CONCLUSIONS
of the evaluation of the level of transparency
of the second level local public administration authorities in Moldova in 2016

Summary

Criteria for transparency and scoring

Local public authorities of the second level were assessed include the powers and duties of local administrations according to the law (*e.g. participation in decision making*), as well as areas deemed important for good governance (*e.g. ethics, conflict of interest).* Among the selected areas, access to information, participation in decision-making, public procurement and budget were considered most important. The results provided are based on publicly available data, measurable and verifiable. The highest score to the administration of a municipality, including all areas is 100 points.

	Criteria of transparency	Score in %
I	Access to information	16
II	Participation in the decision-making process	32
III	Public procurement	12
IV	Managing public property	7
V	Budgeting	12
VI	Human resources	5
VII	Professional ethics and conflict of interest	6
VIII	Social services	4
IX	Investments, municipal companies and participation in companies	6

Ranking classes

The overall ranking of a local government of level I range from 0% (worst) to 100% (best). For a faster comparison administrations were classified according to the following scale:

Class	%
A+	80 - 100
A	75 - 79
A-	70 - 74
B+	65 - 69
B	60 - 64

B-	55 - 59
C+	50 - 54
C	45 - 49
C-	40 - 44
D+	35 - 39
D	30 - 34
D-	25 - 29
E+	20 - 24
E	15 - 19
E-	10 - 14
F	0 - 9

Ranking of the most transparent rayons in Moldova

Nr.	RAYON	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII	IX	TOTAL	CLASS
1	Straseni	15.0	22.0	2.3	3.5	11.0	3.5	0.0	1.0	1.0	**59.3**	B-
2	Falesti	12.5	14.5	6.0	2.0	8.5	2.5	1.0	1.5	1.0	**49.5**	C
3	Soroca	13.5	16.0	2.5	2.0	9.5	3.5	0.0	0.5	1.0	**48.5**	C
4	Stefan Voda	15.0	14.2	3.2	1.0	9.0	1.5	1.5	1.0	1.0	**47.4**	C
5	Singerei	15.0	8.5	3.5	2.0	9.5	3.5	2.0	1.5	1.0	**46.5**	C
6	Glodeni	13.0	10.0	0.8	3.5	8.5	2.5	1.5	1.5	1.0	**42.3**	C-
7	Criuleni	13.5	13.5	2.5	0.0	8.5	1.5	0.0	1.0	1.5	**42.0**	C-
8	Cimislia	12.5	10.0	0.0	3.5	9.5	3.0	1.5	0.5	1.0	**41.5**	C-
9	Ungheni	14.5	8.0	6.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.5	3.5	1,0	**41,5**	C-
10	Calarasi	10.5	12.9	3.3	1.5	6.5	3.5	1.0	1.0	0.0	**40.2**	C-
11	Edinet	13.5	14.0	2.0	0.0	5.0	1.5	0.0	3.0	0.0	**39.0**	D+
12	Leova	13.5	11.8	1.0	2.0	6.0	1.5	1.5	0.5	1.0	**38.8**	D+
13	Riscani	9.0	13.6	1.0	3.5	7.5	1.0	1.0	1.0	0.0	**37.6**	D+
14	Basarabeasca	12.8	10.0	1.5	2.0	5.5	2.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	**34.8**	D+
15	Causeni	11.5	6.0	2.3	2.0	6.5	2.0	1.0	2.5	1.0	**34.8**	D+
16	Cahul	11.1	10.5	2.5	3.5	3.5	1.5	0.0	2.0	0.0	**34.6**	D+
17	Cantemir	12.0	9.6	3.5	3.5	4.5	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	**34.1**	D
18	Orhei	8.5	10.5	7.5	2.0	2.5	0.5	2.0	0.0	0.0	**33.5**	D
19	Donduseni	12.4	7.3	1.2	2.9	5.5	1.0	0.0	1.0	2.0	**33.3**	D
20	Dubasari	14.5	6.0	3.5	0.0	6.5	0.0	1.0	1.5	0.0	**33.0**	D
21	Nisporeni	11.5	10.0	0.0	3.0	4.0	3.5	0.0	1.0	0.0	**33.0**	D

22	Ocnita	10.5	10.0	2.5	0.0	5.0	1.5	1.5	1.0	0.0	**32.0**	**D**
23	Rezina	8.0	4.0	4.0	2.0	8.5	2.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	**29.5**	**D-**
24	Telenesti	8.5	7.0	0.0	0.0	4.0	2.0	2.0	0.0	0.0	**23.5**	**E+**
25	Anenii Noi	6.9	7.9	2.5	1.5	1.5	0.0	1.0	1.0	0.0	**22.3**	**E+**
26	Hincesti	9.0	4.0	0.0	0.0	6.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.0	**21.5**	**E+**
27	Soldanesti	9.0	5.0	2.0	0.0	1.5	0.5	1.0	0.0	1.5	**20.5**	**E+**
28	Ialoveni	8.5	2.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	2.0	2.0	0.0	0.0	**16.5**	**E**
29	Drochia	8.0	0.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	0.5	0.0	0.0	1.0	**11.5**	**E-**
30	Floresti	7,5	0.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	**11.5**	**E-**
31	Taraclia	2.0	0.0	0.0	2.0	2.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	**6.0**	**F**
32	Briceni	2.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	**2,5**	**F**

Top three transparent Local Public Administrations of second level (LPAs II)

	RAYON	POINTS
I	Straseni	**59.3**
II	Falesti	**49.5**
III	Soroca	**48.5**

I. Results of assessing the transparency criteria

Access to information

- 59.4% of rayon authorities have sections dedicated to decisional transparency on their web page, 28.1% do not have such web sections, and 12.5% of webpages containing such compartments were not filled in and did not contain all the information required by legislation.
- About 31.2% of the local public administration authorities' web pages contain information on the contact details and the work schedule of the president, vice-presidents, rayon councilors, subdivisions of the rayon council and secretary of the rayon council, indicating the president's days and hours of audience , vice-presidents of the rayon and the secretary of the council.
- Only nine rayon administrations (28.1%) announce the citizens about the public sessions.
- In 2016, 10 rayon councils (31.2%) have not made public the draft decisions / provisions and materials related to the meeting of the public authority
- The best examples of access to information are the local public authorities from the following rayons: Straseni, Stefan Voda and Singerei, who have accumulated on this criterion 15 points out of 16 possible.

Participation in the decision-making process

- 28 rayons (87.5) did not hold public consultations in 2016 for draft decisions / provisions and only Straseni organized only public consultations for all draft decisions, with the announcement of the public consultation on the web page.
- Only 8 rayon councils (25%) placed the Transparency Report for the year 2016 on the web: Cahul, Cimislia, Edinet, Falesti, Riscani, Stefan Voda, Straseni and Telenesti.
- 24 authorities ensure the opportunity for citizens to participate in all meetings of the rayon council. For the citizens of ten districts, it is difficult to attend all the meetings of the specialized commissions of the rayon council.
- No rayon public administration has information on the creation of institutionalized mechanisms of cooperation and partnership between public authorities and the civil society.
- The best example of participation in the decision-making process is represented by the local public authorities of Straseni rayon, which has accumulated to this criterion 22 points out of 32 possible; Soroca rayon – 16 points and Falesti, with 14.5% points.

Public procurement

- Three rayon administrations (Falesti, Ungheni and Orhei) made public announcements through the web pages of the intention plans (public procurement plans)
- Only two rayon administrations (Ungheni and Falesti) published on the web the 2016 public procurements results.
- Only on the web pages of the Orhei and Rezina rayons, we find public procurement monitoring reports.
- The best examples are: the Orhei rayon – with 7,5 points, Ungheni and Falesti rayons with six points each, out of 12 possible maximum.

Managing public property

- No rayon public administration do not publish on the web site the announcements regarding the tender for selling / leasing / renting the property of the administrative-territorial unit.
- The local public authorities in 7s% of rayons fail to inform on the web site about the results of tenders / competitions / direct negotiations for the sale / lease of the property of the administrative-territorial unit.
- The best examples of transparency in the management of public property are the local public authorities from the following rayons: Straseni, Riscani, Glodeni, Cimislia, Cantemir and Cahul, with 3.5 points out of seven possible maximums.

Budgeting

- Three rayon administrations (9.4%): Straseni, Stefan Voda and Causeni used the web page to organize public consultations and announce the public about the draft budget for 2017
- About 71.9% of local governments (23) have published the current administrative-territorial unit budget for 2016 on the web.
- 20 of the rayon administrations (65.5%) published on the web reports on the execution of the annual budget for 2016
- The best examples of transparency in the drafting and execution of the budget are the local public authorities of Balti, Cahul, Cimislia, Chisinau, Soroca and Zaim, who have each 10 points out of 12 possible maximums.

Human resources

- 14 rayon public authorities (43.7%) did make public vacancies in the public service 2016.
- Only the administration of the Singerei rayon communicated on the web page the results of the minutes of the selection board of candidates for the vacant job, including the evaluation of the commission and the ranking of the applicants.
- The best examples of transparency in the selection and employment of cadres in public service are the rayon authorities from Straseni, Calarasi, Nisporeni and Soroca, with 3.5 points out of five maximum possible.

Professional ethics and conflict of interest

- 17 rayon councils (53.1%) made public on the website the CV of the rayon's president, that includes information on higher education, work experience, previous membership to companies and non-profit organizations.
- Only the Orhei Rayon Council published on the web a Code of Ethics for civil servants in the district administration.
- Incomes and property statements of the president, vice-presidents and civil servants were not published on a web page of the rayon councils.
- The best example is the rayon administration of Ungheni, which has gathered 2.5 out of six possible points in terms of publishing information on professional ethics and conflict of interest. This is followed by administrations of Telenesti, Singerei, Orhei and Ialoveni rayons, with two points.

Social services

- Only two rayon councils – Ungheni and Edinet informed the public of the social assistance programs, information on the social services provided by the administrative-territorial unit and the way of an application for a potential beneficiary.
- Unfortunately, 12 rayon public authorities (37.5%) did not report any information regarding the existing social services.

- The Ungheni Rayon Council has accumulated 3.5 points out of four possible and represents the best example of transparency and accessibility for the population in the information on social services existing in the administrative-territorial unit. Ungheni is followed by the Edinet Rayon Council – with three points and Causeni Rayon Council, with 2.5 points out of four.

Investments, municipal companies and participation in companies

- Only 11 rayon authorities (34.4%) published the data on the web regards to programs and projects, including technical assistance, whose beneficiaries are public authorities (name, basic goals and objectives, beneficiaries and executors, main program deadlines and the expected results, the volume and funding sources).
- On the web pages of the local public authorities, there is no list of municipal enterprises and companies with majority ownership held by the administrative-territorial unit.
- On the web pages of the local public authorities, there is no CV of the managers of the municipal enterprises and the majority companies owned by the administrative-territorial unit.
- In terms of transparency of investments, municipal enterprises and participation in commercial companies the best examples are the Hancesti Rayon Council and the Donduseni Rayon Council, with two points out of six possible.

…

More detailed information on the criteria of transparency and indicators can be found on the website: www.localtransparency.viitorul.org.

Conclusions of the evaluation of the level of transparency of the second level local public administration authorities in Moldova in 2016 were prepared within the initiative "Transparent, financially healthy and competitive local governments in Moldova". The initiative is implemented by the Institute for Economic and Social Reforms in Slovakia (INEKO), in partnership with IDIS "Viitorul" with the financial support of the Official Development Assistance of the Slovak Republic (SlovakAid) and the USA Embassy in Moldova. It aims to increase the transparency, financial accountability, and competitiveness of local authorities in Moldova.