REPORT
Final Evaluation of the Joint Integrated Local Development Programme (JILDP)

Zehra Kacapor-Dzihic (Lead Consultant)

Olesea Stamate (National Consultant)

December 2015

Table of Contents

ABBREVIATIONS

APA	Academy for Public Administration
CALM	Congress of Local Authorities of Moldova
CEDAW	Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women
CSO	Civil Society Organization
DCFTA	Deep and Comprehensive Free Trade Agreement
EU	European Union
FGD	Focus Group Discussion
GIZ	Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit
HRBA	Human Rights Based Approach
IDRMS	Integrated Documentation and Records Management System
IMC	Inter-municipal cooperation
JILDP	Joint Integrated Local Development Program
LED	Local Economic Development
MDG	Millennium Development Goals
NDS	National Decentralization Strategy
OECD DAC	Development Assistance Committee of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development
PPP	Public Private Partnership
SIDA	Swedish International Development Agency
TA	Technical Assistance
TOR	Terms of Reference
UN	United Nations
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UN Women	United Nations Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women
USAID	United States Agency for International Development
USD	United States Dollar

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This document represents the Final Evaluation Report of the Programme "Joint Integrated Local Development Programme" (hereinafter called "the JILDP Programme") implemented by UNDP and UN Women in Moldova.

Programme description

The overall aim of the Programme is to is *to support better and equitable service provision and sustainable local development, facilitated by the improved legal and institutional framework resulting from the implementation of the National Decentralization Strategy*. It planned to achieve three specific objectives: (1) To support the Government in improving the policy and legal framework as mandated by the National Decentralization Strategy to ensure local autonomy, availability of resources, and more effective local management for better and equitable service provision, and (2) To improve the capacity of LPAs to deliver efficient, equitable and accessible local public services, to facilitate sustainable development and foster social inclusion. The Programme supported central and local public authorities to implement the decentralisation strategy, including support for the elaboration of sector-specific strategies and the assistance to various central government institutions to actually implement the strategy. Support for the development of an enabling environment for local civil society and business development and identification, implementation of innovative income generating and community development activities with a particular focus on vulnerable women and men was provided.

The target groups of the Programme are central and local governments, civil society, businesses and citizens themselves, particularly those belonging to vulnerable and minority groups. The total estimated budget of the JILDP was 9,000,000 USD and its duration was 2013-2015.

Context of the Programme

Moldova's transition to a market economy has been slow and challenged by slow economic and social reforms, the collapse of the industrial sector, and territorial dismantling of the country with the self proclamation of Transnistria. Political instability and slow economic development contributed to high poverty rates qualifying Moldova as the poorest country in Europe. Moldova's Human Development Index value for 2012 is 0.660, positioning the country at 113 out of 187 countries and territories and placing it in the medium human development category. Poverty levels are further compounded by non-monetary dimensions, such as limited access to water and sanitation. Moldova faces significant disparities between the capital city and the rest of the country, between urban and rural areas and, more recently, between development regions.

Employment rates in Moldova are among the lowest in Europe and Central Asia due to a significant decrease in Labour Force Participation (from 53% to 41% compared to 60-70% for countries in Europe and Central Asia). According to government statistics in 2014, 15.5% of men and 7.8% of women of working age were working abroad or looking for work abroad.

Local governance in Moldova is fragmented, underfinanced and can provide only few services, thus negatively impacting vulnerable and poor population. Education and communal services such as water, sanitation and waste management account for 80-90% of local expenditures, however large part of the population in rural areas still does not have access to these services.

Despite the solid policy foundation in the areas of decentralization and regional development since 2005, challenges in advancing local government reform and regional development persist.

Objective, purpose and scope of the evaluation

The purpose of the evaluation is to *review the progress made by the Joint Integrated Local Development Programme* in fulfilling its agreed objectives through the planned activities and to assess the efficiency and effectiveness with which resources have been used to generate results and achieve Programme objectives with special emphasis on impact and sustainability; and gather *findings, lessons learned and recommendations for potential follow-up interventions*, for the expansion of JILDP interventions beyond 2015, which UN Moldova could offer as support to the Government in view of advancing with the implementation of the decentralization reform.

Evaluation methodology

The evaluation was carried out in three phases. Review of project documentation and relevant literature and reference documents was conducted in the Inception phase, resulting in the Inception report for the Evaluation. Within this phase, the evaluation framework, primary data collection methods and evaluation tools were developed. The Field Phase was organised within a limited timeframe, and was devoted to the collection of data from key stakeholders at central and local levels through semi-structured interviews, focused discussion groups and site visits to a limited number of municipalities. In the Synthesis Phase, the OECD-DAC criteria of relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, and sustainability were applied to assess the achievement of planned results of the programme, against which informed conclusions and recommendations were drawn.

Main Findings and Conclusions

The Programme is *relevant and responds well* to the needs and priorities of the Moldovan government through furthering the decentralisation reforms and strengthening local governance and service delivery, and enhancing the opportunities of civil society and businesses to contribute meaningfully to local development. It addresses important gaps in the evidence base for existing and new policy frameworks, as well as capacity development needs of partners from government, civil society and business sector. It also addresses the challenges for service delivery through supporting municipal and inter-municipal cooperation and public-civic and public private partnerships. The Programme was designed on the basis of evidence base and lessons learned both from implementation of previous programme phases but also from assessments and studies conducted focusing on local governance and decentralisation reforms in Moldova and corresponds to the strategic and legislative framework for (fiscal) decentralisation in the country. The Programme is highly relevant for the needs of citizens, particularly vulnerable and minority groups as it provides technical assistance and empowerment measures to take more active part in community life.

As far as *human rights and gender equality* are concerned, the Programme is highly relevant for Moldova's international commitments deriving from the ratification of relevant international conventions. The Programme had a major contribution to the promotion and integration of human rights based approach and gender equality principles in the policies and mechanisms relating to decentralisation and service delivery. It managed to ensure an equity focus by orienting investment to vulnerable groups, particularly women.

The **programme achieved, albeit to varying degrees, all of its envisaged outputs, and made contributions to its planned outcomes**. Particularly strong contributions were noted in relation to strengthening the local governance and service delivery trough support to LPAs' transparency and accountability mechanisms, investment in inter-municipal cooperation and public-civic and public-private partnerships in delivery of communal services. The project succeeded in enhancing capacities of the local administration, citizens, CSOs and business securing an inclusive and sustainable local planning and development. JILDP supported technical advisory, research and analytical support to the central government, providing strong evidence base and inputs for sectoral and fiscal decentralisation policies and legislation.

The Programme was **strategic and efficient** in using available resources. Management efforts by the JILDP team were appropriate and contributed to the effective and efficient implementation of planned initiatives. JILDP put appropriate systems in place to monitor and report on project progress, thereby placing emphasis on capturing not only activities but also emerging results. The project results framework, while having a number of minor weaknesses, provided guidance in this regard. The Programme faced challenge of decreased funds due to withdrawal of Swedish funds, but the challenge was mitigated by adjusting the programme and using the core funding of UNDP and UN Women for work with national policy level. Management structure by JILDP team were appropriate and contributed to the effective and efficient implementation of planned initiatives.

Sustainability of effects and results of the programme are mixed. Although the current policy and legal framework governing the (fiscal) decentralisation is supportive, the lack of adoption of pending territorial and administrative reform poses constraints for adequate development and expansion of local governance and service delivery. In targeted communities, acquired skills and institutionalised governance mechanisms, practices and established municipal and intermunicipal services have higher sustainability prospects. However, external support continues to be crucial for increasing access to equitable services until solid rights-based foundations of practices and procedures are built and capacities are in place to ensure that policies, practices and mechanisms run effectively.

Lessons learned

- Investment in strengthening local level good governance through investment in LPAs and in community mobilization (through strengthening CSOs and entrepreneurship) brings positive outcomes for citizens.
- Although higher costs are associated, grants programs for LPAs constitute an important motivation for the local administration to actively participate in the capacity building activities, thus a combination of the two tools is effective.
- Local development cannot be achieved without investment in integration of good governance principles and mechanisms in practices of both duty bearers and right holders.
- Modeling new approaches to service delivery and basing advocacy for new policy or legislative solutions for improvement of public services is a good approach.
- Co-financing from LPAs may be a challenge due to reasons such as budget limitations, political interests, and lack of strategic approach in development work.
- Strengthening capacities and changing institutional culture needs champions of change, characterized by motivation, commitment and trust that the change will bring benefits to the institution and wider community.

- Grants for LPAs provide good opportunity to apply the community mobilization practices in small projects.
- Continued, longer term engagement with national partners facilitates results achievement.

Recommendations

Recommendations have been developed on the basis of the evaluation findings and conclusions as well as on consultation with all key stakeholders that were interviewed during the field phase.

Strategic Recommendations

- Continue the initiatives started by the Programme towards further institutionalisation of positive results and to contribute to the Programme goal.
- Conduct Impact Assessment of the (J)ILDP Programme(s)

Programming Recommendations

- Ensure good governance principles are mainstreamed into all development efforts towards integrated local development
- Identify and provide capacity building support to local/community experts (agents of change) for community facilitation and mobilization (Community Facilitators)
- Continue investing in local economic development and IMCs
- Invest in CSOs representing business interests (e.g. Business associations, associations of employers, etc.)

1. INTRODUCTION

Aims of the Evaluation

A team of two consultants, one International Consultant – Team Leader and National Consultant, was commissioned to undertake two evaluations: Evaluation of the Sustainable local and regional development Outcome and the Final Evaluation of the Joint Integrated Local Development Programme (JILDP). The purpose of this report is to present the overall findings, conclusions and recommendations coming out of the evaluation of the JILDP. The Development Objective of the Joint Integrated Local Development Programme, implemented by UNDP and UN Women, is *to support better and equitable service provision and sustainable local development, facilitated by the improved legal and institutional framework resulting from the implementation of the National Decentralization Strategy*. The Immediate Objectives of the Programme are: (1) To support the Government in improving the policy and legal framework as mandated by the National Decentralization Strategy to ensure local autonomy, availability of resources, and more effective local management for better and equitable service provision, and (2) To improve the capacity of LPAs to deliver efficient, equitable and accessible local public services, to facilitate sustainable development and foster social inclusion. The total estimated budget of the JILDP was 9,000,000 USD and its duration was 2013-2015.

As outlined in the Terms of Reference (ToR), the overall objective of the evaluation was to assess the achievement of Programme results, help identify and critically analyse the relevance of the Programme activities, as well as, the effectiveness of the implementation. The comprehensive evaluation examined whether the activities, outputs and objectives outlined in Programme document had been achieved, and underlying factors affecting either positively or negatively the implementation of the Programme, drew lessons and make forward-looking recommendations for improvement of the sustainability of benefits obtained from the Programme.

Further, the purpose of the evaluation was to: 1) *review the progress made by the Joint Integrated Local Development Programme* in fulfilling its agreed objectives through the planned activities and to assess the efficiency and effectiveness with which resources have been used to generate results and achieve Programme objectives with special emphasis on impact and sustainability; and 2) gather *findings, lessons learned and recommendations for potential follow-up interventions*, for the expansion of JILDP interventions beyond 2015, which UN Moldova could offer as support to the Government in view of advancing with the implementation of the decentralization reform.

Specific evaluation objectives included to:

- Analyse the relevance of the programme's implementation strategy and approaches to the Programme's results chain;
- Review the relevance of the logical framework and respective Monitoring and Evaluation Plan of the programme;
- Validate Programme results in terms of progress toward the achievement of outcomes and outputs;
- Assess the potential for sustainability of the results and the feasibility of ongoing, nationally-led efforts;
- Document lessons learned, best practices, success stories and challenges to inform

future work of both   UNDP and UN Women and key stakeholders on local development;
- Document and analyse possible weaknesses in order to improve future intervention interventions in the   area of women, peace, and security programming.

The UNDP Country Office and UN Women Country Office accordingly will make use of the exercise as a learning opportunity for the offices and key partners and stakeholders, as inclusively and practically possible. In particular, the findings and recommendations generated by the evaluation inform the implementation and targeting of activities planned for the next stage of the project development.

To respond to the requirements of the Evaluation, a careful methodology for the Evaluation was devised in order to provide an opportunity to both look at what progress has so far been achieved and also understand how to improve and build on elements for programming of the next stage of the Programme.

2. CONTEXT ANALYSIS

After being a part of the Soviet Union for a half century, Moldova's transition to a market economy has been slow and challenged by slow economic and social reforms, the collapse of the industrial sector, and territorial dismantling of the country with the self-proclamation of Transnistria (which once generated a third of Moldova's industrial output and almost all of its energy production). Political instability and slow economic development contributed to high poverty rates qualifying Moldova as the poorest country in Europe. Moldova's Human Development Index value for 2013 is 0.663, positioning the country at 114 out of 187 countries and territories and placing it in the medium human development category. Between 1990 and 2012, Moldova's HDI value increased from 0.65 to 0.663, an increase of 2 percent or average annual increase of about 0.1 percent. Still, Moldova has the lowest HDI in Europe today. Poverty levels are further compounded by non-monetary dimensions, such as limited access to water and sanitation. Moldova faces significant disparities between the capital city and the rest of the country, between urban and rural areas and, more recently, between development regions.

Employment rates in Moldova are among the lowest in Europe and Central Asia due to a significant decrease in Labour Force Participation (from 53% to 41% compared to 60-70% for countries in Europe and Central Asia). The general unemployment rate was 3.9% in 2014, however unemployment among youth aged 15-24 was 9.8% are a cause of concern. According to government statistics in 2014, 15.5% of men and 7.8% of women of working age were working abroad or looking for work abroad.

According to the Third Millennium Development Goals Report, the Republic of Moldova has made remarkable progress in reducing poverty. The incidence of poverty according to the international threshold of 4.3 dollars per day decreased from 34.5% in 2006 down to 20.8% in 2012. The share of the population living under the absolute poverty line decreased from 30.2% to 11,4.% in 2014, while the share of population suffering from hunger – from 4.5% to 0.1%.[1] In spite of these successes, special concerns are raised by the pronounced inertia of rural poverty: in big cities absolute poverty has decreased by more than two times from 2008 to 2012(from 10.9% to 4.3%), while in villages the decrease was slower (from 34.6% to 22.8%). *The gap between rural and urban living standards increased: in 2006, 75.7% of the population living in poverty were in villages, while in 2014 this percentage increased to 84%.*[2]

As regards gender equality, data has not significantly improved over the last few years. The gender wage gap has actually increased, from 76,1 in 2010, to 87,6 in 2014.[3] Women participation in decision making has not increased either, in the reference period. Thus, in 2010 the percentage of seats in the Parliament held by women was 19,8, while in 2014 it was 18,8. Another significant disparity in economic opportunity between men and women related to the agricultural sector is access to land and other agricultural resources. Even if by legislation women and men are granted equal rights in access and ownership of land and natural resources, women form the minority of landholders. In Moldova 36 percent of landholders are women, while these holdings account for only 19 percent of agricultural lands. Land is a key

---

[1] National Statistics Office reporting on MGD,
http://statbank.statistica.md/pxweb/Dialog/view.asp?ma=ODM0101&ti=Indicatorii+revizuiti+ai+Obiectivelor+Dezvoltarii+Mileniului%2C+2000-2010&path=../quicktables/RO/ODM/&lang=1, visited in November 2015
[2] http://www.md.undp.org/content/dam/moldova/docs/Publications/UNDP_MD_3rdMDGReport_Eng.pdf
[3] National Statistics Office reporting on MGD,
http://statbank.statistica.md/pxweb/Dialog/view.asp?ma=ODM0101&ti=Indicatorii+revizuiti+ai+Obiectivelor+Dezvoltarii+Mileniului%2C+2000-2010&path=../quicktables/RO/ODM/&lang=1, visited in November 2015

agricultural resource, used for example as collateral to access credit and obtain membership of cooperatives. Thus if women are not able to fully exercise their tenure rights, food security of rural households can be severely challenged in the face of changes such as outmigration of the male head of household.[4]

On the policy level, in the last few years, Moldova has reached a new level in its relations with the EU. A visa-liberalization agreement entered into force in April 2014, and the Association Agreement, including the DCFTA were signed in June 2014. These new cooperation frameworks provided for whole new possibilities to implement, with considerable support from the EU, reforms in significant areas, such as the justice sector reform and the public administration reform.

In this regard, after two years of debates, the National Decentralization Strategy and the Action Plan for its implementation were adopted on April 4, 2012. The aim of the National Decentralization Strategy is to transfer competences and financial resources from the central authorities to local authorities. Implementing the reform will allow providing better quality public services at a lower price, while the overall standard of living will improve, gradually eliminating disparities between rural and urban areas.

Due to various estimations, the decentralization agenda has been so far implemented to about 50 to 70 percent, while the Action Plan expires in 2015, and most probably will have to be extended for a new period. The seven areas covered by the Action Plan are: 1) allocation of responsibilities; 2) fiscal decentralization; 3) decentralization of property; 4) local economic development, urban and regional planning; 5) administrative capacity (territorial-administrative organization); 6) institutional capacity; 7) democracy, participation and ethics.

Among the most important actions implemented with the decentralization reform was the adoption of a set of amendments to the law on local public finances, as of November 2013. These amendments provide for a whole new type of financial relations between the central public administration and the local administrations of first and second levels, securing higher degree of independence of the local authorities.

A set of actions need to be implemented in order to make the decentralization reform complete and thus successful. Sectorial decentralization strategies should be adopted and implemented to ensure appropriate delegation of responsibilities, as well as bringing vital services as close to citizens as possible. Decentralization of property is another area which needs to be tackled in a next phase of the reform.

Indisputably a territorial administrative reform is a prerequisite for an efficient decentralization reform as well as for increasing the viability and economic potential of rural communities. Considerable fragmentation is what describes the current territorial-administrative structure of the country. There are 898 first level administrative-territorial units (towns and villages) and 32 second level districts for a population of 2.9 million inhabitants. The average number of population in first level local government is 2958, while almost a third of them have less than 1500 inhabitants (which is a minimum required by the Law on Administrative-Territorial

---

[4] European Commission on Agriculture, The Gender Gap in Agriculture in Eastern Europe - Results of Recent Country Rural Gender Assessments, http://www.fao.org/3/a-au818e.pdf.

Organization). At the same time, all of them are allocated the same types and number of responsibilities, which do not take into account the fiscal or administrative capacity.

An administrative territorial reform needs a stable political context, and, according to the legal framework in force, administrative territorial reorganization cannot take place in the middle of an election cycle (for local elections). These two conditions need to be met simultaneously, in order for the reform to be pursued.

After a period of relative political stability in 2014, the political turmoil has again captured Moldova in 2015. Besides the fact that in 2014 general parliamentary elections were held, and in 2015 the local ones, in just one year four governments have changed, and the last one was dismissed on October 28, 2015. In such circumstances, the implementation of fundamental reforms is on hold.

Despite deadlocks in several reform areas, one domain has advanced considerably. E-Governance is the field where significant progress was achieved. After the adoption in 2011 of the Strategic Program of technological modernization of the Government (e-Transformation), the e-Governance Center was established. During 5 years of its activity, it has managed to create and launch such important tools like MCloud, Mpass, MPay, as well as digitize 105 services and start the re-engineering of another set of services. This opens the doors to whole new range of possibilities to both the Central Public Administration and the Local Public Administration to perform and deliver its services to citizens more transparently, efficiently and faster.

Civil society remains weak, both at central and particularly at local level in Moldova. Although the normative framework is in place, civil society organizations are not particularly active in monitoring the implementation of government policies, and, when they are, very few of its recommendations are actually adopted. The "2% law" was adopted to provide for greater financial sustainability of the civil society organizations; however, until practical mechanisms for its implementation are in place, changes are not going to occur.

Regarding human rights, little progress was achieved in the integration of national minorities. Although the Bureau for Inter-ethnic Relations formed a working group to draft a 'Strategy on the integration of national minorities', the process stopped before the parliamentary elections in 2014, and has been re-launched recently. The draft strategy was published on the web for public consultations.[5] Insignificant progress was also made in implementing the Action Plan to support Roma minority in Moldova (2011-2015). With the recent local public finance reform, the Roma mediators position should be financed by local administration, and due to limited resources available at the local level, less than half of 24 Roma mediators positions created are currently budgeted. Although the Roma mediators' network has considerably extended, the fact that they are legally placed under the local administration' authority, which does not provide budgets for financing these positions, undermines their independence.

---

[5] http://particip.gov.md/proiectview.php?l=ro&idd=2373

3. Overview of the JILDP Programme

The initiative for integrated local development was initiated by UNDP in the form of the Integrated Local Development programme, with main focus on local level. In 2010, the Joint Integrated Local Development Programme was initiated by UNDP and UN Women. The Development Objective of the JILDP is *to support better and equitable service provision and sustainable local development, facilitated by the improved legal and institutional framework resulting from the implementation of the National Decentralization Strategy.* The joint programme is in its second phase, making it the third phase of the interventions as a whole.

The joint programme was funded by the Danish and Swedish governments, which were interested in supporting the governments and the reforms with programmes based on the human rights based approach and the gender equality principles, making the two UN Agencies perfect fit for applying these principles in local development. The Programme has twofold approach: support to policy processes and support to local level development, results in each reinforcing the other.

The Immediate Objectives of the Programme are: (1) To support the Government in improving the policy and legal framework as mandated by the National Decentralization Strategy to ensure local autonomy, availability of resources, and more effective local management for better and equitable service provision, and (2) To improve the capacity of LPAs to deliver efficient, equitable and accessible local public services, to facilitate sustainable development and foster social inclusion. The Programme consists of two inter-related outputs as follows:

Output 1: Policy and legal frameworks to support autonomous, efficient and financially-sustainable LPAs developed and implemented.

Activities under the output 1 aim to support for the elaboration of sector-specific strategies and the assistance to different central government institutions to actually implement the NDS. From 2014, financial resources for the JILDP activities under this output were not available, except for some interventions on specific topics that were financed from UNDP's and UN Women's TRAC funds, as well as by other donors and with the active involvement of the JILDP team. In 2014-2015 JILDP activities was limited in the assistance to the rayons piloting the new local public finance system and the elaboration of the sectoral decentralization strategies for communal services. Another important activity was providing assistance to Government in developing a public policy document on the territorial administrative reform in the Republic of Moldova. The project also continued its support in strengthening the capacities of the CALM, namely support in CALM Women's network Strategy and Action Plan development, as well as support in creation of another professional network – CALM Network of women secretaries of LPAs.

Output 2: Capacities of LPAs and communities strengthened to deliver better services to citizens and create models of LPAs - in line with changes brought by the Decentralization Strategy.

Under Output 2, the interventions at the local level aimed at developing models of operational local governments - 'champions of change' - by providing support to implement changes in the operation and structure of local governments in line with the changes brought by the Decentralization strategy. JILDP assisted LPAs in improving their capacity and operations and support 30 pilot target communities and their local authorities to provide quality public services to achieve sustainable economic and social development, in the main areas affected by the

Decentralization strategy. The quality of life of local communities as well as empowerment of the most vulnerable women and men, increased through further supporting to implementation of the Programmes (in 20 communes and 10 clusters of communities) using innovative tools such as inter-municipal cooperation, private-public partnerships and e-governance, among others, to serve as best examples of decentralized arrangements for service provision at local level. To ensure an integrated approach to local governance and development, support for the development of an enabling environment for local business development and identification, implementation of innovative income generating activities with a particular focus on vulnerable women and men was provided.

As per the Programme document, the programme utilised a pass-through funding modality whereby the Participating UN Organizations (PUNOs) have appointed, through a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU), the UNDP Multi-Partner Trust Fund Office (MPTF Office) to perform the role of the Administrative Agent (AA). Under this system, the donor transferred the funds to the MPTF Office, pursuant to the duly signed Standard Administrative Arrangement (SAA). UNDP served as a Participating UN Organization in connection to this Joint Programme. UNDP and UN Women managed their own funds in accordance with assigned responsibilities under the Joint Programme Proposal and Budget, and as set forth in more detail in the MoU. They managed the funds in accordance with their individual organizational internal rules and regulations.

4. EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

The evaluation methodology was in line with the Development Assistance Committee of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD-DAC) Evaluation Quality Standards and responded to the requirements as set out in the ToR for this evaluation.

The evaluation methodology was based on ratings of the four [6] OECD-DAC established evaluation criteria: relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability:

a) **Relevance**: concerns the consistency of activities and targets with national and local development programmes and national development challenges, and the needs of intended beneficiaries. It also relates to the relevance to UNDP/UN Women's corporate and human development priorities.
b) **Effectiveness:** refers to the manner in which the intended outcome targets were achieved. Measuring effectiveness will involve - to the extent possible - an assessment of cause and effect, and judging the extent to which observable changes be attributed to Programme activities.
c) **Efficiency:** refers to how economically resources (funds, expertise and time) were used to achieve results.
d) **Sustainability:** refers to the extent to which the benefits of the results will continue beyond the support provided. Assessing sustainability involves evaluating to what extent capacity can be maintained.

The evaluation applied "mixed methods" to optimise the potential of the analysis and to reach sound evaluation. That is, the evaluation applied qualitative and quantitative methods and instruments, such as focus groups and interviews, as well as document review, and meetings with UNDP/UN Women staff, government partners, donors, other UN agencies and international and national partners.

4.1 EVALUATION DESIGN

The evaluation was carried out in three phases:

- The inception phase and the document review;
- The fieldwork phase comprising the field visits to the target communities and follow-up interviews.
- Analysis and report writing phase. This phase was marked by two main points of consultation, the field work de-briefing meeting with the UNDP/UN Women team, and the final presentation of the report.

Qualitative data was collected by using a number of methods including:

- **A critical desk review of materials related to the Programme**, as well as any material that is provided by UNDP such as Programmes' reports and annual work plans, data on achievement of performance indicators, etc. This review also extended to documents external to the UNDP/UN Women that were identified by the consultants through own research or through informants, which have a bearing on the evaluation questions. The Evaluation team conducted a comprehensive review of historical information and reports

---

[6] As per the ToR, Impact criterion was not be included in this evaluation

pertaining to the JILDP since its inception, and earlier, as necessary. This information was analysed and the results were tailored to answer the main evaluation questions outlined in the ToR.

- **Interviews with UNDP/UN Women teams**. Joint and individual meetings with team members from the two Agencies have been conducted to gather the more detailed information on the programme implementation, efficiency and value added.
- **In-depth, semi-structured interviews** with representatives from the government counterparts. Semi-structured interviews were conducted as a more appropriate and valuable technique, because they allowed partners to present and explain points freely. Purpose of in-depth interviews was to familiarise and assess the use of Programme's delivered outputs by beneficiaries, be it a government institution or local community.
- **In-depth interviews with a variety of representatives of the beneficiaries and partners** (e.g. managers and users of public services, IMCs, local governments, CSOs, etc.)
- **Field visits and meetings with partners in target communitie**s as envisaged in the ToR. These visits were an opportunity to meet some of the beneficiaries, to conduct field observation, and gather best practices and lessons learned from programme implementation as well to observe changes towards achievement of the outcome.
- **Follow up phone interviews with local communities**. During the field phase, the Team realized the need for gathering additional information on experiences and benefits of the programme to the local communities, besides the field visits to the two communities, so phone interviews with a total of nine (9) communities (of the target communities) have been conducted. The community sample included two (2) large communities (over 10,000 inhabitants), and eight (8) medium communities (between 4,500 and 10,000 inhabitants). The municipalities reached were: Bratuseni, Edinet; Sculeni, Ungheni; Pirlita, Ungheni; Chiscareni, Singerei; Zaim, Causeni; Vulcanesti, UTA Gagauzia; Carpineni, Hincsti; Corlateni, Riscani; Mingir, Hincesti.
- **Interviews with other international donors or implementing agencies**, especially those involved in supporting local economic development in Moldova, as well as representatives of other UN Agencies. This allowed obtaining information about the expertise of other development organizations and their partnerships with the Programme in delivering development initiatives related to local economic development.
- **Focus Group Discussions (FGDs)** to obtain qualitative information to strengthen analysis and understand the relationship between the interventions and the results they achieved, within the given context in the country. Focus groups discussions were primarily conducted with government counterparts and final beneficiaries of Programme interventions (e.g. trained and supported government representatives, local services users, etc.) Selection of participants of focus group discussions was conducted by UNDP.

Quantitative data collection methods consisted of:

- Review of data sourced from the interventions on indicators related to the Programme
- Collection and review of secondary data from the analysis of the strategic framework, including but not limited to the National Decentralization Strategy, the National Strategy for Regional Development 2013-2015, etc.
- Review of data from other secondary sources.

Data Analysis

Data analysis was guided by the Evaluation matrix developed during the inception phase of the evaluation process. In order to ensure that findings and related conclusions are objective and evidence based, triangulation was used to identify inconsistencies and ensure reliability. Also, the evaluation team used both the descriptive statistic but also more advanced analytical exercises such as measures of correlation (say, between geographic region and success rate) to strengthen the evidence base for findings and conclusions.

Ethical considerations

The evaluation approach was to combine the Results-Based Management with a Human Rights-Based Approach to evaluation i.e. achievement of planned results through morally acceptable processes to realise human rights. The Evaluation team applied the Human Rights based approach, whereby the five core principles of normativity, participation, non-discrimination, accountability and transparency were guiding the Evaluation as per the document Common Understanding on Human Rights-Based Approaches to Development Cooperation and Programming, approved by the United Nations Development Group in 2003. At the same time, the evaluation was guided by gender equality and gender mainstreaming principles, in line with Moldova's international commitments, most notably the CEDAW, and UN Women's and UNDP's gender mainstreaming policies and principles. The evaluation used to the extent possible disaggregated data by gender and deprivation profiles.

The evaluation team encouraged active participation and gave the opportunity of all key stakeholders in the evaluation process to provide data, information and feedback, but also space for stakeholders to discuss and share top priorities for the continuation of reforms in the area of decentralisation and good governance as well as to validate the findings and recommendations of this evaluation report. Overall, there has been a high level of participation of stakeholders in the evaluation process.

During data collection, the evaluation team ensured that the evaluation process is ethical and that participants in the process can openly express their opinions, protecting the confidentiality of their answers. All interviewed people were informed in advance about the purpose and the themes of the interviews, focus groups and discussion groups, as the case.

4.2 EVALUATION LIMITATIONS

There was one limitation encountered during this evaluation:

Limited number of visited communities. Due to time constraints, the team could not conduct site observations in more than two communities targeted by the programme. To mitigate the risk of biased conclusions regarding the local level work of the programme, the Team conducted phone interviews with the total of 9[7] communities to include the views and experiences of these communities in the data pool for triangulation.

---

[7] Bratuseni, Edinet; Sculeni, Ungheni; Pirlita, Ungheni; Chiscareni, Singerei; Zaim, Causeni; Vulcanesti, UTA Gagauzia; Carpineni, Hincesti; Corlateni, Riscani; Mingir, Hincesti .

5. KEY FINDINGS

JILDP is a Programme that includes a holistic approach with comprehensive set of interventions working towards enhancing municipal and inter-municipal management capacity to develop and implement developmental policies and projects, and enhancing socio-economic development. The Programme is implemented in a complex socio- economic and political context and includes a range of partners from national and local governments and CSOs, as well as a range of developmental partners active in the region. This Chapter examines the performance of the Programme and analyses its work in terms of relevance, efficiency, effectiveness and sustainability prospects. The consideration of these criteria is based on a set of evaluation questions and related evaluation criteria and indicators as detailed in the Terms of Reference and the Evaluation Matrix provided in Annexes 1 and 2. For easier reference, relevant Evaluation Question is highlighted to guide the analysis. Also, analysis of the Programme design and Factors influencing the programme are provided as separate sections in this Chapter as input for better understanding of the programme performance.

5.1 RELEVANCE

How does the Programme design match with the complexity of national structures, systems and decision-making processes?
Is the Programme design based on quality analysis, including gender and human rights based analysis, risk assessments, socio-cultural and political analysis?
Were the programmatic strategies appropriate to address the identified needs of beneficiaries?

The relevance of the Programme has been assessed using available data, facts and statistics for year 2012 when the Programme started as well as relevant legal and strategic documents of the Government and the Parliament as well as Moldova's international commitments. Interviews with key stakeholders were also used to triangulate findings.

Its main objective was *to support better and equitable service provision and sustainable local development, facilitated by the improved legal and institutional framework resulting from the implementation of the National Decentralization Strategy.*

The Programme supports the provisions of article 109 of the Constitution of the Republic of Moldova, which states that *Local public administration is being established on the basis of principles of local autonomy, of decentralization of local services, of eligibility of the local public authorities and of citizens' consultations on issues of primary interest.*[8] The project has contributed to strengthening the local autonomy by assisting the national authorities to develop, adopt and implement the fiscal decentralization reform, namely through amendments to the Law on local public finances, no. 397 as of 16.10.2003, adopted in November 2013.[9] These have contributed to establishing a new type of relations between the central pubic authorities and the local public authorities of first and second level, increasing the equity and transparency of the state-local transfers. This will, as well, increase the possibilities of local authorities to strengthen their fiscal basis and generate more income. It has also contributed to launching the process of decentralization of local services, through the development of sectorial decentralization strategies (e.g. in education, social protection, water and sanitation, waste management). The strategies have been developed by the responsible central public authority with the advisory assistance provided by the Project, thus ensuring strong ownership of the results. Besides these

---

[8] Constitution of the Republic of Moldova, http://lex.justice.md/index.php?action=view&view=doc&lang=1&id=311496
[9] http://lex.justice.md/md/350367/

two important areas, the Project has also contributed to re-launching the process of citizen's consultations at local level, in the 30 target communities, on issues of particular importance for the community. Or, this principle, enshrined in the Constitution, has been long forgotten in Moldova.

The review of the national legislation confirmed that the Project has been fully in line with the provisions stated therein. The **Law on Administrative Decentralisation** (No. 435-XVI of 28 December 2006) sets forth nine principles for administrative decentralisation. The Programme was resonant to a number of them, specifically:
- principle of local autonomy, which means guaranteeing the right and the effective capacity of the local public authorities to regulate and administer, according to the law, and by their own responsibility, in the interest of the local population, a large share of public affairs;
- Principle of equity, which means guaranteeing equal opportunities and conditions to all local public authorities to attain its objectives that come from the carrying out of their competencies;
- Principle of correspondence of resources with competences, which means that financial resources allocated to the local public authorities should correspond to the nature and amount of competences assigned to them;
- Principle of partnership between public-private, public-public, public-civil, which brings about guaranteeing real cooperation possibilities between government, local authorities, private sector and civil society.

The Programme has contributed to strengthening local autonomy, as well as securing equity and correspondence of resources and competences through assisting the Government in developing policy instruments that would ensure predictability of local incomes via transfers from the central budget, and equal treatment of local administration based on fully transparent fiscal relations as compared to the old system where political "colour" of the local administration influenced the amount of transfers received by the locality. There is no need to repeat the above mentioned adoption of amendments to the Law on local public finances, and the development of the sectorial decentralization strategies. At the same time, the Programme has engaged in a set of activities to foster partnerships. Public-civic partnerships have guided most of the Programme activities related to policy development, organizing wide consultations on central, regional and local levels. Public-private partnerships have been fostered through the establishment of the Inter-municipal enterprises whereby 4-5 local administrations joined their effort in order to be able to provide better public services to their communities. This was not an easy task, as local administrations are used to "do business" alone, and many of them had to overcome this approach and give up on the role of leader in favour of public benefit.

Further on, the Project's objective and activities are in line with the principles laid down in the **Law on Local Public Administration** (No. 436-XVI of 28 December 2006), stipulating that the local public authorities have decision-making, organizational, and financial autonomy; are entitled to carry out local public affairs management, and to exercise their authority according to the law within the limits of their jurisdiction.

The evaluation has also revealed evidence of significant relevance of the Programme in the context of the **National Decentralization Strategy** (hereinafter NDS). Its main aim is *to ensure a local public administration which operates democratically and autonomously, has the necessary resources and capacity to provide local services according to the needs and demands of the beneficiaries-including with respect to the rights of the vulnerable groups-and functions effectively, efficiently, equitably-and following fiscal discipline.* Building on principles

set out in the legal framework (outlines above), the NDS puts forward a set of seven objectives, as follows:

- Decentralization of services and competences
- Fiscal (Financial) Decentralization
- Decentralization of property (real assets)
- Local development
- LPA administrative capacity
- Institutional Capacity
- Democracy, ethics, human rights and gender equality

The Programme was designed in a way that it covered most of the areas mentioned in the NDS. As described above, it has backed the process of decentralization of services and competences and the fiscal decentralization. It has also embarked in a process of boosting local development through various mechanisms: enhancing the capacity of the LPA, mobilizing community groups, contributing to enhanced transparency and participation in local decision-making, offering small grants for community-based activities as well as for institutional strengthening of the LPAs, strengthening local economic development – support to local administrations, existing businesses and women and men willing to create new businesses. Human rights based approach and gender mainstreaming cross through all Programme components, from policy development to community mobilization.

The Programme is also bringing value to the **Action Plan to support Roma population in Moldova 2011-2015** (approved by Government Decision no.494 as of 08.07.2011[10]), as it addressed Roma ethnic groups in a particular manner, aiming to capacitate Roma local groups, including Roma women groups, as well as to break the stereotypes of the inhabitants of the local communities and of the public administration and secure Roma inclusion in the social, economic and political life of the country.

The Programme is fully in line with Moldova's international commitments. One of them is **European Charter of Local Self-Government**, ratified by the Republic of Moldova on July 16, 1997, which guarantees the right of local public authorities to have effective capacity to solve and manage an important share of the public affairs according to the law, under their own responsibility and for the public benefit.

The Programme also addressed some of the issues set forth by the **Millennium Development Goals**. It has directly contributed to promoting gender equality and empowering women, by streamlining the gender perspective into national policies and consolidating women groups at local and central levels. For example, the Programme has invested significant efforts in mainstreaming gender and human rights into relevant policies (e.g. Decentralisation Strategy). Also, the programme worked with women grass roots groups and particularly Roma women groups, making progress in women empowerment, particularly for political participation (See Section on Effectiveness).

The relevance of the Programme should also be noted in the context of **EU-Moldova relations**. At the time the Programme launched, the EU has recommended Moldova, *inter alia*, in the ENP Progress Report for 2012, to *step up the reform of the public administration and start implementing the decentralisation strategy, with a view to strengthening institutional capacity, efficient use of public resources and optimization of local administration*.

---

[10] http://lex.justice.md/index.php?action=view&view=doc&lang=1&id=339319

The Programme was formulated in coordination with the key national stakeholders, primarily the State Chancellery as the primary institution responsible for the decentralisation reform. Therefore, all interventions were highly relevant and needed in the reform context. Moreover, the Programme matched the complexity of national structure, providing targeted assistance to the institutions mostly involved in the decentralisation agenda. The Programme Board was chaired by the State Chancellery and was composed of representatives of line ministries and local public authorities, together CSOs and donor institutions, thus securing effective coordination of all Programme activities and timely interventions in case of need. Besides a Programme Board, an Advisory Group and an Inter-agency coordination committee have been set up to provide substantive advice for an effective and quality implementation and coordination of the project.

The Programme was highly responsive to the needs of beneficiaries, and interviews with all stakeholders demonstrated that the Programme has managed to rise up to their expectations providing maximum possible support in the identified intervention areas. To illustrate this, the Program has responded to Government request and extended its capacity building efforts to all 898 mayors and accountants (one one-day newly elected mayors' induction training and two one-day trainings in the field of Performance Based Budgeting). Also, the Program implemented capacity building activities in all 30 communities, and not in the originally planned 20, reacting to the requests coming from the respective LPAs.

The Programme has incorporated two innovative approaches. The **Human Rights Based Approach** (hereinafter HRBA) is an approach of mainstreaming the content of the international human rights treaties in development work. As per JILDP Programme Document, operationalizing HRBA into the decentralization and local governance reform in the first place means focusing on the practical implementation of the following human rights principles: Participation, Non-discrimination, Transparency and Accountability in each component of the project. As outcomes, HRBA aims for increased human rights empowerment for people and communities, social inclusion for vulnerable or marginalized groups, and aims to ensure that, in development processes, equality of outcome and dignity for all are core results.

Analysis of Programme results, documents, as well as interviews with stakeholders and beneficiaries demonstrated that HRBA was applied in programme's implementation. For example, policy design was done in a highly participatory manner, both at central and local levels. Community mobilization activities, on the other hand, empowered marginalized groups to take action and to be "heard" by the public administration and by the community.

Another innovative tool used by the Programme was **gender mainstreaming,** which is a globally accepted strategy "for making women's as well as men's concerns and experiences an integral dimension of the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of policies and programmes in all political, economic and societal spheres so that women and men benefit equally and inequality is not perpetuate"[11]. In the context of the decentralisation reform, the Programme progressed to make gender mainstreaming a "local" practice in the Moldovan Government.

Women's Empowerment is another universal approach that concerns women gaining power and control over their own lives. The Programme has particularly worked with women community groups, to build their self-confidence, inform them of various opportunities as well as, raise awareness among local decision-makers about the importance of women participation

---

[11] Platform for Action, UN Fourth World Conference on Women,
http://www.un.org/womenwatch/daw/beijing/platform/decision.htm

in local governance. The Programme worked also towards creation of a Roma women's network, further supported by a grant, and towards establishment of the Women's Network of CALM – professional network of women mayors, as well as towards creation of network of women secretaries of LPAs. As result of these efforts, women from these networks were further empowered and strengthened by support from another UN joint project "Women in Politics".

The **chosen programmatic strategies** were appropriate to secure successful implementation of Programme activities as well as to respond to the needs of the target groups. The perpetual combination of policy and piloting activities has proven to be highly effective. On one hand, pilot activities were constantly backed by policy research, and on the other, pilot activities were the ones to show communities immediate results as compared to the long-run policy changes.

The Programme has correctly **identified the needs of each target group** and acted accordingly. It has positioned itself as a key advisor and provider of technical expertise to the Government on decentralisation subjects. Interviewed stakeholders acknowledged that many of the policy changes might not have happened without Project's support.

At the same time, it has rightly responded to the needs of the local public administration in capacity and institutional building activities. Trainings provided to local authorities were greatly relevant taking into account the changing legislative framework and necessity to adapt to new regulations. In the public finance sector and budgeting alone, several essential acts have been amended and local authorities need to adjust their way of operation accordingly. In this regard, consultants hired by the Programme provided valuable support through both training and on-site coaching on program based budgeting, on new budgetary classification, new provisions in the area of local public finance. Classical subjects such as human resources management, transparency and participatory decision-making have completed the training curricula, so that the newly elected officials (and old ones) are equipped with necessary knowledge and information to fulfil their tasks at a higher quality level.

To secure lasting results within the LPA, the Programme has embarked into a complicated process of community mobilization, with the aim to empower local inhabitants to keep the government accountable for its actions, as well as, to undertake joint activities with the local government in order to improve the situation in their communities. Local community groups have become aware of their rights in relation to the local authorities, they have been consolidated around common interests and provided assistance in how to develop and implement community projects. This intervention is particularly relevant in the context were Moldovan citizens are not taking an active role in their communities, and are, as a rule, expecting the authorities to take care of everything. Thus mobilizing and empowering local communities is an important step towards the establishment of a participatory democracy in the country.

5.2 PROGRAMME DESIGN ANALYSIS

Programme design of the JILDP represents a **holistic approach** to increasing municipal and inter municipal capacities through support and mentoring to design and implement local policies integrating good governance and citizen participation mechanism, while at the same time supporting designing policies and legislation to support these needed changes at local level.

Common area of concern, and thus policy priority identified in JILDP, is the need to create sustainable mechanisms for appropriate decentralisation reforms, supported by capacities and knowledge of partners at state and local levels to implement the policy instruments. For many municipalities, the lack of capacities is perceived as deterring both new investments and design of inclusive policies based on good governance and democracy. Municipalities face difficulties in designing appropriate local development and economic policies, which when accompanied with lack of coherent and consistent governance mechanisms, create a major deterrent to local development and investments. It is obviously important to actively address such institutional weaknesses as an integral and essential element in donor programmes promoting decentralisation.

With its focus on both the central and local levels of governance, the support to policy making, capacity building, community mobilisation, local economic development and inter-municipal cooperation, JILDP is a complex intervention, particularly if the local capacities and current political and developmental climate in Moldova is taken into account. The Programme is in its third phase, envisaged as a three-year intervention, the period during which a number of positive changes were be achieved. Reform processes supported by the Programme require long term support to enable that changes in approaches, mind sets and procedures become embedded within the municipal administration but also to be accepted as developmental objectives by the central government. The Programme has picked up on the experiences of the previous interventions (ILDP and JILDP previous phase), but the analysis of the local governance capacities show that there is a significant need to continue providing this approach in the medium term. Also, the current political and developmental context of the Republic of Moldova is such that policies supproted by the Programme are on stand-by and there is no certainty that they will be adopted (or implemented) in the short to medium term At the moment, JILDP is time-framed to a three year period and has, as yet, no funding commitments from donors to cover the essential follow-up activities necessary to firmly embed the initial improvements, which is a challenge for achievement of overal goal and sustainability of the action, except in case of newly developed flagship programmes of UN Women which provide for follow-up on mainstreaming gender in fiscal laws, policies and national action plans. That is why, **the follow up programme to build on the achievement of the JILDP and its predecessor programmes would be important instrument for institutionalisation of new practices and mechanisms introduced by the current programme**. Yet, we should mention that UNDP managed to mobilize resources for a new project, called Migration and Development Project, whereby some of the success practices from JILDP will be up-scaled and replicated.

Technical review of the Programme's logical framework shows the **weaknesses in reflecting the scope and holisticness of the programme's strategies to achieve the overall objective**. The log frame contains the overall objective, two specific objectives and two expected results. The specific objectives and expected results are repetition of each other and neither provides any cause-effect relationship, which would be needed to adequately represent the changes to be achieved. Also, the programme's log frame does not capture all results and

objectives to be achieved, as there are a number of indicators that are numbered differently and do not relate to any of the two designated objectives/results (e.g. business development). Only in indicators, the true scope of the asssitance may be seen, while some of the areas reflected in indicators cannot be linked directly to any of the results (See log frame of the Programme in Annex 7).

5.2.1 Comparative advantage of the Joint Programme

The intervention started as a UNDP Integrated Local Development Project in 2007, followed by the current Joint Integrated Local Development Programme, implemented by UNDP and UN Women. Joining forces of two agencies was a welcome intervention, particularly as it introduced a fresh and innovative gender dimension to the local governance development and decentralization. Also, it is an important move taking into account the gender face of deprivation and social exclusion in the country. Thanks to the programme's imperative of mainstreaming gender in all supported processes, Moldovan policies focusing on decentralization (in draft and those adopted) reflect gender principles and human rights. In that sense, the Joint Programme has its value added in good combination of more classical UN approach to development assistance coupled with innovative tools such as HRBA and gender mainstreaming, which were enshrined in programme activities.

At the same time, the **JILDP is a good example of how joint programming should work in practice in development context**. The field research and interviews with both UN Agencies teams and stakeholders reveal good cooperation, complementarity and cohesiveness of the mandates and approaches of the two agencies towards common goal. There have been no major weaknesses in joint management of the current programme, and both agencies confirm that the cooperation has been improving with mutual understanding of the need and value of working together on this intervention.

5.3. FACTORS INFLUENCING THE PROGRAMME

This section presents relevant drivers and hindering factors for the programme success as identified through document and literature review, stakeholder consultations, and observations during the site visits.

DRIVERS OF SUCCESS

The main driver of the Programme has been the good cooperation of UNDP and UN Women with government and development partners and recognition of the two UN agencies niche and expertise in the decentralisation and local development. Programme's holistic approach to addressing the issues of local development through modelling innovative services and interventions, bringing lessons learnt from modelling processes to policy agenda, while simultaneously building capacities of duty bearers and right holders to organise and take active part in decision making processes brings valuable results and changes, particularly in targeted local communities. Data derived from document and literature review, stakeholder consultations, and observations during the site visits confirm that such approach builds confidence social capital in terms of relationships with partners and commitment and ownership over results. Grants to LPAs and community groups, efforts to improve transparency and accountability of LPAs empower right holders to enhance their participation in social sphere through joint initiatives address jointly identified local needs and priorities. General agreement among

stakeholders participating in interviews and in group discussions is that the JILDP interventions has been valuable and positive experience to all parties and brought change, particularly at local level.

Another driver of success of the Programme was application of individualised approach. Programme interventions at local level were based on needs assessments and recognition that each community has its own reality and that, while overall needs fall within same category, individualised approach to the communities is needed. Approach by which community facilitators were backstopping targeted communities provided hands-on and strong support based on the needs and levels of development for each community.

HINDERING FACTORS

Moldova suffers from complex political and institutional context. Besides the fact that Moldova held Parliamentary elections in November 2014 and local ones in June 2015, during the last two years four governments have changed, the last one being dismissed just after the evaluation mission was finalized. The governing Alliance for European Integration which has been in power since 2009, did not do much to advance reforms, particularly not in the sensitive areas. It has been active in designing and adopting reform strategies, but much less with their actual implementation.

Similar was the situation with the decentralization agenda. The Strategy has been adopted in 2012, and almost two years later, with much insistence from the development partners and civil society have the new amendments to the local public finance law been adopted. A crucial step, however, the territorial-administrative reform is still on hold. There was a clear lack of political will to implement it before the local elections in 2015, and now one has to wait up to the next local elections in order not to "break" the local election cycle.

After the recent dismissal of the government, the so-called Alliance for European Integration broke up. The chances that a pro-European alliance will be re-shaped are very small. In case a centre-left governing coalition is formed, the future of the decentralization agenda becomes even more questionable.

Besides political constraints, there are institutional factors hindering the implementation of the decentralization reform. Moldovan public administration is challenged by low capacities and small salaries, political changes affecting turn over of officials and staff in mid- or higher – levels; which provide for significant obstacles to sustainability of efforts of development partners towards improvement of public administration and decentralisation. Capacity building efforts often do not provide sustainable institutional changes as trained civil servants move to other positions either within public administration or other sectors due to political (changes in political leadership inducing changes in the division of roles) or other reasons.

Many new mechanisms introduced by development partners rely on new technologies (internet) and use of computers (e.g. e-governance, data management, transparency through websites and online transfer of sessions, etc.). While Internet connection in Moldova is good; computer literacy especially among public servants at lower levels of government is very limited, making it difficult for them to use new technologies in their work. The Programme invested in e-governance, but it is only slowly taking root due to these challenges.

On a programme level, main hindering factor for success of the programme was withdrawal of the   SIDA funding for the policy component of the programme. During the programme design phase, SIDA committed 5 million USD for support to programme. However, due to the lack of political commitment to push further the decentralisation and territorial and administrative reform, SIDA decided to withdraw from supporting any policy work in this sector. This was a huge drawback for the programme, mitigated partially by use of core funding of UNDP and UN Women, but still affected achievements in this component significantly.

5.4 EFFECTIVENESS

What has been the progress made towards achievement of the expected outcomes and expected results? What are the results achieved?
What were the key factors influencing the achievement or non-achievement of the Programme objectives to date?
To what extent have capacities of relevant duty-bearers and rights-holders been strengthened?
To what extent has the joint programme promoted or led to improved communication, synergies, coordination and collaboration among national stakeholders, e.g. between different line ministries and among government and civil society?
To what extent this joint programme affected increased collaboration, coordination, and information exchange between UNDP and UN Women in relation to local development?
To what extent has this joint programme modality contributed to inter-agency networking, informal information exchange, a constructive team spirit, a conscious feeling of being a member of one UN family, etc. among the UN agencies involved in the design and implementation of this programme?

The Programme, in its previous phases, supported the development and adoption of the Decentralization Strategy as overarching framework for decentralization in the country. The Strategy envisaged a number of reforms at different levels and different sectors, and the Programme's strategy was to continue supporting further decentralization efforts through strengthening policies and central and local public authorities with the support mechanisms to implement this strategy and support to the development of viable models of operational local governments. At the same time, the Programme supported communities – citizens, grass root organisations and businesses, creating a holistic approach to community development and good governance.

As mentioned already, the programme has two specific objectives to which two related expected results are tied. The two specific objectives define desired changes at two levels: the central (policy) level and the local governance level. This section summarizes evaluation findings on programme contributions to results at the levels of expected results and specific objectives, as well as on internal and external factors supporting or hindering programme performance.

Evaluation findings on programme contributions to its envisaged objectives are generally positive. Varying degrees of progress have been made towards achieving the results formulated in the programme log frame, and contributions towards the two formulated objectives were observed. While available data do not permit measuring the extent to which the programme has made progress towards its overarching goal of contributing *to better and equitable service provision and sustainable local development, facilitated by the improved legal and institutional framework resulting from the implementation of the National Decentralization Strategy,* available data indicate that it has made meaningful contributions to strengthening the capacities and awareness of key actors and their efforts to this end at national and local levels, as well as to strengthening the enabling environment for change in local communities in Moldova.

Specific Objective 1. To support the Government in improving the policy and legal framework as mandated by the National Decentralization Strategy to ensure local autonomy, availability of resources, and more effective local management and service provision.

Output 1.1. Policy and legal frameworks to support autonomous, efficient and financially sustainable LPAs developed and implemented.

Based on evidence from the documentation review and stakeholder consultations, it may be concluded that the Output 1.1 has been partially achieved. Reviewed documents and consultations with stakeholders showed that throughout programme implementation, the Programme made successful efforts to encourage and facilitate meaningful **dialogue and evidence based policy making processes** among various duty bearers as well as among and with rights holders. The respective dialogue mechanisms varied, and included regular working groups, public hearings, as well as formal and informal meetings with and among stakeholders. Research and policy studies commissioned and/or supported by the programme included consultations and dissemination sessions with duty bearers, e.g. in form of presentations, working group or round table discussions involving a broad range of stakeholders. Policies and legislative solutions for many reform areas have been supported, but adoption and further implementation of many of the supported ones are pending or in question, mainly due to political reasons. It is clear that many of the supported strategies have not been adopted yet or there are issues with budgeting for implementation, the evaluation team did not find sufficient supporting information on the extent to which the various changes in laws, policies or strategies have been implemented at national and local levels, and with what effects in view of improvements of governance. This is not surprising given that most of the noted achievements are fairly recent. Thanks to programme support, government has all necessary justification for new reformist laws and strategies but it needs political will and support for adoption and further implementation. These reform processes are complex, and the Programme's value added was support to necessary reform preparations, so that the government has all background information and policy options on the table for faster decision making and adoption of the documents. Another value comes from the fact that all processes included local government counterparts, ensuring the information, ownership but also informed advocacy by local governments for adoption and implementation of reforms.

The Programme's plan was to support to the government in the process of improving the policy and legal framework stemming from the Decentralisation Strategy and to move the reforms further towards an overarching territorial and administrative reform. However, the envisaged support to reforms at central level could not be implemented as planned due to withdrawal of the Swedish SIDA funding (5 Million USD), due to which the policy support of the programme was very limited and funded by UNDP core funds. The Programme mitigated the risk of lack of support to policy level by ensuring core funds from UNDP and UN Women to continue working with central government. Another important factor influencing the programme support to central government and policymaking process was the complex political situation in Moldova. The detailed account of these and other hindering factors is presented in the section on hindering factors below.

Despite the drawback of funding for the policy work, the Programme continued supporting the needed reforms with much smaller funds allocated for this component (amounting to 300,000 USD). As reflected in the original programme document, the respective policy framework for decentralisation in general was already set at programme onset. However, a number of gaps existed, which the programme helped identify and address. These areas were the need to support the 1) sectorial strategies (education, social protection, etc.); 2) public finance reform; 3) property delimitation; 4) territorial and administrative reforms.

Data derived from document review and stakeholder consultations indicate that the various **research and policy studies and related publications**[12] commissioned and supported by the programme were (and continue to be) effective tools in facilitating the adoption or amendment of existing legal and policy frameworks and budgets. The programme also supported capacity building of government institutions and public consultations for inclusive development of policies of interest of the programme through Technical Assistance (TA) and direct logistics and management support. Evidence gathered through document review and stakeholder consultations points to changes resulting from the programme support, as detailed below.

Support to elaboration of Sectorial decentralization strategies (education, social, water and sanitation, solid waste management, property delimitation; local public finance law). The Programme support to elaboration of these sectorial decentralization strategies was in the form of analyses, TA to the process of policy development, ensuring that the strategy development is evidence based (analysis) and participatory (TA for public consultations and capacity building). Importantly, the processes supported by JILDP placed Ministries in the driver seat, ensuring full ownership of the process. The Technical assistance and analytical support provided by the Programme came upon request of the government and included full support to consultation process, and public hearings. Also, it included national and international expertise, which was added value to the process, bringing in European and regional experiences and expertise.

In education sector, the JILDP supported elaboration for **Education Sector Decentralisation Strategy**, the Ethical Code of educational professionals and also the Nomenclature of competencies in education with participation of sector experts, public consultations with teachers, educational professionals but also parents and students. The process was inclusive and participatory, but in the meantime, the new Educational Code was adopted in November 2014, integrating many segments of the policy, making the adopted of the policy itself redundant. All interviewed stakeholders from the sector agree that this is an acceptable arrangement as the law is binding and the implementation is now mandatory.

Programme support to the **Social Protection Decentralisation Strategy** was similar (TA and analytical support) and resulted in strategy adoption by the Ministry of Labor, Social Protection and Family. However, the Ministry lacks funds for full implementation and this is the main hindering factor to moving the needed reforms in the social protection sector forward. The lack of financial support to this strategy also has repercussions on the state of local communities and deprivation.

The **Property Delimitation sector strategy** and the drafting the Law on delimitation of local/state property was probably the most complex supported reform besides the territorial and administrative reform. This sector is very complex, depends on many vested interests, lack of understanding and clear definition of public property as well as lack of clear political decision on the criteria for the property delimitation. The programme supported the strategy and law development through bringing local and international expertise and also the TA. The law is developed but it still does not ensure clear delimitation of property and criteria for this process. The Law is still not adopted.

Another area of JILDP support was the **Local Public Finance law** (including inter-budgetary relations), which was approved in 2014 for piloting in three rayons and Chisinau. Due to the

---

[12] The programme produced a range of documents including draft strategies; guidelines; methodologies, etc. The full list of documents produced is listed in Annex 6.

political reasons, the government decided to only pilot the reforms and not to initiate full fledged reform process of public finance. The new system, introduced by the Local Public Finance Law, introduces a formula for distribution to ensure appropriate proportionality. JILD support was directed towards supporting the programme measures at local governance level to help the improvement of policy and legislative framework for better context for activities of local governments. Importantly, the Programme supported piloting of fiscal decentralization by analysis of local revenues (in 74 local governments), process, which resulted in a number of recommendations on how to develop new budgets. Also, the programme assisted in development of the Revenue Increase plans in the four rayons (74 communities) through coaching and mentoring local governments in developing these plans.

JILDP supported the development of the **sectoral decentralization strategies for water and sanitation and for solid waste management**. The strategies were developed by consultants contracted by JILPD together with responsible counterparts from the Ministry of Environment. The strategies have not yet been adopted. Due to some internal changes in the Ministry of Environment, the strategies are now being updated and their unification in one document is considered. JILDP has contributed to the process with preparation of necessary background documentation to assist the Ministry of Environment in finalising the strategic framework.

One more relevant achievement of the programme was the **adoption of the government Decision for establishment of the common service operators**, so to improve institutionalization and sustainability of the Inter-Municipal Cooperation (IMC) mechanisms, supported by the programme. This decision was a result of bottom-up approach, testing new models of IMC in communal service provision and advocacy with central government to recognize the model through legislative mechanism.

Support to the **territorial and administrative reform** was another complex area of intervention of the programme. The reform is a needed intervention towards making the local governments more efficient, effective and able to initiate developmental projects and attract investments. At the moment, there are almost 900 LPAs in Moldova, and majority of them is not in position to initiate any developmental projects. That is why, the State Chancellery requested support of JILDP in bringing international and local expertise towards development of policy documentation and a Roadmap for the reform. Territorial administrative reform contributions were done through extensive analysis of the current state of play in the territorial and administrative structure of Moldova, regional and international experiences with such reforms, resulting in the policy documentation including several policy options - territorial-administrative changes scenarios with costing and potential pros and cons of each choice. The draft Strategy with policy options was presented twice to the Parliament of Moldova. There is a wide agreement that such reform is needed in Moldova but that, due to political instability, Moldova is not ready for its adoption and implementation.

The programme has supported important initiatives within the decentralization agenda. There is a need for further efforts in the short to medium term in connecting all strategies/policies in line ministries between them, under one "decentralization umbrella", which will have synchronised concept and vision. Otherwise, there is a high risk of conflicting provisions affecting the implementation of decentralization-related activities. Examples of such lack of coordination have been shared with the Evaluation team; e.g. existing regulations at the Ministry of Environment are countering the IMC regulation, as the Ministry regulation stipulates that no joint land fields should be established at the level of district or several communities. This goes against the initiative of creating IMC which would organise waste management services operating within the

region of several communities. This is the area for further focus of support of UN and other development partners.

Specific Result 2. To improve the capacity of LPAs to deliver efficient, equitable and accessible local public services, to facilitate sustainable development and foster social inclusion.

Output 2.1. Capacities of LPAs and communities strengthened to deliver better services to citizens and create models of LPAs - in line with changes brought by the Decentralization Strategy

The Programme engages with local public administrations (LPAs) with a goal to establish and pilot/test models of change as showcase of how LPAs can develop and offer better local public services and development interventions to their citizens.

Capacity development

Support to strengthening LPA capacities was multi-fold. It goes hand in hand with the efforts at central level, bringing lessons learned to policy agenda and transforming good reform models to the local stakeholders, at the same time building their capacities, awareness and responsiveness to citizens. The programme utilized different methodologies to achieve necessary changes with LPAs: facilitation role and capacity development for local development tools, leadership, community mobilization tools; and professional development of local government staff through specialized and advanced trainings, coaching in local finance, human resource management, procurement, project writing, IT skills, etc. Additionally, quarterly mayors' meetings to support

A total of 60 communities were included in the Programme: ten (10) communities as cluster centers selected for IMC models and 30 communities benefiting from them; as well as 20 communities provided with assistance to become 'champions of change', benefiting from full fledged support in different areas of governance and community mobilization. Initially, the IMC support was planned for less communities, but due to interest in IMC and possibility to get more effective support with allocated resources, the number increased to 40 for IMC support. Selection of communities to be supported ensured that vulnerability, geographic distribution, and population size (more than 4,500 people) was respected (as per Communities selection criteria, JILDP target communities are with over 4,500 inhabitants). The decision was not to work in bigger cities and rayons in order not to duplicate efforts with USAID and GIZ.

networking, learning and advocacy; reflection (on success of the programme in local realities) and study visits between communities were integral part of the programme – bringing competitive feeling and exchange of examples. The methodology and process of capacity development was based on the thorough needs assessment (NA) conducted at onset of cooperation with local governments, based on which the support was provided. The methodology for LPAs needs assessment was developed with support of JILDP during previous phase, and was improved during the current phase within the evaluation exercise with target communities. The support was individualized as the NA showed different levels of development and different needs of target communities.

The project has invested considerable effort in building capacities of the mayors, local councillors and mayoralty staff. Through joint training programs, circa 95% of public servants

from 30 target communities (354 public servants, including 222 women and 132 men) improved their knowledge and management skills in their core areas of activity during comprehensive professional development trainings programs in human resource management and public procurement (four training days for each programme), public finance management (nine-days training programme); tax collection and public property management (three-days training for each programme). At the same time ICT skills, webpage development, and HR soft trainings were provided for local secretaries – 552 public servants, including 386 women and 175 men. Although initially the training program was designed only for the 20 communities part of the community mobilization component, at the request of the ten communities involved in the IMC activities, the latter were also included in the capacity-building programme. In addition to this, 313 Mayors and accountants from 74 pilot localities improved their knowledge in public finance management. Extensive support was offered by the Program to local governments in applying the new performance based budgeting methodology when developing the budget for 2016. A nation-wide training program for 1480 representatives of first level local governments and public institutions (chief accountants, accountants, mayors, heads of public institutions, rayon representatives) was implemented with program's support. An important element of joint training activities was networking between training participants, providing for possibility for mayors and councillors from different communities to interact and share experiences.

In order to secure sustainability of the capacity building effort, a partnership with the Academy for Public Administration (hereinafter APA) was established. In this context, four Training programmes were elaborated on public property, public procurement, public finance management and tax collection, and human resource management in cooperation with APA. Further, training of APA trainers was organized for three of the programmes and the training materials transferred to the Academy to be further used in their regular curriculum. Interviews with APA representatives confirmed that they do use the training programs developed with JILPD support in their courses for training local elected officials.

Also, the programme recognized the need to offer local expertise, which would allow also building capacities of individual community facilitators, CSOs and consulting service providers to be partners of LPAs in development work. That is why, community facilitators were hired to offer backstopping, mentoring and overall supporting role to the LPAs in their everyday efforts to improve their operations. For training components, several local CSOs have been contracted to provide training and coaching to LPAs in various fields, such as: strategic planning, local economic development, land relations, human resource management, public relations, inclusive and transparent budgeting, but also raising awareness of existing legislation in different areas of good governance[13]. With this strategy, the Programme enabled mutual learning, capacity building, which also affects positively the sustainability of the knowledge acquired on both the giving and receiving ends of the trainings component. The Programme's insistence in participation and inclusive local development brought additional value of local strategies reflecting community priorities based on articulated needs of inhabitants through community forums.

Evaluation data indicate that the programme has contributed to **raising the awareness** of targeted LPAs as regards existing standards and procedural and legal obligations for good governance pertaining to their area of work, as well as to **enhancing (**to varying extent**) institutional capacities** e.g. by investment in human resources development, contributing to the development or improvement of procedures, mechanisms and guidelines for how to

---

[13] One example mentioned multiple times in interviews is raising awareness and informing LPAs of provisions of the Law on Access to Information No 982 of May 2000, of which many LPAs were not aware existed

organise LPA operations and improvement of LPA profile among citizens and wider. **Direct engagement with LPAs resulted in changing ways in which LPAs operate**. Procedures and mechanisms for LPA operations have been improved, as, for instance, the local development strategies; budgeting and application of the new Local Public Finance law; internal regulations on HR or transparency, profiles of the communities have been updated or adopted from scratch. The local development strategies and the local profiling (which includes most important information about the community, and can be included later as a component of the strategy) are not only important for the community to be able to prioritize interventions, but also a pre-condition for attracting investments and grants. Through training sessions provided, the LPAs

also learned how to develop policy documents and will be able to adjust/update them when necessary. From discussions with mayors from the beneficiary communities, a large part of these documents are being used, even by newly elected mayors, who did not take part in the process of elaboration of these documents. Piloting of services showed clearly that there is capacity to institutionalize some of the new models. However, it showed also different level of success, depending on the motivation, level of capacity and commitment of the relevant LPAs. Overall, the program has exceeded its targets in terms of improved capacities/management. It was initially planned for 20 communities; instead, extensive capacity building was implemented in 30 communities.

> The Transparency week organized in 2015 was supported by JILDP and participating LPAs demonstrated best practices and new tools they use in their communities to advance transparency. Among innovative practices to communicate to citizens were, for instance, sending sms to all community inhabitants on important events/news at the mayoralty/in the community.

Another contribution of the Programme was support further strengthening of the the Women Mayors Platform, which was established under the auspices of CALM, as result of the JILDP support during the previous phase. The programme also supported the network of women secretaries of LPAs. The initiative to organise and further support women mayors and women secretaries of LPAs platforms towards stronger advocacy at all levels for meeting the needs of women came from women mayors and secretaries and was supported by the Programme through trainings and study visits. The result is visible, yet not an envisaged one – in 2015 there are 20 more women elected as mayors compared with 2011.

Community mobilisation

Besides capacity building for LPAs and IMC establishment, an important contribution JILDP had in community mobilisation, whereby several community facilitators have identified and later on capacitated the local community groups, focusing on the most vulnerable ones (youth, elderly, ethnic and religious minority, women).

In a first phase, community groups have been assisted to prioritise (in a participatory way) the design and implementation of local development measures to address the needs of community groups, especially women and most vulnerable. A pool of experienced community facilitators assisted the target communities in profiling their situation and priority needs. The Programme supported the empowerment of community groups in becoming dialogue partners of LPAs, through joint meetings, coaching and information sessions. As result, 18 community-based organizations (11 of them have women leaders) have been created by representatives of vulnerable groups, and registered by the LPAs. The newly created 18 community based organizations, as well as other existing 13 community-based organizations, from all 30 target

communities, later in 2015 received further capacity building with additional 7 training modules, with over 120 persons trained. As result of the capacity building, the groups were able to develop and implement local projects based on the needs identified in their communities within a participatory and transparent process together with local authorities.

Interviews with facilitators revealed that the groups were very different in each community, prompting application of individual approach for each case. For instance, in some communities, members of these groups had difficulties of expressing themselves, or even writing.

The community mobilisation activities contributed to shifting the general approach to local decision-making. Community members are no more regarded as outsiders, but increasingly become partners of the mayoralty in developing the community. Capacitating the community, combined with strengthening LPA has brought a critical change in people's minds, particularly with regards to LPA activity. To exemplify, if prior to the JILDP activities councillors in a certain community might have protested against filming or taking pictures during local council meetings, now they broadcast these meetings live on the community websites, as well as some mayors are actively posting on Facebook, as well as SMS-ing citizens about events which occur in the mayoralty. For example, Larga village in Briceni district mayor has created a Facebook page of the mayoralty and daily posts news and pictures from the activity/events of the mayoralty or community, and also sends sms to community members on important issues occurring in their community. At the same time, with the contribution of MiLab Innovation Hub, an application was developed so that mayors can easily use sms system to notify local community members about various news/events.

Visible results can also be noted at the chapter of women empowerment. First of all, from the 18 registered CSOs, eleven (11) have women leaders. Secondly, participation of women in politics increased. As compared to 2011 local elections, in 2015, there were 20 more women elected as mayors. Two Roma women councillors were also elected, which was unexpected result of this Programme. This happened due to concerted efforts of JILDP, such as CALM Women's Network creation in 2011 and further strengthening during 2012-2014, including support to creation of Women Secretaries of LPAs network within CALM, as well as mobilization and empowerment of Roma women from 5 JILDP target communities which led to set up of Romani Women and Girls Network, which was strengthened with JILDP support and backed up with a small grant in 2014, and later interventions made by "Women in Politics" project14 .

At the same time, challenges are faced by the two Roma women councillors. They both worked as Roma mediators before election. The normative framework provides that elected officials cannot keep the public servant positions; they need to choose between the two positions. This is a difficult decision as keeping the mediation position brings more income, while work in Council brings changes. UN Women and Roma Women network are currently working on finding a solution for this issue, to enable Roma women to take more active role in government work.

Taking into account the fact that Roma are one of the most vulnerable groups in Moldova with specific needs for social inclusion, JILDP had hired as one of community facilitators a consultant for Roma groups' social inclusion, who worked in the teams with other community facilitators to ensure Roma groups are mobilized and empowered and that they voice their need and participate actively in decision-making for solving issues related to their community. Thus,

---

[14] UN Women and UNDP joint project "Women in politics", where UN Women is leading.

JILDP has also made a visible contribution no only regarding mobilizing Roma groups, but also on raising awareness of mayoralties and local councils about the Government Decision No. 494 regarding the implementation of the Action Plan on Roma population support for 2011-2015. This Action Plan comprises activities which should be implemented at local level by the local administration, which was in most of cases totally unaware of. JILDP worked with both the LPAs and Roma groups on discussing the potential and already implemented measures that contribute to the Action plan.

Grants to community groups/CSOs

Programme's grant component for community actions and investments was a timely and needed component of the overall LPA capacity development and community mobilization. The logic behind the grants was to support developmental initiatives by local community groups. As result of the community mobilization efforts described above, several active groups were established in each of the 20 communities. The groups were usually centred around common interests or belongingness to a specific category of population, such as women's group, young people's group, religious or ethnic minority group. local groups have established CSOs in 18 of communities (CSOs already existed in two communities), which then had a chance to apply for a small grant up to 5,000 USD in the grant call announced by the Program. In total 22 grants have been allocated, with projects ranging from improved sports facilities, renovated kitchen and dining spaces in educational institutions, improved accessibility to local service-providers, to creation of community information centres, laundry services, accessibility services to women and vulnerable groups in terms of access to education, healthcare and social services, as well as inclusion and capacity building. Additional 4 small grants were dedicated to child care facilities, and they relate to local needs identified by LPA and community groups. The necessity comes from the idea that ensuring adequate child care facilities, women have increased opportunities to get employed or open a business, and thus have as primary result women's economic empowerment.

> Community members have identified interesting initiatives to be realized through small projects. One of them was transforming a potentially dangerous small forest-like area in the middle of the village into a recreational park for youth. It had a double effect: preventing some harmful activities among youth and enhancing security in the community and at the same time promoting a healthy life-style among the young generation.

These projects were selected in inclusive decision-making process with local inhabitants, thus empowering citizens and their interest/representative groups to take more active part in the decision making processes. The grants also offered 'learning by doing' – experiential learning for grass roots CSOs, to test the new methods of community mobilization and development. Most of the projects also managed to attract community or LPA funds, in total value of about 40,000 USD. Interviews and site observations show multiple benefits of such interventions: selecting the most immediate priority and local support and ownership over results. The local ownership was enhanced through considerable community contribution to most of the project. Neither the LPA, nor the community members expected to mobilize significant financial resources in order to finance community projects. Another important benefit was for citizens to access local democracy and practice of decision-making in the community, which is a good incentive for change.

Another demonstration of the sustainability of the capacity building activities for the community mobilizers and representatives of vulnerable groups from target localities, was that 15 community groups have identified local issues and needs and implemented 15 micro-projects with external funding and own resources, amounting to 200,000 USD in total. Another 15 project have been developed and/or submitted for funding.

Grants for LPAs

Besides the grant competition for the local community groups, the Program envisaged offering incentives to the local authorities. Thus, following a complex process of participatory strategic planning based on HRBA and gender mainstreaming, 20 community development projects to improve the service delivery at local level were fully implemented. The projects targeted improvement of the following services: rehabilitation of public lighting in 4 communities, extending water supply in 1 community, setting up of communal services operators in 4 communities, reconstruction of education and youth infrastructure in five (5) communities, modernization of agro-markets in two (2) communities, development of social assistance infrastructure in one (1) community, rehabilitation of road and public space infrastructure in three (3) communities.

Grants up to 15,000 USD were offered for each community. In addition, each LPA had to secure a minimum of 20% co-financing, which impacted positively on local ownership of the projects. The project ideas were selected through a transparent and participatory process, through consultation with the community inhabitants and prioritization of development needs of the community.

In addition to that all the 30 communities (20 for community mobilization and plus ten (10) where IMCs were established) also received financial support for institutional development. Thus, 30 communities got grants of up to 5,000 USD to purchase the necessary equipment for the mayoralty which would improve the functioning of the institution. Although local contribution was not mandatory, most of the communities succeeded to co-finance these projects, in a total amount of about 33,000 USD. An important indicator of the ownership of the LPA is the fact that they contributed with a total average of 62% of additional financing and 15% of funds were mobilized from other donors.

Moreover, four communities also received financial support to implement e-solutions (up to 5,000 USD each), as, for instance, developing a local web-portal on local agricultural products and producers, business opportunities, local services and employment opportunities. The developed solutions will be shared among LPAs, thus ensuring multiplier effect.

Combining the capacity-building and transparency activities with such an incentive as a small grant for community needs was a good strategic approach chosen by the Program. First of all, it ensures increased interest in participating in the Program by the community leaders, and secondly, it provides a "learning-by-doing" practice, to exercise acquired skills on transparency and participatory decision-making, as well as project management and reporting.

Local economic development (LED) and entrepreneurship

An important component in this phase of JILDP was support to entrepreneurship development. It was introduced as novelty for the programme and aims at supporting community mobilisation and capacity building through support to economic development, adding important component

of business development fulfilling the holistic approach to local development by the Programme. LED support aims to help government identify local economic development opportunities and share experiences and capacities on how to attract businesses. Trainings on business development were organized with great interest of people in all communities. All in all, 235 people from rural areas (including 45% women) were enabled to open/develop small businesses; 114 of them (including 45% women) developed business plans for their ongoing or new businesses, thus increasing employability potential at local level. 38 small local businesses were created through this component (with grants up to 5000 $) and 21 are fully operational. Importantly, the programme succeeded in identifying and supporting 17 women business, whereby 13 are start-ups, and 4 were supported extend business. Most of the businesses supported are in agriculture (20), bringing new products or increasing business profile. Yet, some businesses are not specific to the rural area, but open new opportunities for the inhabitants of the respective villages, for instance a gym, a beauty salon, accountancy services or training services. JILDP contributed to creating 130 new jobs, as result of the business support grants. Site observation organized within the scope of the Evaluation and interviews with supported business show satisfaction and increased enthusiasm of businesses to work on improvement of their business opportunities. Overall, the Program has over delivered on the target for business development. It was initially planned for 20 businesses to be supported, instead, 38 were.

This component is of significant importance and brings added value to the capacity building and investment in local services' activities. One of the biggest problems in rural area is the lack of decent jobs and/or possibilities to generate income. This is one of the reasons for extensive labour migration of the population (particularly rural). Hence, unless comprehensive efforts towards sustainable local economic development are made, other activities may lose their relevance in time.

Inter-municipal cooperation (IMC)

The programme investment in piloting partnerships between LPAs through building *inter-municipal cooperation* and other forms of partnerships, as models for improved local services is an example of best practice. The inter-municipal cooperation component focused on **10 clusters** of municipalities, which were assisted to pilot several forms of inter-municipal cooperation for common priority sectors and services, encouraging clustering of municipalities around common needs. The 10 new IMC operators are planned to ensure a multi-functional approach, by covering the whole range of communal activities in targeted communities: water and sanitation, roads maintenance and snow removal, waste management and greening, public lighting.

The **IMC model was developed** based on lessons learned and models from other countries (e.g. Romania, former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Czech Republic, etc.), but building in the local solutions, through bottom up and needs based approach for organizing services in more effective manner. Document review and stakeholder consultations with LPAs applying IMC but also wider stakeholder groups confirm that IMC is an instrument for improving efficiency and effectiveness of service delivery and offer better service for lower cost. Document review and stakeholder Joining services brings some 25% of cost reduction for individual municipalities (sewerage, waste, water) and especially if more communities join to organize regional hubs. The approach to building IMC included joint trainings, exchanges and joint work towards developing partnerships: from planning and creating them, selecting the most appropriate model of cooperation to effectively managing and maintaining the selected public services. **The IMC**

support resulted in establishment of Service Operators and also improvement of services, but also in enabling clusters of communities to benefit from the Regional Development Fund, which supports local and regional initiatives. As a result of efforts and lessons learned from modelling IMC, the IMC guide of Council of Europe was adapted to Moldovan context and published, as a tool for raising awareness and guide how to organize such services locally. To date, the ten IMC service operators are serving 40 localities with over 100,000 inhabitants, and over 100 jobs were created within the IMC joint service operators. It is worth mentioning that over 40,000 citizens from rural area obtained access to regular waste management services, and other 10,000 to public street lighting, as result of the IMCs. Over 50,000 rural inhabitants got access to basic roads maintenance services, inclusively effective and timely snow removal during the winter. More than 10 illegal landfills were liquidated and others are in the process. While largely co-financed by the beneficiaries (over 2,5 million MDL), the yearly turnover recorded per each joint IMC operator is exceeding 500,000 million MDL, which goes beyond the targeted breakeven points. This comes to demonstrate that all established IMCs are functional and effective, and do not require subsidy from the government.

Being initiated on some basic public services (waste management, water supply and roads maintenance), the newly established joint IMC service operators also are launching complimentary communal services to citizens and firms, which are significantly increasing their financial and economic sustainability and viability. Particularly, thanks to JILDP granted equipment, tools and consultancy, all ten IMC joint operators are developing a comprehensive set of complimentary services required by the population (e.g. plumber, electrical and carpenter works, funeral services, emergency technical interventions, draw-well cleaning, garbage evacuation, small renovation works, goods transportation, etc.). By expanding and diversifying their activities, the IMC service operators are both increasing the quality of life in deprived rural areas, and ensuring their financial and economic sustainability.

It is also worth to mention that JILDP IMC model, based on 'joint municipal enterprises' legal form, became the IMC model promoted by the Congress of Local Authorities from Moldova (CALM) among Moldovan municipalities.

E-learning

In order to assess the readiness of the LPAs to use e-tools for various purposes, including e-learning and providing e-services, a baseline survey was conducted in 30 target communities on the level of information and participation of communities in the local decision making process, their satisfaction with local governments' performance and public services. An additional component of this study also looked into citizen's readiness to use IT tools and e-services to communicate with the local governments and access local services, but also local governments' capacity and willingness for e-transformation. 18% of respondents currently access public services from their personal computer, while 69% still go to mayoralty for this purpose. The survey also looked at the perspective, and 58% of respondents said they will still go to mayoralty for public services in the future, while the share of those accessing them on PC would increase to 26%. Even though the evidence of e-readiness is not strong enough at local level, the survey also shows that 44% have total or strong confidence in the security of online public services, which suggests that it is mainly a matter of appropriate promotion of benefits in using e-services, to make them more widely used.

JILDP established a partnership with the e-Governance Centre, and both looked at possibilities to localise e-solutions in the target communities, at least pilot in some of them. It is also

important to mention that most of the products developed by the E-Governance Centre can also be used/re-used at the local level.

At the same time, there are just few services which are rendered by the local government which could be digitalized, thus, mostly the effort is worth for re-engineering existing services, which is an exercise the LPAs cannot do without external support. In this line of ideas, JILDP started an attempt of local public service re-engineering in one of its communities. The exercise was implemented in cooperation with the E-governance Centre and the UNDP MiLab project. Based on the piloting results, JILDP explored the possibility of re-engineering other local services.

In order to make the activity of the mayoralty more efficient and effective, JILDP has designed a software solution called the Integrated Documents and Records Management System (IDRMS). It allows the institution to introduce data electronically, exchange it between personnel, as well as other local institutions monitor and track requests, letters, generate reports, etc. At this stage, the system is being finalized and will soon be piloted in ten target communities.

With an aim to maximise impact and sustainability of training activities, an e-learning platform is currently being developed in partnership with APA. It will constitute a good tool for minimizing time and costs of training, as well as contribute to a greater number of local officials trained.

In terms of using e-tools for promoting transparency and information about LPA activity, we should mention that out of 30 localities, only 3 had web pages at the beginning of the project. By the end of project implementation, half of communities have created web pages and all 30 – Facebook profiles. This comes in contrast to general data per country, where only 28% from the localities from Moldova have a webpage and only 7%-social media profile[15].

5.4.1 Gender and human rights

The most valuable feature of the Programme and probably the best practice for joint UN programmes was the Moldovan JILDP work on engendering policy making and applying the human rights to development of policies and other aspects of the local development. The programme succeeded in ensuring buy-in of the governments at both central and decentralized levels to integrate HRBa and gender equality in different segments of joint efforts of the government and the programme. Also, important were efforts to increase capacities for gender mainstreaming and Human rights, equitable participation of women that resulted in better quality of drafted policies and stronger focus of services and LPA interventions on Human rights and women empowerment. The Programme insisted in integrating gender in policies supported and developing policy documents applying HRBa. The programme worked with women groups, particularly at local level, to empower them to become more active agents of change. As a result of efforts, the Decentralisation strategy but also sectorial strategies that followed from this one include separate chapters on gender or make it a cross cutting theme. This is an example of good practice both in Moldova and regionally and globally.

Also, a Women Mayors Platform was established within the framework of CALM, in the previous phase of JILDP, promoting women in decision making processes. It has as members not only women Mayors, but also other women working in local administration. The Women Mayors Platform can be considered one of the professional networks within CALM, with currently over

---

[15] "Presence on the web of the Moldovan communities", http://idsi.md/prezenta-web-a-localitatilor-din-Republica-Moldova

160 members. Another professional network of Women Secretaries was created under CALM with support of JILDP.

JILDP has made an essential contribution to empowering Roma women, through supporting the creation and further strengthening of the Romani Women and Girls. The Network is very active and has high prospects for sustainability, also demonstrating first "tangible" results, by election of two Roma women as local councillors.

Needless to say that JILDP has promoted women's empowerment throughout the program, in all its components. Thus, women were particularly encouraged to start-up a business or supported to extend an existing one, as well as, taking the lead and establishing community based organisations.

5.4.2. Partnerships and cooperation

This section provides an analysis of the partnerships and cooperation of the Programme with other development partners.

Partnership with the Government was strategic. Government of Moldova, its State Chancellery, Ministries and relevant institutions as well as LPAs have been main strategic partners of the Programme. The team ensured close cooperation and support to the government institutions, basing its interventions on the articulated priorities and needs. Stakeholder consultations and site observations confirm that JILDP team included them in planning and implementation of interventions, responding to their needs for different kinds of support (to capacity building, support to strategic planning, introducing innovative methods, granting, etc.) Cooperation with LPAs, particularly in the context of the support to the local development, has been effective.

The partnership with the **Academy for Public Administration** was fruitful. The Academy is an important stakeholder for JILDP since 2012, when JILDP developed a training programme for LPAs and CPAs about decentralisation. During 2013-2015, a more comprehensive training program was carried out. Several companies were contracted to develop training modules on public procurement, public finance management, human resources management, public property management. A ToT was organized and later, 30 trainings were carried out for all employees of the target communities. The courses which have been developed are now used by the APA in its curriculum. In May 2015 JILDP supported the development of the platform for distance learning. APA representatives highly praised their cooperation with JILDP, outlining the staff' responsiveness and professionalism. At the same time, for JILDP, the partnership with APA contributes to securing sustainability of the training effort, as well as enhancing local ownership of the project activities.

Partnerships with Civil Society and Private Sector were effective. JILDP partnered with CSOs and businesses in provision of capacity building and mentoring support to LPAs, local CSOs and businesses. This cooperation was effective as it offered the space for building local expertise but also profiling CSOs and businesses as leaders in local development. Also, efforts to build grass roots civil society and citizen activism was a needed and welcome component of local development and creation of vibrant civil society.

Partnership between UNDP and UN Women was effective in achieving the objectives of the Programme. The two UN Agencies implemented joint programme in successful

partnership, relying on knowledge and expertise base towards joint goals. Interviews with teams of the two agencies reveal good cooperation based on open communication of potential problems or issues arising from differing procedures or approaches. A joint monitoring and evaluation mechanism was established, as agreed by both UNDP and UN Women teams in JILDP, and guided the program activity throughout the cycle. Joining forces, the two agencies succeeded to build in the HRBa and gender equality into the efforts of the Programme and the government, also ensuring holistic approach was applied.

Coordination and cooperation with other development partners was open and ensured avoiding overlaps. JILDP ensured a good cooperation with other stakeholders present in the area of local development and decentralization, particularly ensuring that the common activities such as trainings to LPAs and regionally, conferences and support activities are not overlapping. For example, synergies were observed in organizing joint events with GIZ and USAID, such as conferences. (e.g. the National Decentralization Conference to be held in November 2015) as well as coordination in implementing IMC-related activities, while training activities have also been coordinated to avoid duplication. In cases where multiple development partners support some initiative, for instance CALM and the Academy for Public Administration, coordination was ensured to avoid double financing. JILDP also used the USAID-developed web-page format for local governments that can be adapted and used by all communities.

5.5 EFFICIENCY

Have resources (financial, human, technical support, etc.) been allocated strategically to achieve the Programme outcomes?
Have the outputs been delivered in a timely manner? Was programme design approach considered a viable and relevant execution instrument to attain development results?
To what extent were relevant stakeholders and actors included in the Programme planning and implementation, as well as policy advocacy processes?
Does the Programme have effective joint monitoring mechanisms in place to measure progress towards results?
How adaptably and rapidly did Programme react to changing country context?

JILDP is a joint programme implemented by UNDP and UN Women, applying National Implementation Modality. Joining forces of the two agencies towards supporting integrated local development has been a suitable choice as the two agencies brought into the programme their mandates, expertise and experiences toegether with UN impartiality and neutrality in implementation of inteventions.

Utilisation of funds through the joint programme was efficient and generally effective. The Joint Programme has succeeded in the phase of focus of this Evaluation to define procedures and processes applied by the two UN agencies, ensuring efficiency of Programme implementation. The Project was steered by the Programme Steering Committee, which ensured transparency and accountability of the programme in selection of partners, grants through decision making and monitoring of the programme performance.

The JILDP is a multidimensional and complex intervention, working on a number of policy and local development thematic areas, which bring value in holistic approach to the local development, but brings the risk of fragmentation and spreading resources too thin. This is particularly relevant taking into account the withdrawal of SIDA funding, which affected the outcomes significantly. The review of financial project data and narrative reports, and consultations with programme partners show that JILDP was still able to achieve a lot with limited resources. The total amounts made available to grass roots organisations through small grants were 5,000 USD, making them for the most part significant contribution for their start-up. The achievements made with these small grants were particularly relevant and useful for local communities given the new practices and tools they acquired, including in fund-raising. Another set of grants, 15,000 USD were offered to the LPAs for improvement of most needed local services. Additionally, 5,000 USD grants were given to LPAs for institutional development. Cooperation agreements signed with CSO partners implementing training activities had an average size of 68,000 USD, amounting to 340,000 USD in total. IMC grants valued 1,452,500 altogether. Business grants value of 176,500 USD.

Nevertheless, consulted stakeholders agreed that the contribution was highly relevant. This was also due to the fact that the provided financial assistance was complemented by ongoing technical assistance, advice, and support from Programme teams.

The Programme's efficiency was enhanced by an experienced team of local experts and outsourced consultants. JILDP team members have extensive experience from the previous phases of the programmes. The team has been further strengthened by outsourcing local expertise for Community Facilitators, LED consultants and CSOs which implemented trainings and other relevant capacity building activities. The choice of having different consultants for

each target group (LPA, community mobilization, Roma inclusion) was a strategic one for the Program and proved to be highly effective. Each of these groups need a particular approach as well as special knowledge and skills, and makes it clear that separate, specialized consultants would make best value. For promoting the HRBA and GE principles at community level, of particular importance was the contracting of community facilitators with professional background in human rights issue. They have managed to bring HRBA and gender sensitivity and understanding to the local community and local decision-makers. On the other hand, the programme is led by a Moldovan, which is positive practice and also contributes to efficient allocation of budget. All other team members and community facilitators are also local staff, however only two Community Facilitators are based outside of the capital. Employing local expertise is a significant value added for the Programme both in terms of utilization of local skills and expertise, efficiency and as a measure to further invest in human capital by utilising and building on the experience and expertise of local experts.

Document review and stakeholder consultations point to the fact that **outputs have been delivered in a timely manner and that the programme approaches and interventions were viable and efficient** in achievement of results. Also, the interviews reveal programme's openness and inclusion of partners from the government and civil society in planning and implementation of the programme activities, strengthening the relevance of the Programme to developmental context of Moldova.

5.6 SUSTAINABILITY

What is the likelihood that the benefits from the Programme will be maintained for a reasonably long period of time after the Programme phase out?
How effectively has the programme been able to contribute to the generation of national ownership of the results achieved, the establishment of effective partnerships and the development of national capacities?
To what extent has the programme been able to promote replication of Programme successes?

The Programme has made appropriate and largely successful efforts to create or strengthen existing conditions likely to foster the continuation of the decentralization reforms in the country. These efforts are presented in this section.

The programme was steered by national government, ensuring ownership over and relevance of interventions and achieved results. The Programme ensured that partners were not only beneficiaries, but co-creators and drivers of different initiatives. All processes included local government counterparts, ensuring the information, ownership but also informed advocacy by local governments for adoption and implementation of reforms.

Overall, policy level interventions guarantee the sustainability of a development effort. In the Moldovan context it was difficult to advance policy change, yet the Programme managed to "influence" political will, through consistent promotion of policies and constant dialogue with decision-makers. Many policies need to be adopted, but it is deemed that with the JILDP contribution a good start for more comprehensive reforms has been made and upcoming government will take over and follow up.

The programme contributed to strengthening the overall **enabling environment** for addressing local development and decentralization. This was done through strengthening evidence base and policy alternatives through relevant research and data on territorial, fiscal and overall decentralization context in Moldova and international experiences, integrating local development dimension, which will remain available to stakeholders beyond the duration of the programme. Extensive research was done in the area of territorial-administrative reform, hence, the future decision-makers have all arguments on the table to make a well-informed decision and implement the reform successfully.

The programme helped to develop individual and organisational capacities of key actors (duty bearers as well as rights holders), and supported these actors to move the development of local communities forward. This is an important investment and brings sustainable change at individual but also to some extent community level of the ways in which actors understand local development, decentralization and inclusion and exchanged between duty bearers and right holders. Through its activities (capacity building, community mobilization, transparency and awareness-raising), the programme has contributed to changing the mind-set of local public authorities as well as of the local population. This is a result which is going to last and produce impact over time.

The programme facilitated exchanges, joint initiatives and platforms for cooperation and networking among national and local actors, thereby enhancing actual and potential future coordination and cooperation efforts among them. This is an important investment in sustaining the initiatives steered by the programme towards territorial and decentralization reforms, but also in strengthening efficiency of duty bearers.

The programme implemented a number of trainings and capacity building activities in cooperation with local CSOs and the Academy for Public Administration, facilitating **institutionalisation** of capacity building packages through incorporating them in (mandatory) training programmes for public officials and civil servants, and by supporting the development of practice-oriented guidelines and manuals (e.g. IMC guide).

The IMC support resulted in establishment of Service Operators and also improvement of services, but also in enabling clusters of communities to benefit from the Regional Development Fund, which supports local and regional initiatives. The IMCs established with support of the Programme are sustainable and self-standing, without the need for government subsidies. Also, their initiative to organise commercial activities is a good investment in longer term sustainability.

However, there are many contextual factors beyond the immediate influence of the programme or other actors that **threaten the sustainability** of the achievements that the programme has contributed to that are discussed in the section 5.3.1. of this Report. Key issue affecting sustainability of the programme results is the political factors and lack of common vision of the Moldovan government to continue the reforms that are of vital relevance for local development. The programme established evidence base and policy alternatives for necessary reforms. Now, government has all necessary justification for all these new reform laws and strategies but it needs political will and support for their adoption and further implementation. These reform processes are complex, and the programme's value added was to support necessary reform preparations, so that the government has all background information and policy options on the table for faster decision making and adoption of the documents. However, adoption of reform documents is beyond the influence of the Programme and will depend on the government/political readiness to embrace reforms.

The Programme is also deemed to have an important spill-over effect. Even though it technically involved 74 communities altogether, in various activities, the number of communities who will indirectly benefit from the Programme is larger. On one hand, there has been evidence that neighbouring communities have approached the LPA from target communities to ask for support in replicating some of the results of the capacity building program, such as drafting some internal regulations, clarifying some financial provisions, etc. On the other hand, the IMC will certainly provide a best practice of cooperation between communities as well as of efficient organization of public service delivery, which will be taken over by other communities in time.

6. LESSONS LEARNED

The Programme implementation thus far generated relevant lessons learnt for a potential successor Programme. The lessons learnt are:

- **Investment in strengthening local level good governance through investment in LPAs and on community mobilization (through strengthening CSOs and entrepreneurship) brings positive outcomes for citizens.** Data gathered through this evaluation shows that there is potential for positively affecting livelihoods by programmes that offer holistic approach towards strengthening duty bearers and empowering right holders.
- **Local development cannot be achieved without investment in integration of good governance principles and mechanisms in practices of both duty bearers and right holders**. The programme supports raising awareness, enhancing approaches and improving practices for transparent, accountable and participatory decision making and prioritization at local (and central) levels of governance. Further investment in integration of good governance in (preferably all) interventions supported through its successor Programme of JILDP will be of utmost importance for improved outcomes and impacts of the Programme.
- **Modeling new approaches to service delivery and basing advocacy for new policy or legislative solutions for improvement of public services is a good approach.** JILDP modelled IMCs and based its advocacy with the government on positive experiences and lessons learned gathered. Showcasing new practices and models assists government to grasp the extent to which new approaches can facilitate development, which in turn facilitates adopting decisions and legislative/policy solutions for replication of such practices.
- **Co-financing from LPAs may be a challenge due to reasons such as budget limitations, political interests, and lack of strategic approach in development work.** However, flexibility of programme to work with LPAs and explore different avenues for local fundraising (even from citizens) and including community organizations in this process has showed positive outcomes and was welcomed by LPAs and citizens.
- **Strengthening capacities and changing institutional culture needs champions of change, characterized by motivation, commitment and trust that the change will bring benefits to the institution and wider community.** Mathematical selection of targeted LPAs or central government beneficiaries is not enough – it does not analyse the ambition of the municipality/institution. Competitive selection of municipalities may bring additional results in programmes focusing on local development.
- **Grants for LPAs provide good opportunity to apply the community mobilization practices in small projects.** Although higher costs are associated, grants programs for LPAs constitute an important financial input for communities to practice their acquired knowledge while also solving communal needs. Also, the fact should not be underestimated that grants give motivation for the local administration to actively participate in the capacity building activities, thus a combination of the two tools is effective.
- **Continued, longer term engagement with national partners facilitates results achievement.** The good example is cooperation with LPAs and central government counterparts as well as CSOs. Such investments into long-term partnerships are valuable as they bring ownership over processes, and support to introduction of new concepts. These partnerships need to be further strengthened and government and CSO capacity increased for more in-depth work on the issues of service provision.

7. CONCLUSIONS

This chapter sets out the Evaluators' conclusions on the strategy and performance of the JILDP Programme based on the triangulation of data gathered through desk review, interviews and focus group discussions as well as site observations.

The programme has been relevant in view of existing and emerging priorities of the Moldovan government to furthering the decentralisation reforms and in light of existing gaps in evidence-based policy inputs and solutions at central and local levels and also low awareness and skills of relevant actors of the process, new mechanisms and their benefits. The project addressed important gaps in the evidence base for existing and new policy frameworks, as well as capacity development needs of partners from government, civil society and business sector. The project also addressed the needs of right holders: most vulnerable groups, through empowering them to take more active part in community life.

Evaluation findings as regards contribution to envisaged results are positive, overall, albeit lower effects are recorded for support to policy level. The programme has succeeded in achieving strong results in its work with local level duty bearers and right holders. However, the achievements in the area policy making are partial, mainly due to external political factors, beyond control of the Programme. At policy level, contributions are visible in encouraging dialogue and supporting evidence based and inclusive policy making processes, albeit not all supported policy processes materialised in adopted and implemented policies. At local level, the Programme achieved a lot of promising results in stimulating an inclusive process of municipal planning and service delivery with enhanced good governance mechanisms. Programme's support to LPAs, CSOs, business and inter-municipal cooperation enhances access to social services, thus improving livelihoods and increasing economic prospects. Cooperation between civil society and local governments towards enabling access to, empowerment of vulnerable groups, and strengthening mechanisms for citizen participation are already bringing results in the communities.

JILDP has been efficiently implemented, contributing to effectiveness of results. Yet, the programme has tackled a range of issues at different levels of governance and involving diverse stakeholders, both duty bearers and right holders, which provides the risk of spreading resources thing and fragmentation. This risk was mitigated by JILDP's experienced team with expertise in policy making and local development as well as ongoing support by both UN Agencies involved in the programme and the donor. Management efforts by JILDP team were appropriate and contributed to the effective and efficient implementation of planned initiatives. While grants and cooperation agreements with individual partners varied in size, they often contributed to achieving results that have the potential to positively influence further development of communities and partners.

However, the *sustainability prospects of the Programme achievements are mixed*. Envisaged policy changes have not been achieved as planned, which makes the sustainability of the development efforts limited only to areas where government response was ensured in the form of adopted policies/legislation (e.g. Sectorial decentralisation strategies for education, social protection; Regulation for IMCs, etc.). At local level, acquired skills and institutionalised governance mechanisms, services and practices have higher sustainability prospects. Improved and established infrastructure and structures (IMCs, businesses, CSOs, social and community infrastructure) have also high sustainability prospects. Also, staff turnover, frequent institutional changes reduce the benefits of capacity building investment.

8. RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendations presented below are based on the findings and conclusions of the evaluation as well as on consultation with all key stakeholders that were interviewed during the field phase. Each interview and discussion group has checked the perceptions of various stakeholders (government counterparts, UNDP and UN Women, development and programme partners and beneficiaries) concerning the priorities of reforms of local government that need to be addressed in the coming years (see Interview Guides in Annex 2). Validation of recommendations was done in two phases: 1) during de-briefing session with UNDP and UN Women, 2) following submission of the draft report with evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendations.

. For ease of reference, recommendations are divided into two categories, as follows:

> **S - Strategic recommendations (2)**

> **PD - Programming and delivery (3)**

No	Recommendation
Strategic (S)	
S1	**Continue the initiatives started by the Programme towards further institutionalisation of positive results and to contribute to the Programme goal** *to support better and equitable service provision and sustainable local development, facilitated by the improved legal and institutional framework resulting from the implementation of the National Decentralization Strategy.*
	The joint development initiative of UNDP and UN Women, government partners and donors for enabling stronger framework for advancement of decentralisation reforms and strengthening duty bearers and right holders should be continued. The JILDP Programme laid foundations for good governance and more inclusive policy processes and created momentum for change. This momentum should not be lost but utilised for supporting government to reach the national and international priorities and standards in service provision and policy making. The new programme should include, but not be limited to efforts to:
	At central level: Further support and advocacy for territorial-administrative reform as a prerequisite for all other related reform activities in different sectors
	At local and regional levels: Continued capacity building of selected LPAs to apply good governance principles in developmental planning and service provision (insisting on transparency, accountability, effectiveness and efficiency of municipal operations, while ensuring participation and inclusion of citizens);
	Replication of good practices of IMCs and PPPs for better service provision;

No	Recommendation
	Continue with in-country exchange visits between target communities and eventually include communities not covered by the project, to contribute to possible spill-over effect. Invest in CSOs as drivers of change and community development, empowering them to be policy actors; Integrate entrepreneurship and business development initiatives in the programme support to local development
S2	**Conduct Impact Assessment of the (J)ILDP Programme(s)** The (J)ILDP Programme has been investing significant efforts and resources in building policies, capacities and new models of services and good governance approaches since its first programme which started in 2007. Impact assessment of the (J)ILDP is seen as an important process to gain knowledge on effects and impacts of these interventions within the Programme. It should be an in-depth assessment of outcomes and impacts of the development interventions on duty bearers and right holders, and should apply sound impact assessment methodologies. Such assessment will be used for designing better development policies at national and local level, as well as for creating new development interventions that will better suit the needs of local government units and citizens. It is recommended that the potential successor Programme is designed based on a comprehensive impact assessment, which would serve as a baseline study for Programme's results (and indicators).
Programming and delivery (PD)	
P1	**Ensure good governance principles are mainstreamed into all development efforts towards integrated local development** Integration of some good governance principles in Programme activities has already been bringing positive results. Further on-going efforts towards integrated local development should ensure good governance principles are imperative for all efforts in order to benefits for LPAs and impacts on improvement of livelihoods. Also, it will contribute to improvement of investment prospects of municipalities, as they will contribute to better competitiveness. The future impact and long term sustainability can be enhanced by focusing on good governance elements.
P2	**Identify and provide capacity building support to local/community experts (agents of change) for community facilitation and mobilization (Community Facilitators)** During the evaluation, the benefits of outsourcing Community facilitators have been visibly shown. The programming of such future efforts should ensure that local/community experts (agents of change) are identified and capacity building support to them is provided towards strengthening critical mass of local experts in targeted communities or regions is maintained.
P3	**Continue investing in local economic development and IMCs** The Programme has established important foundations and developed successful models for economic development and IMCs. These models should be further replicated in the follow up and other UN/DP programmes.
P4	**Invest in CSOs representing business interests (e.g. Business associations, associations of employers, etc.)**

No	Recommendation
	Invest in CSOs as drivers of change, empowering them to be policy actors (evidence based advocacy) from different areas of business sector to enable them to influence policies relating to economic and business development (e.g. supporting advocacy in agribusiness by agribusiness associations).

ANNEX 1. EVALUATION MATRIX

No.	Evaluation question	Judgment criteria	Indicator	Sources of information
Relevance				
EQ 1.	How does the Programme design match with the complexity of national structures, systems and decision-making processes?	• Alignment of PD objectives and activities to the complexity of national structures, systems and decision-making processes for advancement of availability of resources, and effective local management to deliver efficient, equitable and accessible local public services, to facilitate sustainable development and foster social inclusion.	▪ Evidence of consistency between needs and priorities of local communities and complexity of national/regional/local structures, systems and decision-making processes <u>and</u> the PD objectives and activities of the Programme	PD and progress reports Key legislation on decentralisation and local development Relevant strategic documents Relevant studies and reports National and local reports, research studies Interviews with key stakeholders
EQ 2.	Is the Programme design based on quality analysis, including gender and human rights based analysis, risk assessments, socio-cultural and political analysis?	• Programme design founded on the needs assessments; human rights based analysis, socio-cultural and political analysis and risk assessments focusing on targeted groups.	• Evidence of consistency between needs and priorities for human rights and the strategy/approach developed by the Programme. • Evidence of rooting the PD on risk, socio-cultural and political analysis	Programme document
EQ 3.	Were the programmatic strategies appropriate to	▪ Alignment of the Programme with	▪ Evidence of consistency between needs and priorities	National and local reports, research studies

		needs and priorities identified in national/regional and local strategies aimed to guide and advance availability of resources, and effective local management to deliver efficient, equitable and accessible local public services, to facilitate sustainable development and foster social inclusion.	for local development and the strategy/approach developed by the Programme	Interviews with key stakeholders Programme reports
Effectiveness				
EQ 4.	What has been the progress made towards achievement of the expected outcomes and expected results? What are the results achieved?	▪ The Programme produced the outputs planned for the reference period[16] ▪ Progress achieved at outputs level is likely to lead to intended results (quantitative and qualitative)	• % outputs and results achieved (indicators) • Quality of outputs and results • The Programme has a well defined intervention logic, demonstrating how the outputs will produce the intended results • Evidence and examples of high/poor effectiveness	Programme reports (progress and field monitoring) Interviews with stakeholders, focus groups and discussion groups Site visits to a selected number of municipalities, including interviews with final beneficiaries
EQ 5.	What were the key factors influencing the achievement or non-achievement of the	• Extent to which external factors affect the operations of the Programme	• Evidence of external factors and their effects on the Programme operations • Evidence of successful	Programme reports (yearly, monitoring) Site visits Interviews with key stakeholders

---

[16] Reference period is 2013 – October 2015, i.e. the Programme implementation period subject to this evaluation

	Programme objectives to date?		mitigation strategies for risks and assumptions	
EQ 6.	To what extent have capacities of relevant duty-bearers and rights-holders been strengthened?	▪ Capacity building activities enhanced the knowledge, skills and abilities of government actors in advancement of availability of resources, and effective local management to deliver efficient, equitable and accessible local public services, to facilitate sustainable development and foster social inclusion. ▪ Quality of capacity building packages/programmes (training packages, guides, manuals) developed with the Programme support	Government actors use the knowledge and skills acquired to overcome constraints and improve the coverage of advancement of availability of resources, and effective local management to deliver efficient, equitable and accessible local public services, to facilitate sustainable development and foster social inclusion. • Local government counterparts use the knowledge and skills acquired to implement local policies and measures for advancement of availability of resources, and effective local management to deliver efficient, equitable and accessible local public services, to facilitate sustainable development and foster social inclusion.	Relevant assessments, reviews, evaluations, researches, studies on local and regional development Programme reports (progress, field monitoring) Site visits Interviews with key stakeholders and discussion groups Focus groups Programme outputs (curricula, manuals, training packages) Training reports
EQ 7.	To what extent has the joint programme promoted or led to improved communication, synergies, coordination and collaboration among national stakeholders, e.g. between different line ministries and among government and civil	The Joint Programme intervention approach promoted and enhanced functioning coordination, synergies and communication with stakeholders and beneficiaries (local and national government, civil society, and other actors	▪ Level of coordination and cooperation between partners in activities contributing to Programme objectives ▪ Programme contains strong reference to coordination mechanisms between partners • Programme document	▪ Programme documents and Reports ▪ Meeting minutes ▪ Government and donor Reports ▪ Interviews with partners

		operating nationally and locally)	contains reference to other interventions promoted by government, civil society and donors and other actors	
EQ 8.	To what extent this joint programme affected increased collaboration, coordination, and information exchange between UNDP and UN Women in relation to local development?	Complementarity, coordination and collaboration between UNDP and UN Women Regular consultations and coordination between the two UN Agencies, particularly within the efforts focusing on local development	▪ Level of coordination and cooperation between partners in Programme ▪ PD contains strong reference to coordination mechanisms between partners ▪ PD contains references to other interventions implemented by the two UN Agencies • Examples of synergies between UNDP and UN Women Programmes contributing to local development	▪ Programme Reports ▪ Meeting minutes ▪ UNDP/UN Women Reports ▪ Interviews
EQ 9.	To what extent has this joint programme modality contributed to inter-agency networking, informal information exchange, a constructive team spirit, a conscious feeling of being a member of one UN family, etc. among the UN agencies involved in the design and implementation of this programme?	Intended contributions to inter-agency networking, informal information exchange, a constructive team spirit, a conscious feeling of being a member of one UN family, etc. among the UN agencies involved in the design and implementation of this programme (i) have been achieved, (ii) have been partially achieved (in which areas) or (iii) have not been achieved	▪ Quality of inter-agency networking, informal information exchange, a constructive team spirit, a conscious feeling of being a member of one UN family, ▪ Evidence and examples of high/poor inter-agency networking, informal information exchange, a constructive team spirit, a conscious feeling of being a member of one UN family	▪ Programme reports (annual and monitoring) ▪ Interviews with UNDP and UN Women teams

Efficiency				
EQ10.	Have resources (financial, human, technical support, etc.) been allocated strategically to achieve the Programme outcomes?	▪ Administration and management arrangements and information flows are appropriately ensured at reasonable cost ▪ Financial and human resources spent for the achievement of outputs and results are adequate	▪ Management and administrative tasks being discharged timely and respecting established deadlines ▪ Adaptation/flexibility in Programme implementation ▪ Examples of management intervention for overcoming barriers and constraints in Programme implementation	▪ Programme reports (annual, monitoring) ▪ Interviews with UNDP and UN Women staff ▪ Interviews with stakeholders and beneficiaries ▪ Site visits to selected communities
EQ 11.	Have the outputs been delivered in a timely manner? Was programme design approach considered a viable and relevant execution instrument to attain development results?	• Management of the Programme ensured timeliness and efficient use of resources	▪ Evidence that chosen management modalities provided for needed efficiency, timely delivery and adaptation/flexibility in Programme implementation	Programme reports (annual, monitoring) Interviews with stakeholders and beneficiaries Site visits
EQ 12.	To what extent were relevant stakeholders and actors included in the Programme planning and implementation, as well as policy advocacy processes?	▪ Relevant stakeholders and actors are systematically involved in Programme planning and implementation, as well as policy planning processes	▪ Evidence of participation of relevant stakeholders and actors in Programme planning and implementation, ▪ Evidence of participation of relevant stakeholders and actors in policy processes	▪ Interviews with partners ▪ Programme report ▪ Site visits
EQ 13.	Does the Programme have effective joint monitoring mechanisms in place to measure	▪ Monitoring and reporting tools are appropriate and ensure evidence	▪ Monitoring and reporting tasks being conducted with quality	Programme reports (annual, monitoring) Interviews with UNDP and UN Women staff

	progress towards results?	based reporting and reflection		▪ Interviews with donors, government, partners
EQ 14.	How adaptably and rapidly did Programme react to changing country context?	▪ Flexibility of the Programme to adapt to the changing country context	▪ Evidence of successful mitigation strategies for risks and assumptions	Programme reports (yearly, monitoring) Site visits ▪ Interviews with key stakeholders
Sustainability				
EQ 15.	What is the likelihood that the benefits from the Programme will be maintained for a reasonably long period of time after the Programme phase out?			
EQ 16.	How effectively has the programme been able to contribute to the generation of national ownership of the results achieved, the establishment of effective partnerships and the development of national capacities?	▪ Commitment of the government exists to continue working on local development	▪ Institutional strategies are in use by beneficiaries ▪ Supporting legislation/policies in place ▪ Government policies towards the relevant sectors encourage/ require regular maintenance and continuation ▪ Quantitative targets of the respective Programme are met (continue to be met)	▪ Administrative data from government (if available); ▪ Monitoring and Evaluation Reports; ▪ Interviews with government, programming and implementing actors, and beneficiaries of the Programme
EQ 17.	To what extent has the programme been able to promote replication of Programme successes?	▪ Extent to which UNDP/UN Women are able to promote replication of Programme success	▪ Evidence of UNDP/UN Women's ability to promote replication of Programme success	Interviews with key stakeholders and donors Programme document Programme reports

Programme Staff

Identification (name, gender, position, contact details, relevant experience, coordinates), date and location.

1. How do the Programme Interventions relate to strategic to national goals in the field of local development? How did the interventions contribute to achievement of targets within the National Decentralisation Strategy and the National Strategy for Regional Development 2013-2015?
2. Tell us about your Programme activities? What specific measures did you implement?
3. What have been the main achievements of your Programme?
4. Which long term effects can be well attributed to Programme interventions? How these achievements relate to improvement of availability of resources, effective local management to deliver efficient, equitable and accessible local public services, to facilitate sustainable development and foster social inclusion?
5. What is the evidence of achievement of the Programme objective in your view? (i) has been achieved, (ii) has been partially achieved (in which areas) or (iii) has not been achieved? Why?
6. What other possible outputs could have been planed to increase Programme's contribution to the achievement of the objective?
7. Which were the main constraints/challenges during preparation and implementation? (prompt political, social, economic, administrative, etc.)
8. Do you have a developed mitigation strategy? Pls, share with us
9. Did communication and coordination work with government, civil society and other actors well for your Programme?
10. Did coordination between UNDP and UN Women work well for your Programme? What were the challenges? How were they overcome?
11. How well have the implementation of activities been managed in terms of a) quality, b) timeliness; c) administration; d) finances?
12. What monitoring and reporting tools have been used?
13. How strong is the level of ownership of the results by the relevant government entities and other stakeholders?
14. What is the level of capacity of the Government to ensure sustainability of the results?
15. Do you think there are any lessons/recommendations that should be considered for the future?
16. What are the most important priorities for the next phase of the programme?
17. What should be the focus of the programme and what activities would bring most benefits for integrated local development? How can they be implemented? Who should be the partners?
18. What modality of the programme would be efficient?
19. What are the main risks? How can they be mitigated?

Donors/International partners

Identification (name, gender, position, contact details, relevant experience), date and location.

1. Do you consider that the JILDP Programme has been is an adequate and balanced response to the identified needs in Moldova?
2. How would you describe the level of efficiency and effectiveness of the Programme in making contributions to improvement of availability of resources, effective local management to deliver efficient, equitable and accessible local public services, to facilitate sustainable development and foster social inclusion?
3. Is coordination and cooperation between UNDP and UN Women sound and does it deliver the desired outputs and results? Which are the main constraints?
4. Can you provide an illustration of impact achieved by the Programme?
5. How do you assess the achieved degree of sustainability for the Programme?
6. What is the level and quality of dialogue between UNDP, UN Women, government, civil society, donors, other actors in planning and implementing the Programme?
7. What is the added value of Programme support in the field of local development?
8. Do you think there are any lessons/recommendations regarding UN Joint interventions in the area of local development that should be considered for the future?
9. What are the main priorities for local development in the context of reforms of local governance in Moldova?
10. What kind of activities would bring most benefits to local development? What should be the focus?
11. Are UNDP/UN Women well placed to continue supporting integrated local development?
12. What other initiatives for local development are implemented with your or other donors' support?

Wider donor community:
1. Do you consider that the JILDP support is an adequate and balanced response to the identified needs in Moldova?
2. Is coordination and cooperation sound and does it deliver the desired outputs and results? Which are the main constraints?
3. Do national and donor coordination work well for the Programme?
4. What is the value added of Programme support?
5. Do you think there are any lessons/recommendations that should be considered for the future?
6. What are the main priorities for local development in the next phase of the reforms in Moldova?
7. What kind of activities would bring most benefits to local development? What should be the focus?
8. Are UNDP/UN Women well placed to continue supporting integrated local development?
9. What other initiatives for local development are implemented with your or other donors' support?

Government and other national counterparts, beneficiaries

Identification (name, gender, position, contact details, relevant experience), date and location.

1. Do you consider that the JILDP support given to your institution was adequate and a balanced response to the identified needs?
2. Does the Programme support correspond to the national/local strategic priorities and your institution/sector strategies?
3. How would you describe the level of efficiency and effectiveness of the JILDP structures in terms of taking into account local community/country-specific views and needs of your institution?
4. Was Programme implementation sound and did it deliver the desired outputs and results? What have been the main results achieved?
5. Which were the main constraints during implementation?
6. Are the results of the Programme implemented in partnership with your institution (beyond the output level) well documented and if so, what are these?
7. Can you provide an illustration of impact achieved by the Programme implemented in partnership with your institution?
8. How do you assess the achieved a degree of sustainability of the Programme implemented in partnership with your institution?
9. What was the level and quality of dialogue between UNDP/UN Women, government, civil society, donors, other actors in planning and implementing the Programme?
10. Do you think there are any lessons/recommendations that should be considered for the future?
11. What are the most important priorities for the next phase of reforms of local governance in Moldova?
12. Is there a need for continuation of the programme? If yes, what should be the focus of the programme and what activities would bring most benefits for integrated local development? How can they be implemented?
13. Are UNDP/UN Women well placed to continue supporting integrated local development?
14. What other initiatives for local development are implemented in cooperation between your institution and international/local development partners?

The focus group discussions will be organized with target groups or beneficiaries of JILDP interventions (local government representatives, local service users, etc.)

Introduction
- Introduction of the consultant to the group, and of the group members to each other.
- Provision of information on background to the interview:
    - The purpose of the discussion
    - The intended recipients of findings and how they will be used
    - How feedback will be handled (issues of anonymity, confidentiality, data protection, etc).
    - Rules of the focus group: who speaks when and agreement on how to indicate when one wants to speak
    - The amount of time the discussion is anticipated to take
- Answering any questions participants may have.

Discussion Topics

1. Overall context

- *How is the current operating environment for starting local development?*
- *What have been the main changes in past few years? [Prompt government approach; funding]*

2. Effectiveness of the JILDP interventions
- *What was the most important benefit or result of the [type of assistance] you received? (Each to name one.)*
- *What was most difficult problem you faced in applying the knowledge/support received in [training/technical assistance/other] activities?*

3. Recommendations
- *How do you think your experience of this [type of assistance] could have been improved?*
- *What are your recommendations for future support by UN Agencies (what are the priorities)?*
- *What are the main priorities for local development in the context of reforms of local governance in Moldova?*
- *What kind of activities would bring most benefits to local development? What should be the focus?*
- *Are UNDP/UN Women well placed to continue supporting integrated local development?*

Rounding up
- *Is there anything further anyone would like to add about any of the issues we've discussed, that you feel you've not had a chance to say?*
- *Is there anything anyone would like to add about any issue we've not really covered which you feel reflects an important aspect of your experience?*

End of Discussion
Thanking participants for attending and giving feedback.

ANNEX 4. LIST OF INTERVIEWS

No.	Name	Position
1.	Dafina Gercheva	UNDP Moldova Resident Representative
2.	Narine Sahakyan	UNDP, Deputy Resident Representative
3.	Valeria Ieseanu	UNDP, Portfolio Manager
4.	Monica Moldovan	UNDP, Advisor
5.	Doina Munteanu	UNDP, Portfolio Manager
6.	Ulzii Jamsran	UN Women Country Representative
7.	Lucretia Ciurea	UN Women, M&E Officer
8.	Elena Spinu	JILDP, programme analyst
9.	Mihai Roscovan	Program manager, UNDP
10.	Olesea Cazacu	Project Manager, JILDP
11.	Zina Adam	Capacity Building Consultant, JILDP
12.	Ghenadie Ivaşcenco	IMC Consultant, JILDP
13.	Natalia Suschevici	Finance Associate, JILDP
14.	Tatiana Solonari	Communication Officer, JILDP
15.	Alex Oprunenco	Policy Analyst, UNDP
16.	Victor Munteanu	SCBM Program manager
17.	Sergiu Ceaus	Deputy Secretary General, State Chancellery
18.	Victoria Cujba	Head of the Decentralization Policy Department
19.	Nolina Pomparau	Main specialist, Legal department, Public Property Agency
20.	Tatiana Demidenco	Deputy chief of Directorate for administration of public property, Ministry of Economy
21.	Doruc Mihail	Head of Directorate for administration of public property, Ministry of Economy
22.	Chilaru Natalia	Deputy chief of Legal Department, Public Property Agency
23.	Cornelia Amihalachioae	Officer for Social Performance and Innovation, e-Governance Center
24.	Oxana Casu	Government's e-Transformation, project manager, e-Governance Center
25.	Valerian Bînzari	Chief of Regional Development Department, Ministry of Regional Development and Constructions
26.	Igor Malai	Deputy-Chief Regional Development Departament, Ministry of Regional Development and Constructions
27.	Galina Norocea	Ministry of Environment
28.	Bolocan Svetlana	Head, waste management directorate, Ministry of Environment
29.	Elena Breahnă	Water management division, Ministry of Environment
30.	Dietrich Hahn	GIZ
31.	Valentina Plesca	GIZ
32.	Natalia Iachimov	GIZ
33.	Andrei Groza	Rector APA, Academy of Public Administration
34.	Aurelia Tepordei	Academy of Public Administration

35.	Alexandru Pelivan	Deputy Chief of Party, USAID Local Government Support Project
36.	Irina Ionita	Specialist in communication, monitoring and evaluation, USAID Local Government Support Project
37.	Dmitri Belan	MiLab project manager
38.	Gheorghe Grigoras	Mayor, Ciuciuleni Village
39.	Anatol Gremalschi	Expert, Ministry of Education
40.	Tudor Cojocaru	Head of DAMEP, Ministry of Education
41.	Rodica Josanu	Head of Legal department, Ministry of Education
42.	Focsa Viorel	Entrepreneur supported by JILDP
43.	Viorica Dumbraveanu	Ministry of Labour, Social Protection, and Family
44.	Cristina Raducan	Consultant, Roma Women Network
45.	Rada Padurean	Roma Women Network
46.	Marin Alla	President, Tarna Rom Association
47.	Veaceslav Bulat	Institute for Urban Development
48.	Liubomir Chiriac	IDIS Viitorul
49.	Liviu Andriuta	Business Consulting Institute
50.	Nina Orlova	Programme manager, Swedish Embassy
51.	Vasile Bulicanu	Head of Local Budgets Division, Ministry of Finance
52.	Ion Diaconi	Ministry of Finance
53.	Aurelia Porumbescu	Ministry of Finance
54.	Diana Toma	Ministry of Finance
55.	Tatiana Badan	CALM President, Mayor of Selemet village, Cimislia district
56.	Alexandru Osadci	Coordinator , CALM
57.	Nadejda Darie	Secretary of Network, CALM
58.	Oleg Gospin	Mayor Ivancea,
59.	Valeriu Gutu	Mayor Cioresti
60.	Nicolae Buzu	Mayor, Peresecina
61.	Silvia Cisleanu	Secretary, local council, Rusestii Noi
62.	Petru Codreanu	Mayor, Rusestii Noi
63.	Cirlan Ivan	vice-mayor, Rusestii Noi
64.	Zasmenco Vera	Chief-accountant, Rusestii Noi
65.	Sabina Cotorobai	Predisent of the local council, Rusestii Noi
66.	Iurie Tap	Head of the Specialized Parliamentary Commission on Decentralization, MP
67.	Veaceslav Balan	National Human Rights Coordinator, OHCHR Moldova

Focus group discussion with Community Facilitators

1.	Ghenadie Cojocaru	JILDP community facilitator
2.	Andrei Brighidin	JILDP community facilitator
3.	Constantin Nunu	JILDP community facilitator
4.	Ion Schidu	JILDP community facilitator
5.	Vasile Cioaric	JILDP community facilitator

6.	Olga Gherman	JILDP community facilitator
7.	Silvia Strelciuc	JILDP community facilitator
8.	Mihail Shalvir	JILDP community facilitator
9.	Sofia Ursul	JILDP community facilitator

ANNEX 5. LIST OF DOCUMENTATION CONSULTED

- UNDP Handbook on Monitoring and Evaluating for Results (Annex A)
- UN Women Evaluation Handbook1
- Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation (Annex B)
- UNDP Results-Oriented Annual Report (ROAR, MPTF) for Moldova (2013, 2014)
- JILDP Project Document (Description of Action) and relevant progress reports
- National Development Strategy Moldova 2020
- Government of the Republic of Moldova Activity Programme (2015 – 2018)
- Government of the Republic of Moldova Activity Programme (2011-2014)
- Project documents and progress reports, project evaluation reports
- UNDP Assessment of Development Results, 2012
- United Nations – Republic of Moldova Partnership Framework (UNPF) "Towards Unity in Action" (2013 – 2017)
- UNDP Country Programme Document (CPD) 2013 – 2017
- UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluations
- UNEG Ethical Guidelines
- UNEG Norms for Evaluation in the UN System
- UNEG Standards for Evaluation in the UN System
- UNEG Guidance Integrating Human Rights and Gender in the UN System
- UN SWAP Evaluation Performance Indicator and related Scorecard
- Development Partners' Briefing Book for the Government of Moldova
- National Decentralization Strategy
- National Regional Development Strategy
- EU-Moldova Association Agreement
- EU Progress Reports on Moldova (2012, 2013, 2014)
- Law on local public administration
- Law on local public finances
- Law on administrative decentralization
- Action Plan to support Roma population in Moldova 2011-2015
- Millennium Development Goals Report
- JILDP documents, including project document, narrative and financial reports, previous evaluation reports, products produced within the project
- E-Governance Centre web-site and reports
- National Statistics Office web-site and reports
- Human Development Report 2014
- State of the Nation Report 2015
- MEGA: Analysis of economic growth in Moldova, Expert-Group
- Final Report UNPF Moldova 2013-2017
- International Labor Organization reports
- UNWOMEN reports
- World Bank reports

- Guide for Sectoral decentralization strategies developed
- Draft of the decentralization strategy in culture developed
- Draft of the decentralization strategy in youth and sport developed
- Sectoral decentralization strategy for social services developed
- Methodology of the decentralization strategies in communal service developed
- Sectoral Strategies for decentralization of services in water and sanitation, waste management and natural resources management developed
- Study on perspectives of inter-municipal cooperation in Moldova
- IMC Guide
- National local service delivery regulatory framework related to IMC in organizing and operating legal units for communal services was amended (Government Decision from 03.07.2014 on adjusting the Regulation on municipal enterprises)
- New system of local government finances approved for implementation from 2015, while three rayons and the Capital City piloted the system during 2014 (Law nr.267 from 1.11.2013, http://lex.justice.md/md/350367)
- Study of local revenues and study visit on increasing the local revenue base
- Assessment Report on the impact of the new local public finance system in 74 pilot LPAs
- Public Policy Document on efficient territorial-administrative organization of the Republic of Moldova
- Plan of Action for implementation of the reform of efficient territorial-administrative organization of the Republic of Moldova
- Methodology for monitoring and assessing the degree of implementation of the National Decentralization Strategy
- Strengthening Local Fiscal Autonomy in the Republic of Moldova (study)
- Baseline survey in 30 communities
- Methodology for assessment of LPA capacity

ANNEX 7. PROGRAMME LOG FRAME

Enclosed to the Report as a separate document.