

MINISTRY OF ENVIRONMENT

STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT PLAN

Moldova Green Shield: Enhancing Resilience through Ecosystem-based Adaptation

REPUBLIC OF MOLDOVA

ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

Acronym	Meaning
AIPA	Agenția de Intervenție și Plăți pentru Agricultură
ANR	Assisted Natural Regeneration
ATUG	Autonomous Territorial Unit of Gagauzia
EbA	Ecosystem-based Adaptation
EPI	Environmental Protection Inspectorate
ESCP	Environmental and Social Commitment Plan
ESF	Environmental and Social Framework (World Bank)
ESMF	Environmental and Social Management Framework
ESRS	Environmental and Social Review Summary (No. ESRSC05644, 8 May 2026)
ESS10	Environmental and Social Standard 10 — Stakeholder Engagement
GBV	Gender-Based Violence
GIES	General Inspectorate for Emergency Situations
GCF	Green Climate Fund
GRM	Grievance Redress Mechanism (community-level)
LAG	Local Action Group
LMP	Labour Management Procedures
LPA	Local Public Authority
MAFI	Ministry of Agriculture and Food Industry
MoE	Ministry of Environment
NCCAP	National Climate Change Adaptation Programme
NDC	Nationally Determined Contribution
NFERP	National Forest Extension and Rehabilitation Programme
NOIEP	National Office for Environmental Projects Implementation
OHS	Occupational Health and Safety
PDO	Project Development Objective
PES	Payments for Ecosystem Services
PI NA Apele Moldovei	Public Institution National Administration Apele Moldovei
PIU	Project Implementation Unit
PSC	Project Steering Committee
RFRMC	Southern Regional Forest Reproductive Material Centre
SDR	Southern Development Region
SEA/SH	Sexual Exploitation and Abuse / Sexual Harassment
SEP	Stakeholder Engagement Plan
W-GRM	Worker Grievance Redress Mechanism
WB	World Bank

1. INTRODUCTION	5
1.1 Purpose and Scope	5
1.2 Project Description	5
1.3 Project Location	6
1.4 Environmental and Social Risk Classification.....	6
1.5 Relationship to Other Safeguard Instruments.....	6
2. REGULATORY AND POLICY FRAMEWORK.....	7
2.1 World Bank ESS10 Requirements	7
2.2 National Legal Framework	7
3. STAKEHOLDER IDENTIFICATION AND ANALYSIS	8
3.1 Methodology	8
3.2 Affected Parties	8
3.3 Other Interested Parties	9
3.4 Disadvantaged and Vulnerable Groups	10
4. STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT DURING PROJECT PREPARATION (2022–2026)	12
4.1 Consultation Events	12
4.2 How Stakeholder Feedback Shaped Project Design.....	14
5. STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT PROGRAM FOR PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION	15
5.1 Engagement Methods	15
5.2 Stakeholder Engagement Action Plan	16
5.3 Reporting Back to Stakeholders	17
6. GRIEVANCE REDRESS MECHANISM (GRM).....	19
6.1 Objectives and Scope	19
6.2 Guiding Principles	19
6.3 GRM Structure: Three Levels.....	19
6.4 GRM Process Steps.....	20
6.5 SEA/SH Complaints	20
7. RESOURCES AND RESPONSIBILITIES	21
7.1 Institutional Responsibilities	21
7.2 SEP Budget.....	22
8. MONITORING AND REPORTING	23
8.1 Key Performance Indicators.....	23
8.2 Reporting Schedule.....	23
9. DISCLOSURE OF PROJECT INFORMATION	24
9.1 Disclosure Prior to Appraisal.....	24
9.2 Disclosure During Implementation.....	24
ANNEX 1 — GRM REGISTRATION FORMS.....	25
Annex 1a. Grievance Registration Form (for Complainant).....	25
Annex 1b. Grievance Record Form (for PIU Staff)	26
ANNEX 2 – Public consultations at appraisal stage	27
ANNEX 3 — KEY STAKEHOLDERS ENGAGED DURING PREPARATION	34

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Purpose and Scope

This Stakeholder Engagement Plan (SEP) has been prepared for the Moldova Green Shield: Enhancing Resilience through Ecosystem-based Adaptation project (P516908). It describes the stakeholder engagement approach applied during project preparation and establishes the framework for continuous, meaningful, and inclusive engagement throughout all phases of project implementation.

The SEP has been prepared in accordance with World Bank Environmental and Social Standard 10 (ESS10) on Stakeholder Engagement and Information Disclosure. It is one of four safeguard instruments required by Appraisal alongside the ESMF, LMP, and ESCP.

Main objectives:

- Identify all stakeholders affected by or interested in the project, including vulnerable groups at risk of exclusion;
- Establish a transparent and inclusive engagement process giving stakeholders a genuine opportunity to participate and influence project design and implementation;
- Define information disclosure requirements and mechanisms to ensure timely and accessible information sharing;
- Establish a project-level Grievance Redress Mechanism (GRM);
- Define roles, responsibilities, and resources for SEP implementation and monitoring;
- Ensure alignment with Law No. 239/2008 on Transparency in Decision-Making and Law No. 148/2023 on Access to Information.

1.2 Project Description

The project is co-financed by the Green Climate Fund (GCF) grant of US\$39.28 million and the IBRD with a loan of US\$10.00 million (total: US\$49.28 million). It is executed by the Ministry of Environment through NOIEP as the PIU. Under Component 2, the project will support ecological restoration across approximately 13,000 ha, comprising afforestation and ecological restoration, forest rehabilitation, riparian restoration, shelterbelt restoration (500 ha), and silvopastoral systems. Site selection and restoration planning will be undertaken through the stakeholder engagement processes set out in this SEP with a grant of US\$39.28 million

Project Development Objective (PDO): To improve the climate resilience of targeted landscapes in southern Moldova and strengthen institutional capacity for climate-informed planning.

Component	US\$M	Main Activities
Component 1: Institutional Capacity Development and Data-Driven Planning	2.89	Institutional strengthening; inter-agency coordination; NOIEP capacity development; climate-resilient landscape knowledge platform; integrated data systems and hydrological/ecosystem modelling for the Lower Prut; digitalization and modernization of the national early warning system (droughts, heatwaves, extreme weather).
Component 2: Climate-Resilient Ecological Infrastructure Restoration in Production Landscapes	38.47	Afforestation; reforestation; ANR; forest rehabilitation; shelterbelts; riparian buffer restoration; wetland/floodplain rehabilitation small-reservoir rehabilitation (desiltation/shoreline); silvopastoral systems; RFRMC construction.
Component 3: Community Engagement, Climate-Resilient Livelihoods and Local Stewardship Systems	5.45	Participatory planning; green job creation; Component 3 livelihood support (direct procurement/transfer of tools and assets); community stewardship agreements; PES pilots.
Component 4: Project Management, Monitoring and Evaluation	2.47	PIU operations; fiduciary management; E&S compliance; MEL system.

1.3 Project Location

Interventions are expected to take place on publicly owned land or through voluntary private participation under the Component 3 livelihood-support scheme, delivered as direct procurement and transfer of tools and assets by the PIU. Final sites, land use arrangements, and potential access restrictions will be confirmed through E&S screening during preparation and implementation. The broader project area of influence includes additional districts (Hîncești, Șoldănești, Ungheni) that may experience indirect effects. While land acquisition or involuntary resettlement is not currently anticipated, this possibility cannot be fully excluded at this stage of project preparation. The Process Framework has been prepared precisely to provide a mechanism for addressing any such impacts should they arise during project implementation.

1.4 Environmental and Social Risk Classification

Per the Concept ESRS (Report No. ESRSC05644, dated 8 May 2026), the overall E&S Risk Classification is Substantial:

- Environmental Risk Rating: Substantial — due to scale, geographic dispersion, and cumulative nature of EbA interventions across ecologically sensitive landscapes.
- Social Risk Rating: Substantial — due to land-based interventions affecting vulnerable, land-dependent rural populations and uncertainty regarding land-use arrangements.
- SEA/SH Risk Rating: Low — no large-scale civil works, labor camps, or significant labor influx anticipated.

1.5 Relationship to Other Safeguard Instruments

- Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF) — including Process Framework (ESS5);
- This Stakeholder Engagement Plan (SEP) — ESS10;
- Labour Management Procedures (LMP) — ESS2, including Worker GRM;
- Environmental and Social Commitment Plan (ESCP);
- Gender Assessment and Action Plan (GAP).

2. REGULATORY AND POLICY FRAMEWORK

2.1 World Bank ESS10 Requirements

ESS10 requires borrowers to engage with stakeholders in a manner that provides timely, relevant, understandable, and accessible information, and consults with them in a culturally appropriate manner free of manipulation, coercion, discrimination, and intimidation. Key requirements:

- Stakeholder identification and analysis with special attention to disadvantaged and vulnerable groups;
- A Stakeholder Engagement Plan disclosed prior to Appraisal and updated throughout implementation;
- Meaningful consultation with genuine consideration of stakeholder views in decision-making;
- An accessible, transparent, and non-retaliatory Grievance Redress Mechanism;
- Reporting back to stakeholders on how their inputs have been considered.

2.2 National Legal Framework

Legal Instrument	Relevance
Law No. 239/2008 on Transparency in Decision-Making	Mandates public consultations for major policy and regulatory decisions; applies to all policy documents developed under the project.
Law No. 148/2023 on Access to Information of Public Interest	Ensures transparency of public sector activities; supports project disclosure obligations.
Law No. 109/2025 on Open Data and Reuse of Public Sector Information	Supports open access to project data and monitoring results.
Law No. 121/2012 on Ensuring Equality	Anti-discrimination protection for Roma, Gagauz, persons with disabilities, and other minority groups.
Law No. 5/2006 on Gender Equality	Mandates equal participation of women in public processes; relevant for gender-responsive engagement.
Law No. 190/1994 on Complaints (as amended)	30-working-day timeframe for public complaints; informs GRM design.
Law No. 86/2014 on EIA (as amended 2023)	Requires public consultation during EIA procedures triggered by project activities.

3. STAKEHOLDER IDENTIFICATION AND ANALYSIS

3.1 Methodology

Stakeholder identification was conducted through systematic mapping combining desk review of national institutional frameworks, analysis of past project engagement records (RE-MAP, TerraMoldova), field consultations (2022–2026), and analysis of land tenure and livelihood systems in the SDR. Stakeholders are classified into three categories per ESS10: (i) Affected Parties; (ii) Other Interested Parties; and (iii) Disadvantaged/Vulnerable Individuals or Groups.

Engagement principles: openness (free of coercion or manipulation); informed participation (accessible formats and languages); inclusiveness (equal access; special attention to vulnerable groups); flexibility (methods adapt to cultural and accessibility factors); accountability (outcomes documented and reported back).

Stakeholder engagement shall remain iterative throughout implementation, particularly where site-specific risks, access restrictions, or land-use conflicts emerge during detailed planning and screening processes.

3.2 Affected Parties

Affected Party	Nature of Impact / Benefit	Engagement Priority
Rural communities in SDR intervention areas	Direct beneficiaries of restored ecosystem services. Potential temporary disruption from site works. Risk of access restrictions to communal grazing lands.	HIGH — primary audience for community meetings, participatory planning, and GRM outreach.
Smallholder farmers and agricultural land users	Benefit from shelterbelts and agroforestry. Risk of temporary exclusion from land parcels near restoration zones.	HIGH — dedicated consultations on site selection and ESS5 access restrictions.
Pastoralists and communal pasture users	At risk of temporary or longer-term access restrictions where afforestation overlaps with communal grazing.	HIGH — targeted engagement under Process Framework; silvopastoral planning consultations.
Women and women-headed households	Disproportionately affected by climate impacts; barriers due to care responsibilities; eligible for targeted livelihood support.	HIGH — gender-responsive scheduling; female engagement intermediaries; dedicated outreach.
Local Public Authorities (LPAs)	Critical implementing partners; land administrators; co-sign stewardship agreements; responsible for post-project maintenance.	HIGH — bilateral meetings; co-design site selection; integration into Local Development Strategies.
Community workers under Component 3	Directly employed in restoration; entitled to LMP protections, OHS training, and W-GRM access.	HIGH — pre-engagement induction; ongoing LMP communication.
Private landowners participating in Component 3 livelihood support	Eligible for voluntary participation in agroforestry and silvopastoral on private lands.	MEDIUM-HIGH — information sessions; simplified application support.

Affected Party	Nature of Impact / Benefit	Engagement Priority
Local Action Groups (LAGs)	LEADER-approach intermediaries for microgrant programs and community entrepreneurship.	MEDIUM-HIGH — active partners in Component 3 design and delivery.

3.3 Other Interested Parties

Government Institutions

Institution	Interest and Role
Ministry of Environment (MoE)	Central environmental authority; project owner; chairs Project Steering Committee; strategic oversight.
NOIEP / PIU	Implementing agency; manages fiduciary, technical, and safeguards implementation; leads SEP.
Agency Moldsilva	Key implementing partner for afforestation, reforestation, ANR, forest rehabilitation, and RFRMC.
PI NA Apele Moldovei	Manages water-fund lands and water bodies. Key partner for riparian buffer restoration rehabilitation. (Also referred to as 'Apele Moldovei' in national usage.)
AIPA	Formerly designated to administer the Component 3 green grant scheme; under the revised design, livelihood support is delivered through direct procurement and transfer of tools and assets by the PIU. AIPA remains a coordination partner for agricultural payments.
Ministry of Agriculture and Food Industry (MAFI)	Coordination partner for agroforestry and silvopastoral; agricultural-environmental policy coherence.
Environmental Agency (EA)	Reviews and approves EIAs; issues Environmental Permits; monitors compliance.
Environmental Protection Inspectorate (EPI)	Enforces environmental regulations; monitoring and enforcement support during implementation.
State Hydrometeorological Service	Provides climate, meteorological, and hydrological data for climate-informed planning. Under Sub-Component 1.3, hosts the integrated digital multi-hazard early warning platform; leads modernization of climate and hydrometeorological data systems; technical counterpart for early warning capacity building.
General Inspectorate for Emergency Situations (GIES)	Linked with the early warning platform under Sub-Component 1.3; co-recipient of real-time climate hazard alerts; coordinates multi-hazard emergency response for droughts, heatwaves, and extreme weather events in southern Moldova.

Civil Society and International Partners

Organization	Interest and Role
EcoContact (Aarhus Centre)	Leading environmental NGO; implementation partner for community engagement and awareness campaigns.
BIOTICA Ecological Society	Science and policy NGO for biodiversity conservation and ecological network restoration; ecological monitoring.
Eco-TIRAS River Keepers Association	Environmental NGO focused on Prut and Dniester river ecosystems; community stewardship.
National Environmental Center	Environmental education, youth participation, community mobilization, and citizen science.
European Investment Bank (EIB)	€200M loan for Moldova's forestry modernization. Coordination required to avoid duplication.
FAO / UNDP / AFD / World Bank	International development and financing partners; donor coordination.

3.4 Disadvantaged and Vulnerable Groups

Group	Specific Barriers	Targeted Mitigation Measures
Women and women-headed households	Limited access to resources; childcare constraints; employment discrimination.	Flexible scheduling; minimum 40% female participation per event, and if not met additional targeted outreach to women and women-headed households will be conducted; dedicated Component 3 livelihood-support allocations for women-led enterprises; female intermediaries.
Elderly persons	Limited digital literacy; limited mobility; hearing impairments.	Accessible venues; printed materials; house visits via LPAs and NGOs.
Youth and out-migrants	High outmigration; limited employment opportunities.	Green job creation; vocational training; environmental education; innovation challenge fund.
Roma communities	Language barriers; social stigma; limited integration.	Materials in Romanian and Russian; Roma National Center as intermediary; CBOs with Roma membership prioritized.
Gagauz and other ethnic minorities	Language barriers; cultural differences.	Gagauz-language summaries for ATUG; dedicated ATUG consultation events.
Persons with disabilities	Physical accessibility barriers; communication challenges.	Accessible venues; adapted materials; accessible digital content on project platform.
Low-income rural households	Limited technology access; potential income loss from access restrictions.	Outreach through LPAs and NGOs; simplified access to Component 3 livelihood support; advance consultation; livelihood support under Process Framework.

Group	Specific Barriers	Targeted Mitigation Measures
Seasonal workers	High turnover; fear of losing welfare benefits.	Longer-term employment modalities; coordination with social authorities; clear LMP provisions.
Children	Limited understanding of risks; dependence on caregivers.	School environmental education programs; involvement of teachers; zero child labor per LMP.
Informal / customary land and natural-resource users	Seasonal, mobile, or undocumented use patterns (grazing, fishing, NTFP collection) risk exclusion from consultation, screening, and livelihood support where eligibility is assessed on formal land title alone.	Eligibility under the Process Framework based on demonstrated customary, seasonal, or informal use (participatory mapping, community or local-authority validation), not formal title; household census specifically captures seasonal and mobile users; alternative grazing/resource-access arrangements identified in Plans of Action.

4. STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT DURING PROJECT PREPARATION (2022–2026)

4.1 Consultation Events

Date	Activity	Location	Key Outcomes
6 Jul 2022	Regional inception workshop	Cahul (in person)	EbA concept introduced; regional priorities and beneficiaries identified; input for GCF concept note.
8 Jul 2022	Regional inception workshop	Ștefan Vodă (in person)	Regional insights on restoration measures; local challenges and opportunities assessed.
27–28 Sep 2022	National consultation workshop	Chișinău	Concept note developed; EbA measures, wetland restoration, pastureland management, institutional frameworks discussed.
20 Feb 2024	Online validation workshop	Online	Theory of Change validated; beneficiaries recalculated; institutional arrangements confirmed.
4–5 Mar 2025	Full Proposal inception workshop	Chișinău (hybrid, 45 participants)	Data gaps identified; Lake Manta NBS-only confirmed; gender and E&S risks identified.
16 Apr 2025	Local consultation	Cahul district	Climate impacts and priorities confirmed; capacity barriers documented.
13 May 2025	Local consultation	Leova (3 districts)	Water scarcity, degraded pastures, invasive species; improved nurseries recommended.
21 May 2025	Local consultation	Căușeni / Ștefan Vodă	Agroforestry incentives; upgrade of Cîrnățeni nursery to genetics centre recommended.
19 May 2025	Local consultation	Comrat (ATUG)	Water/land scarcity; financial support for agroforestry requested.
27–28 May 2025	Joint field mission	Cahul district	Lake Beleu removed from scope; Lake Manta NBS-only confirmed.
9 Oct 2025	Local consultation	Cimișlia / Basarabeasca	Water scarcity, soil erosion; equipment sharing enterprises recommended.
15 Oct 2025	Local consultation	Cantemir	Low sapling survival; school environmental education requested.
17 Sep 2025	Online validation workshop	Online via Zoom (56 participants)	Land prioritization criteria validated; mixed public/private nursery approach and EU INSPIRE alignment endorsed.
9 Jul 2026	Public consultation (appraisal stage) – Meeting notes are in Annex 2	Chișinău (22 participants)	Scientific and academic institutions provided technical feedback: hydrological assessment before wetland restoration; selection of drought-resistant native species and cautious use of black locust in southern Moldova; integrated silvopastoral systems; forest-health, biodiversity and ecosystem-

Date	Activity	Location	Key Outcomes
9 Jul 2026	Public consultation (appraisal stage) - Meeting notes are in Annex 2	In-person meeting (15 participants)	connectivity assessments; and a proposal to establish a permanent scientific advisory mechanism to support implementation. Civil society and NGOs consulted on project objectives, components, timelines and budget. Key issues raised: alignment with the National Forest Extension and Rehabilitation Programme (NFERP); land availability for afforestation; climate-informed selection of planting material and species; need for biodiversity assessments before afforestation in steppe ecosystems and Emerald Network sites; and the role of NGOs under Component 3.

These preparation-stage consultations (2022–2026) were initiated and led by the Client (Government of Moldova) and other development partners; the World Bank became engaged in the project only in March 2026. The events below are presented for completeness and continuity of the engagement record and do not imply World Bank involvement prior to that date.

Sex-disaggregated data on consultation participants were not available at the time of document preparation for all events listed above. Going forward, all consultation events will record and report participation by gender using sex-disaggregated sign-in sheets. Available data indicate that women’s participation was actively encouraged across all consultation events, consistent with the approach described in Section 3.4 and the GAP. Sex-disaggregated participation data will be provided for all implementation-phase consultations in quarterly E&S monitoring reports to the World Bank.

4.2 How Stakeholder Feedback Shaped Project Design

- Lake Beleu is set aside during preparation over oil-extraction concerns; wetland and floodplain rehabilitation is planned in Prut river catchment under Sub-Component 2.2, with no physical restoration planned in protected areas
- Under the revised design, the AIPA green grant mechanism is superseded by direct procurement and transfer of tools and assets under Component 3;
- Nursery upgrade incorporated into RFRMC design based on Căușeni consultation recommendations;
- Community-based equipment sharing incorporated into Component 3 based on Cimișlia/Basarabeasca recommendations;
- Dedicated Gagauz-language engagement for ATUG communities added to this SEP based on ATUG consultation findings.
- Two appraisal-stage public consultations held in July 2026 — on 9 July 2026 in Chișinău with scientific and academic institutions, and on 9 July 2026 with civil society and NGOs — confirmed broad stakeholder support and generated technical recommendations reflected in the final project design;
- Climate-informed species selection, prioritising drought-resistant native species and cautious use of black locust in southern Moldova, reinforced in restoration planning based on appraisal-stage consultation feedback;
- Requirement for site-level biodiversity and hydrological assessments prior to afforestation and wetland restoration — particularly in steppe ecosystems and Emerald Network sites — reinforced in the ESMF screening procedures following appraisal-stage consultations;
- Integrated silvopastoral and landscape-mosaic approaches, and the proposed establishment of a permanent scientific advisory mechanism with national research institutions, incorporated into project preparation in response to appraisal-stage consultation recommendations.
- Women's feedback during stakeholder consultations shaped several key design elements: women's preference for longer-term, stable employment contracts (over short seasonal assignments) informed the design of community stewardship and livelihood support activities under Component 3; women's identification of barriers to participation — including limited childcare, transport to remote sites, and inflexible scheduling — informed the gender-responsive participation approach in this SEP (see Section 3.4) and in the Gender Action Plan; women foresters' confirmation of their skills and leadership in restoration work informed the explicit employment targets and capacity-building provisions in the GAP; and women's concerns about SEA/SH risks in isolated restoration sites informed the adaptation of the SEA/SH mitigation approach for remote contexts, as reflected in the ESMF and LMP.

5. STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT PROGRAM FOR PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION

5.1 Engagement Methods

The project applies a diverse range of engagement methods adapted to the needs, languages, and accessibility requirements of different groups. All materials are available in Romanian and Russian; Gagauz-language summaries provided for ATUG communities.

Method	Description	Target Groups
Online Platform	Dedicated project webpage on https://onipm.gov.md/ro . Publishes all E&S instruments, consultation notices, meeting minutes, GRM information, and progress reports.	All stakeholders; general public.
Community Meetings	District and community level for site selection, E&S disclosure, and restoration planning. Min. 24 meetings over project lifetime (6/year). Accessible venues.	Local communities; LPAs; farmers; pastoralists.
Seminars and Workshops	Technical workshops on EbA, NBS, watershed management for institutional stakeholders; on-the-job trainings for community workers.	MoE; Moldsilva; PI NA Apele Moldovei; LPAs.
Social Media and Digital Channels	Facebook, Viber, and WhatsApp groups; short video reels and infographics; regular project updates.	Youth; LPAs; communities with internet access.
Information Boards and Printed Materials	Physical boards at LPA offices, schools, and community centres. Romanian, Gagauzian, and Russian leaflets. Min. 1 board per intervention community; updated quarterly.	Elderly; communities with limited digital access.
Beneficiary Surveys	Mid-project (Year 2) and end-of-project (Year 4) perception surveys. Door-to-door for no-internet communities. Target: ≥70% satisfied.	All affected parties.
Focus Groups	Targeted sessions for vulnerable groups. Min. 2 vulnerable-group sessions per year. Household visits where direct participation is not feasible.	Vulnerable and disadvantaged groups.
GRM	Multi-channel mechanism via phone, email, online platform, and physical suggestion boxes at all LPA offices. Full details in Section 6.	All project-affected parties.

5.2 Stakeholder Engagement Action Plan

Stage	Activity	Topics / Messages	Methods	Stakeholders	Responsible
Pre-Appraisal (Aug–Sep 2026)	E&S disclosure	ESMF and SEP. Public disclosure and comment period in advance of the AE's or GCF Board decision (whichever is earlier). Documents disclosed in Romanian and English on NOIEP website, World Bank external website, and GCF project portal, as well as in locations convenient to affected peoples.	NOIEP/WB websites; emails.	All stakeholders.	NOIEP/PIU; MoE.
Month 3 (Launch)	Launch event	Project objectives, components, GRM channels.	Launch event; press release; social media; info boards.	All stakeholders; media.	NOIEP/PIU.
Year 1 Q1	Site selection consultations	Participatory restoration priorities; ESS5 access restriction screening.*	Focus groups; field visits; community meetings.	LPAs; communities; farmers; pastoralists.	NOIEP/PIU; Moldsilva.
Year 1 Q1–Q2	GRM awareness campaign	GRM channels; access; anonymity protections.	Info boards; leaflets; community meetings.	All affected parties.	PIU E&S Specialists.
Years 1–2	Component 1 workshops	EbA; restoration planning; NBS; watershed management; digitalization; early warning systems; climate data use.	Seminars; workshops; study tours.	MoE; Moldsilva; PI NA Apele Moldovei; LPAs; State Hydrometeorological Service; General Inspectorate for Emergency Situations.	NOIEP/PIU.
Years 1–2	Component 2 community engagement	Site selection; participatory restoration planning; Process Framework consultations.	Community meetings; focus groups; info boards.	LPAs; communities; farmers; pastoralists.	NOIEP/PIU.

Stage	Activity	Topics / Messages	Methods	Stakeholders	Responsible
Years 2–4	Community restoration activities	Tree planting, wetland revitalization, habitat restoration; citizen engagement.	Info boards; video tutorials; online platform; surveys.	Local communities; NGOs; vulnerable groups.	NOIEP/PIU.
Year 2	Mid-project survey	Satisfaction with engagement; perceived benefits; GRM effectiveness.	Online survey; interviews; door-to-door.	LPAs; residents; NGOs; vulnerable groups.	NOIEP/PIU.
Years 2–4	Component 3 livelihood-support consultations	Eligibility and application support for private landowners and women-led enterprises/cooperatives under Component 3 livelihood support (direct procurement/transfer of tools and assets).	Info sessions; application workshops.	Private landowners; cooperatives; women-led enterprises.	NOIEP/PIU.
Annual (Years 1–4)	Vulnerable group consultations	Targeted consultations with women, elderly, Roma, Gagauz, persons with disabilities.	Focus groups; household visits.	Vulnerable groups.	PIU Social Specialist.
Year 4	End-of-project survey	Final satisfaction; lessons learned; post-project stewardship recommendations.	Online and household survey; community meetings.	All affected parties.	NOIEP/PIU.
Post-project	Maintenance engagement	Importance of maintenance; monitoring of outcomes; stewardship obligations.	Public meetings; monitoring visits; bilateral meetings.	LPAs; communities; Moldsilva.	MoE; NOIEP.

* No site-specific intervention shall commence before site-level stakeholder consultations, screening of land use and access restrictions, disclosure of relevant site-specific E&S instruments, and documentation of feedback received from affected land users, including farmers, pastoralists, vulnerable households, and LPAs. Consultation cycles for PF-triggered sites allow a minimum 30-day window to enable genuine participation, consistent with the Process Framework's consultation principles. The eligibility cut-off date (household census commencement) is publicly announced through LPA notice boards and a community meeting at the start of the census, so that affected communities are aware of the eligibility deadline from the outset.

5.3 Reporting Back to Stakeholders

- Consultation meeting minutes published on the project online platform within 10 working days;
- Quarterly summaries of stakeholder engagement submitted to the World Bank;

- Annual stakeholder engagement reports published on NOIEP and MoE websites;
- Quarterly GRM monitoring reports shared with the World Bank (aggregated and anonymized).

Consultation records shall document not only attendance and questions raised, but also objections, unresolved concerns, proposed mitigation/alternatives, agreed follow-up actions, and explanations of how stakeholder feedback was considered in project decision-making.. Where significant objections are raised by affected users, the PIU shall not proceed with the site until the issue is assessed and addressed through the Process Framework and relevant E&S procedures.

6. GRIEVANCE REDRESS MECHANISM (GRM)

6.1 Objectives and Scope

The GRM is a structured, accessible, and transparent process for project-affected parties to raise concerns, file complaints, provide feedback, and seek resolution. This community-level GRM is distinct from the Worker GRM (W-GRM) established in the LMP for project workers.

6.2 Guiding Principles

Principle	Application
Accessibility	Available in Romanian, Russian, and Gagauz (where feasible). Verbal submissions accepted. No cost to the complainant.
Confidentiality	Anonymous submissions accepted. Identities protected. SEA/SH through dedicated confidential pathway.
Impartiality	No conflict of interest for persons handling grievances. NOIEP Director ensures independence.
Timeliness	Acknowledgment within 2 working days; resolution within 30 working days (extendable to 60 with notification).
No Retaliation	Zero tolerance toward reprisals. Complainants explicitly informed of this protection upon receipt.
Free of Charge	No cost, fee, or charge imposed at any stage.
Transparent	Complainants informed of process, timelines, outcomes, and escalation options at each step.

6.3 GRM Structure: Three Levels

Level 1 — Local (LPA Grievance Focal Points)

Physical suggestion/petition boxes at all LPA mayoralty offices (min. 50 boxes across SDR). Written, verbal, and online submissions accepted. Forwarded to PIU within 2 working days.

Level 2 — Project Implementation Unit (NOIEP)

- Online Platform: <https://onipm.gov.md/ro> (link confirmed at project launch)
- Email: cancelaria@onipm.gov.md
- Address: NOIEP, str. Gheorghe Tudor 5, etajul 4, mun. Chişinău, MD-2028
- Tel.: 068 222 249

Level 3 — Ministry of Environment

- Online: www.mediugov.md
- Email: cancelaria@mediugov.md
- Address: MD-2004 mun. Chişinău, Bd. Ştefan Cel Mare şi Sfânt 162
- Tel.: (022) 204-587

The World Bank Grievance Redress Service (GRS) is available to complainants who have exhausted project-level channels.

6.4 GRM Process Steps

Step	Activity	Description	Timeframe	Responsible
1	Uptake	Grievance received via any channel. Staff completes Grievance Registration Form and enters in GRM Register.	Day 0	Local focal point; NOIEP staff.
2	Acknowledgment	Complainant informed of receipt, reference number, expected timeframe, and escalation procedure.	Within 2 working days	NOIEP E&S Specialist.
3	Sorting	Forwarded to legal department; categorized per 10-category system; NOIEP Director notified. NOIEP	Within 3 working days	NOIEP legal department.
4	Investigation	Facts gathered; proposed resolution submitted to NOIEP Project Coordinator for decision.	Within 15 working days	Complaint committee.
5	Resolution	Complainant informed of findings and resolution in person (preferred), by phone, or in writing.	Within 30 working days	NOIEP Director.
6	Appeal	Complainant informed of right to escalate to next level, national courts, or WB GRS.	At any time	NOIEP; WB GRS.
7	Closure	Grievance closed in register with documentation. Aggregate data reported quarterly to WB.	After confirmation	NOIEP E&S Specialists.

Grievance categories: Cat.1 — Social Safeguards; Cat.2 — Environmental Safeguards; Cat.3 — Policy/procedure violations; Cat.4 — Contract violations; Cat.5 — Financial concerns; Cat.6 — Abuse of power; Cat.7 — PIU staff performance; Cat.8 — Force majeure; Cat.9 — Project interventions; Cat.10 — Other.

6.5 SEA/SH Complaints

SEA/SH complaints are handled through a separate, highly confidential pathway:

- Managed by PIU GBV Focal Point per World Bank Good Practice Note on Addressing SEA/SH in IPF;
- No proof required; not processed through standard grievance steps;
- Separate confidential SEA/SH register accessible only to GBV Focal Point;
- Survivors referred to national GBV service providers (psychosocial, medical, legal) within 24 hours;
- Survivors retain independent access to national legal remedies and WB GRS;
- No identifying survivor information in routine quarterly GRM reports.

7. RESOURCES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

7.1 Institutional Responsibilities

Actor	SEP Responsibilities
MoE / Project Steering Committee	Strategic oversight of SEP; endorsement of E&S instruments; inter-ministerial coordination; PSC chairs at least annually.
NOIEP Director	Ensures SEP implementation and follow-up; trains PIU staff; provides resources for stakeholder representation.
PIU Social Specialist	Day-to-day SEP implementation; community visits; vulnerable group outreach; GRM management; quarterly E&S monitoring reports.
PIU Environmental Specialist	Technical lead for environmental engagement aspects; coordinates site-level consultations; environmental GRM components.
PIU GBV Focal Point	Manages confidential SEA/SH pathway; survivor referral within 24 hours; coordinates with national GBV service providers.
Component Team Leaders	Ensures SEP is implemented within their component; identifies additional stakeholders.
Contractors / Service Providers	Comply with all SEP requirements; communicate concerns to PIU; provide performance data; cascade to subcontractors.
LPAs and Community Focal Points	First point of GRM contact at local level; facilitate community consultations; assist vulnerable group outreach.
NGO Partners	Support community mobilization, awareness, and inclusive participation; reach vulnerable and minority groups, after receiving training on ESS10 requirements, inclusive consultation methods, GRM referral procedures, SEA/SH confidentiality principles, and documentation standards. The PIU Social Specialist shall supervise and quality-check NGO-led engagement activities. Under the Process Framework, NGOs also carry out mandatory independent verification of the voluntary nature of community agreements before any such agreement is finalised or access restriction imposed, addressing the risk that LPAs or mayors may hold a dual role as project partners and informal community authorities.
World Bank (Accredited Entity)	Implementation support consistent with ESS10; reviews quarterly E&S reports and GRM performance.

7.2 SEP Budget

Budget Category	Total (US\$)	Notes
Events (launch, 24 community meetings, 8 focus groups, 2 surveys, closing event)	20,000	6 community meetings/year; min. 24 over project lifetime. Standalone events streamlined under the revised budget (launch and closing events combined with existing community meetings where feasible); mandatory community consultations retained.
Communication (posters/flyers, social media, video reels, 50 information boards)	40,000	Materials in Romanian and Russian; boards updated quarterly. Communication materials consolidated into fewer, multi-purpose products and integrated with existing channels
Trainings (Component 1 x4, incl. Sub-Component 2 x8, Component 3 x6)	134,000	Capacity building on EbA, restoration, stewardship, livelihoods. Integrated into service providers contracts
Beneficiary surveys (mid-project + end-of-project)	55,000	Target: ≥70% satisfied at both survey points, included as part of M&E budget
GRM (50 suggestion boxes, communication materials, online portal)	6,500	GRM portal integrated into NOIEP project platform.
TOTAL	255,500	

The SEP budget of US\$255,500 is financed from GCF grant proceeds and IBRD loan resources and is sourced from the overall project budget under Component 1-3 (where activities embedded in service providers contracts) and Component 4 (Project Management, Monitoring and Evaluation), where E&S staffing costs (PIU Social Specialist, Environmental Specialist, and GBV Focal Point) are covered within Component 4 and PIU operational costs.

8. MONITORING AND REPORTING

8.1 Key Performance Indicators

KPI	Measurement Method	Target
Number of community consultation meetings	Frequency and number of community meetings; documented in meeting minutes.	Minimum 24 over project lifetime (6/year).
Female participation in consultations	Percentage of female participants; gender-disaggregated sign-in sheets.	Minimum 40% in each consultation event.
Information boards and materials	Number and visibility of boards/leaflets in intervention communities.	Min. 1 board per community; updated quarterly.
Beneficiary satisfaction	Mid-project and end-of-project perception surveys.	Minimum 70% satisfied at both survey points.
GRM — timeliness	Percentage of grievances resolved within 30 working days.	Minimum 90% resolved within 30 working days.
GRM — volume	Grievances received, categorized, resolved (by type and gender).	All grievances logged; zero unaddressed after 60 working days.
Vulnerable group engagement	Number of dedicated vulnerable group consultations.	Minimum 2 per year.
Stakeholder feedback integration	Number of project adjustments made in response to feedback.	All feedback documented; changes tracked and reported.
SEP updates	Frequency of SEP review and version control.	Reviewed and updated at least annually.

8.2 Reporting Schedule

Report	Content	Submitted to
Monthly internal summary	GRM status; community concerns; engagement activities; issues flagged for follow-up.	NOIEP Director; PIU Component Leaders.
Quarterly E&S monitoring report	Consolidated SEP KPIs; GRM summary; gender data; vulnerable group outreach; corrective actions.	World Bank Task Team.
Annual stakeholder engagement report	Annual engagement summary; GRM trend analysis; KPI performance; lessons learned; SEP update. In accordance with the Funded Activity Agreement, the AE is required to reflect SEP implementation activities in the Annual Performance Reports (APRs) submitted to GCF. The PIU Social Specialist will include a	World Bank; PSC; published on NOIEP and MoE websites.

Report	Content	Submitted to
	dedicated SEP progress section in each APR covering: consultation events held; sex-disaggregated participation data; GRM performance; disclosure compliance; and adaptive engagement actions.	
Serious incident notification	SEA/SH allegation, violent community protest, or stakeholder safety incident within 48 hours.	World Bank; national authorities.

9. DISCLOSURE OF PROJECT INFORMATION

9.1 Disclosure Prior to Appraisal

The following documents will be disclosed publicly prior to Appraisal: ESMF and this SEP. All instruments disclosed in Romanian and English on the NOIEP website, World Bank external website, and GCF project portal. Comments documented and reflected in final versions before Approval.

9.2 Disclosure During Implementation

During implementation, the following information will be proactively disclosed on the project online platform and community information boards:

- Quarterly E&S monitoring reports (accessible summaries);
- Consultation meeting minutes within 10 working days;
- GRM status reports (quarterly, aggregated and anonymized);
- Annual stakeholder engagement reports;
- Site-specific ESMPs and BMPs prior to commencement of related works.

ANNEX 1 — GRM REGISTRATION FORMS

Annex 1a. Grievance Registration Form (for Complainant)

Field	Information
Reference Number (office use)	
Date Received	
First Name	
Last Name	
I wish to raise my grievance anonymously	☐ Yes ☐ No
I request not to disclose my identity without consent	☐ Yes ☐ No
Preferred contact method	☐ By telephone: _____ ☐ By email: _____ ☐ Online (anonymous)
Preferred language	☐ Romanian ☐ Russian ☐ Gagauz ☐ Other: _____
Description of grievance (What happened? Where? When? Who was affected? What is the result?)	
Occurrence	☐ One-time (date: _____) ☐ Repeated (how many times: _____)
Signature	_____
Date	_____

Submit to: NOIEP, str. Gheorghe Tudor 5, etajul 4, mun. Chişinău, MD-2028 | Email: cancelaria@noiep.gov.md | Tel.: 068 222 249

Annex 1b. Grievance Record Form (for PIU Staff)

Field	Information
Date Grievance Received	
Name of Staff Completing Form	
Level received	☐ National ☐ District ☐ Municipality ☐ Village
Mode of filing	☐ In person ☐ Phone ☐ Email ☐ SMS ☐ Website ☐ Suggestion box ☐ Community meeting ☐ Other
Name of Person Raising Grievance (optional, confidential)	
Gender	☐ Male ☐ Female ☐ Prefer not to say
Contact information (optional, confidential)	
Location where grievance occurred	District: _____ Village: _____
Brief description of grievance	
Category	Cat.1: Social Safeguards / Cat.2: Env. Safeguards / Cat.3: Policy violations / Cat.4: Contract violations / Cat.5: Financial concerns / Cat.6: Abuse of power / Cat.7: PIU staff / Cat.8: Force majeure / Cat.9: Project interventions / Cat.10: Other
Resolution / action taken	
Date resolved	
Complainant satisfied	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Escalated to next level

ANNEX 2 – Public consultations at appraisal stage

MINUTES OF MEETINGS

Public consultation on Moldova Green Shield Project

	Date	09.07.2026	
	Time	14:00	
	Project name	Green Shield	
	Venue	Public consultation	
	Moderators	Aliona Rusnac – State Secretary, Ministry of Environment	
	Number of participants	22	List of participants attached
	Main course of consultations	Providing stakeholders with key information regarding the objectives of the Project, its components, channels for submitting inquiries and proposals, implementation timelines, and budgetary aspects.	
The issues raised by stakeholders and their corresponding answers.			
1. Ion Marin, EcoContact			
Question: Asked whether the project's forest restoration activities under Component 2.1 are intended to support implementation of the National Forest Extension and Rehabilitation Programme (NFERP). He also sought clarification on whether the project would cover restoration activities in the Lower Prut area and how it would coordinate with other donor-funded initiatives, including the Canadian-funded programme on pasture management.			
Response: The project team confirmed that one of the project's main objectives is to support implementation of the Government's National Forest Extension and Rehabilitation Programme by financing priority restoration activities. The project is designed to complement national budget allocations and other donor initiatives, with coordination mechanisms to avoid duplication. Restoration activities will include the Lower Prut landscape while maintaining a strong focus on biodiversity conservation and climate resilience.			
2. Alexandru Sainsus, NGO Arboretum			
Question: Asked whether sufficient public land would be available for afforestation, considering the scale of the National Forest Extension and Rehabilitation Programme and other restoration projects already under implementation.			
Response: The project team explained that detailed estimates of land availability are still being refined as project preparation progresses. Current assessments indicate that approximately 7,000 hectares of degraded land remain available for restoration, and land availability is not expected to become a major constraint. Greater challenges relate to the production and procurement of sufficient quantities of quality planting material and the degraded condition of forests, particularly in southern Moldova. The team also noted the importance of learning from restoration experiences in countries facing similar climatic conditions, including Romania, Ukraine and Armenia, particularly with respect to addressing land degradation, water scarcity and soil erosion.			
3. Munteanu Natalia, Platform Climatica			
Question: Asked whether tree species had already been selected for afforestation, noting that projected climate change may require moving away from traditionally used species, including some oak species. She			

emphasized that species selection should be based on future climate conditions rather than historical planting practices.

Response: The project team explained that preliminary species lists have already been developed by national research institutions, but acknowledged that the availability of quality seeds and planting material remains a major constraint. Final species selection will be informed by climate projections, ecological suitability and restoration objectives.

4. Vitaliy Ajeder, Society for Bird and Nature Protection

Comment: *Expressed concern that afforestation in steppe ecosystems could unintentionally damage habitats of high biodiversity value, including habitats of protected species. He stressed that restoration interventions should be preceded by detailed biodiversity assessments and clear delineation of areas suitable for afforestation, ensuring that valuable grasslands and steppe habitats are conserved where appropriate. He also noted that, in some cases, maintaining natural grasslands or agricultural landscapes may provide greater biodiversity and carbon benefits than tree planting.*

Response: The project team acknowledged these concerns and noted that previous studies have already identified some areas requiring particular attention. It was explained that proposed restoration sites should be supported by appropriate site assessments and mapping before implementation. The discussion also highlighted the importance of clearly delineating land categories and applying existing national guidance that distinguishes pastureland from forest land to help avoid inappropriate afforestation of valuable grassland habitats.

5. Vitaliy Ajeder, Society for Bird and Nature Protection

Comment: *Suggested considering landscape management approaches used in Spain, where forests, shrubs and open habitats are managed as interconnected ecosystems rather than as separate land uses. He noted that such integrated approaches could help maintain biodiversity while enhancing landscape resilience.*

Response: The project team noted that this is an inter-institutional issue requiring coordination among the relevant authorities. It was suggested that integrated land-use categories and management approaches could be further explored to better reflect the mosaic of ecosystems and support appropriate long-term management of these landscapes.

6. Ion Marin, EcoContact

Comment: *Highlighted the ecological importance of the Bugeac Steppe and Emerald Network sites, emphasizing that restoration activities in these areas should be supported by appropriate biodiversity and environmental impact assessments. He noted that successful ecosystem restoration requires balancing forest expansion with the conservation of existing steppe ecosystems and acknowledged that restoration efforts worldwide have produced mixed results, underscoring the need for careful planning and implementation.*

Response: The project team agreed that restoration interventions require a cautious and evidence-based approach. It was noted that vegetation restoration plays an important role in climate adaptation, while biodiversity considerations need to be integrated throughout project preparation. The team also highlighted that botanical and biodiversity expertise has informed the ongoing feasibility studies and that ecosystem interactions will continue to be considered during project design.

7. Gabriel Biotica, Gabriel Margineanu

Comment: *Asked whether the project could support restoration activities in the south-eastern part of Moldova, including restoration of public land and rehabilitation of wetlands identified under another feasibility study. He highlighted opportunities for complementary investments in ecosystem restoration and waterbody rehabilitation.*

Response: The project team explained that, although the project cannot address all restoration needs across the country, opportunities for complementarity with other initiatives will continue to be explored during implementation.

8. Nadejda Cebotari AO Hai Moldova

Question: Asked how civil society organizations would participate in project implementation, including environmental monitoring, impact evaluation, community engagement and grant opportunities.

Response: The project team emphasized that NGOs are expected to play an important role throughout project implementation, particularly under Component 3. Civil society organizations will support community engagement, capacity building, environmental awareness, preparation of local stewardship and management plans, vocational training and livelihood activities. NGO participation will be procured through competitive procedures in accordance with World Bank procurement requirements.

List of participants¹

n/o	Name	Organization / Affiliation
1.	Untu Anatolie	Ministry of Environment
2.	Ludmila Hituc	AJMTEM
3.	Sergiu Gutu	AJMTEM
4.	Alexandru Sainsus	NGO Arboretum / Nursery
5.	Dorin Gritcan	NGO 100 Frontiers Green Initiatives
6.	Dr. Elena Tofan-Dorofev	Botanical NGO / Researcher
7.	Dr. Vitalie Ajder	Society for Bird and Nature Protection (SPPN)
8.	Gabriel Margineanu	NGO Biotica Ecological Society
9.	Ion Marin	NGO EcoContact
10.	Valeriu Istrati	Agro-Forestry & NGO Travel Forever sustainable tourism in Moldova
11.	Nadejda Ciubotaru	NGO Hai Moldova
12.	Alexandru Galupac	Institute for Forest Research and Management
13.	Natalia Munteanu	Platform Climatica
14.	Ala Camerzan	UNDP
15.	Victor Balaban	
16.	Dumitru Galupa	Consultant at ICAS
17.	Eric Prosii	Deputy Director of ICAS
18.	Pancu Mircea	IP AMM
19.	Lidia Trecilo	IP AMM

¹ Not all participants filled in the registration form

20.	Mardari Vitalie	IP AMM
21.	Hangan Mihai	M.M
22.	Chicaros Ana	Nutritionist

Screenshot with the announcement of public consultations:



Ministerul Mediului al Republicii
Moldova

3 Jul •

Consultări publice

Consultare inițială privind structura
propusă a proiectului „Scutul Verde al
Moldovei”

- ✓ 9 iulie 2026, ora 14:00
- ✓ Institutul Cercetări și
Amenajări Silvice
mun. Chișinău, str. Calea
Iesilor 69




MINISTERUL MEDIULUI
AL REPUBLICII MOLDOVA

The Ministry of the Environment invites interested parties to the initial public consultation on the project "Moldova's Green Shield" ("Moldova Green Shield Project").

The project is geared towards protecting the environment, expanding green spaces and supporting communities to face climate change. The discussions will target the project's objectives, the proposed structure and how it can meet the needs of local communities and the country's environmental priorities.

 July 9, 2026, 14:00
 Institute of Forest Research and Landscaping, mun.
Chisinau Street the route of exits 69

 [Rate this translation](#)

Photos from public consultations



	Date	9.07.2026	
	Time	9:00	
	Project name	Moldova Green Shield	
	Venue	In-person meeting	
	Moderators	Fisseha Tessema Abbissa, Adrian Laurentiu Mihailescu	
	Number of participants	15	List of participants attached
	Main course of consultations	Providing stakeholders with key information regarding the objectives of the Project, its components, and gaining feedback and inputs on technical aspects	
The issues raised by stakeholders and their corresponding answers.			
1. Veaceslav Purcic, Moldova State University (Water Resources Expert)			
Comment: Noted that water scarcity is becoming one of Moldova's most pressing climate change challenges and suggested that the project should not limit its focus to southern Moldova but consider opportunities across the country where interventions could provide greater resilience benefits. He also highlighted that not all historical wetlands remain suitable for restoration, as many			

have lost their groundwater sources or have undergone irreversible hydrological changes. He stressed that restoration efforts should be based on comprehensive hydrological assessments and long-term sustainability rather than attempting to restore sites that no longer have ecological potential.

Response: The project team explained that the project remains in the design stage and that intervention sites have not yet been finalized. Hydrological modelling and technical assessments will guide site selection, while pilot interventions will help inform future restoration approaches.

2. Victor Sfecia, Technical University of Moldova, and Gheorghe Florența, Institute for Forest Research and Management (ICAS)

Comment: Welcomed the project's ambitious objectives while emphasizing the importance of coordinating with existing restoration initiatives, particularly those already implemented in southern Moldova. They recommended conducting field visits before finalizing intervention areas to better understand local ecological conditions and community needs. Participants stressed that restoration planning should balance biodiversity objectives with local livelihoods by considering the need for fuelwood, shelterbelts, fruit tree species, and other vegetation that can generate economic benefits. They also noted that water availability remains one of the main constraints for ecosystem restoration and recommended integrating watershed management into project planning.

Response: The project team confirmed that the project is intended to complement, rather than duplicate, existing initiatives. Site selection will be informed by technical assessments, field investigations, stakeholder consultations, and land ownership considerations. Restoration measures will seek to balance ecological objectives with community needs wherever appropriate.

3. Svitlana Bakan, Moldova State University (Zoology)

Comment: Highlighted the importance of considering forest health during afforestation activities, noting that pests, insects and fungal diseases have contributed to forest decline in several areas. She recommended involving specialists in forest pathology, entomology and plant health during project preparation to ensure that restoration efforts are based on healthy and resilient planting material.

4. Alexandru Galupac, Institute for Forest Research and Management (ICAS)

Comment: Shared lessons from afforestation and wetland restoration projects in Moldova and other European countries with similar climatic conditions. He advised against extensive use of black locust in southern Moldova because of its high water consumption and recommended selecting drought-resistant native species better adapted to local conditions. He also suggested exploring silvopastoral systems, drawing on successful examples from Mediterranean countries, as a more suitable land management approach for steppe ecosystems. He further noted that previous wetland restoration efforts demonstrated significant ecological benefits but also highlighted the importance of resolving land ownership issues and engaging neighbouring landowners during project planning.

5. Dr. Galina Busmachiu, Institute of Zoology, Moldova State University

Comment: Emphasized that biodiversity assessments should play a central role in selecting project intervention sites. She noted that southern Moldova is experiencing rapid changes in species composition, including the spread of invasive invertebrates and changes in bird migration patterns associated with disappearing wetlands. She recommended that restoration planning consider rare species, invasive species, habitat connectivity and wildlife migration patterns to maximize biodiversity benefits and avoid unintended ecological impacts. The Institute of Zoology expressed its willingness to support the project through ecological surveys and species assessments.

6. Aliona Miron, Botanical Garden (Grassland and Silvopastoral Systems Specialist)

Comment: Strongly supported prioritizing southern Moldova but emphasized that afforestation should be based on detailed ecological inventories and careful species selection. She noted that grasslands are often overlooked despite being among the country's most threatened ecosystems, with significant losses caused by degradation, ploughing and afforestation on former pasturelands. She recommended conducting comprehensive ecosystem inventories before selecting interventions and promoting integrated silvopastoral systems that conserve grasslands while increasing tree cover. She also stressed that long-term management plans should guide restoration activities at the community level.

7. Ala Donica, Institute of Ecology and Geography, Moldova State University

Comment: Offered the Institute's expertise to support ecological and hydrological modelling, biodiversity assessments, and the identification of priority restoration areas. She noted that previous research on hydrology, flash floods and ecological stability could directly inform project preparation. She also recommended strengthening landscape connectivity through the creation of ecological corridors and suggested that the establishment of ecological corridors could serve as an indicator of project success.

8. Ion Roșca, Director, National Botanical Garden

Comment: Welcomed the project and noted that its objectives align closely with the Botanical Garden's scientific and technical expertise. He confirmed the institution's willingness to support project implementation through research, technical advice, plant propagation and other scientific activities.

9. General discussion

Participants emphasized the importance of maintaining close collaboration between the project and Moldova's scientific community throughout project preparation and implementation. Several institutions expressed their willingness to contribute technical expertise, data, modelling, laboratory facilities and scientific advice. It was suggested that a permanent scientific advisory mechanism be established to support project implementation and ensure that restoration measures are based on the best available evidence. The project team welcomed these proposals and confirmed that additional consultations would be organized during project preparation to refine project design and strengthen collaboration with national research institutions.

No.	Participant	Organization
1	Dr. Ion Roșca	Director Botanical Garden)
2	Dr. Aliona Miron	Botanist, Grassland & silvopasture specialist, ICAS
3	Dr. Victor Șfecla	Deputy Head Faculty of Horticulture, Forestry and Environment / Technical University of Moldova
4	Dr. Galina Busmachiu	Institute of Zoology, Moldova State University, Expert in terrestrial biodiversity, entomology and ecosystem monitoring
5	Dr. Veaceslav Purcic	Senior Professor Wildlife, Faculty of Biology & geosciences, Moldovan State University
6	Dr. Ala Donica	Institute of Ecology and Geography, Moldovan State University
7	Alexandru Galupa	Soil specialist, ICAS
8	Ghenadie Cojocaru	GIS Head of Department, ICAS
9	Dr. Gheorghe Florenta	Deputy scientific director ICAS, Expert in forest genetics, monitoring, climate resilience
10	Bacal Svetlana	Institute of Zoology

ANNEX 3 — KEY STAKEHOLDERS ENGAGED DURING PREPARATION

Government Institutions

Institution	Representatives Engaged
Ministry of Environment (MoE)	Sergiu Lazarencu (Minister); Aliona Rusnac (State Secretary); Paula Tatamirov (International Affairs); Victoria Gratii (Head DPIWR); Vitalie Dragan (Head DPNCB).
Agency Moldsilva	Durbala Victor (Director); Iulian Mamai (Deputy Director); Ghenardie Cojocaru (Division Chief).
PI NA Apele Moldovei	Radu Cazacu (Deputy Director); Catalin Burghilea (Main Specialist); Daniel Buzila.
AIPA	Diana Cosalic (Deputy Director).
NOIEP	Nicolae Arnaut (Director); Angela Lozan; Veronica Ursu (Financial Manager); Victoria Covali (Project Manager).
EPI; State Hydrometeorological Service; Environmental Agency	Representatives engaged at national events and bilateral meetings (2022–2026).

Local Public Authorities

- Mayors and representatives from: Cahul, Cantemir, Leova, Cimișlia, Căușeni, Ștefan Vodă, Basarabeasca, Taraclia, Comrat (ATUG).
- Over 150 individual LPA representatives engaged through local consultations (2025).

NGOs and Civil Society

- EcoContact (Aarhus Centre): Iordanca-Rodica Iordanov (Director); Ion Marin; Larisa Cupcea.
- BIOTICA Ecological Society; Eco-TIRAS River Keepers; National Environmental Center; Arboretum/LURENOM.
- 100 Frontières; Local Action Groups from Cahul, Leova, and Cantemir districts.

International Partners

- Austrian Development Agency (ADA): Christine Bitzinger; Tobias Schnitzler; Andrei Ursache; Sandra Horina.
- GCF: Sun Mi Lee; Marc Dumas-Johansen.
- E Co.: Jean-Baptiste Routier; Tamara Trumbic; Aurelio Padovese; Carme Machi; Victor Sfecla; Eric Proșii.
- European Investment Bank (EIB); French Development Agency (AFD); UNDP Moldova; FAO; World Bank.

ANNEX 4 — NGOs ACTIVE IN THE SDR

Name	Area of Work	Contact
EcoContact — Aarhus Centre	Public participation; environmental information access; EU directives; legal assistance; transparency.	office@ecocontact.md +373 22 996 162
BIOTICA Ecological Society	Biodiversity conservation; ecological network restoration; habitat restoration; ecological education.	biotica.md@gmail.com +373 22 49 88 37
Eco-TIRAS River Keepers	Prut and Dniester ecosystems; riparian buffer zones; community stewardship (51 NGO members).	ilyatrom@mail.ru 069121726
National Environmental Center	Environmental education; youth participation; community mobilization; citizen science.	cnm@environment.md +373 79 812 721
Ecovisio	Community development; climate; agrifood; green changemakers.	info@ecovisio.org +373 79 395303
Arboretum / LURENOM	Forest restoration; nursery activities; afforestation.	office@arboretum.live +373 68 099958
AFPMDD (Women's Assoc. for Environment)	Sustainable development; gender and environment; women in conservation.	mediu.afpmdd@gmail.com +373 78 001 026
Roma National Center	Roma rights; social inclusion; anti-discrimination advocacy.	lepadatu.ana75@gmail.com +373 22 227099
Gender Center	Gender equality promotion; information, education, and communication.	secretariat.platformadegen@gmail.com
CALM (Congress of Local Governments)	Local authority representation; advocacy for improved legal and administrative environment.	info@calm.md +373 22 22-35-09

Key online portals for project communication: unimedia.info; newsmaker.md; tv8.md; moldova.org; ecopresa.md; diez.md; stirilocale.md; replicamedia.md