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FOREWORD

This analytical report is part of a complex exercise – the Extended Migration Profile (EMP) of the Republic of Moldova (RM). The entire process of supporting the establishment of the EMP for RM implied a set of multifaceted actions and synergies between all the involved stakeholders and partners and will help to improve the data collection and sharing, promote greater coherence and a more comprehensive and coordinated approach to policy development related to migration.

The key challenges identified prior to implementing the EMP in RM, such as the restricted capacity of government institutions to utilize migration data and evidence for policy development, limited policy coherence, inefficient coordination between involved institutions, the complexity of integrating migration in the wider development context, problems with the accuracy and relevance of the existing migration data as well ensuring national ownership and sustainability of this instrument, have determined the adoption of a process-oriented strategy from the outset until the final steps of its implementation.

As the EMP exercise requires extensive capacity-building and government support, from the beginning, a Technical Working Group (TWG) was established in RM; and for the first time a platform for dialogue between government entities, data users and producers was created to discuss and address jointly issues of data/information sharing, capacity-building and coherent policy development related to migration and to oversee the entire EMP implementation process.

As a very first step to analyse and assess the Moldovan migration statistics’ field information sources and data collection processes, a Data Assessment Report, also providing recommendations on how to improve the current data collection and information sharing was produced. Based on the assessment made, the next step was the development for RM of a template for the regular drafting process of the analytical EMP Report and a set of standardized EMP Indicators – both documents being largely and repeatedly consulted at national level with the TWG members, to also allow for better comparative analysis of migration
trends and policies at regional level. Further on, matrixes based on the EMP list of Indicators were designed for each data-producing/providing institution to organize the data collection along the List of Indicators towards the EMP Report.

One of the challenges faced by the experts during this phase was the data gaps in some migration-related fields. In order to deepen the Government’s understanding of available policy options in such particular areas, and to address the identified data gaps targeted researches such as Diaspora Mapping studies in five destination countries and a study on the Specific Needs of Children and Elderly Left Behind as a Consequence of Labour Migration were also carried out. These technical research papers also proposed mechanisms on how to use data better in support of policy development in the above-mentioned areas.

Based on the EMP template and the data collected according to the EMP Indicators, the first EMP Report for RM was produced. This EMP Report went beyond a concise statistical report, providing a framework for bringing the existing information from different sources together in a structured manner and analysing it as a means to identify and develop strategies to address the data and policy development needs, thus strengthening the evidence base and broadening the evidence application to migration policymaking. Collaboration was established between IOM and the International Labour Organization (ILO) to enhance the EMP process with relevant expertise, in particular the analysis on labour migration issues.

As the wide consultations and national ownership appeared as a condition sine qua non for this tool to guarantee the sustainability of the EMP exercise, the Government assigned the Bureau for Migration and Asylum (BMA) of the Ministry of Internal Affairs to take over the functions for regular production of the EMP jointly with the TWG as a body to coordinate these activities at expert level, thus taking over the process from IOM RM. In this context, a draft Two-Year National Action Plan for developing and updating the EMP was also developed, proposing concrete measures for producing the next editions of this document, and for further work to improve the migration data and the national data and analytical capacity. This document foresees not
only well-defined activities and responsibilities of BMA but also of all the ministries and institutions involved in collecting data and analysing trends in the field of international migration and asylum, for a period of two years.

In addition, considering the migration profile’s “extended” format, this tool was also the first step for the mainstreaming of migration into development planning. In order to promote and validate the EMP at the international level as an advanced innovative planning tool required to promote evidence-based migration and development policies from the perspective of coherence, capacity and cooperation, a workshop on “Mainstreaming Migration into Strategic Policy Development” was jointly carried out, in close link within the Moldovan Migration Profile exercise, part of the Swiss Global Forum for Migration and Development (GFMD) Chairmanship in October 2011. Targeting specifically policymakers, it heightened the awareness of the linkage between migration and development and promoted the channeling of migration data into national policies and strategic documents such as poverty reduction strategies and development plans. In this regard, the Migration Profile exercises aim, inter alia, at enabling policymakers to access the existing evidence in a simple and time-efficient way, to enhance the policymakers’ skills and practices in correctly interpreting available migration evidence and applying it directly to their policymaking decisions.

The implementation of an EMP is one of the deliverables under the EU–Moldova Visa Liberalization Dialogue. As such, the EMP also serves as a key reference document for the consultations on the Moldova 2020 National Development Strategy and the United Nations–Moldova Partnership Framework 2013–2017 operationalization, as well as providing the basis for the quantitative benchmarks for the EU–Moldova Mobility Partnership Impact Evaluation and midterm evaluation of the National Migration and Asylum Strategy. Finally, the recommendations from the initial data assessment build the basis for forthcoming activities aiming to improve the existing evidence base on migration. In this context, by providing comprehensive, accurate, up-to-date and reliable information on current migration trends, RM’s Migration Profile serves the interest of both the EU and RM, and its other international partners.
This exercise, as well as the EMP Report is the result of a joint work performed by a team of national and international experts under the coordination and guidance of IOM:

The international experts, Michel Poulain and Anne Herm, contributed throughout the entire process of the EMP exercise in RM, by developing the Data Assessment Report, the EMP Template and the basic List of Indicators. To ensure the sustainability of this exercise, the international experts also developed a draft Two-Year National Action Plan for further EMP development and updating. Not less important are the overall inputs provided by the experts all the way through the EMP Report writing and endorsement process.

The national experts Maria Vremiş and Viorica Craievshi-Toartă executed the information and data collection, populated the data matrix and calculated statistical indicators. They were lead authors of the EMP, integrated fellow experts’ contributions, executed Parts A and B on demographic, economic and social development, as well as migration and health.

The ILO provided technical inputs and advice to the EMP report on Migration, Employment and Labour Market through Gloria Moreno-Fontes Chammartin, Senior Specialist on Migration Policy; Natalia Popova, Senior Specialist on Employment and Skills; and Francesco Panzica, international human resources development expert within the framework of the EU-funded project Effective Governance of Labour Migration and its Skills Dimensions in RM and Ukraine, implemented by the ILO in partnership with IOM.

Eugeniu Burdelnii developed Parts C and D, respectively analysing the migration management framework and proposing key findings, policy implications and recommendations of the EMP Report.

This report is also the outcome of a large joint effort of data gathering and analysis, to which many institutions and individuals have contributed in different but equally important ways. In that regard, gratitude is expressed to all TWG members and observers for their active participation and important inputs. Maria Vremiş and Viorica Craievshi-Toartă wish to
thank specifically Elena Vătcărău and Ala Negruța at the National Bureau of Statistics (NBS), as well as Olga Poalelungi, formerly of the Academy of Sciences of Moldova (ASM), and Elena Laur from UNICEF for their support. Eugeniu Burdelnii wishes to thank Daniela Morari of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and European Integration (MFAEI) and Diana Hîncu from International Centre for Migration Policy Development (ICMPD) Moldova for the information provided.

Ghenadie Crețu, Silas Rapold, Oxana Maciuca and many other colleagues at the IOM Mission to Moldova office provided intellectual guidance, encouragement and support throughout the process.
# KEY DATA

## Republic of Moldova – Key data

### Geography:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total area</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>33,800 km²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Economy and development:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GDP per capita (in current prices)</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>USD 1,632</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Human Development Index</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>0.649</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Population:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total residents</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>3.56 million</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Estimated forecast</td>
<td>2050</td>
<td>3.13 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreigners</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>20,099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Born abroad</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>253,847</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### International migration:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Net international migration rate, per 1,000 inhabitants</th>
<th>2005–2010</th>
<th>-9.4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2010–2015</td>
<td>-5.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Net number of migrants</th>
<th>2005–2010</th>
<th>-175,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stock of international migrants</td>
<td>2010–2015</td>
<td>-103,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**a** Statistical Yearbook of Moldova 2010 (Chisinau, 2010), p.10.


**e** G. Paladi et al., Population Ageing in the Republic of Moldova: Economic and Social Consequences (Chisinau, ASM, 2009). The forecast was calculated based on three scenarios, for the closed-type population, without taking into consideration migration, but taking into account the lack of some complete data on migration processes. According to the pessimistic scenario, the number of inhabitants may decrease to 2.6 million in 2050. According to the second scenario – moderately pessimistic – it would go down to 2.83 million, and in the third scenario – optimistic down to 3.13 million.

**f** SE CSIR “Registru”, Total number of foreign citizens, including stateless persons, staying on the territory of the Republic of Moldova, as of 31 December of the year of reference. Data submitted for the EMP Matrix.

**g** SE CSIR “Registru”, Number of persons born abroad, regardless of their citizenship, as of 31 December. Data submitted for the EMP Matrix.

**h** Hereinafter, international migration will mean “migration”, except for the cases when the adjunct “internal” is placed in front of the word “migration” or “migrant”.


EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The present Extended Migration Profile (EMP) Report of the Republic of Moldova (RM) is a country-owned tool, prepared in consultation with a broad range of government and non-government stakeholders, to be used to enhance policy coherence, evidence-based policymaking and the mainstreaming of migration into development planning.

The EMP Report comports four elementary blocks of information and analysis, Part A: Migration trends; Part B: Migration impact; Part C: Migration management framework; and Part D: Main findings, policy implications and recommendations. Based on all nationally and internationally available statistical and administrative data, collected for the reference period 2005–2010, and evidence from secondary sources as well as legal, regulatory and policy documents, the Report offers:

- a description of key migratory trends and migrants’ characteristics in Part A;
- an analysis of the impact of migration on development in terms of the interlinkages with demographic, economic, labour force employment and labour market, social and public health development in Part B;
- a succinct explanation of existing migration policies and governance frameworks within national and regional contexts in Part C; and
- policy recommendations and actions on how to promote more effective and humane management of migration, ensure policy coherence across various sectors, and help maximize the positive impact of migration on development and minimize associated risks and negative effects in Part D.

Following broadly the EMP Report structure, this executive summary aims at informing policy and decision makers of the main findings of the report and proposed recommendations, and at presenting a snapshot of RM’s overall situation in terms of international migration, arguing concomitantly how the situation and migratory trends could develop in the short- to midterm future.
Migration trends and patterns

Since proclaiming its independence on 27 August 1991, RM has gone through several migratory periods distinguishable along factors such as push and pull factors, level of prevalence of migration, direction and composition of migratory flows, and duration and legal status of migrants’ stay in host countries. Starting with the turn of the century, migration progressively increased to significant proportions compared to the population. The data series for 2005–2010 analysed for the EMP Report show consistently high annual migration outflow of Moldovan citizens, denoting the involvement in a migration experience of an estimated one-quarter to one-third of the working-age population at any given moment during the reference period.

At this stage, RM is primarily a country of origin of migration, and to a much lesser extent a country of destination or transit for migrants. Regarding the latter, data from the European Agency for the Management of Operational Cooperation at the External Borders of the Member States of the EU (FRONTEX) shows that only an insignificant number of irregular migrants to the EU use RM as transit country. The migration situation is predominantly characterized by emigration of Moldovan citizens, while immigration of non-citizens or foreign-born persons may be described as insignificant from a statistical point of view. The main push factor for Moldovan migrants is economic: poverty, lack of adequate employment opportunities and low salaries, while higher living standards abroad act as a pull factor. From a national migration policy and governance point of view, both immigration and emigration benefit from strong attention in terms of the country’s EU approximation objectives and the amplitude of current and future impact on development in all sectors, respectively.

Emigration

Emigration flows are of the highest interest and concern for RM, and in a situation of population and workforce decline, specifically the number of international emigrants is important, defined by the United Nations as well as the Statistical Office of the European Communities (Eurostat) as persons who change their usual residence by staying abroad for 12 or more months, implying thereby a heightened likelihood of permanent emigration and loss of human capital to the country. A number of internal and external data sources exist with information on migration
of Moldovan citizens, yet none of them would suffice to reliably gauge either the number of international emigrants or the equally highly policy-relevant circularity of temporary migration movements.

In-country, the national Population Registry provides data with multiple variables on the limited number of emigrants who deregistered formally before departure abroad and notified about their new country of residence. Through the Labour Force Survey (LFS) of the National Bureau of Statistics (NBS), it establishes the number of temporary labour migrants representatively for the entire population and with multiple options of disaggregation. Data collected by the Border Guard Service (BGS) on border crossings offer few variables and present a number of technical challenges, but is the only data source proposing insights into the actual duration of stays inside and outside the country of all persons crossing the national border. The Consular Registry of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and European Integration (MFAEI) offers limited insights currently but in perspective will become a valuable complementary data source, linked to the Population Registry. From an external point of view, Eurostat and individual EU Member States provide important data on Moldovan migrants with citizenship and regular stay in the concerned destination countries. Due to the varying data collection methodologies and coverage, the listed data sources offer divergent information both in absolute numerical terms and along variables of migrant stocks and flows composition.

The migrants captured through the Population Registry, dubbed “documented emigrants” in the EMP Report, represent only a cumulative stock of 92,184 emigrants since such records have been systematically kept in electronic form (from 2005). Their analysis shows a higher share of female emigrants; Ukraine, the Russian Federation, Italy, Israel, and the United States of America (USA) as top destinations; a higher share of migrants from urban areas, tendentially equal representation of age groups, and on average high educational attainments. Finally, the analysed data shows a slightly decreasing documented emigration trend starting with 2009. However, contextualizing the annual figures varying during the years of reference between 5,000 and 8,000 persons, it must be observed that these doubtlessly established permanent emigrations could be pictured as the yearly disappearance of two to three large villages or a small town from the map of RM.
Conversely, LFS data, which captures predominantly temporary migrants who still have or visit a household in RM, shows consistently around 300,000 persons, or approximately 25 per cent of the economically active population, who during the reference period recently returned from, worked or intended to work abroad, with an annual average of 311,000 in 2010. Based on the analysed data, no clear trend is distinguishable either of a decrease or further increase of labour migration, beyond a temporary downtrend caused by the onset of the global financial crisis in 2009; 63.7 per cent of migrants in 2010 were male; the Russian Federation (over 60%) and Italy (around 20%) as dominating destination countries followed far behind by Turkey, Israel, Ukraine and Portugal; more than two thirds of migrants were from rural areas; and a 77 per cent representation of the age between 15 and 44 in the total. Important additional remarks pertain to the divergence in composition of migration flows in correlation with the migration corridor or specific country. Thus, the gender gap is characterized by a high prevalence of males among young migrants and progressively flattens out to equal shares in age groups above 35 years old, and in specific cases, such as Italy, women prevail and represent 68 per cent of migrants due to the labour demand. Furthermore, less skilled migrants opt for the Community of Independent States (CIS) migration corridor, Turkey or Israel, and the educated migrants, with secondary to higher education, tend to migrate to the EU. The data also shows that an important group among those with higher education is represented by young persons aged 25–34 years old, who did not enter a job after graduation, likely due to lack of necessary work experience, skills mismatch and reservation wages.

The border crossing data offers highly valuable information in absolute numerical terms about persons abroad disaggregated by duration of stay despite not being fully accurate or comprehensive, inter alia, due to multiple citizenships of travellers and, notably, the uncontrolled border segment in the Transnistrian region. According to BGS data, on 31 December 2010, the stock of persons currently abroad was about 720,000, roughly 285,000 of whom were absent for a period longer than 12 months, and the remaining being abroad for durations qualifying them as excursionists (up to 3 months: 190,000) and short-term migrants (between 3 and 12 months: 245,000). As regards the number of those qualifying as international emigrants, their number has increased by 20 per cent since 2008 alone, the earliest year for which data was obtained.
Furthermore, the border crossing data is similar to the Population Registry’s: a slight prevalence of female international migrants at 52 per cent, and comparable age structure to the other sources, with migrants aged 25–29 years old emerging as the single largest group.

The Eurostat database, with information collected from 30 countries in the European Economic Area (EEA) hosting Moldovan migrants, provides valuable data for comparison with RM’s data. It must be mentioned that these 30 countries do not include all countries where Moldovans immigrate, and that data is also not available for these countries for every reference year. For a number of countries, the latest data submitted to Eurostat dates as far back as 2000, for many to 2007 or 2008, and only 14 nations provided data for the actual year 2010. Thus, the EMP took the newest data to be valid for all subsequent years to establish estimates. Calculated in such a conservative fashion, the cumulative estimated stock of such Moldovan immigrants accounted for about 196,000 persons on 31 December 2010, representing approximately a 60 per cent increase from the analogous figure in 2007. In addition to the possible underestimation implied by the insufficient data availability in Moldovan migrant stocks, it must be mentioned that migrants with irregular status are not included in these estimates due to the specifics of this data source (documented immigrations).

Across all three data sources providing stocks of migrants, women account for about 55 per cent in the sex structure during 2007–2010 and present a stronger trend for long-term emigration, while presumably more temporary labour migration, evidenced through NBS LFS, is dominated by men. All types of datasets converge to confirm an outflow of the population in best working age. A triangulation of all collected data would indicate that a minimum of 300,000 Moldovan citizens were international emigrants at the end of the reference period. Considering specific cases of available updated destination country data, such as Italy’s, alone evidencing over 120,000 legally residing Moldovans, the quoted figure may be considerably underestimated. In addition, a substantial amount of labour migration, notably in the CIS corridor is of a de facto circular nature, and would indicate the further engagement in shorter-term migration experiences of up to 200,000 Moldovan citizens. It may thus be retained that between 25 and 40 per cent of the economically active population of RM have had or are in a migration experience.
Immigration

At the end of 2010, the stock of foreigners (including stateless persons) staying on the territory of RM represented less than 0.5 per cent of the total population, or 20,099 persons in absolute figures, while the annual flows of legal immigrants over the five-year reference period averaged around 2,000 persons.

Among the stock of foreigners, citizens of Ukraine (35.4%) and the Russian Federation (24.9%) are significantly represented, while citizens of other nations remain under the 5 per cent mark. More remarkably, stateless persons and persons with undetermined citizenship represent 10.3 per cent of the group discussed. However, the relatively large number of stateless persons, the majority of whom are concentrated in the Transnistrian region, as well as the presence of 253,847 foreign-born persons, or 6.5 per cent of the population, is mainly a legacy of Soviet-era mobility and does not constitute evidence of recent immigration trends.

It is important to note that despite the reduced relevance in absolute figures, the growth rate of the stock of foreigners and stateless persons reached 71.2 per cent over the five-year reference period. At the end of 2010, three quarters of persons in this group held a permanent residence permit, while approximately one quarter held temporary residence permits, nearly equally distributed among the purposes of studies, work/business and family reunification.

In 2010, 2,298 immigrants were apprehended as irregularly staying on the territory of RM, the growth rate of this indicator being 19.4 per cent as compared to 2005. Over 90 per cent of the cases were pending a final decision by the competent courts at end of year and an expulsion took place only in 58 cases, which conditions RM’s efforts to conclude readmission agreements with countries of origin of irregular migrants.

Regarding international protection, RM registered fluctuating numbers of applications of asylum-seekers during the reference period. No clear trend can be established based on the available data and absolute numbers between 40 and 100 applicants yearly, which predominantly stem from CIS countries.
Demographic development

The demographic decrease over the past years was determined both by the negative natural growth, as well as by the negative balance of external migration. The mortality rate exceeds the birth rate, registering a negative natural growth in the past decade, the lowest birth rate during the reference period in 2005 having been 10.5 per cent (born alive per one thousand persons), and the total fertility rate, particularly low in 2010, accounted for 1.309 and was thus considerably lower than the replacement rate.

The population ageing coefficient was continuously increasing during the reference period, reaching 14.4 per cent in 2010 (16% for women). According to United Nations forecasts along with the demographic ageing, by 2050, the country’s population will decrease of 20 per cent. Migration compounds this process of population ageing because mainly the younger, working-age persons migrate. At the same time, the prevalence of rural compared to urban emigration compounds a rural depopulation tendency visible through the parallel increase by 0.68 percentage points of the urbanization rate in 2010 as compared to 2005.

Finally, the observed gender ratio of rural emigration, with 65 per cent male emigrants, associated with the low life expectancy of men from rural areas leads to a feminization of the rural population.

The share of persons under 15 years old decreased in 2010 as compared to 2005 by 2 percentage points. In this context, the demographic dependency ratio, estimated according to the national definition, remains rather high and registered at about 50 per cent in 2010, which means that one working person maintained a person who is not employed. Going by the international definition, the same indicator stood at 35 per cent, in particular representing 41 and 29 per cent in rural versus urban areas, respectively.

Economic development

After a significant decline in the socioeconomic situation during the post-independence proclamation period, starting in the year 2000, the economy of the country registered some improvement. According to the World Bank (WB), migration exerted a significant positive impact on the
macroeconomic stability of RM. The inflow of foreign currency generated by labour migration contributed to compensating the trade deficit of the country, fiscal consolidation, and supporting the national currency.

Remittances have represented and continue to represent the most substantial and stable contribution in foreign currency, as compared to foreign direct investments, exports, loans, and external assistance. The respective foreign currency inflows have also contributed to increasing the state budget through value added tax (VAT) and import taxes, development of the bank system, financial mediation services, and increase of capital.

With the exception of a strong dent in 2009, the GDP has shown a constant growth averaging 5 per cent during the reference period and the cumulated growth of the GDP by 2010 accounted for 17 per cent compared to 2005. During the period under study, the total final consumption accounted for over 90 per cent of the GDP and, given the high volumes of remittances and their predominant use for consumption, it may be stated that remittances significantly contribute to the GDP and through VAT indirectly to the state budget.

The National Bank of Moldova (NBM) balance of payment records do not allow for the separation of migrant remittances from other foreign currency transfers made by individuals such as payments for services. The foreign currency transfers are, however, the basis of remittance estimates. The foreign currency transfers made by individuals through banks during 2010, amounting to USD 1.24 billion, increased by nearly two and a half times as compared to 2005, and reaching in 2008 the maximum value of USD 1.66 billion, a share of 27.4 per cent in the GDP. Conversely, as estimated by WB, remittance flows to RM have reached a historical peak in 2007 with a remarkable 36 per cent ratio to GDP. According to both sources, remittances level have remained consistently above 20 per cent of the GDP after the global economic downturn, and WB forecasted in 2011 that remittances would remain at this level for another five years at least.

Over one fifth of households in Moldova benefit from remittances, and in 2008, this share reached the maximum figure of 26.4 per cent during
the reference period. The share of remittances in the average disposable income per person in all households in the country accounted for more than 15 per cent during 2006 to 2010, reaching the maximum value of 19.1 per cent in 2008. In remittance-receiving households, the share of remittances in the household’s disposable income is considerable and represents, on average, around 60 per cent, and almost half of the income in rural and urban households, respectively.

While remittances have contributed to decreasing poverty in the benefiting households, and have increased access to education, as described under the section Migration and social development, less than 10 per cent of remittances are productively invested, the bulk being used for consumption and acquisition of real estate. A government-owned remittances investment programme has, since 2010, attracted EUR 2.4 million of remittances into the SME sector, with one-to-one matching funds from government and donors.

**Migration, employment and labour market**

The constant GDP growth over the past decade did not translate into an improvement of employment opportunities. On the contrary, the employment rate decreased from 54.8 per cent in 2000 to 38.5 per cent in 2010. The labour force inactivity rate was 58.4 per cent in 2010, compared with 32 per cent in the EU-27, but in this context, a reported share of more than a third informal employment in the total should be taken into account. Informal employment can reach considerable proportions in certain settings, constituting 45 per cent of all employment in rural areas, or in sectors such as construction and agriculture, constituting 80 and 72 per cent, respectively.

While the number of vacancies registered at the National Employment Agency (NEA) dropped by approximately 40 per cent after 2008, inversing a steady growth trend therein from 2005 onwards, unemployment remains moderate at 7.4 per cent in 2010. It affects most strongly the age group 15–24 and followed by 25–34, presents an observable gender gap of 3.3 per cent, a disparity between rural and urban unemployment rates (respectively 9.6% and 5.4%), and concerns almost a third of all cases of long-term unemployment.
The level of wages is one of the main indicators of the capacity of the domestic labour market to reduce emigration stimuli as well as remittances-induced reservation wages, and finally, make the informal economy less competitive. In this context, monthly average gross salary varies from USD 138 in the agriculture sector to USD 199 for education, USD 270 in the public sector, USD 503 in information technology and communications (ITC), and USD 556 in financial services. Furthermore, real salaries are also heavily affected by high inflation rates. High wage differentials to destination countries in both migration directions (the gross monthly salary is almost two and a half times smaller than in Romania and the Russian Federation, about two times smaller than in Bulgaria, and 17.4 per cent lower than the gross monthly salary in Ukraine) and perceived good saving/remitting perspectives associated to working abroad remain a central pull factor for labour migrants.

Mirroring the structure of labour force by education level, the majority of labour migrants according to LFS hold secondary education (64.17%), while the percentage of those with primary or no education is less than 1 per cent. It is interesting to note that migrants holding higher education represent 10.7 per cent of the total, while in the workforce they account for 22.7 per cent. The share of labour migrants with higher education in 2010 has however increased by 2.8 percentage points compared to 2005.

Higher education has strongly increased in the years of reference, the number of graduates having increased by 63 per cent from 2005 to 2010, and in 2010 represented 40 per cent of all graduates with upper secondary to higher education or 24 per cent of all graduates with secondary education and higher. At the same time, the labour market demands skilled workers and about 80 per cent of registered vacancies are for candidates with a secondary vocational education level. Yet the chances of candidates with higher education to obtain a position are higher, reflecting the fact that young persons with higher education get employed in areas that are far from their specialization, resulting in skills waste. The same aspect is relevant for migration, as a 2007 survey showed that 35 per cent of returning migrants with university education had worked in construction, while 28 per cent had worked as domestic workers.
Migration and social development

RM is a middle-income country and according to United Nations ranking it is characterized as a country with a medium human development level. Over the past 15 years, it has moved from the eighty-first place in 1995 to place ninety-ninth in 2010 among 166 listed States, outranking only Uzbekistan, Kyrgyzstan and Tajikistan among all former Soviet republics. The cumulative value of the Human Development Index (HDI) for RM in 2010 was 0.644, representing a growth of 0.013 units as compared to 2005.

Remittances have contributed to decreasing poverty in the households benefiting from remittances during 2006 to 2010. The decline has varied between 8 and 14 per cent annually in the total number of households in the respective group, and in case of households which do not receive remittances, the poverty rate was 40 per cent. This poverty reduction outcome of migration and remittances is highest in rural areas during the entire period of reference, with the maximum value of 16.7 per cent registered for the end of 2008. This is best reflected in the fact that the share of households benefiting from remittances under the poverty line was twice lower than the respective share among non-migrant households.

Migration also produces social effects on the elderly, the most affected being the rural elderly population. Due to lack of support from emigrated children and relatives, the elderly people are forced to cope all by themselves. At the same time, they often take over some additional social roles, like that of caregivers for children left behind. In about 91 per cent of cases where both parents have left, the elderly persons replace them as caregivers and do so even in 36 per cent of situations where one parent is still present. It should be mentioned that elderly people also replace the parents de jure, as the guardianship for such children is taken over in 35 per cent of households with members involved in migration.

In over 35 per cent of school non-attendance, the reported causes relate to migration of parents, and in migrant families, the dropout of young persons from school in view of emigrating is almost two times higher. Besides these immediately migration-related facts, a general decrease of the rates of mandatory school enrolment, especially in
rural areas, is observed in parallel with an overall school-age population decrease. Conversely, **parents’ migration has an observed positive impact on access to higher education of children left behind**, as about two thirds of students/graduates have had the possibility to study at a faculty thanks to the transfers received from abroad, have a higher rate of computer ownership and access to the Internet. Related to the occasionally virulent media discourse against migrant parents, especially mothers, it must be stated that according to surveys, parents’ labour migration is not sign of abandonment, but the contrary, in view of funding their children’s studies.

**Migration affects migrants’ participation in the social protection system and mechanisms.** For instance, at the end of 2009, only 300 migrants had concluded individual social insurance contracts. A number of factors contribute to the described situation, such as: the solidarity-based pay-as-you-go pension system, the narrow spectrum of insurable social risks (old age and death), and the reduced size of pensions (the minimum pension in 2010 accounted for 50.2 per cent and the average pension only for 70.6 per cent of the subsistence minimum for pensioners). The sustainability of the system in terms of replacement rate is thus imperilled by the outflow of labour migrants, additionally to the dropping occupation rate and considerable rate of informal work.

The access of migrants and their families to monetary means testing-based social assistance is ambiguous, because **the system does not have a mechanism for monitoring the incomes of households.** The poverty-based benefits function on self-declaration of income and changes therein with application of penalties in cases of non-informing, yet generally few households declare such changes and the situation for migrant households has been even more complex due to the automatic stop of benefit provision when the household declares one of its member’s migration, even if such members do not send remittances home.

**Various surveys confirm that migrants preserve solid levels of social cohesion.** They choose their destination based on already emigrated family and friends’ choices, meet other Moldovans regularly abroad, communicate frequently with those back home and access relatively frequently homeland media. However, **the growing number of diaspora associations is not considered by migrants as a source of information and support**, and in some countries such as the Russian Federation, ignore
their very existence, while in others such as Italy, diaspora associations are developing into rallying points of mostly cultural nature.

**Migration and health**

One of the factors determining the overall population’s access to health services is related to health insurance availability. In 2010, the level of health insurance coverage among households accounted only for 74 per cent, out of which 46.2 per cent are insured by the state free of charge and only 27.8 per cent contribute to the system with mandatory payments or buy individual insurance policies. Among the reasons for non-participation in the system investigated through the NBS Ad-hoc Module on Health, working abroad is quoted by 3.4 per cent of respondents. Conversely, migrants surveyed separately on barriers encountered in accessing health services in RM indicate the following: high cost of medical assistance – 59.3 per cent; lack of health insurance – 44.9 per cent; lack of trust in local doctors’ professionalism – 29.2 per cent; the need to receive a referral from the family doctor – 19.1 per cent.

Migrants themselves call on medical assistance two times less frequently than non-migrants, unsurprisingly in relation to their stay abroad. However, medical services are not instead accessed abroad and the reduced use of medical services is therefore an absolute fact among migrants. **Only 6.5 per cent of migrants do not report obstacles in accessing health care abroad**, while reasons for not doing so like lack of health insurance, irregular status, financial constraints and fear of losing his or her job are cited by 34, 28, 25 and 20 per cent of migrants, respectively.

**Accessing health care is less frequent not only among migrants but also among their family members staying in the country.** The number of migrants’ visits to the doctor accounts, on average, to 1.5 visits per year, as compared to 3.2 visits registered for the members of households benefiting from remittances and 3.5 visits registered for the members of households not benefiting from remittances. The latter small differential between migrant and non-migrant households may reflect great vulnerability for specific subgroups. For instance, 23 per cent of the children with migrant mothers working abroad stated in a 2006 study that no one goes with them to the doctor.
Informal, unqualified employment abroad, frequently in harmful conditions, influences migrants’ health, but current data allow reflecting the correlation with mortality only in specific cases. Thus, maternal mortality is associated to migrant lifestyles in 13 per cent of cases, and in 27 per cent to work abroad in harmful conditions.

Migration also has a strong valence related to the incidence of socially conditioned diseases. Concerning HIV/AIDS, whose incidence in 2010 accounted for 17.12 per 100,000 persons, double as compared to 2005, 34 per cent of new cases were among migrants. Surveyed migrants showed a higher propensity of engaging in sexual relations with occasional and commercial partners, including lower rates of consequent use of condoms. Also, the aggregated indicator of HIV knowledge among the young persons aged 15–24 years old with migrant parents reflects that only 38.2 per cent of them provided a correct answer to key questions, and 66.3 per cent were informed regarding the methods of safe intercourse. Thus, the high migration prevalence may be a key determinant for the further evolution of HIV/AIDS incidence in RM.

While the incidence of tuberculosis (TB), reaching 107.4 cases per 100,000 inhabitants in 2010, dropped by 18.6 per cent since 2005, an increase of new cases registered among migrants was seen in the past years. About 15.5 per cent of the new TB cases registered in 2010 were identified among persons who were abroad for a period of over 3 months in the past 12 months and the lower adherence to treatment of migrants favours a multidrug-resistant form of the disease, which represented 44.3 per cent of the total number of sick persons in 2010 and a growth of 1.3 percentage points compared to the previous year.

Migration management framework, key findings, policy implications and recommendations

During the past years, an increasing awareness of migration as a phenomenon both liable to produce positive development outcomes for the country and negative social costs and the concomitant commitment to a proactive management of migration challenges and opportunities led to intensive legislative and policymaking activities of the Moldovan Government. An array of conceptual documents and laws determining migration policy in the key areas of migration management and practices
over the mid to long-term outlook were adopted, mostly in line with the international standards and, given the European integration aspirations context, the EU *acquis communautaire*.

Within the exhaustive overview given in the respective chapters, the most significant recent legislative initiatives include the adopted Law on Labour Migration (2008), Law on Foreigners (2010), Law on Integration of Foreigners (2011) and Law on Border Police (2011). Government decisions in 2012 institutionalized the EMP under the purview of the BMA and provided for the establishment of a Bureau for Relations with Diaspora within the State Chancellery. The central reference in migration policies is the National Migration and Asylum Strategy for 2011–2020 and the related Action Plan for 2011–2015, which covers a number of actions falling thematically under the migration and development nexus. Further strategies, programmes and action plans focus on specific migration-related areas – diaspora, return, remittances investment, trafficking in human beings (THB), integrated border management – in a targeted way. They also establish migration sensitivity in interlinked areas – SME sector development, demographic security, employment and the like. Strategies and action plans are occasionally overlapping rather than complementary, lack fully developed mechanisms and capacities for monitoring and evaluation, and do not tackle migration in a fully comprehensive and coherent manner.

**RM invests in and seeks bilateral and multilateral as well as international dialogue on migration. In 2008, it entered one of the first two Mobility Partnerships with EU.** It is one of the most active Eastern Partnership (EaP) countries and supports actively its Migration and Asylum Panel, having been an equally active partner in the Söderköping Process. The country takes part in the Prague Process and the Budapest Process. It participates regularly in and makes noted contributions to the GFMD, having also hosted a forum event in Chisinau under the 2011 Swiss chairmanship. During 2008 to 2012, seven bilateral social security agreements with EU Member States were concluded, and RM is operationalizing bilateral labour agreements with Italy and Israel. It has a Readmission Agreement with the EU and signed 11 implementing protocols between itself and EU Member States, as well as readmission agreements with five non-EU States from 2009 to 2011.
The country has a strongly developed institutional framework in the field of migration management, as well as formulation of migration policies, with the participation of numerous institutional actors. At least 12 state authorities with various remits and functions deal directly with migration. This has led to an ample coordination set-up and the existence of currently seven inter-institutional migration-related coordination bodies. These are at various levels, from commissions to committees and working groups, with differing chairs, thematic focuses and functions ranging from strategic to sectorial planning, implementation, monitoring, and coordination of activities linked to specific instruments and processes. Given the observed partially overlapping competences, human resource constraints and the complexity of ensuring efficient overarching coordination among numerous existing bodies, it is recommended to streamline the coordination set-up, including among associated stakeholders. This may include rationalization through the designation of one leading body, the establishment and capacitation of a central policy and project review body on migration and development issues, and the fuller development of a network of migration and diaspora focal points in all institutions.

At least 10 international and intergovernmental organizations can be described as active associated stakeholders, both in terms of defining approaches and partnering on implementation of migration-targeted or sensitive action, with IOM having a clear leadership across the board. While non-governmental actors are involved, albeit unevenly, in planning and implementation of migration-related initiatives, mechanisms for the enhanced participation at all levels of civil society, including the growing number of diaspora associations, are recommended to be examined.

Approximately 200 migration-related actions have been implemented or are under implementation with external support in the period 2007–2012, with 85 of them under the EU–Moldova Mobility Partnership umbrella. These actions of heterogenous scope, duration and funding, are thematically unevenly spread. Assessing this spread is beyond the scope of the EMP Report, given also various possible parameters of measurement. If using the EU Global Approach to Migration and Mobility as reference, it may be said that all areas are covered. A tendency for more numerous but smaller initiatives in the irregular migration and international protection domains seems to exist, while legal migration and migration
and development initiatives would be less numerous but more substantial, maybe in reflection of a global shift to more facilitative approaches to migration. The number of supported initiatives has grown strongly, having roughly tripled between 2007 and 2011, and this fact underscores the need to manage coordination for synergies and effectiveness, with the Government assuming a proactive role in aligning support to its priorities. In this context, and given the broad range of priority areas for further development of policies and programme interventions identified by the EMP Report, it is recommended to examine how migration can be more prominently mainstreamed in the national aid coordination mechanism, specifically in the activities of the joint Sector Coordination Councils.

A shorthand list of areas for further development of policies and programme interventions identified within the EMP exercise and concomitant instances of coordination would include:

a. fostering return migration and circular labour migration;

b. enhancing migrants’ social protection;

c. strengthening national migration management framework, including institutional capacity development, visa facilitation and readmission;

d. fostering the productive investment of remittances and the development of SMEs in the regions;

e. consistently monitoring migration flows;

f. fighting against irregular migration and trafficking;

g. protecting of family members left behind;

h. adapting national education strategies and policies to national labour market needs; i) enhancing the transfer of skills and innovation, and improving academic mobility as a means to combat brain drain;

i. facilitating the access to health services and managing the mobility of medical professionals;

j. engaging diaspora as an interlocutor and actor in development policies. While the key overall priorities for RM are return and retention of migrants as well as the fostering of ties with diaspora members, a long-term perspective with a development assumption also justifies the increased attention to integration of foreigners and incipient discussions on replacement labour.
The Moldovan Government has recognized at the highest level the need for a coordinated and integrated approach to manage migration through the National Development Strategy 2012–2020, that was adopted by Parliament on 11 July 2012, and includes a focus on remittances and youth emigration. Yet the analysed high prevalence of migration and its ramified impacts condition the need to assess sectorial interlinkages with migration and to factor them at all levels of the country’s development policy cycle. To bear out the sustainability of integrating the migration and development agendas, the Moldovan Government undertook a process of enhancing the systematic mainstreaming of migration into development planning in 2011, a process led by the State Chancellery in a whole-of-government approach supported by the United Nations Country Team in RM, with IOM acting as its focal point. Having already served for impact evaluation purposes within the EU–Moldova Mobility Partnership, the EMP exercise has both confirmed and answered the need for better and more accurate data and analysis of migration in the Moldovan context, required for mainstreaming it into evidence-based policymaking. The EMP’s sustainability ensured, it is thus recommended that it be continued in the previous multi-stakeholder cooperative spirit and with a momentum not only towards further improvements in data collection, sharing and analysis mechanism, but also increasingly directly towards the formulation of attainable migration-sensitive development objectives and policies for the benefit of migrants and Moldovan society as a whole.
PART A: MIGRATION TRENDS

A1. Background and main determining factors

The collapse of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (USSR) and the Declaration of State Independence on 27 August 1991, offered the population of RM a number of opportunities, including possibilities to go abroad for a certain period, whether temporarily or permanently. Difficulties encountered during the first years of independence, and the challenges imposed by the administrative, economic and social reforms triggered migration processes, especially migration for economic purposes.\(^1\) Since 1991, RM has experienced different migration patterns: international and internal, voluntary and forced, and permanent and temporary.

Internal migration in RM was caused mainly by the economic situation, and it was considered to be primarily of a voluntary nature. It included, especially, persons leaving for cities to look for a job, while preserving their original place of residence. A particular aspect was the internal migration from Transnistria to the right bank of the Nistru, registered during the first years of transition, and caused by the military conflict taking place at that time.

International migration has evolved during different periods and has resulted in two main patterns: permanent and temporary emigration.

Permanent migration reached its peak in 1985–1995, specifically to four main countries of destination: Israel, the Russian Federation, Ukraine and Germany. Later, permanent emigration flows, especially of skilled persons, were attracted by Canada, a flow that continues until the present, mainly comprising highly qualified specialists and entire families.

Temporary migration progressively assumed significant proportions starting in the mid-1990s, mainly taking place in view of improving one’s financial situation or in search of educational attainment, the latter including the youth who obtained the opportunity to apply individually for scholarships to study abroad.

\(^1\) [www.unesco.org/fileadmin/MULTIMEDIA/FIELD/Moscow/pdf/migration_conference_proceedings_volume1.pdf](www.unesco.org/fileadmin/MULTIMEDIA/FIELD/Moscow/pdf/migration_conference_proceedings_volume1.pdf)
The generally economically induced voluntary temporary migration abroad is the most statistically significant among the observed forms of migration. Propelled by the socioeconomic situation, the migration phenomenon has evolved in correlation with migration policies adopted during different periods, including along variables such as irregular or regular stay abroad.

According to experts, the evolution of the migration phenomenon may be divided into four stages with specific characteristics.²

**First stage (1990–1994)** – The specific characteristic of this stage relates to the regulation of migration processes originating from the specific Soviet and post-Soviet geopolitical space. It should be mentioned that at the beginning of this period, more than 560,000 thousand Moldovans lived in the former Soviet Union’s republics. After the proclamation of independence, a number of issues related to migration emerged, including protection of the rights of Moldovans working in the former Soviet republics. Bilateral labour migration agreements were concluded with the Russian Federation (May 1993), Ukraine (December 1993), Belarus (May 1994), and a number of agreements with other CIS countries.³ Deterioration of the socioeconomic situation, closing of enterprises, job loss and poverty growth led to the emergence during the first half of the 1990s of the so-called shuttle migration. This became a dominant pattern during the period, representing migration for procuring of goods abroad and trading these in the country with high margins.⁴ The main commercial migration routes identified were towards Turkey, the Russian Federation, Romania, Germany and Poland (especially from the northern districts). The introduction of the visa regime, strengthening of customs control, price adjustment in post-communist countries, and active involvement of medium-sized and big business in import–export operations with European countries, progressively prevented commercial migration from being profitable. Over the following years, this type of migration was gradually reduced and replaced by labour migration. Another characteristic of the given period was the internal migration of the population from the Transnistrian region, especially to the capital, as a consequence of the military conflict in 1992.

---
³ See no. 1.
⁴ Ibid.
Second stage (1995–2000) – This period is characterized by the integration of RM into global migration processes, particularly towards Europe. Around 1997, socioeconomic reforms promoted by the Government resulted in minor economic recovery, due to a modest growth of industrial production. The GDP registered an increase of 1.6 per cent compared to the previous year. During this period, the banking sector also restructured and consolidated, the privatization process was completed, and the bases of agricultural reform were established. Despite these positive results, the economic situation was aggravated in 1998 as a result of the regional financial crisis and the default in the Russian Federation, which was the main commercial partner of RM. It was followed by a de facto embargo imposed by the Russian Federation on the import of Moldovan industrial and agricultural products. Currency collapse and inflation growth came next. The years 1998–1999 were marked by an acute economic crisis, which led to business closures, job loss and poverty growth affecting 73 per cent of the total population. All these led to a significant deterioration of the labour market in the country. The result was an increase in spontaneous, mostly irregular labour migration. The business of smuggling blossomed and THB became widespread.

The positive effects of migration, which by 2000 mostly concerned the Russian Federation and Italy, started appearing. The inflow of foreign currency into RM surged, interest in migration increased both among the general public and policymakers, and measures were undertaken by the State to regulate labour migration processes.

Third stage (2001–2006). This stage is characterized by the measures adopted by the Moldovan Government to promote the regularization and regulation of irregular migration flows and migrants’ rights protection in the countries of destination. A State Migration Service was established in 2001 with the mandate to improve migration policies management. During this time, migration in an irregular situation was caused, first of all, by the difficulty in obtaining a visa, lack of possibilities to work legally abroad due to the small number of labour agreements concluded between RM and other States, and high taxes charged to obtain regularization in countries of destination. Attempts to regulate labour migration flows were undertaken by RM, as well as by other European countries. Dialogues were initiated during

5 Government Decision No. 872 of 21 August 2001, on the establishment of the State Migration Service.
this period with 19 countries, bilateral labour agreements were signed, and consular offices of the main migration-receiving countries (Portugal, Greece and Italy) were opened in RM. By the end of this phase, seasonal labour migration (mainly comprising men working in the construction industry) to the Russian Federation and Ukraine started to grow. Women left mainly for Italy for a longer period of time, mostly involved in domestic work.

**Fourth stage (May 2006–present)** – In May 2006, within the central public administration reorganization process, the State Migration Service was dissolved, and its mandate was divided between two ministries: the Ministry of Internal Affairs (MOI),\(^6\) which created the BMA under its responsibility; and took over duties related to immigration of foreigners and asylum; and the Ministry of Economy and Trade (MEc), which took over the competence related to labour migration.\(^7\) In 2009, these responsibilities were delegated to the newly established Ministry of Labour, Social Protection and Family (MLSPF).\(^8\) During the current migration stage, the conceptual approach to labour migration regulation was promoted. An institutional reform was carried out, and closer cooperation with the EU was achieved. Along with the launching of the European Integration vector, RM started to undertake essential efforts to migration processes, and irregular labour migration was gradually replaced by a policy to regulate legal migration flows through the signing of agreements with countries of destination. The main countries of destination for Moldovans migrants continue to be the Russian Federation, Ukraine and Italy. Migration flows to Turkey, Portugal, Romania and Greece have gradually been reduced.

In 2010, almost a quarter of the economically active population left the country to look for a job. The share of remittances coming from abroad achieved significant proportions. Remittances accounted for one third of GDP in 2006 and maintains a high ratio up to now.

---

\(^6\) Government Decision No. 529 of 17 May 2006, on actions to reorganize some specialized central bodies of public administration.

\(^7\) MOI Order No. 258 of 20 July 2006, on the organization of subdivisions of the Ministry of Internal Affairs, and MOI Order No. 236 of 18 June 2009 on approval of the Regulation for organization and operation of the Bureau of Migration and Asylum (with status of General Unit).

\(^8\) Government Decision No. 735 of 19 June 2008, on the approval of the Regulation of the Ministry of Economy and Trade.
A significant number of migrants who continue to leave the country temporarily to look for a job abroad come from rural areas. Reduced revenues resulting from land ownership, lack of employment opportunities and low salaries in the agricultural sector, together with poorly developed infrastructure and poor quality services, have resulted in the decrease in the number of people employed in agriculture and related activities. This has contributed to a significant drain of labour force from rural areas, through parallel emigration and urbanization processes.

A1.1. Push and pull factors of migration

Moldova is currently in a phase in which, parallel with economic restructuring and social changes, transition has determined increasing migration (internal rural–urban, international emigration). In most Western European countries (e.g. Spain, Italy, Greece and Ireland), which went through such a transition, the initial increase of emigration was followed in the longer run by decreasing emigration tendencies and a switch from net emigration into net immigration due to immigration of unskilled and semi-skilled workers from developing countries. While this development scenario of the migration flows from and to RM may occur, the country has not yet entered this phase of decreasing emigration per the quantitative evidence analysed herein. Such a situation may be taken into account as only one among a number of possibilities.

According to different studies, the main push factor for Moldovans is migration for economic purposes, mainly due to poverty, lack of employment opportunities and low salaries.

Some indicators can give a clear idea on the objective economic environment in which many citizens live that represents a powerful push factor in their decision to migrate.

1. First of all, the transition started in the 1990s, determined by a dramatic change in economic and employment structures. Agriculture’s modernization determined a diminishing of employment levels from representing more than 50 per cent

---

of total employment to 27.5 per cent today.\textsuperscript{11} The parallel restructuring of industry caused other losses in working opportunities, which were not compensated by new employment created in the services and construction sectors.

2. At the end of the 1990s, the level of GDP in RM was 34 per cent higher than a decade earlier. The robust economic development over the past 10 years (5\% average GDP growth), did not translate into an improvement of employment opportunities, but in a negative trend as the employment rate dropped from 54.8 per cent in 2000 to 38.5 per cent in 2010.\textsuperscript{12}

3. Nominal real salaries remain low compared to neighbouring countries. The monthly average gross salary varies from USD 138 for the agriculture sector\textsuperscript{13} to USD 199 for the educational sector, USD 270 for public administration, USD 503 for ITC, and USD 556 for financial services. Real salaries are heavily affected by high inflation rates. As a result, poverty is widespread. WB estimated that in 2009, 21.9 per cent of the Moldovan population was below the national poverty line.\textsuperscript{14} Thus, mass migration was basically economically driven, a coping mechanism to alleviate poverty.

4. The informal economy accounts for 30.92 per cent of total employment.\textsuperscript{15}

In such a difficult environment, migration appears to represent a survival strategy. Migration strategies are sometimes supported by the success stories of migrants and by social networks established abroad (relatives, acquaintances and close friends who already live and work overseas).

Language skills can also play an important role in migrating to CIS countries, as a large number of Moldovans do speak Russian. Migration towards EU countries can be also facilitated for those holding Romanian passports, at least since 2007 when Romania became a member of the EU.

\textsuperscript{12} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{13} 1 USD = MDL 11.8350, as of 15 February 2012
A2. Current migration patterns

Available data and sources of information. To develop migration policies focused on the areas and groups affected by the given phenomenon, it is necessary to increase the knowledge base about migration and its demographic, social and economic impact on the country. The Matrix of the EMP Indicators for RM was developed in order to assess the migration phenomenon multilaterally. The respective indicators allow the description of the situation from different aspects, to assess and point out the negative and positive effects that emerged in Moldovan society because of the intensification of migration flows. Hence, available data sources from different areas were assessed, a comprehensive report on availability of migration information was developed, and necessary data was collected to develop the analytical report contributing to the country’s EMP.

A number of governmental structures were involved in collecting information, and submitting the necessary data. Also, national and international online databases were used to collect statistics that could not be obtained or were not the responsibility of the state structures of RM. As a result, according to the EMP Matrix, data was collected and a number of indicators identified from the following sources:

- NBS – 64 indicators;
- MITC: SE CSIR “Registru” – 47 indicators;
- MOI: BMA, CCTP – 38 indicators in total;
- BGS – 6 indicators;
- MLSPF: National Coordination Unit for the National Referral System (NRS) for the assistance and protection of victims or potential victims of THB, NEA – 5 indicators in total;
- MFAEI – 6 indicators; and
- MEd – 5 indicators.

Whenever datasets for the same indicators were submitted from two sources, both were studied, the relevant information analysed in terms of correlation, and in some cases, a comparative analysis was presented, pointing out the differences. The matrix also includes a number

---

of indicators in which data was collected on an ad hoc basis due to lack of appropriate information systems. In some cases, only trends of certain phenomena could be analysed, the existence of some facts ascertained, and some situations related to migration observed, without ensuring the absolute accuracy and reliability of data.

The Matrix of EMP Indicators includes data series for 2005–2010. It should be mentioned that some limitations were encountered in relation to availability of annual data for the period under study. For instance, the indicators obtained based on the NBS statistical surveys, LFS and Household’s Budget Survey (HBS), are available only starting from 2006. During this year, the surveys were launched on a new sample, and no comparability is ensured for the obtained data with the data from the previous surveys. Furthermore, the data on population for 2005–2007, submitted by the SE CSIR “Registru”, do not include the number of children, as they are not registered in the database in that period. Therefore, the data submitted by SE CSIR “Registru” about population for the mentioned years may be underestimated. At the same time, the information can also be overestimated due to inclusion in the calculation of a number of persons who live in Transnistria, but have citizenship and official documents from RM. It is worth mentioning that all the data submitted by the rest of the providers refer only to the part under the control of the Government of the Republic of Moldova (GORM), without including the data about Transnistria.

It was not possible to collect national data for five indicators. Thus, the respective matrixes were filled in with the necessary data gathered from international databases, as follows:

- United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) – 1 indicator
- Eurostat – 2 indicators
- United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) – 2 indicators.

The list of data providers and indicators, divided according to the compartments stipulated in the Matrix of EMP Indicators is presented in full in Annex 1.

The report has also analysed the data series of official statistics, extracts from the NBS databank, administrative data and statistics of the MOH and MLSPF. These additional figures, which are not included in
the Matrix of EMP Indicators, explain and confirm the analytical results regarding the dynamics of the migration phenomenon in RM. It also reinforces results on the impact on demographics, specifically the ageing population; social situation such as education and health; and economic impact, including poverty reduction as a result of the flow of monetary transfers from abroad.

The tables with the respective data are included in the statistical annexes with references to every chapter of this report.

### A2.1. Flow of international migration of Moldovan citizens and stock of Moldovan citizens living abroad

The migration phenomenon in RM is characterized mostly by international emigration of Moldovan citizens, and less by immigration of persons from abroad. There are different national approaches to assessing the number of persons involved in migration processes, but they differ from the international ones. These different approaches led to the vehiculation of different figures.

According to the EU definition, “‘emigrant’ means a person undertaking an emigration,” and “‘emigration’ means the action by which a person, having previously been usually resident in the territory of a Member State, ceases to have his or her usual residence in that Member State for a period that is, or is expected to be, of a least 12 months”.\(^{17}\)

According to the United Nations definition, “‘long-term’ migrant means a person who moves to a country other than that of his or her usual residence for a period of at least a year (12 months), so that the country of destination effectively becomes his or her new country of usual residence. From the perspective of the country of departure the person will be a long-term emigrant and from that of the country of arrival the person will be a long-term immigrant.”\(^{18}\)

In general terms, three approaches are used in RM to estimate international emigration:


i. documented emigration, a form that includes deregistration from the place of residence and declaration of long-term emigration or emigration for good from the country, also known in RM as permanent emigration;

ii. leaving to work or to look for a job abroad, also considered to be temporary migration; and

iii. exit from the country, which is registered at the border, including, de facto, both documented/permanent emigration and temporary/circular migration.

There are different data and sources of information in estimating emigration, and the most relevant data that could be used for monitoring the process and the impact of migration on the situation in different areas are present and analysed in this report.

One of the main providers of data on international emigration development is NBS, which estimates the number of those who left using the administrative data submitted by MITC SE CSIR “Registru”, as well as the data from the statistical surveys carried out by the same bureau (LFS, HBS).

The number of emigrants, Moldovan citizens and foreigners living in RM, estimated based on data provided by the MITC SE CSIR “Registru” sums up the number of those who stated and documented their emigration from the country, the so-called “documented emigration”. This number has varied annually over the past years in between 5,000 and 8,000 persons (Table 1). These figures were also used to estimate the cumulative stock of Moldovan citizens living abroad reported by the MITC. By the end of 2010, about 92,000 persons documented their emigration, a number calculated since 2005, when such evidence was started to be kept systematically in electronic registers. This number also includes the emigrants coming from the left side of the river Nistru, and in correlation with the country’s total stable population calculated without Transnistria, this data includes an overestimation in the context of the applied definition. At the same time, there is a major underestimation of this indicator because of the non-compliance of the national definition for assessing the number of emigrants with the international definition used to estimate the same number. The analysis of the situation regarding the annual flow of “documented emigration” from the country is presented in chapter A2.1.
The profile of “documented emigration” is also presented in chapter A2.1., with the analysis being based on the data regarding the cumulative stock of Moldovan citizens living abroad.

The data from LFS reveals an annual average of almost 300,000 persons aged 15 years and over working or looking for a job abroad. The labour migrants captured by the LFS, which does not collect any indication on the duration of stay abroad, include both migrants who conserve their usual residence in RM, moving back and forth for shorter spells of work, and migrants who may work abroad for periods exceeding one year and have established their usual residence abroad, but are reported by respondents as household members working abroad. The number established through LFS may not be equal with the total number of migrants, as emigration for other than labour purposes will not be captured. Furthermore, due to the survey-based data collection, households that have emigrated entirely are not captured because no family member is left in RM to report under this survey. Finally, the survey data does not cover the territory on the left bank of the river Nistru. The composition and migration patterns of the migrants captured by the LFS, which may be considered as predominantly temporary or de facto circular migrants in light of the above, will be discussed in more detail under section A2.1.

The BGS data about the registration of border crossings is another important source of information. The data was accumulated from the state border crossing points controlled by the official authorities of RM. The Integrated Automated System, “Migration and Asylum” (SIIAMA) covers data regarding the number of Moldovan citizens who are abroad, estimated by MITC SE CSIR “Registru” based on the data collected at the border by BGS. On 31 December 2012, the number was about 720,000 persons. These are people who were registered at the border when exiting the country, without being registered as entering the country at the reporting moment.

BGS also provides information regarding the period during which the persons stay abroad. Based on the duration of the stay outside the country

\[19\] Despite the fact that a considerable part of labour migration, according to other periodic surveys, is of circular nature and notably so in the CIS migration corridor, no regular data collection instrument currently exists to monitor the phenomenon and establish reliable data on the prevalence of circular migration.
after exit, the number of international emigrants according to the EU and United Nations definitions can be established. At the end of 2010, around 300,000 out of the total 720,000 Moldovan citizens would therefore qualify as international emigrants, as per international definition (absent from the country for one year and longer). Taking into consideration the fact that a segment of the state border is not controlled, this figure could be underestimated. At the same time, there is an overestimation of the given indicator, as persons may exit the country via the controlled segments of the state border and enter through the left side of the River Nistru. Another cause for the overestimation in relation to the size of RM population (calculated without Transnistria), which could be registered for all the indicators assessed based on the administrative data, is the fact that the inhabitants from the left side of the river Nistru having passports and crossing the border with such passports when exiting the country are also counted. The BGS data reports that 33,000 persons residing on the left side of the river Nistru before leaving the country were registered at the end of 2010. While the BGS data cannot be considered fully reliable, its analysis along the existing variables will be used to complement the patterns and trends observed among the emigrants included in the NBS emigration statistics.

An estimation of the number of persons annually leaving RM, the immigrants’ flow to the receiving countries, is presented based on Eurostat data. This data does not reflect the total number of persons annually emigrating from RM; they include the information only for 30 countries from the EEA. Still, annual data is not presented for all these countries (Table 2). The Eurostat database has also estimated the total number of persons who left RM and live outside the country (the stock by the end of every year), with the same data being available only for 30 countries from the European area. It should be mentioned that data is not available for these countries every year. It was necessary to make some adjustments in the figure (Table 9), and the cumulatively estimated stock of such persons was about 196,000 on 31 December 2010. This number

---

20 Armenia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Germany (including the former German Democratic Republic from 1990), Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Republic of Moldova, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Romania, Russian Federation, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Uzbekistan.

21 Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany (including the former German Democratic Republic from 1990), Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.
could be underestimated as there is no available data for all destination countries for Moldovans. This number also does not include those who are irregularly staying in receiving countries. At the same time, the number could be overestimated, as some persons registered in the host countries are involved in temporary, seasonal migration and cannot be considered as emigrants according to the definition.  

Certain underestimation gaps are noted in relation to keeping records about migration by sectors. Education abroad is one of the factors that determine the number of persons to emigrate, and the estimation of this number is a real challenge. MEd has official data regarding the number of Moldovan citizens who study abroad based on international agreements, which reached 4,000 persons in 2010. There is no record, however, of those who apply for and obtain by themselves possibilities to study abroad. Actually, the number of Moldovans studying abroad seems much higher. A WB report said that 9,000 Moldovans were studying abroad in 2006. Moreover, there is no evidence of migration’s impact in other sectors. Therefore, the annual flow of specialists from socioeconomic areas, including migration, may be estimated only based on surveys and research. Nevertheless, measures and different activities were undertaken for this purpose. One problem is keeping the records of the children left behind by parents who have migrated – this is a task divided among several ministries, which report different data that are frequently not correlated. Hence, starting in 2010, the MLSPF, as the central legal guardianship authority, collects and supplies data to the NBS on the number of children left without parental care, including those caused by migration. At the same time, MEd, upon the request of the government or some international organizations such as UNICEF, periodically collects data regarding children who left together with their parents or children left behind. There are discrepancies between the data presented by these two institutions, which can be explained by the collection method and lack of mechanisms to verify the accuracy of data. For 2010, the MLSPF presented a cumulative stock of 52,065 children

---

22 See no. 17.
23 J.A. Sabadie et al., Migration and Skills: The Experience of Migrant Workers from Albania, Egypt, Moldova and Tunisia, (Washington, D.C. WB / European Training Foundation (ETF) 2010).
24 Statistical Form 103.
25 MLSPF collects the data from the raion Sections/Divisions of social assistance and family protection at the level of mayoralties through the community-based social assistants. MEd collects data from the General Division of Education, Youth and Sport through schools and mayoralties.
whose parents went abroad, while the figure coming from MEd is 54,176. A third source of data is MOI, which monitors the annual evolution of juvenile delinquency, reporting for 2010 a total of 29,681 children left behind by both parents who have gone overseas to work.\(^\text{26}\)

It should be mentioned that some efforts were undertaken to introduce in the national practice the international definitions for estimating emigration and to adjust the process of data collection and processing to international standards, applied in the respective area. Involvements are necessary in decision-making processes, development and enforcement of methodologies for assessing and quantifying the phenomenon (the number of persons involved in migration processes, the volume of remittances, etc.), and all these need certain financial and human resources. An important step in managing international migration flows for R\text{M} was the special methodology for estimating international migration flows using the database on border crossings, which was developed with IOM support in 2010–2011 and which was proposed for testing to the main data providers in the area: MITC (SE CSIR “Registru”), BGS and NBS. The following chapters analyse the situation of migration flows and the migration profile will be based on the data available at the current moment, both administrative data and data from the most recent surveys and studies carried out in the migration area. It should be noted that data is collected and estimated based on the legislative-normative framework in force at the moment this report was concluded.

**Emigration of citizens**

The analysis of emigration from RM in this chapter is focused mainly on data regarding the annual flows of those who have left the country according to the sources presented above and the available information in this respect. Only in some cases, the data related to the cumulative stocks on the reporting date will be presented for comparison.

**Annual flow of international “documented emigration”**. Documented emigration abroad, based on estimates of MITC SE CSIR “Registru” continues to be up-to-date, but the phenomenon registers a downward trend.

\(^{26}\) MOI Informative Memo regarding the situation on juvenile delinquency and the activity of services for minors in the territorial subdivisions during the 12 months of 2010. www.mai.md/node/7007 (accessed 11 June 2012)
According to official data, 6,828 persons emigrated abroad in 2005, while in 2010 this number dropped 30 per cent to 4,714 persons (Table 1). This number includes Moldovan citizens and persons of other citizenships, and is limited only to those who deregistered from the place of residence before leaving the country for good. To be noted is that there is an underestimation of this data for 2005–2008. Data regarding children’s emigration for this period is not available due to the lack of any registration for them. The registration of children for the age groups 0–4, 5–9, and 10–14 years in the database of MITC SE CSIR “Registru” started with the enforcement of the respective legislative-normative acts\(^27\) on issuance of passports to children and assignment of an Identification Number to minors.

According to the data on the annual flow of documented emigration over the past five years, a huge number of women have emigrated.

Figure 1. International documented emigrations from RM, by sex, 2005–2010

![Graph showing documented emigrations from RM, by sex, 2005–2010](image)

Source: NBS.

Thus, the share of women exceeded the share of men by 10 percentage points during the respective period (Figure 1). The highest

number of emigrants, 7,172 persons (3,276 men and 3,896 women), was registered in 2007, after which the number of men and women has dropped continuously.

Over the past three years, more rapid decreasing trends were registered for women as documented emigrants abroad compared to the number of men (Table 1.). Hence, the decrease rate for women in 2010 as compared to 2007 is 35 per cent as against 33 per cent for men.

The data on the annual flow of documented emigration reveals that it is mainly young persons who migrate. In the total number of documented emigration of 4,714 persons according to the data for 2010, the highest share of 12.7 per cent is registered for the population aged 25–29 years old, followed by the age group of 30–34 years old (11%), 20–24 years old (10.2%) and 35–39 years old (8.2%). The lowest number of those who leave abroad was observed for persons of retirement age (65 years), representing a share of 8.8 per cent of the total number of emigrants who have documented their permanent emigration from the country. In sum, the age groups between 20–39 years old together make up the largest group of 42 per cent of the total.

The largest share of documented emigration flows is to the Russian Federation and Ukraine, which hosted during 2005–2010 about 80 per cent of the population that left the country each year (Figure 2). In 2005, Russia hosted 48.5 per cent of all emigrated persons and Ukraine 30 per cent. The same shares of emigrants were maintained until 2007 inclusively.

Starting in 2008, the trends changed, with international documented emigration as based on formal deregistration in RM being mainly directed to Ukraine (45%), followed by Russia (43%), with 2,057 and 3,310 persons respectively. In 2010, 47.2 per cent left for Ukraine (2,227 persons) and only 24.6 per cent (1,162 persons) went to Russia.

Another important country of destination is the USA, with a downtrend between 2009 and 2010 (899 and 523 persons, respectively). It may be noted that annually, the USA receives about 10 per cent of Moldovan emigrants, followed by Israel and Germany with almost 5 per cent of the total of emigrants leaving RM.
Analysing only the Moldovan citizens in this group, it is worth mentioning that they represent about 95 per cent or 4,459 persons of those who documented their emigration in 2010 (Table 1 and Table 3). The last two years of the period included in the report registered a drop of Moldovan citizens’ emigration. In 2009 as compared to 2008, the rate of Moldovan citizens’ flows of international documented emigrations registered negative growth of 20.5 per cent. This drop continued, falling 27.8 per cent in 2010 as compared to the previous year (Table 4).

It is mainly Moldovan citizens from urban areas who emigrated, with the 2010 figure (2,968 persons) double the number of those from rural areas (1,490 persons) (Table 3). The relative share of international emigrants from rural versus urban areas registered a constant increase from 2007 to 2008, from 62.9 per cent to 68.5 per cent, respectively. In the following year, 2009, the indicator decreased by 18 percentage points, reaching 50 per cent in 2010 (Table 4).

The number of women who emigrated prevails over that of men, registered at 2,385 and 2,074, respectively, in 2010. The gender gap of
Moldovan citizens’ international emigration went up from 110.3 per cent in 2008 to 115 per cent in 2010 (Table 3). It should be mentioned that among the persons with a different citizenship than Moldovan (who before emigration were living in RM), there were more women than men who emigrated in 2010 (136 versus 119).

The age distribution of all annual flows of documented emigration of Moldovan citizens reveals some differences. The share of younger persons is higher for Moldovan emigrant citizens as compared to the total number of emigrants (Figure 3).

Figure 3. Comparative structure of international emigration flow, by age, 2010

Source: NBS, MITC (SE CSIR “Registru”).
About 65 per cent of Moldovan emigrants are less than 39 years old, while for the total of emigrants, this group accounts for 62 per cent. The situation is reversed for the age group of 40–64 years old. For Moldovan citizens, this group accounts for 27 per cent, while in the total of emigrants from RM, it represents 29 per cent. For those aged 65 years old and over, more or less the same share of 8 per cent is registered for both Moldovan citizens and total international emigrations documented from RM. Thus, the elderly people who emigrate are mainly Moldovan citizens, and the persons with other citizenships who are documented emigrants from the country are mainly 40–64 years old.

More than one fourth of Moldovans who documented their emigration during 2007–2010 have professional secondary and higher education (Table 5). The highest number of people with such qualifications was registered in 2008, reaching 2,069. In the following years, a stable decrease was registered at about 36.5 per cent in 2010 compared to 2008. The number of persons with higher education who documented their emigration from the country in 2010 was 1,314, while the number of emigrants who had general secondary, secondary or incomplete secondary or gymnasium education reached 2,502. Persons holding scientific degrees emigrate less, varying in between four and eight cases per year during the mentioned period.

*International emigration from RM registered by the host countries.* For a better understanding of the migration phenomenon evolution, it is also necessary to study it through the data presented by the host countries, meaning the reporting on *international immigration from RM* by the host countries. According to the Eurostat database, the highest flow of immigrations from RM during 2005–2010 was registered in 2010 by Italy, at 27,034 persons (Table 2). The annual number of immigrants from RM to Italy continued to increase, with the 2010 figure roughly three times that of 2005 (27,034 versus 9,366 persons, respectively).

Due to the fact that data is not available for all countries and years, it is not possible to draw definite conclusions in this respect. Only some 28

---

findings may be reported, offering information regarding the trends of the phenomenon (Figure 4).

For instance, data for the Russian Federation exists only for the period 2005–2007, but it is necessary to mention an uptrend in immigrants from RM. This trend was confirmed by data from the Russian Federal Statistics Service, which showed an increase (by 16,433 persons) in the number of persons from RM in 2009 and a slight decrease of this figure in 2010. In 2010, the number of persons that arrived from RM was 14,090 as against 6,569 in 2005. For Romania, the data for 2005–2008 shows that immigration from RM was highest in 2006 at 4,349 persons, after which the annual number of Moldovan citizens settling in Romania declined to 3,476 in 2008. A constant decrease in annual flows of persons from RM were noted for Spain and Cyprus (Figure 4 and Table 2), while Germany and Austria received approximately a constant number of immigrants from RM every year (from 2006 to 2008, the annual flow for Germany was about 800 persons, and fewer than 200 for Austria).

There are significant differences in relation to the choice of country of destination depending on the sex of migrants from RM. Women mainly left for Italy, Spain, Germany and Cyprus. The number of women who went to Italy in 2010 accounted for two thirds of the total number of persons leaving RM (19,799 women as against 7,441 men). The Russian Federation, Romania, Austria and the Czech Republic received mostly men (Table 2).

International emigration of children. Starting from 2009, the annual flow of children’s emigration has been decreasing constantly, registering a drop of 25 per cent against the previous year (Figure 5). In 2010, the number of children taken abroad by their parents was 869 compared to 1,575 in 2008. It should be mentioned that this data refers to annual flow of children under 18 years old who have emigrated together with their parents, being abroad on permanent basis during the year of reference.

Data on population emigration depending on age is available by groups of five years, which is why there is no possibility of coming up with a more detailed analysis of the migration of children up to 18 years old. Figure 6 presents the evolution of the documented emigration flow of children up to 14 years old. The age structure of emigrants aged 0–14 years reveals that the highest share of children who emigrated in 2007–2008 was registered
Figure 4.1. Immigrations from RM, by countries of destination, 2005–2010

Source: Eurostat database, ROSSTAT.

Figure 4.2. Immigrations from RM, by country of destination, 2005–2010

Figure 5. Number of children under 18 years old taken abroad by their parents, 2007–2010

Source: MITC SE CSIR "Registru".

Figure 6. Total number of children’s emigrations and percentage by age, 2007–2010

Source: NBS, MITC SE CSIR "Registru".
for the age group of 10–14 years old, accounting for 35 per cent. The lowest percentage is registered for children aged 0–4 years (Figure 6). During 2009 and 2010, the given indicator showed reverse trends, with the highest share of 35 per cent being registered for children 0–4 years old. The trend for parents bringing small children is also confirmed by the increase of the age group 5–9 years old and the decrease of the age group 10–14 years old.

As previously mentioned, MEd has no well-established system to collect data and keep records about the number of children taken abroad by their parents. Data is not gathered systematically, and only submitted on request. Such information is partially incomplete and the accuracy depends on how conscientiously teachers register this data in schools. Additionally, these numbers are collected based on the information provided by the parents, who are not always willing to tell that they have gone abroad with their children. Data provided by MEd shows that in 2009, 4,194 children went abroad with their parents. In 2010, this number increased 9 per cent to 4,556 children as of 1 October 2010 (Table 6).²⁹

**Stock of Moldovan citizens living abroad**

There are several data sources that can be used as basis for estimating the stock of Moldovan citizens living abroad:

i. The number of Moldovan citizens who have documented their emigration;

ii. The number of persons who have exited the country by crossing the border and are registered as being absent for one year and longer; and

iii. The number of Moldovan citizens living abroad, as presented by the host countries and extracted from the Eurostat database.

An official census is considered as one of the most reliable sources of data on emigrant stocks, but the most recent one in RM was done in 2004, and the next round is planned for 2014.

*Number of Moldovan citizens who live abroad.* According to data from RM estimated based on documented emigration, the number of

²⁹ MEd data.
Moldovan citizens who reside abroad was continuously increasing. The number grew by almost 20,000 persons tp 92,184 in 2010 compared to 2007 (Table 7), according to the State Register of Population. The number of emigrated persons is underestimated, if based on the international definition of emigration. Other estimations reveal the stock of Moldovan citizens who can be considered as emigrants in line with the international definitions. The data from border crossings estimates a total number of 284,304 persons who by the end of 2010 were abroad for one year and longer. This number increased by 46,000 or 20 per cent against 2008 (Table 7). There is also an estimate of 311,000 persons from NBS based on 2010 LFS data, a figure that is also ascending. Nevertheless, even though the LFS data includes a segment of persons who consider themselves as emigrated abroad in the context of the international definition, these cases could concern temporary/circular labour migration and are to be analysed below.

Additionally, this report includes data regarding the number of Moldovan citizens who live abroad as provided by host countries and posted on the Eurostat online database (Table 7). This data differs significantly from the information provided by RM. In 2010, the number submitted by the host countries was estimated to be 196,176 persons, more than twice the number of Moldovan citizens living abroad according to Moldovan data for documented emigration, which was 92,184 persons. At the same time, this number is lower than the number of persons who were abroad for one year and longer, estimated from the data gathered at border crossings and pegged at 284,304. As not all the countries submitted the annual information about immigrants because the data was missing, the consultants made adjustments based on the figures from previous years, considering in a very conservative way that their number did not change over the following years. Given

---

31 The Eurostat data includes the available information for the following countries: Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany (including the former German Democratic Republic from 1990), Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.
32 The adjustments made were as follows: Belgium – data from 2003 was considered for 2005–2007; Bulgaria – data for 2001 was considered for 2005–2007, data for 2009 was considered for 2010; Estonia
that all analysed sources show a continuous increase of emigrant stocks, the underestimation of the extrapolated Eurostat data can be inferred (Figure 7).

Figure 7. Number of Moldovan citizens living abroad, 2007–2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>According to documented emigration</th>
<th>According to border crossings</th>
<th>According to Eurostat data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>73,431</td>
<td>124,466</td>
<td>237,650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>82,337</td>
<td>142,485</td>
<td>272,479</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>87,933</td>
<td>179,178</td>
<td>284,304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>92,184</td>
<td>196,716</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: MITC SE CSIR "Registru", BGS, Eurostat database.

The number of Moldovan citizens who live abroad, according documented emigration, accounts only for 47 per cent of the number submitted by the host countries and only one third of the number based on the data from border crossings (Figure 7). The respective differences may be explained by the insufficient record-keeping done in the country, which results from the non-correlation of the definition of emigration applied in RM with the international definition, as well as by the lack of information – data for 2000 was considered for 2005–2010; Ireland – data for 2009 was considered for 2005–2008, this being the first submission to the database; Greece – data for 2001 was considered for 2005–2010, this being the only year for which data exists; France – data for 2005 was considered for 2006–2010; Lithuania – data for 2008 was considered for 2009–2010; Luxembourg – data for 2001 was considered for 2005–2010, this being the only year for which data exists; Malta – data for 2001 was considered for 2005–2007, and data for 2008 was considered for 2009–2010; Austria – data for 2009 was considered for 2010; Poland – data for 2002 was considered for 2005–2006; Portugal – data for 2003 was considered for 2005–2006; Romania – data for 2009 was considered for 2010; United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland – data for 2005 was considered for 2006–2010; Iceland – data for 2003 was considered for 2005–2007, and data for 2008 was considered for 2009; Turkey – data for 2000 was considered for 2005–2007, and data for 2009 was considered for 2010.
about persons settling abroad before the launch of the Population Register information system and database.

It should be mentioned that all three sources presented in Figure 7 indicate the same increasing trends for the dynamics of indicators, but numerically, the increase is different. In the case of documented emigration, as it was stated above, the trends of leaving the country are kept over the period under the study, but with a reduced pace in comparison with the previous years – a fact revealed also by the annual flow of this type of emigration (Table 1). In this context, in 2009 as compared to 2008, the increase of the number of persons who have documented their emigration was 5,596 persons, and in 2010 as compared to 2009, the increase was at 4,251 persons. The leaves for one year and longer registered at the border are rather dynamic, and show a decreasing trend on an annual basis. This source shows that in 2009, the number of persons who went abroad for one year and longer was higher by 34,829 compared to 2008, and in 2010 higher by 11,825 persons as compared to 2009. Comparable figures are also noted when referring to data submitted by the host countries, where the difference between 2009 and 2008 figures exceeded 36,000 persons, and in 2010 this number was 17,000 higher than in 2009 (Table 7).

The record-keeping from the country, in both cases, reveals that a huge number of Moldovan citizens who live abroad are women. During 2007–2010, the number exceeded that of men who live abroad (documented emigration) by 20 per cent. The largest discrepancy in women–men correlation was registered in 2007, after which this ratio evolved constantly.

The dynamics of the number of men, as well as that of women witnessed an increasing trend during the reported period, registering the same growth rate every year.

It should be mentioned that the evolution of the number of persons leaving RM for one year and longer registered at the border had similar ascending trends, while the correlation women–men was lower during 2008–2010. The latter indicator has constantly decreased in the mentioned period from 115.1 per cent to 109.5 per cent, reducing the gap by almost 3 percentage points annually (Figure 9).
Figure 8. Stock of Moldovan citizens abroad according to documented emigrations, by sex, and sex ratio (percentage), 2007–2010

Source: MITC SE CSIR "Registru".

Figure 9. Number of Moldovan citizens registered at the border as having left for one year and longer, by sex, and sex ratio (percentage), 2008–2010

Source: BGS.
According to the three sources presented in Figure 10, women account for about 55 per cent in the sex structure during 2007–2010. According to the data presented by the host countries, the share of women is higher and accounts for almost 60 per cent of the total number of Moldovan citizens living abroad (Figure 10).

Figure 10. Sex structure of Moldovan citizens living abroad, 2007–2010

It should be mentioned that the structure of migrants by sex registers constant trends over the analysed period of time according to the data submitted by RM, while based on Eurostat data, the share of men in 2009–2010 increased by 6 percentage points. This reveals the increased trend for men to emigrate with registration of their stay in the host country.

Three groups are pointed out according to the age structure of documented emigration, for which the highest shares of Moldovan citizens living abroad are registered (Figure 11). In 2010, persons aged 30–34 years accounted for 12.8 per cent of the total number of Moldovan citizens living abroad; persons 35–39 years old 11.2 per cent, and those aged 25–29 years 10.5 per cent. These three age groups together account for about 35 per cent of the total number of Moldovan citizens living abroad during 2007–2010. The following group is that of people 40–44 years old, 45–49 years old, and 50–54 years old – about 8 per cent each – who together represent about 23 per cent in the reported period. A relatively high share is noted for the
age group of 70–74 years old, accounting for about 5 per cent of the total number of Moldovans living abroad during the reported period.

It should be also mentioned that the number of children living abroad accounted for 7.8 per cent of the total in 2010, cumulating the age groups of 0–4, 5–9 and 10–14.

The analysis of the distribution by age of the persons who have left the country for one year and longer, registered at the border by the end of 2010, reveals that the highest shares are registered approximately for the same age groups, with larger volumes for the groups of young persons. When analysing the same large age groups presented above, it shows that for the whole period under the study, the share of persons from the age groups of 25–29 years old, 30–34 and 35–39 cumulate annually about 44 per cent of the total persons who have left RM for one year and longer. The age groups of 40–44 years old, 45–49 years old and 50–54 years old collectively represent 25 per cent. Children under 14 years old account for 4.1 per cent of the annual total of those who left the country during the whole period under study (Figure 11). It is important to mention the evolution of the age group of 20–24 years old, which is rather representative according to this source of data (10.3% in 2010), but which registers decreasing trends. In 2010, this group decreased by 3,000 as compared to 2009 (from 32,543 to 29,288 persons). This fact confirms the above-mentioned conclusion that those who leave the country are mainly young working-age persons, and fewer are elderly people.

According to the data from RM, the largest number of Moldovan citizens residing abroad in the years between 2007 and 2010 was registered for the Russian Federation, followed by Ukraine, USA, Germany and Israel. It should be mentioned that this analysis was of the stock of Moldovans who have documented their emigration from the country, where about one third of the total number of persons living abroad in 2010 were in the Russian Federation, 26.7 per cent in Ukraine, 15.2 per cent in the USA, and 12 per cent in Germany (Figure 12). Even though a many Moldovan citizens were already living in these countries, the number increased 25 per cent that year in comparison with 2007 (Table 8). The highest increase for this indicator was registered for Ukraine (50%), Russian Federation (23%), and the USA (about 19%).
Figure 11. Age structure of Moldovan citizens living abroad, 2007–2010

**According to documented emigration**

Source: MITC SE CSIR "Registru".

**According to those who have left for one year and longer, registered at the border**

Source: BGS.
Figure 12. Distribution of Moldovan citizens living abroad according to RM data, by host country, 2010

*Source: MITC SE CSIR "Registru".*

Figure 13. Distribution of Moldovan citizens living abroad according host countries’ data by country of destination, 2010

*Source: Eurostat database.*
In 2010, according to Eurostat information (Figure 13), the highest share of Moldovan citizens living abroad were in Italy (53.7%), Portugal (10.6%) and Spain (8.9%), followed by Germany (6.7%), Romania (5.3%) and the Czech Republic (5%).

The distribution by country of Moldovans living abroad by sex is different (Figure 14). Women mainly leave for Italy and according to Eurostat data, 60 per cent of all Moldovan women living abroad in 2010 were located there (men – 44.7%). In addition, the number of women has been continuously increasing since 2007. In 2010, about 105,000 persons coming from RMoldova were in Italy, of which 69,000 were women. Comparatively, in 2005 these figures were only 37,000 and 26,000 thousand, respectively.

Another country preferred by Moldovans is Portugal, where 14.5 per cent of men and 7.8 per cent of women were living in 2010. Other countries where Moldovans live are Spain, Germany, Romania and the Czech Republic—these being preferred mainly by men—followed by Turkey, where the share of women is higher than that of men. It is necessary to mention that this data is also underestimated due to the performed adjustments, as well as due to the fact that data only refers to officially registered persons (Figure 14).

It should also be noted that there is no complete data for all host countries in dynamics. Hence, only the comparative evolution over the time may be followed for the number of Moldovan citizens living abroad, but it is also necessary to take into account the fact that the presented absolute figure is an estimated one.

Emigration for studies

The number of Moldovans studying abroad based on international agreements signed in the education area during the reference years is increasing. It reached 4,009 persons in 2010, double that in 2005 (Table 10).

In 2010, almost 90 per cent of Moldovans studying abroad were in Romania. Ukraine hosted 2.6 per cent of them, and Bulgaria and the
Figure 14. Distribution of Moldovan citizens living abroad according to host countries’ data, by country of destination and sex, 2005–2010

Source: Eurostat database.
Russian Federation 2.7 per cent each. About 1 per cent of these persons studied in Turkey. A relatively small number of 9 to 15 persons were in China, the Czech Republic, Sweden and Greece (Figure 15).

Figure 15. Distribution of Moldovan citizens studying abroad, by country of destination, 2010

Due to the limited number of places offered to RM based on international treaties, the number of persons studying abroad, according to the data submitted by MEd, is relatively small.

**Involuntary migration**

Involuntary emigration registered a significant decrease by 2010 as compared to 2005. The analysis, in this context, is based on the information obtained from international databases. According to this data, the number of Moldovans who sought asylum abroad was 4,852 in 2005 and has dropped gradually to 633 in 2010 (Table 11). It should be mentioned that the sharpest fall was in 2006, down 73.7 per cent as against 2005. The decreasing trend was preserved in the following years (Figure 16).
The same downturn was also registered for the number of asylum-seekers from RM who obtained the status of refugee abroad. In 2005, 12,064 persons were recognized as refugees from Moldova. The same number was maintained the following year, and afterwards it plunged 57.9 per cent in 2007. Over the following years up to 2010, the dynamics of this indicator witnessed a slightly increasing flow. In 2010, 6,200 persons originating from Moldova were recognized as refugees, accounting for just about 50 per cent of refugees registered in 2005.

**Temporary migration**

Temporary labour migration has been persistent in the Republic of Moldova for two decades. LFS data shows an approximately stable number of persons, about 300,000, who worked outside the country for a certain period within 2005–2010. Based on the LFS data, NBS estimates labour migration as the number of persons aged 15 years and over who have gone abroad to work or look for a job at the moment the survey was carried out. According to LFS estimates, the top receiving countries of Moldovan emigrants during the analysed period were, in order, the Russian Federation, Italy, Turkey, Israel, Portugal, Ukraine, Greece and Romania.
Figure 17. Distribution of persons aged 15 years and over working or looking for a job abroad, by destination countries, 2010 (thousands)

*Source: NBS.*

Figure 18. Distribution of temporary labour migrants, by country of destination, 2006–2010

*Source: NBS.*
During 2005–2010, the number of persons who were abroad at the time the survey was executed was relatively constant, with an average exceeding 300,000 annually. In 2010, the total was 311,000, 70.9 per cent of them coming from rural areas. The structure of migrants by age groups shows a share of 77 per cent for those 15–44 years old, of whom 32.9 per cent represent the persons aged 25–34 years, followed by those 15–24 years old and 35–44 years old, each representing over 22 per cent. Those aged 45–54 years make up 18.8 per cent of the migrant structure, and those aged 55–64 years old represent about 3.9 per cent. The reduced prevalence of migrants aged 45 years and over may be the reflection of fewer chances to be integrated in the foreign labour market (Figure 19).

Figure 19. Temporary migrants by age, 2005–2010

Men are frequently the ones who leave the country. In 2010, the share of men in the total number of migrants accounted for 63.7 per cent and of the total number of those who went abroad, about 198,000 are men and 113,000 are women. Significant disparities may be noted when analysing the migrants’ age groups by sex. The younger the group, the higher the share of men, while the older the group, the lower the

33 NBS Statistical databank (2012).
discrepancy. Within the age range of 15–24 years old, men accounted for 76 per cent, while in the 45–54 years old range, men constituted 50.9 per cent, the difference being 25.1 percentage points (Figure 20).

Figure 20. Gender gap in the structure of temporary migrants, by age, 2010

Statistical data shows that a person’s educational level plays a significant role in setting the migration flow, because it influences the capacity of the person to be integrated in the labour market. In 2010, more than 50 per cent of the total number of migrants had secondary education (lyceum, gymnasium), being followed by those with specialized secondary and vocational education at 38.6 per cent. The persons with higher education account for 10.7 per cent of the total number of migrants. The distribution by migrants’ level of education and area of residence differs (Figure 21).

The share of migrants with higher, specialized secondary and vocational secondary education from urban areas is 65.7 per cent versus 43 per cent from rural areas. The same ratios were registered for the whole period under study. The percentage of those with higher education from rural areas is rather low at just 7 per cent. It is important to mention that the percentage of persons with higher education is increasing, especially those from urban areas.

The data shows that an important group among those with higher education is composed of young persons aged 25–34 years who did not obtain a job after graduation because of a lack of necessary work experience,
skills mismatch, reservation wages, etc. This segment represents about 47.7 per cent of the total number of migrants with higher education. Among urban migrants, the share is even higher –more than 50 per cent of those with higher education who leave the country to work abroad (Table 13).

Figure 21. Distribution of migrants by areas of residence and education level, 2005–2010

Source: NBS, authors’ calculations.

The main destination countries for labour migration are the Russian Federation and Italy, which in 2010 hosted about 191,900 and 58,700 persons, respectively (Table 14). These nations are followed by Turkey and Israel with almost 8,000 persons apiece, and Ukraine and Portugal with each nearly 6,000 persons coming to work from RM.

The distribution of migrant workers by sex reveals significant discrepancies regarding the countries of destination (Figure 22).

Thus, the share of men who leave for the Russian Federation accounts for more than 70 per cent during the analysed period. About 9 per cent of migrant men go to Italy. About 40 per cent of women migrants head to Russia, and about 35 per cent move to Italy. Turkey and Israel separately host about 6 per cent of female Moldovan migrants annually.
Figure 22. Distribution of persons aged 15 years and over working or looking for a job abroad, by sex and country of destination, 2006–2010

Some differences are noted in the structure of migrant workers depending on their level of education (Figure 23).

Figure 23. Distribution of migrants, by level of education and country of destination, 2010
The migrants who leave RM to work in Italy, Portugal and Romania are characterized by a larger share of persons with a higher level of education (higher education, specialized secondary education and vocational education). Such migrants account for 59 per cent of the total migrant workers in Italy, while the ratio is 54.9 per cent in Portugal and more than 78 per cent in Romania. The Russian Federation, Turkey, Israel, Ukraine and Greece are characterized by a dominant share of migrants with lyceum, secondary general and lower educational levels.

It is necessary to mention that the LFS does not include data regarding the migration of children with their parents who are involved in presumably temporary labour migration, and it is also not possible to estimate the emigration for studying abroad, or the length of time of migrant workers’ stay abroad. Hence, this group may not be analysed in view of establishing the number of international migrants per the United Nations definition.

Almost one fifth of households from Moldova are involved in labour migration and this share is maintained over the whole reported period, with a decreasing trend registered by 2010 (Figure 24).

Figure 24. Labour migration, by area of residence, 2006–2010

Source: NBS and authors’ calculations based on NBS data.
If permanent emigration would mainly involve persons from urban areas, then temporary migration would involve members of rural households in the majority of cases. Hence, in 2010, more than 20 per cent of rural households and only 13 per cent of urban households had members who temporarily went abroad. The number of rural households that stated that at least one member is abroad was two times higher than the number of urban households (Table 12). In the case of urban households, a downward trend was noted in 2010 for the same indicator, while for rural households it remained stable.

A relatively large number of households with members temporarily abroad have children. More than half of households from the mentioned group include children up to 18 years old (Figure 25). The respective dynamics was decreasing from 2007 to 2010, with this indicator declining almost 7 percentage points. During 2007–2010, more than one fourth of the total number of households with children also had a member temporarily working abroad. In 2010 specifically, the share of households with children under 18 years old that also had members temporarily abroad accounted for 26.25 per cent of the total number of households with children in RM.
Demographic movement of Moldovan citizens abroad

An important aspect in the migration flow context refers to the factors that influence the demographic evolution of Moldovan citizens abroad. To analyse the situation in this area, the statistical data from MFAEI and MITC were used (Table 16 and Table 17). During 2007–2010, the number of marriages concluded between the Moldovan citizens abroad was 44,568, of which 73 per cent were concluded between young people 20–34 years old. Most of the marriages were registered in the Russian Federation (11.8%), Ukraine (10.2%), Romania (8.1%) and Italy (2.3%). The number of divorce documents transcribed abroad by the end of 2010 reached 2,630, of which 58.7 per cent were registered among young people aged 20–39 years. In 24.3 per cent of cases, the information about the age of the divorced people is missing.

Another aspect of the demographic movement refers to the data on births and deaths of Moldovan citizens abroad. By the end of 2010, the number of birth certificates issued abroad and transcribed by the Moldovan authorities was 43,740, most of them being issued in the Russian Federation (2.6%), Italy (3.2%), Portugal, Spain, Romania and Turkey (0.5% each), as well as Greece, France and Turkey (0.3% each). It should be mentioned that this number includes not only the certificates issued at birth, but also those transcribed in the respective countries and issued in RM. The number of deaths registered for the same period was 3,819, of which more than 70 per cent were among men. It should be mentioned that more than 80 per cent of the dead were of working age (15–64 years old). The structure of deaths by registration country, as in the case of marriages, is dominated by the Russian Federation, followed by Italy, Ukraine and Romania.

Repatriation

During 2006–2009, the annual number of repatriated persons was increasing (Figure 26).

Year-on-year growth rates were between 6 and 18 per cent (Table 15). In 2010, repatriations dropped significantly, registering negative growth of about 22 per cent.

According to Law No. 200 of 16 July 2010 on the regime of foreigners in RM, repatriation is defined as the voluntary return of persons born in RM and their descendants to the homeland.
Several children were registered among the repatriated individuals, accounting for roughly 10 per cent of the total number of repatriated people in 2006 and 2007. The lowest share was observed in 2009 at only 1 per cent. In 2010, this indicator increased to 3.4 per cent.

**Readmission**

An important element of migration management is an efficient system for readmission.

The readmission of Moldovan citizens from EU countries is carried out in line with the provisions set in the Agreement between the European Community and RM on the readmission of persons residing without authorization and other readmission agreements signed with countries of destination of Moldovan migrants which contributed to making more efficient the activities in the respective area. A positive dynamic is registered for readmission in RM. In 2010, 110 persons were readmitted,

---

representing an increase of 25 per cent compared to 2009, and a threefold increase from 2007 (Table 15 and Figure 27). The majority of the readmitted persons come from France, the Czech Republic, Germany, Hungary, Spain and Austria (Figure 27).

Figure 27. Number of readmitted persons and annual growth rate, 2005–2010

Preventing and combating trafficking in human beings

Preventing and combating THB was set as a national priority, and a number of international acts were ratified and a set of legislative-normative and strategic acts was adopted with the aim to straighten the situation in this area.36

---

Besides the measures for constraining the phenomenon, the need to support the victims based on a cross-sectoral and multidisciplinary approach was identified. In 2006, with the support of IOM, external donors and civil society, the NRS was launched in RM with the aim of ensuring a complex framework of protection and assistance for victims of THB and high-risk groups. Currently, it represents the main framework for cooperation and coordination of efforts undertaken by the stakeholders active in the area of combating of THB. The activities set in the NRS are carried out through the Multidisciplinary teams (MDTs), which cover the whole country.

The statistical data shows that 132 victims of THB were identified in 2010 through MDTs within the NRS, which is five times higher than the number registered in 2006 – a fact that may be explained by more efficient identification of such victims (Table 24). The composition of the identified victims is the following: 75.8 per cent adults (of which 73% consist of women and 27% men) and 24.3 per cent children (65.7% girls and 34.3% boys) (Figure 28).

Figure 28. Share of victims of THB, 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>in %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Children</td>
<td>24.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adults</td>
<td>75.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: MLSPF/NRS.

37 Including single, divorced or widowed mothers with minor children, unmarried women without children, and victims of domestic violence.
More than 80 per cent of the victims of THB come from rural areas, having an average age of 18–39 years old with a level of compulsory education cycle.

Further, 328 potential victims of THB were identified and assisted through the NRS in 2010. It is assumed that this number could be much higher, as it includes also an extended group of persons considered to be at high risk of becoming a victim of THB. Hence, the number of potential victims of THB reported by non-governmental organizations (NGOs) for that year is 904.39

The analyses in the area show that despite the applied measures, RM continues to be one of the countries of origin for THB, and it is less a country of transit for victims from the ex-Soviet Union countries to the European States. According to IOM data, the main countries of destination for the victims of THB remain the same in recent years: United Arab Emirates (27%), Russian Federation (17%) and Turkey (14%). But other countries were also included in the list of destination countries for the first time: 11 cases in Egypt (except for one case in 2003), 2 in Malaysia, and 1 in Indonesia.40

A2.2. Resident population with foreign background

This chapter will analyse the migration processes of the population of persons with foreign background residing in RM based on the data submitted by MITC SE CSIR “Registru” and MOI/BMA, which are the main sources in the respective context. The following will be used as additional data sources: administrative data of MLSPF and MFAEI, the results of analytical reports related to the subject, the normative and governmental strategic framework, as well as the statistical data of international organizations such as UNHCR and IOM.

Stock of population with foreign background

By the end of 2010, the total number of foreigners (including stateless persons) staying in the territory of RM was 20,099, representing

---

39 Ibid.
0.5 per cent of the total population. This shows 8.3 per cent growth in foreigners’ numbers as against 2009, and a 71.2 per cent increase against 2005 (Table 16 and Figure 29). From the geographical distribution perspective, data shows that 78.5 per cent of foreigners are concentrated in urban areas, mainly because of the more developed infrastructure, which offers more opportunities for economic and social integration as compared to rural areas.

Figure 29. Number of foreigners living in RM and annual growth rate, 2005–2010

![Figure 29. Number of foreigners living in RM and annual growth rate, 2005–2010](image)

Source: MITC SE CSIR “Registru”.

The analysis of foreigners’ structure by their countries of citizenship reveals that the most significant share, exceeding 60 per cent, goes to people originating from Ukraine (35.4%) and the Russian Federation (24.9%). This is followed by those from Israel (4.8%), Turkey (3.9%), Romania (3.4%), Italy (1.2%), Germany (0.6%) and other nations. At the same time, a rather large share in foreigners’ structure constitutes stateless persons and those with undetermined citizenship at 8.6 %, as well as former citizens of RM at 4 % (Table 17, Figure 30).

---

41 The data of MITC SE CSIR “Registru” does not include the number of persons who have been living in RM since the Soviet Union period but have not regularized their citizenship status until the present.
Naturalization in RM is carried out in line with the provisions set in the Law on Citizenship, which provides the conditions for applying for naturalization.\footnote{Article 17 of the Law No. 1024 of 03 June 2000, on Citizenship in RM.} The total number of naturalized foreigners during 2005–2010 was 645 persons (Table 18). It should be mentioned that stateless persons account for 70.2 per cent of the total number of naturalized persons, followed by foreigners with undetermined citizenship at 23.6 per cent, and other foreigners (those who previously had another citizenship) at 6.2 per cent. Over 2010, 14 naturalizations were registered, and the naturalization rate was 0.09 per cent\footnote{Calculations of international consultants based on data of EMP indicators.} (Figure 31).

Non-natives. During the period of 2005–2010, the number of foreign-born persons (regardless of the citizenship) staying in RM doubled. By the end of 2010, non-natives reached 253,847 or 6.5 per cent of the total
population. The growth rate for non-natives compared to 2009 year was 3.8 per cent (Figure 32). The non-natives’ structure according to the birth country shows that more than 80 per cent of them were born in Ukraine (41.7%) and the Russian Federation (38.7%). The share of non-natives born in other countries varies – for Italy from 1.7 to 1.3 %, for Romania – 0.6 per cent, for Turkey and Saudi Arabia – 0.01 per cent (Table 19). The analysis by areas of residence points out that more than 73 per cent of non-natives living in RM are concentrated in urban areas.

Figure 31. Share of naturalized foreigners, by category, and naturalization rate, 2005–2010

---

**Immigration of foreigners**

The geopolitical changes occurring in the region over the past decade, especially the existence of borders with EU countries and the appearance of the new integration perspectives, has made RM somewhat more attractive for immigration to foreign citizens. Annually, more than 2,000 foreigners immigrate to RM. According to MOI/BMA data, the number of foreign immigrants to Moldova reached 2,311 in 2010, which is 200 persons fewer than the figure presented by NBS. Nevertheless, this discrepancy does not influence trends. The immigration of foreigners increased 15.1 per cent from the previous year, and 12.5 per cent as compared to 2005 (Table 20). From the perspective of human capital,
about 51.3 per cent of these foreigners have an educational level not lower than professional secondary, the majority being men. The gender gap is 44.4 per cent (Figure 33).

Figure 32. Number of foreign-born persons in RM and annual growth rate, 2005–2010

Figure 33. Gender gap for foreign immigrants, 2005–2010

Source: MITC SE CSIR “Registru”.

Source: MOI/BMA.
According to their citizenship, the most significant share in 2010 goes to citizens of Israel (20.7%), Ukraine (14.3%), Romania (11.5%), the Russian Federation (10.7%) and Turkey (10.3%) (Table 21 and Figure 34). It should be mentioned that during 2005–2010, the evolution of foreign immigrants’ structure was not uniform. Hence, the number of immigrants from Israel increased five times, those from Germany more than three times, those from Romania two and a half times, and those from the Russian Federation one and a half times. In the same span, the number of immigrants from Turkey decreased 48.7 per cent and immigrants from the Syrian Arab Republic fell 68.3 per cent.

Figure 34. Distribution of foreign immigrants by country of citizenship, 2005–2010

Source: MOI/BMA.

**Temporary stay of foreigners in RM**

An increasing number of foreigners requesting for documentation in RM can be noted. Currently, depending on the entry goal, foreigners may obtain a temporary stay permit (for work, studies, family reintegration,
humanitarian and religious activities, and health treatment) or a permanent stay permit for other goals according to the national legislation.

By the end of 2010, the number of foreigners living in RM and holding a permanent stay permit was 15,546, with growth from the previous year being 5.8 per cent. As compared to 2005, the number of those holding a permanent stay permit increased 81.7 per cent. The group of working-age foreigners represent over 79 per cent of permanent stay permit holders.

About 12.7 per cent of the total number of foreigners documented in RM with permanent stay permits have higher education. Compared to 2005, the share of foreigners with higher education decreased by 4.5 percentage points, while there was an increase by 4.4 percentage points for those with incomplete higher education and incomplete secondary education.44

Statistical data shows that more than 2,000 foreigners obtain temporary stay permits annually. By the end of 2010, the total number of holders of such valid permits exceeded 4,500. About 36 per cent of the total consists of persons who have reunified with their families. One third came for training or studies, and 30.6 per cent for work and business (Figure 35). Although national legislation also provides for other conditions for issuing temporary stay permits to foreigners, such as humanitarian and religious activities, treatment, or other well-reasoned arguments, no such cases were registered during 2005–2010 (Table 22).

**Foreigners in the educational system of RM.** According to NBS data, 1,604 foreigners were studying in RM in 2010, of which 85.5 per cent were students at the I and II cycles of higher education. The structure of foreign students by country of origin shows that about 90 per cent of doctorate students come from Romania, while most of the students at the I and II higher education cycles come from Israel (55.7%), CIS (Ukraine – 14.7%, Russian Federation – 8.6%, Turkey – 5.5% and the Syrian Arab Republic – 1.7%)45 (Figure 36).

---

Figure 35. Distribution of foreigners holding temporary stay permits, by purpose, 2005–2010

Figure 36. Share of foreign students educated in RM, by country of origin, 2005–2010
The attractiveness of the Moldovan educational system may be explained by relatively lower costs. Compared to other countries, possibilities for subsequent authentication of obtained diplomas through the Bologna Process, as well as the lack of linguistic barriers, especially in case of the students coming from the neighbouring countries, makes it easier for foreign students to be integrated from the educational and social point of view.

**International protection**

International protection of foreigners in RM is carried out within the limits of the provisions set in international norms, as well as in the national legislation derived from them. Statistical data shows that the number of asylum-seekers in RM during 2005–2010 has varied continuously. Hence, 90 applications (at the first request) were registered in 2010, which is double the number in 2009, but lower by 14.3 per cent as compared to 2005. It should be noted that the number of asylum-seekers with pending applications by the end of 2010 was 81, up 55.8 per cent from the previous year (Table 23).

The structure of asylum-seekers by countries of origin is dominated by citizens from Armenia, who accounted for 25.6 per cent of the total in 2010, followed by Afghans (10%), Russians (8.9%), Kazakhs (6.7%), Iraqis (4.4%), Uzbeks (3.3%) and Georgians (2.2%).

For the first time, there were applications from Ukrainian citizens in 2010, which accounted for almost 15.6 per cent of the total (Figure 37).

Significant gender-based disparities are observed among asylum-seekers, the majority of applications coming from men, while women accounted for only 32.4 per cent in 2010.

In the same year, 25 foreigners (including stateless persons) benefited from humanitarian protection, while 35 persons were refused.

---

46 RM joined the Bologna Process in 2005, which imposed the country to adjust its higher education stages to the common international requirements.

47 Law No. 677 of 23 November 2001 on Republic of Moldova’s accession to the Convention relating to the Status of Refugees and the Protocol relating to the Status of Refugees.
By the end of 2010, 70 persons with *refugee status* were living in RM, growing 87.5 per cent since the beginning of the year. It should be mentioned that according to UNHCR data, the stock of refugees living in the country by the end of 2010 was 148 persons, about 32 per cent consisting of women.\(^48\)

**Stateless persons.** According to national statistical data, by the end of 2010, 2,079 persons documented in RM were stateless.\(^49\) This data differs insignificantly from that presented by UNHCR, which reports a total of 2,031 stateless persons in RMoldova by the end of 2010.\(^50\)

The analysis of the stateless persons’ distribution reveals that of the total, 70 per cent reside in the districts on the left side of the river Nistru (Transnistria).\(^51\) About 60 per cent of stateless persons residing in the rest of the territory are concentrated in urban areas. Women make up roughly

---


\(^{49}\) MITC SE CSIR “Registru” data includes 1,360 stateless persons who are foreigners in RM and 719 stateless persons who have been living in RM since the Soviet Union period but have not regularized their citizenship status until the present.

\(^{50}\) See no. 48.

60 per cent of the total number of stateless persons. The biggest number of stateless persons comes from the former Soviet bloc – the Russian Federation, Belarus, Georgia, Uzbekistan, etc. – who did not succeed to regularize their status in RM for different reasons.52

It should be mentioned that the analyses of the national legal framework of RM reflected a high level of its compliance with international standards, as well as the presence of an adequate information system to identify, prevent and reduce cases of statelessness. Based on these conditions, as well as on the international recommendations, in December 2011, RM ratified the two United Nations Conventions from 1954 and 1961 relating to status of stateless persons53 and those relating to reducing cases of statelessness,54 including a number of amendments made to the national legislation to introduce procedures for determining the status of stateless person. The ratification of the two conventions was included as an additional paragraph in the process of visa regime liberalization for the EU.

**General cross-border mobility**

The bilateral agreements signed to abolish the visa regime for the citizens of the EU, CIS,55 European Region countries and highly industrialized countries, the regulation of the visa-based entry56 and staying conditions in RM for the citizens of some states, as well as the legalization of Moldovan emigrants in the host countries, contributed to increasing cross-border mobility.

During 2010, about 6.9 million entries were registered at the border of RM, with the difference compared to the number of exits being -1.4 per cent.

In terms of cross-border mobility, Moldovan citizens register a share of 72 per cent, with exits prevailing over entries. For foreigners, the situation is proportionally reversed (Figure 38).

---

52 MOI (2012). Ministry of Internal Affairs – specialized structure for recognizing the stateless persons’ statute. Press Release. Available at: www.mai.md/content/11242


55 Except for Turkmenistan.

The number of Moldovans’ entries and exits as against 2009 decreased 0.4 and 1.4 per cent, respectively, while those of foreigners increased 27.4 and 13.3 per cent. It should be mentioned that the number of entries and exits increased as compared to 2005. For Moldovans, these grew 38.3 and 35.9 per cent, while for foreigners they jumped 92.8 and 97.6 per cent (Table 25).

As for the visa-based entries of foreigners, the statistical data of the MFAEI shows that during 2010, the diplomatic missions and consular offices of RM abroad issued 14,954 visas, down 10.8 per cent from 2009, but 250 per cent higher than in 2005 (Table 25). According to the legislation in force, the visa regime is applied for citizens of 135 States, mainly those in Asia, Africa, the Middle East, and Latin and South America. The citizens of the EU, USA, Canada, Japan, Norway, Switzerland, Israel, and other CIS countries enter the territory of RM, based on bilateral agreements, without visas for a stay up to 90 days calculated from the first entry date.\textsuperscript{57}

\textsuperscript{57} \url{www.mfa.gov.md/entry-visas-moldova}
The Agreement on Small Border Traffic signed between RM and Romania\textsuperscript{58} represents an important aspect in the context of trans-border mobility management, according to which the residents of the contracting parties who legally reside for at least one year in the border zone (administratively determined as the area in between 30 and 50km), are issued small border traffic permits. During 2010, such permits were issued to 17,772 persons,\textsuperscript{59} who can use them to enter the territory of Romania without visas for travelling in the area of a well-marked administrative zone.

**Legislation enforcement in the area of migration and migrants’ return**

**Application of legislation in combating irregular migration.**

As a result of the democratization process and RM’s joining different international bodies, the foreign relations framework has enlarged. This has generated and increased the flow of foreigners arriving to the country, with some irregular migrants being potential asylum-seekers. The conditions that substantially favor this process on the territory of RM are the following:

i. the gap between the socioeconomic development of countries with high migration potential and countries from Western Europe and North America;

ii. conflicts, including military ones, in different regions of the world, provoked by religious, inter-ethnic, political and other reasons;

iii. the geographical location of RM, the territory of which was used by a comparatively limited number of irregular migrants (about 1 per cent of the total number of irregular migrants identified at the European level) to get to Western European countries;\textsuperscript{60} and

iv. the impossibility to control the Transnistrian sector of the eastern border by the authorities of RM.


\textsuperscript{59} EMP Matrix, Indicator 2.2.10. based on the data offered by the MITC SE CSIR “Registru”.

All these factors attract illegal migrants from CIS countries, especially those from the Caucasus region, as well as those from China, India, Bangladesh, countries in the Near and Middle East, Turkey, etc.\textsuperscript{61}

During 2010, 2,298 immigrants were identified as illegally staying in RM, 17.2 per cent higher than in 2009 and 19.4 higher than in 2005. The measure of expulsion from the country was used only in the case of 58 foreigners, while the measure of taking under public custody was used for 80 foreigners. All other cases were included in the group of those waiting for a final decision by the competent courts.

It should be mentioned that no case of cancellation, revocation or refusal of the foreigner’s right to stay in the territory of RM was registered during 2005–2010, including cases of declaring the foreigner’s stay as unwanted (Table 26).

As for readmission and return of foreigners, it should be specified that currently, RM has a number of tools based on bilateral agreements, signed with the EU (in force since 1 January 2008), Ukraine (1997), Switzerland (2004 and 2010), the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia (2008), Serbia and Denmark (2011). In the meantime, the process of negotiation for readmission agreements with the main countries of origin of the irregular immigrants is ongoing. In 2007, an intergovernmental agreement on readmission of persons with unauthorized residence was approved and sent to the following countries: the Russian Federation, Uzbekistan, Tajikistan, Georgia, Azerbaijan, Armenia, Kazakhstan, Belarus, Kyrgyzstan, Turkmenistan, Turkey, the Syrian Arab Republic, Bangladesh, India, Lebanon, Pakistan, Jordan, Afghanistan, Iran, Iraq, China, Bosnia and Herzegovina, and Montenegro. As a result, negotiations are carried out to sign agreements with Russia, Montenegro, and Bosnia and Herzegovina. At the same time, a number of discussions on readmission were initiated with Turkey.

\textsuperscript{61} See no. 2.
PART B: MIGRATION IMPACT

B1. Migration and demographic development

The magnitude of the labour migration phenomenon in RM registered over the past two decades had a dual impact on the population of the country: on one hand, the positive socioeconomic effects determined by remittances, and on the other hand, the sociodemographic effects that led to the deterioration of human capital over time. The prevalence of emigration over immigration has an immediate impact on the size of the population and influences its continuous decrease, and the labour migration of women of childbearing age leads to the deterioration of the main demographic indicators due to birth rate decrease.

**Continuous contraction of the population.** Over the past two decades, RM registered deep negative demographic trends. The demographic decline is confirmed by a number of statistical indicators.

Since 1998, the total stable population has been dropping significantly and constantly, registering, by the end of 2010, a decrease of more than 95,000 persons. In the period 2005–2010, the stable population decreased by almost 30,000 persons to 3.56 million persons in 2010 compared to 3.59 million persons in 2005 (Figure 39).

The highest decrease was registered in 2005–2007. Even though the decline of the population was slightly diminishing over the past years, it still continued to fall annually. The demographic decrease was determined both by the negative natural growth, as well as by the negative balance of external migration. The mortality rate exceeds the birth rate, registering a negative natural growth in the past decade. The lowest value of this

---


63 Stable population is defined as the number of persons who have resided stably on the respective territory, including temporarily absent persons.

indicator was registered in 2005 at 1.95 per thousand (Table 27). At the same time, the year is characterized by the magnitude of the migration phenomenon, and this is confirmed by the fact that the gross emigration rate (per 1,000 persons) significantly exceeded the gross immigration rate of Moldovan citizens – the phenomenon that actually fostered, de facto, these negative demographic trends.

Figure 39. Demographic trends in RM, 2005–2010

Emigration versus immigration. Statistical data confirms that emigration continues to prevail over immigration in RM. Nevertheless, the evolution of the phenomenon shows a trend towards stabilization.

If in 2005 this indicator accounted for −1.01 percentage points, in 2010, the difference between emigration and immigration of Moldovan citizens was only 0.15 percentage point in favor of emigration. It might be noted that the economic crisis in the region has also influenced migration phenomenon in RM. Until 2008, both emigration and immigration were ascending, while starting in 2009, the two phenomena registered a decreasing trend. This is more pronounced in the case of emigration, and a significant decrease of the number of emigrations was registered in 2010 as compared to the previous years. If during 2005–2009 this indicator varied between 6,000 and 7,000 persons, in 2010, this number decreased significantly to 4,714 migrants.
It is observed that some Moldovan citizens leave the country forever or for a long time, while, de facto, they are kept in the records of their places of residence. This conclusion is supported by the fact that every year, within the period of 2005–2008, according to the state border records, the total border crossings for Moldovans leaving the country was higher than the number of those entering the country (Table 27). The difference between entries and exits at the border until 2008 was maintained at more than 100,000. Although the expectations for massive return of Moldovans as a result of the economic crisis from the region did not come true, these indicators nevertheless registered a decreasing trend starting in 2009. In 2008, 5.3 million entries and 5.4 million exits were registered, while in 2009 the situation was reversed, with 5.2 million entries and 5.1 million exits. This demonstrates that the number of exits had become lower than that of entries. In 2009, a difference of about 110,000 entry crossings was registered for Moldovans, but the following year the migration phenomenon increased again. As a result, in 2010, a gap exceeding 80,000 border crossings was registered for Moldovans leaving the country (Figure 41). The exit–entry difference for foreigners was negative up to 2007, with more entries into the country being registered than exits, with an insignificant difference. When the economic crisis set off in 2008, foreigners registered more exits from the country, with an essential difference of 195,000 in 2009. In 2010, this phenomenon decreased, however preserving the upward trend.
Figure 41. Entry-exit difference for Moldovan citizens and foreigners, 2005–2010

![Bar chart showing the entry-exit difference for Moldovan citizens and foreigners, 2005–2010.](chart)

Source: BGS Integrated Information System.

Figure 42. Annual growth rate of foreigners' entries versus Moldovan citizens' exits, 2005–2010

![Bar chart showing the annual growth rate of foreigners' entries versus Moldovan citizens' exits, 2005–2010.](chart)

Source: BGS Integrated Information System.
The year-on-year growth rates of the number of Moldovans’ exits at the State border: before the crisis, this indicator registered a continuous increase, in 2009 a drop was registered, and in 2010 the uptick returned (Figure 42). The trends registered for foreigners are reversed: before the crisis, foreigners registered more entries, but during the crisis, more exits. In this context, data shows that before the crisis, a larger number of Moldovans were abroad, during the crisis they came back to the country, and one year later, the migration flow increased again.

**Demographic composition.** In general, the demographic situation is influenced by the migration phenomenon, and the structure of the population by sex and age is somehow influenced by the migration direction. This leads to modification of the main demographic indicators, including the total population of the country. During the period of ample migration, the demography of RM was characterized by a continuous drop in the population, which goes hand in hand with the demographic ageing process, and the decrease of the number of children and young persons. The demographic dependency ratio, estimated according to the national definition, remains to be rather high and registered about 50 per cent in 2010. The so-called social pressure phenomenon grows, which in this case is expressed by the fact that a working person maintains a person who is not employed. During the analysed period, the respective indicator registered a decline of 2 percentage points (when applying the international definition, the decrease is larger at 3.28 percentage points). It seems that the trend for the falling demographic dependency ratio registered over the past five years would indicate an improvement of the demographic situation, but the analysis of the complementary demographic indicators reveals a rather concerning situation. Thus, the proportion of persons under 15 years old went down in 2010 as compared to 2005 by almost 2 percentage points. The total fertility rate was particularly low in 2010, accounting for 1.309 (1.055 and 1.531, respectively, in urban and rural areas); thus being far below the replacement rate. As well, over the past years, the population ageing coefficient was continuously increasing (Figure 43).

---

65 Total fertility rate is defined as the average number of children delivered by a woman during the fertile period of her life, in the fertility conditions of the respective year.


67 The population ageing coefficient is the number of persons aged 60 years and over per 100 inhabitants.
Migration compounds the process of population ageing, because it is mainly the young persons of active population who participate in this phenomenon. As a result, in 2010, the ageing coefficient reached the value of 14.4 per cent, indicating an advanced stage of the phenomenon. This coefficient is higher in the case of women, exceeding the critical value of 16 per cent, and in rural area 18 per cent. The forecasts prepared by the researchers confirm that by 2050, one in every three persons will be over 60 years old in Moldova, and the share of the elderly could constitute about 35–50 per cent of the country’s population. According to United Nations forecasts, along with the demographic ageing, by 2050, the population of the country would decrease by 20 per cent.

Data shows the decreasing trend in the share of population aged 65 years and over starting from 2007, while the ratio of those 80 years old and over in the total population of the mentioned group was ascending. The indicator registered an increase of 5 percentage points in 2010 as compared to 2005 (Figure 44.).
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68 NBS Statistical databank, Population ageing coefficient, 1980–2009. Available from http://statbank.statistica.md/pxweb/Database/RQ/02%20POP/POP01/POP01.asp (accessed 21 April 2012). According to Boje-Garnier scale, the coefficient of 12 % is assessed for the population which is already aged; the ageing coefficient of 16 % is assessed in the specialized surveys as being critical from the demographic continuity point of view.


70 V. Sainsus, The impact of demographic ageing on the pensioning system: Subtleties and possible ways of solving the issue, Public Policy, 3 (Chisinau, IDIS “Viitorul”, 2010).
The risk of death is more accentuated for the men of retirement age. In 2010, the share of men aged 65 years and over accounted for 7.7 per cent of the total male population, while women of the same age accounted for about 12 per cent. The data reveals that the femininity ratio for those aged 65 years and over exceeded 165 per cent over the past five years.

Together with the negative natural growth, migration has influenced the structure of population by age. It is necessary to mention that this phenomenon led to decrease of children’s number and the comparative analysis of the population’s demographic structure for 2005 versus 2010 confirms this observation. A decrease of the young population aged 5–9 years, 10–14 years, and 15–19 years may be noted – this decrease is rather strong and in 2010 registered a drop of 2 percentage points as compared to 2005 (Figure 45).

These trends are observed for both sexes, predominantly for male, especially from the age group of 15–19 years old.

Among the main causes contributing to the decrease in the young population include: the decrease of the birth rate due to emigration of
persons of childbearing age; the parents who left the country to work abroad are taking their children with them; and the break-up of families due to lost links when one of the spouses is abroad. These indications are confirmed by the downward trend in the age groups 40–44 and 45–49 years old.

Figure 45. Pyramid of the demographic structure, by age and sex, 2005 and 2010

A significant decline in population is also observed for the age group of 65–69 years old. This trend has a dual explanation. First of all, persons of this age were born during the Second World War, a period when there was a low number of births. Secondly, this decline may also be conditioned by migration processes, deriving mainly from the initial stage of illegal migration. During the period of reference, the migration processes...

71 During 1990–2005, the “business” for organizing illegal emigration to EU countries was very widespread, but it has diminished gradually due to a number of reasons, including increased security at the border, appearance of opportunities to leave legally through the established social networks, possibilities for family reintegration, reacquiring of Romanian citizenship for RM citizens, etc.
process would involve a significant share of women, who have left for the West, mainly through irregular ways. Due to no possibility to come back home, a considerable number of fertile women remained for a rather long time in the countries of destination. This assumption is confirmed by the fact that it is mainly the female population that has contracted for this age group.

It is noted that the transformations of the population’s age structure are determined also by the differentiation based on sex. Within the age group of up to 29 years old, the sex structure for 2005–2010 is slightly dominated by men, while the quantum of women increases for the following groups. For the age groups of 55 years old and over, the sex misbalance increases significantly with a solid prevalence of the female population. The number of women aged 65 years and over has significantly exceeded the number of men of the same age, and in 2010, the femininity ratio for this age group was 167 per cent. It should also be mentioned that this indicator increased over the past years for the same age group and in 2010, it registered an increase of 2 percentage points as compared to 2007. The older the age groups are, the more pronounced are the registered differences, and for the age group of 80 years old and over, the femininity ratio in 2010 exceeded 200 per cent.

**Urban versus rural areas.** Migration phenomenon is more pronounced in rural areas as compared to urban ones. In 2010, the number of persons 15 years old and over working or looking for a job abroad was 316,900, of whom more than 70 per cent were from rural areas. In general, statistical surveys reveal that during the past five years, the share of the said group as related to the active population is twice higher in rural areas as compared to urban areas, accounting for 34 and 15 per cent, respectively, in 2010. (Figure 46).
At the same time, it is necessary to mention that there is a stable trend for urban population increase in the context of the total population decrease in the country. In 2010, the urbanization rate increased by 0.68 percentage points as compared to 2005 (Table 30). It can be also noted that along with the growing urban population, a particularly small share of persons under 15 years old is registered, and this trend keeps a constant pace of decrease. The share of the elderly, aged 65 years and over is also relatively small (Figure 47). These observations lead us to the conclusion that besides international migration, stable trends are also registered for internal migration, from villages to cities, especially of the active population. More opportunities to get a job, better infrastructure in cities compared to villages, improved access to education and health, and more diverse possibilities for leisure, etc. – all these are factors that foster mobility from rural areas to the cities (Figure 47).

Graduates of higher education also contribute to internal migration towards cities. Due to the lack of employment opportunities or low remuneration in rural localities, they stay and work in urban areas,

Source: NBS Statistical databank.
especially in the capital. This phenomenon is supported by workers from abroad who invest remittances in procuring flats for their children who study and graduated from the educational institutions of the capital city.

Figure 47. Demographic dependency indicators, by area of residence, 2005–2010

Both emigration and internal migration to cities of the active population contribute to a relevant deterioration of the human capital in the rural areas. This fact is confirmed by a number of demographic indicators. In 2010 the population ageing coefficient was 15.2 and 13.2 per cent respectively for the rural and urban populations. The dependency ratio calculated according to the international definition was 41 and 29 per cent in rural versus urban areas. Finally, the share of elderly people is higher in villages than in cities, accounting for 21 and 18 per cent, respectively.

Data also confirms that the changes in population structure are quicker in rural areas than in urban ones. In 2010, the share of persons up to 15 years old has decreased 2.07 percentage points in rural areas and 1.57 percentage points in urban areas compared to 2005 (Figure 47). The share of elderly people in the total population in rural areas has essentially
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progressed. Hence, the old age ratio in villages registered an increase of 5.96 percentage points in 2010 versus 3.38 percentage points in cities (Figure 48). Comparatively, the indicator had almost the same share in 2005.

Figure 48. Seniority ratio, by areas of residence, 2005–2010
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Source: NBS.

Migration essentially contributes to this situation because relatively younger persons migrate from rural areas as compared to urban areas. The average age of persons leaving to work abroad from the former is 34 years old, compared to 37 years old for urban migrants.\(^{74}\)

Men are mainly the ones who leave the country to work abroad. According to statistical data, within the population of persons 15 years old and over working or looking for a job abroad, men represent 65 and 60 per cent respectively from rural and urban areas.\(^{75}\)

Together with the life expectancy at birth, which is lower for men from rural areas as compared to urban areas (63.41 years versus 67.77 years in 2010),\(^{76}\) this leads to a rather high femininity ratio for those aged 65 years and over.

---

\(^{74}\) NBS, Labour Migration in the Republic of Moldova, complementary module to the LFS (Chisinau, 2008).

\(^{75}\) See no. 72.

It should be mentioned that this indicator shows opposed trends by areas of residence (Figure 49 and Table 30).

A rather rapid increase is registered in rural areas for the number of women aged 65 years and over per 100 men of the same age, while in urban areas, the same correlation is decreasing. In both cases, these discrepancies accounted for about 6 percentage points in 2010 as compared to 2005.

Figure 49. Femininity ratio in the elderly population, by areas of residence, 2005–2010

---

**Foreign population.** RM is a country characterized by the magnitude of emigration among its population. The phenomenon of foreigners’ immigration is not pronounced, although there is an increasing trend for the total number of foreigners residing in the territory of RM over the past five years. The number has increased by more than 8,000 persons since 2005, registering about 20,000 persons on 31 December 2010. This represents slightly over half a per cent of the total stable population of the country, thus not influencing the population structure by age.

It should be also mentioned that the number of persons younger than 15 years old during the reported period varied between 60 and 70 (Table 31). The share of foreign elderly persons developed in parallel with the total number of this group, and in 2010, it reached 0.36 per cent of the total population from the respective group in the country (Figure 50).
It should be noted that the number of men is higher among foreigners, although in 2010, the sex ratio for foreigners dropped by 18 percentage points as compared to 2005. (Table 31).

**B2. Migration and economic development**

*Macroeconomic context.* After a significant decline in the socioeconomic situation during the initial transition period, the economy of the country registered some improvement starting in 2000. The studies carried out by WB during this period attested to the significant positive impact of migration on macroeconomic stability in RM. According to this analysis, the inflow of foreign currency generated by labour migration contributed to compensating the trade deficit of the country, to fiscal consolidation, and to supporting the national currency. Remittances have represented and continue to represent the most substantial and stable contribution to foreign currency, as compared to foreign direct investments, exports, loans and external assistance. The foreign currency inflows have also contributed to increasing the budget through VAT and import taxes, development of the bank system, financial mediation services, and increase of capital.

---

The inflow of foreign currency has a certain contribution in this respect, and labour migration abroad has an important and significant role not only in demographic terms, but also in economic ones. Together with the increase of the number of persons going abroad for work, there is also a significant increase of individuals’ transfers from overseas, which has an influence on the main macroeconomic indicators.

The constant year-on-year growth of the GDP\(^78\) is mainly due to the revenues sent by Moldovan migrants abroad. According to WB estimations, remittances were highest in 2007, accounting for 36 per cent of GDP.\(^79\) This trend was maintained until 2008 (Table 32 and Figure 51).

Figure 51. GDP volume indices, 2005–2010

The GDP growth rate was negative in 2009, at -6 per cent compared to 2008, but returned to being positive in the next year.


\(^79\)N. Maddock and L. Ramguttee, How to respond to falling remittances and returning migrants? (Bratislava, UNDP Regional Centre, 2009).
Thus, the cumulated growth of the GDP from 2005 to 2010 was 17 per cent (Figure 51). It should be mentioned that the GDP structure by use categories is characterized by a significant share of the total final consumption, influenced by the consumption of individual households. During the period under study, the total final consumption accounted for over 90 per cent, with a decline of 4 percentage points in 2009 (Figure 52). At the same time, it is noted that households’ consumption increased 6 per cent in 2008 as compared to 2007 (Table 33), while in 2009, it decreased 8 per cent from the previous year. In 2010, it went back to its upward trend, registering an increase beyond 9 per cent as compared to 2009.80 This fluctuation is due to the inflow of foreign currency from abroad, which registered the same trend.

The consumer price index registered stable dynamics up to 2008, with a sharp drop in 2009 (Figure 53), conditioned mainly by the decrease of prices for foodstuff during the first eight months of 2009 and weakened internal demand. Some ascendancy was observed in 2010 as compared to the previous year.

In 2009, the exchange rate for the national currency witnessed a depreciation of 18.3 per cent against the USD in nominal terms (from MDL 10.40 to USD 1 on 1 January 2009, to MDL 12.30 on 31 December 2009).81 The leu depreciated even more compared to the euro, by 19.6 per cent. The main factors affecting the exchange rate were the fluctuations of the demand for foreign currency which led to the temporary destabilization of the internal exchange market, the decrease of remittance inflows from abroad, and the fluctuations of the exchange rate for the USD compared to other currencies on the international markets.82

There is no available official data regarding the total volume of remittances sent by migrants, as they enter the country through difference channels, both official and unofficial. Even in the case of bank transfers, it

is not possible to keep records about the origin of the money sent to the country by individuals. The analysis of the inflow of remittances into the country is presented based on the official data on money transfers through banks, as well as based on the estimations of NBM.

Figure 52. Share of expenditure components to the GDP, 2005–2010

Figure 53. Inflation indicators, 2005–2010
Thus, according to the balance of payments, the inflow of foreign currency was continuously growing until 2008 (Figure 54).

The money transfers from abroad, performed in favor of individuals through banks from RM during the year of reference increased nearly two and a half times as compared to 2005.

The incomes of the residents abroad coming from compensation for work, including credits, increased more than one and a half times. Personal transfers increased more than two and a half times (Table 34).

In 2009, a significant fall was registered for the inflows of foreign currency. Money transfers to RM made in favor of individuals through banks decreased 28.8 per cent (Figure 55) to USD 1.18 billion from USD 1.66 billion in 2008. The share of these transfers in the GDP was 21.7 per cent, registering a drop of 7 percentage points as compared to 2008. According to the balance of payments, the estimation of compensation for work, including credits, of the residents abroad decreased 33.1 per cent to USD 563.42 million, while the decrease of personal transfers was even deeper – by 39.3 per cent to USD 635.21 million (Table 34).
In 2010, the inflow of foreign currency again registered an ascending trend, with the growth rate for money transfers to RM made in favor of individuals through banks at 5.3 per cent as against 2009. As a share of the GDP, it stayed the same as in the previous year (Figure 55).

Figure 55. Transfers of monetary means to RM made by individuals through banks, 2005–2010

Remittances can have a positive impact on the overall economy and society if the resources are transformed into productive investments. In 2009, the amount of savings that could have been channelled to investments was estimated at EUR 601 million. In the majority of cases, the money sent from abroad was used for daily living expenses and buying furniture and other household goods. Half of migrants sent money home for savings or the education costs of children, while 15.5 per cent of migrants used the money to buy property (house or flat) and only 2.9
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83 Centre of Sociological, Politological and Psychological Analysis and Investigations (CIVIS) and International Agency for Source Country Information (IASCI), Strengthening the Link between Migration and Development in Moldova, (Chisinau, 2010).
per cent invested in a business, confirming that remittances improve the well-being of the migrant’s family and very little the country’s economic development. (European Training Foundation (ETF), 2007)

The level of remittances has increased year after year, reaching its peak in 2008 (USD 1.89 billion), then dropping steeply in 2009 as a consequence of the global financial crisis and starting to grow again in 2010 and 2011 (Figure 56).

Figure 56. Remittance flows in RM, 2003–2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Remittances, USD millions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>1,182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>1,498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>1,897</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>1,211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>1,363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>1,612</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: WB.

Compared with some of the nation’s neighbouring countries such as Romania, the flow of remittances in RM appears to be the most hardly hit by the crisis (Figure 57).

The importance of remittances for the economy of the migrants’ countries of origin can be measured by the percentage of the GDP they represent (Figure 58).

From this point of view, the impact of remittances appears very critical for the Moldovan economy as they constitute more than one fifth of the overall GDP (23.2 % in 2010). As shown in Figure 58, the impact on GDP is very important also for Bosnia and Herzegovina (12.9%) and Albania (10.9%)
Figure 57. Remittance flows in some South-Eastern European countries, 2003–2010

![Graph showing remittance flows](image)

Source: WB.

Figure 58. Remittances’ share of GDP in some South-Eastern European countries, 2010

![Bar chart showing remittances’ share of GDP](image)

Source: WB.
Households and remittances. Remittances are an important source of financial means for the population of RM to escape poverty. HBS data shows an ascending trend before 2008 for the share of households receiving remittances out of the total number of households in the country (Table 35). Hence, more than one fifth of the total number of households benefits from remittances, and in 2008 this share reached the maximum figure of 26.4 per cent. A larger share of households benefiting from remittances is registered in rural area as compared to urban ones, 29.5 and 22.6 per cent respectively, registered in 2008 (Figure 59).

Figure 59. Share of households benefiting from remittances, by areas of residence, 2006–2010

After a decline of 3 per cent in the number of households benefiting from remittances in 2009, the upward trend was restored. The lack of job opportunities in rural areas, the low salaries in agriculture, and no other income-generating activity have fostered labour migration. In 2010, the share of the households benefiting from remittances in rural areas increased again, accounting for 27.6 per cent.
**Households’ disposable income is influenced significantly by remittances.** The share of remittances in the average disposable income per person in the total number of households in the country was over 15 per cent during 2006–2010, and reached a maximum value of 19.1 per cent in 2008 (Table 36). According to HBS data, the amount of remittances dropped 13 per cent in 2009 as against the previous year. Remittances’ decrease had a major negative impact, especially on the rural area. The amount received from remittances in the rural area decreased by 19 per cent, and this has been a key factor trigger poverty increase in villages during 2009 (Table 37). A new increase of 16 per cent in remittances directed to rural population was registered in 2010, while the trend for urban areas remained descending (-4%).

Significant differences were registered regarding the volume of remittances by areas of residence, with a positive prevalence registered for rural households both as a share of the total disposable income, as well as in the remittances’ quantum. Starting in 2007, the share of remittances in the average income calculated for all rural households exceeded 20 per cent, registering an increase as against 2006, when the same indicator for urban households was 12 per cent, which remained stable during the entire period under study (Figure 60).

**Figure 60. Source of households’ disposable income, by areas of residence, 2006–2010**

![Figure 60: Source of households’ disposable income, by areas of residence, 2006–2010](image)

Source: NBS.
After reducing the gap of remittances by areas of residence in 2009, this trend actually increased in 2010 and reached the value registered in 2008 (Figure 61).

The NBS HBS data shows that in 2007–2010, remittances represented more than half of the disposable income of the remittances-dependent households in the country (Figure 62).

Differences exist in this respect by areas of residence, as well as in the case of this group of households. The share of remittances in the disposable income of rural households is very significant, accounting for about 60 per cent. The amounts received from abroad by urban households benefiting from remittances also represent an important income source, accounting for almost half of their disposable income (Figure 62).

The respective trends are kept throughout 2007–2010, including during the period of the economic crisis, when the share of households benefiting from remittances decreased. This fact proves certain stability for the portion of the incomes obtained from remittances, which is an important factor fostering labour migration.
According to IASCI and CIVIS (2010), about 84 per cent of migrants transferred money to households in RM in 2009, with a total amount of EUR 422 million. A remittances-benefiting household received an average of EUR 4,403 per year. The declared goal for remittances was to support the dependent members of the family (spouse, children and parents). The majority of the money is used for the households’ consumption and contributes to the population’s poverty reduction.\(^{84}\)

**Remittances contribute to increasing households’ level of well-being.** The share of population absolutely under the poverty line registered stable trends in 2007–2009, accounting for about 26 per cent of the country’s total population (Figure 63).

The poverty rate decreased by almost 5 percentage points in 2010, with incidence higher in cases of children under 18 years old.

The flow of financial resources from persons working abroad contributes to diminishing absolute poverty, but it also leads to increasing inequality between the households that benefit from remittances and those that do not. The distribution and structure of the disposable income by quintiles confirm that the income generated by remittances deepen the gap between such households (Table 38). It was noted that the largest amount of remittances are found in the upper quintiles, and this differentiation is more significant in rural areas. The 80/20 distribution for the total disposable income is almost the same, of about 3.3 and 3.1, respectively, for urban and rural areas, while in remittances’ case, this indicator was 8.5 for urban areas and 10.2 for rural ones.

The HBS data reveals that remittances contributed to reducing poverty in the households that benefited from remittances during 2006–2010, and this decrease varied between 8 and 14 per cent annually (Figure 64).

The largest contribution was registered in 2008, when the share of the households that would have been in poverty had they not received remittances accounted for 14 per cent. If there were no remittances, the poverty rate would be about 40 per cent. The respective indicator
decreased 2 percentage points in 2009, and came back to its ascending path in 2010. The largest impact on population living standards is registered for rural areas during the entire period of reference, with a maximum value of 16.7 per cent registered in 2008. It is necessary to mention that the trends for the following years differ in rural and urban areas. The share of rural households that would be poor without remittances decreased in 2009 and returned to its upward trend in 2010, while the same indicator for the urban households was unchanged. This leads to the conclusion that de facto, in 2010, the migration experience has started again especially among the rural population. Resultantly, the remittances from abroad to the households in the country also restarted.

Figure 64. Share of households that would be under the poverty line without remittances, 2006–2010

![Graph showing the share of households that would be under the poverty line without remittances, 2006–2010.](image)

**Source:** NBS.

Remittances are invested in the real estate market. Before 2008, in the context of difficult business conditions, persons who went abroad to work mainly invested in dwelling spaces, especially in Chisinau. According to experts, about 80 per cent of apartments were bought by Moldovan citizens who worked abroad or using money sent home by migrants. The impact of these investments was dual: on one hand, it led to the

---

85 www.gazda.md/forum/13-86-1
boom in the construction sector; on the other hand, it resulted in rising real estate prices. The increase in prices in Chisinau during this period was fostered by the increase of the population’s purchasing power, resulting from remittances-based revenues. This conclusion is confirmed by the data from LFS 2008, which reveals that over 20 per cent of the interviewed people were using remittances to procure and repair their dwelling, representing actually the largest share of the population following the group using remittances for daily needs.86

After 2008, although flat rental rates remained unchanged, the demand to purchase real estate started to decrease, and prices started falling. National experts in the area87 confirm that compared to 2008–2009, some stability may be noted in 2010 for both costs and number of registered transactions, while real estate operators in the capital city indicate a significant stagnation in the sector. The dynamics of such economic activities’ contribution to the GDP confirms these assumptions and affirmations (Figure 65).

Figure 65. Contribution of real estate and construction activities to the GDP, 2005–2010

Source: NBS.

86 NBS, Labour Migration in the Republic of Moldova, complementary module to the LFS (Chisinau, 2008).
87 www.lara.md/main/analytics/archive
It may be noted that the contribution of revenues to constructions increased before 2008, after which it registered a sharp drop. Ascending dynamics may be observed for real estate transactions until 2009, while in 2010 a real decrease in the volume of such transactions was obvious. The following may be mentioned among the main factors that influenced the situation: freeze in purchasers’ demand for procurement of real estate and investors’ lack of interest in the real estate market.

**Investing remittances in business activities.** The remittances’ impact on economic development depends on their being invested in productive businesses. According to surveys from the Centre for Sociological Investigations and Marketing (CBS-AXA) in 2008 and 2009, respondents were aware of the remittances’ potential to contribute to the economic development of the country, by investing them in businesses (Table 39); this was mentioned by more than 26 per cent of respondents. Migrants also mentioned as a development opportunity the contribution to promoting local exports, by consuming Moldovan products abroad; this was mentioned by 2 per cent of respondents (Figure 66).

Figure 66. Ways to contribute to RM’s development according to migrants, 2009

---

Source: IOM; CBS AXA.
It should be noted that traditionally, investments are made in RM at the small or micro level, and migrants’ financial flows are oriented mainly towards agriculture, retail trade (including bars and restaurants), construction, real estate and services. It is worth noting that the contribution of economic activities to setting the GDP by industry confirms this notion (Table 40). In 2010, the contribution of the retail and wholesale trade accounted for 12.8 per cent, agriculture – 12 per cent, transport and communications – 11.3 per cent, and processing – 10 per cent. Construction and real estate transactions accounted for 8.2 per cent of the GDP in the respective year of reference.

It is important to mention that the qualitative studies on the subject reveal that migrants think that the knowledge and new skills in different fields acquired by Moldovans when working abroad is an important achievement. Migration offered them the opportunity to learn about modern technologies, different strategies for business planning and organization, and how to take business ideas and implement them upon return to the country. But besides the potential availability of the migrants to invest, the business environment remains unattractive, and the economic risks are still too high. All these lead to failure of the efforts undertaken to launch a business. Sometimes, multiple failures push migrants to lose hope and confidence in succeeding in business, and thus, they have to leave the country again to work abroad.

Remittance-based savings. Saving a portion of remittances is a practice for a number of households. Savings are in lei, but also in foreign currencies. According to surveys carried out in the area, population’s savings are mainly directed towards consumption, having some specific purposes (Table 41). The data shows that in 52.9 per cent of cases, savings are for backup in critical situations (emergency cases in general, sickness of a household member, insurance for old age or for funerals, in case of job loss). Saving for investment in assets or human capital is done by 20.2 per cent of households (education, leisure, procurement or reparation of real estate, domestic devices and car). The households have also indicated some other objectives for their savings: family events (3.7%), investment in business (2%) or an eventual emigration (1.3%).

---

88 See no. 83.
According to the same source, the population mainly prefers to keep the savings at home, especially in lei (Table 42). Confidence in the banking system is rather low, and this is supported by the fact that 67 per cent of households benefiting from remittances prefer to keep the money at home either in lei or in the foreign currency. The share of households keeping the money at home out of the total number of households that do not receive money from abroad is even higher at 77.7 per cent, and 61.4 per cent prefer to keep the money in lei. The households benefiting from remittances prove to have a high confidence level in the banking system. Thus, 20.5 per cent of households from this group stated that they keep their savings in commercial banks, while only 12.4 per cent of the group of households that do not benefit from remittances mentioned the same practice. The trend to invest in business is moderate for both groups of households, accounting for 2.4 per cent in the case of remittances’ beneficiaries and 3.3 per cent for those households than do not receive money from abroad.

The trend for saving remittances is also confirmed by the data presented in NBM reports. Before 2008, individuals’ deposits registered a stable ascending trend, both in foreign currencies and in Moldovan lei (Figure 67).

Figure 67. Individuals’ deposits, by currency, 2005–2010
(MDL millions, at the end of the period)

Source: NBM, Annual reports 2005-2010: Monetary indicators.
In 2009, individuals’ deposits in lei decreased considerably as compared to 2008. In the following year, they grew again but at a reduced pace. In this context, in 2010, the volume of the newly attracted deposits grew 16.6 per cent, while those in a foreign currency only by 6.5 per cent. According to experts from NBM, an increasing trend for savings in the national currency was noted during March–December 2010 as a consequence of the current revenues’ increase and appreciation of the MDL in the international market.

B3. Migration, employment and labour market

B3.1 Labour market features

The socioeconomic transition of RM has significantly influenced the evolution of the labour market and its indicators, with a dramatically negative impact on the employment level, which continued despite the economic development from the year 2000. The economically active population\(^{90}\) in RM dropped from 1.8 million in 1998 to 1.42 million in 2005 and even further down to 1.23 million in 2010. There was also a high number of inactive population,\(^ {91}\) which has increased from 1.1 million in 2000 to 1.7 million in 2010. According to NBS data, by the end of 2010, the working-age population (16–56/61 years old)\(^ {92}\) consisted of 2.37 million persons, representing a share of 66.7 per cent in the country’s total population and a growth rate of 0.15 per cent as compared to 2009. The active population, assessed according to the international definition (15–64 years old) accounted for 73.6 per cent of the total population in 2010, with a growth rate of 0.5 per cent compared to the previous year (Figure 68). It should be mentioned that
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\(^{90}\) The economically active population (labour force) includes all persons aged 15 years and over (including the employed and unemployed population), who supply available labour force for production of goods and services during the period of reference. (ILO definition)

\(^{91}\) Economically inactive covers all persons, regardless of the age, who did not work at least one hour and who were not unemployed during the period of reference. The economically inactive population includes the following categories of population:

i. pupils or students;
ii. pensioners (of all categories);
iii. housewives (who perform only domestic works in the household);
iv. persons maintained by other persons or by the state, or those who maintain themselves from other revenues (rents, interest rates, leases, etc.); and
v. persons declared as working or looking for a job abroad (this category of population conventionally is attributed to the economically inactive population). (NBS definition)

\(^{92}\) According to the national definition.
according to the high values registered for this indicator, RM is ranked in the top countries of Europe (68.3%) and the EU-27 (67%) as a county with the higher share of working-age population, being followed by the Russian Federation (72.2%), Belarus (71.4%) and Romania (70.4%). This situation may be explained by the fact that currently, the working-age population of the country is increasing, as it includes persons born between 1980 and 1990 when a birthrate boost was registered. In the midterm, due to the low birthrate, migration of young persons, and increase in the elderly population, the active population would be reduced considerably, thus increasing the pressure on the labour market and the social insurance system.

Figure 68. Share of the economically active population and annual growth rate, 2005–2010

![Graph showing share of the economically active population and annual growth rate, 2005–2010]

Source: NBS.

---

93 WB Data, Population ages 15–64 (percentage of total). Available from: http://data.worldbank.org/indicator/SP.POP.1564.TO.ZS (accessed 23 June 2012). Estimation based on the de facto definition of population, which counts all residents regardless of legal status or citizenship – except for refugees not permanently settled in the country of asylum, who are generally considered part of the population of the country of origin.
The evolution of the labour market indicators is also confirmed by its characteristic and specific demographic features. The value of the demographic labour pressure index, which represents the ratio between the young population about to join the labour force (aged 5–14 years) and the elderly population (aged 55–64 years) about to withdraw from the labour market, has suddenly dropped from 54.4 per cent in 2005 to 1.2 per cent in 2010. Changes are also noted within the economically active population structure, registering an increase of the prevalence of persons 40–65 years old over persons aged 15–39 years. Thus, the value of the age structure index for the working-age population accounted for about 76.8 per cent in 2010 with a growth of 3.3 percentage points as compared to 2005 (Figure 69). As for the femininity ratio, data shows that the evolution of this indicator over 2005–2010 was uniform, representing an average of over 98 per cent for the population aged 15–39 years and more than 114 per cent for the population aged 40–64 years.

*Foreign working-age population.* By the end of 2010, the number of working-age foreigners reached 18,626 persons, representing a share of
92.7 per cent in the total number of foreigners staying in RM. The growth rate of the group as against 2009 was about 8.2 per cent (Figure 70).

Figure 70. Number of working age foreigners (thousands) and annual growth rate, 2005–2010

The share of foreigners aged 15–64 years within the working-age population segment accounted for 0.6 per cent, registering an increase by 0.2 per cent as against 2005. The age structure index for the working-age foreigners in 2010 accounted for 67.3 per cent, reflecting a prevalence of the young population, aged 15–39 years, over the adult population, aged 40–64 years, and registering an increase by about 23 percentage points as against 2005. The femininity ratio of foreigners accounted for 95.1 per cent for those 15–39 years old and for 90.5 per cent for those 40–64 years old.

As mentioned at the beginning of the chapter, migration represented one of the factors that contributed to reduction of the economically active population. Statistical data shows that the economically active population of RM has constantly decreased over the past decade. By the end of 2010, it accounted for 1.23 million persons or 34.7 per cent of
the country’s total population. The number of the economically active population has dropped by 29,900 persons (or by 2.4%) as against 2009, while the difference as against 2005 and 2000 were 186,900 (or 13.1%) and 419,300 thousand (or 25.3%). The rural areas were most affected by the decrease in the active population, as by the end of 2010, they hosted about 52 per cent of the country’s labour force. The decrease of the rural active population compared to 2005 was 136,500 persons (or 17.6%), while compared to 2000, the drop reached 329,000 persons (or 34%). The rate of decrease in number for the urban economically active population was slower, as this figure dropped two times less than the rural counterpart. The urban active population decreased by 50,400 persons (or 7.8%) as against 2005, and by 90,300 persons (or by 13.2%) as against 2000 (Figure 71).

Figure 71. Economically active population, by area of residence, 2000–2010 (thousands).

Source: NBS.

### Notes


95 See no. 33. Authors’ calculation.
Figure 72. Labour force participation rate, 2005–2010

NBS data also reflects a decrease for the labour force participation rate. The value of this indicator for 2010 was 49 per cent for the population aged 16–56/61 years (according to the national definition) and about 46.5 per cent for the population aged 15–64 years (according to the international definition). Compared to 2009, the activity rate dropped by 1.3 per cent for the population aged 16–56/61 years old and by 1.2 per cent for the population aged 15–64 years old. The difference from 2005 for both categories exceeds 7 per cent (Figure 72). When comparing with the EU-27 countries where the activity rate for 2010 accounted for 71 per cent, the value of this indicator for RM\textsuperscript{96} appears much lower.

As long as the active population drops in number, the inactive population grows, thus increasing the pressure on labour market sustainability. In 2010, the inactive population consisted of 1.73 million persons, representing 65 per cent of the country’s total population.\textsuperscript{97} This indicator increased 16.9 per cent compared with 2005 and by 56.2 per cent as against 2000. The inactivity rate for 2010 was 58.4 per cent, much higher than the average of the EU-27 at 29 per cent.\textsuperscript{98}

\textsuperscript{97} See no. 94.
Young people aged 15–24 years represent more than one third of the total inactive population: some of them are integrated in education or involved in migration. A significant share of elderly people aged 65 years and over, make up 19.5 per cent of the total. Significant disparities within the inactivity area are noted by sex. The share of inactive women is 10.9 per cent higher than the ratio of men, who represent 44.5 per cent of the total.

Migration is one of the main factors contributing to the decrease of labour activity and increase of inactivity. According to the national methodology, migrants are calculated as a share of the inactive population, although they represent an important segment of the active population and they are involved de facto in the economic activities of other countries. In 2010, migrants represented 25.2 per cent of the economically active population: in rural areas they accounted for 20.7 per cent, while in urban areas, 13.6 per cent. The gender disparities are significant: the share of male migrants in the total male active population is 25.6 per cent, which prevails over two times the female active population (Figure 73).99

Figure 73. Share of migrants in the economically active population, by area of residence and sex (2005–2010)

Source: NBS, authors’ calculations.

99 See no. 33. Authors’ calculations.
It should be mentioned that an additional factor contributing to decreased participation in labour force relates to remittance-based incomes and savings, which do not encourage the household members to enter the labour market in the current conditions.

**Employment**

As mentioned earlier, the transition towards market economy has been characterized by a profound change in the economic structure and correlated changes in the quantity and quality of the labour force.

The “once-in-a-century credit tsunami” defined the devastating financial crisis, which, starting from the USA, has created a domino effect on almost all economies worldwide. RM was also hit hard by the global recession, throughout the multifaceted vehicles of dissemination of the crisis:

- Real GDP in 2009 shrank by 6 per cent after years of constant growth (+7.2% in 2008);
- External shocks, such as falling remittances and FDI inflows;
- Increasing unemployment rate;
- Increasing public budget deficit due to shortfall of fiscal revenue. As a result, the Government cut expenditure by 20 per cent;
- Trade shocks – weak demand for exports due to the economic recession in the Russian Federation, Ukraine, Belarus and the EU.

By the end of 2010, the employed population represented 1.14 million people with a reduction by 13.3 per cent in relation to 2005 and 24.5 per cent compared to 2000. Even the employment structure by national economy sectors has suffered changes, the most affected sector being agriculture, where the employed population has been reduced by 221,800 people (or by 41.3%) compared to 2005 and by 445,700 (or 59.2%) compared to 2000 (Figure 74).

The employment rate in 2010 according to the national definition was approximately 38.5 per cent and roughly 43 per cent according to the international definition.

The declining activity rate in the country is mirrored by a significant rise in inactivity rates, which stood at 58.4 per cent in 2010, compared
to 32 per cent in the EU-27. The high number of economically inactive persons, increasing from 1.1 million in 2000 to 1.7 million in 2010, is becoming one of the most challenging features in the functioning of the Moldovan labour market. Over 80 per cent of the inactive population is composed of persons with a secondary level of education (secondary general, secondary vocational); the persons with higher education represent only 8.8 per cent, and those with primary and no education, 11.6 per cent (Figure 74).

Figure 74. Employment by sectors, 2000–2010 (thousands)

The analysis of the employed\textsuperscript{100} by educational level is in line with the overall structure of the labour force, with a large majority of workers holding secondary education, followed by higher education and an almost insignificant percentage of people with primary or no education (less than 1%) (Figure 75).

\textsuperscript{100}The employed population comprises all persons aged 15 years and over, who furnish the supply of labour for the production of goods and services for at least one hour during a one week reference period, in order to get some income, such as wages, salaries, payment in kind or other benefits.
Out of all employed persons in 2010, 9.3 per cent were underemployed, with an increase of 13,700 compared to the previous year. The phenomenon of underemployment is a characteristic mostly of rural areas: 69.5 per cent of the underemployed population from villages, with men being more affected than women.

Based on NBS data for 2010, nearly one third of the employed population (30.9%) was working in some kind of informal employment. Informal employment in rural areas represents 45.5 per cent, and in sectors such as agriculture, forestry, fishing and construction, represents 72.5 and 80.5 per cent, respectively, out of the total employment.

Unemployment

The unemployment level remains moderate, accounting for 6.4 per cent in 2009 and 7.4 per cent in 2010 (Figure 76). Significant sex-

---

101 Underemployed persons are those who are employed but willing to work additional hours or available to work additional hours.


103 The unemployed population consists of persons aged 15 years old and over who do not supply labour for the production of goods and services, but are actively looking for a job or have created a business in the recent past (ILO definition).
based differences are registered: 9.1 per cent for men and 5.7 per cent for women, making the unemployment gender gap 3.35 per cent. The unemployment rate among youth is 5.7 per cent, registering an increase by 0.8 per cent compared to 2009. Significant disparities are registered for the unemployment rate in urban and rural areas: 9.6 and 5.4 per cent, respectively (Figure 76).

Figure 76. Unemployment rate, 2000–2010

![Unemployment rate graph]

The long-term unemployed constitute almost 30 per cent of total jobseekers. The age groups most affected by unemployment are 15–24 years old at 27.8 per cent (20% male and 15% female), and 25–34 years old, which accounts for 28.7 per cent.

An overwhelming majority of registered unemployed persons are jobseekers with secondary education (general, professional or specialized) at 61.8 per cent. This group is followed by people with higher education, accounting for 19.8 per cent. Those with primary or no education are only 200 out of 92,100, or 0.2 per cent.

In conformity with the annual report 2011 of NEA, the number of registered unemployed people increased further on from 92,100 in 2010 up to 107,973 (+14.7%), of which 55,622 were women and 52,351 were men. www.anofm.md/documents/57

The OECD defines long-term unemployment as the condition of being out of work and looking for a job for 12 months or more. See: http://stats.oecd.org/glossary/detail.asp?ID=3586

See no. 33.
Wage policies

The level of wages is one of main indicators of the capacity of the domestic labour market to offer decent remuneration, to prevent migration, to reduce reservation wages that are induced by remittances, and to make the informal economy less competitive. The average gross wages in RM are: USD 138 in agriculture sector,\textsuperscript{107} up to USD 199 in education, USD 270 in public administration, USD 503 in ITC, and USD 556 for financial services. It should be mentioned that despite the fact that monthly salaries were constantly raised over the past four years, they remain to be small in comparison with living costs at the national level, and even smaller compared to the average in the neighbouring countries.

The gross monthly salary in RM for 2010 was almost 150 per cent smaller than in Romania and the Russian Federation, about 100 per cent less than in Bulgaria, and 17.4 per cent lower than in Ukraine (Figure 77).

Figure 77. Gross monthly salary, by country, 2005–2010 (USD)

\textbf{USD}

\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline
\hline
Bulgaria & 200 & 200 & 200 & 200 & 200 & 200 \\
Republic of Moldova & 100 & 100 & 100 & 100 & 100 & 100 \\
Romania & 500 & 500 & 500 & 500 & 500 & 500 \\
Ukraine & 600 & 600 & 600 & 600 & 600 & 600 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Source: ILO, KILMnet, authors’ calculations.

In 2010 and 2011, the minimum wage in RM was MDL 6.51 per hour or MDL 1.10 (calculated based on a full-time working programme averaging

\textsuperscript{107} See no. 13.
169 hours per month). As a result, this low minimum wage, coupled with the availability of undeclared work, makes the employment-disincentive effect unlikely.  

**B3.2 Labour migration**

**Outward migration**

RM is a country of recent migration. Until its independence in 1991 and in the following decade, migration rates were quite modest. The emigration phenomenon started after the collapse of the Soviet Union and was boosted during the Russian financial crisis in 1998–1999, when business closures, massive layoffs and decrease in wages or even non-payment of wages by insolvent enterprises were common. Mass migration continued with high intensity in the following years. Already in 2005, the Moldova Demographic and Health Survey, conducted by MOH showed that 17 per cent of Moldovan households had at least one member living and working abroad. The main issue is that there are no reliable figures on Moldovan migration, with estimates ranging from a stock of 311,000 calculated by NBS in 2010 to 770,300 by WB. The official figures from NBS appear to be underestimated upon cross-checking data with other sources, such as information on the supposed distribution of migrants by countries of destination.

Further, the above figures are different from those reported by the official statistics of some of the main receiving countries. For example, in 2010, the Italian National Institute of Statistics (ISTAT) officially registered 130,948 Moldovans (32.8% male and 67.2% female) residing in Italy against the 58,600 stated by NBS (almost one third). A partial justification of the discrepancy between the two sources is that NBS takes into account the population over 15 years old, while ISTAT considers all ages of the resident foreigners, including children, who are calculated, on average, as consisting of 22 per cent of the total for all nationalities. Further, ISTAT reports only on legal migrants and most of the migration flows are irregular, thus suggesting even higher figures.


109 ISTAT, Italy’s resident foreigner population (Rome, 2011). Available at: www.istat.it/it/archivio/39726.
In total, male migrants represent 64.5 per cent of the total migration outflow in 2011, meaning that mobility towards other countries excluding Italy are very much male-dominated, probably reflecting the temporary migration towards the Russian Federation and sector distribution, such as construction.

Looking at the age distribution of the migration flows, the highest propensity to migrate is in the age group of 25–34 years, which corresponds to 33.4 per cent of the total migration outflow (Figure 78).

The majority of migrants come from rural areas – 70.7 per cent against 29.3 per cent from urban areas. The increasing gap (it was 59.4% against 40.6% in the year 2000) gives a clear indication of the decline in employment in agriculture, which was around 50 per cent in mid-1990 to fall dramatically to 27.5 per cent in 2010.

Mirroring the structure of labour force by education level, the majority of migrants hold secondary education (64.17%), while the percentage of those with primary or no education is less than 1 per cent. It is interesting to note that migrants holding higher education represent 10.7 per cent of the total, while in the workforce they account for 22.7 per cent. This could be an indication that more qualified workers have better labour market outcomes in terms of finding a job. However, it does not reveal anything about job quality and proper skills matching on the national labour market (Figure 79).
Figure 79. Migrants, by level of education, 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education level</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Higher education</td>
<td>33,300</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary specialized</td>
<td>40,700</td>
<td>13.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary professional</td>
<td>79,500</td>
<td>25.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary school</td>
<td>79,400</td>
<td>25.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gymnasium</td>
<td>76,200</td>
<td>24.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary or no education</td>
<td>1,900</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>311,000</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: NBS, authors’ calculations.

Information and pre-departure training

Before undertaking such an important step of moving abroad, individuals usually try to collect more information on the favored destination country/ies. In general terms, potential migrants with secondary and higher education can find on their own the required information by accessing the Internet and print media. Potential migrants with lower education and seriously considering moving abroad would probably need support to enrich their knowledge about the destination country. The main source is from relatives and friends in the destination country (ETF, 2007).

NEA, which has a statutory competence to assist labour migrants, is able to provide relevant information on the main destination countries through the extended network of 35 local branch offices. Leaflets have been prepared in the past with the support of the ILO. Moreover, 50 job counsellors of the Territorial Employment Agencies will be trained this year on counselling and information regarding legal migration.

Another relevant source of information is the network of 10 information centres established with support from the project “Safe bridges for migrant workers”, co-financed by the EU and the Confederation of Trade Unions in Italy through its Trade Unions Institute for Development Cooperation, and managed by the National Confederation of Trade Unions
from Moldova. Even if the sustainability of such an initiative is difficult to assess, beyond the donors’ support, the trained staff of the project will be very useful to workers interested in exploring different migration options.

The preparation for migration ideally should be coupled with ad hoc training to help in living and working abroad. The most useful courses would be to learn the language of the destination countries well as to have adequate cultural orientation.

Such opportunities are rare and specifically linked to concrete migration schemes such as the one established by private employment agencies for the preparation, based on specific protocols, of family care workers for migration to Israel.

The Italian Ministry of Labour, as a complement to the bilateral agreement recently signed, has launched a project aiming to create a long list of jobseekers wanting to migrate to Italy. Training will be provided in learning the Italian language, cultural orientation and technical issues. There is no real link to migration packages: the list could be activated just in case, if and where there will be a legal possibility.

**Migration effects on skilled workers**

It is of key importance to carry out in-depth analysis of the migration phenomena in order to have effective and efficient migration policies, thereby allowing national authorities to adopt evidence-based actions. Surveys in this area show that the socioeconomic crisis registered during the first decade after independency triggered migration processes, with one of the most affected sectors being health and education.

Due to low salaries and poor working conditions, more than 12,000 health workers left the health system from 1996 to 2000. About 82 per cent consisted of mid-level medical workers.

As a consequence, the level of doctors’ staffing dropped 14.3 per cent, and that of secondary health personnel by 21 per cent.\(^\text{110}\) Once the economy

\(^{110}\) MOH, (Preliminary indicators on population health and medical-sanitary institutions’ activity for 2009–2010 (2011). Authors’ calculation.)
started to recover in 2000 and the compulsory health insurance scheme was introduced, the intensity of the brain drain from the system was reduced, but the turnover and the deficit of personnel are still acute problems.

In 2010, the health protection system had 10,619 doctors and 22,003 secondary health personnel. As compared to 2009, these numbers decreased 1.3 per cent for doctors and by 0.6 per cent for secondary health personnel. Compared to 2005, the decline was by 2 per cent. The staffing level for doctors is 29.8 per 10,000 inhabitants, and 64.5 secondary health workers with secondary education. This is a little bit under the EU average level, at 32.3 and 77.5 per 10,000 inhabitants, respectively.

Another problem refers to the uneven distribution of health personnel by areas of residence, the number being eight times higher in urban areas (63.7 doctors per 10,000 inhabitants) as compared to rural areas (5.7 doctors per 10,000 inhabitants) (Figure 80).

Figure 80. Distribution of health personnel, by areas of residence, 2000–2010

Source: MOH/NHIC.

111 Personnel employed in health institutions under the authority of MOH, excluding other ministries.
112 MOH and the National Health Insurance Company (NHIC), Statistical yearbook of the health system in Moldova 2010 (2011). Authors’ calculation.
114 See no. 112.
The deficit of medical personnel in rural areas is explained by a higher development level and concentration of hospital infrastructure in cities, thus offering additional social and economic opportunities. It is also due to the high level of mobility of medical personnel outside the country. Annually, MOH issues about 500 certificates for authentication of medical education documents (which are necessary when getting employed abroad), of which about 200 are for doctors (representing 50% of the number of doctors, holders of postgraduate degrees in health education), and about 300 for health workers with secondary education. It is estimated that the real numbers of migrant health workers is much higher (about 35,000 persons), but the majority of them (mainly the nurses) work informally in the care-giving sector and only some of them work legally in the health industry.\textsuperscript{115} Currently, the EU is supporting an initiative managed by the World Health Organization (WHO) in RM, aimed at turning the health-care workforce migration to circular mobility, strengthening workforce training, and preventing risks from brain drain and waste in the country by creating an enabling environment for their legal migration, reducing the negative effects of this phenomenon on the health system, and facilitating the reintegration of returned medical workers.\textsuperscript{116}

Migration of personnel from the Moldovan education system led to a worsening in the teaching process. Due to unattractive salaries, which are among the lowest in the national economy, about 9,400 teachers left the educational system during 2005–2010.\textsuperscript{117} Statistical data shows that the share of young teaching personnel in the education sector has been decreasing, while the share of those reaching retirement age is continuously increasing. During 2002–2010, the share of teaching personnel of retirement age has tripled, increasing from 6.7 per cent to 19.6 per cent, and the share of young teaching personnel declined from 8.7 per cent to 8.2 per cent (Figure 81).\textsuperscript{118}

The data from MEd shows that although admission to pedagogical faculties and colleges is increasing, only 60 per cent of graduates of such faculties and colleges follow a teaching career. In 2010, the monthly

\textsuperscript{115} MOH, Annual Health Report 2010 (Chisinau, 2011).
\textsuperscript{116} See no. 83.
\textsuperscript{117} Authors’ calculation based on NBS data.
\textsuperscript{118} NBS, Education in the Republic of Moldova, Statistical publication 2011/2012 (Chisinau, 2012).
average salary in education was only equal to 79.4 per cent of the monthly average salary in the national economy.\textsuperscript{119}

Figure 81. Share of young and old teaching personnel in the general education system, 2002–2010

\begin{figure}
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{chart}
\caption{Share of young and old teaching personnel in the general education system, 2002–2010}
\end{figure}

According to preliminary data from a survey on the impact of migration on teaching staff and researchers on the economy, educational system and labour force competitiveness in the short, medium, and long term in RM,\textsuperscript{120} at least half of the interviewed teaching staff expressed their intention to leave the country. About 40 per cent of respondents said they want to go abroad for temporary work, and 7.9 per cent want to live abroad permanently. Roughly 5.4 per cent would like to study overseas.

The profile of those who intend to leave temporarily to work abroad is the following: young teachers, aged 25 to 39 years, without children, living in rural areas, with small incomes, usually with dual citizenship. Those who wish to leave the country permanently are: single, divorced or widowed teachers, with work experience up to 10 years, living in urban areas (except for those who live in Chisinau and Balti municipalities) and

\textsuperscript{119} NBS, Monthly average salary of a worker by types of economic activities 2000–2012 (Chisinau, 2012).
\textsuperscript{120} Cheianu, D., The impact of migration on teaching staff and researchers in Moldova, (forthcoming).
have average incomes. Single teachers with work experience of up to 10 years and living in Chisinau and Balti municipalities, with high salaries, are the ones inclined to study abroad.

The main reasons for migration are: to earn more money abroad; to improve family’s living conditions; to buy a house or flat for the family or children; to obtain new experience and skills; to access the best services and technologies; to pay for children’s education; to escape the economic, political and social situation in RM; and to secure a future that cannot be found in RM either for the migrants or their children.

The probability to leave RM within the next 12 months is higher among those who have dual citizenship, lecture at universities and/or hold a scientific degree, as well as those who have more than 20 years of work experience and live in urban areas. The countries preferred by respondents are: Italy (23.3%), Canada (17.4%), France (15.1%), Russian Federation (10.5%), Germany (9.3%), USA (9.3%), United Kingdom (3.5%), Romania, Spain and Israel (2.3% each), and the Netherlands, Portugal, Bulgaria and Belgium (1.2% each). The country of destination is selected based on the following: better opportunities for employment higher salaries as compared to other countries (69.8%), friends and relatives working in the given country (46.5%), mastery of the language of the given country (44.2%), reduced living costs as compared to other countries (24.4%), and better opportunities for studies (17.4%).

Young teachers and researchers with high qualifications tend to migrate to Canada and the USA.

The majority of those who intend to go abroad attend or intend to attend training courses in RM to be better prepared for life abroad. Many of them study the language of the country of destination. Some attend vocational training courses, and others study the culture of the country of destination.

As was mentioned, 40 per cent of teachers and researchers who went abroad launched a business or found a better paying job in another sector. Among respondents, 34.3 per cent think that this is due to the money earned abroad, and 25.7 per cent think that the knowledge and skills obtained abroad contributed to this fact.
Returning migrants and their reintegration in the labour market

Returning migrants do have the potential to make a positive contribution to development in their countries of origin. Identifying those who would be interested to return to the homeland is very important in order to better target the action for attracting them. Since there are no recent surveys, this report will refer to the study carried out in 2007 by ETF and to the survey carried out in 2008 by the NBS, with the support of the ILO, on labour force migration.

A large number of respondents to the ETF survey mentioned that they went home either to join their family and parents in their country of origin or due to the feeling of loneliness while in the destination country. Among returning migrants, 14.6 per cent said they had earned sufficient money, while 12.9 per cent returned because their residence permit had expired. A large majority of returnees had secondary vocational education. More than 12 per cent had higher education and 9.5 per cent were college graduates. Lower secondary education was finished by 23.8 per cent, and 1 per cent had finished only four grades or fewer. The majority of returnees were more than 30 years old and only one third were younger than 29.

The male migrants mainly worked in construction, while female migrants within trade and household services. Around two thirds of migrants (especially women) had undertaken unskilled work. Equally, two-thirds of migrants with higher education were in jobs that did not demand a degree.

According to the IASCI and CIVIS study in 2010, in most cases, migrants are confronted with reintegration problems back home due to the lack of jobs and low salaries. The creation of their own businesses is difficult due to insufficient funds and lack of information. In these circumstances, some migrants have no other choice than to re-emigrate.

Currently in RM, migrants do not receive the support they need upon returning and thus their impact on local development is still limited. In general, it seems that the best way to encourage migrants to come home is a combination of a vibrant economy, a conducive business climate and sensible government policy tailored to their needs. This includes better
advice on investment opportunities and support for entrepreneurship. The issue of recognition of skills and qualifications is also important. Currently, there are no mechanisms in countries of origin for recognizing the skills that migrants may have acquired while they were abroad, with the exception of higher education in some cases. How to validate skills acquired outside the formal education system is a particular concern as most migrants gain their skills on the job.

**Education and skill shortages and/or oversupply**

Attendance in different education levels has dropped in the past decade as indicated in Figure 82.

**Figure 82. Attendance at different education levels, by sex, 2000–2011**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>General</th>
<th>Vocational</th>
<th>College</th>
<th>Higher education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000–2001</td>
<td>315,765</td>
<td>315,498</td>
<td>14,594</td>
<td>8,210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005–2006</td>
<td>259,328</td>
<td>259,699</td>
<td>15,885</td>
<td>9,120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010–2011</td>
<td>198,911</td>
<td>197,577</td>
<td>14,853</td>
<td>6,566</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: NBS.

The total number of students in the past 10 years fell from 753,046 to 557,884, which represents more than a quarter of total students. The decrease is more severe for attendance in general education at 37.19 per cent, explained by the decrease in the school-age population as an impact of the low birth rate. Meanwhile, there is remarkable increase in post-secondary non-university (+61.86%) and in higher education (+36.33%). Concerning gender, the balance between female and male students was maintained over the period for general education. Female participation diminished for vocational training and retained a similar share for both post-secondary non-university and for higher education. Specifically, for the share for women securing their higher education was 56.28 per cent in 2000 and 56.77 per cent in 2010. Obviously,
the changing structure of school enrolment has a direct impact on the number of graduates as shown in Figure 83.

Figure 83. Graduates by type of educational institution, 2000–2011

Figure 84. Number of graduates, 2000–2010

Source: NBS.
The visual impact is more evident in Figure 84 showing the decrease of graduates from gymnasiums and lyceums by 8.4 and 24.1 per cent and an impressive increase for higher education – from 12,248 in 2000 to 28,408 in 2010 (+132%).

Higher education is becoming more and more relevant for the domestic labour market and for migration issues. This situation may be explained by the changes in the employed population structure, despite the obvious deficit of skilled workers (about 80% of vacancies are for candidates with secondary vocational education)\(^{121}\), the chances of those with higher education to obtain a position are higher. Hence, young persons with higher education accept employment in sectors that are far from their specialty (especially in case of the first job), mainly due to a lack of vacancies in the industry in which they graduated, as well as due to a lack of work experience that is requested for recruitment.

The same aspects are relevant for migration as in many cases there is a real skills waste: a survey carried out by ETF in 2007 showed that 35 per cent of returning migrants with university education have worked in construction, while 28 per cent have worked as domestic workers.

It should be mentioned that brain drain at the international level was recognized as a major problem for RM, being one of the indicators of the World Economic Forum for measuring the efficiency of labour market. In this context, RM has a rating of 2 points on a scale from 1 to 7 (where 1 = citizens can find better opportunities abroad to harness their own capital and 7 = the country of origin offers more opportunities to harness human potential). This means that the labour market in RM is practically inefficient from the point of view of harnessing the human potential in the country.

Entering the Bologna Process offers the country an opportunity to change the traditional academic approach based on supply side, to liaise effectively with a challenging and changing labour market. It is therefore necessary to undertake serious skills forecast for the medium and long term in order to prepare students to acquire the new skills. Coupled with this, it would be necessary to offer an in-depth information and career

\(^{121}\) See no. 33.
guidance services in order to raise awareness among students on the real employability of different education paths. If some subjects appear to be oversaturated compared with the future opportunities, adequate information might reduce the volume of students in some branches such as 15,186 students taking up Education Sciences in 2010, 21,942 for Economics or 11,081 for Law (even if there was already a drastic reduction in demand in the last two areas since 2005) (Figure 85).

Figure 85. Graduates of higher education, by subject, 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>First cycle</th>
<th>Master</th>
<th>PhD</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education science</td>
<td>3,100</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3,422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>848</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political science</td>
<td>612</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>898</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social sciences</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>557</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social service</td>
<td>511</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>567</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication science</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic science</td>
<td>7,319</td>
<td>1,828</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9,147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>3,737</td>
<td>706</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4,443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural science</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>497</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exact science</td>
<td>517</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering and related activities</td>
<td>1,951</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing and processing</td>
<td>598</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>637</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemical technology and biotechnology</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture and building</td>
<td>825</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural science</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterinary medicine</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>527</td>
<td>527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacy</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public services</td>
<td>797</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>856</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical training and sports</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental protection</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security services</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>23,264</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,536</strong></td>
<td>608</td>
<td><strong>28,408</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: NBS.
Another reported negative factor affecting the labour market is that secondary vocational education does not correspond to the requirements of the labour market (ETF, 2009), as well as the lack of constructive dialogue between the vocational education institutions and businesses.\textsuperscript{122}

The above is confirmed by the following indicators from 2010:

- The employment share of those holding secondary professional education is 24.3 per cent and 20.7 per cent for general secondary.
- An overwhelming majority (61.8%) of registered unemployed persons consists of jobseekers holding secondary education (general, professional or specialized) followed by the higher education holders at 19.8 per cent. Those with primary or no education are only 200 out of 92,100, or 0.2 per cent.
- Almost 80 per cent of the inactive population is made up of people with medium level of education (gymnasium, secondary – general, specialized and professional), while those with higher education represent 8.8 per cent and those with primary or no education 11.6 per cent.

The situation is made even more complex by the fact that there are vacancies unfilled by the unemployed. In addition to low salaries, poor working conditions and the higher reservation wages induced by remittances, one decisive element is the mismatch between demand and supply. This is a big issue everywhere, but it seems that the initiatives undertaken by the Moldovan Government are on track to solve the problem.

**B4. Migration and social development**

The cumulative effect of the social costs incurred during the transition period after the independency contributed to the appearance of a number of problems in Moldovan society. Thus, evolution of human development indicators in the country has been influenced by the following:

- increase in unemployment,
- decrease in economic opportunities,

\textsuperscript{122} CIVIS, Assessment of the link between education and migration in Moldova (2012). Unpublished.
• poverty outburst (which in 1999, placed about 80 per cent of the population under the absolute poverty line and 20 per cent under the extreme poverty line), 123
• the triggering of migration processes, and
• reduction of access to and quality of an entire range of social services.

According to United Nations rankings, RM is currently characterized as a country with a medium human development level, and over the past 15 years, it has moved from eighty-first place in 1995 (102nd in 2000 and 115th in 2005) 124 to ninety-ninth in 2010 in the list of 166 States included in the ranking. From the former USSR countries, RM is followed only by Uzbekistan (102nd), Kyrgyzstan (109th) and Tajikistan (112th). 125 The cumulative value of the HDI for Moldova in 2010 was 0.644, representing a growth of 0.013 units as compared to 2005 (Figure 86).

Figure 86. Human development in RM, 2005–2010

Source: UNDP statistics.

---

Data from several studies show that over 70 per cent of the factors triggering migration are of economic nature, and poverty, as a social phenomenon, is the main determinant in this context.\textsuperscript{126} According to NBS HBS data, about 22 per cent of Moldovan households were living under the absolute poverty line in 2010, and 30.4 per cent of households under the relative poverty line. Although poverty registered a decreasing trend at the national level, dropping by 8.3 percentage points for absolute poverty and by 1.1 percentage points for relative poverty since 2006, rural areas continue to be the most affected, concentrating about 80 per cent of poor households in the country.\textsuperscript{127} In 2010, the rural poverty rate was 30.3 per cent, 20 percentage points higher than the level registered in urban areas.

The structure of the poor population is dominated by:

i. persons employed in agriculture (45% employees and 36.5% self-employed);

ii. families with children under 18 years old, especially with three or more children, with a poverty incidence exceeding 39 per cent; and

iii. households composed of elderly people who are single or married but without children.

A rather high poverty level is also noted for the group “other households with children”,\textsuperscript{128} which represents 28.5 per cent of the total poor population (Table 43).

It should be mentioned that if in the first case, the persons with incomes from agriculture represent a migration source, in the next cases, the children and elderly represent the population uninvolved in migration depending on external sources. The share of children under 18 years old living in households under the poverty line accounted for 24.2 per cent in 2010, 33 per cent of whom come from rural areas (Table 44 and Figure 87).

\textsuperscript{126} ETF, The Contribution of Human Resources Development to Migration Policy in Moldova (Turin, 2008).

\textsuperscript{127} MEc, Briefing Note on Poverty in the Republic of Moldova 2010 (Chisinau, 2011).

\textsuperscript{128} The group of “other households with children” includes households in which children are cared for by persons other than their parents.
At the same time, the share of elderly people who were under the poverty line accounted for 21.3 per cent, with the poverty rate growing as the head of the household ages. The poverty incidence for the group of households led by 75-year-olds was 37.7 per cent, twice as high as at the minimum age of retirement.\textsuperscript{129}

The income structure of poor households is dominated by the incomes from self-employment in agriculture (36.5%), social benefits (28.4%), and other incomes, including remittances (21.5%). The incomes from employment and those from self-employment in sectors other than agriculture represent only 15.5 per cent and 12 per cent of poor households’ income.

Remittances play a significant role in reducing households’ poverty. In 2010, remittances represented about 17 per cent of households’ income, accounting for a share of 8 per cent in poor households’ income. The statistical data shows that if households receive no remittances, about

\textsuperscript{129} UNDESA and UNFPA, Population Ageing in the Republic of Moldova (2011).
13 per cent would be under the poverty line, and in rural areas, their share would be higher by 6.8 percentage points compared to urban households at 15.7 per cent. At the same time, the share of households with migrants who live under the poverty line is twice lower than that of households with migrants and accounts for 12.8 per cent.

Figure 88. Poverty rate in households with migrants versus those without migrants, 2006–2010

Source: NBS.

About 41 per cent of households’ expenditures are for food consumption, 17.8 per cent for dwelling maintenance, and 10.8 per cent for footwear and clothes. The share of the poorest quintile in the national consumption represents 8.1 per cent (Table 45).

Migration reduces poverty, but generates powerful social effects on children and elderly persons. According to NBS HBS data, the number of households with members abroad reached 237,600 in

---

130 NBS, Aspects on population living standards in 2010 (Chisinau, 2011).
2010, representing 18.8 per cent of the total number of households. The statistical data reflects that the migration process has decreased in intensity, as the annual number of households with members involved in migration is declining. However, in 2010, the number of households with migrants increased by 2.7 per cent compared to 2005, which accounted for 21.4 per cent. It should be mentioned that more than 53 per cent of the total number of households with migrants represent households with children, the share of which among the total number of households with children accounts for 26.3 per cent (Table 46).

Figure 89. Number of children left behind, 2009–2010 (thousands)

Currently, there is no exact figure at the national level about the number of children left behind; the estimate varies between 90,000 and 100,000. Starting in 2010, NBS introduced a new reporting form, the data being collected from MLSPF, which represents the authority with duties related to protection of children in difficulty. According to the presented data, by the end of 2010, more than 52,000 children up to 18 years old had their parents working abroad, representing about 12.3 per cent of the
total number of children in the country. Thus, about 35,600 had one parent left and 16,400 had both parents or the sole parent abroad (Table 47 and Figure 89). Compared with the previous year, the number of children left behind decreased 4.6 per cent: children left by one parent by 3.5 per cent, and children left by both parents by 6.9 per cent.

It should be mentioned that these figures differ from those presented by MEd, which reported for the same period 54,000 children left behind, of which about 33,700 had one parent left and 20,500 had both parents abroad. This figure does not influence the trends in this area. At the same time, it is necessary to mention that the data of MOI, which monitors the annual evolution of juvenile delinquency, reports for 2010 a number of 29,681 children left by both parents to work abroad.\(^{131}\)

Surveys show that the situation of children left behind without parental care and love is perceived by 45.7 per cent of population as being the most serious problem caused by emigration, followed by youth drain at 29.5 per cent and brain drain at 15.6 per cent.\(^{132}\)

Migration influences emotional conditions in family life and family roles, directly affecting the social development of the children.

The parents’ absence from the family disposes the child of attachment, affection, assistance and guidance, and conditions drawbacks in the formation of self-identity.\(^{133}\) The majority of children left behind are aged 10 years and over, being mainly supervised by relatives, but there are also children left with some acquaintances or even with no adult in the house. The quality of relations with caregivers is sometimes a problem. Some children refuse to recognize their authority and show a negative attitude towards them, when they consider them to be too severe. The money sent to children by their parents also represents a reason for some tension, especially when children are not involved in decision-making for

---

\(^{131}\) MOI, Informative memo on juvenile delinquency and activity of Minors’ Services within the territorial subdivisions during the 12 months of 2010. Available from: www.mai.md/node/7007 (accessed 11 June 2012).


\(^{133}\) IOM, Special needs of children and elderly people left behind as a consequence of migration (Chisinau, IOM Mission to Moldova, 2011).
money administration. At the same time, the majority of children with migrant parents associate their future with life abroad close to their family and intend to leave the country.\textsuperscript{134}

\textit{Migration also produces social effects on the elderly population,} the most affected being the rural elderly. Due to lack of support from children and relatives, elderly people are forced to cope all by themselves. At the same time, they are forced to take over some additional social roles, like that of caregivers of children left behind. In about 91 per cent of cases where both parents have left, elderly persons replace them, and when one parent has left and the other stays in the country, parents’ functions are taken over by elderly people in 36 per cent of cases. It should be mentioned that elderly people also replace the parents de jure, as the guardianship for such children is taken over in 34.7 per cent of households with members involved in migration.\textsuperscript{135}

Children’s migration, loneliness and need for help determine whether elderly persons seek social services. In 2010, the elderly represented 43.3 per cent of the beneficiaries of day care centres, 32.4 per cent of the beneficiaries of mixed centres, and 12.7 per cent of the beneficiaries of community asylums. (Table 48 and Figure 90).

![Figure 90. Share of elderly people benefiting from social services, by type of service](source: MLSPF RSA 2010.)


\textsuperscript{135} HelpAge International and UNICEF, Staying behind: The effects of migration on older people and children in Moldova (Chisinau, 2010).
At the same time, the number of single elderly people benefiting from social care provided at home exceeded 25,000, registering a growth of 3.9 per cent as against 2005. The demand for these services continues to be twice as much as the availability.\textsuperscript{136}

\textit{Migration influences integration in education, as well as the perception on school enrolment opportunity.} Statistical data shows that parallel to the contraction of the school age population,\textsuperscript{137} the rates of coverage within compulsory general education are decreasing as well, inducing significant gaps between rural and urban areas. The gross enrolment rate in primary education in rural areas was 88 per cent in 2010, 16 percentage points lower than in urban areas, and down 5.7 percentage points from 2005. While the gross enrolment rate presents a decreasing trend in rural areas, it is actually ascending in urban ones, representing a difference of 1.6 percentage points as compared to 2005. The enrolment rate in gymnasium education in rural areas was 84.3 per cent in 2010, 11.3 percentage points lower than in urban areas, and down 6 percentage points since 2005 (Table 49 and Figure 91).

Figure 91. Gross enrollment rate in primary and gymnasium education, by areas of residence, 2005–2010

Source: NBS.

\textsuperscript{136} See no. 40. Author’s calculations.

\textsuperscript{137} By 28.8 % as against 2005. Authors’ calculation based on NBS data.
It should be mentioned that the cases for non-enrolment in schools, especially in Moldovan rural areas, are related to low well-being levels, lack of income and/or the absence (due to migration) of parents, the last one accounting for almost 35 per cent of the total causes (Figure 92).

School integration of Roma children is a more specific case due to the fact that they usually go abroad for certain periods of time with the entire family. In the majority of cases, Roma families do not send children to school in the host country and school enrollment becomes a problem. Hence, 1 in 5 Roma persons cannot write and read; 3 in 10 Roma people have at most primary education and another 3 (in 10) have only secondary education (including incomplete education or vocational education).\footnote{UNDP, Roma in the Republic of Moldova (Chisinau, UNDP Moldova, 2007).}

\textit{Migration contributes to reduced schooling.} It is obvious that the absence of one or both parents represents a psychological challenge for children left behind. When parents are missing, many migrants' children have the responsibility to maintain the household, to which the obligation to go to school and to do homework is added. Hence, an overload in domestic activities, as well as no supervision and support from parents,
leads to a decrease in educational attainment, non-attractiveness of studies, school dropout and school absenteeism.\textsuperscript{139}

Moreover, data from surveys show that school environment (the quality of school equipment and programmes, laboratories, teaching materials, and textbooks) and the characteristics of the teaching personnel (education, length in service, qualifications) do not have significant influence on the educational attainment of children left behind, as long as all children from the community go to the same school. The factors that do affect this indicator, however, are the attitude and involvement of the teaching personnel and the peers of such children. Because some teachers treat migrants’ children differently from other students, children left behind feel marginalized and are unmotivated to attend school.\textsuperscript{140}

\textit{Migration determines new behavior patterns, which are imitated by migrants’ children.} According to NBS data, the rate of early school dropout among persons aged 15–19 years is 20 per cent, and among persons aged 20–24 years about 60 per cent. The main factors contributing to this phenomenon are:

i. difficulties in funding education – 28 per cent;
ii. the desire to work – 23.1 per cent; and
iii. going abroad to work – 20.4 per cent.\textsuperscript{141}

Many young persons do not even try to find a job in RM after graduation; they focus on going to the countries in which their parents already reside.\textsuperscript{142} Statistical data shows that the share of young persons who left the educational system to seek work abroad is increasing. During 2000–2004, only 13.8 per cent wished to leave the country to find a job, while in 2007–2009, this share increased to 20.4 per cent.\textsuperscript{143}

An important factor explaining the early dropout from the education system is the parents’ level of training because parents instil in children the value of education and their attitude towards studies. In this

\textsuperscript{139} UNICEF, The situation of children without parental care as a result of migration (2006).
\textsuperscript{140} See no. 133.
\textsuperscript{141} NBS, Youth entry into the labour market (Chisinau, 2010).
\textsuperscript{142} G. Mocanu, et al, 100 of the most pressing issues in the Republic of Moldova in 2007 (Chisinau, IDIS “Viitorul”, 2009).
\textsuperscript{143} See no. 141.
context, children are guaranteed to attain the same level of education as their parents.

Migration trends among parents also represent a problem for transferring values and attitudes related to educational opportunities. Thus, in families with one or both parents abroad, the risk for early dropout is almost two times higher than in families with no migrants. This trend is more solid in households where migrant members have secondary general or vocational education, the registered difference being 16.4 percentage points for both parents. For migrants with higher education, the difference is 18.9 percentage points for migrant mothers and 8.1 percentage points for migrant fathers. This confirms once again the mother’s larger role in children’s education and life attitude (Figure 93).

Migration and investments in human capital. According to NBS data, expenditure for education in 2010 accounted for 1.3 per cent of total household expenditures. Other households without children are the ones to spend the most for education at 2.7 per cent of all disbursements, followed by single parents with children – 2.3 per cent, and other households with children – 1.3 per cent. The surveys on the subject show that education is one of the main reasons for remittances and migrants’ saving priorities. Migrants send money back home to finance the education of their children or siblings. They also put away part of their income for their own studies. University fees increase every year, reaching amounts that many families cannot afford without financial support from abroad.\(^{144}\)

Migrants’ children, especially those from urban areas, have access to education and extra-curricular activities. The chances for urban migrants’ children to buy a computer and to have an Internet connection at home are higher as compared to other children.

At the same time, the families receiving remittances frequently opt for their children to be enrolled in secondary vocational or higher education levels, as compared to the families that do not receive money from abroad (57.9 versus 29.7%). About two thirds of students/graduates were able to study their preferred discipline thanks to the transfers received from abroad. Similarly, 50.5 per cent of persons who do not receive remittances

\(^{144}\) See no. 83.
Figure 93. Migration and intergeneration exclusion from education of youth, 2006–2009

By mother’s level of education

By father’s level of education

opted for vocational education due the inability to cover the necessary costs for higher education.\textsuperscript{145}

Some parents finance their children’s migration for them to study and acquire experience abroad. According to MEd data, about 4,000 Moldovans were studying abroad in 2010, about 90 per cent of whom were in Romania. At the same time, surveys show that the estimated figure for those who study abroad is much higher, many of them succeeding to connect themselves individually to the educational system from the host country. The number of such children in 2006 reached 9,000.\textsuperscript{146} It should also be mentioned that many young persons succeed in becoming integrated in the host country before graduation and very few of them return to RM. At the same time, these young persons represent a source to be explored and harnessed in future.

**Assuring guarantees and migrants’ access to the social protection system.** The assurance of social minimum guarantees for migrant workers and their families is a priority among the social policies of RM. The first bilateral agreements in social security meant for labour migrants were signed in the second half of the 1990s with five main countries of destination for Moldovan migrants: the Russian Federation, Ukraine, Belarus, Uzbekistan and Azerbaijan. It should be mentioned that these agreements are enforced based on the territoriality principle,\textsuperscript{147} which due to the economic realities of the past 15 years, lost their relevance. Consequently, the launch of some procedures for the agreements’ revisions and the negotiation of new agreements based on the principle of proportionality and export of benefits were imposed.

During 2008–2012, seven bilateral agreements were signed with Bulgaria (December 2008), Portugal (February 2008), Romania (April 2010), Luxembourg (June 2010), Austria (September 2011), Estonia (October 2011) and the Czech Republic (November 2011). Negotiations were also conducted regarding the draft agreements in social security between RM and the following States: Poland, Hungary, Belgium and Lithuania.

\textsuperscript{145} See no. 122.
\textsuperscript{146} See no. 23.
\textsuperscript{147} The territoriality principle provides for pensions to be set and paid by the state on whose territory the person resides, regardless of the contributions paid to the public social insurance system of the state of residence.
Moreover, a number of other States expressed their availability to regulate affairs in the area of social insurance: Latvia, Spain, Israel and France.

It should be noted that the public social insurance system of RM does not have any advantageous conditions for migrants and their families. The access to the system is offered only when some general conditions are met, specifically social insurance contributions.

The majority of migrants who work abroad do not participate in the public social insurance system and this fact generates increased pressure undermining the financial sustainability of the social insurance system. Current migrants are potential applicants for state social allocations (social assistance benefits similar to social pensions) which are nine times higher in 2010 than the average age-limit pension.\textsuperscript{148} Although the state social insurance system has been offering since 2006 the option of individual insurance\textsuperscript{149} by concluding a contract with the National Social Insurance Company to obtain a minimum pension under general conditions, very few migrants access this opportunity. By the end of 2009, only 300 out of the total number of persons individually insured in the public social insurance system were migrants. The following are the main reasons for this situation:

i. Taxpayers are discouraged by the solidarity-based system and lack of cumulative pylon;

ii. There are limited options of social risks that may be insured, including only old age and death;

iii. The minimum pension that may be obtained is small. For instance, in 2010, it accounted for 50.2 per cent of the existing minimum for pensioners.

As for migrants’ and their families’ access to monetary social assistance, surveys show that the situation of families with seasonal migrants is confusing, when dealing with their inclusion in the poverty-based benefit called “Social Help”. Currently, the national social assistance system does not have a mechanism for absolute monitoring of households’ incomes, and the situation is worse in case of households with migrants. Although access to state monetary support is based on self-declaration of incomes and

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item See no. 40. Authors’ calculations.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
conditions intervening in incomes’ change, with penalties applied in cases of non-informing, very few households actually do it. The majority of such cases are denounced by neighbours. Another aspect of the problem relates to the automatic stop of benefit provision when a household declares a member’s migration, even if the member does not send remittances.\textsuperscript{150}

\textbf{Moldovan migrants prove to have a high level of social cohesion.}

The social capital and the mutual assistance among migrants, as well as between migrants and home communities, play an important role at all stages of the Moldovan migration experience/cycle, from planning to leave until the eventual return and reintegration. These social networks play a crucial role in assisting Moldovan migrants to manage migration-related risks, decrease afferent financial costs and increase earnings. Data from sociological surveys shows that at the stage of preparing to leave, four out of five Moldovan migrants ask their relatives to help them with emigration, and 70 per cent of migrants choose their destinations where they already have social contacts or even a guaranteed job.\textsuperscript{151} At the same time, 70 per cent of migrants stay with their relatives or friends abroad.

Moldovan migrants tend to keep solid contacts in the destination country and maintain links with their motherland. This is an important fact for exchange of information and support with economic and social conditions both at the migration place and in RM. Hence, about 40 per cent of all Moldovan migrants meet weekly in public places, and 66 per cent pay mutual visits at home once per month. Moldovan migrants usually communicate with family and friends in RM through telephone (94% weekly), the Internet (40% weekly) and SMS (37% weekly), and 9 out of 10 migrants visit RM annually. Migrants in the CIS visit RM more frequently in April and January, while migrants in EU countries come home usually in August and December.

Although Moldovan migrants hold solid horizontal social capital, this is not valid for the structural social capital (meaning formal organizations and networks that promote common action). Even though there are migrants’ associations and diaspora organizations, their importance and

\textsuperscript{150} UNICEF, Impact of social benefits on families with children, in the context of switching from a system based on categories to a system based on income testing (2011).

\textsuperscript{151} IOM, Migration in Moldova: Country Profile (Geneva, 2008).
role in the communities of migrants and their families seem to be extremely limited. The results of the survey show that only 4.6 per cent of migrants consider these associations as a “trustful source of information”.

B5. Migration and health

The achievement of a high level of health, health risk prevention, including risks associated with migration, and the equitable distribution of health-care services to the population is the main goal of any health system. The migration phenomenon has not only generated a strong impact on social and economic development in RM, but also significantly influenced the evolution of population health indicators, including the capacity and sustainability of the national health system.

The mandatory health insurance serves as the basis for the organization of the national health system in the RM. It was introduced in 2004 and represents the second stage of the reform process in the health system started in the mid 1990s, when the inherited Semashko system had given in to transition imperatives. According to the method of resource collection, the mechanism for financing the health system is characterized as a mixed one. Hence, resources are collected from:

i. compulsory health insurance contributions paid by the insurant and insurer;
ii. direct and indirect taxes;
iii. private health insurance premiums; and
iv. consumers’ direct payments for health services.

It should be mentioned that although the introduction of compulsory health insurance had a positive impact on reviving the system and facilitating access to health services for the socially vulnerable population, a number of deficiencies appeared alongside the mentioned advantages, which actually justify the need for continuous adjustment of the system to new economic developments.

---

152 See no. 84.
154 See no. 115.
155 Expert-Grup, Feasibility of mandatory health insurance market liberalization in the Republic of Moldova (Chisinau, 2011).
Expenditures for health do not merely represent a cost, but also an investment with long-term impact on socioeconomic development.\textsuperscript{156} During 2005–2010, the costs for health care increased, occupying the third place (following social protection and education) as a share of social sector expenditures. The costs for health care in 2010 accounted for 5.6 per cent of the GDP (or 13.6% in the total expenditures of the consolidated budget), growing 1.4 percentage points as against 2005, but registering a decrease of 0.8 percentage point in the GDP as against 2009. This situation is explained by the impact of the financial and political crisis, which reduced revenues in the health budget, down 2.5 per cent in 2010 (Figure 94 and Table 50).\textsuperscript{157}

Although the financial crisis influenced public costs for health care, these costs nevertheless continue to be higher than the average in CIS countries but lower than the average in the EU, where the share varies


\textsuperscript{157} Centre for Health Policies and Studies, Health Monitor. Impact Analysis of Reforms in Health Sector (Chisinau, 2010).
from 7.4 to 12 per cent of the GDP depending on the country.\(^{158}\) Hence, the national expenditure per person in health does not exceed USD 113, while the EU average is 20 times higher.\(^{159}\)

**Population access, including migrants’ access to the health system,** is influenced by multiple factors. One of the determinants of the population’s access to health services is health insurance availability. According to NBS HBS data,\(^{160}\) in 2010, the level of health insurance coverage among households reached 74 per cent. However, population participation through contributions to the health insurance system is rather low. Only 26.4 per cent of the total number of households contribute to the system by paying the compulsory monthly contributions, and only 1.4 per cent of households bought health insurance. The remaining insured persons – 46.2 per cent – are those who are insured by the State free of charge (Figure 95).

Figure 95. Share of insured population by type of insurance and area of residence

![Figure 95](image)

Source: NBS Ad-hoc Module on Health.
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\(^{158}\) OECD Health Data 2011. Available from: [www.oecd.org/document/16/0,3746,en_2649_33929_2085200_1_1_1_1,00.html](http://www.oecd.org/document/16/0,3746,en_2649_33929_2085200_1_1_1_1,00.html) (accessed 17 April 2012).

\(^{159}\) See no 113.

\(^{160}\) NBS HBS, Ad-hoc Module on Health (Chisinau, 2011).
At the same time, the statistical data shows that 26.4 per cent of the population remains outside the health insurance system, 73 per cent of whom are in rural areas. The reasons for non-participation in the health insurance system are diverse, the main ones being: the rather high cost of insurance policies as against the obtained income – 26.2 per cent; unemployment – 33.3 per cent; activity in the informal sector – 17 per cent; the superfluousness of an insurance policy as they will have to pay anyway – 10.8 per cent, and migration – 3.4 per cent. Although the national health system also provides the option of facultative insurance, this benefit is accessed only by 0.7 per cent of the population (Figure 96 and Table 51).

The population’s access to health services is also influenced by financial and geographic conditions, time available for visiting a medical institution, and the means to leave the children in someone’s temporary
care. The data from NBS HBS shows that 29.2 per cent of the total number of households do not ask for medical assistance because of lack of money. Most of these households are from villages (36.4%) and small towns (30.3%).  

About 5.5 per cent of households encounter problems with access to medical services due to the long distances to clinics, hospitals and health centres. The problem of distance and lack of transportation is pointed out more in rural areas (8.5%) than in urban ones (2%).

Survey data shows that due to long-term absences, migrants call for a doctor two times less frequently compared to the population not involved in migration. The number of migrants’ visits to the doctor amounts, on average, to 1.5 visits per year, compared to 3.2 visits registered for members of households benefiting from remittances and 3.5 visits registered for the members of households not benefiting from remittances.

Migrants encounter barriers to accessing health services, both in the country and abroad. The main obstacles encountered by migrants in accessing health services in the country include:

i. high cost of medical assistance – 59.3 per cent;
ii. lack of health insurance – 44.9 per cent;
iii. lack of trust in local doctors’ professionalism – 29.2 per cent; and
iv. the need to receive a referral from the family doctor – 19.1 per cent (Figure 97).

The structure of obstacles encountered by migrants abroad is different from that in RM. Hence, the most frequently encountered obstacles are:

i. lack of health insurance – 34 per cent;
ii. illegal status, which makes it difficult to access doctors – 28.7 per cent;
iii. financial constraints – 25 per cent;
iv. restrictions from leaving their job during workdays – 14.7 per cent; and
v. fear of job loss – 20.5 per cent.

---

161 NBS, Multiple Approaches of Social Exclusion in the Republic of Moldova, Methodological and analytical aspects (Chisinau, 2010).
162 See no. 160.
Figure 97. Obstacles in accessing medical services for migrants in Moldova

- Do not know / no answer: 11.7%
- Other: 6.3%
- Don't know the family physician: 8.1%
- Medical institution is an other locality: 11.1%
- Don't know where to apply: 14.4%
- Need to get dispatch from doctor: 19.1%
- Don't trust doctors: 29.2%
- Missing medical insurance: 44.9%
- High cost of medical services: 59.3%


Figure 98. Obstacles in accessing medical services by migrants abroad

- Do not know / no answer: 19.1%
- No barriers: 6.5%
- Don't trust in professionalism of doctors: 6.1%
- Need to get dispatch from doctor: 9.3%
- Distance from medical institutions: 11.1%
- Cannot leave job on working days: 14.7%
- Don't know where to apply: 17.2%
- Fear of losing job: 20.5%
- High cost of medical services: 25%
- Illegal staying: 28.7%
- Missing medical insurance: 34%

The lack of trust in doctors’ professionalism in the case of the Moldovan health system places third (29.2%), while abroad, it is a rather insignificant factor at 6.1 per cent (Figure 98).\textsuperscript{163}

Another important problem is parents’ migration, which influences children’s access to medical services. Children whose mothers work abroad are more affected in this context. Hence, 23 per cent of children whose mothers are overseas stated that no one goes with them to the doctor, as compared to 6 per cent in cases when the father is abroad, and 4 per cent in cases when both parents are abroad.\textsuperscript{164}

\textit{Health status perception} is a factor that correlates with the level of addressability for the doctor. The statistical data reflects an optimistic level of health perception among the population of RM. According to data from NBS HBS,\textsuperscript{165} 46.5 per cent of household members consider themselves to have good or very good health, 41.1 per cent satisfactory, and 12.4 per cent bad or very bad health. In general, the positive perception of health decreases as the age increases – a fact determined especially by the prevalence of certain diseases in specific age groups. Thus, the share of persons with good or very good health drops from 78 per cent among children to 2 per cent among those aged 75 years and over.

Women are more critical of their health than men, as only 43.2 per cent of women stated a good or very good health status as compared to 50.2 per cent of men. The urban population states more frequently a satisfactory health status (42.9%) as compared to rural residents (39.8%), with the difference registered for this indicator being 3.1 percentage points. At the same time, 13.4 per cent of the rural population assessed their health as bad or very bad as compared to 11 per cent of the urban population. The level of health perception is also influenced by the population’s degree of well-being. Persons from quintile I (the poorest) more often state that they have good or very good health (52.5%) as compared to persons from the other quintiles. At the same time, the higher the well-being level, the larger the share of persons perceiving their health as satisfactory (from 35.3% in quintile I to 42.8% in quintile V).\textsuperscript{166}

\textsuperscript{163} IOM et al., Health of Moldovan Migrants: Socioeconomic Impact (Chisinau, 2010).
\textsuperscript{164} See no. 134.
\textsuperscript{165} NBS, Population access to health services (Chisinau, 2011).
\textsuperscript{166} Ibid.
The quality of population health is characterized by life expectancy at birth, which starting in 2000 registers a solid increasing trend both in European countries and outside the region. In 2010, RM registered 69.1 years of life expectancy at birth (73.4 years for women and 65 years for men), representing an increase of 1.3 years compared to 2005 and 1.7 years from 2000. Life expectancy at birth in the urban population is 4.7 years higher than in the rural population. At the same time, significant differences are noted when analysing this indicator by sex – it is 8.4 years higher for women than men (Figure 99 and Table 53). It should be mentioned that the difference in values for the given indicator is comparable to those from Romania (7.5 years) or Ukraine (10 years), but are two times higher, or even incomparable with those from countries with a high HDI, such as Island and Norway, where the given difference is 3.9 and 4.3 years. Nevertheless, when comparing with the average for the EU-27 States, the indicator of life expectancy at birth for RM is still lower by 10.8 years, but higher by 1.5 years compared to the average of CIS States (Figure 100).

Figure 99. Life expectancy at birth in RM, 2000–2010

Source: NBS.

See no. 33.

The decreased mortality rate for infants and children under 5 years old is the main factor that determined the variation of life expectancy at birth in RM. Hence, in 2010, the infant mortality rate was 11.7 per 1,000 live births, registering a decrease of 0.4 percentage points as compared to 2009 and 0.7 percentage points from 2005. Meanwhile, the mortality rate in 2010 for children under 5 years old was 13.6 per 1,000 live births, declining 0.7 percentage points as compared to the previous year and 2.1 percentage points as compared to 2005 (Figures 101 and 102).

The main causes of death for children under 1 year old and those under 5 years old are: conditions appearing in the prenatal period (39.9 and 34.5% respectively), congenital malformations, deformations and chromosome anomalies (29.4 and 28.2%), respiratory diseases (13.5 and 12.4%), accidents, intoxications and trauma (6.5 and 10.4%), and parasitic diseases (3.4 and 3.6%, respectively).

---
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Figure 101. Infant mortality, by region, 2000–2010

per 1,000 births

Source: MOH, WHO.

Figure 102. Mortality of children under 5 years old, by region, 2005–2010

per 1,000 births

Source: MOH, WHO.
It should be mentioned that as a result of the policies promoted over time in the area of health assistance to mothers and children (including adjustment of national targets to the Millennium Development Goal (MDG) global framework), the mortality rate for infants and children under 5 years old decreased between 2000 and 2010 by 6.6 and 8.8 percentage points, respectively. Nevertheless, these indicators continue to be elevated at more than one and a half times higher than the average for European countries and nearly three times higher than the average for the EU. It should be specified that currently, there is no data or analysis that identify any causal links between the evolution of children’s mortality and migration effects.

Maternal mortality illustrates women’s status and their access to medical assistance, as well as the capacity of the health system to respond to every case separately. In 2010, maternal mortality ratio in RM registered maximum shares in the past decade and accounted for 44.5 deaths per 100,000 live births, (18 deaths in absolute figures). The value of the indicator increased 160 per cent as compared to 2009 (17.2 deaths per 100,000 live births), and 140 per cent as compared to 2005 (18.6 deaths per 100,000 live births). In comparison, it can be mentioned that in 2010, the maternal mortality ratio for European countries was 13.3 cases per 100,000 live births, for EU – 6 cases per 100,000 live births, and for CIS – 23 cases per 100,000 live births (Figure 103).

It should be noted that in order to avoid the “small figure” errors, according to WHO recommendations, the estimation of the maternal mortality ratio in countries with an annual number of live births below 100,000 thousand (as it is in Moldova’s case with 40,476 live births in 2010) should be carried out once in three to five years via the “nest” method. Hence, as a result of these recommendations, the sliding average of the maternal mortality ratio for 2008–2010 was 34.4 deaths per 100,000 live births, as compared to 22.9 cases per 100,000 live births for 2007–2009.

170 Authors’ calculations based on NBS data.
171 UNDP and Centre for Assistance to Public Authorities (CAAP), Analysis of population health via statistical indicators (2010).
172 Excluding the eastern districts of RM.
173 According to data from the National Centre for Health Management (NCHM) in RM, 2011.
The increase of maternal mortality in 2010 is mainly due to cases of death via indirect obstetrical risk (53%), pandemic flu (29.4% or five cases), followed by oncological diseases, heart failures and nuclear icterus (17.6%).

It should be mentioned that the results of the analysis carried out for maternal mortality causes show that about 47 per cent of such cases are determined by the existence of social problems such as migrating lifestyle (in 13% of cases) and women’s work abroad (27%), which implies occasional or seasonal work, and harmful and extremely dangerous conditions for reproductive health. About 7 per cent of registered cases of maternal death are caused by not addressing health problems or late request for qualified medical assistance. The main reasons for failing to seek timely help are:

i. lack of available transportation;
ii. faultiness of telecommunication means;

MLSPF, Combined fourth and fifth periodical report on the implementation of the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women in the Republic of Moldova (Chisinau, 2011).

iii. deterioration of medical institutions’ material resources; and
iv. acute lack of medical personnel in rural areas, where pregnancy supervision most of the time is carried out only by the midwife or family doctor.

These conditions also explain the fact that about 58 per cent of maternal deaths originate in rural areas, which are also characterized by a higher level of poverty.176

*The mortality of working-age population*177 continues to prevail in the general structure of population mortality, ranking RM among the top countries in Europe. In 2010, this indicator accounted for 558 cases per 100,000 inhabitants, registering an increase by 30.6 cases as compared to the previous year and by 11 cases as compared to 2005.178 The structure of working-age population mortality continues to be dominated by cardiovascular diseases (26.4%), traumas and intoxications (20.5%), tumors (17.5%), and diseases of the digestive system (16.9%). More than 65 % of working-age population deaths are registered in rural areas; this situation may be explained by reduced access to health services. The mortality rate of working-age men is 10 per cent higher than that among women, being highly influenced by their lifestyle (including alcohol consumption and smoking), food culture, and harmful work conditions.179

The analysis of migration influence on working-age population mortality is rather interesting. It is obvious that informal employment and unqualified work, frequently in harmful conditions, and work accidents worsen migrants’ health status. Nevertheless, there is no data or survey that allows us to reflect this correlation.

*Socially conditioned diseases* such as HIV/AIDS and TB have the highest impact on life quality and duration, and are the main causes of poverty, discrimination and marginalization.180 According to
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176 See no. 171.
177 According to NBS, the working age in RM is between 16 and 61 years old for men, and 16 and 56 years old for women.
178 See no. 112.
statistical data, by the end of 2010, the number of those living with 
HIV/AIDS in RM reached 6,404 persons (of whom 39.9 per cent are 
from the Transnistrian region). About 1,219 persons infected with 
HIV/AIDS benefited from antiretroviral treatment (including 306 from 
the Eastern territories), of whom 234 (including 97 from the Eastern 
territories) were included in 2010.

HIV/AIDS incidence in 2010 was 17.12 per 100,000 persons, 
preserving the level registered in the previous years, but twice as high as 
compared to 2005 (Figure 104). To a big extent, the high incidence levels 
are induced by the Transnistrian region, which annually represent about 
36.8 per cent\textsuperscript{181} of all newly registered cases, and the prevalence of HIV 
infection is 173 per cent higher compared to the territories from the right 
side of the river Nistru.

HIV affects most rapidly the young and fertile population. Hence, 
79.5 per cent of the total number of identified persons are registered in 
the age group 15–39 years old, including 17.47 per cent in the age group 
20–24 years old and 22.3 per cent in the group of 25–29 years old.\textsuperscript{182}

The surveys in the field show that young persons whose parents 
work abroad are exposed to a higher vulnerability risk in this context, as 
compared to those whose parents are in the country.\textsuperscript{183} The aggregated 
indicator of HIV knowledge among the young persons aged 15–24 years 
old with parents abroad reflects that only 38.2 per cent of them provided a 
correct answer to key questions, and 66.3 per cent regarding the methods 
of sexual protection. It should be mentioned that the mother’s absence 
influences on youth level of knowledge about the methods for preventing 
HIV infection, and only one third of them answered correctly as compared 
to 35 per cent in case of other categories.\textsuperscript{184}

\textsuperscript{183} N. Vladicescu, HIV Knowledge, Attitude, Practices (KAP) study on teenagers with parents working 
abroad in the frame of a Fact Finding Mission (FFM) in the non-EU countries and EU border areas, 
\textsuperscript{184} Ibid.
Among the different HIV/AIDS transmission modes, sexual interaction accounts for 39.3 per cent of cases, including 24.7 per cent in Transnistria). At the same time, the share of the new cases increases among the rural population at 34.9 per cent, and migrants at 34 percent, with a drop of new cases among injection drug users. In the high migration context, this phenomenon may determine the further spread of HIV in RM. This hypothesis was confirmed by surveys in the area, which indicated a higher probability of engaging in sexual relations with occasional and commercial partners, including lower rates of consequent use of condoms among migrants.

Solid trends are observed for the feminization of the epidemic, being conditioned by biological peculiarities (the rate of sexually transmissible

---
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cases being 10 times higher in men–women than in women–men direction) as well as by gender patriarchal norms within society.\textsuperscript{188} Hence, the share of women infected with HIV over the past years increased from 40.9 per cent in 2005 to 51.6 per cent in 2010. It should be noted that annually, about 80 new cases of HIV infection are registered among pregnant women.

Moreover, although a service of Voluntary Testing and Counselling was launched, the number of persons using this service has decreased. The barriers identified in accessing these services are lack of confidentiality, drawbacks in medical ethics and deontology, lack of trust, and persistence of stigma and discrimination.\textsuperscript{189}

**Global incidence of TB** in RM is decreasing. In 2010, there were 107.4 cases per 100,000 inhabitants, registering a decrease of 4.5 per cent as against 2009 and 18.6 per cent as against 2005, when it was 130.9 cases per 100,000 inhabitants (Figure 105).

Figure 105. Global incidence of TB and TB-associated mortality, 2000–2010

\begin{figure}
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{figure105.png}
\caption{Global incidence of TB and TB-associated mortality, 2000–2010}
\end{figure}

\textsuperscript{188} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{189} O. Scutelniciuc et al., Baseline situation analysis of children and families affected by HIV and persons living with HIV in the Republic of Moldova, Survey Final Report (Chisinau, NCHM, 2008).
The incidence of new TB cases has decreased as well, accounting for 87.3 per 100,000 inhabitants in 2010. Considerable discrepancies are observed based on gender and areas of residence. More than two thirds of new TB cases were registered among men. At the same time, about 60.7 per cent of people with TB are from rural areas, of whom 71 per cent are men.\textsuperscript{190}

An increase of new TB cases among migrants was registered over the past years because most infected persons do not follow TB treatment due to frequent change of place of residence. Hence, about 15.5 per cent of the new TB cases registered in 2010 were identified among the persons who were abroad for a period exceeding 3 months in the past 12 months.\textsuperscript{191} Thus, due to the low adherence to treatment and high mobility of the population, multidrug-resistant TB incidence is on the rise. According to medical statistics in 2010, multidrug-resistant strains of TB accounted for about 44.3 per cent of the total number of sick persons, registering growth of 1.3 percentage points as compared to the previous year.\textsuperscript{192}

TB-associated mortality, however, is decreasing. In 2010, it was 16.5 cases per 100,000 persons, decreasing by 13.5 per cent\textsuperscript{193} as compared to 2005, when it was 19.5 cases per 100,000 inhabitants. Nevertheless, the results obtained by RM in this context did not fulfil the intermediary MDG target for 2010, thus suggesting the need to consolidate further the efforts undertaken in this respect.

\textsuperscript{190} See no. 112.
\textsuperscript{191} See no. 154.
\textsuperscript{192} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{193} Authors’ calculation based on statistical data provided by MOH and NHIC.
PART C: MIGRATION MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK

This chapter provides a comprehensive overview of the national legal and regulatory framework in the field of migration under section C1.

The section C2 presents a carefully structured description of the remit and functions of central government authorities, as well as of international organizations, non-governmental actors and migrants’ groups assisting in national migration management. It also summarizes RM’s participation in certain regional migration partnerships aimed at enhancing the country’s cooperation in terms of policies with neighbouring countries, countries of destination, and home countries of migrants.

Under the section C3, a synopsis of the overall migration strategy of RM is provided. It also offers insight into the coordination and coherence of migration policies on national level.

The section C4 provides an overview and assessment of programmatic actions that have been implemented in the country recently, attempting to assess the actions from the point of view of their relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, cross-complementarities, synergy and timeliness. In addition, areas for future interventions are suggested.

C1. Laws and regulations (national, regional and international levels)

This section provides a comprehensive overview of the national legal and regulatory framework in the field of migration, following the categorization applied in RM’s National Strategy for Migration and Asylum (2012–2020):

a) Regular migration, including emigration, immigration and social integration;

b) Asylum;

c) Policies of prevention of irregular migration and smuggling of migrants.
The national legal and regulatory framework in the field of migration is focused on the legal aspect of migration processes and regulates the rights and interests of refugees and migrants, their employment opportunities, freedom of movement and access to justice. It also controls migration processes at the state border, staying arrangements in the country for foreign citizens and stateless persons, and the prevention and combating of irregular migration and human trafficking.\textsuperscript{194}

During the past years an array of conceptual documents and laws determining migration policy in the key areas of migration management (regular migration, including emigration, immigration and social integration; asylum; policies of prevention of irregular migration and smuggling of migrants)\textsuperscript{195} and practices for the long term were adopted (see Annex 3). Although some further improvements are necessary, the instruments adopted are largely in line with international standards.\textsuperscript{196}

Organizing and facilitating legal migration. On 24 December 2011, the Law on Foreigners No. 200, adopted on 16 July 2010, came into effect and determined a number of departmental reorganizations (e.g. establishment of a “one-stop-shop” within BMA). The new law makes procedures for applying for visas, residence and work permits in RM clearer and simpler, representing an important step forward in the development of a migration management system.\textsuperscript{197} However, some older national laws still applying


\textsuperscript{195} While discussing and analysing migration management in RM, the macrolevel pillars exposed in the country’s National Strategy for Migration and Asylum (2012–2020) are used for categorization. The choice of this Strategy is predeterminded by the fact that it seeks to link the realm of migration and asylum to the general development policy framework of the country and is closely intertwined with the Government’s activity programme, as well as feeds in into the new development strategy of RM (Moldova 2020: National Development Strategy: Seven Solutions for Republic of Moldova) that has been in force since January 2012. (A. Oprunenco, National Strategy for Migration and Asylum: An Attempt of Holistic and Integrated Approach towards Migration Issues in Moldova, Consortium for Applied Research on International Migration (CARIM East) Explanatory Note 12/10. Socio-Political Module (Florence, CARIM East, 2012). Available at: www.carim-east.eu/media/sociopol_module/ExplanatoryNotesTemplateMoldova2010.pdf

\textsuperscript{196} High Representative of the EU for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy, Second progress report on the implementation by the Republic of Moldova of the Action Plan on Visa Liberalisation, Joint Staff Working Document (Brussels, 2012).

to the legal status of foreigners in RM should be repealed and integrated into the new law.\textsuperscript{198} The Law on Integration of Foreigners in the Republic of Moldova No. 274, adopted on 12 December 2011, entered into force on 1 July 2012. For the first time, the measures of social character, as well as the economic rights of foreigners (immigrants, asylum-seekers, refugees and unaccompanied children) were clearly stipulated, contributing to their better adaptation and integration. This law brings greater legal certainty with regards to the integration rights and facilities that are to be provided for all foreigners in RM.

The country has also adopted a solid legal framework for \textit{asylum} in a very short period of time, largely in line with international standards\textsuperscript{199} (i.e., Law No. 270-XVI of 18 December 2008 on Asylum in Moldova, the National Strategy of the Republic of Moldova for Migration and Asylum (2011–2020) and the National Action Plan for 2011–2015 regarding the implementation of National Strategy in the area of migration and asylum).

The issues related to the temporary labour migration were examined superficially for a long period of time. Its impact on the labour market, level of remittances and poverty alleviation was not sufficiently considered. However, the intensity of migration processes and gradual exertion of the negative consequences of the migration phenomenon factored in the labour migration challenges into national legal exercises: National Strategy regarding employment policy for 2007–2015, National Action Plan in the area of employment for 2012, Law on Labour Migration No. 180 of 10 July 2008, and Action Plan for enhancing the return of Moldovan labour migrants from abroad (2008–2011).

\textbf{Migration and development.} Action Plans and other policy documents relevant to the migration and development pillar are discussed in section C3.

\textbf{Combating irregular migration and THB.} According to experts in the European Commission, the legislative and policy framework on preventing and fighting THB has been consolidated in line with

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{198} Ibid.
\item \textsuperscript{199} Ibid.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
international standards. Additionally, RM is party to the following bilateral agreements in the field of labour migration with the Russian Federation (1993), Ukraine (1993), Belarus (1994), Azerbaijan (2005) and Italy (2011), and in the field of social security with Bulgaria (2008), Romania (2010), Luxembourg (2010), Austria (2011), Estonia (2011), Portugal (2011) and the Czech Republic (2011). Currently, under negotiations are the social security agreements with Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Belgium and Italy. Bilateral labour agreements are an important tool chosen by governments for providing a high degree of flexibility for countries to target specific groups of migrants, adapting to fluctuating labour market conditions, and sharing responsibility for monitoring and managing migration between sending and receiving countries. The aim of the social security agreements is to determine the right of Moldovan citizens moving between countries to receive social security, removing the restrictions on the entitilement to such benefits.

Regulating and controlling migration. The National Strategy on Integrated State Border Management for 2011–2013, the Action Plan for the implementation of the Strategy and the Law on the State Border were adopted in 2011. In the same year, the Law on Border Police, approved on 28 December 2011, amends the national legislation in view of demilitarization and professionalization of the Border Police.

In the field of readmission, between 2009 and 2011, RM signed additional implementing protocols to the EU–RM Readmission Agreement with 11 EU Member States, as well as readmission agreements with 5 non-EU countries. In the same context, additional protocols of implementation of the EU–RM Readmission Agreement are being negotiated with nine EU Member States and a number of main countries of origin of irregular immigrants. Here, the conclusion of the Agreement between the European Community and the Republic of Moldova on the facilitation of the issuance of visas on 19 December 2007 should also be mentioned as it is “paying special attention to security and readmission”.
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C2. Institutional framework

This section presents a carefully structured description of the remit and functions of central government authorities, as well as of international organizations, non-governmental actors and migrants’ groups assisting in national migration management. It also summarizes RM’s participation in certain global and regional migration partnerships aimed at enhancing the country’s cooperation in terms of policies with neighbouring countries, countries of destination and home countries of migrants.

As regards national authorities in charge of migration management in RM, the country has a solid institutional framework in the field of formulation of migration policies and migration management, with the participation of numerous institutional actors (see Annex 4).

The President of RM (www.president.md), according to the Constitution, has powers to “find solutions to problems concerning the rights of citizenship of the Republic of Moldova and grant political asylum”.

The main powers of the Moldovan Parliament (www.parlament.md), according to the Constitution, refer to initiating and passing laws, decisions and motions, to approving the main directives of the state’s internal and external policy, to ratify international treaties and agreements as part of the parliamentary control over the executive power. All these powers have direct relevance to the field of migration.

The Government (www.gov.md), jointly with the Parliament and the President, ensures the management and coordination of the activities of the ministries’ and of other government agencies for migration policy implementation. It also “implements the state policy aiming at regulating migration processes”.

MOI (www.mai.gov.md) holds the primary responsibility over controlling and managing migration processes in RM, particularly
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203 Ibid.
204 Law No. 64 of 31 May 1990, on Government. Available at: http://lex.justice.md/index.php?action=view&view=doc&lang=1&id=312895
in monitoring and coordination of migration processes, as well as development of draft legislation and regulatory norms in the field of legal status of foreign citizens and stateless persons.

The following branches and subdivisions of the MOI are involved in the managing migration processes:

The **Border Police of RM** (www.border.gov.md), which was preceded by the Border Guards Service until 1 July 2012, has competences in promoting policies in the field of integrated state border management, combating irregular migration, investigation of border crimes, trafficking in persons, forgery of travel documents, etc. Also, the Border Police is empowered to issue visas at the state border crossing points in emergency situations, a task taken over from the Bureau for Migration and Asylum.

The **BMA** (www.bma.gov.md) was created in July 2006 and is responsible for the development and implementation of state policy on migration and asylum. BMA is assigned the supervisory and control functions of migration law, evidence and issuance of documents for foreign nationals, managing migration, the stay of foreign citizens and stateless persons in RM, combating irregular immigration, and expulsion, readmission and detention of foreigners. Currently, there are several administrative sources, developed and maintained by ministries that are directly or indirectly involved in regulating the migration process, collecting data on persons crossing national borders. To make use of the great potential of administrative data sources and in order to increase the cooperation between ministries working with international migration, an Integrated Automated Information System “Migration and Asylum” (SIIAMA)\(^{205}\) has been developed, being held by the BMA. At the same time, in the European Commission experts’ opinion, further capacity consolidation of the BMA, including offering appropriate human resources, is needed, as well as establishing cooperation protocols between the relevant bodies of MOI, which would clarify the division of competences during the immigration procedures.\(^{206}\)

**CCTP**, under MOI, was created in September 2005 and is an operative body for investigation and prosecution in order to prevent

---


\(^{206}\) See no. 197.
and combat human trafficking and irregular migration. The International Criminal Police Organization’s **National Central Bureau** (www.mai.md/atrib_bncint), and **National Contact Point “Europol”** (www.europol.europa.eu/sites/default/files/flags/moldova.pdf) under MOI, also have in common attributions to prevention and combating trafficking in persons and irregular migration.

The **National Virtual Centre SECI/GUAM** (www.mai.md/node/403), under the MOI, was created in January 2006, with the aim to develop specific actions to prevent and combat cross-border crime and other serious crimes in the SECI and GUAM Member States.

**MEc** (www.mec.gov.md) is responsible for creating a favorable environment for investments in RM in order to attract domestic and foreign investments, including remittances. The **Organization for Small and Medium Enterprises Sector Development (OSME)** (www.odimm.md), which works in close cooperation with MEc, is a non-profit, non-commercial organization with the status of public institution, created in May 2007 that aims at promoting efficient and effective development of small and medium enterprises. In 2010, OSME launched the pilot Programme on Attracting Remittances into the Economy (**PARE 1+1**), which “aims to facilitate migrants’ access to finance, while helping to boost remittances through official channels, the introduction of best practices in host states of migrants, creating a lever for introducing innovations and know-how, but while creating jobs and solving other social issues”.

**MLSPF** (www.mpsfc.gov.md/en/start), created in September 2009, along with its subdivisions, namely Migration Policies Unit, **Human Resources Development and Employment Policies Division**, **Social Assistance Policies Division**, **Social Security Policies Division**, **Demographic Policies Unit** and **Policies of Ensuring Gender Equality and Violence Prevention Division**, is responsible for development and implementation of state policy for employment relations and the demographic field. It is also in charge of the formulation and development of policies concerning labour activity, social and legal protection of migrants, development mechanisms to regulate labour migration processes, including the negotiation and conclusion of bilateral agreements aimed at regulating labour migration
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flows and protecting migrant workers, and the prevention of domestic violence and trafficking in persons. NEA (www.anofm.md), created in 2003, is an institution subordinated to the MLSPF, and focuses mostly on promotion of state policies, strategies and programmes in the field of development labour market, social protection of employees and those seeking employment, unemployment prevention and combating its social effects. It also implements labour migration policy, monitors activity of private employment agencies, and contributes to management of labour migration (through the issuance and extension of right to work permits to foreign citizens and stateless persons, recording employment of Moldovan citizens abroad, coordination of activities of private employment agencies, integration in the local labour market of Moldovan citizens and those returning from work abroad).

MFAEI (www.mfa.gov.md) issues entry visas for RM, delivers travel documents to Moldovan citizens, offers consular services and protects Moldovan citizens abroad through diplomatic missions and consulate offices. MFAEI also negotiates on behalf of the country for international treaties and agreements, including the migration-related field. MFAEI coordinates the European integration process, including the EU–Moldova dialogue in the area of the liberalization of visa regime (migration and mobility are a component of the dialogue) and EU–Moldova Mobility Partnership implementation, at the national level. The Ministry has also a prominent role in ensuring RM’s participation in various migration-related international platforms and consultative processes.

MOH (www.ms.gov.md) is responsible for the mobility of medical personnel and accessibility of the health-care system for migrants.

MEd (www.edu.gov.md) administrates issues related to recognition of qualifications of returned migrants through its Information and Qualifications Recognition Service. The Ministry is also involved in the regulation of issues related to the academic mobility of teaching personnel.

MITC SE CSIR “Registru” (www.registru.md) ensures the formation, maintenance, storage, use and management of the State Population Register, Register of Legal Entities, National Geographic Information System, State Transport Register and State Drivers Register. It operates
departmental registers, guaranteeing monitoring of informational systems and resources, and applies information technologies to manage migration flows as a holder of the State Population Register.

The SE CSIR “Registru” also collects data, and produces and updates 24 statistical tables designed to summarize the data provided by each ministry involved in SIIAMA.

Since 1 February 2008, RM has been issuing biometric passports in line with the imperative requirements of the process of the European integration and visa liberalization. Starting in 2012, biometric passports could also be issued through Moldovan diplomatic missions and consular offices abroad.

**NBS (www.statistica.md)** is the central administrative authority that manages and coordinates activity in the field of statistics in the country, including the migration field.

The **Bureau for Inter-ethnic Relations (www.bri.gov.md; www.diaspora.md)**, under the Prime Minister’s office, is responsible for coordinating and forging ties with the Moldovan Diaspora, including the support of ethno-cultural needs of nationals living abroad.

The **Information and Security Service (www.sis.md)** acts to counter and prevent irregular migration, trafficking in persons, and organized crime.

**International Organizations assisting national migration management**

**IOM** is the leading intergovernmental organization in the field of migration that has been working in RM since June 2003. On 29 May 2003, RM accepted IOM’s Constitution through Law No. 215 http://lex.justice.md/viewdoc.php?action=view&view=doc&id=313034&lang=2 IOM works in partnership with the Moldovan Government, international intergovernmental organizations and local NGOs on all aspects of migration, including building capacities to manage migration flows, developing international cooperation, leveraging migration for development, better protecting migrants’ rights, providing guidance on migration

---

legislation, improving migration management and border management, and combating THB. Since 2011, IOM Mission to Moldova has already implemented 85 projects. Currently, there are 27 ongoing projects under the country office’s mandate.

**UNDP** activity in Moldova is regulated by the Country Cooperation Framework and Country Programme Action Plan (2007–2012), which encompasses five key areas: institutional development, justice and human rights, environment and climate change, poverty reduction, local governance/regional development, and civil society. Some of the projects, implemented under these thematic areas, include migration-related components.

**UNHCR** works in a diverse range of situations in RM, specifically those involving asylum-seekers, refugees, internally displaced persons, returnees and stateless people.

**UNICEF** Mission to Moldova was officially launched in 1995 as a response to the emerging needs of children, young people and their families in the country. Under the Social Policy Programme, UNICEF RM seeks to ensure social inclusion of children who are excluded from Moldovan society and do not receive attention, care and services from public institutions and decision makers.

**Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) Mission to Moldova** was established in 1993 to support efforts to find a peaceful solution to the Transnistrian conflict. Under its Anti-Trafficking and Gender Programme, the Mission contributes to combating trafficking in persons and promoting gender equality.

The **United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA)** started its cooperation with RM in 1995. Since 2001, UNFPA assistance to the country has grown significantly and has become consistent. The UNFPA Country Programme has three components: (a) reproductive health (b) population and development, including migration issues and (c) gender.

The **ILO** began working in RM on labour migration issues in 2003. Under its mandate, ILO cooperates extensively with the Moldovan
Government, other international organizations and local NGOs, addressing such issues as reduction of trafficking of young women into labour exploitation, strengthening of national migration and employment management capacity, formulation of gender-balanced migration policy measures, regulating labour migration and promoting sustainable return, with particular focus on enhancing human capital and preventing skills waste.

The **WB Country Office** began working in RM in 1993. The current WB’s Country Partnership Strategy for RM for 2009–2012 focuses on three strategic priorities: improving economic competitiveness to support sustainable economic growth based not only on remittances but also on exports and investments; minimizing social and environmental risks, building human capital and promoting social inclusion; and improving public sector governance.

RM’s **WHO Country Office** was established in 1995, to provide continuous support to health authorities in improving population health through evidence-based, sustainable public health and health-care interventions, as well as to advice on overall health policies. In RM, WHO, with other donor partners, focuses its efforts also on studying the impact of the mobility/migration of health professionals, and offering recommendations as to the most efficient management of this process and addressing its negative impact from the perspective of human capital development.

In July 2010, the United Nations General Assembly created the **United Nations Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women (UN Women)**,\(^\text{209}\) as part of the United Nations reform agenda, covering such topics as preventing trafficking in persons and empowering economic participation of women as the result of participation in migration processes. In 2010, a new project in RM called **Women’s Economic Empowerment through increasing Employability in the Republic of Moldova for the period 2010–2013** was launched by UN Women, and

\[^{209}\text{UN Women merged and built on the important work of four previously distinct parts of the United Nations system, which focused exclusively on gender equality and women’s empowerment: Division for the Advancement of Women; International Research and Training Institute for the Advancement of Women; Office of the Special Adviser on Gender Issues and Advancement of Women; and the United Nations Development Fund for Women.}\]
is being jointly implemented with MLSPF and MEc, supported financially by the Government of Sweden. This programme is primarily aimed at addressing the needs of the rural and suburban population, especially poor women, with special focus on employment, economic empowerment and social protection areas.


International Centre for Migration Policy Development (ICMPD) was founded in 1993 upon the initiative of Austria and Switzerland, with the purpose of promoting innovative, comprehensive and sustainable migration policies, and functioning as a service exchange mechanism for governments and organizations. ICMPD is an international organization with 15 Member States. On 9 January 2012, the Agreement between ICMPD and the Republic of Moldova on the Status of the Organization in the Republic of Moldova and on Cooperation in the Migration Field was signed in Vienna, and a field office was opened in Chisinau. Currently, Moldovan institutions are involved in ICMPD projects dealing with combating trafficking in persons, return and readmission, border management and migration management.

Non-governmental actors, and engagement/representation of migrants’ groups

The International Centre “La Strada”, launched in RM in March 2001, is part of the international network of Prevention of Trafficking in Women in Central and Eastern Europe that is present in nine countries: the Netherlands, Poland, Czech Republic, Bulgaria, Ukraine, RM, Belarus, the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, and Bosnia and Herzegovina.

The Centre for Prevention of Trafficking in Women (CPTW) represents a project implemented by the NGO Association of Women in Legal Careers. The CPTW project was launched in 2001 and its objectives
are to raise public awareness on the issue of trafficking in persons, to inform the vulnerable categories of people about risks and consequences of trafficking, and to contribute to strengthening institutional capacities in preventing and prosecuting trafficking in persons.

Since 2008, the Representative Office of Winrock International in RM has been contributing to the fight against trafficking in persons by empowering underprivileged young people, mainly from rural areas, to improve their confidence and livelihoods and develop their communities, thus becoming part of the solution to the social and economic causes of outward migration and trafficking in persons.

**Terre des homes Foundation** has been active in RM since 2004. It works towards the improvement of social follow-up and protection of Moldovan children in vulnerable situations within and outside the country, including migrant children. The implementation of projects is done thanks to its partners such as the Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation, Medicor Foundation, OSCE, UNICEF, IOM and the Union of European Football Associations.

The Moldovan branch of the London-based Emmichild charity has been in the country since 1995. Currently, collaborating with local public authorities, EveryChild develops programmes focused on the prevention of child abandonment and children’s institutionalization. It also works in the realm of children’s social rehabilitation and family reintegration as consequences of the migration processes.

**Centre for Health Policies and Studies (PAS Centre, formerly MedNet Centre)** was established in 1999 and is a Moldovan, independent, non-profit, non-political organization. Specifically, PAS Centre is qualified for health programme implementation and capacity-building in HIV/AIDS, TB, sexually transmitted infections, and hepatitis B and C, including among migrants.

**National Women’s Studies and Information Centre “Partnership for Development” (CPD),** founded in 1998, is a non-profit institution that promotes an integrative approach to gender issues, women’s rights and equal opportunities. CPD integrates gender mainstreaming into all
domains of social life, promotes public policy and issues regarding the role of women in society and their empowerment, and strives to eliminate all forms of discrimination against women, including migrant women.

**The Centre for Assistance and Protection of Victims of Trafficking**, founded in 2001, with the support from IOM Mission to Moldova, is a highly specialized institution that assists victims and potential victims of trafficking in persons in crisis situations, identified abroad and in the country. In 2008, through continuous collaboration with the Moldovan Government, and its increasing efforts in addressing trafficking in persons, the Centre became a public institution subordinated to the MLSPF and co-managed by IOM.

**National Centre for Training, Assistance, Counselling and Education in Moldova**, which opened in September 2011, helps victims and potential victims of trafficking in persons, as well as other categories of vulnerable migrants in crisis situations. It also coordinates and monitors assistance activities in their reintegration to society.

Cooperation with **Moldovan diaspora associations** abroad represents part of state policy, implemented through a number of strategies and action plans in this regard. The Organization of the Diaspora Congresses in Chisinau is considered a mechanism of establishing relations and promotion of cooperation with compatriots abroad, as well as enhancing diaspora structures. Since 2004, four Moldovan Diaspora Congresses have taken place. The fifth Congress is planned for in autumn 2012. On 1 June 2012, there were 147 Moldovan diaspora associations registered under the aegis of the Bureau for Inter-ethnic Relations, representing 30 countries in Europe, the CIS, North America and the Middle East.

**Migration partnerships and consultative processes**

RM is part of specific regional migration partnerships, which aim at consolidating policy cooperation with neighbouring countries, countries of destination and home countries of migrants.\textsuperscript{210}

\textsuperscript{210}The mentioned migration partnerships and consultative processes predominantly relates to cooperation with the EU on migration issues.
The country was part of the **Söderköping Process**,\(^{211}\) launched in 2001, to respond to the challenges of EU expansion eastward, and to promote better cooperation on asylum- and migration-related issues among the countries situated along the eastern border of future EU Member States. Since 2004, the Söderköping Process has specifically focused on sharing experiences on asylum, protection, migration and border management issues among Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Hungary, Poland, Romania, Slovakia and Sweden on the one hand, and Belarus, RM and Ukraine on the other. The Process is coordinated by a network of National Coordinators from the participating countries, the BMA’s Education, Forecasts and Strategy Service acting as the Moldovan National Coordinator, and Secretariat operated by the Swedish Migration Board.

**EU Border Assistance Mission to Moldova and Ukraine (EUBAM)** was launched on 30 November 2005 following a request made jointly to the European Commission by the Presidents of RM and Ukraine. Fully funded by the EU within the context of the European Neighbourhood and Partnership Instrument, and with the UNDP acting as implementing partner, EUBAM participates in two standing working groups with the host countries’ border services: one focuses on irregular migration and trafficking in persons, and the other on weapons smuggling, contraband and customs fraud.

The EU’s **EaP**,\(^{212}\) launched on 7 May 2009, represents the initiative directed at six countries of Eastern Europe and the South Caucasus: Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Georgia, RM and Ukraine. The initiative aims at tightening the relationship between the EU and the Eastern partners by deepening their political cooperation and economic integration, as well as facilitating trade and increasing mobility between the EU and the partner states, including visa liberalization. **Multilateral cooperation** within the EaP is pursued within permanent structures – the so-called **thematic platforms** devoted to democracy, good governance and stability; economic

---

\(^{211}\) In 2011, the Söderköping Process was integrated into EaP, placing it under the aegis of the multilateral dimension of EaP’s Platform 1.

\(^{212}\) It should be mentioned that, alongside the EaP’s initiatives, the EU launched a five-year Stockholm Programme with guidelines for justice and home affairs of the Member States of the EU for the years 2010–2014. The Programme touches areas as diverse as homeland and public security, migration, including migration profiles for developing countries, mobility partnerships (European pact on immigration and asylum), combating organized crime, and even family law, private law, inheritance law and others.
integration and convergence with EU policies; energy security; and people-to-people contacts. RM welcomed the launch of the panel *Migration and Asylum* in the sixth meeting of Platform No. 1 “Democracy, Good Governance and Stability” of EaP on 17 November 2011. This form of cooperation creates a forum for multilateral exchange of information and best practices on migration and asylum policies, and contributes to better cooperation between countries at the bilateral and regional level. The international conference *Eastern Partners’ Contribution to the Stockholm Programme: Strengthening Synergies for Improving Mobility and Safety*, convened at the initiative of RM on 24 and 25 January 2011 in Chisinau, helped to integrate the Söderköping Process in Platform 1.

On 12 August 2008, the Working Arrangement on establishing the Operational Cooperation between RM’s BGS and **FRONTEX** was signed. As result, the country’s Border Police is a participant of different pilot projects and operational measures organized by FRONTEX, including data exchange, risk analysis, and detecting false or forged travel documents and stolen means of transport.

**Mobility partnerships (MPs)** are comprehensive and balanced, offering actions in all four major areas of the EU’s Global Approach to Migration and Mobility: legal migration and mobility, irregular migration and THB, international protection and asylum policy, and maximizing the development impact of migration and mobility. The aim of the MPs is to “identify novel approaches to improve the management of legal movements of people”. The Joint Declaration on Mobility Partnership between the EU and RM was signed during the Slovenian Presidency of the EU, on 5 June 2008 in Luxembourg, at the meeting of the Council of EU Ministers of Justice and Home Affairs.213 Under this “umbrella” partnership, parties not only can implement cooperation initiatives (e.g. training of practitioners or institutional support), but also can negotiate and conclude bilateral agreements (such as labour migration agreements and agreements on social security of migrant workers – e.g. negotiations and signing of Labour Migration Agreement with Italy in 2011). They can

213 **MPs** have now been signed with RM (2008), Cape Verde (2008), Georgia (2009) and Armenia (2011). MPs are being negotiated with Azerbaijan, Tunisia, Algeria and Morocco. EU Member States currently participating in MPs through various projects are Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Cyprus, France, Germany, Greece, Italy, Lithuania, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovakia, Sweden and Hungary. The European Commission, FRONTEX and ETF are also participating in the partnerships.
also directly contribute to mobility facilitation (for example, liberalization of labour market by Poland for Moldovan citizens). In the case of RM, the partnership allows the expansion of EU activity in the area of migration from solely addressing border management and illegal migration by incorporating the migration and development dimension.

Participation in the **Prague Process** allows RM to join in a new political process promoting migration partnerships among the participating states of the EU, the Schengen Area, South-Eastern and Eastern Europe, and Central Asia, based on principles adopted in a Joint Declaration by 49 signatory States in 2009. ICMPD hosts the organizational support team, which provides organizational and substantial assistance to the leading States, which are the Czech Republic, Hungary, Poland, Romania and Slovakia.

RM also takes part in the **Budapest Process** – a consultative forum of more than 50 governments and 10 international organizations, aiming at developing comprehensive and sustainable systems for orderly migration, with the purpose of exchanging information and best practices in dealing with topics such as regular and irregular migration, asylum, visa, border management, trafficking in persons and smuggling of migrants, readmission and return.

The country plays an active role in the **GFMD**, which has provided more than a decade of international dialogue on the growing importance of the link between migration and development. GFMD is a voluntary, informal, non-binding and government-led process open to all Member States and Observers of the United Nations, to advance understanding and cooperation on the mutually reinforcing relationship between migration and development and to foster practical and action-oriented outcomes. From the very beginning, RM has actively participated in GFMD’s thematic seminars, which cover different topics, including managing migration for development, migration profiles and mainstreaming migration into strategic policy development.
C3. Policy framework

Under this section, a synopsis of RM’s overall migration strategy, including ongoing policy initiatives to strengthen the migration policy framework, is provided. The chapter also offers analyses of the coordination and coherence of migration policies on the national level and within other sectors’ policies (labour, education, health, etc.), and strategies and action plans. Moreover, it elucidates and analyses existing gaps and challenges.

General overview: Despite a solid institutional set-up and legal framework laying down a comprehensive basis for an efficient migration management system, migration policies are managed by a variety of government regulations and legislative instruments that give the appearance of duplications and conflicts. Strategies and action plans are occasionally overlapping rather than complementary, lack fully developed mechanisms and capacities for monitoring and evaluation, do not tackle migration in a comprehensive way, or provide a clear answer to important questions such as how to maximize migration’s benefits and reduce negative social effects. Migration processes are included in specific contexts without fully being mainstreamed in the field of employment and improvement of remuneration for labour, education, health and social protection.

The migration strategy of RM: The Moldovan Government has already recognized the need for a coordinated and integrated approach to manage migration through the National Development Strategy 2012–2020, which was adopted by Parliament on 11 July 2012. But the Government continues the formulation of the policy framework, related to integration of migration and remittances into national development planning. Furthermore, to bear out the sustainability of integrating the migration and development agendas, the Moldovan Government launched a new project on mainstreaming migration into the country’s National Development Strategy 2012–2020 in 2011, an initiative supported by the United Nations Country Team in RM, with IOM acting as its focal point. The process aims at integration of migration in the national development planning instruments such as the implementation and sector strategies of the National Development Strategy 2012–2020. Other objectives are

---
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Broadly speaking, the National Strategy of the Republic of Moldova for Migration and Asylum (2011–2020)\(^\text{215}\) and the related Action Plan for 2011–2015 for its implementation aim at ensuring a comprehensive regulatory management of migration and asylum policies. They also intend to integrate the existing strategic frameworks in this field and mainstream the policies into different strategic planning actions (in the field of education, health, social inclusion, etc.). The Strategy reflects the efforts of national migration policies towards compliance with the EU’s Global Approach to Migration and Mobility, by covering all of its four areas: promoting legal migration, fighting irregular migration, fostering migration for the development of the country and ensuring the right of asylum.

As regards the scope of maximizing the development impact of migration and mobility, some progress was achieved through the creation of an appropriate environment for channeling remittances into investment. The State Programme Supporting the Development of Small and Medium Enterprises for 2009–2011, approved in February 2009, could be mentioned in this context. As the old strategy expired in 2011, a new Strategy for the development of small and medium enterprises for the period 2012–2020 and the Action Plan for its realization for the period 2012–2014 have been drafted by the Government “in the context of shifting from the economic development model based on consumption to a new paradigm, oriented towards exports, investments and innovations”\(^\text{216}\). From the mobility perspective, the EU–Republic of Moldova Action Plan in the area of liberalization of the visa regime and the National Programme for its implementation (in force since 2011) pursue to offer visa-free travel to Moldovan citizens to the EU as a long-term goal, taking into account the EU Global Approach to Migration and ensuring necessary conditions for well-managed and secure mobility.


Reintegration and return of Moldovan migrants represent one of the elements present in national legislation. A number of activities have been implemented, such as the PARE 1+1 Programme and National Economic Empowerment Programme for Youth (PNAET), which foresees training in entrepreneurial skills as well as financial assistance for business start-ups. In addition, activities aimed at improving the system for the recognition of skills and qualifications (i.e. National Concept of validation of the informal and non-formal learning, approved in November 2011), and strengthening the local labour market have been implemented, including in the context of the EU–RM Mobility Partnership. Although the Action Plan for enhancing the return of Moldovan labour migrants from abroad, approved by the Government on 9 October 2008, already expired, the return and retention of Moldovan migrants remains a major policy objective that is clearly stipulated in the National Strategy of the Republic of Moldova for Migration and Asylum 2011–2020) and the related Action Plan for 2011–2015.

Cooperation with diaspora associations of Moldovan citizens abroad is part of the state policy. From the institutional perspective, the necessary framework for the dialogue with the diaspora is being further developed. For instance, state-owned pilot programmes for investment of remittances and permanent/temporary re-attraction and socioeconomic reintegration of migrants have been set up. Currently, the emphasis is on the protection of Moldovan citizens and their rights abroad, preservation of cultural identity, and stimulation of migrants’ return home. In this regard, the Action Plan for supporting the the Moldovan Diaspora for the period 2006–2009, National Action Plan for 2008 on the protection of citizens of Republic of Moldova abroad, and Action plan for the national cultural and social support of the Moldovan Diaspora for 2012–2014 were adopted. Their purpose was the promotion and creation of conditions for preserving development and manifestation of cultural and linguistic identity in the resident country, and guaranteeing multidimensional cooperation with Moldovans residing abroad.

To enhance the mechanism of cooperation with Moldovan diaspora associations, the Government of RM operated some modifications in 217 See no. 196.
the Regulations of the State Chancellery\textsuperscript{218} that introduced the Bureau for Relations with Diaspora in the organigram of the State Chancellery, under direct subordination to the Deputy Prime-Minister in charge of reintegration policies. Under newly operated modifications, the Bureau is responsible for “ensuring coordination of the state policy in the field of relations with the Diaspora [...]; coordination [of] the process of policymaking in the field of relations with the Diaspora, thus contributing to keeping and affirming Moldovans’ ethnic, cultural and linguistic identity abroad; capitalization of the human and material potential of the Diaspora; coordination [of] activities of cultural, educational, economical and social nature developed by ministries and other public authorities aimed at supporting and collaborating with the Diaspora representatives”.

From the perspective of combating irregular migration and THB, the following are worth mentioning:

- Specific Additional Plan for the prevention and combating of trafficking in persons for 2010–2011;
- National Programme for the prevention and combating of trafficking in persons for 2010–2011;

The main operationalization instrument of the above-mentioned policies and strategic documents is the NRS of the MLSPF for victims and potential victims of trafficking in persons. The NRS is an integrated system that provides comprehensive assistance to victims and vulnerable persons, including children and elderly left behind, through referrals to local authorities and civil society service providers. In 2008, the NRS was thematically expanded to provide support to victims of domestic violence following the approval of the Law on Prevention of Domestic Violence.

\textsuperscript{218} Government Decision No. 780 of 19 October 2012. Available at: http://lex.justice.md/viewdoc.php?action=view&view=doc&id=345122&lang=2
Coordination and coherence of policies at national level: Currently, the coordination of migration-related policies and strategies occur within an impressive institutional set-up, channeled through the following inter-institutional bodies:

The Inter-ministerial Committee for Strategic Planning was created in 2008 and represents the highest coordination body in RMoldova aimed at coordinating the central public administration reform process. As a replacement for a number of committees and commissions with complementary functions, it has the purpose of ensuring substantiation and analysis of policy documents, and providing an honorable process of strategic planning that efficiently correlates national priorities determined in the key strategic documents of the Government with the policies elaborated by the central public administration. Further, it takes charge of coordination of international assistance provided for national priorities. In this sense, under its mandate, the Committee also covers migration-related issues.

The National Commission for Population and Development (NCPD) (http://demografie.md) and its executive secretariat, represented by the Demographic Policy Unit of MLSPF, was established in February 2007. It functions under the Prime Minister’s office as an institutional body of analysis, synthesis, monitoring, correlation and coordination of sectoral policies with impact on demographics. NCPD manages the priorities and demographic risks for RM, formulates and develops state policies as regards population and prevention of demographic risks. In 2010, NCPD created the Working Group on ensuring better efficiency of the evidence mechanism of internal and external migration flows, with the purpose of examining the quality of demographic statistics and proposing measures to streamline the mechanism for recording external and internal migration flows. The Working Group was composed of representatives of MITC – SE CSIR “Registru”, MOI, MLSPF, MFAEI, Ministry of Justice, NEA, NBS and IOM Mission to Moldova.

The National Committee to Combat Trafficking in Human Beings is a permanent consultative body of the Government, created in 2005 for coordinating activities in the field of anti-trafficking by presenting proposals on state policy in this area to the Government. The Committee

also coordinates the activities of territorial committees and of specialized institutions regarding the implementation of actions to prevent and combat THB. The Committee is chaired by the Deputy Prime Minister of MFAEI.

The **Commission for Coordination of Certain Activities Relating to Migration Process**\(^{220}\) is a permanent advisory body under the Government that was established in February 2010 and is chaired by the MOI. It was created for the coordination of the activities of public authorities as regards management and monitoring of the migration processes, for the supervision of activities in the field of migration, and for ensuring cooperation between state institutions, NGOs and international agencies/organizations with competences in the field of migration management. The Commission is convened when necessary or at least once per trimester. However, the Commission is not efficient because of the sporadic character of its activity and recommendatory character of decisions.

The **Working Group on the coordination of the visa liberalization regime with the EU**, created in May 2010, is responsible for planning and coordinating the process of implementation of the EU–RM Action Plan on Visa Liberalization. The Working Group reports to the Governmental Commission for European Integration.

According to the Governmental Ordinance, a **National Committee of Monitoring the Implementation of the Joint Declaration on Moldova–EU Mobility Partnership (MP)**, chaired by the Deputy Minister of MLSPF, was instituted at the national level in November 2008, and includes officials in charge of national institutions responsible for the MP implementation. The MFAEI is the main coordinating national institution of the MP with the EU and responsible for monitoring the reports on implementation done on a quarterly basis.\(^{221}\) The MP is coordinated through the High-Level Meetings of the MP (held yearly, on the level of Deputy Minister and Head of Department of MFAEI, back to back with the RM–EU Subcommittee on Justice and Home Affairs), the Local Cooperation Platform (held yearly, and includes representatives of the Moldovan authorities and of the Member
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\(^{220}\) [www.carim-east.eu/media/legal%20module/natfr/MD_3.1%20General_RO.pdf](www.carim-east.eu/media/legal%20module/natfr/MD_3.1%20General_RO.pdf)

\(^{221}\) The Scoreboard ([www.mfa.gov.md/mobility-partnership-ro](www.mfa.gov.md/mobility-partnership-ro)) represents the monitoring tool of the MP implementation, which contains information on the initiatives, responsible partners, contact points, indicators for evaluation, implementing period of the initiatives and their funding source. It is updated on a quarterly basis.
States’ diplomatic missions and the EU Delegation) and the Extended Local Cooperation Platform (held yearly, and includes implementing partners, representatives of international organizations, civil society and the academe). Given the enhanced coordination outcomes of this meeting format, it was decided in 2012 to organize forthwith all Cooperation Platform meetings in extended format.

Within the IOM project Supporting the implementation of the migration and development component of the EU–Moldova Mobility Partnership, in June 2010, a Technical Working Group (TWG) was created. The TWG represents a body that coordinates the activities related to drafting the EMP of RM and its further implementation. It includes 15 institutions integrated with representatives of donor organizations, United Nations partners and academic society as observers.

The Coordination Council of people originating from the Republic of Moldova and residing abroad, established in February 2005, works as an advisory body to the Government. Its purpose is the promotion, preservation, development and expression of the ethnic, cultural, linguistic and religious identity of Moldovans residing abroad. The Council comprises officials of RM and representatives of Moldovan diaspora associations.

In order to secure the efficient use of financial resources for supporting the Moldovan Diaspora, the Council for managing the funds for sustaining financially the activities aimed at preserving the national cultural identity of persons originating from the Republic of Moldova and residing abroad (Moldovan Diaspora) was created in December 2007.

However, despite already existing solid institutional set-up, RM requires further improvement of the inter-institution coordination mechanism (which could, eventually, be built through tailored and targeted assistance) in order to develop more effective institutional migration management framework and policies. For instance, the Commission for Coordination of Certain Activities Relating to the Migration Process under the Government is inefficient because of the sporadic character of its activity and non-binding, recommendatory character of decisions. A part of migration issues is considered within other field-specific Commissions affiliated to the
Coherence of national migration policies requires appropriate compilation and availability of internationally comparable migration data, national policy coordination, active cooperation among involved authorities and active international cooperation in legislation at all levels. The Government needs timely access to more accurate and detailed data and analysis of factors driving migration. The lack of adequate information and analysis in this field limits the capacity of Government to envisage appropriate migration policies address in a targeted manner the different categories of migrants, and approach the problems linked to migration such as children and elderly people left behind. In addition, the insufficient interface between national education strategies and national labour market need to be mentioned. Education policies necessitate more complex decisions involving considerations of national and international nature. For instance, it is necessary to take into account existing skills pools and needs in-country, as well as within destination countries, highlighting the need for multi-stakeholder coordination. The need for more policies and strategies that focus on migrant-sensitive health systems could also be reiterated (i.e. a need to strengthen dialogue between services of MOI and MOH at the national level).

C4. Programme framework

This section provides an overview and assessment of programmatic actions that have been implemented in the country recently, attempting to assess the actions from the point of view of their relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, cross-complementarities, synergy and timeliness. In addition, areas for future interventions are suggested.

---

222 Expert interviews with representatives of IOM Mission to Moldova, August 2012.
From 2007 until up today, 200 migration-related actions have been implemented or are under the implementation. These projects range from effective governance of labour migration and its skills dimensions to protection and empowerment of victims of domestic violence and human trafficking. Generally, a considerable part of the migration-related programmatic actions was or is implemented under the MP umbrella (to date, within the framework of the MP, 85 migration-related initiatives have been or are being carried out in various fields, starting with the migration profile until the promotion of schemes/projects for circular migration). \(^{223}\)

Given the high number of migration-related projects, it is not feasible within the scope of the EMP to list and assess each action according to its relevance, efficiency and timeliness. However, given that a considerable part of the migration-related actions is under the MP, the below non-exhaustive list of major migration-targeted projects under the MP may serve as an exemplification of the type, scope and distribution by domains of intervention.

In accordance with the evaluation of the expert from IOM Mission to Moldova of the EU–RM MP during the period 2008–2011, the following projects use best practices for Moldovan state authorities: \(^{224}\)

- **Strengthening Moldova’s capacity to manage labour and return migration** implemented by the Swedish Public Employment Service, which informs on opportunities for legal migration to the EU, options for return to RM, and risks of undocumented migration and work;
- **Effective Governance of Labour Migration and its Skills Dimensions in Moldova** implemented by the ILO and co-financed by the European Commission;
- **Supporting the implementation of the migration and development component of the EU–Moldova Mobility Partnership**, implemented by IOM and financed by the European Commission;
- **Addressing the Negative Effects of Migration on Minors and Families Left Behind**, a collaboration of MLSPF, the Italian Ministry of Labour and IOM, financed by the European Commission and the Italian Government;

---


\(^{224}\) See no. 222.
• Strengthening capacities and cooperation in identifying false and forged travel documents at the Moldovan–Romanian border, implemented by IOM and financed by the EU;
• Support to implementation of the EU readmission agreements with the Republic of Moldova, the Russian Federation and Ukraine: facilitation of assisted voluntary return and reintegration, implemented by IOM and financed by the EU; and
• activities pertaining to the production of the EMP under the project Supporting the implementation of migration and development components of EU–Moldova Mobility Partnership, implemented by IOM and financed by the EU.

Furthermore, the projects Supporting the Implementation of the EC visa facilitation and readmission agreements in Moldova and Georgia with a total budget of about EUR 800,000225 and Building training and analytical capacities on migration in Moldova and Georgia, implemented by ICMPD and financed by the European Commission, and the activities aimed at strengthening the Moldovan asylum system funded by Germany were highlighted. PNAET, with a total budget for 2008–2011 of EUR 13.5 million,226 and PARE 1+1, started in 2010 and intended to be prolonged until 2014, were also mentioned.

Additionally, some other important projects in the different thematic areas relevant for the migration and development pillar are worth mentioning.

On 24 November 2011, WHO’s European Commission-funded initiative Better managing the mobility of health professionals in the Republic of Moldova, with a total budget of EUR 2 million, was launched to focus on turning health-care workforce migration to circular mobility, strengthening workforce training, and preventing risks of brain drain and waste in RM.

The Immigration Department of the Italian Ministry of Labour and Social Policies and its reference agency Italia Lavoro, jointly with IOM RM, launched in January 2012 a programme called International Labour

---

225 Ibid.
Mobility, which includes the establishment of a Labour Coordination Office to be operated by the Italian Government in RM. The aim of the programme is to contribute to the creation of an integrated system of management of labour migration flows from RM to Italy by promoting the concrete application of the bilateral cooperation agreements signed by the two countries.

MEd and ETF continue to work towards creating and strengthening the mechanism of recognition and validation of migrants’ skills based on the National Concept of validation of the informal and non-formal learning, mainly through the ETF project Development of the Vocational Training and Education System.

In the field of capacity-building of state institutions, the EU is financing several large projects. As the example is the project Effective Governance of Labour Migration and its Skill Dimensions aimed at capacity-building in the area of legal migration, benefiting both Ukraine and RM, with a budget of EUR 800,000 (approximate share for RM) implemented by the ILO. The Automatic Information System Evidence of Labour migration developed within the project Strengthening the Republic of Moldova’s capacity to manage labour and return migration and currently used by NEA will further permit the generation of statistics on migrant workers and emigrants, which will facilitate the elaboration of policies in this area.

Children and elderly left behind due to migration were covered by the Czech Government-supported Moldovan National Action Plan on the protection of children left without parental care for 2010–2011 (in force since June 2010), as well as by the project Addressing the negative effects of migration on minors and families left behind, implemented by the Italian Government in collaboration with IOM and co-funded by the European Commission. Further activities in the field were undertaken by IOM in the frame of the European Commission-funded project Supporting the implementation of the migration and development component of the EU–Moldova Mobility Partnership”. Taken together, these initiatives have a budget of around EUR 2.4 million.

---

227 See no. 222.
228 Ibid.
229 Ibid.
It is worth mentioning that RM has been rated among the top countries in terms of progress made in the field of addressing trafficking in persons by the US State Department, and seventh worldwide in terms of prosecution, protection and prevention of trafficking in persons in a 2010 scientific report. In this context, besides the long-standing efforts of IOM’s counter-trafficking programme, the ILO-ICMPD project *Elimination of human trafficking from Moldova and Ukraine through labour market-based measures* and the concluded UNDP/IOM/OSCE *Protection and empowerment of victims of human trafficking and domestic violence* project have to be mentioned.

Among the most active key donors are: the European Commission, United Nations Human Security Trust Fund, US Agency for International Development, Soros Foundation, Czech Development Agency, Austrian Development Agency, Swedish International Development Agency, the Governments of Japan, Romania, Finland, Italy, Cyprus, Germany, Greece, Denmark and Norway, Soroptimist International (Norway), and Lakarmissionen (Sweden). The main implementing partners are IOM Mission to Moldova, the ILO, UNHCR, UNDP, UNFPA – RM, OSCE – RM, ETF and ICMPD.

There is obvious growth and diversity in the number of migration projects over the past five years (Figure 106).

For example, in 2011, there were three and a half times more migration-related foreign assistance projects under implementation compared to 2007. Further, the IOM Mission in Moldova alone is currently implementing 27 projects. Under such circumstances, in broader terms, there is a risk that the rapid increase and diversity of migration projects would presumably heighten gaps in project coordination that could lead to duplications and overlaps. Moreover, the situation could be jeopardized by the fact that, according to the opinion of international experts, unlike in the humanitarian and development fields, there is little training or educational materials available on the evaluation of migration programmes.

---

230 See: S. Cho et al., 3P Anti-trafficking Policy Index 2010 Ranking and Several Developed Countries Fail to Protect Human Trafficking Victims – Release of the 2010 Anti-trafficking Policy Index (Goettingen, University of Goettingen, 2011).

An analysis of the distribution of the foreign assistance projects and programmes allows the following conclusions:

Donors’ assistance covers the whole spectrum of the national institutional actors involved in migration management processes.

Donors’ assistance was not distributed uniformly. For example, the balance of reported monetary funds under the MP framework committed between 2008 and 2011 to the respective domains is very roughly measured as follows:

- expenses for initiatives in the field of legal migration and mobility accounted for about 20 %;
- expenses for initiatives for fighting irregular migration and trafficking (excluding material support to border security) made up about 37 per cent; and
- expenses for initiatives in the field of migration and development constituted about 43 per cent.\(^{232}\)

\(^{232}\)See no. 222. Note: It is worth mentioning that financial distribution is only one way of estimating the intervention of the MP in the areas covered by the Global Approach to Migration and Mobility pillars. However, some initiatives that have produced a change did not require any specific budget allocations in the framework of the MP (being of legislative nature, for instance).
Here, it is important to note that the reforms supported through external assistance projects should continue after the projects’ end. However, the results of the survey, conducted by the Moldovan State Chancellery in 2011, indicate that, in many cases, weak public service structures, poor conditions of service and insufficient financial and human resources undermined capacity-building efforts.\(^{233}\) In broad terms, the annual process of assessing the impact of external assistance, including in the migration field, on the social and economic development of RM carried out by the State Chancellery, revealed that in 2011, 50 per cent of projects achieved “sustainability” and therefore, “\textit{further assistance would be necessary}”. The degree of complementarities among projects of various donor agencies, active in the same sector, has been assessed as “substantial”, after the establishment of sector councils chaired by line ministries comprising all active donors in a specific sector.\(^{234}\) Donor coordination and complementarities among various donor projects and strategies is critical to overall development. It leads to the avoidance of duplication and conflicting advice, saving both national and foreign resources.\(^{235}\) However, assessment of the sustainability of projects and strengthening of capacities for beneficiaries returned generally poor marks. While the attainment of project objectives is generally good, changes at the microlevel, as impacted by external assistance projects, are often not reflected in reforms at the overall level.\(^{236}\) In view of respondents of the mentioned State survey, the main obstacles to efficient external assistance delivery and consistent impact are:

- bureaucratic impediments;
- human resource constraints (insufficient number of project staff, skills and degree of communication with final beneficiaries);
- legislative ambiguity and weak legislative enforcement;
- lack of institutional coordination; lack of time and financial resources; and
- excessive reliance on the intervention of international experts without taking into sufficient account national expertise.\(^{237}\)

- Additionally, there are no answers to broader questions such as:
- In which areas has progress been made?

\(^{234}\) Ibid.
\(^{235}\) Ibid.
\(^{236}\) Ibid.
\(^{237}\) Ibid, p. 51.
• Which areas have been neglected?
• On which areas should the collaboration in the field of migration and mobility focus in the future?
• Which other capacity gaps need to be addressed?

Here, a sector-oriented evaluation of beneficiaries’ needs is important in order to identify clearly which sectors need more donor attention, thereby avoiding fragmentation or duplication of efforts. For the near future, Moldovan authorities have identified the following priority areas for future interventions in the framework of the EU–RM MP:

a) labour migration (to foster return migration and circular migration);

b) migrants’ social protection that receives relatively little attention by some States that host a significant number of Moldovan migrants;

c) strengthening national migration management, including institutional capacity development, visa facilitation and readmission;

d) the efficient investment of remittances and the development of small and medium enterprises in the regions;

e) monitoring of migration flows;

f) fight against irregular migration and trafficking.²³⁸

The situation of family members left behind by migrants is being tackled by comprehensive initiatives, but numbers show that the problem remains.²³⁹ In other less addressed fields, the insufficient interface between adapting national education strategies and policies to the national labour market needs and skills validation and promotion of academic mobility was highlighted in a number of contexts. Transfer of skills and innovation in relevant sectors through temporary return of highly skilled expatriate nationals was also recommended as a programmatic intervention facilitative of knowledge circulation. In the health sector, access to health services by

²³⁸ The priority areas were presented in the framework of the fourth High-Level Meeting of the EU–RM MP that was held in Brussels, Belgium, on 24 November 2011 and in the framework of the Extended Meeting of the EU–RM MP Local Cooperation Platform, which took place on 18 June 2012 in Chişinău www.mfa.gov.md/news-mobility-partnership-en/492435/

²³⁹ Ibid.
migrants and their families, and the migration of medical staff could also be mentioned. Moreover, Moldovan authorities should obtain additional support in the field of linking diaspora organizations in different countries, as well as considering diasporas associations as interlocutor and actor in the design and implementation of migration and development policies.

**Donor coordination mechanisms:** By the end of 2009, donor coordination mechanisms have been established to improve coordination among development partners and between development partners and the Government. At the national level, the key development partner coordination mechanism is the monthly Regular Donors’ Meeting. The *Partnership Principles Implementation Plan (PPIP)*, signed in March 2010 by the Government, WB, the EU, United Nations, and other relevant and bilateral donors, sets out a more formal process for establishing Sector Foreign Assistance Boards (also called Sector Coordination Boards), and an advisory body – the Joint Partnership Council – that will reflect the partnership between Government, civil society (including private sector) and development partners. The Council will be co-chaired by the Prime Minister of RM and a representative of the external aid partners. As the Joint Partnership Council has not been established yet, the rapid implementation of this commitment, as well as putting migration issues on its agenda, given their cross-cutting nature, is recommendable.

Although the PPIP allows the establishment of Coordination Boards in Ministries and Central Public Authorities, there is no clear link between these respective institutions and key priority areas for external assistance identified by the Government. Experience in the country has shown that the Sector Boards do need specific support to ensure their effective functioning. Linking a secretariat function for Sector Boards to the Planning Units of line Ministries has been particularly effective in ensuring an interaction between externally funded projects and the broader actions of the sector as a whole. Building capacity of such secretariats (including within the context of improving strategic planning) will be important and could be linked to broader capacity-building support at sector level, much

---

240 This section gives an overview of the mechanisms of donor coordination among development partners and between development partners and the Moldovan Government. External assistance projects, coordinated by this mechanism, contain implicitly various migration-related projects under relevant sectors.


242 Ibid.
of which is supported by development partners. The National Coordinating Authority for Foreign Aid, situated in the State Chancellery, uses the information provided by Sector Coordination Boards to define priorities for foreign assistance to be approved by the Inter-ministerial Committee for Strategic Planning. The State Chancellery is running an electronic database called the Integrated Database for External Assistance (IDEA), which is a management and information handling system for external assistance. It stores and retrieves data on external technical assistance (and project-related information) and allows reporting on external assistance activity in Moldova (see Figure 107). 

Figure 107. Distribution of projects by sectors, 2011

The majority of the migration-targeted projects are contained under the Governance and civil society sector (e.g. Strengthening Moldova’s capacity to manage labour and return migration within the framework of the Mobility Partnership with the EU; Supporting the implementation of the migration and development component of the EU–Moldova mobility partnership), whereas one project is included in other sectors, such as “Health” (Managing the impact of migration on the health-care system of Moldova 2009). However, it would be recommendable to introduce migration-related projects as a distinct cross-cutting project sector included IDEA.

243 See no. 233, p. 49.
PART D: KEY FINDINGS, POLICIES’ IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Section D1 summarizes the main findings of Parts A, B and C revealed by the available data on the current migration and development situation.

Under section D2, based on assessment of the current situation, some key recommendations for policymakers to improve current migration management are presented.

Section D3 presents an array of recommendations regarding mainstreaming migration into development policies of the country.

Section D4 indicates existing data gaps and offers recommendations and possible strategies to improve migration statistics and the overall evidence base on migration.

D1. Main findings on migration and development nexus

This section summarizes the main findings revealed by the available data on current migration and development situation.

General overview: Since 1991, RM has experienced different migration patterns: international/internal, voluntary/forced and permanent/temporary. The migration phenomenon is characterized mostly by international emigration of Moldovans, and to a much lesser extent by immigration of persons from abroad. RM is currently in a phase in which, parallel with economic restructuring and social changes, transition has determined increasing emigration (internal rural–urban, international). In most Western European countries (e.g. Spain, Italy, Greece and Ireland), which went through such a transition, the initial increase of emigration was followed in the longer run by decreasing emigration tendencies and a switch from net emigration to net immigration due to immigration of unskilled and semi-skilled workers from developing countries.244

244 See no. 10.
While such a development scenario of the migration flows from and to RM may occur, the country has not yet entered this phase of decreasing emigration per the quantitative evidence analysed herein. This outcome may be taken into account as only one among a number of possible scenarios.

Migrants not only contribute to development through their labour, but also through the creation of enterprises, development of new markets, creation of commercial ties between countries of origin and destination, and transfer of technology. Other significant contributions include the improvement of migrant children’s education and skills and their own skills, the transfer of their skills and knowledge acquired abroad, and the transfer of ideas, beliefs and new values on rights and opportunities.

Gender dimension issues linked to labour rights and protection need to be significantly considered since they matter in migration and development linkages and in determining the positive and negative impacts of migration to development. Providing guidance to policymakers, governments, trade unions, employers’ organizations, civil society organizations, migrants themselves and migrant organizations on how to enhance the contributions of women migrants and migrant workers to development is essential to advance on the issue of empowerment of women migrants.

As such, various areas linking international migration and development could include not only remittances, but also respect of migrants’ rights, particularly concerning migration status abroad, working conditions and wages, skills-related issues such as brain drain and brain waste, and others such as leadership and specific work of male migrant workers compared to female migrant workers in migrant organizations, and entrepreneurship.

---

245 A total of 124 small and medium business start-ups were selected under PARE 1+1 in the period 2010–2012. Total investment under this programme was MDL 75 million, out of which the Government contributed MDL 22.5 million, remittances constituted MDL 38.6 million, and other sources MDL 15 million.

246 Surveys in this area show that education is one of the main reasons for remittances and migrants’ saving priorities. For instance, families receiving remittances frequently opt for their children to be enrolled in secondary vocational or higher education levels, as compared to the families that do not receive money from abroad (57.9 versus 29.7%) (See no. 122.)
According to different studies, the main push factors for Moldovan migrants are economic: improving their standard of living, poverty, lack of employment opportunities and low salaries. In such a difficult environment, migration appears to be a survival strategy. Migration strategies are sometimes supported by the successful stories of migrants and by the social networks already established abroad (relatives, acquaintances and close friends who already live and work overseas).

**Current Migration Patterns:** The comparative analysis of data from in-country and host-country data sources, none of which is fully comprehensive, would indicate that the stock of Moldovan international emigrants ranges from approximately 200,000 (Eurostat) to 300,000 (border crossing records) persons. The analysed available data does not permit confirmation of the decreasing trend exhibited by the SE CSIR “Registru” administrative data, which covers a limited cohort of migrants who deregistered before leaving abroad for good, but would on the contrary denote a flattening or still modestly increasing trend in international emigration. The tendentially temporary labour migration captured with a wealth of detail through LFS, assuming both irregular and regular forms during the period of 2005–2010, show an approximately stable number of around 300,000 persons, or a quarter of the economically active population, who were working or looking to work outside the country each year. The main countries of destination continued to be Russia, Ukraine, Italy, Turkey, Portugal, Romania and Greece. In the age structure, migration significantly prevails among those 15–44 years old. However, certain gender disparities are observed in the age structure of migrating population: the younger the group is, the higher is the share of men, and the older the group is, the lower is the discrepancy.\(^{247}\) Also, the distribution of temporary migrant workers by gender reveals significant discrepancies regarding the countries of destination.\(^{248}\) From the education level perspective, persons with secondary education (lyceum, gymnasium) predominate, followed by those with specialized secondary education and vocational education.

---

\(^{247}\) For instance, men composed about 76\% of the age group 15–24 years, whereas this share declined to 50.9\% in the age group 45–54 years, the difference being 25.1 percentage points (NBS Statistical databank, 2012).

\(^{248}\) For instance, in the period 2006–2010 the share of men who went to Russia accounted for over 70\% during the analysed years. About 9\% of migrant men go to Italy. Roughly 40\% of the total number of women migrants are destined for Russia, and about 35\% are in Italy. Turkey and Israel each host about 6\% of female Moldovan migrants annually.
If permanent emigration, as recorded by the Population Registry would mainly involve persons from urban areas, temporary migration involves predominantly members of rural households. As regards educational migration, the number of Moldovans studying abroad during the period 2005–2010 is increasing, the main destination countries being Romania, Ukraine, Bulgaria and Russia.\textsuperscript{249} While the number of persons who are studying abroad, presented by the MED, is relatively small due to the limited number of study places overseas that are offered to RM under international treaties, the total, including students who independently organize their studies abroad, would presumably be sizeably higher.

*Involuntary emigration* registered a significant decrease by 2010 as compared to 2005. For instance, the number of Moldovan asylum-seekers abroad was 4,852 in 2005 and gradually decreased to 633 persons in 2010.\textsuperscript{250}

*Repatriation:* During 2006–2009, the annual number of repatriated persons was increasing, reaching 9,109 persons.\textsuperscript{251} However, this number was reduced significantly in 2010, registering negative growth rate of about -22 per cent.

*Resident foreign population:* By the end of 2010, the total number of foreigners (including the stateless persons) staying on Moldovan territory was 20,099 persons (0.5\% of the total population), registering a growth of 71.2 per cent as against 2005.\textsuperscript{252} Most of the foreigners come from Ukraine, the Russian Federation, Israel, Turkey, Romania, Italy and Germany.

*Preventing and combating THB:* RM continues to be characterized as a country of origin for THB, and it is less a country of transit of victims of trafficking from former Soviet countries to European States. Statistical data shows that 132 victims of THB were identified in 2010 through the NRS, which is five times higher than in 2006 – a fact that may be explained by more efficient identification of such victims. The number of potential

\textsuperscript{249} Compared with 2005, this number doubled in 2010 to 4,009 people.
\textsuperscript{250} Table 11.
\textsuperscript{251} Figure 25 and Table 15.
\textsuperscript{252} Table 16 and Figure 29.
victims of THB reported by NGOs for 2010 is 904.\textsuperscript{253} The main countries of destination for victims of THB remain the same over the past years: the United Arab Emirates, Russian Federation and Turkey. RM is not a country of destination for trafficking in persons. According to the US Department of State Trafficking in Persons Report (June 2012), RM is rated as Tier 2 country.\textsuperscript{254}

Positive dynamics are registered for \textit{readmission} in RM. For instance, the number of readmitted persons increased 25 per cent compared to 2009 and about three times compared to 2007.\textsuperscript{255} The majority of readmitted persons come from France, the Czech Republic, Germany, Hungary, Spain and Austria.

The prevalence of emigration over immigration influences \textit{demographic development}, characterized by continuous contraction of the population and amplification of the process of population ageing. According to the calculations of the scientists of ASM, the population of the country would decrease by more than 30 per cent or 1 million persons in the period 2010–2050, without considering migration data.\textsuperscript{256} The migration phenomenon is more pronounced in rural areas as compared to urban areas. At the same time, there is a stable trend for urban population increase in the context of the total population decrease in the country.\textsuperscript{257} This statistical data\textsuperscript{258} leads to the conclusion that besides population migration abroad, stable trends are also registered for internal migration, from rural to urban areas, especially of the economically active population.

The studies\textsuperscript{259} carried out by WB in 2006 attested to a significant positive impact of migration on \textit{macroeconomic stability} in RM. According to WB experts, currency inflows to the country, coming from labour migration, helped to offset the country’s trade deficit, whereas fiscal consolidation contributed to support the national currency. Remittances

\textsuperscript{253} See no. 38.  
\textsuperscript{254} www.state.gov/documents/organization/192587.pdf  
\textsuperscript{255} Table 15 and Figure 37.  
\textsuperscript{257} Here, it is worth mentioning that the growing urban population could also be explained as part of the overall socioeconomic development and urbanization of the country.  
\textsuperscript{258} See no. 72.  
\textsuperscript{259} See no. 77.
represented and continue to represent the most substantial and stable currency contribution, compared with foreign direct investments, exports, foreign loans and assistance. The share of remittances coming from abroad achieved significant proportions and reached its peak in 2008 with a ratio to GDP of over 30 per cent (USD 1.89 billion) and a ratio to GDP of 23.2 per cent in 2010 (USD 1.3 billion).  

Currently in RM, returning migrants confront the problem of reintegration, generated by the lack of jobs and low salaries. The launch of a business is fraught with difficulties as a result of insufficient financial resources and lack of information. Under such circumstances, some migrants have no other choice but to re-emigrate.

Migration also has an impact on social development, reducing access to an entire range of social and medical services parallel to the degradation of social and medical services’ quality due to mass emigration of qualified personnel in these sectors. Additionally, migration reduces poverty, but generates powerful social effects on children and elderly persons left behind as the result of mass emigration of Moldovan citizens.

At present, there is a large number of state authorities of different character directly or indirectly involved in migration management processes in the country. They create a solid institutional basis, although more resources should be allocated to the implementation of the relevant regulatory provisions. The national legal and regulatory framework is largely in place and RM has made very good progress on laying down a comprehensive basis for an efficient migration management system. However, despite a solid institutional set-up and the legal and regulatory framework in place, migration policies are managed by a variety of government regulations, legal instruments, action plans and strategies that determine the appearance of duplications and create conflicts. Strategies and action plans are occasionally overlapping rather than complementary, lack fully developed mechanisms and capacities for monitoring and evaluation, do not tackle migration in a fully comprehensive way nor

---

260 As the consequence of the global economic crises, remittances registered a sharp decline in 2009, though started to grow again in 2010 and 2011 – see Figure 56.

261 See no. 83.

262 See no. 197.
provide a clear answer to important questions such as how to maximize migration’s benefits and reduce negative social effects. Migration processes are included in specific contexts without their full mainstreaming in the field of employment and improvement of remuneration of labour, education, health and social protection.

**D2. Recommendations on migration management**

Under this Section, based on an assessment of the current situation, some key recommendations for policymakers to improve current migration management are presented.

Since 2008, progress has been made in various areas of migration management: readmission, facilitation of migration (return, management of RM’s labour market, conclusion of bilateral labour and social protection agreements), asylum system improvement and regulation of migration (border security strengthening, enhancement of document security, promotion of short-term mobility through facilitating issuance of short-stay visas).

However, Moldovan authorities would welcome more support in the fields of:

a) labour migration (to foster return migration and circular migration);

b) migrants’ social protection, which receives relatively little attention from some States that host a significant number of Moldovan migrants;

c) strengthening national migration management, including institutional capacity development, visa facilitation and readmission;

d) the productive investment of remittances and the development of small and medium enterprises in the regions;

e) monitoring of migration flows; and

f) fight against irregular migration and trafficking.\(^{264}\)

---

\(^{263}\) See no. 222.

\(^{264}\) See no. 238.
The situation of family members left behind by migrants is being tackled by comprehensive initiatives, but numbers show that the problem remains.

There is an urgent need to address the issue of skills mismatch on the labour market due to the insufficient interface between adapting national education strategies and policies to the national labour market demands and measures such as setting up a skills forecasting system and occupational sector committees. Further, there is a need for proper skills validation and accreditation.

Transfer of skills and innovation in relevant sectors through stepping up temporary return of highly skilled nationals would facilitate knowledge circulation. Here, the necessity to deepen the analysis of migration management and devising of comprehensive policy responses in the following two distinct areas of health sector – i) access to health services of migrants and families, and ii) migration of medical staff – should be highlighted.

Moldovan authorities should also obtain additional support in the field of linking diaspora organizations in different countries, as well as considering diaspora associations as interlocutor and actor in the design and implementation of migration and development policies. The initiative of the State Chancellery of RM to establish the Agency for Diaspora Relations, officially launched in June 2012, aims at supporting Moldovan diaspora associations.

---

265 Initiatives such as: NRS (since 2006); National Action Plan on the protection of children left without parental care for 2010–2011 (since June 2010); and the project “Addressing the negative effects of migration on minors and families left behind”, implemented by the Italian Government in collaboration with IOM, and co-funded by the European Commission (2011–2012).

266 See no. 238.

267 National Concept of validation of the informal and non-formal learning, approved in November 2011 in the context of the EU–RM MP, could be mentioned as a good example of addressing the issue of proper skills validation.

268 The initiative entitled “Addressing brain drain through temporary return of expatriate Moldovan scientists and young researchers overseas to strengthen Moldova as a research and development hub and to promote temporary and permanent return and skills transfer” funded by the EU and implemented by IOM in the period 2010–2011 within the project “Supporting the implementation of the migration and development component of the EU-Moldova Mobility Partnership” could be mentioned in this regard.

Although RM has already created a solid institutional framework in the field of migration management, further capacity-building is required. The national models for migration management need to be focused on a comprehensive and carefully structured set of country-specific interests and objectives, and should be related to the different aspects of general public policy: labour market policy, demographic policy, return and reintegration policies, etc. In this regard, the following actions aimed at strengthening migration management could be mentioned:

- GFMD recommendations propose the elaboration of a national action plan that establishes oversight structures in the form of one “key/leading body” responsible for coordination of migration-related issues, harnessing the various activities of the Government, and drawing on the useful work of non-State agencies such as diaspora associations and international organizations that can best equip the country to meet its own challenges.\textsuperscript{270} In the Moldovan case, the powers, attributions and mandates of the already existing structures and their Secretariats (e.g. the Commission for coordination of certain activities related to the migration process, NCPD) could be strengthened and extended in this regard;

- Incorporation of international law into national legislation – i.e. harmonization of the national legislation with the \textit{acquis communautaire};

- More data, research and evaluation are needed to understand the scale, scope and development impacts of a managed approach to migration;

- Capacity should be built in government institutions dealing with migration issues (more material resources, training workshops, elimination of bureaucratic impediments, use of local practices and expertise to avoid excessive reliance on the intervention of outside experts, etc.). In this context, human resources have to be made available within the structures that are expected to take a stronger coordinating role, and the fluctuation of personnel within local authorities in RM and related loss of human capital has to be effectively addressed.\textsuperscript{271} Thus, more than one person per institution should be in charge of migration management issues, so as to ensure continuity and sustainability if an official leaves the job;

\textsuperscript{270} GFMD, Managing Migration and Minimizing the Negative Impact of Irregular Migration, Round Table Session 2.2 (Manila, 30 October 2008).

\textsuperscript{271} See no. 222.
The different authorities could consider further collaborative activities to improve coordination among them, for example, in the form of workshops or regular inter-institutional meetings where best practices and good policy models would be shared, strengthening the idea of joint responsibility and ownership among them and internally coordinated coherent approaches.\textsuperscript{272} The *Commission for Coordination of Certain Activities Relating to the Migration Process* under the Government, established in February 2010, and the *Working Group on the coordination of the visa liberalization regime with the EU*, created in May 2010, represent positive examples in this sense. Additionally, increased collaboration and consultations with NGOs and statistical offices in addressing migration challenges should be put in place.

In the field of external assistance, coordination among partners (including local authorities) should take place before projects are initiated, or at an early stage. Moldovan authorities should take a more proactive role in the design of the initiatives in order to ensure that they reflect their priorities. This could be achieved through systematic consultation steps for each initiative, as well as regular evaluation and monitoring exercises in order to assess and improve the efficiency and impact of initiatives and the general migration management mechanism.\textsuperscript{273}

**D3. Recommendations on mainstreaming migration into development policies**

This section presents an array of recommendations regarding mainstreaming migration into development policies of the country.

Mainstreaming migration into development planning should be implemented *as a longer-term process* that requires strong political will and ownership by the implementing government, appropriate national capacity, sustained coordination and cooperation within government institutions, and coherence among relevant policy areas and interventions. In this context, the Moldovan Government’s already existing consolidated political desire and commitment to the policy reform agenda is worth mentioning as it is reflected in the following strategic documents:

\textsuperscript{272} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{273} Ibid.
• Joint Declaration regarding Republic of Moldova–EU Mobility Partnership (signed in 2008) and the National programme of implementation of the Republic of Moldova–EU Action Plan in the area of liberalization of the visa regime (approved in 2011) prove Government’s commitment towards institution reform and policies harmonization with the acquis communautaire;


Policies of mainstreaming migration into development policies need synchronization with the current planning of the long-term sector objectives with the aim of achievement of coherence and coordination of activities. These policies should be correlated, particularly with the planning process of public funding, and could be supported by inclusion of the appropriate financial resources at the stage of drafting midterm expenditure frameworks and annual budgets for each sector, which mainstreams migration under various conditions.

Moreover, the Government and its partners need to ensure that the objectives of migration policy initiatives are understood, accepted and supported, not only by governmental authorities, social partners such as workers’ and employers’ organizations and NGOs, but also by citizens/public opinion.

• A national migration mainstreaming plan in the form of a roadmap that expressly states the Government’s commitment to


275 RM’s National Strategy for Migration and Asylum (2012–2020), adopted in 2011, and the National Action Plan for 2011–2015 regarding the implementation of National strategy in the area of migration and asylum link the realm of migration and asylum to the general development policy framework of the country. They also feed into the new development strategy of RM – Moldova 2020: National Development Strategy: Seven solutions for Republic of Moldova (in force since January 2012), laying down a good start for mainstreaming migration in the national policy development process. Moldova 2020 focuses, among others, on youth emigration reduction (by 50% by 2020) under its seven pillars, one of which is Education, as well as on the attraction of more remittances as investment. It is also correlated with sector strategies, implemented by the different line Ministries – e.g. National Strategic Programme in the area of demographic security of Republic of Moldova 2011–2025 (approved in 2011); National Action Plan in the area of employment for 2012 (approved in 2011). Thus, such a “national development plan” could either complement or be integrated into the National Action Plan for 2011–2015 regarding the implementation of National strategy in the area of migration and asylum.
migration as an issue is significant, as it provides a mandate for the development, streamlining and integration of sector policies and strategies implemented by the different line ministries (e.g. Agriculture, Education, Economy, etc.) in the future overall migration strategy. It will describe issues to be addressed, respective roles and responsibilities, strategic goals and priorities, stakeholders (including Government, social partners, civil society, donors/development partners, academe, migrants, diaspora associations, etc.), programme/intervention areas, institutional structure, consultative processes, appropriate timeline for reflection, consensus-building, commissioning and carrying out analytical work, etc. The content of the Plan might draw upon the annual analyses and recommendations of the members of the TWG that coordinates the activities related to the drafting of the EMP of Moldova and its further development, already created in June 2010;\(^{276}\)

- The challenge is to bridge the objectives and approaches in “traditional” development sectors with those adopted regarding migration (infrastructure, housing, health, education, etc.). For example, interventions on poverty reduction, social protection and employment creation proved to offer synergies with efforts to combat trafficking in persons, as they address some of the factors that render people vulnerable to trafficking.\(^{277}\) Efforts to engage diasporas can have positive effects for sectors such as health, education and infrastructure if the contributions of the diaspora in terms of money and skills are channelled into those areas and matched by domestic investments;\(^{278}\)

---

\(^{276}\) Since 24 August 2012, the BMA within MOI has been responsible for the production and annual update of EMP’s indicators. See: http://lex.justice.md/viewdoc.php?action=view&view=doc&id=344691&lang=2

\(^{277}\) The NRS of MLSPF, for victims and potential victims of human trafficking, started to be implemented in 2006, adopted and continues develops such an approach. Since its launch, the NRS has been piloted and is operational in 27 raions and municipalities out of altogether 32 raions, 3 municipalities and 2 territorial areas of RM. Furthermore, local identification, short- and long-term assistance structures (the MDTs) are being integrated, strengthened and made more sustainable, and can be adapted to cater to the needs of children and elderly left behind. The MDTs include raion- and community-level social workers, law-enforcement bodies, teachers and educators, health professionals, psychologists and local public administration.

\(^{278}\) PARE 1+1, started in 2010 and intended to be prolonged until 2014, which “aims to facilitate migrants’ access to finance while helping to boost remittances through official channels” and the PNAET with a total budget of EUR 13.5 million for the period 2008–2011 are very valuable examples in this regard.
• Establishment, capacitation and functioning of a Migration and Development Policy and Project Surgery Point within the State Chancellery, the highest body of policy coordination in RM. Introducing into the Government’s ex-ante and ex-post impact evaluation methodologies elements allowing the State Chancellery to ensure thorough reviewing and proofing of all draft policies/programmes emanating from line ministries at central, systemic level, and that the interlinkages with migration are adequately assessed and factored in;

• Continuing to produce and update migration profiles that provide flexibility, allowing the information to be tailored to the priorities of RM;²⁷⁹

• Encouraging the involvement of migrants in countries of origin and destination does not necessarily mean that policies must target migrants exclusively. Rather, policies and programmes should follow an inclusive approach and should, to the extent possible, open up opportunities for all members of society, including migrants;

• Introducing migration in the dialogue with development partners, and securing funding and technical assistance for migration-related activities as development partners can also be proactive in supporting the integration of migration and development concerns in their assistance frameworks;

• Developing a joint approach to migration and development at the subregional or regional level through:
  
  (i) building trust between States and increasing understanding of migration issues;

  (ii) breaking down divides between networks and facilitating the harmonization of positions across regions; and

  (iii) building capacity and effecting changes in concrete laws, policies or practices governing how migration is mainstreamed at the national and regional level.²⁸⁰

²⁷⁹ The TWG that coordinates the activities related to the drafting of the EMP of RM and its further implementation, created in June 2010 and encompassing 15 institutions, integrated with representatives of donor organizations, United Nations partners and academic society as observers, lays down an important basis for the further mainstreaming of migration into development policies.

²⁸⁰ RM holds all necessary instruments for applying the potential of migration-related regional partnerships for mainstreaming migration into development policies, being actively involved in all key regional partnerships – e.g. EaP, MP, Budapest Process and Prague Process.
D4. Recommendations on improving migration statistics and overall migration evidence base policy design

This section indicates existing data gaps and offers recommendations and possible strategies to improve migration statistics and the overall evidence base on migration.

Effective migration management can only be achieved if policies and strategies are based on sound knowledge and up-to-date information on migratory flows. Thus, the collection of reliable data, including forecasting purposes, has to be part of a comprehensive national migration policy. However, administratively defined criteria and definitions for national data collection often differ, are gathered by different ministries and do not usually take into account or foresee their use for longer-term analytical purposes. There is also too little information available on crucial themes such as migrants’ creation of enterprises, development of new markets, creation of commercial ties between countries of origin and destination, transfer of technology, improvement of migrant children’s education and skills and of their own skills, importance of the transfer of their skills and knowledge acquired abroad, and transfer of ideas, beliefs and new values. There is also no data linking migration and development data to the respect of migrants’ rights concerning migration status abroad, working conditions and wages, and skills-related issues such as brain drain and brain waste.  

Certain underestimation/gaps are noted in relation to keeping the records about migration by sectors. For example, MEd has official data regarding the number of Moldovan citizens who study abroad based on international treaties, but there is no record of those who apply for and obtain by themselves opportunities to study abroad. A problem refers to keeping the records of children left behind by parents who have migrated – this is a task divided among several ministries, which report different datasets that are frequently not correlated. Currently, each SIIAMA table

---

281 The issues were raised in the framework of multi-stakeholder consultative conference “From Evidence to Policies: Extended Migration Profile Consultations” (Chișinău, 3 July 2012); half-day Migration and Development workshop to United Nations Country Team and senior United Nations programme staff within the Joint Pilot Programme Mainstreaming Migration into Development in Moldova (Chișinău, 4 July 2012); and consultations on diaspora policies within the Joint Pilot Programme Mainstreaming Migration into Development in Moldova (Chișinău, 19 July 2010).
is based on data from a unique information provider and there is no data that results from the combination of figures collected under SIIAMA. In addition, some state authorities mention lack of unified methodologies for assessing and quantifying migration processes, and collection and processing of data that create certain discrepancies in available data.

Among the recommended actions/strategies to improve or generate migration data, the following could be mentioned:  

The EMP, seen as a process rather than just a product, represents a high potential of synergy with mainstreaming processes as regards the aim of understanding and using data for informed decisions and evaluation of progress achieved. To this end, the Moldovan Government approved the “Republic of Moldova Extended Migration Profile List of Indicators and Template” on 25 August 2012. According to Government Decision No. 634 of 24 August 2012, BMA, in cooperation with other relevant ministries and central public authorities, shall ensure the annual production and update of EMP indicators, as well as draft the annual analytical report based on the list of indicators and on the country’s EMP Template.

In order to obtain these objectives, the following suggestions are proposed:

- Compiling and updating an EMP should be done in a sustainable way, channelling EMP findings into policymaking. In this regard, developing a strategy/action plan for regularly updating the migration profile and further developing the migration profile exercise is highly recommended;

- The State Chancellery should make up a supervision committee responsible for monitoring the process of compiling and updating the EMP according to the respective Action Plan. SE CSIR “Registru” should develop an information technology tool for gathering data and metadata for updating the EMP indicators from all data.

---

282 This Section is based on the main findings of M. Poulain, et al., Data Assessment Report, (Chisinau, IOM, 2011). Available at: www.iom.md/attachments/110_data_assess_rep_eng.pdf


284 A specialized unit responsible for the update and elaboration of the EMP shall be established and ensured within BMA.

285 Currently, a so-called two-year Action Plan for regularly updating RM’s EMP is in the making and shall be officially presented in Autumn 2012.
producers, including a reminder alert system to ensure that the complete dataset will be aggregated and available in due time. NBS should investigate the data received in order to ensure their statistical validity. Ad hoc meetings with some data producers may be organized in order to solve problems of inconsistency and non-application of international standards;

- Resolving the problem of inadequate data requires building capacity of the state institutions (NBS, SE CSIR “Registru”, MOI, etc.), involved in data collection at the national level;

- The need for constructive and more active collaboration between the main statistical data producers SE CSIR “Registru” and NBS is an urgent need. Here, a necessity for more active cooperation in the statistical field with the Border Police within MOI as regards registering migrants while crossing borders should also be mentioned;

- The problem of lack of unified methodologies for assessing and quantifying migration processes could be mitigated through adopting certain governmental acts that would set up and introduce unified applications of the clear, segregated and desegregated norms and definitions alongside all the criteria, in accordance with the internationally agreed-upon methodological approaches and comparative statistical indicators covering a broad range of migration-related issues;

- Sharing data with countries receiving migrants from RM is a concrete possibility for checking the reliability of emigration data. This data is not often included in published annual migration statistics. Therefore, a regular request of data from receiving countries may be needed;

- Targeted training and technical cooperation for the institutional and national experts responsible for updating the EMP, including through twinning-type projects, are needed.
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ANNEXES

Annex 1. List of data providers and of the indicators present, by compartments

I. National Bureau of Statistics (NBS)

1.1. General demographic indicators
   1.1.1. Total population
   1.1.2. Population growth rate
   1.1.3. Birth rate
   1.1.4. Death rate
   1.1.5. Natural growth
   1.1.6. Gross immigration rate
   1.1.7. Gross emigration rate

1.2. Demographic composition of the population
   1.2.1. Proportion of persons aged less than 15 years
   1.2.2. Proportion of persons aged 65 years and over
   1.2.3.1. Demographic dependency ratio (national definition)
   1.2.3.2. Demographic dependency ratio (international definition)
   1.2.4. Seniority ratio
   1.2.5. Proportion of males aged 65 years and over
   1.2.6. Proportion of females aged 65 years and over
   1.2.7. Femininity ratio for those aged 65 years and over
   1.2.8. Total population age and sex pyramid

1.3. Urban versus rural population
   1.3.1. Total urban population
   1.3.2. Urbanization rate
   1.3.3. Growth rate of the urban population
   1.3.4. Proportion of persons aged less than 15 years in urban areas
   1.3.5. Proportion of persons aged 65 years and over in urban areas
   1.3.6. Proportion of persons aged less than 15 years in rural areas
1.3.7. Proportion of persons aged 65 years and over in rural areas
1.3.8. Dependency ratio in urban areas (international definition)
1.3.9. Seniority ratio in urban areas
1.3.10. Femininity ratio for the population aged 65 years and over in urban areas
1.3.11. Dependency ratio in rural areas (international definition)
1.3.12. Seniority ratio in rural areas
1.3.13. Femininity ratio for the population aged 65 years and over in rural areas

1.4. Working-age population
1.4.1.1. Proportion of the working-age population (national definition)
1.4.1.2. Proportion of the working-age population (international definition)
1.4.2.1. Growth rate of the working-age population (national definition)
1.4.2.2. Growth rate of the working-age population (international definition)
1.4.3. Demographic labour pressure index
1.4.4. Age structure index for the working-age population
1.4.5. Femininity ratio for the population aged 15 to 39 years
1.4.6. Femininity ratio for the population aged 40 to 64 years

1.5. Labour force indicators
1.5.1.1. Labour force participation rate (national definition)
1.5.1.2. Labour force participation rate (international definition)
1.5.2.1. Employment rate (national definition)
1.5.2.2. Employment rate (international definition)
1.5.3. Unemployment rate
1.5.4. Youth unemployment rate
1.5.5. Female unemployment rate
1.5.6. Unemployment gender gap
1.6. Global economic indicators
1.6.1. GDP
1.6.2. Growth rate of real total GDP, dynamics of the main macroeconomic indicators (1995–2011)
1.6.3. GDP per capita
1.6.4. Growth rate of GDP per capita, dynamics of the main macroeconomic indicators (1995–2011)
1.6.5.1. Share of population below absolute poverty line
1.6.5.2. Share of population below absolute poverty line
1.6.6. Proportion of children under 18 years old living in households under the poverty line

1.7. Remittances
1.7.1. Annual amount of remittances
1.7.2. Growth rate of remittances
1.7.3. Share of remittances in the GDP
1.7.4. Remittances per capita (USD)
1.7.5. Proportion of households receiving remittances
1.7.6. Proportion of remittances in the household available income depending on remittances
1.7.7. Proportion of households that would be under the poverty line without remittances

2.1. Emigration
2.1.1. Annual number of international emigrations reported by the Republic of Moldova (RM)
2.1.4. Growth rate of international emigrations of Moldovan citizens
2.1.5. International emigration gender gap for Moldovan citizens

II. Ministry of Information Technology and Communications (MITC)
State Enterprise, Centre for State Information Resources “Registru” (SE CSIR “Registru”)

2.1. Emigration
2.1.3. Annual number of international emigrations of Moldovan citizens reported by RM
2.1.4. Growth rate of international emigrations of Moldovan citizens
2.1.5. International emigration gender gap for Moldovan citizens (different from NBS data)
2.1.6. Relative proportion of international emigrants from rural areas reported to urban
2.1.7. Annual number of international emigrations of Moldovan citizens by level of education
2.1.8. Number of children taken abroad by their parents

2.2. Temporary emigration
2.2.1. Number of households with member(s) temporarily abroad
2.2.2. Number of households with children under 18 years with member(s) temporarily abroad
2.2.3. Proportion of households with member(s) temporarily abroad
2.2.4. Proportion of households with children under 18 years with members who are temporarily abroad in the total households with children
2.2.5. Growth rate of the number of households with member(s) temporarily abroad
2.2.10. Number of local border traffic permits issued to Moldovan citizens

2.3. Moldovan citizens living abroad
2.3.1. Number of Moldovan citizens living abroad according to RM data

3.2. Population with foreign background
3.2.1. Total number of foreigners living in RM
3.2.2. Growth rate of the number of foreigners
3.2.3. Proportion of foreigners in the total population
3.2.4. Countries of citizenship
3.2.5. Proportion of stateless among foreigners
3.2.6. Proportion of foreigners living in urban areas
3.2.7. Annual number of naturalizations
3.2.9. Countries of previous citizenship of naturalized persons
3.2.10. Number of foreign-born persons
3.2.11. Growth rate of the number of foreign-born persons
3.2.12. Proportion of foreign-born persons in the total population
3.2.13. Proportion of foreign-born persons living in urban areas
3.2.14. Countries of birth of foreign-born persons
3.3. Demographic composition of the population of foreign origin

3.3.1. Proportion of foreigners among the total population aged less than 15 years
3.3.2. Proportion of foreigners among population aged 65 years and over
3.3.3. Sex ratio for the population of foreigners

3.4. Regulated migration

3.4.1. Number of foreigners holding a permanent residence permit
3.4.2. Growth rate of the number of permanent residence permit holders
3.4.3. Proportion of working-age foreigners with permanent residence permit
3.4.4. Number of foreigners who received temporary residence permits for the first time
3.4.5. Number of foreigners holding valid temporary residence permit
3.4.6. Proportion of foreigners being granted a temporary residence permit for family reunion
3.4.7. Proportion of foreigners being granted a temporary residence permit for work and business
3.4.8. Proportion of foreigners being granted a temporary residence permit for study or training
3.4.9. Proportion of foreigners being granted a temporary residence permit for humanitarian and religious activities
3.4.10. Proportion of foreigners being granted a temporary residence permit for treatment
3.4.11. Proportion of foreigners being granted a temporary residence permit for other purposes
3.4.12. Proportion of foreigners who received local border traffic permits

3.5. Population of working-age foreigners

3.5.1. Number of working-age foreigners
3.5.2. Growth rate of working-age foreigners
3.5.3. Proportion of working-age foreigners
3.5.4. Age structure index for working-age foreigners
3.5.5. Femininity ratio for foreigners aged 15 to 39 years
3.5.6. Femininity ratio for foreigners aged 40 to 64 years
Ill. Border Guard Service (BGS)

1.1. General demographic indicators

1.1.9. Annual number of arrivals of Moldovan citizens at State borders
1.1.10. Annual number of arrivals of foreigners at State borders
1.1.11. Growth rate of the number of arrivals of foreigners at State borders
1.1.12. Annual number of departures of Moldovan citizens at State borders
1.1.13. Annual number of departures of foreigners at State borders
1.1.14. Growth rate of the number of departures of Moldovan citizens at State borders

IV. Ministry of Internal Affairs (MOI)

Bureau of Migration and Asylum (BMA):

2.4. Repatriation

2.4.1. Annual number of repatriated persons
2.4.2. Growth rate of the number of repatriated persons
2.4.3. Proportion of repatriated children among repatriated persons
2.4.4. Number of Moldovan citizens readmitted based on Readmission Agreements

3.1. Immigration of foreigners

3.1.1. Annual number of immigrations of foreigners reported by RM
3.1.2. Growth rate of immigrations of foreigners
3.1.3. Gender gap for foreigners’ immigration
3.1.4. Countries of citizenship of foreign immigrants
3.1.5. Annual number of immigrations of foreigners with secondary vocational education/high education/scientific titles
3.1.6. Growth rate of immigrated foreigners with secondary vocational education/high education/scientific titles
3.1.7. Proportion of persons with secondary vocational education/high education/scientific titles among immigrant foreigners
3.4. Regulated migration
3.4.5. Number of foreigners who received temporary residence permits for the first time
3.4.6. Number of foreigners holding valid temporary residence permits
3.4.7. Proportion of foreigners being granted a temporary residence permit for family reunion
3.4.8. Proportion of foreigners being granted a temporary residence permit for work and business
3.4.9. Proportion of foreigners being granted a temporary residence permit for study or training
3.4.10. Proportion of foreigners being granted a temporary residence permit for humanitarian and religious activities
3.4.11. Proportion of foreigners being granted a temporary residence permit for treatment
3.4.12. Proportion of foreigners being granted a temporary residence permit for other purposes
3.4.13. Proportion of foreigners who received local border traffic permits

3.7. Asylum and statelessness
3.7.1. Annual number of asylum applications (first request)
3.7.2. Countries of origin of asylum-seekers
3.7.3. Femininity ratio of asylum-seekers
3.7.4. Annual number of humanitarian protection beneficiaries, including stateless persons
3.7.5. Number of persons refused to be granted humanitarian protection
3.7.6. Number of asylum-seekers with pending applications on 31 December
3.7.9. Growth rate of the number of asylum-seekers with pending applications
3.7.10. Number of refugees in RM
3.7.11. Growth rate of the number of refugees

3.8. Irregular migration
3.8.1. Number of irregular migrants (illegal migrants)
3.8.2. Number of expelled foreigners
3.8.3. Number of foreigners with cancelled right to stay in RM
3.8.4. Number of foreigners with revoked right to stay in RM
3.8.5. Number of foreigners with refused right to stay in RM
3.8.6. Number of foreigners towards whom was disposed the measure of return on the territory of RM
3.8.7. Number of foreigners declared undesirable on the territory of RM
3.8.8. Number of foreigners taken into public custody

Centre for Combating Trafficking in Persons:

2.5. Victims of human trafficking
2.5.2. Countries where victims of human trafficking have been exploited

V. Ministry of Labour, Social Protection and Family (MLSPF)

2.2. Temporary emigration
2.2.6. Number of children left in RM by at least one of the emigrated parents
2.2.7. Number of children left behind in RM by both parents

National Coordination Unit of the National Referral System (NRS) for assistance and protection of victims and potential victims of trafficking in human beings (THB):

2.5. Victims of human trafficking
2.5.1. Number of Moldovan victims of human trafficking, identified and assisted within NRS
2.5.4. Number of potential THB victims assisted within NRS

National Employment Agency:

2.3. Moldovan citizens living abroad
2.3.6. Number of Moldovan citizens working abroad with legal contracts
VI. Ministry of Education (MEd)

2.1. Emigration
   2.1.8. Number of children taken abroad by their parents

2.2. Temporary emigration
   2.2.6. Number of children left in RM by at least one of the emigrated parent
   2.2.7. Number of children left behind in RM by both parents
   2.2.8. Proportion of children left behind because their parents left abroad

2.3. Moldovan citizens living abroad
   2.3.9. Number of Moldovan citizens studying abroad under international education treaties

VII. United Nations Development Programme database

1.6. Global economic indicators

VIII. Statistical Office of European Communities (Eurostat) database

2.3. Moldovan citizens living abroad
   2.3.2. Number of Moldovan citizens living abroad, according to data from host countries

IX. United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) data

2.3. Moldovan citizens living abroad
   2.3.7. Number of Moldovan citizens registered as asylum-seekers abroad
       www.unhcr.org/pages/4a0174156.html
   2.3.8. Number of Moldovan citizens registered as recognized refugees abroad
       www.unhcr.org/pages/4a0174156.html
## Annex 2. Data tables

Table 1. Annual number of international emigrations reported by RM

A) Documented emigration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008(^1)</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>3,093</td>
<td>3,011</td>
<td>3,276</td>
<td>3,237</td>
<td>3,138</td>
<td>2,193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>3,735</td>
<td>3,674</td>
<td>3,896</td>
<td>3,751</td>
<td>3,525</td>
<td>2,521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age groups</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0–4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>199</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5–9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>232</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10–14</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15–19</td>
<td>445</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20–24</td>
<td>916</td>
<td>888</td>
<td>939</td>
<td>910</td>
<td>775</td>
<td>481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25–29</td>
<td>1,179</td>
<td>1,136</td>
<td>1,246</td>
<td>1,228</td>
<td>966</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30–34</td>
<td>882</td>
<td>869</td>
<td>1,008</td>
<td>947</td>
<td>818</td>
<td>517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35–39</td>
<td>624</td>
<td>592</td>
<td>665</td>
<td>692</td>
<td>570</td>
<td>386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40–44</td>
<td>504</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>495</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45–49</td>
<td>469</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>479</td>
<td>489</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50–54</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>464</td>
<td>497</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>404</td>
<td>277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55–59</td>
<td>445</td>
<td>451</td>
<td>536</td>
<td>453</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60–64</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65–69</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70–74</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75–79</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80–84</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85 +</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Destination countries, Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>6,828</strong></td>
<td><strong>6,685</strong></td>
<td><strong>7,172</strong></td>
<td><strong>6,988</strong></td>
<td><strong>6,663</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,714</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukraine</td>
<td>2,057</td>
<td>2,350</td>
<td>2,663</td>
<td>3,163</td>
<td>2,952</td>
<td>2,227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian Federation</td>
<td>3,310</td>
<td>2,890</td>
<td>3,110</td>
<td>2,663</td>
<td>1,866</td>
<td>1,162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>568</td>
<td>612</td>
<td>695</td>
<td>588</td>
<td>899</td>
<td>523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belarus</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kazakhstan</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other countries</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: NBS.

\(^1\) Data up to 2008 does not include the number of children who emigrated with their parents.
B) International emigration estimated according to the international definition (being abroad one year and more)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age groups</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>237,650</td>
<td>272,479</td>
<td>284,304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>110,470</td>
<td>128,443</td>
<td>135,690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>127,180</td>
<td>144,036</td>
<td>148,614</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0–4</td>
<td>767</td>
<td>976</td>
<td>1,399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5–9</td>
<td>2,181</td>
<td>3,030</td>
<td>4,091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10–14</td>
<td>4,045</td>
<td>5,252</td>
<td>6,209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15–19</td>
<td>9,354</td>
<td>11,331</td>
<td>11,656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20–24</td>
<td>30,191</td>
<td>32,543</td>
<td>29,288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25–29</td>
<td>41,419</td>
<td>46,696</td>
<td>46,643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30–34</td>
<td>36,283</td>
<td>42,268</td>
<td>44,135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35–39</td>
<td>26,530</td>
<td>31,252</td>
<td>34,805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40–44</td>
<td>21,590</td>
<td>24,497</td>
<td>25,563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45–49</td>
<td>21,770</td>
<td>23,463</td>
<td>23,159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50–54</td>
<td>17,203</td>
<td>20,024</td>
<td>21,480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55–59</td>
<td>11,982</td>
<td>13,621</td>
<td>14,587</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60–64</td>
<td>4,841</td>
<td>6,414</td>
<td>8,588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65–69</td>
<td>3,787</td>
<td>4,009</td>
<td>4,090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70–74</td>
<td>2,916</td>
<td>3,536</td>
<td>4,089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75–79</td>
<td>1,515</td>
<td>1,851</td>
<td>2,258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80–84</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>1,156</td>
<td>1,496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85 +</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>768</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Integrated Automated System “Migration and Asylum” (SIIAMA), BGS.*
Table 2. Total number of international immigrations from RM reported by receiving countries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Destination countries</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>9,366</td>
<td>7,963</td>
<td>13,662</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>1,917</td>
<td>4,349</td>
<td>4,019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>1,635</td>
<td>2,332</td>
<td>3,378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>1,805</td>
<td>2,198</td>
<td>2,863</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>1,202</td>
<td>871</td>
<td>808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>429</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovakia</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belarus</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other States</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>560</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Eurostat, data available for European Economic Area States
http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/portal/page/portal/population/data/database,
Immigration by sex, age group and country of previous residence [migr_immSprv], data as of 28 April 2012.
Table 3. Annual number of international emigrations of Moldovan citizens reported by RM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>By residence area</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>5,755</td>
<td>7,771</td>
<td>6,176</td>
<td>4,459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>2,223</td>
<td>3,106</td>
<td>2,510</td>
<td>1,490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>2,626</td>
<td>3,695</td>
<td>2,922</td>
<td>2,074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>3,129</td>
<td>4,076</td>
<td>3,254</td>
<td>2,385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age groups</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0–4</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5–9</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>419</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10–14</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>446</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15–19</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>527</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20–24</td>
<td>645</td>
<td>923</td>
<td>752</td>
<td>465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25–29</td>
<td>818</td>
<td>1118</td>
<td>863</td>
<td>575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30–34</td>
<td>690</td>
<td>872</td>
<td>773</td>
<td>491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35–39</td>
<td>461</td>
<td>665</td>
<td>493</td>
<td>354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40–44</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>494</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45–49</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>443</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50–54</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>412</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55–59</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60–64</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65–69</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70–74</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75–79</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80–84</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85+</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Destination countries, total</strong></td>
<td>5,755</td>
<td>7,771</td>
<td>6,176</td>
<td>4,459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukraine</td>
<td>1,930</td>
<td>3,372</td>
<td>2,659</td>
<td>2,022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian Federation</td>
<td>2,445</td>
<td>2,830</td>
<td>1,679</td>
<td>1,069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>656</td>
<td>816</td>
<td>896</td>
<td>551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belarus</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kazakhstan</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other countries</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: NBS.*
Table 4. Relative indicators on international emigrations of Moldovan citizens, percentage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.1. International Emigration</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1.4. Growth rate of international emigrations of Moldovan citizens</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>35.03</td>
<td>-20.53</td>
<td>-27.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.5. International emigration gender gap for Moldovan citizens</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>110.31</td>
<td>111.36</td>
<td>115.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.6. Relative proportion of international emigrants from rural areas reported to urban</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>62.94</td>
<td>66.58</td>
<td>68.47</td>
<td>50.19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: NBS, MITC (SE CSIR “Registru”).

Table 5. International emigration of Moldovan citizens, by level of education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Studies</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mid-level specialized education</td>
<td>871</td>
<td>1,107</td>
<td>790</td>
<td>644</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University degree</td>
<td>720</td>
<td>955</td>
<td>799</td>
<td>666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scientific degree</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>1,598</td>
<td>2,069</td>
<td>1,597</td>
<td>1,314</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: MITC (SE CSIR “Registru”).

Table 6. Annual number of children taken abroad by their parents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.1. International emigration</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1.8. Number of children taken abroad by their parents</td>
<td>Stock data&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>4,194</td>
<td>4,556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Flow&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>1,088</td>
<td>1,575</td>
<td>1,206</td>
<td>869</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source:  
<sup>a</sup> Data provided by the Ministry of Education, on 1 October of the year of reference.  
<sup>b</sup> Data provided by MITC (SE CSIR “Registru”).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.3.1. Number of Moldovan citizens living abroad according to RM dataa</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>73,431</td>
<td>82,337</td>
<td>87,933</td>
<td>92,184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>32,959</td>
<td>37,268</td>
<td>39,888</td>
<td>41,829</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>40,472</td>
<td>45,069</td>
<td>48,045</td>
<td>50,355</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Moldovan citizens living abroad according to border crossing data (registered as having been absent from the country for one year and more) b</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>237,650</td>
<td>272,479</td>
<td>284,304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>110,470</td>
<td>128,443</td>
<td>135,690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>127,180</td>
<td>144,036</td>
<td>148,614</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.3.2. Estimated number of Moldovan citizens living abroad, according to data from host countries c</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>82,859</td>
<td>96,331</td>
<td>124,466</td>
<td>142,485</td>
<td>179,178</td>
<td>196,716</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>32,105</td>
<td>38,522</td>
<td>44,100</td>
<td>50,234</td>
<td>74,608</td>
<td>80,987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>50,753</td>
<td>57,808</td>
<td>64,932</td>
<td>77,528</td>
<td>104,569</td>
<td>115,728</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source:  
a data provided by MITC (SE CSIR “Registru”).  
b SIIAMA data, estimated by BGS.  
c Eurostat data, available for: Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany (including the former German Democratic Republic from 1990), Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, United Kingdom.  
### Table 8. Repartition of the number of Moldovan citizens living abroad, by country

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>73,431</td>
<td>82,337</td>
<td>87,933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukraine</td>
<td>16,352</td>
<td>20,236</td>
<td>22,730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>11,815</td>
<td>12,543</td>
<td>13,391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>10,403</td>
<td>10,453</td>
<td>10,711</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>5,981</td>
<td>6,214</td>
<td>6,411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belarus</td>
<td>1,728</td>
<td>1,891</td>
<td>2,008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>559</td>
<td>566</td>
<td>576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other States</td>
<td>1,166</td>
<td>1,281</td>
<td>1,431</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: MITC (SE CSIR “Registru”).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>82,859</td>
<td>37,971</td>
<td>47,632</td>
<td>55,803</td>
<td>68,591</td>
<td>89,424</td>
<td>105,600</td>
<td>11,759</td>
<td>16,193</td>
<td>19,488</td>
<td>23,033</td>
<td>30,019</td>
<td>36,193</td>
<td>26,212</td>
<td>31,439</td>
<td>36,315</td>
<td>45,558</td>
<td>59,405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>15,524</td>
<td>14,813</td>
<td>21,353</td>
<td>20,805</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>12,271</td>
<td>11,754</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>9,082</td>
<td>9,051</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>8,449</td>
<td>10,705</td>
<td>13,043</td>
<td>15,710</td>
<td>17,536</td>
<td>17,512</td>
<td>4,700</td>
<td>5,970</td>
<td>7,153</td>
<td>8,448</td>
<td>9,170</td>
<td>8,820</td>
<td>3,749</td>
<td>4,735</td>
<td>5,890</td>
<td>7,262</td>
<td>8,366</td>
<td>8,692</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>12,941</td>
<td>13,027</td>
<td>13,826</td>
<td>13,475</td>
<td>13,214</td>
<td>13,199</td>
<td>6,015</td>
<td>5,938</td>
<td>6,152</td>
<td>5,906</td>
<td>5,740</td>
<td>5,166</td>
<td>6,926</td>
<td>7,089</td>
<td>7,674</td>
<td>7,569</td>
<td>7,474</td>
<td>7,483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>5,446</td>
<td>5,459</td>
<td>5,466</td>
<td>5,477</td>
<td>10,450</td>
<td>10,450</td>
<td>2,275</td>
<td>2,281</td>
<td>2,286</td>
<td>2,293</td>
<td>5,276</td>
<td>5,276</td>
<td>3,171</td>
<td>3,178</td>
<td>3,180</td>
<td>3,184</td>
<td>5,174</td>
<td>5,174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>2,388</td>
<td>3,563</td>
<td>4,658</td>
<td>6,235</td>
<td>8,435</td>
<td>9,902</td>
<td>1,448</td>
<td>2,151</td>
<td>2,893</td>
<td>3,954</td>
<td>5,405</td>
<td>6,311</td>
<td>940</td>
<td>1,412</td>
<td>1,765</td>
<td>2,281</td>
<td>3,030</td>
<td>3,591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>5,716</td>
<td>5,716</td>
<td>5,716</td>
<td>5,716</td>
<td>5,716</td>
<td>1,709</td>
<td>1,709</td>
<td>1,709</td>
<td>1,709</td>
<td>1,709</td>
<td>1,709</td>
<td>1,709</td>
<td>1,709</td>
<td>1,709</td>
<td>1,709</td>
<td>1,709</td>
<td>1,709</td>
<td>1,709</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>3,139</td>
<td>3,139</td>
<td>3,139</td>
<td>3,139</td>
<td>3,139</td>
<td>1,422</td>
<td>1,422</td>
<td>1,422</td>
<td>1,422</td>
<td>1,422</td>
<td>1,422</td>
<td>1,422</td>
<td>1,422</td>
<td>1,422</td>
<td>1,422</td>
<td>1,716</td>
<td>1,716</td>
<td>1,716</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>652</td>
<td>652</td>
<td>652</td>
<td>2,028</td>
<td>2,182</td>
<td>2,182</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>1,706</td>
<td>1,846</td>
<td>1,846</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>1,243</td>
<td>1,350</td>
<td>1,316</td>
<td>1,304</td>
<td>1,357</td>
<td>1,357</td>
<td>555</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>515</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>688</td>
<td>790</td>
<td>771</td>
<td>789</td>
<td>837</td>
<td>837</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4,823</td>
<td>4,997</td>
<td>5,323</td>
<td>5,997</td>
<td>6,372</td>
<td>6,854</td>
<td>2,017</td>
<td>2,093</td>
<td>2,247</td>
<td>2,579</td>
<td>2,740</td>
<td>2,930</td>
<td>2,806</td>
<td>2,904</td>
<td>3,076</td>
<td>3,418</td>
<td>3,632</td>
<td>3,924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>82,859</td>
<td>96,331</td>
<td>124,466</td>
<td>142,485</td>
<td>179,178</td>
<td>196,716</td>
<td>32,105</td>
<td>38,522</td>
<td>44,100</td>
<td>50,234</td>
<td>74,608</td>
<td>80,987</td>
<td>50,753</td>
<td>57,808</td>
<td>64,932</td>
<td>77,528</td>
<td>104,569</td>
<td>115,728</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: Eurostat, data available for: Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany (including the former German Democratic Republic from 1990), Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, and United Kingdom

Table 10. Number of Moldovan citizens studying abroad

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Countries of destination, total</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>3,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukraine</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian Federation</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: MEd.

Table 11. Number of Moldovan citizens registered abroad

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.7.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Moldovan citizens registered as asylum-seekers abroad</td>
<td>4,852</td>
<td>1,278</td>
<td>909</td>
<td>888</td>
<td>739</td>
<td>633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.8.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Moldovan citizens registered as recognized refugees abroad</td>
<td>12,064</td>
<td>11,680</td>
<td>4,918</td>
<td>5,555</td>
<td>5,929</td>
<td>6,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth rate compared to previous year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.7.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Moldovan citizens registered as asylum-seekers abroad</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-73.7</td>
<td>-28.9</td>
<td>-2.3</td>
<td>-16.8</td>
<td>-14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.8.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Moldovan citizens registered as recognized refugees abroad</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-3.2</td>
<td>-57.9</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: UNHCR.
Table 12. Temporary emigration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.2. Temporary emigration</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.2.1. Number of households with member(s) temporarily abroad, total, thousands</td>
<td>242.2</td>
<td>261.4</td>
<td>243.1</td>
<td>231.4</td>
<td>237.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By residence area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>77.0</td>
<td>86.0</td>
<td>81.2</td>
<td>76.2</td>
<td>76.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>165.2</td>
<td>175.3</td>
<td>161.9</td>
<td>155.2</td>
<td>161.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex of the household leader</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>133.4</td>
<td>141.5</td>
<td>135.8</td>
<td>137.2</td>
<td>138.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>108.8</td>
<td>119.9</td>
<td>107.4</td>
<td>94.2</td>
<td>98.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.2. Number of households with children under 18 years with member(s) temporarily abroad</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>157.0</td>
<td>140.8</td>
<td>126.2</td>
<td>126.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.3. Proportion of households with member(s) temporarily abroad</td>
<td>19.99</td>
<td>21.39</td>
<td>19.44</td>
<td>18.53</td>
<td>18.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.4. Proportion of households with children under 18 years with members who are temporarily abroad in the total households with children</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>30.84</td>
<td>28.34</td>
<td>26.00</td>
<td>26.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.5. Growth rate of the number of households with member(s) temporarily abroad</td>
<td>80.17</td>
<td>107.93</td>
<td>93.00</td>
<td>95.19</td>
<td>102.68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: NBS.

Table 13. Highly educated migrants, by age and residence area, 2010 (thousands)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age groups, total</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Urban</th>
<th>Rural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>15.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15–24 years</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25–34 years</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35–44 years</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45–54 years</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55–64 years</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 + years</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: NBS.
Table 14. Temporary migration, by sex and destination country (thousands)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Destination Country</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All States</td>
<td>310.1</td>
<td>335.6</td>
<td>309.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian Federation</td>
<td>192.5</td>
<td>210.8</td>
<td>191.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>54.7</td>
<td>62.4</td>
<td>55.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukraine</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>26.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: NBS.
## Table 15. Repatriation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.4. Repatriation</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.4.1. Annual number of repatriated persons</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1,491</td>
<td>1,764</td>
<td>2,023</td>
<td>2,152</td>
<td>1,679</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.2. Growth rate of the number of repatriated persons</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>18.31</td>
<td>14.68</td>
<td>6.38</td>
<td>-21.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.3. Proportion of children among repatriated persons</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>9.32</td>
<td>10.32</td>
<td>6.43</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>3.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.4. Number of Moldovan citizens readmitted based on Readmission Agreements</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>44.0</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>88.0</td>
<td>110.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: MOI/BMA.

## Table 16. Resident population of foreign origin: Main indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3.2.1. Total number of foreigners living in RM</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.2.2. Growth rate of the number of foreigners</td>
<td>113.8</td>
<td>109.5</td>
<td>115.5</td>
<td>114.2</td>
<td>109.5</td>
<td>108.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2.3. Proportion of foreigners in the total population</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2.5. Proportion of stateless among foreigners</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2.6. Proportion of foreigners living in urban areas</td>
<td>83.4</td>
<td>82.5</td>
<td>81.4</td>
<td>79.8</td>
<td>78.2</td>
<td>78.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2.7. Annual number of naturalizations</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2.10. Number of foreign-born persons</td>
<td>212,284</td>
<td>222,416</td>
<td>230,096</td>
<td>235,877</td>
<td>244,530</td>
<td>253,847</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2.11. Growth rate of the number of foreign-born persons</td>
<td>110.9</td>
<td>104.8</td>
<td>103.5</td>
<td>102.5</td>
<td>103.7</td>
<td>103.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2.12. Proportion of foreign-born persons in the total population</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2.13. Proportion of foreign-born persons living in urban areas</td>
<td>76.6</td>
<td>75.8</td>
<td>75.1</td>
<td>74.6</td>
<td>73.8</td>
<td>72.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: MITC (SE CSIR “Registru”).
Table 17. Resident population of foreign origin, by country of citizenship

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total (thousands)</td>
<td>11,743</td>
<td>12,863</td>
<td>14,853</td>
<td>16,955</td>
<td>18,563</td>
<td>20,099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukraine</td>
<td>3,004</td>
<td>3,606</td>
<td>4,669</td>
<td>5,630</td>
<td>6,552</td>
<td>7,114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian Federation</td>
<td>2,529</td>
<td>2,842</td>
<td>3,246</td>
<td>3,854</td>
<td>4,430</td>
<td>5,001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stateless persons (Art.1 of the 1954 Convention)</td>
<td>963</td>
<td>1,042</td>
<td>1,065</td>
<td>1,180</td>
<td>1,350</td>
<td>1,360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>637</td>
<td>957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RM (former citizens)</td>
<td>847</td>
<td>716</td>
<td>795</td>
<td>964</td>
<td>995</td>
<td>804</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>811</td>
<td>885</td>
<td>1005</td>
<td>941</td>
<td>779</td>
<td>792</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>595</td>
<td>557</td>
<td>691</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons with undetermined citizenship</td>
<td>472</td>
<td>483</td>
<td>468</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belarus</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azerbaijan</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syrian Arab Republic</td>
<td>423</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>1,561</td>
<td>1,569</td>
<td>1,613</td>
<td>1,700</td>
<td>1,698</td>
<td>1,814</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: MITC (SE CSIR “Registru”).

Table 18. Number of naturalized persons according to the country of previous citizenship, all possible

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>589</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>608</td>
<td>614</td>
<td>630</td>
<td>645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stateless person (art.1 of the 1951 Convention)</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>436</td>
<td>447</td>
<td>453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armenia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azerbaijan</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanitarian protection beneficiaries</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 19. Number of persons born abroad, regardless of citizenship

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total (thousands)</td>
<td>212,284</td>
<td>222,416</td>
<td>230,096</td>
<td>235,877</td>
<td>244,530</td>
<td>253,847</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukraine</td>
<td>94,926</td>
<td>98,339</td>
<td>100,947</td>
<td>102,759</td>
<td>104,342</td>
<td>105,949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian Federation</td>
<td>84,906</td>
<td>88,895</td>
<td>91,660</td>
<td>93,574</td>
<td>95,774</td>
<td>98,280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kazakhstan</td>
<td>11,696</td>
<td>12,222</td>
<td>12,523</td>
<td>12,714</td>
<td>12,924</td>
<td>13,088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belarus</td>
<td>4,477</td>
<td>4,653</td>
<td>4,750</td>
<td>4,831</td>
<td>4,896</td>
<td>4,969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>720</td>
<td>1,106</td>
<td>2,554</td>
<td>4,427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>1,427</td>
<td>1,684</td>
<td>1,894</td>
<td>2,054</td>
<td>2,876</td>
<td>3,338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>1,803</td>
<td>1,896</td>
<td>1,975</td>
<td>2,044</td>
<td>2,114</td>
<td>2,205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azerbaijan</td>
<td>1,662</td>
<td>1,774</td>
<td>1,852</td>
<td>1,893</td>
<td>1,936</td>
<td>1,992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uzbekistan</td>
<td>1,719</td>
<td>1,809</td>
<td>1,870</td>
<td>1,913</td>
<td>1,939</td>
<td>1,971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>1,624</td>
<td>1,713</td>
<td>1,777</td>
<td>1,808</td>
<td>1,832</td>
<td>1,850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>7,722</td>
<td>8,961</td>
<td>10,128</td>
<td>11,181</td>
<td>13,343</td>
<td>15,778</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: MITC (SE CSIR “Registru”).
Table 20. Immigration of foreigners: Main indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1.1. Annual number of immigrations of foreigners reported by RM</td>
<td>2,054</td>
<td>2,057</td>
<td>2,073</td>
<td>2,744</td>
<td>2,008</td>
<td>2,311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1.2. Growth rate of immigrations of foreigners</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>100.15</td>
<td>100.78</td>
<td>132.37</td>
<td>73.18</td>
<td>115.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1.3. Gender gap for immigration of foreigners</td>
<td>44.55</td>
<td>49.27</td>
<td>44.06</td>
<td>46.58</td>
<td>52.47</td>
<td>44.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1.5. Annual number of immigrations of foreigners with secondary vocational education/high education/scientific titles</td>
<td>935</td>
<td>1233</td>
<td>1280</td>
<td>1810</td>
<td>1186</td>
<td>1183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1.6. Growth rate of immigrated foreigners with secondary vocational education/high education/scientific titles</td>
<td>110.91</td>
<td>131.87</td>
<td>103.81</td>
<td>141.41</td>
<td>65.52</td>
<td>99.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1.7. Proportion of persons with secondary vocational education/high education/scientific titles among immigrant foreigners</td>
<td>45.52</td>
<td>59.94</td>
<td>61.75</td>
<td>65.99</td>
<td>59.06</td>
<td>51.26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: MOI/BMA.

Table 21. Distribution of foreign immigrants, by country of citizenship

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,054</td>
<td>2,057</td>
<td>2,073</td>
<td>2,744</td>
<td>2,008</td>
<td>2,311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>478</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukraine</td>
<td>393</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>576</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>352</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian Federation</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>512</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syrian Arab Republic</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>471</td>
<td>471</td>
<td>433</td>
<td>533</td>
<td>427</td>
<td>503</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: MOI/BMA.
Table 22. Temporary migration of citizens of foreign origin

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3.4.1. Number of foreigners holding a permanent residence permit</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8,548</td>
<td>9,666</td>
<td>11,387</td>
<td>13,165</td>
<td>14,781</td>
<td>15,546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4.2. Growth rate of the number of permanent residence permit holders</td>
<td>115.1</td>
<td>115.1</td>
<td>113.1</td>
<td>117.8</td>
<td>115.6</td>
<td>112.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4.3. Proportion of working-age foreigners with permanent residence permits</td>
<td>71.6</td>
<td>71.6</td>
<td>74.1</td>
<td>75.9</td>
<td>77.0</td>
<td>79.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4.4. Proportion of foreigners living in the country since for at least five years</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4.5. Number of foreigners who received temporary residence permits for the first time</td>
<td>2,054</td>
<td>2,057</td>
<td>2,073</td>
<td>2,743</td>
<td>2,008</td>
<td>2,232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4.6. Number of foreigners holding valid temporary residence permits</td>
<td>3,195</td>
<td>3,197</td>
<td>3,466</td>
<td>3,790</td>
<td>3,782</td>
<td>4,553</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4.7. Proportion of foreigners being granted a temporary residence permit for family reunion</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>41.0</td>
<td>39.9</td>
<td>44.9</td>
<td>36.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4.8. Proportion of foreigners being granted a temporary residence permit for work and business</td>
<td>35.4</td>
<td>42.1</td>
<td>48.3</td>
<td>41.1</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>30.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4.9. Proportion of foreigners being granted a temporary residence permit for study or training</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4.10. Proportion of foreigners being granted a temporary residence permit for humanitarian and religious activities</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4.11. Proportion of foreigners being granted a temporary residence permit for treatment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4.12. Proportion of foreigners being granted a temporary residence permit for other purposes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4.13. Proportion of foreigners who received local border traffic permits</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: MOI/BMA.
### Table 23. International migration of foreign-origin citizens: Main indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.7.1. Annual number of asylum applications (first request)</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.7.3. Femininity ratio of asylum-seekers</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>68.0</td>
<td>32.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.7.4. Annual number of humanitarian protection beneficiaries, including stateless persons</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.7.5. Number of persons refused to be granted humanitarian protection</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.7.6. Number of asylum-seekers with pending applications on 31 December</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.7.7. Number of persons granted stateless person status</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.7.8. Number of stateless persons granted the right to stay in RM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.7.9. Growth rate of the number of asylum-seekers with pending applications</td>
<td>80.4</td>
<td>52.7</td>
<td>101.3</td>
<td>41.8</td>
<td>157.6</td>
<td>155.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.7.10. Number of refugees in RM</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.7.11. Growth rate of the number of refugees</td>
<td>131.6</td>
<td>113.3</td>
<td>104.7</td>
<td>94.4</td>
<td>95.2</td>
<td>87.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: MOI/BMA.*

### Table 24. Trafficking in human beings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.5.1. Number of Moldovan victims of human trafficking, identified and assisted within NRS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.4. Number of potential THB victims assisted within NRS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>328</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: MLSPF.*

### Table 25. Border crossing mobility, including number of visas granted: Main indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1.8. Annual number of visas granted by Moldovan Consulates abroad</td>
<td>5,916</td>
<td>5,292</td>
<td>17,351</td>
<td>23,068</td>
<td>23,000</td>
<td>16,772</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1.9. Growth rate of the number of granted visas</td>
<td>57.3</td>
<td>-10.5</td>
<td>227.9</td>
<td>32.9</td>
<td>-0.3</td>
<td>-27.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.9. Annual number of arrivals of Moldovan citizens at State borders</td>
<td>3,608.60</td>
<td>4,105.20</td>
<td>4,474.80</td>
<td>5,304.00</td>
<td>5,241.40</td>
<td>4,990.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.9. Growth rate of the number of arrivals of Moldovan citizens at State borders</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>13.76</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>18.53</td>
<td>-1.18</td>
<td>-4.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.10. Annual number of arrivals of foreigners at State borders</td>
<td>978.5</td>
<td>997.7</td>
<td>1,366.90</td>
<td>1,735.00</td>
<td>1,480.70</td>
<td>1,886.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.11. Growth rate of the number of arrivals of foreigners at State borders</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>-14.7</td>
<td>27.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.12. Annual number of departures of Moldovan citizens at State borders</td>
<td>3,731.20</td>
<td>4,217.50</td>
<td>4,600.20</td>
<td>5,404.30</td>
<td>5,131.40</td>
<td>5,071.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.12. Growth rate of the number of departures of Moldovan citizens at State borders</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>13.03</td>
<td>9.07</td>
<td>17.48</td>
<td>-5.05</td>
<td>-1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.13. Annual number of departures of foreigners at State borders</td>
<td>960.9</td>
<td>986</td>
<td>1,355.30</td>
<td>1,739.50</td>
<td>1,676.10</td>
<td>1,898.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.14. Growth rate of the number of departures of Moldovan citizens at State borders</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>37.45</td>
<td>28.35</td>
<td>-3.64</td>
<td>13.27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: BGS.

Table 26. Irregular migration of foreigners: Main indicators

| 3.8.1 Number of irregular migrants (illegal migrants) | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 |
| 3.8.2 Number of expelled foreigners | 0 | 1,925 | 2,961 | 3,245 | 1,961 | 2,298 |
| 3.8.3 Number of foreigners with cancelled right to stay in RM | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 3.8.4 Number of foreigners with revoked right to stay in RM | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 3.8.5 Number of foreigners with refused right to stay in RM | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
### 3.8.6. Number of foreigners towards whom was disposed the measure of return on the territory of RM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Value</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.8.7. Number of foreigners declared undesirable on the territory of RM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Value</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.8.8. Number of foreigners taken into public custody

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Value</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: MOI/BMA.*

### Table 27. General demographic indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1.1. General demographic indicators</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1.1 Total population</td>
<td>3,589,936</td>
<td>3,581,110</td>
<td>3,572,703</td>
<td>3,567,512</td>
<td>3,563,695</td>
<td>3,560,430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.2 Population growth rate</td>
<td>-0.29</td>
<td>-0.25</td>
<td>-0.24</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.3 Birth rate</td>
<td>10.48</td>
<td>10.48</td>
<td>10.62</td>
<td>10.93</td>
<td>11.44</td>
<td>11.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.4 Death rate</td>
<td>12.43</td>
<td>12.03</td>
<td>12.04</td>
<td>11.75</td>
<td>11.82</td>
<td>12.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.5 Natural growth</td>
<td>-6,994</td>
<td>-5,550</td>
<td>-5,077</td>
<td>-2,930</td>
<td>-1,336</td>
<td>-3,157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.6 Gross immigration rate</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.7 Gross emigration rate</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.8 Net migration rate</td>
<td>-1.01</td>
<td>-0.87</td>
<td>-0.93</td>
<td>-0.62</td>
<td>-0.68</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.9 Annual number of arrivals of Moldovan citizens at State borders</td>
<td>3,608.6</td>
<td>4,105.2</td>
<td>4,474.8</td>
<td>5,304.0</td>
<td>5,241.4</td>
<td>4,990.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.10 Annual number of arrivals of foreigners at State borders</td>
<td>978.5</td>
<td>997.7</td>
<td>1,366.9</td>
<td>1,735.0</td>
<td>1,480.7</td>
<td>1,886.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.11 Growth rate of the number of arrivals of foreigners at State borders</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>102.0</td>
<td>137.0</td>
<td>126.9</td>
<td>85.3</td>
<td>127.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.12 Annual number of departures of Moldovan citizens at State borders</td>
<td>3,731.2</td>
<td>4,217.5</td>
<td>4,600.2</td>
<td>5,404.3</td>
<td>5,131.4</td>
<td>5,071.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.13 Annual number of departures of foreigners at State borders</td>
<td>960.9</td>
<td>986.0</td>
<td>1,355.3</td>
<td>1,739.5</td>
<td>1,676.1</td>
<td>1,898.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.14 Growth rate of the number of departures of Moldovan citizens at State borders</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>113.0</td>
<td>109.1</td>
<td>117.5</td>
<td>95.0</td>
<td>98.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: NBS.*
Table 28. Demographic composition of the population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1.2. Demographic composition of the population</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.2.1. Proportion of persons aged less than 15 years</td>
<td>18.33</td>
<td>18.16</td>
<td>17.57</td>
<td>17.08</td>
<td>16.71</td>
<td>16.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.2. Proportion of persons aged 65 years and over</td>
<td>9.84</td>
<td>10.29</td>
<td>10.33</td>
<td>10.25</td>
<td>10.12</td>
<td>9.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.3. Demographic dependency ratio</td>
<td>51.94</td>
<td>52.85</td>
<td>51.68</td>
<td>50.87</td>
<td>50.29</td>
<td>49.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.3.1. Demographic dependency ratio (national definition)</td>
<td>39.20</td>
<td>39.77</td>
<td>38.70</td>
<td>37.61</td>
<td>36.68</td>
<td>35.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.3.2. Demographic dependency ratio (international definition)</td>
<td>15.27</td>
<td>17.01</td>
<td>17.52</td>
<td>18.61</td>
<td>19.40</td>
<td>20.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.4. Seniority ratio</td>
<td>7.65</td>
<td>8.08</td>
<td>8.10</td>
<td>8.03</td>
<td>7.89</td>
<td>7.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.5. Proportion of males aged 65 years and over</td>
<td>11.84</td>
<td>12.34</td>
<td>12.39</td>
<td>12.30</td>
<td>12.19</td>
<td>12.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.6. Proportion of females aged 65 years and over</td>
<td>168.30</td>
<td>165.19</td>
<td>165.09</td>
<td>165.52</td>
<td>166.73</td>
<td>167.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: NBS.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age groups</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th></th>
<th>2006</th>
<th></th>
<th>2007</th>
<th></th>
<th>2008</th>
<th></th>
<th>2009</th>
<th></th>
<th>2010</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Men</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0–4</td>
<td>181,669</td>
<td>93,772</td>
<td>87,897</td>
<td>185,590</td>
<td>95,388</td>
<td>90,202</td>
<td>186,033</td>
<td>96,981</td>
<td>90,054</td>
<td>190,597</td>
<td>98,075</td>
<td>92,522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5–9</td>
<td>203,408</td>
<td>104,412</td>
<td>98,996</td>
<td>208,612</td>
<td>101,744</td>
<td>96,868</td>
<td>209,792</td>
<td>101,546</td>
<td>98,246</td>
<td>211,508</td>
<td>103,287</td>
<td>98,221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15–19</td>
<td>349,138</td>
<td>173,563</td>
<td>175,575</td>
<td>354,503</td>
<td>173,951</td>
<td>170,552</td>
<td>359,037</td>
<td>174,846</td>
<td>174,191</td>
<td>363,897</td>
<td>177,090</td>
<td>186,807</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20–24</td>
<td>349,754</td>
<td>176,624</td>
<td>173,130</td>
<td>355,592</td>
<td>179,330</td>
<td>176,262</td>
<td>361,362</td>
<td>182,437</td>
<td>178,925</td>
<td>367,462</td>
<td>185,412</td>
<td>182,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40–44</td>
<td>252,139</td>
<td>119,199</td>
<td>132,940</td>
<td>259,278</td>
<td>120,491</td>
<td>138,787</td>
<td>266,570</td>
<td>123,842</td>
<td>142,728</td>
<td>274,528</td>
<td>127,320</td>
<td>147,208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45–49</td>
<td>285,000</td>
<td>133,877</td>
<td>151,123</td>
<td>294,308</td>
<td>137,126</td>
<td>157,182</td>
<td>303,534</td>
<td>141,575</td>
<td>162,959</td>
<td>313,489</td>
<td>145,987</td>
<td>167,502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50–54</td>
<td>246,984</td>
<td>114,415</td>
<td>132,569</td>
<td>256,532</td>
<td>119,390</td>
<td>137,142</td>
<td>265,944</td>
<td>123,842</td>
<td>142,054</td>
<td>274,898</td>
<td>127,320</td>
<td>147,578</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55–59</td>
<td>186,343</td>
<td>84,245</td>
<td>102,098</td>
<td>192,380</td>
<td>89,378</td>
<td>102,002</td>
<td>200,282</td>
<td>92,243</td>
<td>107,039</td>
<td>208,319</td>
<td>95,076</td>
<td>113,243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60–64</td>
<td>122,126</td>
<td>51,661</td>
<td>70,465</td>
<td>126,378</td>
<td>55,832</td>
<td>70,546</td>
<td>132,924</td>
<td>58,292</td>
<td>74,632</td>
<td>140,556</td>
<td>60,324</td>
<td>79,232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65–69</td>
<td>127,296</td>
<td>51,321</td>
<td>75,975</td>
<td>132,378</td>
<td>56,919</td>
<td>75,469</td>
<td>138,399</td>
<td>59,471</td>
<td>78,928</td>
<td>145,877</td>
<td>63,390</td>
<td>82,487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70–74</td>
<td>98,769</td>
<td>38,084</td>
<td>60,685</td>
<td>102,878</td>
<td>39,563</td>
<td>63,315</td>
<td>110,415</td>
<td>40,913</td>
<td>69,492</td>
<td>118,407</td>
<td>45,986</td>
<td>72,421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75–79</td>
<td>73,121</td>
<td>25,793</td>
<td>47,328</td>
<td>78,967</td>
<td>28,524</td>
<td>50,443</td>
<td>85,993</td>
<td>30,419</td>
<td>55,574</td>
<td>93,482</td>
<td>36,464</td>
<td>56,018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80–84</td>
<td>38,336</td>
<td>11,856</td>
<td>26,480</td>
<td>42,503</td>
<td>13,193</td>
<td>29,310</td>
<td>47,253</td>
<td>14,485</td>
<td>32,768</td>
<td>52,035</td>
<td>20,748</td>
<td>31,287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85–89</td>
<td>15,585</td>
<td>4,553</td>
<td>11,032</td>
<td>15,281</td>
<td>4,709</td>
<td>10,572</td>
<td>15,996</td>
<td>5,328</td>
<td>10,668</td>
<td>16,402</td>
<td>5,677</td>
<td>10,725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90–94</td>
<td>3,927</td>
<td>1,130</td>
<td>2,797</td>
<td>3,415</td>
<td>1,031</td>
<td>2,384</td>
<td>3,676</td>
<td>1,066</td>
<td>2,610</td>
<td>3,848</td>
<td>1,099</td>
<td>2,549</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95–99</td>
<td>857</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>622</td>
<td>927</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>692</td>
<td>925</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>660</td>
<td>1,141</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>777</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100+</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>211</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3,589,936</td>
<td>1,719,368</td>
<td>1,870,568</td>
<td>3,581,110</td>
<td>1,721,030</td>
<td>1,860,080</td>
<td>3,572,703</td>
<td>1,717,459</td>
<td>1,855,244</td>
<td>3,567,512</td>
<td>1,714,931</td>
<td>1,852,581</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: NBS.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1.3. Urban versus rural population</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.3.1. Size of urban population</td>
<td>1,469,828</td>
<td>1,478,011</td>
<td>1,476,110</td>
<td>1,476,099</td>
<td>1,476,681</td>
<td>1,481,696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3.2. Urbanization rate</td>
<td>40.94</td>
<td>41.27</td>
<td>41.32</td>
<td>41.38</td>
<td>41.44</td>
<td>41.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3.3. Growth rate of the urban population</td>
<td>99.58</td>
<td>100.56</td>
<td>99.87</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>100.04</td>
<td>100.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3.4. Proportion of persons aged less than 15 years in urban areas</td>
<td>15.56</td>
<td>15.33</td>
<td>14.81</td>
<td>14.41</td>
<td>14.17</td>
<td>13.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3.5. Proportion of persons aged 65 years and over in urban areas</td>
<td>8.48</td>
<td>8.35</td>
<td>8.50</td>
<td>8.53</td>
<td>8.57</td>
<td>8.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3.6. Proportion of persons aged less than 15 years in rural areas</td>
<td>20.24</td>
<td>20.15</td>
<td>19.52</td>
<td>18.97</td>
<td>18.51</td>
<td>18.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3.7. Proportion of persons aged 65 years and over in rural areas</td>
<td>10.78</td>
<td>11.66</td>
<td>11.62</td>
<td>11.46</td>
<td>11.23</td>
<td>10.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3.8. Dependency ratio in urban areas</td>
<td>31.65</td>
<td>31.04</td>
<td>30.40</td>
<td>29.77</td>
<td>29.42</td>
<td>29.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3.9. Seniority ratio in urban areas</td>
<td>15.19</td>
<td>15.67</td>
<td>16.34</td>
<td>17.23</td>
<td>17.97</td>
<td>18.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3.10. Femininity ratio for the population aged 65 years and over in urban areas</td>
<td>162.03</td>
<td>169.91</td>
<td>167.84</td>
<td>166.76</td>
<td>166.81</td>
<td>165.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3.11. Dependency ratio in rural areas</td>
<td>44.97</td>
<td>46.64</td>
<td>45.21</td>
<td>43.73</td>
<td>42.32</td>
<td>41.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3.12. Seniority ratio in rural areas</td>
<td>15.32</td>
<td>17.68</td>
<td>18.13</td>
<td>19.34</td>
<td>20.18</td>
<td>21.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3.13. Femininity ratio for the population aged 65 years and over in rural areas</td>
<td>171.86</td>
<td>162.87</td>
<td>163.69</td>
<td>164.87</td>
<td>166.69</td>
<td>167.83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: NBS.
Table 31. Demographic composition of the population of foreign origin

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3.3. Demographic composition of the population of foreign origin</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.3.1. Proportion of foreigners among the total population aged less than 15 years</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3.2. Proportion of foreigners among population aged 65 years and over</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3.3. Sex ratio for the population of foreigners</td>
<td>120.11</td>
<td>111.98</td>
<td>109.23</td>
<td>105.07</td>
<td>100.12</td>
<td>101.78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: MOI/BMA.

Table 32. Global economic indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1.6. Global economic indicators</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.6.1. GDP</td>
<td>37,651,869</td>
<td>44,754,367</td>
<td>53,429,571</td>
<td>62,921,545</td>
<td>60,429,803</td>
<td>71,849,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6.2. Growth rate of real total GDP</td>
<td>107.5</td>
<td>104.8</td>
<td>103.0</td>
<td>107.8</td>
<td>94.0</td>
<td>107.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6.3. GDP per capita</td>
<td>10,473</td>
<td>12,483</td>
<td>14,937</td>
<td>17,625</td>
<td>16,948</td>
<td>20,171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6.4. Growth rate of GDP per capita</td>
<td>107.8</td>
<td>105.1</td>
<td>103.2</td>
<td>108.0</td>
<td>94.1</td>
<td>107.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6.7. HDI</td>
<td>0.631</td>
<td>0.637</td>
<td>0.638</td>
<td>0.644</td>
<td>0.638</td>
<td>0.644</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: NBS.

Table 33. Share of expenditure components to the GDP in current prices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GDP</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final total consumption</td>
<td>109.9</td>
<td>113.9</td>
<td>113.5</td>
<td>113.6</td>
<td>113.5</td>
<td>115.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where of households</td>
<td>92.2</td>
<td>92.4</td>
<td>92.1</td>
<td>91.9</td>
<td>88.3</td>
<td>91.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net capital formation</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>32.7</td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td>39.2</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net export, including:</td>
<td>-40.7</td>
<td>-46.6</td>
<td>-51.6</td>
<td>-52.8</td>
<td>-36.6</td>
<td>-39.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Export</td>
<td>51.2</td>
<td>45.3</td>
<td>45.6</td>
<td>40.8</td>
<td>36.9</td>
<td>39.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Import</td>
<td>91.9</td>
<td>91.9</td>
<td>97.2</td>
<td>93.6</td>
<td>73.5</td>
<td>78.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: NBS.
### Table 34. Dynamics of payments’ balance indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GDP (USD millions)</td>
<td>2,988.2</td>
<td>3,408.1</td>
<td>4,402.5</td>
<td>6,056.3</td>
<td>5,437.6</td>
<td>5,810.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Money transfers from</td>
<td>683.24</td>
<td>854.55</td>
<td>1,218.23</td>
<td>1,660.09</td>
<td>1,182.02</td>
<td>1,244.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>abroad made by</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>natural persons</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(labour migrants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and others) through</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moldovan banks (USD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>millions)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth rate</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>25.1</td>
<td>42.6</td>
<td>36.3</td>
<td>-28.8</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share of GDP</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>25.1</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>21.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compensation for work,</td>
<td>520.0</td>
<td>573.0</td>
<td>649.0</td>
<td>842.0</td>
<td>563.4</td>
<td>743.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>credit, (USD millions)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth rate</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>-33.1</td>
<td>31.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal transfers,</td>
<td>395.1</td>
<td>602.8</td>
<td>842.3</td>
<td>1046</td>
<td>635.2</td>
<td>604.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>credits, (USD millions)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth rate</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>52.6</td>
<td>39.7</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>-39.3</td>
<td>-4.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


### Table 35. Remittances’ impact on the welfare of households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.7.5. Proportion of households</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>23.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>receiving remittances</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>20.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>25.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7.6. Proportion of remittances</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>49.5</td>
<td>55.2</td>
<td>55.7</td>
<td>55.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in the household available income</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>51.5</td>
<td>52.2</td>
<td>48.4</td>
<td>49.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>depending on remittances</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>48.1</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>60.7</td>
<td>59.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7.7. Proportion of households</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>that would be placed under the</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>poverty line if not receiving</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>13.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>remittances</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: NBS.
Table 36. Households’ available income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total in the country</strong></td>
<td>MDL</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>MDL</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>MDL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Available income – total</strong></td>
<td>839.6</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1,018.7</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1,188.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary activity</td>
<td>348.9</td>
<td>41.6</td>
<td>421.7</td>
<td>41.4</td>
<td>509.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual agricultural activity</td>
<td>156.1</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>154.2</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>125.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income from individual non-agricultural activity</td>
<td>65.4</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>65.1</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>89.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income from property</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social payments</td>
<td>110.8</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>138.1</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>176.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>..pensions</td>
<td>92.2</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>116.9</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>151.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>..indemnities for children</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>..compensations</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.. social help</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other incomes</td>
<td>156.6</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>236.7</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>284.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>..remittances</td>
<td>116.3</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>178.5</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>227.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Growth rate of remittances</strong></td>
<td>53.5%</td>
<td>27.5%</td>
<td>-13.0</td>
<td>-4.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Available income – total</strong></td>
<td>1,000.6</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1,210</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1,463.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary activity</td>
<td>571</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>679.4</td>
<td>56.2</td>
<td>827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual agricultural activity</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income from individual non-agricultural activity</td>
<td>103.6</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>129.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income from property</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social payments</td>
<td>116.5</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>143.6</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>198.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>..pensions</td>
<td>92.8</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>119.1</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>167.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>..indemnities for children</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>..compensations</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.. social help</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other incomes</td>
<td>179.5</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>256.4</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>284.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>..remittances</td>
<td>118.6</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>155.6</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>189.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Growth rate of remittances</strong></td>
<td>31.2</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>-2.1</td>
<td>-4.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Available income – total</strong></td>
<td>723.8</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>878.9</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary activity</td>
<td>189.2</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>233.4</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>276.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual agricultural activity</td>
<td>249.4</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>249.5</td>
<td>28.4</td>
<td>204.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income from individual non-agricultural activity</td>
<td>37.9</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>60.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income from property</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social payments</td>
<td>106.8</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>161.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>..pensions</td>
<td>91.8</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>115.3</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>140.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>..indemnities for children</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>..compensations</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>..social help</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other incomes</td>
<td>140.1</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>222.3</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>283.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>..remittances</td>
<td>114.7</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>195.3</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>255.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth rate of remittances</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural/urban relation of remittances</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: NBS.

### Table 37. Dynamic of poverty indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1.6.5.1. Share of population below absolute poverty line</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>30.2</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>21.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: NBS.
Table 38. Distribution by quintile of available incomes of households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MDL, average monthly per person</th>
<th>Urban</th>
<th>Rural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Available incomes – total</strong></td>
<td>699.4</td>
<td>977.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary activity</td>
<td>340.4</td>
<td>492.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual agricultural activity</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income from individual non-agricultural activity</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>54.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income from property</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social payments</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>259.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>…pensions</td>
<td>160.9</td>
<td>220.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>…indemnities for children</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>…compensations</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>…social help</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other incomes</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>142.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>…remittances</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>101.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Structure of available income</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Available incomes – total</strong></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary activity</td>
<td>48.7</td>
<td>50.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual agricultural activity</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income from individual non-agricultural activity</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income from property</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social payments</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>26.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>…pensions</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>22.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>…indemnities for children</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>…compensations</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>…social help</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other incomes</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>…remittances</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: NBS.
### Table 39. Ways to contribute to RM’s development according to migrants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Send money home</td>
<td>51.6%</td>
<td>51.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Start /invest in a business in RM</td>
<td>26.9%</td>
<td>26.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help the country during crises</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promote the image of RM abroad</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defend the interests of RM abroad</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create relations with persons from other States</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buy Moldovan export products while abroad</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stay politically active (voting, etc.)</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


### Table 40. Contribution of economic activities to GDP, by sector

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GDP</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net products incomes</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>16.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net added value - total</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>83.4</td>
<td>83.1</td>
<td>82.3</td>
<td>84.1</td>
<td>83.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial intermediaries services calculated indirectly</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-2.5</td>
<td>-2.3</td>
<td>-2.1</td>
<td>-1.6</td>
<td>-2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole sale and retail commerce</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture, hunting and silviculture</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transports and communications</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial activities</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real estate transactions</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and social assistance</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public administration</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constructions</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy, gas, water</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other activities</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotels and restaurants</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procreative, cultural and sport activities</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 41. Purpose of savings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose of Savings</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emergency cases</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eventual disease</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education of children or other family members</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ageing, funeral</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter costs</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buy/renovate house, apartment</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family events</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eventual unemployment</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some pleasures (holidays, etc.)</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Start a business</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buy expensive goods (PC, TV)</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buy a car</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re-emigrate</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No savings/No intention to save</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2009, IOM; CBS-AXA.
Table 42. Saving methods and patterns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Households receiving remittances</th>
<th>Households not receiving remittances</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In foreign currency</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In MDL</td>
<td>37.0%</td>
<td>61.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procurement of goods</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savings in loan associations</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savings in banks</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investments in business</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2009, IOM; CBS-AXA.

Table 43. Poverty dynamics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1.6.5.1. Share of population below absolute poverty line</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30.2</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>21.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By residence area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big towns</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small towns</td>
<td>30.1</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>14.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>34.1</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>34.6</td>
<td>36.3</td>
<td>30.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>32.8</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>23.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centre</td>
<td>33.7</td>
<td>30.2</td>
<td>31.2</td>
<td>33.2</td>
<td>29.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South, including Autonomous Territorial Unit of Gagauzia</td>
<td>34.1</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>35.2</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td>27.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chișinău</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Type of the household

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Household Type</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One person</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family with no children</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>18.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family with children up to 18 years old</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>19.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single parent with children up to 18 years old</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other households with children</td>
<td>34.9</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>28.8</td>
<td>31.9</td>
<td>28.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other households without children</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>18.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Composition of households
### Households with one child up to 18 years old

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25.1</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>20.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Households with two children up to 18 years old

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31.7</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>22.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Households with three children up to 18 years old

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>52.8</td>
<td>43.1</td>
<td>42.3</td>
<td>47.5</td>
<td>38.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Households without children up to 18 years old

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Social economical categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employed in the agricultural sector</td>
<td>42.8</td>
<td>39.9</td>
<td>42.8</td>
<td>48.1</td>
<td>44.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed in non-agricultural sectors</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-employed in agriculture</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>36.9</td>
<td>47.0</td>
<td>36.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-employed in non-agriculture sectors</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>41.8</td>
<td>33.5</td>
<td>37.3</td>
<td>35.6</td>
<td>28.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Main income source of the household leader

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salary</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-employed in agriculture</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>36.9</td>
<td>47.0</td>
<td>36.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-employed in non-agriculture sectors</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social payments</td>
<td>41.6</td>
<td>33.6</td>
<td>36.9</td>
<td>35.6</td>
<td>28.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Money from another country</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>21.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Education of the household leader

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High education</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium professional education</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium general education</td>
<td>33.5</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>23.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incomplete or primary medium education</td>
<td>45.4</td>
<td>40.7</td>
<td>42.6</td>
<td>46.7</td>
<td>39.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No education</td>
<td>55.2</td>
<td>51.0</td>
<td>55.9</td>
<td>57.0</td>
<td>53.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Type of households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>With migrants</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Without migrants</td>
<td>31.9</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 1.6.5.2. Share of population below absolute poverty line

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>31.2</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>32.9</td>
<td>30.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: NBS Household’s Budget Survey (HBS).*
Table 44. Share of children under 18 years old living in households below the poverty line

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>32.8</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>24.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By residence area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big towns</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small towns</td>
<td>30.2</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>14.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>34.9</td>
<td>37.7</td>
<td>33.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zones</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>31.9</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>24.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centre</td>
<td>37.7</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>33.8</td>
<td>37.6</td>
<td>33.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South, including Autonomous Territorial Unit of Gagauzia</td>
<td>38.2</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>35.3</td>
<td>37.1</td>
<td>29.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chişinău</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: NBS HBS.*

Table 45. Distribution of consumption expenditures by quintile, for adult equivalent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quintile I</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quintile II</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quintile III</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>16.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quintile IV</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>21.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quintile V</td>
<td>39.1</td>
<td>40.1</td>
<td>39.8</td>
<td>39.6</td>
<td>40.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: MEd based on NBS data.*
Table 46. Children without parental care in households with migrants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.2.2. Number of households with children under 18 years with member(s) temporarily abroad</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>157,000</td>
<td>140,800</td>
<td>126,200</td>
<td>126,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.3. Proportion of households with member(s) temporarily abroad</td>
<td>23.79</td>
<td>19.99</td>
<td>21.39</td>
<td>19.44</td>
<td>18.53</td>
<td>18.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.4. Proportion of households with children under 18 years with members who are temporarily abroad in the total households with children</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>30.84</td>
<td>28.34</td>
<td>26.00</td>
<td>26.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.5. Growth rate of the number of households with member(s) temporarily abroad</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-19.8</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>-7.0</td>
<td>-4.8</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: NBS HBS.

Table 47. Number of children left in RM by emigrated parents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MLPSF</th>
<th>MEd</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>2010 +/-, %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One parent</td>
<td>36,930</td>
<td>35,624 -3.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both parents or the single parent</td>
<td>17,656</td>
<td>16,441 -6.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>54,586</td>
<td>52,065 -4.62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: MLSPF, MEd.

Table 48. Social services and elderly benefitting from these

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of Service Providers</td>
<td>Number of Beneficiaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asylums</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily centres</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>2,209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centres/placement services</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed centres</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medico-social rehabilitation</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>5,059</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: MLSPF.
### Table 49. Evolution of net rates of obligatory general education enrolment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>102.4</td>
<td>93.7</td>
<td>100.5</td>
<td>91.4</td>
<td>100.9</td>
<td>90.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>101.6</td>
<td>89.4</td>
<td>101.6</td>
<td>88.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>102.4</td>
<td>88.9</td>
<td></td>
<td>88.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>96.7</td>
<td>93.7</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>90.5</td>
<td>93.6</td>
<td>88.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>93.5</td>
<td>88.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>93.6</td>
<td>93.6</td>
<td>93.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: NBS.

### Table 50. Evolution of expenditures for health protection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Assistance and social support</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Health</th>
<th>Culture, sports, youth activities</th>
<th>Total social sector</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>% in National Public Budget (NPB)</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% in GDP</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>53.8</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>% in NPB</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% in GDP</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>63.3</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>% in NPB</td>
<td>28.7</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% in GDP</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>25.38</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>% in NPB</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% in GDP</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>26.28</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>% in NPB</td>
<td>30.2</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% in GDP</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>27.18</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>% in NPB</td>
<td>33.2</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% in GDP</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>31.75</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>% in NPB</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% in GDP</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>29.81</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Ministry of Finance.
Table 51. Medical personnel in the health protection system

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Doctors, total</strong></td>
<td>13,886</td>
<td>10,833</td>
<td>10,767</td>
<td>10,646</td>
<td>10,757</td>
<td>10,761</td>
<td>10,619</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Medium medical staff, total</strong></td>
<td>32,406</td>
<td>23,510</td>
<td>22,678</td>
<td>22,648</td>
<td>22,658</td>
<td>23,141</td>
<td>23,003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree of insurance with doctors per 10,000 inhabitants</td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td>30.2</td>
<td>30.1</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td>30.1</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td>29.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>64.5</td>
<td>65.1</td>
<td>63.8</td>
<td>64.4</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>63.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree of insurance with medium medical staff per 10,000 inhabitants</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>65.5</td>
<td>65.1</td>
<td>63.4</td>
<td>63.5</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>64.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>137.1</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>116.6</td>
<td>117.8</td>
<td>121.3</td>
<td>125.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>25.1</td>
<td>24.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Ministry of Health (MOH), National Centre for Health Management (NCHM).

Table 52. Causes of non-participation in the health policy system

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Urban</th>
<th>Rural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not employed</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>40.7%</td>
<td>30.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Works unofficially</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>25.9%</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Considers himself healthy</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expensive</td>
<td>26.2%</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
<td>29.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No need, will have to pay anyway</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seasonal worker</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Works abroad</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has another type of insurance</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 53. Life expectancy at birth, by areas of residence and sex

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>67.59</td>
<td>67.85</td>
<td>68.4</td>
<td>68.79</td>
<td>69.36</td>
<td>69.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>63.87</td>
<td>63.84</td>
<td>64.57</td>
<td>65.04</td>
<td>65.55</td>
<td>65.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>71.22</td>
<td>71.66</td>
<td>72.23</td>
<td>72.56</td>
<td>73.17</td>
<td>73.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>68.79</td>
<td>70.03</td>
<td>70.39</td>
<td>70.45</td>
<td>71.22</td>
<td>71.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>65.01</td>
<td>66.11</td>
<td>66.53</td>
<td>66.4</td>
<td>67.12</td>
<td>67.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>72.57</td>
<td>73.99</td>
<td>74.11</td>
<td>74.32</td>
<td>75.1</td>
<td>75.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>66.82</td>
<td>66.5</td>
<td>67.18</td>
<td>67.76</td>
<td>68.22</td>
<td>67.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>63.07</td>
<td>62.41</td>
<td>63.34</td>
<td>64.2</td>
<td>64.59</td>
<td>63.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>70.42</td>
<td>70.62</td>
<td>71.1</td>
<td>71.48</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72.18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: NBS.

Table 54. Life expectancy at birth, by region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RM</td>
<td>67.6</td>
<td>67.8</td>
<td>68.4</td>
<td>68.8</td>
<td>69.4</td>
<td>69.3</td>
<td>69.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>73.74</td>
<td>74.64</td>
<td>75.27</td>
<td>75.6</td>
<td>75.83</td>
<td>76.23</td>
<td>76.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU-27</td>
<td>77.5</td>
<td>78.7</td>
<td>79.2</td>
<td>79.4</td>
<td>79.6</td>
<td>79.8</td>
<td>79.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIS</td>
<td>67.0</td>
<td>67.1</td>
<td>68.0</td>
<td>68.5</td>
<td>68.8</td>
<td>69.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: NBS, World Health Organization (WHO) statistical data.

Table 55. Infant deaths, by region (Millennium Development Goal (MDG) 4)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RM</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU-27</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIS</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: NBS, WHO statistical data.
Table 56. Deaths of children up to 5 years old, by region (MDG 4)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RM</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>10.36</td>
<td>9.94</td>
<td>9.59</td>
<td>9.45</td>
<td>9.23</td>
<td>9.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU-27</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>5.07</td>
<td>5.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIS</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>17.42</td>
<td>16.64</td>
<td>15.82</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: NBS, WHO statistical data.

Table 57. Maternal deaths, by region (MDG 5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RM</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>38.4</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>44.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>13.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU-27</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIS</td>
<td>39.32</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>26.65</td>
<td>26.27</td>
<td>24.76</td>
<td>27.76</td>
<td>23.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: NBS, WHO statistical data.

Table 58. Incidence of socially conditioned diseases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Incidence of HIV/AIDS per 100,000</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>17.12</td>
<td>17.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inhabitants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incidence of HIV/AIDS among persons</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>21.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-25 years old</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global incidence of active TB per</td>
<td>68.7</td>
<td>130.9</td>
<td>128.4</td>
<td>127.1</td>
<td>114.4</td>
<td>112.4</td>
<td>107.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100,000 inhabitants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Death rate associated with TB</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: MOH.
### Annex 3. Current legal and policy framework of the Republic of Moldova in the field of migration management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instrument</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Key national migration laws and regulations** | 1. 274/27 December 2011 Law on integration of foreigners in the Republic of Moldova  
2. 215/04 November 2011 Law on the State Border of the Republic of Moldova  
3. 200/16 July 2010 Law on the legal status of foreigners  
4. 180/10 July 2008 Law on labour migration  
5. 270/18 December 2008 Law on asylum in the Republic of Moldova  
7. 241/20.10.2005 Law on prevention and fight against human trafficking |
| **Key migration-related Government Decisions** | 1. 128/24 February 2012, on facilitating the procedure of granting the right to stay and issuing identity acts to foreigners employed in foreign assistance projects  
2. 4. 82/24 August 2011, on the improvement of the situation in the field of foreigners immigration in the Republic of Moldova and facilitating the conditions to obtain the right to stay for foreign investors and other immigrants categories  
3. 1187/22 December 2010, on the implementation of the One Stop Shop for foreigners’ documentation  
4. 847/11 July 2008, on the creation of Assistance and Protection Centre for Victims and Potential Victims of Trafficking in Human Beings  
5. *1401/13 December 2007, approving the Concept of the Information Integrated Automatic System “Migration and Asylum”*  
6. 741/29 June 2007, on the demographic situation in the Republic of Moldova  
7. 40/12 January 2007, on the establishment of the Information Integrated Automatic System in the field of migration  
8. 1386/11 October 2002, regarding approval of Migration Policy Concept of Republic of Moldova |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key migration-related Government Strategies and Action Plans</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Pilot Programme of attraction of remittances in the economy „PARE 1+1” for 2010–2012 (approved by Government Decision No. 972 on 18 October 2010)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Actions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. Strategy of the National Referral System for the protection and support of victims and potential victims of human trafficking and of the Action Plan regarding the implementation of the Strategy of the National Referral System for the protection and support of victims and potential victims of human trafficking for 2009–2011 (approved by Government Decision No. 257 on 05 December 2008)  
5. Action Plan for enhancing the return of Moldovan labour migrants from abroad (approved by Government Decision No. 1133 on 09 October 2008)  
6. Joint Declaration regarding Republic of Moldova–EU Mobility Partnership, signed on 5 June 2008 in Luxembourg |
2. National Strategy for protection of child and family (approved by Government Decision No. 727 of 16 June 003) |
| 2002 | Migration policy concept of the Republic of Moldova (approved by Parliament Decision No. 1386 on 11 October 2002) |
| Key bilateral agreements | RM is party to the following bilateral agreements in the field of social security: Bulgaria (2008), Romania (2010), Luxembourg (2010), Austria (2011), Estonia (2011), Portugal (2011), Czech Republic (2011). In addition, RM concluded Agreements in the field of labour migration with Italy (2011).  
*Note: Currently, under negotiations are the following Bilateral Agreements in the field of social security – with Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Belgium and Italy. The draft bilateral agreement in the field of labour migration is currently being negotiated with the Russian Federation.* |
|---|---|
| Readmission agreements | RM is party to following readmission agreements with the EU (in force since 1 January 2008), Ukraine (1997), Switzerland (2004 and 2010), Norway (2006), the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia (2008), Serbia (2011) and Denmark (2011). Between 2009 and 2011, the country signed additional implementing protocols to the EU–Republic of Moldova Readmission Agreement with 11 EU Member States. Negotiations are under way with another 11 EU Member States.  
In the same context, the Additional Protocols of implementation of the EU–Republic of Moldova Readmission Agreement are being negotiated with the following countries: Italy, Netherlands, Finland, Cyprus, Ireland, Portugal, Poland, Spain and Sweden.  
In the meantime, negotiations for readmission agreements between RM and main countries of origin of irregular migrants continue. In 2007, a draft intergovernmental agreement on readmission of persons residing without authorization was approved and sent to the Russian Federation, Uzbekistan, Tajikistan, Georgia, Azerbaijan, Armenia, Kazakhstan, Belarus, Kyrgyzstan, Turkmenistan, Turkey, the Syrian Arab Republic, Bangladesh, India, Lebanon, Pakistan, Jordan, Afghanistan, Iran, Iraq, China, and Bosnia and Herzegovina. |

---


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Council of Europe Convention on the fight against human trafficking (ratified by Law No. 67 on 30 March 2006)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>European Convention on the legal status of labour migrants (ratified by Law No. 20–XVI on 10 February 2006)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ILO Convention No. 97 on Migration for Employment (ratified by Law No. 209–XVI on 29 July 2005)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IOM Constitution (ratified by Law No. 215–XV on 29 May 2003)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ILO Forced Labour Convention of 1930 (No. 29) (in force since 23 March 2001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>European Convention on the legal status of migrant workers on 24 November 1997 (in force since 01 October 2006)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex 4. Institutional framework for immigration and asylum policies

- **President**
  - www.president.md
  - Rights of citizenship
  - Grants political asylum

- **Parliament**
  - www.parliament.md
  - Passes laws and ratifies international treaties in the field of migration

- **Government**
  - www.gov.md
  - Ensures the management and coordination of activities of the ministries’ and other government agencies for migration policy implementation

- **The Information and Security Service**
  - www.sis.md
  - Prevention of irregular migration, human trafficking and organized crime

- **Border Police**
  - www.border.gov.md
  - Border control, control and evidence of aliens entering RM; combating illegal migration and human trafficking; promoting policies

- **Ministry of Interior**
  - www.mai.gov.md
  - Primary responsibility over controlling and managing migration processes

- **Ministry of Labour, Social Protection and Family**
  - www.mpsfc.gov.md
  - Analyses of migration flows and labour migration needs, social services

- **Bureau for Migration and Asylum**
  - www.bma.gov.md
  - Control and monitoring of migration legislation, evidence and issuing of residence permits, migration management, fighting illegal staying, running centre for temporary placement of foreigners

- **Centre for Combating Trafficking in Persons**
  - Prevention and combating trafficking in human beings

- **National Employment Agency**
  - www.anofm.md
  - Issues work permits for foreigners
  - Implements policies in the field of labour migration

- **Ministry of Foreign Affairs and European Integration**
  - www.mfa.gov.md
  - Visas (via missions abroad); relations with third countries; citizen protection abroad

- **Ministry of Information Technology and Communications**
  - www.mtic.gov.md
  - Print and issue residence permits for migrants; keeps the National Population Register

- **National Committee to Combat Trafficking in Human Beings**
  - Consultative body of the Government
  - Coordinates activities in the field of anti-trafficking.

- **Commission for Coordination of Certain Activities Relating to the Migration Process**
  - Permanent advisory board; coordination and monitoring of activities in the migration domain and ensuring interaction between local and central public authorities

- **National Commission for Population and Development**
  - Analyses and coordination of the sector policies which have an impact on demographic situation
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