



UNODC

United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime

Annex I

Guidance Note

Experiences, good practices and challenges in measuring corruption and the effectiveness of anti-corruption frameworks

Measuring corruption and the effectiveness of anti-corruption frameworks can enhance our understanding of its causes, risks, consequences, and trends. It allows for the identification of gaps and weaknesses in legal and institutional frameworks and the monitoring and evaluation of the effectiveness of anti-corruption policies and actions and can thereby inform domestic policy responses.

Due to the hidden and often complex nature of corruption, measuring it poses various challenges. In addition to requiring financial and technical capacity to gather and analyse data, any measurement approaches need to take into account the specificities of geographic, sectoral and legal contexts.

In resolution 10/4, the Conference of the States Parties requests the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime to collect information on good practices, lessons learned and challenges in measuring corruption and to collect data on methodologies and indicators for measuring corruption risks, trends and prevalence, as well as for assessing the effectiveness of their policies and actual measures to combat corruption.

Part 1 of this Annex contains dedicated questions regarding measuring the effectiveness of anti-corruption frameworks. In this respect, reference is made to the document “Good practices, lessons learned and challenges in periodically evaluating the efficiency and the effectivity of anti-corruption measures and policies” (CAC/COSP/WG.4/2023/2), which contains an analysis of the information submitted by 38 parties to the Convention and was presented to the 14th session of the Working Group in 2023. Parties are invited to send additional information regarding measuring the effectiveness of anti-corruption frameworks and may wish to consider using the questionnaire contained below.

Part 2 of the below questionnaire contains questions on the measurement of corruption.

The answers to the questionnaire will flow into an analytical paper to inform the discussions of the 15th session of the Working Group on Prevention. In addition, unless otherwise requested, the responses will be published as part of the creation of a repository of methodologies and indicators for measuring corruption risks, trends and prevalence in line with paragraph 8 of resolution 10/4.

Part 1 – National experiences with assessing the effectiveness of anti-corruption frameworks

1. Does your country have any mechanisms in place to assess the effectiveness of its legislative and/or institutional anti-corruption framework? Please briefly summarize the methodology, scope and frequency of the process as well as any specific tools your country uses.

The Integrity Law no.82/2017 regulates integrity control measures in the public sector, including anti-corruption expertise and institutional integrity assessment.

The anti-corruption expertise represents the identification in the draft legislative and normative acts of the corruption risks, of the factors that generate them, as well as the submission of recommendations for their removal. (Law on Integrity No. 82/2017 and the Methodology for conducting anti-corruption expertise on draft legislative and normative acts, approved by the College of the National Anti-Corruption Centre).

Making the world safer from drugs, crime and terrorism

Institutional integrity assessment is the process of external assessment of corruption risks within the public entity in order to identify corruption risks using analytical and practical methods (professional integrity testing), to describe the factors that determine the identified risks and their consequences, and to provide recommendations for their mitigation. (Integrity Law no.82/2017 and Law 325/2013 on Institutional Integrity Assessment).

As of 2024, the National Integrity and Anti-Corruption Programme for 2024-2028 entered into force. Respectively, at the date of filling in this questionnaire, no data evaluated on the anti-corruption side are held, therefore we will present the data held in the National Integrity and Anti-Corruption Strategy for the years 2017-2020 and extended until 2023.

The development of the national integrity climate and the implementation of corruption prevention actions are coordinated within a single national document, the National Integrity and Anti-Corruption Strategy for 2017-2020 (NIAS/Strategy), adopted by Parliament Decision No. 56 of 30 March 2017 and subsequently extended until 2023.

With reference to the evaluation of the effectiveness of the anti-corruption legal framework, the Strategy annually assesses the degree of implementation of institutional integrity policies (the legal framework of integrity policies being established by the Integrity Law no.82/2017). Thus, assessing institutional integrity policies is directly interconnected with the effectiveness of the legal framework in the area of integrity and anti-corruption.

The NIAS is structured on 8 pillars (I. Parliament; II. Government, public sector and local public administration; III. Justice and anti-corruption authorities; IV. Central Electoral Commission and political parties; V. Court of Auditors; VI. Ombudsman; VII. The private sector; VIII. Civil society and media. Pillar II of the Strategy, entitled 'Government, public sector and local public administration', contains 14 actions included in the Action Plan, which aim to implement the institutional integrity climate in accordance with Integrity Law No 82/2017 (Article 10).

The Strategy also sets out the procedure for monitoring and evaluating the actions of the Action Plan (annexed to the Strategy), including actions related to institutional integrity policies.

2. Please describe the institutional setup for assessing the effectiveness of the anti-corruption framework. Which institutions are involved in the assessment? Is there a mechanism for interagency cooperation in assessing the effectiveness of the anti-corruption framework? Does your country engage with academia, civil society and the private sector throughout these processes?

According to the monitoring and evaluation mechanism of the National Integrity and Anticorruption Strategy (process directly regulated in Chapter V of the Strategy), the NIAS Monitoring and Evaluation Reports are heard during the meetings of the NIAS Monitoring Groups.

The Monitoring Groups of the Strategy consist of leaders of the implementing institutions of the pillars they monitor. The monitoring activity of the Strategy is organized in 3 groups, as follows:

Monitoring Group 1 – responsible for Pillars I. Parliament and IV. Central Electoral Commission and political parties.

Monitoring Group 2 – responsible for Pillar II. Government, public sector and local public administration and VII. The private sector.

Monitoring Group 3 – responsible for Pillars III. Justice and anti-corruption authorities, V. Court of Accounts and VI. Ombudsman.

During the meetings of the Monitoring Groups, the progress and difficulties in implementing the due actions planned according to the Strategy are publicly heard. During the implementation of the NIAS, 7 meetings of the Monitoring Groups were held.

The National Anti-Corruption Centre (NAC) of the republic of Moldova is a body specialized in preventing and combating corruption, corruption-related acts and acts of corrupt behavior. NAC is the Secretariat of the Monitoring Groups of the NIAS for 2017-2023 and ensures the management of anti-corruption policies by coordinating strategic actions, receiving reports on the implementation of NIAS, monitoring the implementation of NIAS on a biannual and annual basis (with the publication of reports on the monitoring and implementation of NIAS on the website: www.cna.md).

Cooperation with the public entities responsible for implementing the strategic actions shall be carried out through the Monitoring Group Secretariat.

Civil society representatives are also included in each of the 3 Monitoring Groups. The appointment of civil society representatives to the Monitoring Groups is made by the National Council of NGOs and the Anti-Corruption Alliance according to the following criteria set out in the Strategy.

Equally, all civil society initiatives to draw up alternative evaluation reports on the implementation of the Strategy are welcomed and encouraged.

3. If your country uses indicators to assess the effectiveness of its anti-corruption framework, please describe the indicators as well as the data sources used.

Each action set out in the NIAS Action Plan is assessed by means of "progress indicators" which are described for each action. Respectively, the information in the half-yearly reporting is presented by the reporting public entities according to the progress indices. Progress indices represent the measurable unit of achievement or non-achievement of each action in the Plan.

The Secretariat of the Strategy Monitoring Groups prepares a report on the evaluation and monitoring of the NIAS in which these progress indicators are evaluated.

At the same time, one of the chapters of the report is entitled 'QUANTITATIVE PROGRESS IN ACHIEVEMENT OF RESULTS AND RESULT INDICATORS', where the Result Indicators are given. They are presented for the last reporting years (comparative presentation) and are established according to public opinion surveys, as well as national and international indicators.

For more details, we recommend analysing the latest Strategy Evaluation and Monitoring Report (for 2023) which is published on the website of the National Anti-Corruption Centre: [https://cna.md/public/files/Report SNIA anul 2023.pdf](https://cna.md/public/files/Report_SNIA_anul_2023.pdf)

4. Please summarize any findings of the effectiveness assessment. If several exercises have been conducted, have any trends been identified?

During the last strategic evaluation in 2023, under the chapter ensuring institutional public integrity (Pillar II.), the Monitoring Groups Secretariat noted the following data:

1) the rate of publication on the public entities website of gifts registers constitutes in 2023 - 77% (compared to 2022 - 62%);

2) on the subject of requesting integrity records for the employment, the reported value for 2023 is 73% (compared to 2022 - 44%);

3) 68% of the implementing public entities reported keeping the register of risks, including corruption risks, of which only 30% informed about the practice of completing the register in case of integrity incidents. For comparison in 2022 - 66% reported keeping the register of risks, including corruption risks, of which 17% informed about the practice of completing the register in case of integrity incidents;

4) 60.8% of public entities reported the adoption of Training Plans, which contain integrity topics, 8.8% more than in 2022 (52%). And in 2020 - 56% of public entities reported the adoption of Training Plans, which contain integrity topics;

5) 46% of the reporting public entities stated that they publish complete information on the management of the public patrimony, compared to 2022, where they reported about 43% of the entities;

6) Publication of Codes of Ethics and Professional Conduct by public authorities was reported in a proportion of 60% (compared to 2017 - 41%).

7) In 2023, it was a first in terms of the high degree of submission of draft legislative acts to the National Anti-Corruption Centre to undergo anti-corruption expertise. Of the total number of draft laws elaborated (subject to anti-corruption expertise), 97.7% were subject to anti-corruption expertise and only 6 legislative initiatives were not subject to anti-corruption expertise, which represents a rate of 2.3%. The findings highlighted above demonstrate an accountability of the authors of the draft normative acts (both in Parliament and in the Government). We mention that the anti-corruption expertise as one of the tools to prevent corruption contributes essentially to the transparency of the decision-making process in the Republic of Moldova.

5. How does your institution or country use the results of the assessments to inform policy-making? Has your country amended its anti-corruption framework in response to the outcomes of the effectiveness assessments?

I. How does your institution or country use the results of the assessments to inform policy-making?
All the findings of the monitoring and evaluation of the NIAS are summarized in half-yearly/annual reports and are published on the website of the National Anticorruption Center in order to ensure the transparency of the evaluated data.

II. Has your country amended its anti-corruption framework in response to the outcomes of the effectiveness assessments?
An example: One of the actions in the NIAS is Action 14 of Pillar III:

- *Assessment of the normative acts related to the institution of whistleblowers in terms of compliance with European standards, deadline: Third quarter 2022.*

The Law on whistleblowers no.122/2018 was developed in order to adjust the national regulatory framework to the international requirements in the field, to implement the National Integrity and Anti-Corruption Strategy for 2017-2020, but also to implement the commitments assumed by the Republic of Moldova under the RM-EU Association Agreement and the Action Plan for the implementation of the provisions of the Agreement (2017-2019), approved by Government Decision no. 1472/2016.

A year later, on 23 October 2019, the European Union Directive on the protection of persons who report breaches of Union law was adopted, representing the most modern tool for the protection of whistleblowers, being a model both for EU Member States and for all states wishing to improve their national legislation in this field.

In this context, it is important to note that, in 2020, the Regional Anticorruption Initiative carried out an analysis of Law No 122/2018 and its implementation mechanisms, as part of the ‘Break the Silence: Improving Whistleblower Policies and Culture in the Western Balkans and the Republic of Moldova’. The analysis carried out concludes that Law No 122/2018 does not fully correspond to the standards reflected, in particular, in Directive (EU) 2019/1937 on the protection of persons who report breaches of Union law, and therefore needs to be revised.

Moreover, in 2021, as part of the pilot monitoring round of the sub-regional peer review programme ‘Istanbul Anti-Corruption Action Plan’ carried out by the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development’s Anti-Corruption Network for Eastern Europe and Central Asia, the expert evaluators stressed the need to adjust national legislation to the provisions of the 2019 EU Directive.

Taking into account the above, but also the fact that the continuous improvement of the normative framework governing the whistleblowing institute is an imminent necessity in the fight against corruption and other types of violations of the law, the National Anticorruption Center has developed and promoted a new law on whistleblowers.

On 22 June 2023, Parliament adopted a new law on whistleblowers (Law No 165/2023) transposing Directive (EU) 2019/1937 on the protection of persons who report breaches of EU law.

6. Which challenges has your country encountered in assessing the effectiveness of anti-corruption frameworks, and which steps have been taken to overcome them?

I. During the monitoring and evaluation period of the Strategy, a number of challenges were identified that compromised, for various reasons, the smooth running of the evaluation process, as follows:

- One of the challenges relates to the frequency of meetings of the NIAS Monitoring Groups, which due to pandemic restrictions were reduced, and the presentation and media coverage of the NIAS implementation reports was made outside the meetings of the Monitoring Groups.
- Another challenge is the quality of the data submitted by the implementing public authorities. There are cases when the information on the implementation of the actions in the Action Plan of the Strategy is either not complete or the reported data is repeated from semester to semester. Thus, the implementing public authorities must be constantly trained on how to report, due also to the large flow of staff that comes and goes from public functions.
- Another challenge was: if, at the time of the adoption of NIAS, the secretariat of the monitoring group (NAC) had three staff units, then, for a substantial period of time, the secretarial work was carried out only by one person, who had to ensure the achievement of a large workload. Two people are currently working in the Secretariat who are responsible for:
 - preparing the biannual and annual reports of the monitoring groups on the implementation of the actions planned according to the Strategy;
 - preparing draft annual reports on the implementation of the Strategy;
 - organizing the meetings of the Monitoring Groups;

- collecting, storing and summarizing the information presented by the institutions implementing the actions in the Strategy.

II. One of the measures taken to ensure maximum delivery of the actions in the Strategy was the revision, update and extension of the Strategy (2027-2020) until 2023.

7. Which good practices could your country share regarding the measurement the effectiveness of anti-corruption frameworks that could benefit other States?

The impact of the National Integrity and Anticorruption Strategy is dependent on the conscientious implementation of the actions jointly agreed by the public authorities involved in the implementation of the policy document, in strict accordance with the progress indicators to which they have expressed their commitment. Thus, the actions set out in the Action Plan sum up the efforts of public entities in achieving the objectives of the Strategy:

- to discourage involvement in corruption (through the uniform implementation of integrity policies in both the public and private sectors),
- to create a mechanism for the recovery of criminal assets (and it was succeeded by the establishment and functioning of the Criminal Assets Recovery Agency - autonomous subdivision specialized within the National Anticorruption Centre),
- to strengthen ethics and integrity in the public and private sectors,
- to protect whistle-blowers (by adopting a legal framework and establishing a mechanism for reporting incidents of corruption and whistle-blower protection with the involvement of the Office of the Ombudsman and the National Anti-Corruption Centre).

8. Has your country been guided by any international efforts aimed at improving or assessing the effectiveness of anti-corruption frameworks (e.g., peer review mechanisms, methodologies provided by international organizations)? If not, are there any tools or measures by international organizations that you would consider helpful in this regard (e.g., guidance on data collection, provision of tools, stronger focus on effectiveness in peer reviews)?

Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD)

The Istanbul Anti-Corruption Action Plan (IAP) is a sub-regional peer review programme launched in 2003 in the framework of the OECD Anti-Corruption Network for Eastern Europe and Central Asia (OECD/ACN). The Republic of Moldova acceded to IAP in 2020. Thus, it benefits from the full set of tools for monitoring and evaluating policies, legislation, institutions and practices applied, contributing to an exchange of recommendations and best practices in order to develop capacities to prevent and fight corruption. Moldova was evaluated under the 5th round of monitoring that was launched with a pilot in the framework of the EU for Integrity Action for the Eastern Partnership (Pilot Indicators and Pilot Overview and Procedures). The Pilot completed in spring 2022 with monitoring reports for Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, Moldova and Ukraine. Moldova also took part in the review of methodological documents for the Assessment Framework and the Guide which were adopted by the ACN Steering Group in November 2022. Moldova's first baseline report for the 5th round of monitoring was adopted in 2023.

9. Please insert any information you would like to add, such as descriptions of indicators or links to sources or reports.

Publication of the National Integrity and Anti-Corruption Programme (English version):
https://cna.md/public/files/PNIA_2024-2028-engleza.pdf

Publication of NIAS 2017-2023:
https://www.legis.md/cautare/getResults?doc_id=129663&lang=ro

Monitoring and evaluation report on the implementation of NIAS 2017-2023, prepared annually by the National Anti-Corruption Centre (link to the latest Evaluation Report: for the year 2023, the previous reports can be accessed on the web page: www.cna.md):
https://cna.md/public/files/Raport_SNIA_anul_2023.pdf

The report on monitoring and alternative evaluation of the implementation of NIAS 2017-2023, prepared half-yearly by the National Anti-Corruption Centre:
https://cna.md/public/files/RAPORT_EIA_2021_FINAL.pdf

https://cna.md/public/files/RAPORT_evaluare-SNIA_2017-2020.pdf

Alternative monitoring reports of the sectoral anti-corruption plans for 2018–2020 (period under monitoring – year 2020):

- Monitoring report on the Customs Sectoral Anti-Corruption Action Plan for 2018-2020

<https://mediaguard.ngo/asociatia-media-guard-a-elaborat-raportul-de-monitorizare-a-planuluisectorial-de-actiuni-anticoruptie-82n-domeniul-vamal-pentru-anii-2018-2020/#more-1100>

- Alternative Monitoring Report of the Sectoral Anti-Corruption Action Plan in the Field of Environmental Protection

<https://cms.ecocontact.md/uploads/ecocontact/originals/87fbc1f9-b484-43f1-8678-22a5e5b56e53.pdf>

- Alternative Monitoring Report of the Sectoral Anti-Corruption Action Plan in the Field of Education for 2018-2020

<https://parinte.md/wp-content/uploads/2020/03/RAPORT-Final-04.03.-WEB.pdf>

- Monitoring report Sectoral anti-corruption action plan in public procurement for 2018-2020

http://viitorul.org/files/library/Raport%20de%20monitorizare%20Plan%20Anticoruptie%202018-2020_0.pdf

- Alternative monitoring report of the sectoral anti-corruption action plan in the field of public order

<https://www.promarshall.md/?go=news&n=157>

Part 2 - National experiences with corruption measurement

A. Existing national or sub-national mechanisms to measure corruption and/or the effectiveness of anti-corruption frameworks

1. Does your country have any mechanisms in place to quantify or measure corruption? Please briefly summarize the methodology and scope (e.g. national, regional, sectoral) and frequency of the measurement process.

The National Anti-Corruption Centre does not organise or conduct public opinion surveys, but the annual reports on monitoring and evaluation of the Strategy contain the reflection of

the Strategy's impact indicators according to alternative data sources (other surveys conducted by non-governmental organisations, national and international organisations). Thus, one of the chapters of the Strategy's monitoring and evaluation report is entitled 'QUANTITATIVE PROGRESS IN ACHIEVEMENT OF RESULTS AND RESULT INDICATORS', in which the *Result Indicators* are given. They are presented for the last reporting years (comparative presentation) and are established according to public opinion surveys, as well as national and international indicators.

For more details, we recommend analysing the latest Strategy Evaluation and Monitoring Report (for 2023) which is published on the website of the National Anti-Corruption Centre: https://cna.md/public/files/Raport_SNIA_anul_2023.pdf

The record of crimes, criminal cases and persons who have committed crimes is regulated by Law No. 216/2003 on the Integrated Automated Information System for the record of offenses, criminal cases and persons who have committed offenses. Thus, the National Bureau of Statistics presents, on the official website, statistical data and statistical data banks with reference to registered crimes, including on some articles of the Criminal Code.

https://statistica.gov.md/ro/nivelul-infractionalitatiei-in-republica-moldova-in-anul-2023-9478_60977.html

https://statbank.statistica.md/PxWeb/pxweb/ro/30%20Statistica%20sociala/30%20Statistica%20sociala_12%20JUS_JUS010/?rxid=2345d98a-890b-4459-bb1f-9b565f99b3b9

In accordance with Law No. 1104/2002 on the National Anti-Corruption Centre, the respective institution performs the operational and strategic analysis of acts of corruption, acts related to acts of corruption and corruptible deeds. Thus, the NAC performs annually the strategic analysis on judicial practice in corruption and corruption-related cases and the strategic analysis on the profile of the offender on corruption cases, based on a set of indicators on the decisions adopted by the courts, namely the sanctions applied in corruption cases, the categories of subjects who committed acts of corruption, the duration of the trial of corruption cases, etc. The analysis reports are public on the official web page of the NAC (<https://cna.md/lib.php?l=ro&idc=217&t=/Studii-si-analize/Analyze-strategie-sectoriale&>).

Subsidiary, civil society conducts various surveys to measure corruption at national and sectoral level, including: Annual Public Opinion Barometer by the Institute for Public Policy, Corruption Perceptions Index by Transparency International, Rule of Law Index by the World Justice Project (WJP), World Bank Governance Indicators, etc.

2. Please summarize any findings of the measurement exercises. If several exercises have been conducted, have any trends been identified?

The National Integrity and Anti-corruption Programme for 2024-2028 (NIAP), approved by Parliament Decision No 442/2023, contains the analytical summary of the corruption phenomenon. According to it, in January 2023, Transparency International launched the CPI for 2022, with the Republic of Moldova scoring 39 points, which places it 91st out of 180 countries included in the ranking (for comparison – in 2021, the CPI score was 36 points, with Moldova ranking 105th out of 180 countries). At the same time, the statistical data on the CPI ranking for 2016-2022 reflect the positive approach and evolution for the Republic of Moldova in terms of perception of corruption, which demonstrates that the efforts made by national public entities in the field of preventing and combating corruption have a positive impact and need to be continued.

According to the above-mentioned NIAP, in 2021, the Republic of Moldova had a public integrity index score of 6.28/10, with a global score of 60/114 and an overall score of 8/12 at regional level. The assessment shows that corruption is considered a serious problem in the Republic of Moldova by the majority of the population and economic agents (about 3/4 of the respondents). The severity of the phenomenon is assessed by 1.9 points by the population and business representatives (on the 10-point scale, where 1 – corruption in Moldova is a very serious problem, 10 – corruption in Moldova is not a problem at all). Women are more likely to see corruption as a serious problem (78%, compared with 73% for men). At the same time, the integrated indicator on corruption intolerance is on the rise – from 53% in 2017 to 57% in 2021. This increase, however, is due to economic agents, which in 2017 had a level of intolerance of 61%, and in 2021 - 72%, this level falling among the population - from 45% to 42%.

The NIAP also notes that, according to the Public Opinion Barometer conducted by the Institute for Public Policy, corruption continues to cause concern among citizens. The share of citizens of concern was 6.4% in 2023, which decreased by around 2.2% compared to 2019.

Similarly, the NIAP mentions that the results of the strategic analysis on judicial practice in corruption and corruption-related cases, prepared by the National Anticorruption Center, show that, in 2022, the courts of first instance in the Republic of Moldova pronounced 209 sentences in respect of 256 persons, who committed a total of 426 acts (cases). In 274 cases (64%), the courts adopted sentencing solutions, in 56 cases (13%) – acquittal solutions, and in 96 cases (23%) the courts ordered the termination of the criminal trial. The strategic analysis showed that the highest conviction rate (79%) is for serious corruption offences, followed by conviction rates for less serious offences (73%) and light offences (12%) respectively. On the other hand, serious, less serious and minor crimes committed in 2022 recorded an absolute conviction rate (100%), while an absolute conviction rate and acquittal rate was recorded for minor crimes committed in 2005–2019 and tried in 2022. Among the factors that favour corruption are the high level of social acceptability of corrupt behaviour, as well as the low awareness of public agents about ethics and integrity.

3. Which institutions are involved in the measurement efforts (*e.g. Ministry/ies, Anti-Corruption Agency, Civil Service Commission, Ethics Commission, National Statistical Office, Supreme Audit Institution, procurement authority, tax authority, law enforcement authority*)? Is there a mechanism for interagency cooperation in measuring corruption?

Law No. 216/2003 provides the list of participants in the Automated Integrated Information System for recording offenses, criminal cases and persons who committed offenses, namely: specialised subdivisions exercising special investigative activity, authorities/bodies conducting and/or exercising criminal prosecution, courts and bodies executing criminal penalties.

Along with other competent authorities, the NAC, through specialized subdivisions for combating and prosecuting, provides data on the crimes investigated in the mentioned information system.

4. Does your country engage with academia, civil society and the private sector in measuring corruption?

The monitoring and evaluation reports of the (annual) Strategy also reflect the level of perception of corruption according to alternative surveys conducted by non-governmental organisations, national and international organisations.

5. Which challenges has your country encountered in measuring corruption and which steps have been taken to overcome them? *E.g. Lack of resources, lack of methodological guidance, lack of technical capacity, lack of credibility of data, lack of legislation and procedures in place, multiplicity of data collection approaches, multiplicity of data sources and formats*

6. Which good practices could your country share regarding the measurement of corruption that could benefit other States?

B. Specific areas of corruption, indicators and sources

1. Which types of corruption does your country measure and which specific indicators does your country use to assess the level of corruption?

Please tick or describe the indicators your country uses to measure corruption.

	Direct measures (e.g. prevalence of corruption collected through surveys)	Perception (among general population or selected groups collected through surveys)	Risk constraints (factors that deter corruption, e.g. use of e-governance)	Risks Opportunities (Factors that enable corruption; e.g. little oversight)	Legislative response (<i>de jure</i> ; e.g. law in place)	(Criminal) Justice response (<i>de facto</i> ; e.g. arrests, convictions for corruption offences)
Bribery	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Click or tap here to enter text.	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Click or tap here to enter text.	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Click or tap here to enter text.	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Click or tap here to enter text.	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Click or tap here to enter text.	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Click or tap here to enter text.
Embezzlement/misappropriation	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Click or tap here to enter text.	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Click or tap here to enter text.	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Click or tap here to enter text.	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Click or tap here to enter text.	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Click or tap here to enter text.	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Click or tap here to enter text.
Money-laundering	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Click or tap here to enter text.	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Click or tap here to enter text.	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Click or tap here to enter text.	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Click or tap here to enter text.	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Click or tap here to enter text.	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Click or tap here to enter text.
Illicit enrichment	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Click or tap here to enter text.	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Click or tap here to enter text.	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Click or tap here to enter text.	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Click or tap here to enter text.	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Click or tap here to enter text.	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Click or tap here to enter text.
Abuse of functions	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Click or tap here to enter text.	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Click or tap here to enter text.	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Click or tap here to enter text.	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Click or tap here to enter text.	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Click or tap here to enter text.	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Click or tap here to enter text.
Public hiring based on merit	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Click or tap here to enter text.	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Click or tap here to enter text.	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Click or tap here to enter text.	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Click or tap here to enter text.	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Click or tap here to enter text.	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Click or tap here to enter text.

	Direct measures (e.g. prevalence of corruption collected through surveys)	Perception (among general population or selected groups collected through surveys)	Risk constraints (factors that deter corruption, e.g. use of e-governance)	Risks Opportunities (Factors that enable corruption; e.g. little oversight)	Legislative response (<i>de jure</i> ; e.g. law in place)	(Criminal) Justice response (<i>de facto</i> ; e.g. arrests, convictions for corruption offences)
Independence and integrity of the judiciary	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Click or tap here to enter text.	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Click or tap here to enter text.	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Click or tap here to enter text.	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Click or tap here to enter text.	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Click or tap here to enter text.	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Click or tap here to enter text.
Conflict of interest	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Click or tap here to enter text.	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Click or tap here to enter text.	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Click or tap here to enter text.	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Click or tap here to enter text.	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Click or tap here to enter text.	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Click or tap here to enter text.
Management of Public finances	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Click or tap here to enter text.	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Click or tap here to enter text.	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Click or tap here to enter text.	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Click or tap here to enter text.	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Click or tap here to enter text.	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Click or tap here to enter text.
Public procurement	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Click or tap here to enter text.	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Click or tap here to enter text.	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Click or tap here to enter text.	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Click or tap here to enter text.	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Click or tap here to enter text.	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Click or tap here to enter text.
Candidature for and election to public office	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Click or tap here to enter text.	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Click or tap here to enter text.	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Click or tap here to enter text.	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Click or tap here to enter text.	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Click or tap here to enter text.	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Click or tap here to enter text.
Preventive measures for the private sector	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Click or tap here to enter text.	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Click or tap here to enter text.	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Click or tap here to enter text.	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Click or tap here to enter text.	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Click or tap here to enter text.	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Click or tap here to enter text.
Preventive measures for state-owned enterprises	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Click or tap here to enter text.	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Click or tap here to enter text.	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Click or tap here to enter text.	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Click or tap here to enter text.	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Click or tap here to enter text.	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Click or tap here to enter text.
Training programmes	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Click or tap here to enter text.	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Click or tap here to enter text.	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Click or tap here to enter text.	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Click or tap here to enter text.	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Click or tap here to enter text.	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Click or tap here to enter text.

	Direct measures (e.g. prevalence of corruption collected through surveys)	Perception (among general population or selected groups collected through surveys)	Risk constraints (factors that deter corruption, e.g. use of e-governance)	Risks Opportunities (Factors that enable corruption; e.g. little oversight)	Legislative response (<i>de jure</i> ; e.g. law in place)	(Criminal) Justice response (<i>de facto</i> ; e.g. arrests, convictions for corruption offences)
Resources allocated to fight corruption	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Click or tap here to enter text.	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Click or tap here to enter text.	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Click or tap here to enter text.	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Click or tap here to enter text.	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Click or tap here to enter text.	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Click or tap here to enter text.
Public reporting and access to information	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Click or tap here to enter text.	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Click or tap here to enter text.	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Click or tap here to enter text.	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Click or tap here to enter text.	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Click or tap here to enter text.	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Click or tap here to enter text.
Protection of reporting persons	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Click or tap here to enter text.	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Click or tap here to enter text.	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Click or tap here to enter text.	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Click or tap here to enter text.	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Click or tap here to enter text.	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Click or tap here to enter text.
Other: Click or tap here to enter text.	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Click or tap here to enter text.	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Click or tap here to enter text.	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Click or tap here to enter text.	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Click or tap here to enter text.	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Click or tap here to enter text.	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Click or tap here to enter text.
Other: Click or tap here to enter text.	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Click or tap here to enter text.	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Click or tap here to enter text.	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Click or tap here to enter text.	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Click or tap here to enter text.	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Click or tap here to enter text.	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Click or tap here to enter text.
Other: Click or tap here to enter text.	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Click or tap here to enter text.	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Click or tap here to enter text.	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Click or tap here to enter text.	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Click or tap here to enter text.	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Click or tap here to enter text.	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Click or tap here to enter text.
Other: Click or tap here to enter text.	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Click or tap here to enter text.	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Click or tap here to enter text.	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Click or tap here to enter text.	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Click or tap here to enter text.	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Click or tap here to enter text.	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Click or tap here to enter text.
Other: Click or tap here to enter text.	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Click or tap here to enter text.	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Click or tap here to enter text.	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Click or tap here to enter text.	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Click or tap here to enter text.	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Click or tap here to enter text.	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Click or tap here to enter text.

Please insert any information you would like to add, such as descriptions of indicators or links to sources or reports.

According to the provisions of Chapter V of the National Integrity and Anticorruption Strategy for 2017-2020, one of the key elements of the Strategy's monitoring process is the evaluation of the impact of the actions targeted in the Strategy's Action Plans. The evolution of the impact indicators of the Strategy for the years 2017-2020 was measured by a survey carried out regularly until 2021 (2017, 2019, 2021), in which 3 target groups participated in questionnaires: general population, economic agents and public agents. The findings of each survey are reflected in the monitoring and evaluation reports on the implementation of the National Integrity and Anti-Corruption Strategy (final part of the Annual Reports on Monitoring and Evaluation of the Strategy: REFLECTION OF THE IMPACT INDICATORS OF THE STRATEGY IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE IMPACT ASSESSMENT STUDY OF THE NATIONAL INTEGRITY AND ANTICORRUPTION STRATEGY).

At the same time, the survey methodology was kept unchanged throughout the survey period, in order to accurately track the evolution of these indicators.

Thus, with the support of UNDP Moldova in the framework of the Projects "Strengthening the corruption prevention and analysis functions of the National Anticorruption Centre" and "Curbing corruption by building sustainable integrity in the Republic of Moldova", funded by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Norway, these three National Integrity and Anti-Corruption Strategy Impact Tracking Surveys were conducted.

At the same time, the Annual Monitoring and Evaluation Reports of the National Integrity and Anti-Corruption Strategy for 2017-2023, prepared by the National Anti-Corruption Centre, reflect the impact indicators for the Integrity Pillars of the Strategy, according to alternative sources, namely: according to relevant international indicators Transparency International (Corruption Perceptions Index), World Bank (Rule of Law Index and Corruption Control Index), Heritage Foundation (Global Index of Economic Freedom and Government Integrity), World Justice Project (Rule of Law Index and Lack of Corruption in Legislation), Freedom House, World Justice Project (Rule of Law Index), etc.

2. Which methods and data sources does your country use to measure corruption?

- Population surveys
- Business surveys
- Public official surveys
- Administrative records
- Procurement data
- Banking data
- Criminal justice records
- Other: *Evidence of criminal information in a single IT system common to all criminal prosecution bodies*

Also, a methodology or a regulated instrument for systemic or national evaluation of the dynamics of the corruption phenomenon over time is not implemented at national level. At the same time, the evaluation of the anti-corruption policy analyzes the indicators set out in the Strategy's Action Plan, the information being collected from the reports on the implementation of the Strategy's actions submitted by the institutions responsible for the implementation of the actions given according to the Strategy's Action Plan.

Alternative sources (surveys and studies conducted by non-governmental organisations, national and international organisations) are another source of data used in assessing the impact indicators of the Strategy.

C. Data collection and use

1. How does your country ensure the validity and integrity of the data collected on corruption?

The National Anti-Corruption Centre does not organise or conduct public opinion polls or surveys, but the annual reports on monitoring and evaluation of the Strategy contain the reflection of the Strategy's impact indicators according to alternative data sources (other surveys conducted by non-governmental organisations, national and international organisations).
The record of criminal information is carried out in a unique information system, which operates on the basis of the Law of the Republic of Moldova no.216/2003.

2. Are policies or mechanisms in place to

- Discuss and agree on data objectives, priorities and scope between relevant stakeholders
- Collect data to measure corruption systematically
- Collect data disaggregated by
 - sex
 - age
- Validate the accuracy and impartiality of the data collected to measure corruption
- Facilitate data sharing across institutions
- Integrate data from different sources
- Ensure easy access to data
- Release information on the measurement of corruption on regular basis (monthly, yearly)

3. Which technological tools or systems are employed by your country in the collection and analysis of relevant data?

The National Anti-Corruption Centre does not organise or conduct public opinion polls or surveys, but the annual reports on monitoring and evaluation of the Strategy contain the reflection of the Strategy's impact indicators according to alternative data sources (other surveys conducted by non-governmental organisations, national and international organisations).

4. How does your country utilize the data on corruption to inform policy-making and anti-corruption strategies?

The data reflected in surveys conducted by non-governmental organisations, national and international organisations, make an essential contribution to determining the problem areas that require a strategic approach. Thus, the data of alternative surveys on corruption prevention and combating issues were reflected in the National Integrity and Anti-Corruption Programme 2024-2028 (in Chapter II - Situation Analysis).

Link: https://cna.md/public/files/PNIA_2024-2028-engeza.pdf

5. Has your country participated in any international efforts or collaborations aimed at improving the measurement of corruption? If not, which efforts would you find helpful to inform your national measurement work?

In 2021, the NAC participated in in-depth interviews conducted within the Sectoral Evaluation of Crime and Justice Statistics from the Perspective of Alignment with European Standards and the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC), conducted by the National Bureau of Statistics of the Republic of Moldova in collaboration with the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) in the framework of the Project “Strengthening Efficiency and Access to Justice in Moldova” (A2J). Subsequently, throughout 2022, the NAC participated in the workshops on the validation of the findings of the above-mentioned evaluations.

In 2023, the NAC examined the Statistical Framework for the Measurement of Corruption and its methodology, developed by the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC).

Also, in 2023, the NAC examined the draft modalities and terms of reference of the Open-ended Intergovernmental Consultative Working Group on the Measurement of Corruption, developed under the aegis of the IACA Secretariat at the open-ended intergovernmental meeting of experts on 04.04.2023.

In 2024, a representative of the National Anti-Corruption Centre participates as an external expert in the monitoring process of Tajikistan in the 5th Monitoring Round of the Sub-regional Peer Review Programme "Istanbul Anti-Corruption Action Plan" in Central Asian countries of the Anti-Corruption Network for Eastern Europe and Central Asia of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (ACN/OECD).

6. If your country does not currently measure corruption, can you indicate why? Would any international efforts, e.g., those by international organizations, be helpful to inform national efforts in this regard? Which tools, support or other measures would you consider helpful?

We consider that conducting regular surveys on the corruption segment (on various sectors) would be appropriate when establishing a balance between the impact and progress indicators established in the National Integrity and Anti-Corruption Programme 2024-2028. These surveys should be conducted by independent subjects (reliable and transparent survey companies), but not by the National Anti-Corruption Centre as the public entity responsible for monitoring anti-corruption policies.

