sup> Annex No. 2 - Funds spent for the Czech ODA in 2018 according to Czech Government Resolution No. 468/2017 accessed on 30 July 2019, [https://www.mzv.cz/file/3555569/Priloha\\_2\\_CRA\\_Informace\\_2018.xlsx](https://www.mzv.cz/file/3555569/Priloha_2_CRA_Informace_2018.xlsx)
- <sup>xii</sup> The Temporary Expert Assignments Programme, accessed 7 August 2019 at <http://www.czechaid.cz/en/get-involved/temporary-expert-assignments/>
- <sup>xiii</sup> The Guidelines for Temporary Expert Assignments, accessed 7 August 2019 at <http://www.czechaid.cz/wp-content/uploads/2017/01/TEA.pdf>
- The Expert Request Form, accessed 7 August 2019 at <http://www.czechaid.cz/wp-content/uploads/2017/01/Expert-Request-Form.doc>
- <sup>xiv</sup> UNDP, Moldova, accessed on 30 July 2019, <https://www.md.undp.org/content/moldova/en/home/about-us.html>
- <sup>xv</sup> GIZ, Moldova, accessed on 30 July 2019, <https://www.giz.de/en/worldwide/293.html>
- <sup>xvi</sup> USAID, Moldova, accessed on 30 July 2019, <https://www.usaid.gov/moldova>
- <sup>xvii</sup> World Bank, Moldova, <https://www.worldbank.org/en/country/moldova>
- <sup>xviii</sup> EU Projects with the Republic of Moldova, accessed on 30 July 2019, [https://eeas.europa.eu/delegations/moldova/area/projects\\_en](https://eeas.europa.eu/delegations/moldova/area/projects_en)
- <sup>xix</sup> EBRD, Moldova, accessed on 30 July 2019, <https://www.ebrd.com/where-we-are/moldova/overview.html>
- <sup>xx</sup> Swiss Cooperation Office in Moldova, accessed on 30 July 2019, <https://www.eda.admin.ch/countries/moldova/en/home/international-cooperation/strategy.html>
- <sup>xxi</sup> Development Cooperation Strategy of the Czech Republic 2010-2017, accessed on 19 June 2019, [https://www.mzv.cz/file/762314/FINAL\\_Development\\_Cooperation\\_Strategy\\_2010\\_2017.pdf](https://www.mzv.cz/file/762314/FINAL_Development_Cooperation_Strategy_2010_2017.pdf)
- <sup>xxii</sup> Czech Development Cooperation Programme with Moldova 2011 – 2017, accessed on 19 June 2019, [https://www.mzv.cz/file/698495/Development\\_Cooperation\\_Programme\\_Moldova\\_2011\\_2017.pdf](https://www.mzv.cz/file/698495/Development_Cooperation_Programme_Moldova_2011_2017.pdf)
- <sup>xxiii</sup> Czech-UNDP Partnership for Sustainable Development Goals which includes Expertise on Demand and according to the new strategy of cooperation (2018-2022), accessed on 19 June 2019, [https://www.mzv.cz/jnp/cz/zahranicni\\_vztahy/rozvojova\\_spoluprace/mnohostranna\\_zrs\\_cr/osn/undp/index.html](https://www.mzv.cz/jnp/cz/zahranicni_vztahy/rozvojova_spoluprace/mnohostranna_zrs_cr/osn/undp/index.html)
- <sup>xxiv</sup> Darknet definition. Internet called Tor network where illicit trading takes place such as the infamous online drug bazaar called Silk Road. It is also considered part of the Deep Web. Anonymous communication between whistle-blowers, journalists and news organisations is facilitated by the "Darknet" Tor network through use of applications including SecureDrop. See <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Darknet>, accessed on 12 August 2019.
- <sup>xxv</sup> Final Evaluation Report, The elaboration of the "Vine and Wine Registry" in the Republic of Moldova May 2019, accessed on 2 August 2019 at [https://www.mzv.cz/file/3533172/ZZ\\_Moldavsko\\_GovLab\\_v\\_3\\_0.pdf](https://www.mzv.cz/file/3533172/ZZ_Moldavsko_GovLab_v_3_0.pdf)

- <sup>xxvi</sup> Meeting of the management of ANSA with a group of Czech experts in the field of vine and wine, ANSA, 14 May 2019, accessed on 1 August 2019 at <http://ansa.gov.md/ro/comunicate/%C3%AEntrevedere-conducerei-ansa-cu-un-grup-de-exper%C8%9Bi-ai-sectorului-vitivinicol-din-republica>
- <sup>xxvii</sup> Currency rate of the National Bank of Moldova as of 13 August 2019: 1 CZK - 0.7603 MDL
- <sup>xxviii</sup> Darknet definition. Internet called Tor network where illicit trading takes place such as the infamous online drug bazaar called Silk Road. It is also considered part of the Deep Web. Anonymous communication between whistle-blowers, journalists and news organisations is facilitated by the "Darknet" Tor network through use of applications including SecureDrop. See <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Darknet>, accessed on 12 August 2019.
- <sup>xxix</sup> The head of the GPI, Alexandru Pînzari, met with representatives of the Czech Development Agency, 2017, accessed on 12 June 2019, <http://politia.md/ro/content/seful-igp-alexandru-pinzari-avut-o-intrevedere-cu-reprezentanti-agentiei-cehe-pentru>
- <sup>xxx</sup> Ochrana přírody v Moldavsku, okrajové téma v nejhudší zemi Evropy, authors: Jindřich Chlapek, Eva Knižátková, 2017, accessed on 13 June 2019, <http://www.casopis.ochranaprirody.cz/mezinarodni-ochrana-prirody/ochrana-prirody-v-moldavsku/>
- <sup>xxxi</sup> a) Workshop "Management of protected areas: can Czech experience be useful in the Republic of Moldova?", 2016, accessed on 13 June 2019, <http://codrii.silvicultura.md/libview.php?l=ro&idc=119&id=326&t=/Comunicare/Comunicare/Atelier-de-lucru-Managementul-ariilor-protejate-poate-fi-experienta-ceha-utilita-in-Republica-Moldova/>, b) Master Attendants, Future Foresters of ULIM Study the Management of Protected Areas from the Prospect of Czech Model, 2016, accessed on 13 June 2019, <http://cci.ulim.md/master-attendants-future-foresters-of-ulim-study-the-management-of-protected-areas-from-the-prospect-of-czech-model>
- <sup>xxxii</sup> The United Nations Conference on Housing and Sustainable Urban Development, Moldova national Report HABITAT III, 2016, accessed on 14 June 2019, <http://habitat3.org/wp-content/uploads/Raport-Habitat-III-eng.pdf>
- <sup>xxxiii</sup> Newsletter „Regional Development“, 2016, accessed on 14 June 2019, <http://www.serviciulocale.md/download.php?file=chVibGjL3B1YmXpY2F0aW9ucy8xMzQzNDZfZW5fMjAxNi8xMjI8wNV9idWxlLnBkZg%3D%3D>
- <sup>xxxiv</sup> Moldovan state chancellery benefits of Czech government's support in public administration reform, 2017, accessed on 14 June 2019, <https://cancelaria.gov.md/en/content/moldovan-state-chancellery-benefits-czech-governments-support-public-administration-reform>  
<https://www.facebook.com/CancelariaRM/posts/1046191712190509>
- <sup>xxxv</sup> The Temporary Expert Assignments Programme is entering the 4th year of its existence, 2018, accessed on 12 June 2019, <http://www.czechaid.cz/en/the-temporary-expert-assignments-programme-is-entering-the-4th-year-of-its-existence/>
- <sup>xxxvi</sup> a) The head of the GPI, Alexandru Pînzari, met with representatives of the Czech Development Agency, 2017, accessed on 12 June 2019, <http://politia.md/ro/content/seful-igp-alexandru-pinzari-avut-o-intrevedere-cu-reprezentanti-agentiei-cehe-pentru>
- b) The training carried out by the experts in the field of drugs will help to implement good practices, 2018, accessed on 12 June 2019, <http://oficial.md/social/gheorghe-cavcaliuc-instruirea-realizata-de-expertii-in-domeniul-antidrog-va-contribui-la-asumarea-bunelor-practici>
- c) Police activity report, 2018, accessed on 12 June 2019, [http://politia.md/sites/default/files/raport\\_activitate\\_igp\\_6\\_luni\\_2018.pdf](http://politia.md/sites/default/files/raport_activitate_igp_6_luni_2018.pdf)
- <sup>xxxvii</sup> The Temporary Expert Assignments Programme is entering the 4th year of its existence, 2018, accessed on 12 June 2019, <http://www.czechaid.cz/en/the-temporary-expert-assignments-programme-is-entering-the-4th-year-of-its-existence/>
- <sup>xxxviii</sup> Meeting with a group of experts from the Czech Republic visiting the Republic of Moldova as part of the Project "Audit of the control system in the wine sector", 2019, accessed on 12 June 2019, <http://ansa.gov.md/en/node/3752>