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INTRODUCTION

This analytical report is a continuation of a complex exercise initiated in 2010: the Extended Migration Profile (EMP) of the Republic of Moldova. The first edition of the EMP analytical report covered a detailed analysis of migration data in the 2005–2010 period. The entire process of supporting the development of the first edition of the EMP encompassed a set of multilateral actions and synergy among all stakeholders, which assisted in improving the collection and exchange of data, and in promoting wider coherence and a more comprehensive and coordinated approach to the development of migration policies.

This third edition of the Republic of Moldova EMP analytical report, which covers the years 2008–2013, was developed by the Bureau for Migration and Asylum (BMA) of the Republic of Moldova Ministry of Internal Affairs, appointed as the institution responsible for subsequent production of the EMP via the Government Decision No. 634 dated 24 August 2012, approving the List of Indicators and the Template of the Extended Migration Profile of the Republic of Moldova. The Editing Committee of the BMA included: Mrs Olga Poalelungi, BMA Director, and Mrs Jana Mazur, Head of Information Development, Data Management and Risk Analysis Unit under the BMA Policy and Legal Division.

This report also represents the outcome of a huge joint effort to collect and analyse data, to which many institutions and persons have contributed in different ways, all equally important. In this context, acknowledgements are expressed to all members and observers of the inter-institutional Technical Working Group (Ministry of Information Technology and Communications; Ministry of Internal Affairs; National Bureau of Statistics; Ministry of Foreign Affairs and European Integration; Ministry of Labour, Social Protection and Family; Ministry of Health, Ministry of Education) for their active participation and valuable input.
KEY DATA: REPUBLIC OF MOLDOVA

Geography
Total area (sq km)\(^1\) 2013 33.8 thousand km\(^2\)

Economy and development
GDP per capita (in current prices)\(^2\) 2013 USD 2,229
Human Development Index\(^3\) 2012 0.660

Population
Total resident population\(^4\) 2013 3,557,600 persons
Population forecast\(^5\) 2050 3,129,800 persons
Foreigner population\(^6\) 2013 21,092 persons
Population born abroad\(^7\) 2013 283,674 persons

International migration
Net international migration rate\(^8\) per 1,000 population\(^9\) 2005–2010 -9.4 2010–2015 -5.9

---

\(^1\) Statistical Yearbook of Moldova, 2013, page10; see www.statistica.md
\(^2\) Dynamics of the Main Macroeconomic Indicators (1995–2013); see www.statistica.md/category.php?l=ro&idc=191&
\(^5\) G. Paladi, O. Gagauz and O. Penina, “Population Ageing in the Republic of Moldova: Economic and Social Consequences” (Chisinau, Academy of Science of Moldova, Institute of European Integration and Political Science, Demography Sector, 2009). The forecast was calculated based on three scenarios – for the closed-type population, without taking into consideration migration, and taking account of lack of some complete data on migration. According to the pessimist scenario, by 2050, the number of inhabitants may decrease to 2,596,200 (according to the II-moderately pessimist scenario, the number may decrease to 2,830,800; and according to III-optimist scenario, it may decrease to 3,129,800).
\(^6\) SE SIRC “Registru”, Total Number of Foreigners, Including the Stateless Persons, Staying on the Territory of the Republic of Moldova as of 31 December of the year of reference. Data submitted for the EMP Matrix; see Table 22 in Annex 2.
\(^7\) SE SIRC “Registru”, Number of Persons Born Abroad, Regardless of the Citizenship, as of 31 December. Data submitted for the EMP Matrix; see Table 24 in Annex 2.
\(^8\) Hereinafter, “international migration” is referred to as “migration”, except when “internal” is used with “migration” or “migrant”.
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This analytical report on the Extended Migration Profile (EMP) of the Republic of Moldova, 2008–2013 edition, is a country-owned tool developed in consultation with a wide number of government and non-government stakeholders, and it is envisaged to be used for enhancing policy coherence, evidence-based policymaking, and for mainstreaming migration into national development planning.

The EMP analytical report covers four basic blocks of information and analysis, namely: migration trends (part A); migration impact (part B); migration management framework (part C); and main findings, policies implications, and recommendations (part D).

The migration studies that have been carried out reveal that the economic reasons remain to be the main push factor for Moldovans, especially the lack of local employment opportunities and low salaries offered in the country. The migration phenomenon in Moldovan context continues to be characterized more by international emigration of the country’s population and less by immigration of persons from abroad. In general terms, three approaches are used to estimate international emigration in the Republic of Moldova, namely:

- authorized emigration, which involves deregistration from the place of residence and declaration of long-term emigration or emigration for good from the country, also known in the country as “permanent emigration”;
- labour migration, that is, leaving to work or to look for a job abroad, with the intention to return, also termed “temporary/circular migration”;
- exit from the country, which is registered at the border, including both authorized/permanent emigration and temporary/circular migration.

Although authorized emigration from the Republic of Moldova continues to be significant, as shown by data estimates from the Ministry of Information Technology and Communications (State Enterprise, State Information Resources Centre “Registru” (SE SIRC “Registru”)), the phenomenon shows a decreasing trend. According to official data, 6,988 persons emigrated in 2008; the number decreased in 2013 by 63.0 per cent, corresponding to 2,585 persons. It is mainly the urban population that emigrates: in 2013 more than double the number of persons from urban (1,923) as from rural areas (662) emigrated. According to the data estimated based on authorized emigration, the number of Moldovan...
citizens going abroad continues to increase: this number increased by 20,000 persons in 2013 as compared with the number in 2008, accounting for 101,937 persons.

Another important source of information that offers the possibility to estimate the volume of emigration according to the international definition is the State border crossing registration provided by the Border Police Department (BPD), specifically the data about the duration of a person’s stay outside the country. By the end of 2013, a total of 358,882 persons had stayed abroad for more than 12 months: the respective number increased by 121,232 persons (51%) as compared with the number in 2008, and by 28,715 persons (8.7 %) as compared with the figure in 2012.

According to the data presented by the National Employment Agency (NEA), the number of Moldovans working in the host countries with legal work contracts concluded via the NEA remains quite small. It is noteworthy to mention that 793 official work contracts were concluded in 2013, as compared with 603 in 2012.

**Overseas student population.** The number of Moldovan citizens studying abroad under international education agreements showed an increasing pattern during the period of reference: this number increased by 2.5 times in 2013 as compared with the number in 2008, accounting for 5,891 persons (in 2012 there were 5,356 persons).

**Involuntary emigration.** This type of emigration registered a significant drop by the end of 2012 as compared with the number in 2008. The analysis in this context is based on information obtained from international databases. According to the data, the number of Moldovan citizens registered as asylum-seekers abroad totalled 888 in 2008, but it decreased to 441 persons in 2012.

Taking into account that the information provided by the BPD only contains data about border crossings accumulated from the State border crossing points under the control of the official authorities of the Republic of Moldova, the total volume of Moldovan emigrants cannot be accurately measured, as emigration volume can be overestimated or underestimated due to the fact that persons may cross the border through the Transnistrian segment.

**Temporary emigration.** The Labour Force Survey data reveals a stable number of Moldovans – approximately 300,000 – who were working abroad at any point from 2008 to 2013. In 2013, the number of Moldovans abroad
increased, totalling 332,500, of whom 216,900 were men and 115,600 were women, as compared with 328,300 in 2012, of whom 218,600 were men and 109,600 were women.

**Repatriation.** In 2008 and 2009, the annual number of repatriated persons increased. However, starting in 2010, the number of repatriated persons decreased, with 1,585 persons in 2013, registering an increase rate of 6.5 per cent as compared with 2012. A certain number of children were registered among the repatriated persons, accounting for 3.5 per cent of the total number of repatriated persons in 2013.

**Readmission.** During the period of reference, the number of readmitted persons continuously increased, registering three-fold growth from 2008 to 2012. There were 88 persons readmitted in 2013, pointing either to the legalization of Moldovan citizens in their host countries or the observance of the stay regimes of the countries they were in.

**Combating trafficking in human beings.** In 2013, the Multidisciplinary Teams of the National Referral System (NRS) identified 131 victims of trafficking in human beings, increasing 1.6 times the figure in 2008. This increase in the number of victims of trafficking may be explained by the improved efficiency of the process for identification of such victims. In the same year, a total of 1,403 potential victims of trafficking in human beings were identified and assisted via the NRS, which is higher compared with 1,214 assisted in 2012 and a seven-fold growth from 2008. It is, however, thought that the true number of such victims may actually be higher, as there is an extended group of persons considered to be at high risk of becoming victims of trafficking.

**Foreigner population.** By the end of 2013, there were a total of 21,092 foreigners (including the stateless persons) staying in the Republic of Moldova, representing 0.6 per cent of the total resident population in the country. The foreigner population growth rate from 2012 to 2013 was 4.5 per cent, and from 2008 to 2013 growth was 24.4 per cent.

**Naturalized foreigner population.** By the end of 2013, there were 681 naturalized foreigners in total. It should be mentioned that stateless persons represent 69 per cent of the total number of naturalized foreigners, followed by foreigners with undetermined citizenship – accounting for 22.6 per cent – and other foreigners (those who had another citizenship before) at 8.4 per cent. Nine persons were naturalized in 2013, 9 in 2012 and 18 in 2011.
Non-natives. The number of persons born abroad (all citizenships) staying in the Republic of Moldova increased from 2008 to 2013. By the end of 2013, there were 283,674 non-natives in the Republic of Moldova, accounting for 8 per cent of the total population. The growth rate of non-natives from 2012 to 2013 was 5.5 per cent.

Immigration into the Republic of Moldova. The annual number of immigrants into the country over the past years has registered an uptrend, from 2,744 persons in 2008 to 3,357 persons in 2013, registering 7.7 per cent growth of the population of foreign immigrants from 2012 to 2013. It is mainly men (with women accounting for only 43.4 per cent of immigrants) and persons with professional secondary education/higher education/scientific degrees (67.3%) who immigrate to the Republic of Moldova. By the end of 2013, there were 11,775 foreigners in the Republic of Moldova holding permanent stay permits, showing negative growth from 2008 (-10.6%). During the period of reference, a significant increase was registered among foreigners coming to the Republic of Moldova for studies – this number increased 1.8 times from 2008 to 2013.

Asylum-seekers. The statistical data shows that the number of asylum-seekers in the Republic of Moldova varied continuously from 2008 to 2013. A total of 163 asylum applications (first request) were registered in 2013, corresponding to an increase of 2.9 times from 2008. It should be mentioned that there were 87 asylum-seekers with pending asylum applications by the end of 2013. The number of asylum-seekers with pending applications from 2012 to 2013 grew 10.1 per cent.

Humanitarian protection. In 2013, 83 foreigners benefited from humanitarian protection; however, 36 persons were refused humanitarian protection. According to national statistical data, 1,526 persons in the Republic of Moldova were documented as stateless in 2013; this figure is 346 persons more than in 2008 and 264 persons more than in 2012. At the same time, there is a decreasing trend in the share of stateless persons among foreigners: 9.2 per cent in 2013 as compared with 11.8 per cent in 2008. By the end of 2013, 78 persons were living in the Republic of Moldova as refugees, registering 108.3 per cent growth from 2012.

Demographic decline. Over the last decades, demographic decline was also observed in the country during the period of reference (2008–2013), when the stable population decreased by over 10,000 persons. The last two years, however, have registered some stabilization trends, confirmed by a number of indicators in the respective areas. Population growth from 2012 to 2013...
was only -0.05 per cent; negative natural growth decreased significantly and registered -0.03 per cent in 2012 and -0.05 per cent in 2013 as compared with -0.82 per cent in 2008. Meanwhile, this phenomenon continues to negatively influence other sociodemographic indicators. It may be noted that during the period of reference, the number of registered marriages continued to decrease from 26,700 in 2008 to 24,400 in 2013, accounting for 6.9 marriages per 1,000 population. The divorce rate registered in 2013 accounted for 3 divorce cases per 1,000 population.

**Demographic composition.** Some other demographic factors have deteriorated in parallel. It may be noted that the share of persons under 15 years old decreased from 17.1 per cent in 2008 to 16 per cent in 2013. Conversely, the share of the elderly people increased from 18.6 per cent in 2008 to 21.5 per cent in 2013. The demographic dependency ratio (national definition) remains rather high in 2013, accounting for 51.4 per cent. Migration accelerates the country’s population ageing, as mainly the young and working-age persons migrate; the ageing coefficient accounted for 15.7 per cent in 2013, coming closer to the critical value of 16 per cent – revealing a rather advanced status of the said phenomenon. In women’s case, the ageing coefficient is even higher, reaching 18.3 per cent.

**Urban migration versus rural migration.** The migration phenomenon, which is more pronounced in rural than in urban areas, has significantly influenced the demographic situation in villages. The demographic indicators confirm the human capital degradation believed to be happening in rural areas. In 2013, the dependency ratio in rural areas exceeded by almost 9 percentage points than in urban areas; the rural share of people aged 65 years old and over exceeds by 1.2 percentage points that of the urban share; and the seniority ratio in rural areas exceeds that in urban area by 4 percentage points. At the same time, the urbanization rate shows an uptrend, alongside a decrease in the share of persons under 15 years old. This reflects the ongoing internal migration from villages to cities, which occurs in parallel with international migration.

**Macroeconomic context.** As the number of persons leaving to work abroad increases, the money transfers from abroad from these individuals have also increased significantly, registering a huge influence on the main macroeconomic indicators. During the period of reference, a fluctuation may be noted for the nominal value of the given indicator, as the growth rate in 2009 dropped by 6 per cent as compared with 2008. Starting in 2010, the nominal value of the GDP per capita has increased continuously, with a value of MDL 28,252 in 2013. Nevertheless, the growth rate registered decreasing trends as compared with the previous years.
For the population of the Republic of Moldova, remittances represent an important resource for escaping poverty. The Household Budget Survey (HBS) data shows that about 23 per cent of households in the Republic of Moldova in 2013 benefited from the remittances; in 2008 this figure registered its highest value, at 26.4 per cent. A higher share of households benefiting from remittances was registered in rural areas (29.5%) than in urban areas (22.6%). The Labour Force Survey (LFS)/Labour Force Migration Study 2012 data reveals that the majority of migrants (81.3%) stated that they sent money to their families. The amounts remitted varied: over one third of migrants (35.8%) stated that they sent under USD 500 on a monthly basis; 12.4 per cent remitted between USD 500 and USD 800; and 7.2 per cent sent more than USD 800. Less than one fifth of migrants (18.7%) stated that they did not send money home. The HBS data shows that from 2008 to 2013, remittances accounted for over half of the disposable income of Moldovan households depending on remittances, registering the maximum value of 58 per cent in 2013.

From 2008 to 2009, the share of the population under the absolute poverty line remained generally stable, averaging 26 per cent of the total country population. However, starting 2010 this indicator has been constantly dropping. In 2013, the share of the population under the absolute poverty line was 12.7 per cent, down 13.7 percentage points from 2008.

From 2008 to 2013, the economically active population decreased constantly from 1,303,000 down to 1,236,000, the difference being 67,000 persons (5.1%). Hence, the activity rate decreased by 2.9 percentage points during this period.

Official statistics reveal a slight downtrend in the working-age population (working age: 16–56/61 years old) from 66.4 per cent to 66 per cent, confirmed by a decrease in the growth rate of this segment from 99.7 per cent to 99.5 per cent. There were 18,803 foreigners of working age (15–64 years old), accounting for 89.1 per cent of the total number of foreigners staying in the country in 2013.

The indicators for labour force participation and employment dropped in 2013 as compared with the indicators in 2012. To be specific, the labour force participation rate, calculated according to the national definition, increased by 1.9 percentage points, while if calculated according to the international definition, it increased by 5.3 percentage points. The unemployment rates decreased in 2013 as compared with the rates in 2012, among the general population, the youth and women.
The shortage of teaching staff continues to be one of the effects of the migration phenomenon in the Republic of Moldova. According to the data of the study on the impact of migration on teaching staff and researchers in the Republic of Moldova, more than half of the interviewed teachers mentioned about their intention to leave for work abroad – 40.3 per cent of respondents said that they wanted to leave for temporary work abroad, 7.9 per cent wanted to leave for good, and 5.4 per cent wanted to leave for studies. In 2013, there were 42,000 children left behind, of whom 10,500 had both parents abroad and 31,500 had one of the parents abroad. The gross enrolment rate in primary education in 2013 was 93.1 per cent, a drop of 0.5 percentage points as compared with the 2008 enrolment rate.

In 2013, the health protection system counted 10,560 doctors and 22,608 health workers with secondary education. Staffing rates were 29.7 doctors and 63.5 health workers with secondary education per 10,000 population, which were below the average European Union (EU) levels of 32.3 doctors and 77.5 health workers with secondary education, respectively, per 10,000 population.

Migration management framework. Over the past years, the increasing awareness of migration as a phenomenon that produces positive results for the country’s development and induces negative social costs, as well as the parallel commitment to proactively manage migration challenges and opportunities, has induced the Moldovan Government to undertake intensive activities in relation to legislation and policy development. A number of concept documents and laws were adopted to determine the migration policy in the key areas of migration management and migration policy administration for the midterm and long term. The majority of them comply with international standards and acquis communautaire, taking European integration aspirations into consideration.

The Republic of Moldova has a well-developed institutional framework in the area of migration management, as well as migration policies developed with the participation of a number of institutional stakeholders. In 2012, the Bureau for Diaspora Relations was created under the State Chancellery, being subordinate to the Prime Minister of the Republic of Moldova, and responsible for coordinating diaspora policies and programmes at the government and ministry levels on the one hand, and for developing a continuous dialogue with Moldovan diaspora on the other hand. The Republic of Moldova also has a comprehensive coordination mechanism in the area of migration involving

---

10 A study carried out within the Project “Effective Governance of Labour Migration and Its Skills Dimension”, implemented in March 2011–December 2013, by the International Labour Organization (ILO), in partnership with the International Organization for Migration (IOM) and the World Bank.
different levels: commissions, committees and working groups chaired by different stakeholders. In this respect, it is important to mention the relaunch (in November 2013) of the commission for the coordination of certain activities related to migration (i.e. the Ministry of Internal Affairs).

The Republic of Moldova continues to benefit from solid foreign assistance. About 200 actions related to migration were implemented with foreign support from 2008 to 2013. A considerable number of these projects, 85 of the total, were implemented under the EU–Moldova Mobility Partnership.
PART A: MIGRATION TRENDS

A.1. Background and main determining factors

Migration processes in the Republic of Moldova have been subject to deep analyses all over their evolution. Migration patterns and evolution have been widely described by researchers in the area. They point out four stages: the first stage (1990–1994), the second stage (1995–2000), the third stage (2001–2006) and the fourth stage which started in May 2006. Each of the four emigration periods is characterized by specific peculiarities; nevertheless, the economic reasons and labour migration are the core elements that serve as a common basis for the development of the migration phenomenon.

The fourth and current stage is characterized by considerable migration management efforts undertaken by the State. The concept-based approach is promoted in relation to the regulation of labour migration, development of institutional reform and closer cooperation with the EU. For purposes of streamlining the migration policies that were being promoted, the Bureau for Diaspora Relations was created in 2012, and some additional competencies regarding the analysis of the migration flows were delegated to the Bureau of Migration and Asylum.

Over the past years, especially during the economic crisis in Europe, the situation of return migration became a timely issue – returning of migrants became a rather emphasized phenomenon when the conditions for the stay and employment of migrants tightened up in the Russian Federation. Moldovan authorities, with the support of international bodies, aimed to provide the necessary assistance to Moldovan citizens who intended to return home or those who had already gone back.

---

12 Government Decision No. 780 dated 19 October 2012; see http://lex.justice.md/md/345122/
A.1.1. Push and pull factors of migration

The studies carried out in the area of migration reveal that the main push factor for Moldovan migrants remains to be economic reasons, especially the lack of employment opportunities and low salaries offered in the country.\textsuperscript{14}

A.2. Current migration patterns

**Available data and sources of information.** The exercise for developing the first Extended Migration Profile (EMP) report – which is a multilateral analysis of the migration phenomenon – involved an assessment of existing data in the country,\textsuperscript{15} the identification of relevant migration indicators and data sources, the development and approval of a list of EMP indicators (which allowed for a description of the complex situation), and the identification and evaluation of the negative and positive effects of migration on the country’s socioeconomic situation.

The necessary actions were identified, along with the authorities responsible for the continuous production of data and the development of the EMP reports – all of these being stipulated in the Action Plan for 2011–2015 for the Implementation of the National Strategy on Migration and Asylum (2011–2020).\textsuperscript{16} The respective central authorities and subordinate institutions have produced and delivered to the Bureau of Migration and Asylum (BMA) several series of data in line with the list of indicators approved for 2011–2013. The report also analyses additional data series from research and surveys carried out during the period of reference.

The tables, which list the data used to develop the analysis on migration profile, are included in Annex 2 of this report.

A.2.1. Flow of international migration of Moldovan citizens and stock of Moldovan citizens living abroad

The migration phenomenon in the Republic of Moldova continues to be characterized by the emigration of Moldovan citizens and less by the immigration of persons from abroad.

\textsuperscript{14}Labour Force Migration (LFM) Study, carried out during the fourth quarter of 2012; see www.statistica.md/pageview.php?id=en&id=2570&idc=350 (According to the survey data, 76.5 per cent of migrants indicated “low salaries in Moldova” as their main reason for leaving the country, and 8.8 per cent indicated “lack of jobs according to their skills/qualifications”.)

\textsuperscript{15}M. Poulain et al., *Data Assessment Report for the Republic of Moldova* (Chisinau, IOM, 2011).

\textsuperscript{16}Government Decision No. 1009 dated 26 December 2011.
Three approaches are generally used in the Republic of Moldova to estimate international emigration, namely:

1. authorized emigration, which involves deregistration from the place of residence and declaration of long-term emigration or emigration for good, also known in the Republic of Moldova as “permanent emigration”;
2. labour migration, that is, leaving to work or to look for a job abroad, with the intention to return, also termed “temporary/circular migration”;
3. exit from the country, which is registered at the border, including, de facto, both authorized/permanent emigration and temporary/circular migration.

There are different data and sources of information for estimating emigration. The most relevant data for monitoring migration and its impact in different areas are presented and analysed in this report. The respective were collected and estimated based on the legislative–normative framework in force at the time this report was developed.

It should be noted that because an important share of the population has dual citizenship, the emigration analysis in this report is focused on data on the country’s population and disregards the citizenships that the persons had at the time, or which was declared by those going through the migration processes; as such, the term “Moldovan citizens” in this context refers to the entire population of the country, unless an alternate definition is provided.

**Emigration of citizens**

The analysis of emigration from the Republic of Moldova in this chapter is focused mainly on the available data regarding the annual flows of those who have left the country from administrative sources. Only in some cases are data related to cumulative stocks on the reporting date presented for comparison.

**Annual flow of international authorized emigration**. Although authorized emigration out of the country, which is estimated based on the data provided by the Ministry of Information Technology and Communications (MITC) (State Enterprise State Information Resources Centre “Registru” (SE SIRC “Registru”), continues to be a timely issue in the Republic of Moldova, the phenomenon

---

17 In the 2005–2010 EMP report, the term “permanent emigration” is used for this group of population, while in this report this term has been replaced by “authorized emigration”. 
shows a downtrend. According to official data, 6,988 persons emigrated in 2008, with the number decreasing by 63 per cent in 2013 to 2,585 persons (Table 1).

It is mainly the urban population that emigrates. In 2013 more than double the number of persons from urban areas (1,923 persons) as from rural areas (662 persons) emigrated (Table 1). The relative share of international emigrants from rural versus urban areas registered a constant increase from 2008 until 2009. Afterwards, the given indicator constantly decreased and was down to 34.5 per cent in 2013 (Table 2).

According to data on annual flow of authorized emigration, more women than men emigrated over the last six years. Hence, the number of women exceeded by almost 15 per cent the number of men in 2013 (Figure 1). The highest number of outflows (emigration) – 6,988 persons (3,237 men and 3,751 women) – was registered in 2008, but afterwards the number of emigrant men and women continuously decreased, to 3,129 persons (1,425 men and 1,704 women) in 2012 and to 2,585 persons (1,201 men and 1,384 women) in 2013. It should be mentioned that in 2013, authorized emigration flow decreased 37 per cent as compared with the rate in 2008 for both men and women.

Data on the annual flow of authorized emigration reveals that it is mainly young persons who are emigrating. The largest share of the total number of authorized outflows in 2013 (2,585 persons) is registered for the population who are 25–29 years old (10.1%) and 30–34 years old (8.9%), followed by the population who are 35–39 years old (8.3%) and 20–24 years old (6.9%).
20–39 years old groups hold a combined share of 34.2 per cent of all authorized outflows in 2013. In the group of closer to the retirement age (65–69 years old), the number of persons leaving the country to settle down permanently abroad is reduced by half (Table 1).

About one third of emigrants have attained secondary and secondary professional education levels and 17.9 per cent have reached incomplete higher education or university education levels. Larger shares of emigrant women have achieved higher education as compared with men (Figure 2 and Table 3).

**Figure 2: Distribution of emigrants by education level and sex, 2012 and 2013 (%)**

![Figure 2: Distribution of emigrants by education level and sex, 2012 and 2013 (%)](source: MITC/SE SIRC "Registru".)

The analysis of the data regarding the authorized emigrants’ countries of destination reveals that in 2013 the Russian Federation and Ukraine continued to receive the largest shares (almost 70%) of authorized emigrants, a decrease from 80 per cent in 2008. Ukraine continued to be on the top in 2013 with 40.8 per cent, followed by the Russian Federation with 26.5 per cent and the United States with 6.2 per cent. It may be noted that there were uptrends for emigration to Germany (9.8% in 2013 as compared with 2.8% in 2008) and Israel (7.7% in 2013 as compared with 2% in 2008) (Figure 3).
Authorized emigration of children. Starting in 2008, the annual flow of children’s emigration has been registering a stable drop, decreasing by 3.2 per cent from 2012 to 2013 (Figure 4), when children who went abroad with their parents decreased to 549 as compared with 1,575 children in 2008. It should be mentioned that this data reflects the annual flow of children aged 0–18 years old, who emigrated with their parents to settle down abroad permanently during the year of reference.
Stock of Moldovan citizens living abroad

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

- the stock of the total number of Moldovan citizens who have done authorized emigration;
- the number of persons who have exited the country by crossing the border and are registered as being absent for one year and longer;
- the number of Moldovan citizens living abroad, which is submitted by the host countries, being obtained from the diplomatic missions and consular offices of the Republic of Moldova; and
- the Population Census, which is considered to be one of the most accurate sources of data on stock of emigrants.

Number of Moldovan citizens living abroad. According to estimates of authorized emigration, the number of Moldovan citizens living abroad continued to increase by almost 19,600 persons from 2008 to 2013 (Table 5 and Figure 5), when the number stood at 101,937. Other estimates of the stock of Moldovan citizens who may be considered emigrants, in line with the international definition,\(^\text{18}\) reveal an underestimation of the total number of emigrants.

Important data sources that allow for the estimation of the volume of emigration according to the international definition are those provided by the Border Police Department (BPD), namely, data about the length of time that a person has stayed abroad, based on registered State border crossings. According to the BPD data, 358,882 persons had been staying outside the county for more than 12 months by the end of 2013 – this number corresponds to an increase by 121,232 persons (51%) from 2008 and by 28,715 persons (8.7%) from 2012 (Table 5 and Figure 5).

---

\(^{18}\) An emigrant is considered to be the person absent from the country for at least 12 months.
It should be mentioned that data from both authorized emigration and border crossing records (Figure 5) shows a similar uptrend over time for the number of persons living abroad, but the actual value of the increase differs between the two. Data on authorized emigration shows that emigration trends during the reference period, as noted above, registered a rather reduced pace as compared with previous years, as indicated by the annual flow of this type of emigration (Table 1). Stays abroad of more than 12 months registered at the border contributed to the uptrend, resulting in an annual numeric increase. According to border crossing data, 870,160 Moldovan citizens had left the country (with various durations of stay abroad) by the end of 2013, of whom 409,271 were men and 460,889 were women, as compared with 820,222 persons in 2012, including 384,169 men and 436,053 women. The distribution of emigrants by duration of their stay abroad and sex is provided in Figure 6 and Figure 7.
Figure 7: Distribution of Moldovan citizens registered at the border as gone abroad by sex and duration of stay, at the end of 2013 (persons)

Given that the BPD data only reflects border crossings accumulated at the State border crossing points controlled by the authorities of the Republic of Moldova, the full volume of emigration from the country cannot be estimated. With this data, there is, therefore, either an underestimation or overestimation of emigration, due to the fact that persons can also cross the border through the Transnistrian segment.

Thus, the BPD data shows that 34,800 more persons had been abroad for more than 12 months in 2009 than in 2008. The number was higher by 28,700 persons in 2013 than in 2012 (Table 5).

Analysis of the data from both sources reveals that women account for a larger percentage of all Moldovan citizens living abroad (Figure 8 and Table 6). In the case of authorized emigration, the women-to-men ratio constantly evolved from 2008 to 2013, with women exceeding the number of men living abroad by almost 20 per cent.

Figure 8: Stock of Moldovan authorized emigrants residing abroad by sex, 2008–2013 (thousand persons)

Source: MITC/SE SIRC “Registru”.

Source: BPD.
Departures from the Republic of Moldova for a period longer than 12 months, registered at the border, followed the same uptrends, but the women-to-men ratio was smaller. During the 2008–2013 period, the ratio varied between 10 per cent and 14 per cent, with uptrend starting in 2011 (Figure 9 and Table 7).

Figure 9: Number of Moldovan citizens registered at the border as being abroad for 12 months and more by sex, 2008–2013 (thousand persons)

Source: BPD.

According to the data presented by the SE SIRC “Registru” (Figure 10), women accounted for 54 per cent of authorized emigrants from 2008 to 2013. In the case of border crossing data, women accounted for almost 53 per cent of the total number of Moldovan citizens living abroad for one year and more. It should be noted that the distribution of emigrants by sex remained generally constant during the period of reference.
Two age groups constituted the largest share of the total number of authorized emigrants during the period of reference (Figure 11). In 2013, persons aged 15–29 accounted for 24.6 per cent of the total number of Moldovan citizens living abroad, followed by the 30–44 years old group, who accounted for 23.3 per cent. These age groups cumulated about 48 per cent of all authorized outflows in 2013.

The age distribution of persons who had been away from the country for 12 months and more, as registered at the border by the end of 2013, reveals that almost the same age groups registered the highest shares, with a more pronounced quantum for the age group of 30–44 years old. It is noted that for the entire reference period, according to border crossing data, the share of persons included in the 15–29 and 30–44 age groups annually cumulated about 65 per cent of the total number of persons who have been abroad for 12 months and more. It is also important to point out the evolution of the 45–59 age group, which was rather representative and annually accounted for about 21.3 per cent of all emigrants. The data confirms the assumption that persons...
of working age are the ones leaving the country. A slight uptrend is also noted for children living abroad: according to border crossing data, an increase in their share of the total number of emigrants was registered from 2.9 per cent in 2008 up to 7.2 per cent in 2013 (Figure 11).

Figure 11: Distribution of Moldovan citizens living abroad by age, 2008–2013 (%)

![Figure 11: Distribution of Moldovan citizens living abroad by age, 2008–2013 (%)](image)

Source: SE SIRC “Registru”, BPD.

Another source of data that can be used to estimate the volume of emigration is the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and European Integration (MFAEI), which obtains such data from Moldovan diplomatic missions and consular offices. According to the data from the Ministry, there were about 819,000 Moldovan citizens living abroad in 2013, regardless of the duration of stay in the host country (Table 9). Analysis of host country distribution reveals that about 86 per cent of all Moldovan citizens living abroad are cumulated by the Russian Federation and Italy (Figure 12).

Figure 12: Distribution of the estimated number of Moldovan citizens living abroad by host country, at the end of 2013 (%)

![Figure 12: Distribution of the estimated number of Moldovan citizens living abroad by host country, at the end of 2013 (%)](image)

Source: MFAEI.

Note: Data of the Republic of Moldova diplomatic and consular missions in the host countries.
According to the data presented by the National Employment Agency (NEA), a rather small number of persons work in host countries with work contracts concluded via the NEA. It should be mentioned that in 2013 this figure grew by 512 cases as compared with 2008, and by 190 cases as compared with 2012 (Figure 13 and Table 10).

**Figure 13: Number of Moldovan citizens working abroad with legal work contracts, 2008–2013 (persons)**

![Graph showing the number of Moldovan citizens working abroad with legal work contracts from 2008 to 2013](image1)

*Source: Ministry of Labour, Social Protection and Family (MLSPF) (NEA).*

The distribution of Moldovan emigrants by country of employment under a legal work contract shows that the largest share of emigrants (70.5%) were hosted by Israel in 2013, followed by the United Arab Emirates (18.5%) and the Russian Federation (6.1%) (Figure 14 and Table 11).

**Figure 14: Distribution of Moldovan citizens working abroad under legal work contracts, by host country, 2013 (%)**

![Pie chart showing the distribution of Moldovan citizens working abroad under legal work contracts by host country in 2013](image2)

*Source: MLSPF (NEA).*
**Emigration for studies**

There was an increase in the number of Moldovan citizens studying abroad under international education agreements during the reference period. In 2013, there were 5,891 students, which is 2.5 times the number in 2008 (in 2012, there were 5,356 Moldovan students) (Table 12).

In 2013, about 93 per cent of Moldovan citizens studying abroad were in Romania, 2.4 per cent in Bulgaria, 1.8 per cent in Ukraine and 1.8 per cent in the Russian Federation.

**Involuntary emigration**

Involuntary emigration registered a significant decrease from 2008 to 2012, based on data from international databases. According to the data, 888 Moldovans sought asylum abroad in 2008; the number dropped gradually and was down to 460 persons in 2011 and 441 in 2012 (Table 13).

At the same time, it may be noted that during the period of reference, the total number of asylum-seekers from the Republic of Moldova, who had obtained the refugee status abroad, increased by 10.7 per cent, and by the end of 2012, a total of 6,148 persons from the Republic of Moldova were registered and recognized as refugees, as compared with 5,555 persons in 2008.

It should be mentioned that the growth rate of the number of Moldovan citizens registered as asylum-seekers abroad and the growth rate of the number of Moldovan citizens registered and recognized as refugees abroad decreased during the period of reference as compared with the previous year (Table 13).

**Temporary migration**

Labour migration has persisted in the Republic of Moldova for two decades. Data from the Labour Force Survey (LFS),\(^\text{19}\) which is carried out on a quarterly basis by the National Bureau of Statistics (NBS), shows that an approximately stable number of persons, about 300,000, were working outside the country for a certain period between 2008 and 2013. Based on the LFS data, the NBS...
estimated the volume of labour migration as the number of persons aged 15 and over who had gone abroad to work or look for a job at the time the survey was carried out. According to the LFS estimates, the top receiving countries of Moldovan emigrants were the Russian Federation, Italy, Turkey, Israel, Ukraine, Portugal, Romania and Greece (Table 14).

In 2013, the number of people staying abroad increased to 332,500, of whom 216,900 were men and 115,600 were women, as compared with 328,300 persons registered in 2012, of whom 218,600 were men and 109,700 were women. Distribution by sex shows significant discrepancies regarding the countries of destination, with men mainly leaving for the Russian Federation, Ukraine, Portugal and Romania, and women going to Italy, Turkey, Greece and Israel (Figure 15).

**Figure 15: Distribution of Moldovan citizens aged 15 and over who are working or looking for a job abroad, by country of destination and sex, 2008, 2011, 2012 and 2013 (%)**

The share of men who left for the Russian Federation in 2013 accounted for 79 per cent of total; for Italy, 6 per cent; and for Ukraine, 2 per cent. In the same year, of the total number of women migrating to work abroad, 46 per cent left for the Russian Federation, 33 per cent went to Italy, and 5 per cent went to Israel and Turkey. Other countries hosted about 1 per cent and less of labour migrants of both sexes (Figure 16).
It should be mentioned that the distribution by sex of Moldovans working abroad reflected the continuous trend of more men migrants in the labour force: in 2013 the distribution was 65 per cent men versus 35 per cent women, as compared with 63 per cent men versus 37 per cent women in 2009 and 2010 (Table 14).

About 72 per cent of Moldovan citizens who were abroad in 2013 came from the rural areas, hence registering an increase as compared with the previous years. As in 2008, this share accounted for 69 per cent (Table 15). Surveys in the area of labour migration confirm that mainly persons who had worked in agriculture (which is mostly in rural areas) prior to migration were leaving the country. The distribution of migrants by economic activity prior to leaving the country reveals that 43.3 per cent were working in agriculture, hunting and forestry; 13.1 per cent in construction; and 11.6 per cent in trade. It should be mentioned that more than half of all the migrants (56.5%) had worked or were currently working abroad in construction. As well, among the most widespread economic activities abroad were domestic services to private households (18.7%) and trade (9.7%) (Figure 17).

20 LFM Study, carried out in the fourth quarter of 2012; see www.statistica.md/pageview.php?l=en&id=2570&idx=350 (According to the survey data, 76.5 per cent of migrants indicated “low salaries in Moldova” as their main reason for leaving the country, and 8.8 per cent indicated “lack of jobs according to their skills/qualifications”.)
The distribution of migrants by wide age group in 2013 is as follows: 77 per cent were persons aged 15–44, of whom 34 per cent were 25–34 years old; this was followed by those aged 35–44 and 15–24, each group accounting for 22 per cent. Migrants aged 45–54 held a share of 18 per cent, and those aged 55 and over accounted for 5 per cent. It may be noted that mainly young people from rural areas leave the country: the 15–34 years old group accounted for 58 per cent of all emigrants from rural areas, as compared with 46 per cent for the same age group in urban areas (Figure 18 and Table 15).
Significant disparities between the sexes are observed within migrants’ age groups. The younger the group is, the larger the share of men, with the gap getting smaller with older age groups. In 2013, men accounted for 73 per cent of the 15–24 years old group and for 51 per cent of the 45–54 years old group – a difference of 22 percentage points (Figure 19 and Table 16).

Figure 19: Gender gap in the distribution of temporary migrants by age, 2012 and 2013 (%)

Source: NBS (LFS).

Statistical data shows that level of education, which influences the capacity to get integrated into the labour market abroad, plays a significant role in setting the migration flow. In 2013, about 50 per cent of the total number of migrants were found to have attained secondary education (lyceum, gymnasium), and 39 per cent were found to have achieved vocational and professional secondary education. Persons with higher education accounted for 11 per cent of the total number of migrants. It is important to mention that the shares of persons with higher education show an increasing trend for both women and men (Figure 20 and Table 17).
The annual number of repatriated persons increased in 2008 and 2009, registering year-on-year growth rates of 14 per cent and 6 per cent (Table 18) over these years. From 2010 to 2012, the number of repatriated persons decreased, but 2013 saw an increase – with 1,585 persons repatriated – thus registering a positive growth rate of 6.5 per cent from 2012. A certain number of children were registered among the repatriated persons, representing 3.5 per cent of the total number of repatriated persons in 2013 (Figure 21).

According to the Law No. 200 dated 16 July 2010, on the foreigners’ stay in the Republic of Moldova, “repatriation” is defined as “voluntary return into the home country of the persons born in the Republic of Moldova and their descendants, according to the law”.

Figure 20: Distribution of Moldovan citizens aged 15 and over who are working or looking for a job abroad by education level and sex, 2008 and 2013 (%)

**Repatriation**

Source: NBS (LFS).

Figure 21: Number of persons repatriated to the Republic of Moldova, 2008–2013

Source: Ministry of Internal Affairs (MIA)/BMA and MITC/SE SIRC “Registru”.

---

21 According to the Law No. 200 dated 16 July 2010, on the foreigners’ stay in the Republic of Moldova, “repatriation” is defined as “voluntary return into the home country of the persons born in the Republic of Moldova and their descendants, according to the law”.

---

Extended Migration Profile of the Republic of Moldova 2008–2013
Readmission

An important element of migration management is an efficient system for readmission. The readmission of Moldovan citizens returning from EU countries is carried out in line with the provisions set in the Agreement between the European Community and the Republic of Moldova on the readmission of persons residing without authorization, as well as in the readmission agreements signed with the countries of destination of Moldovan migrants, which have helped made the activities in migration management more efficient. During the period of reference, the number of readmitted persons increased continuously, and in 2011 the figure was three times that in 2008. In 2013, 88 persons were readmitted (Table 18 and Figure 22), which was due to either the legalization of Moldovans or the observance of the stay regime in the countries they live.

Figure 22: Annual number of Moldovan citizens readmitted, 2008–2013 (persons)

![Graph showing the annual number of Moldovan citizens readmitted, 2008–2013 (persons)](image)

Source: MIA/BMA.

The distribution of readmitted Moldovan citizens by country indicates that 48 persons returned from France, 11 from Spain, 7 from Belgium, 7 from Germany and other EU countries (Figure 23).

22 In 2008, the Agreement between the EU and the Republic of Moldova on the readmission of persons residing without authorization and the Agreement between the EU and the Republic of Moldova on the facilitation of visa issuance entered into force. In 2010, the provisions of the Readmission Agreement signed with the EU regarding the readmission of the third-country nationals entered into force.
Preventing and combating trafficking in human beings

Preventing and combating trafficking in human beings was set as a national priority; hence, a number of international acts were ratified and a set of legislative–normative and strategic acts were adopted to straighten out the situation in this area.\textsuperscript{23}

Besides the measures for constraining the given phenomenon, the need to support victims based on a cross-sectoral and multidisciplinary approach was identified.

In 2006, with the support of the International Organization for Migration (IOM), external donors and civil society, the National Referral System (NRS) was launched in the Republic of Moldova, with the aim of ensuring a complex framework of protection and assistance for victims of trafficking in human beings and high-risk groups. Currently, it constitutes the main framework for cooperation and coordination of efforts undertaken by the stakeholders active in the area of combating trafficking in human beings. The activities set in the NRS are carried out through the Multidisciplinary Teams (MDTs), which cover the whole country.

Statistical data shows that 131 victims of trafficking in human beings were identified in 2013 through the MDTs of the NRS. This is 1.6 times higher than the

number registered in 2008 (Table 19), a fact that may be explained by a more efficient identification of such victims. Of the identified victims, 90 per cent were adults (76.3% women and 23.7% men) and 9.9 per cent were children (46.2% girls and 53.8% boys).

A total of 1,403 potential victims of trafficking in human beings were identified and assisted through the NRS in 2013, as compared with 1,214 in 2012. This figure is seven times as many as that in 2008, registering an increase of 15.6 per cent (Figure 24). It is assumed that the real number could actually be much higher, as there exists an extended group of other persons considered to be at high risk of becoming victims of trafficking.

Figure 24: Number of Moldovan citizens – victims and potential victims of trafficking in human beings – assisted within the National Referral System, 2008–2013 (persons)

Source: MLSPF.

Analysis of data on trafficking in human beings shows that despite the measures in place, the Republic of Moldova continues to be a country of origin and less a country of transit for victims of trafficking from the ex-Soviet Union countries to the European States.

A.2.2. Resident population with foreign background

This sub-chapter analyses the migration trend among persons with foreign backgrounds residing in the Republic of Moldova, based on data submitted by the MITC (SE SIRC “Registru”) and the MIA/BMA, which are the main sources of
information on this subject. The following are used as additional data sources: administrative data of the MLSPF and the MFAEI; results of the analytical reports related to the subject; the normative and government strategic framework; and statistical data from international organizations such as the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) and IOM.

**Stock of population with foreign background**

By the end of 2013, there were 21,092 foreigners (including stateless persons) staying in the territory of the Republic of Moldova in total, representing 0.5 per cent of the total population. This shows 4.5 per cent growth in terms of the size of the foreigner population as against that in 2012, and 24.4 per cent growth as against 2008 (Figure 25).

![Figure 25: Number of foreigners living in the Republic of Moldova and year-on-year growth rates for the foreign population, 2008–2013](image)

Source: MITC/SE SIRC “Registru”.

An uptrend was likewise observed for the concentration of foreigners in urban areas, with the share of those settling down in cities accounting for 77 per cent of all foreigners in the Republic of Moldova during the entire period of reference (Table 20). The 2013 distribution of the foreigner population by country of previous citizenship shows that the most significant share, 56 per cent cumulatively, was registered by those originating from Ukraine and the Russian Federation (33.2% and 22.8%, respectively), followed by Israel (8%), Romania (5.1%) and Turkey (4.4%). Other nations held shares of less than 2 per cent each (Figure 26 and Table 22).
A rather important share (8.8%) of the foreigner population was held by stateless people and persons with undetermined citizenships.

**Naturalized citizens.** Naturalization in the Republic of Moldova is carried out in line with the Law on Citizenship, which sets the eligibility conditions for applying for naturalization. By the end of 2013, a total of 681 foreigners had been naturalized (Table 23). It should be mentioned that stateless persons accounted for 69 per cent of the total number of naturalized persons, followed by foreigners with undetermined citizenship at 22.6 per cent, and other foreigners (those who previously had another citizenship) at 8.4 per cent (Figure 27). A total of nine persons were naturalized in 2013 (Table 20).
**Non-natives.** The number of foreign-born persons (regardless of citizenship) staying in the Republic of Moldova increased during the 2008–2012 period. By the end of 2013, there were 283,674 non-natives in the country, representing 7.3 per cent of the country’s total population (Table 24). The population of non-natives grew 5.5 per cent from 2012 (Figure 28). The distribution of the non-natives according to country of birth shows that 74.4 per cent of them were born either in Ukraine (37.3%) or the Russian Federation (37.1%). The shares of non-natives born in other countries vary from 5.3 per cent to 0.7 per cent (5.3% – Italy; 4.6% – Kazakhstan; 1.7% – Belarus; 1.8% – Romania; and 1.1% – Turkey).

Figure 28: Number of persons from the Republic of Moldova born abroad and growth rates for this group, 2008–2013

![Diagram showing the number of persons from the Republic of Moldova born abroad and growth rates from 2008 to 2013.](image)

Source: MITC/SE SIRC “Registru”.

**Immigration of foreigners**

Annual immigration to the Republic of Moldova registered an uptrend over the period of reference, from 2,744 persons in 2008 to 3,357 persons in 2013. Immigrant population grew 22.3 per cent in 2013 as compared with 2008, and grew 7.7 per cent as compared with 2012. It was mainly men (with women accounting for 43.4% of immigrants) and persons with professional secondary education/higher education/scientific degrees (67.3%) who immigrated to the country (Table 25). There was also an increase in the number of those with higher education, from 903 persons in 2008 to 1,231 persons in 2013 (Table 26).
The 2013 distribution of immigrants by country of citizenship reveals that over the past years, most of them arrived from Romania (17.9%), Israel (13.8%), Turkey (13.3%) and Ukraine (11.8%) (Figure 29 and Table 27).

Figure 29: Distribution of immigrant population by country of citizenship, 2008–2013 (%)

In 2013, 31.8 per cent of the total number of immigrants came to the country for work, 21.1 per cent came for studies and 32 per cent for family reintegration (Table 28).

Foreigners’ stay in the Republic of Moldova

The number of foreigners seeking permission to stay in the Republic of Moldova is continuously growing. Currently, depending on the purpose of entry and stay in the country, a foreigner may obtain either a temporary stay permit (for work, studies, family reintegration, humanitarian and religious activities, health treatment and other reasons under the national legislation) or a permanent stay permit.

By the end of 2013, 11,775 foreigners were living in the Republic of Moldova and holding permanent stay permits, growing 10.6 per cent from 2008. Over the past two years, the share of the working-age foreigners (15–64 years old) holding permanent stay permits decreased; in 2013 the share of this group decreased by 20.9 percentage points. The share of foreigners living in the country for at least five years decreased by 3.5 percentage points as compared with 2012, accounting for 16.3 per cent (Table 29).
Statistical data shows that more than 2,000 foreigners annually obtain temporary stay permits for the first time. By the end of 2013, the total number of holders of such valid permits exceeded 7,000. About 39 per cent of the total number of foreigners holding temporary stay permits were persons who reunified with their families; 33 per cent came for work or business; and 16.3 per cent for studies or training. In 2013, 16 foreigners obtained local border traffic permits, which is six persons more than the number of foreigners who registered in 2012 (Table 29).

**Foreign students in the Republic of Moldova.** A significant growth in the number of foreigners coming to study in the Republic of Moldova was registered during the period of reference, being 1.8 times higher in 2013 than in 2008 (Figure 30).

According to the data presented in the figure above, 2,138 persons were studying in the Republic of Moldova in 2013. The distribution by country of origin reveals that the majority of those who came to the Republic of Moldova to study were from Israel (1,551 persons), Ukraine (164 persons), Romania (108 persons) and the Russian Federation (82 persons) (Table 30).
International protection

International protection of foreigners in the Republic of Moldova is carried out within the limits of the provisions set by international norms, as well as by the national legislation derived from them. Statistical data shows that the number of asylum-seekers in the Republic of Moldova varied continuously from 2008 to 2013. A total of 163 first applications were registered in 2013, which is 2.9 times higher than in 2008. It should be mentioned that there were 87 asylum-seekers with pending applications by the end of 2013, registering 110 per cent growth as compared with the previous year (Table 31).

The 2013 distribution of asylum-seekers by country of origin was dominated by citizens from the Syrian Arab Republic, who accounted for 52.2 per cent of the total, followed by those from Afghanistan (8.6%), Uzbekistan (4.9%), Kyrgyzstan (6.1%), Iraq (3%), Pakistan (2.5%), the Russian Federation (2.5%), Cuba (1.8%), Nigeria (1.8%) and Tajikistan (1.8%) (Table 32).

Significant gender-based disparities were observed among the asylum-seekers during the period of reference. The majority of applications were from men, while applications from women accounted for only 28.2 per cent in 2013 (23.9% in 2008).

In 2013, 83 foreigners benefited from humanitarian protection, while 36 persons were refused protection.

By the end of 2013, 78 persons with refugee status were living in the Republic of Moldova, recording 108.3 per cent growth from 2012 (Table 31).

Stateless persons. According to statistical data, 1,526 stateless persons were documented stateless in the Republic of Moldova by the end of 2013, which is 346 persons more than in 2008 (Table 22). At the same time, some decreasing trends were observed for the share of stateless persons among foreigners: in 2013 this group accounted for 9.2 per cent as compared with 11.8 per cent in 2008 (Table 20).

It should be mentioned that analysis of the national legal framework of the Republic of Moldova reveals a high level of its compliance with international

\[25\text{Law No. 677 of 23 November 2001, on Republic of Moldova’s Accession to the Convention relating to the Status of Refugees and the Protocol relating to the Status of Refugees.}\]
standards, as well as the presence of an adequate information system to identify, prevent and reduce cases of statelessness.\(^{26}\)

**General cross-border mobility**

Cross-border mobility continuously increased during the reference period. About 7,578,000 entries were registered at the Moldovan border (roughly 5,215,000 Moldovans and around 2,363,000 foreigners), the difference as compared with the number of exits being 1.8 per cent (Table 33).

In terms of cross-border mobility, Moldovans represented 68.8 per cent of all movements, with exits prevailing over entries. The share of Moldovans’ exits decreased in 2013 by 6 percentage points as compared with 2008 (Figure 31).

![Figure 31: Cross-border mobility, 2008–2013 (%)](image)

Source: BPD.

---

As for visa-based entries of foreigners, statistical data from the MFAEI shows that in 2013 the diplomatic missions and consular offices of the Republic of Moldova abroad issued 15,272 visas, recording 1.7 per cent growth from 2012. The low number of visas as compared with 2012 was conditioned by the abolition of visas for some States in 2013 (Table 34).

Legislation enforcement in the area of migration and return

In 2013, 2,917 immigrants were identified as illegally staying in the Republic of Moldova – double as compared with the number in 2012, and lower by 10 per cent as compared with the figure in 2008. Thirty-two foreigners were expelled from the country, while 81 foreigners were taken under public custody. All other cases were included in the group of those waiting for a final decision by the competent courts, and eight foreigners were declared undesirable on the territory of the Republic of Moldova (Table 35).

27 The visa system is applied for citizens of 131 states (mainly from countries in Asia, Africa, the Middle East and the Far East, Latin America and Southern America). The citizens of the EU, the United States, Canada, Japan, Norway, Switzerland, Israel and the CIS States, except for Turkmenistan, may enter the territory of the Republic of Moldova without visas and stay in the country up to 90 days, calculated from the date of the first entry. See www.mfa.gov.md/entry-visas-moldova/
PART B: IMPACT OF MIGRATION

The magnitude of the labour migration phenomenon in the Republic of Moldova during the past several years has had a dual impact on the population of the country: on one hand are the positive socioeconomic effects determined by remittances; on the other hand, the sociodemographic effects that lead to the deterioration of human capital.

B.1. Migration and demographic development

International migration continues to be an important factor for the country’s demographic development, having both direct-and-immediate and indirect impacts over time. To be specific, the prevalence of emigration over immigration has an immediate impact on the size of the population and contributes to its continuous decrease, and the labour migration of women of childbearing age leads to the deterioration of the main demographic indicators due to birth rate decrease.

Population trends. The demographic decline registered in the country over the past two decades was also observed during the analysed period. From 2008 to 2013, the stable population decreased by almost 10,000 persons.

In addition, the past two years witnessed some stabilization trends, confirmed by a number of indicators in the area (Table 36). Thus, population growth in 2013 registered -0.05 per cent as compared with 2012, and the negative natural growth registered minimum values of -0.06 in 2013 and -0.03 per 1,000 population in 2012 as compared with -0.82 in 2008 (Figure 32).

Figure 32: Demographic trends in the Republic of Moldova, 2008–2013

Source: NBS.
**Emigration versus immigration.** Statistical data confirms as well that emigration continued to prevail over immigration in the Republic of Moldova. Nevertheless, the recent years exhibit a trend towards stabilization.

At the same time, labour migration or migration to seek a job abroad continued to influence negatively other sociodemographic indicators. For example, the number of registered marriages continued to drop from 26,700 in 2008 to 24,400 in 2013, accounting for 6.9 marriages per 1,000 population. The emigration of one of the spouses leads to a definite break-up; as a result, many marriages fall apart. In 2013, the number of divorces accounted for 10,800, which is 138 cases more than in 2012; hence, the divorce rate was 3 divorces per 1,000 population (Table 36).

**Demographic composition.** In parallel, it may be noted that other demographic indicators have also worsened. The population share of persons aged under 15 dropped from 17.08 per cent in 2008 to 16 per cent in 2013, while the share of elderly people increased from 18.61 per cent in 2008 to 21.50 per cent in 2013, and the demographic dependency ratio (national definition) remained to be rather high in 2013, accounting for over 51.44 per cent (Table 37).

Migration accelerates population ageing, because it is mainly the young and working-age population who emigrate. It should be noted that the ageing coefficient reached in 2013 the value of 15.7 per cent, getting closer to the critical value of 16 per cent, indicating an advanced stage of the phenomenon. The ageing coefficient for women is even higher, computed at 18.3 per cent in 2013 (Figure 33).

---

28 In 2012, the demographic composition (according to international definition) accounted for 35.21 per cent of the population, decreasing 3 percentage points as compared with that in 2008 (Table 37).
Urban migration versus rural migration. Migration is more common in rural areas than in urban areas, significantly influencing the demographic situation in villages. Demographic indicators, disaggregated by area of residence, confirm the deterioration of human capital in rural areas. For example, it may be noted that in 2013, the dependency ratio in rural areas exceeded by almost 9 percentage points than in urban areas; the population share of persons aged 65 and over in villages exceeded by 1.2 percentage points than in cities, and the seniority ratio exceeded by 4 percentage points. At the same time, there was an increasing urbanization rate alongside a decreasing share of persons aged under 15, leading to the assumption that internal migration from villages to cities was in parallel with international migration (Table 39). According to the survey carried out by Nexus in 2013\(^{29}\) (the presented data referred to the 12 months prior to the data collection period of May–August 2013), 411,566 persons in total were abroad for a long period of time, of whom about 30 per cent were from urban areas and 70 per cent were from rural areas. According to the report on the survey results, the distribution of persons who went abroad by reason is as follows: among the 368,157 persons who left for work, 31.6 per cent were

\(^{29}\) For more details about the “Households Survey, Country Migration Profile (2013)”, please contact info@nexusnet.md, info@iasci.info
from urban areas and 68.4 per cent were from rural areas; of the 18,377 persons who left for studies, 33.9 per cent from urban areas and 66.1 per cent were from rural areas; and among 18,717 persons who left for family reunification, only 28.1 per cent were from urban areas and 72 per cent were from rural areas.

**Foreigner population.** An uptrend over the last five years was noted for the foreigner population in the Republic of Moldova. The population of persons of foreign origin by the end of 2013 reached 21,092. This represents just a little over 0.5 per cent of the total stable population of the country and, thus, does not affect the population age distribution.

An uptrend was registered for the number of elderly foreigners. Foreigners’ share of the population of the elderly (aged 65 and over) increased from 0.28 per cent in 2008 to 0.58 per cent in 2013. There were more men than women among foreigners, with the foreigner men-to-women ratio reaching 114 per cent in 2013 (Table 40).

**B.2. Migration and economic development**

**Macroeconomic context.** Labour force migration out of the country has an important and significant role, not only in terms of demographic indicators but also from an economic perspective. As the number of Moldovans leaving the country to work abroad increased, a significant growth was noted for the amount of transfers made by these individuals from abroad, widely influencing the main macroeconomic indicators. The growth of the Republic of Moldova’s GDP over the previous years is mainly attributed to the revenues sent by Moldovan migrants working abroad. It seems that the return of Moldovan migrants to the country during the global economic crisis influenced the positive dynamics of GDP per capita. During this period, fluctuations were registered for the nominal value of the indicator, with a 6 per cent decrease in the growth rate in 2009 as compared with 2008. Starting in 2010, the value of the GDP per capita increased continuously, but the growth rate registered a downtrend until 2012, while afterwards a 10 per cent increase is noted in 2013 (Figure 34 and Table 41).
Households and remittances. Remittances are an important means for the population of the Republic of Moldova to escape poverty. The Household Budget Survey (HBS) data reveals a considerable share of Moldovan households receiving remittances during the reference period (Table 42). Over 22.7 per cent of the total number of households benefited from remittances in 2013, with the highest figure (26.4%) obtained in 2008. A higher share of households benefiting from remittances was registered in rural areas than in urban areas, 29.5 per cent and 22.6 per cent, respectively. After a jump in 2010, the share of households receiving remittances started to register a downtrend, dropping to 25.6 per cent in rural areas and 19.2 per cent in urban areas in 2013 (Figure 35).
The 2012 LFS/LFM data reveals that the majority of migrants (81.3%) sent or transferred money to their families. The transferred amounts varied: over one third of migrants (35.8%) sent less than USD 500 on a monthly basis; 12.4 per cent remitted between USD 500 and USD 800; and 7.2 per cent sent over USD 800 (Table 43). Less than one fifth of the migrants (18.7%) stated that they did not transfer money back home (Figure 36).

Figure 36: Distribution of migrants by average monthly amounts sent home in 2011 and 2012 (%)

Source: NBS (LFM).

Households’ disposable income is significantly influenced by remittances. The HBS data shows that during the 2008–2013 period, remittances accounted for half of the disposable income of recipient households (the share depending on the amount received), with the highest value reached in 2013, at 58 per cent (Table 42).

Significant differences in the volume of remittances received are observed between urban and rural households. In rural areas, the share of remittances of the total household disposable income is very significant, exceeding 60 per cent in 2013, with a difference of 9.3 percentage points than the share in urban areas. Among urban households receiving remittances, the share is nevertheless important, accounting for almost half of the disposable income (Figure 37).

LFM Study, carried out in the fourth quarter of 2012; see www.statistica.md/publicaţii: (According to the survey data, 76.5 per cent of migrants indicated “low salaries in Moldova” as their main reason for leaving the country, and 8.8 per cent indicated “no jobs according to their skills/qualifications”.)
Remittances help improve a household’s well-being. The proportion of the population under the absolute poverty line registered stable trends in 2008–2009, accounting for 26 per cent of the total population of the country. This indicator had been constantly decreasing since 2010 (Table 44). In 2013, the population under the absolute poverty line accounted for 12.7 per cent, decreasing by 13.7 percentage points as compared with 2008. It should be mentioned that poverty incidence is higher among children (persons under 18 years old), at 15 per cent (Figure 38).
The flow of financial resources from persons working abroad may help diminish absolute poverty, and also leads to an increase in inequality between households that receive remittances and those that do not. The NBS data indicates that the proportion of households which would be under the poverty line if not for remittances increased from 14 per cent in 2008 to 23.6 per cent in 2013, with the highest increase registered in rural areas from 16.7 per cent to 31.5 per cent (Table 42 and Figure 39).

Figure 39: Share of households which would be under the poverty line if not for remittances, 2008–2013 (%)

Source: NBS.

B.3. Migration, employment and the labour market

B.3.1. Labour market features

The labour market in the Republic of Moldova continues to face difficulties, with a dramatically negative impact on the employment rate. During the 2008–2013 reference period, the size of the economically active population decreased constantly from 1,303,000 to 1,236,000, the registered drop being 67,000 persons (5.1%). Hence, the activity rate decreased by 2.9 percentage points during the reference period (Figure 40 and Table 45).

31 The economically active population includes those persons supplying labour for production of goods and services, including the employed the unemployed.
A large economically inactive population,\(^{32}\) was registered during the period of reference, which increased from 1,639,000 persons in 2008 to 1,751,000 persons in 2013 (Figure 41). A significant share of the working-age population that is economically inactive has become one of the most challenging demographic features of the labour force market in the Republic of Moldova.

---

\(^{32}\) Economically inactive covers all persons, regardless of age, who did not work at least one hour and who were not unemployed during the period of reference. The economically inactive population includes the following categories of population: (i) pupils or students; (ii) pensioners (of all categories); (iii) housewives (who perform only domestic works in the household); (iv) persons maintained by other persons or by the State, or those who maintain themselves from other revenues (rents, interest rates, leases, etc.); and (v) persons declared as working or looking for a job abroad (this category of population conventionally belongs to the economically inactive population) (NBS definition).
**Working-age population.** Official statistical data indicates a slight decrease in the size of the working-age population (working age: 16–56/61 years old\(^{33}\)) from 66.57 per cent in 2011 to 66.03 per cent in 2013. This trend is confirmed by a decline in growth – from 99.78 per cent in 2011 to 99.46 per cent in 2013 (Table 46). Although these differences seem insignificant, the data reveals some changes in the population structure. In 2013, the share of population of persons under the working age decreased from 18.7 per cent to 17.1 per cent as compared with 2008, while the share of the population of persons over the working age increased from 15 per cent to 17 per cent. If the migration of the younger segments of the population persists, the working-age population will continue to shrink, inducing negative effects associated with this phenomenon (Figure 42).

**Figure 42: Structure of population by age, 2008 and 2013 (%)**

![Population Structure Chart](image)

Source: NBS.

A number of specific demographic indicators confirm the deterioration of the labour force. From 2012 to 2013, a downtrend was registered – for the labour demographic pressure index from 88.4 per cent to 84.1 per cent, and for the femininity ratio for the population of persons who are 15–39 years old from 97.4 per cent to 97.2 per cent. On the other hand, the age structure index for the working-age population increased from 78.7 per cent to 80 per cent, while the femininity ratio for the population of persons aged 40–64 remained at the same level, accounting for 115.5 per cent (Figure 43).

\(^{33}\) According to the national definition.
Foreign working-age population (15–64 years old\textsuperscript{34}). In 2013, there were 18,803 working-age foreigners, accounting for 89.1 per cent of the total number of foreigners staying in the Republic of Moldova. The number of working-age foreigners in 2013 was higher by 142 persons than in 2012, but the growth rate of the group was lower in 2013 (100.8%) than in 2012 (102.7%) (Table 47). The age structure index for working-age foreigners increased from 72.5 per cent in 2012 to 97.2 per cent in 2013, while the femininity ratio decreased (Figure 44).
Participation in the labour force and employment. The indicators characterizing employment and participation in the labour force decreased in 2013 as compared with 2012. To be specific, the labour force participation rate, calculated according to the national definition, decreased by 1.9 percentage points; while using the international definition, the same rate increased by 5.3 percentage points. The employment rate, estimated according to either definition, increased by 0.9 percentage points (Figure 45).

Figure 45: Dynamics of indicators related to employment and participation in the labour force, 2012 and 2013 (%)

Unemployment. Unemployment indicators also registered a downtrend. For instance, the unemployment rate decreased in 2013 as compared with 2012, both overall as well as among youth and women (Figure 46 and Table 48). It would seem that the situation is getting better, but taking into consideration the continuously growing migration flow and the increasing number of Moldovans working abroad, unemployment indicators should be interpreted carefully, as the observed effect may be due mainly to continuous migration processes.
b.3.2. Labour migration

Labour migration in the Republic of Moldova is assessed based on the LFS data. As mentioned in Part A of this report, about 300,000 persons aged 15 and over are registered annually as working abroad or looking for a job abroad. The migration profile throughout the reference period is characterized by a large share of inhabitants from rural areas, and the urban-to-rural migrant ratio ranges between 219 per cent and 252 per cent. There were more male migrants than female migrants, with the men-to-women ratio ranging between 186 per cent and 188 per cent during the 2008–2013 reference period (Figure 47). Moldovans who were younger than 44 were mainly those who migrated abroad for work, accounting for 76.8 per cent of the total number of labour migrants in 2013 (Table 16); of those migrants, about 11 per cent had higher education (Table 17).
B.4. Migration and social development

To develop effective and efficient migration policies, it is very important to carry out an in-depth analysis of the migration phenomenon, which would allow the national authorities to adopt data-based actions.

_The shortage of teaching staff continues to be one of the negative effects of the migration phenomenon._ Education remains to be an area heavily affected by migration, and teaching staff drain continues to be triggered by economic factors. The data revealed by the survey on the impact of migration among teaching staff and researchers in the Republic of Moldova\(^{35}\) shows that low wages in the country are among the main push factors for emigration of teachers and researchers. Even though teaching staff benefited in 2010 from a large wage increase, their salaries are 20 per cent lower than the country’s mean salary. This problem of small salaries is rather acute among young teachers and researchers. Another important economic push factor is the impossibility to improve living conditions of families.

According to the data from the aforementioned survey, over half of all interviewed teachers reported having intentions to go abroad; 40.3 per cent of respondents mentioned that they would like to leave the country for temporary work; 7.9 per cent would like to leave for good; and 5.4 per cent would like to study overseas. The profile of those who intend to leave temporarily to work abroad is as follows: young teachers, aged 25 to 39, with children, living in rural areas, with small incomes and usually with dual citizenship. Those who wish to leave the country permanently are – in most cases – married, with work experience up to 10 years, living in urban areas (except for those who live in municipalities of Chisinau and Balti) and have average incomes. Migration intentions are more pronounced among men than women. Intention to leave the country is more common among young teaching staff and researchers, with the largest share held by the 25–29 years old group (67%).

_Migration of the population to look for better-paying jobs abroad reduces poverty on one hand but leaves a strong social impact on children on the other hand._ According to the information provided by the Ministry of Education from the analysis of the data collected during the school census, there were 42,000 left-behind children in 2013, of whom 10,500 children had both parents working abroad and 31,500 children had one of their parents abroad (Table 49).

---

\(^{35}\) Survey implemented within the Project “Effective Governance of Labour Migration and Its Skills Dimension”, implemented in March 2011–December 2013, by the ILO, in partnership with IOM and the World Bank.
Migration also influences integration in education, as well as the perception on school enrolment opportunity. Statistical data shows that the enrolment rates within compulsory general education are decreasing, with significant urban–rural gaps. The overall gross enrolment rate in primary education in 2013 was 93.1 per cent, which is 0.5 percentage points lower than in 2008 (Table 51). The gross enrolment rate in primary education in rural areas in 2013 was 84.8 per cent and was 22.4 percentage points lower than in urban areas. The overall gross enrolment rate in gymnasium education in 2013 was 87 per cent as compared with 89.3 per cent in 2008—a decrease by 2.3 percentage points. The gross enrolment rate in gymnasium education in rural areas was 81.4 per cent, 16.3 percentage points lower than in urban areas (Figure 48).

**Figure 48: Gross enrolment rates in primary and gymnasium education by area of residence, 2008–2013**

Source: NBS.

**Assuring social minimum guarantees and migrants’ access to the social protection system.** The assurance of social minimum guarantees for migrant workers and their families is a priority among the social policies of the Republic of Moldova. From 2008 to 2013, bilateral social security agreements were signed with Bulgaria (December 2008), Portugal (February 2009), Romania (April 2010), Luxembourg (June 2010), Austria (September 2011), Estonia (October 2011), the Czech Republic (November 2011), Belgium (September 2012), Poland (2013) and Hungary (2013). As well, negotiations were held regarding the draft social security agreements between the Republic of Moldova and Lithuania, Latvia, and Turkey. Moreover, a number of other States, namely, Italy, Spain, France, Greece, Israel and the Russian Federation, have expressed their availability to regulate relations in the area of social insurance.36

---

It should be mentioned that the social insurance system of the Republic of Moldova does not impose any conditions that are advantageous to migrants and their families. Access to the system is offered only when some general conditions are met, specifically social insurance contributions. As such, the majority of migrants who work abroad do not participate in the social insurance system, and this fact generates increased pressure that undermines the financial sustainability of the system. Current migrants are potential applicants for State social allocations (social assistance benefits similar to social pensions). Although the State social insurance system has been offering the option of individual insurance since 2006, through a contract with the National Social Insurance Company to obtain a minimum pension under general conditions, very few migrants avail of this opportunity. In 2013, based on the social security agreements signed by the Republic of Moldova with other States, two types of pensions were established: age-limit pension (42 cases) and disability pension (3 cases). As for migrants’ and their families’ access to monetary social assistance, surveys show that the situation of families with seasonal migrants is confusing, when dealing with their inclusion in the poverty-based benefit programme called “Social Help”. Currently, the national social assistance system does not have a mechanism for the complete monitoring of household incomes, and the situation is worse in case of households with migrants.

B.5. Migration and health

The health sector continues to cope with problems related to health professional staffing. With the relaunch of the economy and the introduction of mandatory health insurance schemes in the 2000s, the intensity of the brain drain in the health sector has decreased. The indicators have been registering a rather constant evolution, but the shortage of personnel in the health sector remains to be a problem.

In 2013, a total of 10,560 doctors and 22,608 health workers with secondary education were working in the health sector (Table 52). Among the health professionals, there were 29.7 doctors and 63.5 health workers with secondary education per 10,000 population, which were below the average levels registered in the EU of 32.3 and 77.5, respectively, per 10,000 population.

Another problem is the uneven distribution of health professionals between rural and urban areas, with staffing levels 11 times higher in urban areas (62.4 doctors per 10,000 population) than in rural areas (5.7 doctors per 10,000 population) (Figure 49).

\[37\text{ Article 2 amended by LP399-XVI dated 14 December 2006; Article 169, Government Decision No. 39-42 dated 23 March 2007.}\]
Figure 49: Number of doctors in urban and rural areas per 10,000 population, 2008–2013

Staffing of health professionals in rural localities registered a downtrend. In 2013, the staffing level accounted for 23.4 specialists per 10,000 population, as compared with 24.3 in 2012, and which is fewer by 1.8 specialists than in 2008 (Figure 50).

Figure 50: Number of health professionals with secondary education by area of residence, per 10,000 population, 2008–2013

Staffing of health professionals in rural localities registered a downtrend. In 2013, the staffing level accounted for 23.4 specialists per 10,000 population, as compared with 24.3 in 2012, and which is fewer by 1.8 specialists than in 2008 (Figure 50).

The shortage of health professionals in rural areas is explained by the higher levels of development and concentration of hospital infrastructure in cities, which provides additional social and economic opportunities, and by the high emigration rate of health professionals.
PART C: MIGRATION MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK

This chapter provides some information and updated data in relation to the EMP 2005–2010 edition. Section C1 reveals the most recent amendments and completions of the national legislative and regulatory frameworks in the area of migration. Section C2 presents a description of the changes that occurred within the institutional framework for migration management, including the creation of the Bureau for Diaspora Relations. Section C3 presents and analyses policy documents pertaining to migration developed and/or adopted over the past several years. Section C4 provides an overview and assessment of programmatic actions that have been implemented in the country over the last three years. For more information on migration management framework, please see the EMP 2005–2010 edition.

C.1. Laws and regulations (national, regional, and international levels)

During the past few years, an array of conceptual documents and laws determining policy in key areas of migration management (namely, regular migration, including emigration, immigration, and social integration; asylum; and the prevention of irregular migration and smuggling of migrants)\footnote{While discussing and analysing migration management in the Republic of Moldova, the macro-level pillars exposed in the country’s National Strategy for Migration and Asylum (2012–2020) are used for categorization. The choice of this Strategy is predetermined by the fact that it seeks to link the realm of migration and asylum to the general development policy framework of the country and is closely intertwined with the Government’s activity programme, as well as feeds into the new development strategy of the Republic of Moldova (Moldova 2020: National Development Strategy: Seven Solutions for Republic of Moldova) that has been in force since January 2012. (A. Oprunenco, National Strategy for Migration and Asylum: An Attempt of Holistic and Integrated Approach towards Migration Issues in Moldova, Consortium for Applied Research on International Migration (CARIM East) Explanatory Note 12/10, Socio-Political Module (Florence, CARIM East, 2012)); available from www.carim-east.eu/media/sociopol_module/Explanatory%20Notes%20Template%20Moldova%20-%202010.pdf} and practices were adopted for the long term.

Although further improvements are necessary, the instruments and policies adopted are largely in line with the international standards.\footnote{High Representative of the EU for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy, Second progress report on the implementation by the Republic of Moldova of the Action Plan on Visa Liberalisation, Joint Staff Working Document (Brussels, 2012).}
Organizing and facilitating legal migration. In line with the opinions expressed by experts from the European Commission, the legislative and policy framework on preventing and counteracting trafficking in human beings is consolidated and aligned with international standards. In 2013, the Republic of Moldova signed bilateral social security agreements with Poland and Hungary. Currently, negotiations are held for signing social protection and insurance agreements with Lithuania, Latvia, Italy and Turkey. Bilateral agreements represent important governing tools meant to provide a high level of flexibility to countries, and which allow these countries to focus on a specific group of migrants, adjust themselves to the fluctuations on the labour market, and share the monitoring and management responsibilities between the countries of destination and origin. The social security agreements aim to determine the rights of the citizens to circulate between States and benefit from social security, hence avoiding the restrictions to the entitlement for such benefits.

On 16 October 2012, an agreement was signed in Jerusalem between the Government of the Republic of Moldova and the Government of the State of Israel regarding the temporary employment of Moldovans in Israel in certain sectors, and the implementation protocol for the construction sector. The top objectives of the agreement are to ensure Moldovans legal, equitable and transparent employment on a temporary basis in Israel. The agreement and the implementation protocol allow for the temporary employment of 1,000 qualified construction workers. The workers have to be high-skilled and well-trained in any of the following specialties: formwork for industrialized construction, wood formwork, steel welding, glazed architectural terra-cotta coating for floors and walls, and coating works. The implementation of the agreement will contribute to ensuring protection of the rights of Moldovan workers according to the Israeli laws and rules, including on labour and living conditions. Workers employed under this agreement will also be protected, according to the legislation in the social security area, in case of work accidents, temporary loss of workability and enterprise insolvency. The temporary employment of the workers will be within the remit of the two States’ relevant public institutions. In the case of the Republic of Moldova, the NEA will be in charge of that. In 2013, negotiations continued for reviewing the bilateral agreements on labour migration with the Russian Federation and started with the State of Qatar.

Communication and collaboration with the diaspora. Given the commitments made under the Moldovan Government Activity Programme for 2011 to 2014, as well as a response to the requests of Moldovan citizens residing

---

40 Ibid.
abroad (e.g. the resolution of the IV Congress of Moldovan Diaspora, 10–12 October 2010, regarding the need to create a State subdivision for the diaspora), a Government Decision was passed on 19 October 2012, to establish the Bureau for Diaspora Relations (BDR), within the State Chancellery of the Republic of Moldova. The BDR is responsible for developing and coordinating public policies for and with the participation of the diaspora.

**Mainstreaming migration into national development strategies.** According to the Prime Minister Decree No. 58 dated 7 June 2013, focal points (at the level of deputy ministers and deputy directors) were appointed in ministries and other central administration authorities to be responsible for promoting and implementing the State policy on the diaspora, as well as for coordinating, applying and implementing topics related to the diaspora at the technical level. In line with the Decree, the respective focal points shall perform their duties in the area of diaspora cooperation in close coordination with the BDR. The objectives of the Decree are: to enhance institutional capacities to implement the State policy in the area of diaspora relations; to ensure the efficient interaction among the government institutions and their cooperation with the diaspora; to ensure better mainstreaming of responsibilities in policymaking for the diaspora; and to implement “the-whole-of-government” approach in developing policies for the diaspora, according to which every institution would be responsible, within the limits of its own mandate, for diaspora-related issues (covering all the Moldovan citizens and persons originating from the Republic of Moldova, whether in the country or outside its borders). This principle was taken into consideration when creating the BDR as an institution to coordinate policies at the government level, according to the directives set forth in the Government’s Activity Programme “European Integration: Freedom, Democracy, Wellbeing” in the area of diaspora relations.42

In line with the Prime Minister Decree No. 58 dated 7 June 2013, as well as for the purpose of assessing the impact of developing and implementing public policies on the diaspora and on migration, and as a result of public consultations held with all the relevant stakeholders in relation to this topic, it was decided that necessary amendments be developed and promoted to include ex-ante and ex-post analyses of the impact of public policies on diaspora and migration in the draft Methodological Guidelines.

C.2. Institutional framework

The Republic of Moldova has a solid institutional framework in the area of migration policymaking, as well as migration management, with the participation of a huge number of institutional stakeholders (see Annex 3).

• The Bureau for Migration and Asylum (BMA), (www.bma.gov.md), established in July 2006, is further on responsible for developing and implementing the State policy in the area of migration and asylum. Additionally, based on the Government Decision No. 634 dated 24 August 2012, the BMA was appointed to be the institution responsible for the development of subsequent EMP reports. In this respect, a new unit was created within the BMA, to be responsible for coordinating the collection and analysis of data for the EMP, as well as for initiating and coordinating the meetings of the TWG for the EMP.

• The Bureau for Diaspora Relations (BDR), established in October 2012, is under the direct subordination of the Prime Minister and deals with developing and coordinating public policies for and with diaspora participation. The strategic objectives of the BDR may be categorized into two directions: on one hand, the BDR ensures the coordination of policies and programmes for the diaspora at the government and ministry levels; on the other hand, it maintains a continuous dialogue with the Moldovan diaspora.

• The Ministry of Labour, Social Protection and Family (www.mpsfc.gov.md/en/start) undertook measures to negotiate and conclude bilateral agreements to regulate the flow of migrant workers and to protect them, and to prevent family violence and trafficking in human beings (more information in this respect is presented in Section C1). In this context, in 2012, a unit was created within the National Employment Agency (www.anofm.md), that is, the Section for Overseas Employment. This unit is responsible for: a) implementing and coordinating activities provided for in the bilateral agreements concluded by the Republic of Moldova with other countries; b) enforcing and observing the provisions of legislation in the area of labour migration; and c) monitoring the activities of the private employment agencies. Other duties of the unit also include: the provision of information assistance to Moldovan citizens about policies on the legal emigration of the labour force; monitoring activities related to the implementation of bilateral agreements signed by the Republic

of Moldova with other States; evaluation and monitoring of private employment agencies’ activities.

- The Ministry of Economy (www.mec.gov.md) is responsible for creating a favourable investment climate in the Republic of Moldova for attracting internal and foreign investments, including remittances. In this respect, the Government decided to extend the pilot programme for attracting remittances into economy (PARE 1+1) (www.odimm.md/ro/pare/default.htm) until 2015, allocating 32 million MDL for 2013, which is double the amount allocated for 2012. The programme continues to be implemented and coordinated by the Organization for Small and Medium Enterprises Sector Development (www.odimm.md) and works “to facilitate migrants’ access to finance, helping at the same time to channel remittances through official ways, to introduce the best practices from the migrants’ host countries, to create some levers to introduce know-how, creating new jobs and solving other social problems”.44

- The National Bureau of Statistics (NBS) (www.statistica.md) is the central administrative authority managing and coordinating statistics-related activities, including those in the area of migration. In 2012, the NBS started undertaking different measures to plan the 2014 Census of Population and Dwellings in the Republic of Moldova. In this respect, the Law regarding the Census of Population and Dwellings in the Republic of Moldova in 2014 was adopted, as well as the Government Decision No. 967 dated 21 December 2012, regarding actions for enforcing the aforementioned law. The 2014 Census was planned to be carried out on 12–15 May, whereby data and information about the population and dwellings would be registered in the census questionnaires, as approved by the NBS. The pilot census was carried out in April 2013 on a selected sample, ensuring the possibility to eliminate registered deficiencies. The exercise aimed to collect data about: the population in the country, including the number of persons who have left the country, the respective migration purposes and periods, population territorial distribution, demographic and economic characteristics; the educational attainment of the population; the funds used for building the dwellings and houses of the citizens; and the living conditions in the country. The Republic of Moldova was the first former Soviet republic to organize a census not only of its population but also of the dwellings of the population, in line with existing practices in the EU.

44 See www.odimm.md/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=36&Itemid=184&lang=en
• The Republic of Moldova participates in regional partnerships on migration intended to consolidate policy cooperation among neighbouring countries, host countries and migrants’ countries of origin.\textsuperscript{45}

C.3. Policy framework

\textit{Development of the small and medium enterprise (SME) sector}. The Government has developed the Strategy for the SME Sector Development for 2012–2020 and an action plan for implementing the Strategy for 2012–2014, “in the context of shifting from the consumption-based economy development model to a new paradigm focused on export, investments, and innovations”.\textsuperscript{46}

\textit{Mobility}. From the mobility perspective, the Association Agreement between the EU and its Member States and the Republic of Moldova was initiated in November 2013, replacing the previous Partnership and Collaboration Agreement. The main objective of the EU–Republic of Moldova collaboration framework, as set forth in the Association Agreement, is to promote the political association and economic integration between the parties, based on common values and close relations, including by increasing the participation of the Republic of Moldova in the EU policies, programmes and agencies. One of the commitments assumed by the parties refers to deepening the dialogue and cooperation in the areas of mobility, migration, asylum and border management, in line with the EU migration policies related to collaboration in the area of legal migration and the assurance of efficient implementation of the readmissions agreement. Hence, migration is reflected as an important topic in the Association Agreement. Specifically:

• Article 14, which tackles: “cooperation in the area of migration, asylum and border management” with a focus on “joint management of migration flows”; “the main causes and consequences of migration”; and facilitation of “circular migration favouring development”;

• Article 32, which discusses “collaboration based on exchange of information and the best practices” in the area of “labour migration efficient management, related to enhancing the positive impact of migration on development”.

\textsuperscript{45} More information about all the regional partnerships in migration area, in which the Republic of Moldova is a stakeholder, may be analysed in the 2005–2010 EMP report, Section C.

Reintegration and return. The return and reintegration of Moldovan migrants is one of the elements included in the national legislation. A number of activities continued to be successfully implemented after 2012 as well, such as the pilot project PARE 1+1 and the Programme for Youth Economic Empowerment (PNAET), which provide training to develop entrepreneurial skills as well as financial assistance for start-ups.

The reintegration and return of Moldovan migrants remain a major objective clearly stipulated in the National Strategy on Migration and Asylum (2011–2020) and in the action plan for implementing the Strategy for 2011–2015. In this respect, the draft action plan was developed for 2014–2016 to support the reintegration of Moldovan citizens who returned from abroad. This draft refers mainly to developing efficient legislative, institutional and informational frameworks to facilitate the integration of return migrants, including their reintegration into the labour market; develop migrants’ entrepreneurial skills so that they can put up businesses that can contribute to the national economy; and support the reintegration of Moldovan citizens who returned from abroad into the mandatory health insurance system and social protection schemes, among others. The MLSPF is monitoring and coordinating the implementation of the said Action Plan. In 2013, there were 644 Moldovans who returned to the country, of whom 121 were employed, according to the MLSPF data.

Socioeconomic reintegration of migrants. The State pilot programmes for remittance investment and permanent/temporary reattraction and socioeconomic reintegration of migrants continued to be successfully implemented. Currently, the focus is on providing Moldovans abroad with wide protection, preserving cultural identity and fostering migrants’ return home. In this context, the action plan for cultural and social support for the Moldovan diaspora was adopted for 2012–2014. This document aims to promote and create conditions for preserving the development and manifestation of cultural and linguistic identity in the country of residence, guaranteeing multidimensional cooperation with Moldovans residing abroad.

Programme for the diaspora children. In August 2013, the pilot programme for the temporary return of diaspora children – Diaspora, Origins, Roots (DOR) Programme – was organized. The DOR Programme is meant for young members of Moldovan diaspora and aims to raise awareness among the second and third generation of migrants regarding their cultural identity and to create emotional links between the country of origin and the diaspora. The Programme emerged as a result of the clearly expressed need of the Moldovan diaspora to preserve the link with traditional Moldovan values and increase
the level of emotional connection with the country. The pilot DOR Programme was organized by the Moldovan Government (through the BDR) in partnership with IOM Moldova. Intended to become a large programme to meet the needs of the different beneficiaries, the pilot project was tested in the country on 20–28 August 2013, with the participation of 20 diaspora members from different countries and 5 young people from the Republic of Moldova.

The main tool for operationalizing the strategic policies and documents related to combating irregular migration and trafficking in human beings continues to the NRS for victims and potential victims of trafficking. The NRS is an integrated system providing comprehensive assistance to victims and vulnerable persons, including left-behind children and the elderly, by referring them to local authorities and service providers for civil society.

**Coordination and coherence of policies at the national level.** Currently, the coordination of migration-related policies and strategies occurs within an impressive institutional set-up, channelled through the following inter-institutional bodies.  

The Commission for Coordination of Certain Activities Related to Migration Process is a permanent government advisory body established in February 2010 and chaired by the MIA. It was created to coordinate the activities of public authorities as regards the management and monitoring of the migration processes; supervise the activities in the field of migration; and ensure cooperation between State institutions, NGOs and international agencies/organizations with competencies in the field of migration management. The Commission convenes as necessary or at least once per quarter. Prior to 2013, the Commission was not efficient due to the sporadic character of its activity and recommendatory character of its decisions. Thus, the Moldovan Government and the UN Republic of Moldova Country Team held a Prioritization Retreat in May 2013, which aimed to set up priorities in the area of migration and development, being organized within the pilot programme “Mainstreaming of Migration into Development in Moldova” (MOMID). During the retreat, the need to relaunch the activity of the Commission was discussed and proposed among many other topics. In this context, the second meeting of the Commission was held on 11 November 2013, convening the members appointed according to the Government Decision No. 133 dated 23 February 2010, to establish this consultative body. In this meeting, the participants discussed the need to amend the Regulation of the Commission so as to complete the Commission membership with representatives from civil

47 More information about the consultative interministerial bodies in migration area may be analysed in the 2005–2010 EMP report, Section C.
society – the main partners in developing and adjusting policies in line with international and European standards, as well as in implementing migration policies. Hence, representatives from the BDR, IOM Moldova and UNHCR Moldova were invited to attend the meeting. All the suggested modifications were made to streamline the activity of the Commission, ensure transparency for its activity and enable better dissemination of information. It was agreed that the entire EMP coordination process would be supervised in the future by the Commission, taking over this function from the National Commission for Population and Development, which had coordinated the process of EMP development and approval until 2013.

The mechanism for monitoring and coordinating the implementation of the EU–Moldova Mobility Partnership encompasses a number of tools, including the High-level Meeting, the Local Platform of Cooperation and the Local Platform for Cooperation in extended format.

It was decided that the two Cooperation Platforms should be organized at the same time to convene representatives of Moldovan authorities, EU Member States, the European Commission, the European External Action Service, international organizations, civil society and the academia. The objectives of such meetings were to: assess the implementation level of the objectives stipulated in the Joint Declaration on the EU–Moldova Mobility Partnership; present the current and planned implemented activities within the MP; assess existing mechanism for implementation, cooperation and monitoring within the MP for their consolidation and improvement; set the perspective and opportunities for future cooperation among partners; identify the priorities for cooperation within other bilateral and multilateral platforms on migration and mobility area at the regional and global levels; and present the preliminary results of the MP evaluation process. In this context, two meetings in extended format were organized since 2012 for the Local Platform of Cooperation, in June 2012 and June 2013. The following topics were discussed within these meetings: the implementation progress of the EU–Moldova Mobility Partnership, mobility, legal migration and integration; the increased impact of migration and mobility on development, border management, readmission, identity and travel documents; combating of illegal migration and trafficking in human beings; and aspects related to monitoring and evaluating the EU–Moldova Mobility Partnership. As well, in November 2012, the fifth High-level Meeting of the EU–Moldova Mobility Partnership was organized in Brussels, during which the results of the activities carried out during the year were discussed and the possibilities to launch new initiatives were explored. Promotion of legal migration, support of academic mobility, mainstreaming
migration into development and combating illegal migration were just some of the areas of priority identified by partners. Subsequently, in December 2013, the sixth High-level Meeting of the EU–Moldova Mobility Partnership was organized in Brussels, where the parties took note of the results and activities performed during the year in different areas: legal migration, academic mobility, mainstreaming migration into development, consolidation of relations with the diaspora, and combating irregular migration; in addition, future initiatives were presented. In the last meeting, the results of the post-pilot exercise for evaluating the EU–Moldova Mobility Partnership as a tool of the Global Approach to Migration and Mobility were tackled, and the online electronic database Mobility Partnership Scoreboard was approved.

The Technical Working Group (TWG) created in 2010 within the IOM Project “Supporting the implementation of the migration and development component of the EU–Moldova Mobility Partnership”, which coordinated the activities related to the development of the Republic of Moldova EMP continues to be operational; the members of this group are actively involved in developing and implementing the third edition of the Republic of Moldova EMP. Currently, the activity of the TWG is coordinated by the BMA, which took over this role from IOM Moldova, after the end of the above-mentioned project.

The Coordinating Council of People Originating from the Republic of Moldova and Residing Abroad, established in February 2005, works as an advisory body to the Moldovan Government. Its purpose is the promotion, preservation, development and expression of the ethnic, cultural, linguistic and religious identity of Moldovans residing abroad. The Council comprises Moldovan Government officials and representatives of Moldovan diaspora associations. For the last time, this Council convened in October 2012, within the Fifth Diaspora Congress. The meeting was attended by 36 representatives of the Moldovan diaspora from 16 foreign countries, of whom 34 were members of the Coordinating Council (according to the Government Decision No. 834 dated 10 November 2011) and 5 persons were from other institutions. The agenda of the meeting included such issues as: approval of the nominal compositions of the Coordinating Council and the role of the Council members, according to the Government Decision No. 834 dated 10 November 2011; the modality of activity and communication of the Coordinating Council; discussions over proposals regarding the action plan of the Coordinating Council for 2013–2014; and discussions regarding the proposal for establishing working groups within the Coordinating Council. As a result of this session, five thematic working groups were created in the following areas: social protection; culture, youth, education and science; justice and human rights; return and reintegration of Moldovan migrants; economy and entrepreneurial environment. Members of these groups
from the diaspora were actively consulted and involved in developing draft normative acts and policy documents related to the diaspora.

In October 2013, the Coordinating Council associations organized in Florence, Italy, the first annual conference outside the Republic of Moldova borders. The event was attended by representatives of over 50 Moldovan diaspora associations from 16 countries, as well as by the representatives of the Government from Chisinau. A resolution was adopted and signed unanimously during the conference, through which the diaspora associations request for a new mechanism for improving the Coordinating Council and the communication and collaboration system between the diaspora and the leadership of the Republic of Moldova. It was also suggested that the Council include highly qualified diaspora representatives for positions of political dignity as well as public officials, to develop and implement some projects for promoting the positive image of the Republic of Moldova around the world, and to improve the legal framework regarding the electoral system so as to ensure the Moldovans abroad with the right to vote.48

Nevertheless, in spite of the already existing solid institutional arrangement, the Republic of Moldova needs to improve its inter-institutional coordination mechanism (which could be eventually developed through a well-organized and adjusted assistance) further to develop a more efficient institutional framework and policies for migration management.

C.4. Programme framework

In line with the Government Decision No. 12 dated 19 January 2010, the State Chancellery functions as the Authority for Assistance Coordination, responsible for coordinating the process of programming, monitoring and evaluating foreign assistance provided to the Republic of Moldova by its development partners. In particular, the General Division for Policies and Foreign Assistance Coordination and Reform of Central Public Administration (the national coordination unit) ensures, inter alia, the provision to the public administration authorities of the necessary support to make the mechanism of foreign assistance sectoral coordination more efficient, monitoring and evaluation of foreign assistance so as to maximize its impact on the economic development of the country, and transparency of foreign assistance and implementation of the communication policy together with the donor community and civil society.49

48 See http://ipn.md/ro/societate/57731
To carry out these tasks, the State Chancellery makes use of:\textsuperscript{50}

- the Information System of Assistance Management to register and process the information regarding the assistance initiatives and the flows of assistance provided to the country; and
- the Sectoral Coordination Councils for managing and monitoring the efficiency of foreign assistance.

The National Authority for Foreign Assistance Coordination uses the information provided by the Sectoral Coordination Councils to define the priorities for foreign assistance, which should be approved by the Interministerial Committee for Strategic Planning. The State Chancellery has an Aid Management Platform (AMP), which provides complete and up-to-date data about the technical assistance provided to the Republic of Moldova, and includes lists of technical assistance projects in different areas implemented in the country. The binding description elements for the projects included in the AMP are the following: name of the project (in Romanian and English); the de facto start and closing days of the project; project status; levels of implementation; financing information; roles of institutions; and classification criteria. Optionally, the AMP may also have data about the objective and results of the project, the signed memorandum, the project budget and special cases. The new projects should be included in the AMP by the responsible institutions, immediately after signing and approval of the project. Donors should update the AMP with new information on a quarterly basis. The State Chancellery is the authority responsible for validating any changes made in the AMP.

The implementation of the migration and development component of the EU–Moldova Mobility Partnership continued in 2012 with ample information about the different migration modalities of the population, as well as increasing the competency of the MFAEI consular officers in the area of diaspora. At the same time, at the end of 2012, the BMA provided support for the launch of the first stage of visa information system development by selecting the company to implement the system.\textsuperscript{51}

In 2013, the Republic of Moldova made progress in implementing the Mobility Partnership signed with the EU, contributing to the achievement of a number of priorities set by the partners, through projects and initiatives from the Global Approach to Migration and Mobility (GAMM). On 27 November 2013, the European Commission came up with the proposal to liberalize the visa

\textsuperscript{50} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{51} Ibid.
regime for Moldovan citizens, which implied the modification of the Regulation 539/2001, abolishing the obligation to possess a visa for short-term trips into the Schengen area for Moldovan citizens.

The area of labour migration focused on improving the legislative framework and adjusting other legislative acts according to legal norms. Hence, changes were made to the Law on Labour Migration and the Law on Foreigners’ Regime in the Republic of Moldova. These amendments – which also include removing the quota for labour immigration – will contribute to creating a more efficient normative framework to regulate the relations between the stakeholders involved in the labour migration process and set an empowering climate for foreign investors. At the same time, the Pilot Project on Labour Force Mobility carried out services in the area of labour force training and employment, and improvement of the management of qualified labour force migration flows between Italy and the Republic of Moldova. The basic activities focused on the organization and implementation of linguistic-vocational courses.52

The “Assisted Voluntary Return and Reintegration of Minors and Young Adults” Project, which focuses on preventing trafficking and is implemented by the Austrian Government and the European Return Fund, has contributed to assisting a number of beneficiaries and creating an inter-institutional committee for monitoring the implementation of project activities.53

The Governments of Norway, Denmark and Switzerland have contributed to combating trafficking in human beings, preventing risks, and identifying victims and potential victims, by developing individual plans for rehabilitation, reintegration and complex assistance for trafficking victims through the NRS.54

Since 2007, a total of around 200 actions relevant to migration have been implemented or are currently under implementation. Project objectives vary – from efficient governance of labour migration and labour skills to protection and empowerment of domestic violence and trafficking victims. A considerable part of actions relevant to migration were and are implemented under the Mobility Partnerships; 85 initiatives relevant to migration were and are implemented in different areas, from the Republic of Moldova’s migration profile to schemes/projects promoting circular migration.55

52 Ibid.
53 Ibid.
54 Ibid.
55 See www.mfa.gov.md/mobility-partnership-en
The following are among the key donors: European Commission; Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation (SDC); UN Human Security Trust Fund; U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID); Soros Foundation; Czech Agency for Development; Austrian Agency for Development; Swedish Agency for International Development; Government of Japan; Government of Romania; Government of Finland; Government of Italy; Government of Cyprus; Government of Germany; Government of Greece; Government of Denmark; Government of Norway; Government of Switzerland; Soroptimist International (Norway); and Lakarmissionen (Sweden). The most important partners for implementing the projects and programmes relevant to migration are: IOM Moldova, International Labour Organization, UNHCR, United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), United Nations Population Fund Moldova, Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE) Moldova, European Investment Fund, and International Centre for Migration Policy and Development (ICMPD).

The following initiatives are among the migration-related projects implemented during the period of reference:

- Enhancing the Moldovan Government’s Capacities in Diaspora Engagement, financed through the IOM Development Fund and implemented by IOM Moldova;
- Strengthening the Link between Migration and Development: Testing an Integrated Service Provider to Moldovan Migrants and Their Communities, financed by EU and implemented by International Agency for Secure Country Information;
- Strengthening the Capacities of the Permanent Secretariat of the National Committee for Combating Trafficking in Persons in the Republic of Moldova, financed by the United States and implemented by IOM Moldova;
- Joint UNDP/IOM/UN Women Pilot Programme “Mainstreaming of Migration into Development in Moldova”, financed by the SDC;
- Supporting the Republic of Moldova in implementing the EU–Moldova Visa Liberalization Action Plan, financed by the EU and implemented by the ICMPD;
• Strengthening Migration Management Capacities in the Republic of Moldova, financed by the EU and implemented by Swedish Public Employment Service.

**Donor coordination mechanisms.** By the end of 2009, donor coordination mechanisms had been established to improve coordination among development partners and between development partners and the Government. At the national level, the key development partner coordination mechanism is the monthly regular donors’ meeting, organized to improve coordination and harmonization between the Moldovan Government and its partners.

The Partnership Principles Implementation Plan, signed in March 2010 by the Moldovan Government, the World Bank and other relevant donors (EU, UN and other bilateral donors), sets out a more formal process for establishing the Sectoral Foreign Assistance Councils (also called Sector Coordination Boards), an advisory body – the Joint Partnership Council – that reflects the partnership between Government, civil society (including private sector) and development partners. The Joint Partnership Council is co-chaired by the Prime Minister of the Republic of Moldova and a representative of the external aid partners. In the context of the migration phenomenon, it is worth mentioning that the Foreign Assistance Coordination Council was established in the area of labour and social protection, chaired by the MLSPF, and co-chaired by a representative of the donor organization active in the area, such as the DFID, the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency, the SDC, IOM, the World Bank, USAID, the OSCE, the Austrian Development Cooperation/Austrian Development Agency, UN Office in Moldova and UN agencies, among others.\(^{56}\)

To improve the coordination of the joint activities of the MLSPF and donor organizations, a Sectoral Foreign Assistance Council for gender equality was created. The MLSPF, in collaboration with UN Women and the Centre for Partnership Development, organized training sessions about gender policy issues, developed a set of legislative amendments related to ensuring equal opportunities for women and men, and initiated the process for approving these changes. With the support of the EU specialists from the Assistance and Protection Centre, and those from the MLSPF, the Multidisciplinary Teams were visited to monitor some specific cases, as well as to assess the extension of the NRS for protection and assistance for victims and potential victims of trafficking at the community level.\(^{57}\)

---

\(^{56}\) MLSPF Order No. 060 dated 17 February 2010, on establishing the Foreign Assistance Coordination Council in the area of labour and social protection (with the respective annexes).

In 2012 and 2013, thematic working groups were formed in the Republic of Moldova, consisting of representatives from government institutions, civil society and the private sector. Together, these groups were tasked to provide support and expertise in the key areas identified by the Government of the Republic of Moldova. As one of the five priorities stipulated in the application of the Republic of Moldova to the Democracy Partnership Challenge (DPC) refers to migration and border management, a working group was created comprising donors in the area of migration, co-chaired by the Embassy of Romania and the Embassy of Slovak Republic in the Republic of Moldova, being hosted by the US Embassy in the Republic of Moldova. From 2012 to 2013, five sessions were held for this working group, which identified and discussed priorities in the areas of migration, border management and combating trafficking in human beings; these areas would be the focus of the efforts of the country’s development partners within the DPC. Although the activity of this working group sometimes duplicates the activity of the Sectoral Foreign Assistance Coordination Council chaired by the MIA, these meetings allow for a deeper discussion on the different areas of foreign support and provide some countries not represented in the Council the possibility to participate as the meetings are held via videoconference. The final goal of this working group of donors within the DPC is to discuss in detail the current assistance initiatives in the Republic of Moldova, to avoid duplication of foreign aid and to identify some new areas of intervention, as the case may be.

In 2013, the Government continued the joint actions for planning foreign assistance, implementing and assessing the performance indicators set forth by the Global Partnership, and improving the process of information exchange via the new platform of AMP data management. To continue the improvement of efforts for streamlining the assistance for development, the State Chancellery envisages a number of commitments in the future, such as:

- aligning foreign assistance with national development priorities and harmonizing the foreign aid programming cycle with the budgetary and policy planning cycle;
- ensuring transparency and publishing relevant information for foreign aid management, as well as revising and adjusting the information platform on foreign assistance;
- rethinking of interministerial coordination, ensuring united and efficient dialog platforms; and
- further supporting and fostering the institutional capacities of the ministries depending on the performance levels achieved.
PART D. KEY FINDINGS, POLICIES’ IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

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

Section D2 presents some key recommendations for policymakers to improve the current migration management situation based on an assessment of the current situation.

Section D3 continues from the previous section and presents an array of recommendations towards mainstreaming migration into the development policies of the country.

Section D4 identifies existing data gaps and offers recommendations and possible strategies to improve migration statistics and the overall migration database.

D.1. Main findings on migration and development nexus

Background. The migration phenomenon in the Republic of Moldova continues to be characterized more by the emigration of the country’s population and less by immigration of people from abroad. The current efforts of the State are focused on managing the phenomenon, including by implementing institutional reforms in this respect and via a close cooperation with the EU.

As the economic crisis engulfed Europe and the migrants’ stay conditions became tougher in the Russian Federation (one of the main countries of destination for Moldovans), tackling the problems of migrants returning home became absolutely necessary. Former migrants may contribute to the development of their country of origin through active involvement in the labour market or by launching their own businesses, establishing business links between the country of origin and the country of destination; transferring skills, knowledge and technologies gained abroad, not to mention ideas, beliefs, and living standards, among others.

According to the different migration studies done, the main push factors for Moldovan migrants are economic in nature: lack of jobs and/or unattractive salaries offered in the labour market in their home country.
Current migration patterns. The migration situation was analysed based on a series statistical and administrative data submitted by different data providers.

A series of administrative data from the SE SIRC “Registru” enables the analysis of the situation of authorized emigration, including the deregistration from the place of residence before leaving the country. Based on this data, it was estimated that 101,900 persons were living abroad in 2013. Authorized emigration registered a stable downtrend, with the decrease rate reaching 63 per cent in 2013 as compared with 2008. The phenomenon is higher in urban areas than in rural areas, with more women emigrating in an authorized manner than men. Mainly trained young people with professional secondary education or higher education leave the country. The main countries of destination are Ukraine and the Russian Federation, wherein almost 70 per cent of the total number of emigrants are found. The United States, Germany, Israel, Belarus and the Czech Republic are other countries with significant shares of emigrants from the Republic of Moldova.

An important source providing the possibility to estimate the volume of international emigration is State border crossing information from the BPD, specifically the duration of a person’s stay abroad. According to this source, by the end 2013, some 358,900 persons had been outside the country for more than 12 months, of whom 64 per cent were between 15 and 44 years old, with women exceeding the number of men by 13.7 per cent. An uptrend was registered in 2013 as compared with 2008 in terms of the number of children who had been residing abroad for 12 months or more.

The data of the MFAEI, obtained from the diplomatic missions and consular offices of the Republic of Moldova, reveals that by the end of 2013, around 819,000 Moldovans were staying abroad, regardless of the duration of their stay in the countries of destination. According to this data, about 68.4 per cent were in the Russian Federation and about 18.2 per cent were in Italy.

Temporary/circular migration for labour purposes with the intention to return home is estimated based on the LFS data. Survey data reveals that about 300,000 persons were working abroad at any time within the 2008–2013 period. The profile of temporary migration is different from that of authorized emigration. It was mainly the rural population who migrated for labour purposes during this period (about 72%). In addition, in this type of migration, the number of men exceeded that of women. As with the MFAEI data, the main countries
of destination overall continued to be the Russian Federation and Italy, but the distribution by sex is different: for almost 78.7 per cent of men the country of destination was the Russian Federation, followed by Italy with 5.6 per cent; in the case of women, the distribution was more uniform, with 45.7 per cent going to the Russian Federation and 33 per cent to Italy.

As for the age distribution of temporary migrants, a significant prevalence may be noted for those who are 15–44 years old, who accounted for about 78 per cent of the total number of temporary migrants. Half of migrants had secondary education (lyceum, gymnasium), and about 40 per cent had professional or vocational secondary education.

The National Employment Agency has observed an uptrend in the number of persons working abroad with legal work contracts; nevertheless, this number remains rather small. The main countries of destination of Moldovans working under legal contracts are Israel and the United Arab Emirates.

As for migration for study purposes, data reveals that the number of Moldovans studying abroad increased by 2.5 times within the 2008–2013 period; and about 93 per cent of them were studying in Romania, 2.4 per cent in Bulgaria, and 1.8 per cent each in Ukraine and the Russian Federation. Because of the limited number of slots for studies abroad provided to the Republic of Moldova under the international agreements, the number of Moldovans studying abroad, according to data from the Ministry of Education, is relatively small. The number of Moldovans who study abroad not by virtue of any international agreements and those who do not notify the Ministry of Education is not known, but it is probably higher.

**Involuntary emigration.** This type of migration registered a significant decrease by the end of 2012 as compared with 2008. There were 888 Moldovan asylum-seekers abroad in 2008, gradually decreasing to 460 persons in 2011 and 441 persons in 2012. During the same period, there was an increase in the number of persons who obtained the refugee status abroad. Nevertheless, downturns were attested and confirmed by the growth rate of the number of Moldovan citizens registered as asylum-seekers abroad, and by the number of Moldovan citizens registered and recognized as refugees abroad – the value for these indicators decreased during the period of reference.

**Repatriation.** During the 2008–2013 reference period, the annual number of repatriated persons evolved differently. However, this number decreased significantly in 2013 as compared with 2008, registering a drop of about
22 per cent. As well, the number of repatriated children declined during the reference period, accounting for 3.5 per cent in 2013 as compared with 6.4 per cent registered in 2008.

It should be noted that since 2011, two institutions – the BMA and the SE SIRC “Registru” – have been collating data on repatriated persons.

**Readmission.** Positive dynamics was noted for readmissions to the Republic of Moldova. After an increase of about 2.8 times registered during the 2008–2011 period, the number decreased by 2012, denoting either the legalization of Moldovans or the observance of the stay regime in their countries of residence.

**Preventing and combating trafficking in human beings.** The NRS\(^5\) is the main framework for cooperation and coordination of the efforts undertaken by active stakeholders in the area of combating trafficking. The activities within the NRS are carried out through the Multidisciplinary Teams which have national coverage. The efficiency of this system is also confirmed by the increased number of persons identified via the NRS. Statistical data shows that in 2013, there were 131 trafficking victims identified – 1.6 times more than the number identified in 2008; NGOs reported that there were 1,403 potential victims of trafficking in 2013, as compared with only 203 persons reported in 2008. Women represented about 76.3 per cent, and children accounted for over 10 per cent of the total number of persons identified as victims of trafficking.

**Resident foreign population.** By the end of 2013, there were a total of 21,092 foreigners (including stateless persons) staying in the Republic of Moldova (representing 0.5% of the total population). The majority of foreigners originated from Ukraine, the Russian Federation, Israel, Romania, Turkey and other countries, represented by less than 2 per cent each. The annual number of foreigners immigrating to the Republic of Moldova increased from 2,744 persons in 2008 to 3,357 persons in 2013. It should be mentioned that this group’s population grew 7.7 per cent in 2013 as compared with the population in 2012.

**Demographic impact of migration.** The prevalence of emigration over immigration influences the demographic development of the country, characterized by continuous contraction of the population and acceleration of population ageing. It should be mentioned that over the past two years some stability has been noted in relation to population size, as estimated by the NBS.

---

\(^{5}\)The NRS was launched in the Republic of Moldova in 2006, with support from IOM, external donors and civil society.
As well, some stability has been observed for other demographic indicators, such as the natural growth and net migration rates. The migration phenomenon is more pronounced in rural areas than in urban areas; at the same time, stable uptrends are noted for the urban population alongside the reduction or stabilization of the total population of the country, hence pointing to internal migration from villages to cities, especially among the economically active population.

**Economic impact of migration.** Labour migration from the country has an important and significant role from an economic point of view. The increase in the number of persons who left for work abroad has resulted in a significant increase in the amount of transfers from them, thus influencing the main macroeconomic indicators. The constant growth of the GDP is mainly attributed to the revenues sent back to the country by Moldovan migrants working abroad.

Remittances represent an important source of income for population to escape from poverty. About 23 per cent of the country’s households benefited from remittance-based financial resources in 2013, with rural households holding a share of 29.5 per cent. According to the 2012 LFS/LFM data, over 80 per cent of migrants sent money to their families on a monthly basis, with half of them sending amounts over USD 500 monthly.

The incomes of Moldovan households are considerably influenced by remittances; thus the respective share accounts for 58 per cent in case of the households benefiting from remittances, and over 62 per cent for the rural households benefiting from remittances. If receiving remittances, the share of households which would be under the poverty level in 2013 would be 23.6 per cent, or 31.5 per cent in rural areas.

The indicators characterizing the labour force market get continuously worse. During the 2008–2013 period, the number of the economically active population decreased constantly from 1,303,000 to 1,236,000, dropping by 67,000 persons or 5.1 per cent. The activity rate dropped by 2.9 percentage points. The share of population under working age decreased from 18.7 per cent to 17.1 per cent, and the share of persons over working age increased from 15 per cent to 17 per cent. If migration of the young population continues, a continuous contraction of the working-age population, with all the negative effects associated with this phenomenon, may be expected.

The studies conducted in this area reveal some trends that motivate migrants to return home to work. At the same time, the return migrants encounter
a lot of reintegration problems, caused by lack of jobs and low salaries. Launching a start-up is rather difficult due to different reasons, including insufficiency of financial resources and lack of information on how to put up a business. In such conditions, a considerable percentage of migrants choose to reemigrate.

**Social impact of migration.** The negative social impact generated by migration is confirmed by a number of studies done. One such impact is the shortage of personnel in areas such as health and education, due to emigration of qualified staff in these sectors. Although migration reduces poverty, it also has negative social effects on children and the elderly left behind. According to the information provided by the Ministry of Education based on the School Census data, there were 42,000 children left behind by their parents in 2013, of whom 10,500 had both parents abroad and 31,500 had one of the parents abroad.

**Labour migration and the national social insurance system.** Labour migration affects the sustainability of the national social insurance system. Being outside the country, a significant percentage of the economically active population does not participate in the system, thus leading to an increased burden on the economically active population in the national economy. This phenomenon has already induced a deficit in the State social insurance budget, which had to be compensated over the past years from the State budget. As well, the lack of the cumulative pillar of the social insurance system and the narrow package of benefits provided by the current individual insurance system make the participation in the system unattractive for migrants. Thus, the non-participation of current migrants in the system will be reflected upon their mid- and long-term return in the impossibility to obtain some benefits within the system, and this will directly contribute to increased burden on the social insurance system. Ensuring the minimum social guarantees for Moldovan labour migrants abroad and finding some adequate solutions for when they return home is a timely concern for the State. In this context, a number of social security agreements have been signed or negotiated over the past years with different countries of destination, with contribution-based principles included.

**Institutional framework.** A number of State institutions are involved directly or indirectly in migration management, in line with their areas of activity and competence. The BDR was created to streamline the activities in communication and collaboration with Moldovan migrants abroad and to coordinate the policies in the area. Focal points (at the level of deputy ministers or deputy directors) were appointed in ministries and other central administrative authorities to be responsible for promoting and implementing State policies related to the diaspora.
The BMA was given new duties when it was appointed as the institution responsible for the subsequent development of the EMP report.

**Legal and regulatory framework.** The national legal and regulatory framework has made significant progress in establishing a comprehensive base for an efficient system of migration management. According to the experts from the European Commission, the legislative and policy framework on preventing and counteracting trafficking in human beings is consolidated and aligned with international standards.

Activities continue in view of signing bilateral agreements in the area of labour migration to ensure social and labour security for Moldovan migrants abroad.

**Policy framework.** Policy framework is continuously developing. Some State policies and strategies in different areas related to migration were developed and enforced, such as mobility at the border, reintegration and return of migrants, investment of remittances for development, SME development, and combating irregular migration and trafficking in human beings. Coordination and assurance of migration policy and strategy coherence is carried out via an impressive institutional arrangement. Nevertheless, it is necessary to further improve the mechanism for inter-institutional coordination for a more efficient management of migration.

**D.2. Recommendations on migration management**

During the period of 2008–2013, being recognized as a political phenomenon with all its positive and negative effects, migration became a key element in developing national, sectoral and intersectoral policies.

The mechanisms related to foreigners’ immigration became the most visible. They have ensured, to a large extent, the transposition of a number of EU directives in this area. This fact has contributed to making more efficient the bilateral dialogue with the EU Member States on migration-related areas (occupational, social, educational, etc.).

At the same time, the following still needs attention:

- Building the capacities of the competent authorities from the country to promote and correlate the principles and procedures for admission into

---

the country and documentation of foreigners in the country (economic and non-economic migrants) with the economic realities of the country, applying a utilitarian approach;

• Continuously improving the normative framework on selective admission of foreigners immigrating for work purposes so as to cope with the shortage of highly qualified personnel: (1) in the areas that lack qualified labour force; (2) in the economic sectors, which are the priority areas for the sustainable development of the country and which do not have the necessary local qualified resources; and (3) in facilitation of admission and stay of foreign investors in the Republic of Moldova, as well as of the persons who manage foreign investments in the economic areas with multiplicative effect. It should be noted that the proactive attraction of foreign investments through migration policies follows a number of international examples. The practices of European and Northern American States include mechanisms for facilitating the admission and documentation of foreigners investing in business in some pre-established economic areas (rural area, and/or development of multiplicative economy in correlation with general conditions) or creating new jobs;

• Development of mechanisms for the recognition of foreigners’ professional qualifications in the areas needing qualified personnel;

• Promotion of higher education institutions in the Republic of Moldova for the purpose of attracting foreigners to study in the country and to improve the image of higher education institutions in the country;

• Improvement of the legal and institutional tools, ensuring the non-discrimination principle for foreigners staying in the country, avoiding any unjustified discriminatory restrictions based on any reasons, such as sex, race, colour, ethnic or social origin, genetic characteristics or health condition, religion or beliefs, among others;

• Promotion of a legality climate for foreigners’ admission and stay in the Republic of Moldova by increasing the information level of potential migrants who would like to come to the Republic of Moldova for a short period of time (for study, work, etc.).

A special role in migration management refers to foreigners’ integration policies promoted in the State. Although the regulatory framework adopted in this area in the Republic of Moldova is recognized as being innovative in the Community of Independent States zone, as well as for a number of Western European countries, its implementation is just at the initial stage and needs more attention to ensure correlation with the needs pointed out.

61 For instance, road construction, economic infrastructure and irrigation systems in agricultural areas.
The rapid increase of foreigners’ immigration into the country did not allow their pre-selection from the third countries, similar countries, or countries closed by their cultural, civilization or religious identities – a fact that would exclude integration deficiencies. EMP data shows that over 20,000 foreigners from 108 different countries stay permanently or temporarily in the Republic of Moldova.

Hence, it is important to develop some long-term policies for mutual accommodation for all the foreigners (beneficiaries of a form of protection, immigrants, persons born outside the country and other categories of persons) and the inhabitants of the Republic of Moldova.

The necessary mechanisms were developed in 2013 for cooperation between the State entities responsible for foreigners’ accommodation and integration, guaranteeing their access to sociocultural and linguistic accommodation programmes by ensuring the necessary allocations in the State budget.63

At the same time, taking into account the importance of foreigners’ integration for the social and civic cohesion in the country, it is necessary to actively support foreigners and stateless persons staying legally in the Republic of Moldova, ensuring their participation in the economic, social and cultural sectors of the country. This objective will be supported by increasing the awareness of public officials, civil society and foreigners about the importance of the integration process.

Although public authorities have recognized the importance of integration policies by allocating public funds for the implementation of such policies, they are not enough to cover the entire range of possible needs and all categories of foreigners. Thus, it is necessary to determine the categories of foreigners who may benefit from a facilitated treatment in this area, for instance, vulnerable categories of persons, beneficiaries of certain forms of protection, unaccompanied minors and women, among others.

The implementation of integration policies needs objective monitoring by establishing some sets of indicators in all relevant areas, as well as collecting, processing and analysing the obtained data.

The emigration area, which has been given utmost attention within the surveys and comprehensive approaches when developing State policies,

continues to prioritize the aspects related to the situation of the family members left behind, especially the elderly and children.

The increase in the number of minors left behind by their parents to look for a job abroad is really alarming. The data obtained in different surveys reveals the reduced level of socialization, increased school dropout rate, reduced level of training and increased level of juvenile delinquency for this category of children.

The aforementioned problems need the proactive involvement of the State and the entire society, the establishment of stable mechanisms of community or social partnerships to prevent the phenomenon, strengthening of the preventive mechanisms in the country, and the development of resocialization mechanisms for the affected group within the population. Unfortunately, there is no coherence between the efforts undertaken by the different authorities responsible for the different aspects of the given problem (e.g. Local Public Administration, MLSPF, Ministry of Education, MIA). In this respect, it is necessary to develop sustainable, efficient and diligent partnerships among all the stakeholders, to fill in the existing gaps in the necessary services at the community level, which would be in line with the needs of children and the youth from migrants’ families. It is important to reshape the attitude of public authorities in relation to the given problem.

It is also important to continue the existing joint initiatives with countries of destination, such as the Russian Federation and Ukraine, which are meant to ensure circular migration and migrant workers’ return and reintegration into the Moldovan labour market.

Fostering the temporary return of highly qualified co-nationals and facilitating brain circulation will ensure the transfer of qualifications and innovations in certain sectors.

Moldovan authorities paid special attention to setting the links between diaspora associations in different countries and their home country, including by establishing a specialized authorities in this area, such as the BDR under the State

---

64 National Action Plan for protection of left-behind children for 2010–2011 (dated 2 June 2010); “Addressing the Negative Effects of Migration on Minors and Families Left Behind” Project, implemented by the Italian Government in collaboration with IOM, and co-funded by the EC (duration 2011–2012).
66 Initiative “Addressing the brain drain through temporary return of scientists – Moldovan expatriates and young researchers from abroad – to strengthen Moldova as a research and development centre and to promote temporary and permanent returns and transfer of skills” financed by EU and implemented by IOM in 2010–2011 within the framework of the Project “Supporting the Implementation of the Migration and Development Component of the EU–Moldova Mobility Partnership” may be mentioned in this context.
Chancellery of the Republic of Moldova. Nevertheless, it is important to further support the BDR in organizing different activities with Moldovan communities and diaspora organizations abroad.

Although the Republic of Moldova has already created a solid institutional framework in the area of migration management, it is still necessary to continue developing migration management capacities. Hence, the development of subsequent policies should be based on comprehensive and well-structured data, and should take into account the specific interests and objectives of the country, referring to the different aspects of the general public policy, such as occupational, demographic and circular migration promotion, and migrants’ return and reintegration, among others.

To achieve this goal, it would be necessary to support and build the capacities of public institutions in ensuring the development and implementation of the policies related to migration issues (e.g. through increased material resources, training workshops, elimination of bureaucratic impediments, increased consideration of local practice and expertise, avoidance of excessive reliance on foreign experts’ interventions).

In this context, there is an increased role for the structures to ensure coordination, as they should have sufficient trained human resources, including in modern areas of activity and communication.

**D.3. Recommendations on mainstreaming migration into development policies**

Mainstreaming migration into development is envisaged in some long-term policies of the country.


---

68 Government Decision No. 133 dated 23 February 2010, on the Commission for coordinating certain activities related to migration process, the Working Group (WG) from the MFAEI on coordination of the visa liberalization regime with EU.
of Moldova\textsuperscript{70} – also contributes towards correlating the sectoral strategies implemented by different line ministries.

In this context, it is worth mentioning that the Moldovan Government has an existing foreign policy and is committed to migration management and development, as reflected in documents such as: the \textit{Joint Declaration regarding the EU–Moldova Mobility Partnership}\textsuperscript{71} and the \textit{National Program for Implementing the EU–Republic of Moldova Action Plan in the area of visa regime liberalization}\textsuperscript{72} (approved in 2011). The National Program, due to the comprehensive approach used by migration management module in line with the EU directives, guided the cardinal legislative and institutional reform in migration management area.

At the same time, the dynamics and magnitude of the migration processes during the reported period need to correct and include some specific elements in the development policies.

Taking into account the continuous decrease of population and acceleration of population ageing, it is necessary to:

- ensure better management of the circular migration processes;
- ensure monitoring of return migrants, especially of persons encountering problems, and to study the problems that emerge during their social, psychological, occupational and educational reintegration; hence, it would be necessary to further develop data collection on persons who have temporarily went abroad (information about emigration to work or study, by age and level of education, in dynamics), to ensure the correlation of information and the analysis of pre- and post-emigration data, and to develop adequate policies;
- develop the aspects related to the country’s demographic security, which implies including in the country’s long-term policies those aspects related to social protection of families and children left behind, and developing demographic security policies based on the monitoring of selected indicators, including the ones established in this analytical report; and
- improve the quality of statistical and administrative data related to authorized emigration, taking into account indicators pertaining to age, training level, sex and area of residence of persons who have left.

To ensure the mechanisms needed for implementing the policies for child

\textsuperscript{70} National Development Strategy: Moldova 2020, approved via the Law No. 166 dated 11 July 2012.

\textsuperscript{71} Joint Declaration regarding the EU–Moldova Mobility Partnership, signed on 5 June 2008, in Luxembourg within the meeting of the Council of Ministers of Justice and Home Affairs of EU.

\textsuperscript{72} Government Decision No. 122 dated 04 March 2011, approving the National Program for Implementing the EU–Republic of Moldova Action Plan in the area of visa regime liberalization.
and family protection during parents’ migration period, it would be necessary to ensure the periodical collection of data about the number of children left behind, the number of marriages and divorces in migrants’ families in dynamics, and the number of children born in migrants’ families abroad.

As the Republic of Moldova has opted for the integration processes and liberalization of the visa regime with the EU, special focus is given to the existence and development of migration control tools to improve migration management. In this context, priority is given to the development of tools to collect statistical and nominal information on migration, to correlate the notions and definitions used in the national legislation with those used in the EU legislation, especially the Regulation 862 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 11 July 2007 on community statistics on migration and international protection.

D.4. Recommendations on improving migration statistics and developing evidence-based policies

The efficient management of migration may be carried out only if policies and strategies are based on up-to-date information regarding migration flows. Hence, collection of reliable data (including for forecasting purposes) should be part of a comprehensive national policy on migration. As well, there is too little available information regarding such important topics as remittances, and current and potential migrants’ awareness about legal migration and return possibilities.

Some underestimations/gaps still exist in relation to migration database in different areas. For instance, the Ministry of Education holds official data on the number of Moldovan citizens studying abroad based on the international treaties, but there is no database about those who apply and get the opportunity to study abroad by themselves. Another problem lies in the record-keeping of left-behind children – a task divided among several ministries that report different data, which are not correlated.

The following can be mentioned among the actions/strategies recommended for improving and generating data on international migration of population.73

The EMP, rather perceived as a process and not as an output, represents

---

73 This section is based on the main findings of M. Poulain Michel et al., Data Assessment Report for the Republic of Moldova (Chisinau, IOM, 2011). Available from www.iom.md/attachments/110_data_assess_rep_eng.pdf
a high potential for synergy with mainstreaming migration, so as to understand and use the data for informed policymaking and progress evaluation. The Government of the Republic of Moldova approved the List of Indicators and the Extended Migration Profile Template for the Republic of Moldova on 24 August 2012. According to the government decision, the BMA – in cooperation with other relevant ministries and central public authorities – shall ensure the update of the EMP indicators, as well as the development of the annual analytical report based on the List of the Indicators and the EMP Template for the Republic of Moldova.

The following is suggested to fulfil these objectives:

1. Compilation and update of the EMP should be carried out in a sustainable way, channelling the EMP findings in policymaking. Hence, it is recommended to develop an action plan or a strategy for regular updating of the EMP and further development of the EMP exercise.

2. To solve the problem of inadequate data, it is necessary to build the capacities of State institutions (NBS, SE SIRC “Registru”, MIA, MLSPF, etc.) that are involved in collecting data at the national level.

3. There is a strong need for more constructive and active collaboration among the main producers of statistical data, namely, the SE SIRC “Registru”, the NBS and the MIA. It is important to mention as well the need for a more active cooperation with the BPD in the area of statistics in relation to migrants’ registration at the border crossing.

4. The problem of an absent unified methodology for assessing and quantifying the migration process could be mitigated by adopting certain government acts that would create and introduce a unified application of rules and class definitions, segregated and disaggregated, alongside all the exiting criteria, in line with the methodological approaches convened at the international level as well as with the comparative statistical indicators, which cover a range of problems related to migration.

5. The data exchange with the countries of destination of Moldovan migrants is a concrete possibility for verifying the reliability of emigration data from the Republic of Moldova. Frequently, this data is not included in the annual statistics on migration; hence, it would be necessary to regularly request data from the countries concerned.

6. There is a need for well-targeted training for and technical cooperation between the institution and the national experts responsible for updating the EMP, including through twinning projects.

In this context, it is necessary to continue developing information

assistance for national and local public authorities as support for ensuring efficient management of migration and asylum.

Activities should continue in relation to building institutional capacities for collecting, aggregating and systematizing the data from the beneficiary for developing and implementing policies in the area of migration and asylum, as well as foreigners’ integration.

For the given purpose, it is important to continue ensuring inter-institutional information activity, both on the horizontal and vertical axes, as well as at all the levels (national, regional, local) of all the competent authorities, so as to provide management of migration, coordinate joint activities and reduce risks.

There should be developed cooperation mechanisms for risk analysis and for collecting and processing data, establishment, if needed, of some joint groups for investigation in new areas of activity; assurance of the access to exiting and newly created databases; and the establishment of joint databases or rapid data exchange systems for public authorities.

It is important to develop mechanisms for joint planning (based on the cooperation protocols) of the inter-institutional cooperation based on joint understanding of risks and threats, especially the ones related to information exchange between authorities, and mediation of competence conflicts, among others.
ANNEX

Annex 1. Glossary of terms

**Absolute poverty line** – calculated based on the food expenditures of the second, third, and fourth deciles, adjusted to 2,282 kcal/person/day and adding to it the non-food expenditures (the weight for all the households from the Household Budget Survey).

**Alien** – a person who is not a national or does not hold the citizenship of a given State (EU definition).

**Asylum-seeker** – a third-country national or stateless person who has made an application for asylum in respect of which a final decision has not yet been taken (Council Directive 2005/85/EC of 1 December 2005 on minimum standards on procedures in Member States for granting and withdrawing refugee status).

**Cancellation** – decision taken by the competent authority for foreigners against the alien, if he or she does not meet the conditions set forth by the law or of it is established that some of the documents which served as basis for granting him or her the right to stay in the country are false (Law No. 200 dated 16 July 2010 on Foreigners’ Regime in the Republic of Moldova).

**Child** – any human being below the age of 18 unless under the law applicable to the child, majority is attained earlier (United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child).

**Citizenship** – legal bond between an individual and a State; it is acquired through birth or through naturalization, regardless if it is through declaration, option, marriage or any other means, in line with the national legislation.

**Confirmation of repatriation** – an official document issued by the competent authority for aliens, confirming the right to repatriation (Law No. 200 dated 16 July 2010 on Foreigners’ Regime in the Republic of Moldova).

**Country of birth** – country of residence (within current borders, if information is available) of the mother at the date of birth; if not possible, the country (within current borders, if information is available) where the birth occurred.

**Declaring the foreigner an undesirable person** – a safety measure undertaken by the authority against a foreigner who has developed, is developing or in whose respect there are well-reasoned indices that he or she intends to develop
activities that would endanger the national security or public order of the country (Law No. 200 dated 16 July 2010 on Foreigners’ Regime in the Republic of Moldova).

*Emigrant* – a person undertaking an emigration (involved in emigration process) (EC Regulation No. 862/2007 of 11 July 2007 on Community statistics on migration and international protection).

*Emigration* – the action by which a person, having previously been usually resident in the territory of a State, ceases to have his or her usual residence in that State for a period that is, or is expected to be, of at least 12 months (EC Regulation No. 862/2007 of 11 July 2007 on Community statistics on migration and international protection).

*Equivalent income* – the total income of the household relative to its “equivalent size”, that is, taking into consideration the size and composition of the households, and being attributed to each member of the household (the total income of the households is reported to its equivalent size, using the so-called “equivalence scale” modified by the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development).

*Expulsion* – an act by an authority of the State with the intention and with the effect of securing the removal of a person or persons (aliens or stateless persons) against their will from the territory of that State (IOM, International Migration Law No. 25: Glossary on Migration, 2nd edition, 2011).

*Foreign-born* – a person who was born outside the country of the current usual residence, regardless of the person’s citizenship (Guidelines for Collecting Data on International Migration According to the Article in Regulation 862/2007 and for Collecting Additional Data on Voluntary Basis: Immigration, Emigration, Usually Resident Population, and Obtaining and Losing Citizenship).

*Humanitarian protection* – a protection form recognized by the Republic of Moldova, provided to the foreigner or the stateless persons due to other reasons than the ones laid down in the Geneva Convention dated 28 July 1951 (Law No. 270 dated 18 December 2008 on Asylum in the Republic of Moldova).

*Irregular migrant* – someone who, owing to illegal entry or expiry of his or her visa, lacks legal status in a transit or host country; the term applies to migrants who infringe a country’s admission rules and any other person not authorized to remain in the host country (IOM, *International Migration Law No. 25: Glossary on Migration*, 2nd edition, 2011).
Illegal stay – presence on the territory of the Republic of Moldova of a foreigner who does not meet or does meet anymore the conditions related to entry, stay or residence in the Republic of Moldova (Law No. 200 dated 16 July 2010 on Foreigners’ Regime in the Republic of Moldova).


Immigration – the action by which a person establishes his or her usual residence in the territory of another State for a period that is, or expected to be, of at least 12 months, having previously been usually resident in another State (EC Regulation No. 862/2007 of 11 July 2007 on Community statistics on migration and international protection).

Local border traffic – regular crossing of an external land border by border residents in order to stay in a border area, for example social, cultural or substantiated economic reasons, or for family reasons, for a period not exceeding three months of uninterrupted stay since the day of the border crossing (Regulation EC No. 1931/2006).

Migrants’ remittances – represent transfers from abroad of monetary means and goods, with an impact on households’ incomes. They arise from the temporary or permanent movement of people to work in foreign economies, settling down for good in other States, as well as from inter-human relations: gifts, donations and inheritances. Remittances include cash and non-cash items that flow through formal channels (such as via electronic wire) or through informal channels (such as money or goods carried across borders) (International Monetary Fund, Balance of Payments and International Investment Position, 6th edition, Appendix 5, Remittances).

Naturalization – the granting of citizenship upon request to persons lawfully and habitually resident in the territory of the Republic of Moldova, under the conditions set forth in the Law on Citizenship of the Republic of Moldova No. 1024 dated 2 June 2000.

Net migration – difference between entries or arrivals of immigrants and exits or departures of emigrants during the same period of time. It is called also “migration balance” (IOM, International Migration Law No. 25: Glossary on Migration, 2nd edition, 2011).

Public custody – a measure for restricting the freedom of movement (Law No. 200 dated 16 July 2010 on Foreigners’ Regime in the Republic of Moldova).
**Readmission** – the action of a State to accept the reentry of an individual (national, third-country national or stateless person).

**Readmission agreement** – international agreements laying down the mutual procedures for returning the illegally staying non-nationals to their country or origin or the country they have transited through.

**Refugee** – any third-country national who, owing to well-founded fear of being persecuted for reasons of race, religion, nationality, membership of a particular social group or political opinion, is outside the country of his or her nationality and is unable or, owing to such fear, is unwilling to avail himself or herself of the protection of that country; or who, not having a nationality and being outside the country of his or her former habitual residence as a result of such events, is unable or, owing to such fear, is unwilling to return to it (based on Article 1 of the UN 1951 Convention relating to the Status of Refugees, as well as Directive 2004/83/EC).

**Repatriation** – the personal right of a refugee, prisoner of war, or a civil detainee to return to his or her country of nationality under specific conditions laid down in various international instruments (Geneva 1949 Convention and 1977 Protocols, the Regulations Respecting the Laws and Customs of War on Land, annexed to the Fourth Hague Convention 1907, human rights instruments and customary international law).

**Return** – the process of going back of a foreigner, through voluntary execution of the return decision or through forced execution of such a decision, to the country of origin, a transit country, in line with the readmission agreements, or to a third country to which the foreigner decided to return voluntarily and in which he or she will be accepted.

**Return decision** – an administrative act of the competent authority for foreigners, establishing the stay of the foreigner as being illegal and obliging the foreigner to leave the territory of the Republic of Moldova within the set deadlines (Law No. 200 dated 16 July 2010 on Foreigners’ Regime in the Republic of Moldova).

**Revocation** – decision taken by the competent authority for foreigners if it is established that the foreigner does not anymore meet the conditions for the right to stay in the country or if he or she does not respect the reason for which the respective right is provided, or if he or she infringes the customs regulations or the regulations related to the State border (Law No. 200 dated 16 July 2010 on Foreigners’ Regime in the Republic of Moldova).
Share of population under the absolute poverty line – number of persons living in households with expenditures per adult equivalent (scale 1:0.7:0.5) under the poverty line, as related to the total size of the population.

Statelessness – this may result from different causes, including conflict of law, transfer of territory, laws regulating marriage, administrative practice, discrimination, missing registration of birth, de-nationalization (when a State cancels the nationality of an individual) and renunciation (when an individual renounces State protection).


Status of refugee – a protection form, recognized by the Republic of Moldova, for the foreigner or the stateless person who meets the conditions set forth in the Convention relating to the Status of Refugees, signed in Geneva on 28 July 1951, as well as in the Protocol relating to the Status of Refugees signed on 31 January 1967 (Law No. 270-XVI dated 18 December 2008).


Taking under public custody – a measure for restricting the freedom of movement undertaken by a court against a foreigner who could not be returned within the deadline set forth in the present law, as well as against a foreigner who has been declared undesirable or whose expulsion has been decided by the court (Law No. 200 dated 16 July 2010 on Foreigners’ Regime in the Republic of Moldova).

Usual residence – the place at which a person normally spends the daily period of rest, regardless of temporary absences for purposes of recreation, holiday, visits to friends and relatives, business, medical treatment or religious pilgrimage or, by default, the place of legal or registered residence (Regulation (EC) No. 862/2007 of 11 July 2007 on Community statistics on migration and international protection).
Annex 2. Statistical tables

I. Emigration of population

A. Authorized emigration

Table 1: Annual number of authorized emigrations by area of residence prior to departure, sex, age and country of destination, 2008–2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total emigrated</td>
<td>6,988</td>
<td>6,663</td>
<td>4,714</td>
<td>4,039</td>
<td>3,129</td>
<td>2,585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Including from:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban areas</td>
<td>4,195</td>
<td>3,955</td>
<td>3,139</td>
<td>2,722</td>
<td>2,152</td>
<td>1,923</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural areas</td>
<td>2,793</td>
<td>2,708</td>
<td>1,575</td>
<td>1,317</td>
<td>977</td>
<td>662</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of the total emigrated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>3,237</td>
<td>3,138</td>
<td>2,193</td>
<td>1,813</td>
<td>1,425</td>
<td>1,201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>3,751</td>
<td>3,525</td>
<td>2,521</td>
<td>2,226</td>
<td>1,704</td>
<td>1,384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0–4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5–9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10–14</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15–19</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20–24</td>
<td>910</td>
<td>775</td>
<td>481</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25–29</td>
<td>1,228</td>
<td>966</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30–34</td>
<td>947</td>
<td>818</td>
<td>517</td>
<td>389</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35–39</td>
<td>692</td>
<td>570</td>
<td>386</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40–44</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45–49</td>
<td>489</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50–54</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>404</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55–59</td>
<td>453</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60–64</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65–69</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70–74</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75–79</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80–84</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85 and older</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 It includes the withdrawal of the residence registration and declaration of long-term emigration or emigration for good, known in the country also as permanent emigration.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country of destination</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ukraine</td>
<td>6,988</td>
<td>6,663</td>
<td>4,714</td>
<td>4,039</td>
<td>3,129</td>
<td>2,585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian Federation</td>
<td>2,663</td>
<td>1,866</td>
<td>1,162</td>
<td>858</td>
<td>772</td>
<td>684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>588</td>
<td>899</td>
<td>523</td>
<td>538</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belarus</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kazakhstan</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other countries</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: MITC/SE SIRC "Registru".

Note: *The data before 2008 does not include the total number of children who have emigrated together with their parents (and namely those who are included in the passport of one of the parents).

### Table 2: Relative indicators of authorized emigration of Moldovan citizens, 2008–2013 (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1.4. Growth rate of authorized emigration of Moldovan citizens</td>
<td>97.4</td>
<td>95.4</td>
<td>70.7</td>
<td>85.7</td>
<td>77.5</td>
<td>82.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.5. Authorized emigration gender gap for Moldovan citizens (women/men)</td>
<td>110.3</td>
<td>111.4</td>
<td>115.0</td>
<td>122.8</td>
<td>119.6</td>
<td>115.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.6. Relative proportion of authorized emigrants from rural areas reported to urban</td>
<td>66.6</td>
<td>68.5</td>
<td>50.2</td>
<td>48.4</td>
<td>45.4</td>
<td>34.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: MITC/SE SIRC "Registru".
### Table 3: Annual number of authorized emigrations by education level and sex, 2011, 2012 and 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total emigrants</td>
<td>4,039</td>
<td>1,813</td>
<td>2,226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of whom with the level of:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University education</td>
<td>421</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incomplete higher education</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary professional education</td>
<td>551</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary education</td>
<td>1,195</td>
<td>513</td>
<td>682</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: MITC/SE SIRC “Registru”.

### Table 4: Annual number of children taken abroad by their parents (authorized emigration), 2008–2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of children aged 0–18 years old taken abroad by their parents</td>
<td>1,575</td>
<td>1,206</td>
<td>869</td>
<td>728</td>
<td>567</td>
<td>549</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth rate of the number of children aged 0–18 taken abroad by their parents (%)</td>
<td>144.8</td>
<td>76.6</td>
<td>72.1</td>
<td>83.8</td>
<td>77.9</td>
<td>96.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: MITC/SE SIRC “Registru”.

### Table 5: Number of Moldovan citizens who live abroad by sex, 2008–2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.3.1. Number of Moldovan citizens living abroad (authorized emigration – stock)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>82,337</td>
<td>87,933</td>
<td>92,184</td>
<td>96,223</td>
<td>99,352</td>
<td>101,937</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>37,268</td>
<td>39,888</td>
<td>41,829</td>
<td>43,642</td>
<td>45,067</td>
<td>46,268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>45,069</td>
<td>48,045</td>
<td>50,355</td>
<td>52,581</td>
<td>54,285</td>
<td>55,669</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Moldovan citizens living abroad according to border crossing data (persons who have left the country for one year and more)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>237,650</td>
<td>272,479</td>
<td>284,304</td>
<td>307,479</td>
<td>330,167</td>
<td>358,882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>110,470</td>
<td>128,443</td>
<td>135,690</td>
<td>145,021</td>
<td>154,282</td>
<td>167,902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>127,180</td>
<td>144,036</td>
<td>148,614</td>
<td>162,458</td>
<td>175,885</td>
<td>190,980</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: i MITC/SE SIRC “Registru”.

i BPD from MIA.
### Table 6: Distribution of the number of Moldovan citizens who have left abroad to get settled permanently, by sex and country of destination (stock by the end of the year), 2008–2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>82,337</td>
<td>87,933</td>
<td>92,184</td>
<td>99,352</td>
<td>101,937</td>
<td>37,268</td>
<td>39,888</td>
<td>41,829</td>
<td>43,642</td>
<td>45,067</td>
<td>46,268</td>
<td>45,069</td>
<td>48,045</td>
<td>50,355</td>
<td>52,581</td>
<td>54,285</td>
<td>55,669</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian Federation</td>
<td>28,811</td>
<td>30,236</td>
<td>31,038</td>
<td>31,896</td>
<td>32,668</td>
<td>33,352</td>
<td>13,139</td>
<td>13,810</td>
<td>14,119</td>
<td>14,498</td>
<td>14,833</td>
<td>15,157</td>
<td>15,672</td>
<td>16,426</td>
<td>16,919</td>
<td>17,398</td>
<td>17,835</td>
<td>18,195</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukraine</td>
<td>20,236</td>
<td>22,730</td>
<td>24,601</td>
<td>26,428</td>
<td>27,884</td>
<td>28,842</td>
<td>8,667</td>
<td>9,857</td>
<td>10,753</td>
<td>11,573</td>
<td>12,191</td>
<td>12,691</td>
<td>11,569</td>
<td>12,873</td>
<td>13,848</td>
<td>14,855</td>
<td>15,597</td>
<td>16,151</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>12,543</td>
<td>13,391</td>
<td>14,034</td>
<td>14,572</td>
<td>14,817</td>
<td>14,977</td>
<td>6,129</td>
<td>6,551</td>
<td>6,869</td>
<td>7,147</td>
<td>7,272</td>
<td>7,351</td>
<td>6,414</td>
<td>6,840</td>
<td>7,165</td>
<td>7,425</td>
<td>7,545</td>
<td>7,626</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>10,453</td>
<td>10,711</td>
<td>11,036</td>
<td>11,215</td>
<td>11,433</td>
<td>11,689</td>
<td>4,688</td>
<td>4,762</td>
<td>4,891</td>
<td>4,953</td>
<td>5,045</td>
<td>5,147</td>
<td>5,765</td>
<td>5,949</td>
<td>6,145</td>
<td>6,262</td>
<td>6,388</td>
<td>6,542</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belarus</td>
<td>1,891</td>
<td>2,008</td>
<td>2,101</td>
<td>2,175</td>
<td>2,223</td>
<td>2,295</td>
<td>903</td>
<td>944</td>
<td>986</td>
<td>1,021</td>
<td>1,045</td>
<td>1,074</td>
<td>988</td>
<td>1,064</td>
<td>1,115</td>
<td>1,154</td>
<td>1,178</td>
<td>1,221</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>566</td>
<td>576</td>
<td>582</td>
<td>588</td>
<td>594</td>
<td>598</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>333</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>389</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>224</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>114</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1,281</td>
<td>1,431</td>
<td>1,589</td>
<td>1,880</td>
<td>2,106</td>
<td>2,240</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>504</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>674</td>
<td>831</td>
<td>855</td>
<td>927</td>
<td>1,029</td>
<td>1,214</td>
<td>1,328</td>
<td>1,409</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: MITC/SE SIRC “Registru”.
### B. Temporary/circular emigration

Table 7: Emigration of Moldovan citizens according to the international definition (persons staying abroad for a period of 12 months and more), total, by sex and age, 2008–2013 (persons)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age – total</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>237,650</td>
<td>272,479</td>
<td>284,304</td>
<td>307,479</td>
<td>330,167</td>
<td>358,882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>110,470</td>
<td>128,443</td>
<td>135,690</td>
<td>145,021</td>
<td>154,282</td>
<td>167,902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>127,180</td>
<td>144,036</td>
<td>148,614</td>
<td>162,458</td>
<td>175,885</td>
<td>190,980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0–4</td>
<td>767</td>
<td>976</td>
<td>1,399</td>
<td>1,664</td>
<td>2,728</td>
<td>4,027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5–9</td>
<td>2,181</td>
<td>3,030</td>
<td>4,091</td>
<td>4,908</td>
<td>6,084</td>
<td>7,799</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10–14</td>
<td>4,045</td>
<td>5,252</td>
<td>6,209</td>
<td>7,106</td>
<td>8,245</td>
<td>9,565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15–19</td>
<td>9,354</td>
<td>11,331</td>
<td>11,656</td>
<td>12,671</td>
<td>13,383</td>
<td>14,421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20–24</td>
<td>30,191</td>
<td>32,543</td>
<td>29,288</td>
<td>27,834</td>
<td>27,083</td>
<td>27,229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25–29</td>
<td>41,419</td>
<td>46,696</td>
<td>46,643</td>
<td>48,254</td>
<td>49,294</td>
<td>49,494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30–34</td>
<td>36,283</td>
<td>42,268</td>
<td>44,135</td>
<td>48,162</td>
<td>51,620</td>
<td>55,902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35–39</td>
<td>26,530</td>
<td>31,252</td>
<td>34,805</td>
<td>39,103</td>
<td>43,087</td>
<td>48,009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40–44</td>
<td>21,590</td>
<td>24,497</td>
<td>25,563</td>
<td>28,108</td>
<td>31,028</td>
<td>34,833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45–49</td>
<td>21,770</td>
<td>23,463</td>
<td>23,159</td>
<td>24,578</td>
<td>25,446</td>
<td>27,073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50–54</td>
<td>17,203</td>
<td>20,024</td>
<td>21,480</td>
<td>23,773</td>
<td>25,177</td>
<td>26,845</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55–59</td>
<td>11,982</td>
<td>13,621</td>
<td>14,587</td>
<td>16,110</td>
<td>17,915</td>
<td>20,218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60–64</td>
<td>4,841</td>
<td>6,414</td>
<td>8,588</td>
<td>10,576</td>
<td>12,326</td>
<td>14,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65–69</td>
<td>3,787</td>
<td>4,009</td>
<td>4,090</td>
<td>4,381</td>
<td>4,881</td>
<td>6,044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70–74</td>
<td>2,916</td>
<td>3,536</td>
<td>4,089</td>
<td>4,675</td>
<td>4,943</td>
<td>5,146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75–79</td>
<td>1,515</td>
<td>1,851</td>
<td>2,258</td>
<td>2,717</td>
<td>3,411</td>
<td>4,146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80–84</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>1,156</td>
<td>1,496</td>
<td>1,763</td>
<td>2,046</td>
<td>2,239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85 and older</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>768</td>
<td>1,096</td>
<td>1,470</td>
<td>1,892</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: BPD from MIA.

---

2 This includes those who have left to work or to look for a job abroad, but with the intention to return, known in the country as temporary emigration.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Age group</th>
<th>0–14</th>
<th>15–29</th>
<th>30–44</th>
<th>45–59</th>
<th>60 +</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Both sexes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2011</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>780,735</td>
<td>43,601</td>
<td>250,779</td>
<td>276,485</td>
<td>166,696</td>
<td>43,174</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>366,461</td>
<td>22,118</td>
<td>126,198</td>
<td>132,212</td>
<td>69,854</td>
<td>16,079</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>414,274</td>
<td>21,483</td>
<td>124,581</td>
<td>144,273</td>
<td>96,842</td>
<td>27,095</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of whom:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Until 1 year</strong></td>
<td>473,256</td>
<td>29,923</td>
<td>162,020</td>
<td>161,112</td>
<td>102,235</td>
<td>17,966</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>251,440</td>
<td>15,146</td>
<td>83,593</td>
<td>76,886</td>
<td>40,072</td>
<td>5,743</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>251,816</td>
<td>14,777</td>
<td>78,427</td>
<td>84,226</td>
<td>62,163</td>
<td>12,223</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>From 1 year to 3 years</strong></td>
<td>151,839</td>
<td>9,851</td>
<td>51,804</td>
<td>54,351</td>
<td>28,166</td>
<td>7,667</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>68,204</td>
<td>5,027</td>
<td>24,304</td>
<td>24,689</td>
<td>11,381</td>
<td>2,803</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>83,635</td>
<td>4,824</td>
<td>27,500</td>
<td>29,662</td>
<td>16,785</td>
<td>4,864</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>From 3 years and more</strong></td>
<td>155,640</td>
<td>3,827</td>
<td>36,955</td>
<td>61,022</td>
<td>36,295</td>
<td>17,541</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>76,817</td>
<td>1,945</td>
<td>18,301</td>
<td>30,637</td>
<td>18,401</td>
<td>7,533</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>78,823</td>
<td>1,882</td>
<td>18,654</td>
<td>30,385</td>
<td>17,894</td>
<td>10,008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2012</strong></td>
<td>820,222</td>
<td>53,137</td>
<td>253,293</td>
<td>289,465</td>
<td>174,616</td>
<td>49,711</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>384,169</td>
<td>27,024</td>
<td>126,936</td>
<td>138,608</td>
<td>73,154</td>
<td>18,447</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>436,053</td>
<td>26,113</td>
<td>126,357</td>
<td>150,857</td>
<td>101,462</td>
<td>31,264</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of whom:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Until 1 year</strong></td>
<td>490,055</td>
<td>36,080</td>
<td>163,533</td>
<td>163,730</td>
<td>106,078</td>
<td>20,634</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>229,887</td>
<td>18,289</td>
<td>84,414</td>
<td>79,003</td>
<td>41,659</td>
<td>6,522</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>260,168</td>
<td>17,791</td>
<td>83,119</td>
<td>84,727</td>
<td>64,419</td>
<td>14,112</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>From 1 year to 3 years</strong></td>
<td>153,115</td>
<td>11,914</td>
<td>51,263</td>
<td>54,808</td>
<td>27,307</td>
<td>7,823</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>67,823</td>
<td>6,067</td>
<td>23,893</td>
<td>24,495</td>
<td>10,603</td>
<td>2,765</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>85,292</td>
<td>5,847</td>
<td>27,370</td>
<td>30,313</td>
<td>16,704</td>
<td>5,058</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>From 3 years and more</strong></td>
<td>177,052</td>
<td>5,143</td>
<td>38,497</td>
<td>70,927</td>
<td>41,231</td>
<td>21,254</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>86,459</td>
<td>2,668</td>
<td>18,629</td>
<td>35,110</td>
<td>20,892</td>
<td>9,160</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>90,593</td>
<td>2,475</td>
<td>19,868</td>
<td>35,817</td>
<td>20,339</td>
<td>12,094</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2013</strong></td>
<td>870,160</td>
<td>62,345</td>
<td>254,295</td>
<td>311,070</td>
<td>185,348</td>
<td>57,102</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>409,271</td>
<td>31,792</td>
<td>128,375</td>
<td>149,951</td>
<td>77,944</td>
<td>21,209</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>460,889</td>
<td>30,553</td>
<td>125,920</td>
<td>161,119</td>
<td>107,404</td>
<td>35,893</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of whom:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Until 1 year</strong></td>
<td>511,278</td>
<td>40,954</td>
<td>163,151</td>
<td>172,326</td>
<td>111,212</td>
<td>23,635</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>241,369</td>
<td>20,893</td>
<td>85,081</td>
<td>84,370</td>
<td>43,646</td>
<td>7,379</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>269,909</td>
<td>20,061</td>
<td>78,070</td>
<td>87,956</td>
<td>67,566</td>
<td>16,256</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>From 1 year to 3 years</strong></td>
<td>162,711</td>
<td>15,114</td>
<td>51,588</td>
<td>58,925</td>
<td>28,628</td>
<td>8,456</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>72,926</td>
<td>7,643</td>
<td>24,320</td>
<td>26,624</td>
<td>11,333</td>
<td>3,006</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>89,785</td>
<td>7,471</td>
<td>27,268</td>
<td>32,301</td>
<td>17,295</td>
<td>5,450</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>From 3 years and more</strong></td>
<td>196,171</td>
<td>6,277</td>
<td>39,556</td>
<td>79,819</td>
<td>45,508</td>
<td>25,011</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>94,976</td>
<td>3,256</td>
<td>18,974</td>
<td>38,957</td>
<td>22,965</td>
<td>10,824</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>101,195</td>
<td>3,021</td>
<td>20,582</td>
<td>40,862</td>
<td>22,543</td>
<td>14,187</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: BPD from MIA.
Note: * Information is presented according to the data collected at the State border crossing points controlled by Moldovan authorities.
Table 9: Estimated number of Moldovan citizens staying abroad, according to the data from Moldovan diplomatic and consular missions in host countries, 2011–2013*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Host country</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>505,139</td>
<td>755,983</td>
<td>819,542**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of whom staying in:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian Federation</td>
<td>211,000</td>
<td>459,700</td>
<td>560,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>130,948</td>
<td>147,519</td>
<td>149,087**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>16,014</td>
<td>17,515</td>
<td>16,758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>559**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>13,490</td>
<td>13,861</td>
<td>15,092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>11,058</td>
<td>13,254</td>
<td>11,699</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>11,872</td>
<td>11,872</td>
<td>11,665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>11,502</td>
<td>11,717</td>
<td>8,825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>13586</td>
<td>11,503</td>
<td>9,971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>7,605</td>
<td>6,764</td>
<td>6,061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>4,023</td>
<td>3,925</td>
<td>3,372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>805</td>
<td>1,682</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>710</td>
<td>783</td>
<td>650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>502</td>
<td>502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>913</td>
<td>1,480</td>
<td>1,299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>876</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukraine</td>
<td>1,547</td>
<td>1,610</td>
<td>18,587</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belarus</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>2371</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>16,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1,515</td>
<td>1,611**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>39,161</td>
<td>13,000</td>
<td>503</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: *MFAEI (data are estimates based on information provided by diplomatic and consular missions).
**EUROSTAT Database.

Table 10: Number of Moldovan citizens working abroad with legal working contracts, 2008–2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of persons working abroad with legal contracts</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>603</td>
<td>793</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth rate of the number of persons working abroad with legal contracts (%)</td>
<td>72.1</td>
<td>84.0</td>
<td>140.7</td>
<td>89.5</td>
<td>203.0</td>
<td>131.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: MLSPF/NEA.
Table 11: Number of Moldovan citizens working abroad with legal working contracts by country of employment and sex, 2012 and 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>603</td>
<td>793</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of whom in:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Arab Emirates</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian Federation</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other countries</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of the total number:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>483</td>
<td>513</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>280</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: MLSPF/NEA.

Table 12: Number of Moldovan citizens studying abroad by country, 2008–2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total studying abroad*</td>
<td>2,371</td>
<td>2,408</td>
<td>4,009</td>
<td>4,270</td>
<td>5,356</td>
<td>5,891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of whom in:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>3,600</td>
<td>3,800</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukraine</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian Federation</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovakia</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Ministry of Education.

Note: *Excluding persons who are studying abroad based on individual contracts.
### Table 13: Number of Moldovan citizens registered as asylum-seekers and recognized as refugees abroad, 2008–2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Persons</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.3.7. Number of Moldovan citizens registered as asylum-seekers abroad</td>
<td>888</td>
<td>739</td>
<td>633</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>441</td>
<td>878</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.8. Number of Moldovan citizens registered as recognized refugees abroad</td>
<td>5,555</td>
<td>5,929</td>
<td>6,200</td>
<td>6,264</td>
<td>6,148</td>
<td>2,207</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Growth rate compared with the previous year**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Growth rate compared with the previous year</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.3.7. Growth rate of the number of Moldovan citizens registered as asylum-seekers abroad</td>
<td>-2.3</td>
<td>-16.8</td>
<td>-14.3</td>
<td>-27.3</td>
<td>-4.1</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.8. Growth rate of the number of Moldovan citizens registered and recognized as refugees abroad</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>-1.9</td>
<td>-64.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: UNHCR.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country of destination</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Men</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Women</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total left</td>
<td>309.7</td>
<td>294.9</td>
<td>311.0</td>
<td>316.9</td>
<td>328.3</td>
<td>332.5</td>
<td>201.5</td>
<td>185.8</td>
<td>198.0</td>
<td>204.4</td>
<td>218.6</td>
<td>216.9</td>
<td>108.3</td>
<td>109.1</td>
<td>113.0</td>
<td>112.5</td>
<td>109.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of whom to:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian Federation</td>
<td>191.1</td>
<td>177.2</td>
<td>191.9</td>
<td>204.8</td>
<td>223.4</td>
<td>223.6</td>
<td>147.5</td>
<td>133.8</td>
<td>147.2</td>
<td>158.0</td>
<td>175.0</td>
<td>170.7</td>
<td>43.6</td>
<td>43.4</td>
<td>44.7</td>
<td>46.8</td>
<td>48.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>55.4</td>
<td>54.8</td>
<td>58.6</td>
<td>58.4</td>
<td>54.9</td>
<td>50.7</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>38.2</td>
<td>37.4</td>
<td>40.1</td>
<td>41.2</td>
<td>39.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukraine</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other countries</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>28.8</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: NBS (LFS).

Note: *Population aged 15 and over, working or looking for a job abroad.
Table 15: Distribution of temporary/circular migrants by area of residence prior to departure and by age, 2008, 2012 and 2013 (thousand persons)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Urban</th>
<th>Rural</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Urban</th>
<th>Rural</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Urban</th>
<th>Rural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>309.7</td>
<td>97.1</td>
<td>212.6</td>
<td>328.3</td>
<td>90.2</td>
<td>238.1</td>
<td>332.5</td>
<td>94.4</td>
<td>238.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15–24</td>
<td>75.8</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>58.1</td>
<td>72.1</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>60.2</td>
<td>69.1</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>58.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25–34</td>
<td>85.9</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>59.8</td>
<td>111.3</td>
<td>33.1</td>
<td>78.2</td>
<td>111.7</td>
<td>31.9</td>
<td>79.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35–44</td>
<td>79.6</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>51.7</td>
<td>72.5</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>52.3</td>
<td>74.6</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>51.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45–54</td>
<td>60.1</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>38.4</td>
<td>59.4</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>40.3</td>
<td>61.4</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>39.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55–64</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 and over</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: NBS (LFS).

Table 16: Distribution of temporary/circular migrants by sex and age, 2008, 2012 and 2013 (thousand persons)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>309.7</td>
<td>201.5</td>
<td>108.3</td>
<td>328.3</td>
<td>218.6</td>
<td>109.7</td>
<td>332.5</td>
<td>216.9</td>
<td>115.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15–24</td>
<td>75.8</td>
<td>55.3</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>72.1</td>
<td>53.8</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>69.1</td>
<td>50.1</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25–34</td>
<td>85.9</td>
<td>59.6</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>111.3</td>
<td>82.6</td>
<td>28.7</td>
<td>111.7</td>
<td>82.2</td>
<td>29.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35–44</td>
<td>79.6</td>
<td>47.0</td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td>72.5</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>74.6</td>
<td>46.1</td>
<td>28.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45–54</td>
<td>60.1</td>
<td>34.3</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>59.4</td>
<td>31.2</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>61.4</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>30.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55–64</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 and over</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: NBS (LFS).

Table 17: Distribution of temporary/circular migrants by education level and sex, 2008, 2012 and 2013 (thousand persons)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education level</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>309.7</td>
<td>201.5</td>
<td>108.3</td>
<td>328.3</td>
<td>218.6</td>
<td>109.7</td>
<td>332.5</td>
<td>216.9</td>
<td>115.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>34.1</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>36.1</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>16.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary professional</td>
<td>38.4</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>39.8</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>39.1</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>19.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary vocational</td>
<td>89.1</td>
<td>65.1</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>86.8</td>
<td>66.2</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>88.9</td>
<td>66.1</td>
<td>22.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lyceum, secondary</td>
<td>85.1</td>
<td>52.6</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>79.7</td>
<td>47.8</td>
<td>31.9</td>
<td>82.8</td>
<td>48.5</td>
<td>34.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>general</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gymnasium</td>
<td>66.1</td>
<td>46.5</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>85.5</td>
<td>63.6</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>83.6</td>
<td>61.1</td>
<td>22.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary, no school</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: NBS (LFS).
II. Immigration of population

Table 18: Repatriation and readmission, 2008–2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.4.1. Annual number of repatriated persons</td>
<td>2,023</td>
<td>2,152</td>
<td>1,679</td>
<td>1,730</td>
<td>1,488</td>
<td>1,585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.2. Growth rate of the number of repatriated persons (%)</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>-22.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>-14.0</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.3. Proportion of children among repatriated persons (%)</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.4. Number of Moldovan citizens readmitted based on the Readmission Agreements (persons)</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: MIA/BMA, MITC/SE SIRC “Registru”.

Table 19: Trafficking in human beings, 2008–2013 (persons)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.5.1. Number of Moldovan citizens victims of trafficking in human beings, identified and assisted through the National Referral System (NRS)</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.3. Femininity ratio for victims of trafficking in human beings</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>251.6</td>
<td>243.6</td>
<td>274.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.4. Number of potential victims of trafficking in human beings assisted through the NRS</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>651</td>
<td>1,214</td>
<td>1,403</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: MLSPF.

Table 20: Resident population with foreign background (by the end of the year), 2008–2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.2.1. Total number of foreigners living in the Republic of Moldova (persons)</td>
<td>16,955</td>
<td>18,563</td>
<td>20,099</td>
<td>19,678</td>
<td>20,191</td>
<td>21,092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2.2. Growth rate of the number of foreigners (%)</td>
<td>114.2</td>
<td>109.5</td>
<td>108.3</td>
<td>104.0</td>
<td>102.6</td>
<td>104.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2.3. Foreigners’ share of the total population (%)</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2.5. Proportion of foreigners who are stateless (%)</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2.6. Proportion of foreigners living in urban areas (%)</td>
<td>79.8</td>
<td>78.2</td>
<td>78.5</td>
<td>78.5</td>
<td>77.9</td>
<td>76.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2.7. Annual number of naturalizations (persons)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2.10. Number of foreign-born persons (non-natives), stock</td>
<td>235,877</td>
<td>244,530</td>
<td>253,847</td>
<td>262,572</td>
<td>268,836</td>
<td>283,674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2.11. Growth rate of the number of foreign-born persons (non-natives) (%)</td>
<td>102.5</td>
<td>103.7</td>
<td>103.8</td>
<td>103.3</td>
<td>102.4</td>
<td>105.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2.12. Foreign-born persons’ share of the population (%)</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2.13. Proportion of foreign-born persons living in urban areas (%)</td>
<td>74.6</td>
<td>73.8</td>
<td>72.9</td>
<td>74.5</td>
<td>72.6</td>
<td>69.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: MITC/SE SIRC “Registru”.
### Table 21: Number of population with foreign background by age and sex (stock by the end of the year), 2011–2013 (persons)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19,678</td>
<td>9,960</td>
<td>9,718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0–4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5–9</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10–14</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15–19</td>
<td>1,153</td>
<td>647</td>
<td>506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20–24</td>
<td>2,402</td>
<td>1,284</td>
<td>1,118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25–29</td>
<td>2,403</td>
<td>1,103</td>
<td>1,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30–34</td>
<td>2,394</td>
<td>1,167</td>
<td>1,227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35–39</td>
<td>2,249</td>
<td>1,155</td>
<td>1,094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40–44</td>
<td>1,863</td>
<td>1,003</td>
<td>860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45–49</td>
<td>1,897</td>
<td>1,045</td>
<td>852</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50–54</td>
<td>1,634</td>
<td>830</td>
<td>804</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55–59</td>
<td>1,319</td>
<td>628</td>
<td>691</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60–64</td>
<td>860</td>
<td>451</td>
<td>409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65–69</td>
<td>576</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70–74</td>
<td>393</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75–79</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80–84</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85 and over</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: MITC/SE SIRC “Registru”.*

### Table 22: Resident population with foreign background by country of citizenship, 2008–2013 (persons)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country of citizenship</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>16,955</td>
<td>18,563</td>
<td>20,099</td>
<td>19,678</td>
<td>20,191</td>
<td>21,092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Including:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukraine</td>
<td>5,630</td>
<td>6,552</td>
<td>7,114</td>
<td>7,392</td>
<td>7,171</td>
<td>7,005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian Federation</td>
<td>3,854</td>
<td>4,430</td>
<td>5,001</td>
<td>5,032</td>
<td>4,736</td>
<td>4,815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stateless (Art. 1, 1954 UN Convention)</td>
<td>1,180</td>
<td>1,350</td>
<td>1,360</td>
<td>1,312</td>
<td>1,262</td>
<td>1,526</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>637</td>
<td>957</td>
<td>1,096</td>
<td>1,527</td>
<td>1,694</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republic of Moldova (former citizens)</td>
<td>964</td>
<td>995</td>
<td>804</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>941</td>
<td>779</td>
<td>792</td>
<td>711</td>
<td>810</td>
<td>929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>595</td>
<td>557</td>
<td>691</td>
<td>714</td>
<td>865</td>
<td>1072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons with non-determined citizenship</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>352</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belarus</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azerbaijan</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syrian Arab Republic</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other countries</td>
<td>1,700</td>
<td>1,698</td>
<td>1,814</td>
<td>1,832</td>
<td>1,990</td>
<td>2,092</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: MITC/SE SIRC "Registru".

Table 23: Number of naturalized persons by country of previous citizenship (stock by the end of the year), 2008–2013 (persons)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>614</td>
<td>630</td>
<td>644</td>
<td>662</td>
<td>671</td>
<td>680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stateless (Art. 1, 1951 UN Convention)</td>
<td>436</td>
<td>447</td>
<td>453</td>
<td>464</td>
<td>468</td>
<td>470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armenia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azerbaijan</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beneficiaries of humanitarian protection</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian Federation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kazakhstan</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied Palestinian Territory</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons with non-determined citizenship</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugees (Art. 1, 1951 UN Convention)</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syrian Arab Republic</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sudan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkmenistan</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukraine</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viet Nam</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yemen</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iran (Islamic Republic of)</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: MITC/SE SIRC "Registru".
Table 24: Number of persons born abroad, regardless of their citizenship (stock by the end of the year), 2008–2013 (persons)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Ukraine</th>
<th>Russian Federation</th>
<th>Kazakhstan</th>
<th>Belarus</th>
<th>Italy</th>
<th>Romania</th>
<th>Germany</th>
<th>Azerbaijan</th>
<th>Uzbekistan</th>
<th>Georgia</th>
<th>Turkey</th>
<th>Spain</th>
<th>Other countries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>235,877</td>
<td>102,759</td>
<td>93,574</td>
<td>12,714</td>
<td>4,831</td>
<td>1,106</td>
<td>2,054</td>
<td>2,044</td>
<td>1,893</td>
<td>1,913</td>
<td>1,808</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>11,181</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>244,530</td>
<td>104,342</td>
<td>95,774</td>
<td>12,924</td>
<td>4,896</td>
<td>2,554</td>
<td>2,876</td>
<td>2,114</td>
<td>1,936</td>
<td>1,939</td>
<td>1,832</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>13,343</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>253,847</td>
<td>105,949</td>
<td>98,280</td>
<td>13,088</td>
<td>4,969</td>
<td>4,427</td>
<td>3,338</td>
<td>2,205</td>
<td>1,992</td>
<td>1,971</td>
<td>1,850</td>
<td>1,793</td>
<td>15,778</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>262,572</td>
<td>107,159</td>
<td>100,669</td>
<td>13,180</td>
<td>5,017</td>
<td>6,549</td>
<td>3,652</td>
<td>2,289</td>
<td>2,004</td>
<td>1,994</td>
<td>1,871</td>
<td>1,793</td>
<td>15,199</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>268,836</td>
<td>105,601</td>
<td>101,104</td>
<td>13,139</td>
<td>4,926</td>
<td>10,590</td>
<td>4,050</td>
<td>2,357</td>
<td>1,998</td>
<td>1,991</td>
<td>1,866</td>
<td>2,294</td>
<td>17,292</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>283,674</td>
<td>105,825</td>
<td>105,147</td>
<td>13,116</td>
<td>4,931</td>
<td>15,110</td>
<td>5,175</td>
<td>2,572</td>
<td>2,018</td>
<td>1,973</td>
<td>1,852</td>
<td>3,111</td>
<td>20,692</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: MITC/SE SIRC “Registru”.

Table 25: Immigration of foreigners, 2008–2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3.1.1. Annual number of immigrant foreigners (persons)</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2,744</td>
<td>2,090</td>
<td>2,510</td>
<td>2,719</td>
<td>3,116</td>
<td>3,357</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3.1.2. Growth rate of immigration of foreigners (%)</th>
<th>132.3</th>
<th>73.2</th>
<th>124.9</th>
<th>108.3</th>
<th>114.6</th>
<th>107.7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1.3. Gender gap for immigrant foreigners (%)</td>
<td>46.6</td>
<td>52.5</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>43.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1.5. Annual number of immigrant foreigners with secondary professional education/higher education/science degrees</td>
<td>1,775</td>
<td>1,186</td>
<td>1,291</td>
<td>1,750</td>
<td>2,008</td>
<td>2,259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1.6. Growth rate of immigrant foreigners with secondary professional education/higher education/science degrees (%)</td>
<td>138.6</td>
<td>66.8</td>
<td>108.9</td>
<td>135.6</td>
<td>114.8</td>
<td>112.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1.7. Proportion of immigrant foreigners with secondary professional education/higher education/science degrees (%)</td>
<td>64.7</td>
<td>59.0</td>
<td>51.4</td>
<td>64.4</td>
<td>64.7</td>
<td>67.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: MIA/BMA.
Table 26: Distribution of immigrants by level of education, 2008–2013 (persons)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total arrived</td>
<td>2,744</td>
<td>2,009</td>
<td>2,510</td>
<td>2,719</td>
<td>3,116</td>
<td>3,357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of whom to study:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>903</td>
<td>707</td>
<td>812</td>
<td>1,022</td>
<td>1,257</td>
<td>1,231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary professional education</td>
<td>872</td>
<td>479</td>
<td>479</td>
<td>728</td>
<td>751</td>
<td>765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary general education</td>
<td>810</td>
<td>740</td>
<td>956</td>
<td>697</td>
<td>874</td>
<td>858</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary incomplete</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary, no school</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: MIA/BMA.

Table 27: Distribution of immigrants by country of citizenship, 2008–2013 (persons)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total arrived</td>
<td>2,744</td>
<td>2,009</td>
<td>2,510</td>
<td>2,719</td>
<td>3,116</td>
<td>3,357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of whom citizens of:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>514</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukraine</td>
<td>579</td>
<td>436</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian Federation</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>445</td>
<td>602</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>482</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>407</td>
<td>463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syrian Arab Republic</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jordan</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other countries</td>
<td>649</td>
<td>539</td>
<td>601</td>
<td>855</td>
<td>927</td>
<td>862</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: MIA/BMA.

Table 28: Distribution of immigrants by purpose of stay, 2008–2013 (persons)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total arrived</td>
<td>2,744</td>
<td>2,009</td>
<td>2,510</td>
<td>2,719</td>
<td>3,116</td>
<td>3,357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Including:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td>1,128</td>
<td>591</td>
<td>777</td>
<td>865</td>
<td>971</td>
<td>1,067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studies</td>
<td>522</td>
<td>516</td>
<td>753</td>
<td>720</td>
<td>617</td>
<td>708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family reintegration</td>
<td>1,094</td>
<td>902</td>
<td>905</td>
<td>865</td>
<td>1,061</td>
<td>1,075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other purpose</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>467</td>
<td>507</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: MIA/BMA.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 29: Temporary migration of the population with foreign background, 2008–2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.4.1. Number of foreigners holding a permanent residence permit</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.4.2. Growth rate of the number of permanent residence permit holders (%)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.4.3. Proportion of working-age foreigners with permanent residence permits (%)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.4.4. Proportion of foreigners living in the country for at least five years (%)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.4.5. Number of foreigners who are first-time temporary residence permit holders</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.4.6. Number of foreigners holding valid temporary residence permits</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.4.7. Proportion of foreigners with temporary residence permits for family reintegration purposes (%)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.4.8. Proportion of foreigners with temporary residence permits for work or business purposes (%)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.4.9. Proportion of foreigners with temporary residence permits for study or training purposes (%)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.4.10. Proportion of foreigners with temporary residence permits for humanitarian and religious activities (%)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008: 0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.4.11. Proportion of foreigners with temporary residence permits for medical treatment purposes (%)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008: 0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.4.12. Proportion of foreigners with temporary residence permits for other purposes (%)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008: 0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.4.13. Number of foreigners with local border traffic permits</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: MITC/SE SIRC “Registru”.
Table 30: Number of foreigners studying in the Republic of Moldova by country of origin, 2008–2013 (persons)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,219</td>
<td>1,300</td>
<td>1,372</td>
<td>1,632</td>
<td>2,028</td>
<td>2,138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of whom arriving from:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belarus</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jordan</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>764</td>
<td>1,068</td>
<td>1,384</td>
<td>1,551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian Federation</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syrian Arab Republic</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sudan</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukraine</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other countries</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: NBS.

Table 31: Involuntary migration of the population with foreign background, 2008–2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.7.1. Annual number of asylum applications (first request) (persons)</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.7.3. Femininity ratio among the asylum-seekers (%)</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>68.0</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>28.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.7.4. Annual number of humanitarian protection beneficiaries, including the stateless people (persons)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.7.5. Number of persons who were refused humanitarian protection</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.7.6. Number of asylum-seekers with pending applications (units)</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.7.7. Number of persons granted stateless status</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.7.8. Number of stateless persons granted the right to stay in the Republic of Moldova</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.7.9. Growth rate of the number of asylum-seekers with pending applications (%)</td>
<td>41.8</td>
<td>157.6</td>
<td>155.8</td>
<td>60.5</td>
<td>161.2</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.7.10. Number of refugees in the Republic of Moldova</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.7.11. Growth rate of the number of refugees (%)</td>
<td>94.4</td>
<td>95.2</td>
<td>87.5</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>128.6</td>
<td>108.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: MIA/BMA.
Table 32: Number of asylum-seekers by country, 2008–2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of whom arrived from:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armenia</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuba</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iran (Islamic Republic of)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyrgyzstan</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian Federation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syrian Arab Republic</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tajikistan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uzbekistan</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other countries</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: MIA/BMA.

Table 33: State border crossing mobility, 2008–2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1.12. Number of departures of Moldovan citizens registered at the State border (units)</td>
<td>5,195,698</td>
<td>4,965,142</td>
<td>4,916,233</td>
<td>5,124,750</td>
<td>5,176,251</td>
<td>5,343,475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.14. Growth rate of the number of departures of Moldovan citizens registered at the State border (%)</td>
<td>121.5</td>
<td>95.6</td>
<td>99.0</td>
<td>104.2</td>
<td>101.0</td>
<td>103.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.9. Number of arrivals of Moldovan citizens registered at the State border (units)</td>
<td>5,089,623</td>
<td>5,062,475</td>
<td>4,825,359</td>
<td>5,011,442</td>
<td>5,056,087</td>
<td>5,215,177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.10. Growth rate of the number of arrivals of Moldovan citizens at the State border (%)</td>
<td>122.3</td>
<td>99.5</td>
<td>95.3</td>
<td>103.9</td>
<td>100.9</td>
<td>103.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.11. Number of arrivals of foreigners registered at the State border (units)</td>
<td>1,717,789</td>
<td>1,478,383</td>
<td>1,885,841</td>
<td>2,194,315</td>
<td>2,273,840</td>
<td>2,363,090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.12. Growth rate of the number of arrivals of foreigners registered at the State border (%)</td>
<td>131.5</td>
<td>86.1</td>
<td>127.6</td>
<td>116.4</td>
<td>103.6</td>
<td>103.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.13. Number of departures of foreigners registered at the State border (units)</td>
<td>1,728,592</td>
<td>1,675,474</td>
<td>1,898,272</td>
<td>2,207,326</td>
<td>2,275,847</td>
<td>2,371,292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.13. Growth rate of the number of departures of foreigners registered at the State border (%)</td>
<td>133.4</td>
<td>96.9</td>
<td>113.3</td>
<td>116.3</td>
<td>103.1</td>
<td>104.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: BPD.
Table 34: Annual number of visas granted to foreigners, 2008–2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1.8. Annual number</td>
<td>23,068</td>
<td>23,000</td>
<td>16,772</td>
<td>14,954</td>
<td>15,541</td>
<td>15,272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>by the Republic of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moldova diplomatic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and consular offices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(units)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1.9. Growth rate</td>
<td>133.0</td>
<td>99.7</td>
<td>72.9</td>
<td>89.2</td>
<td>103.9</td>
<td>98.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of the number of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>granted visas (%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: MFAEI.

Table 35: Illegal stay of foreigners – main indicators, 2008–2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.8.1. Number of</td>
<td>3,245</td>
<td>1,961</td>
<td>2,298</td>
<td>1,711</td>
<td>1,452</td>
<td>2,917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>irregular migrants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.8.2. Number of</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>expelled foreigners</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.8.4. Number of</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>foreigners with</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>revoked right to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stay in the Republic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of Moldova</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.8.5. Number of</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>foreigners with refused</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>right to stay in the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republic of Moldova</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.8.6. Number of</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>foreigners on who</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>was disposed the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>measure of return</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>on the territory of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the Republic of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moldova</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.8.7. Number of</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>foreigners declared</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“undesirable” on the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>territory of the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republic of Moldova</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.8.8. Number of</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>foreigners taken into</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>public custody</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: MIA/BMA.

III. Impact of migration

Table 36: General demographic indicators, 2008–2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1.1. Total population (thousand persons)</td>
<td>3,567.5</td>
<td>3,563.6</td>
<td>3,560.4</td>
<td>3,559.5</td>
<td>3,559.5</td>
<td>3,557.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.2. Population growth rate (%)</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.3. Birth rate (%)</td>
<td>10.93</td>
<td>11.44</td>
<td>11.36</td>
<td>11.00</td>
<td>11.08</td>
<td>10.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.4. Death rate (%)</td>
<td>11.75</td>
<td>11.82</td>
<td>12.25</td>
<td>11.02</td>
<td>11.11</td>
<td>10.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.5. Natural growth (%)</td>
<td>-0.82</td>
<td>-0.38</td>
<td>-0.89</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.6. Gross immigration rate (%)</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.7. Gross emigration rate (%)</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.8. Net migration rate (percentage</td>
<td>-0.62</td>
<td>-0.68</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
<td>-0.35</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>points)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marriage rate (‰)</strong></td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Divorce rate (‰)</strong></td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ageing coefficient of population – total</strong></td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>15.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Of which, for:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Men</strong></td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Women</strong></td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>18.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Life expectancy at birth (years) – total</strong></td>
<td>69.4</td>
<td>69.3</td>
<td>69.1</td>
<td>70.9</td>
<td>71.1</td>
<td>71.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Of which, for:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Men</strong></td>
<td>65.5</td>
<td>65.3</td>
<td>65.0</td>
<td>66.8</td>
<td>67.2</td>
<td>68.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Women</strong></td>
<td>73.2</td>
<td>73.4</td>
<td>73.4</td>
<td>74.9</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>75.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: NBS.

### Table 37: Demographic composition of the population, 2008–2013 (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.2.1. Proportion of population who are younger than 15</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.2. Proportion population aged 65 and older</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.3. Demographic dependency ratio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.3.1. Demographic dependency ratio (national definition)</td>
<td>50.9</td>
<td>50.3</td>
<td>49.9</td>
<td>50.2</td>
<td>50.1</td>
<td>51.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.3.2. Demographic dependency ratio (international definition)</td>
<td>37.6</td>
<td>36.7</td>
<td>35.9</td>
<td>35.4</td>
<td>35.2</td>
<td>35.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.4. Seniority ratio</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>21.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.5. Proportion of males aged 65 and over</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.6. Proportion of females aged 65 and over</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.7. Femininity ratio for those aged 65 and over</td>
<td>165.5</td>
<td>166.7</td>
<td>167.1</td>
<td>166.9</td>
<td>166.5</td>
<td>166.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: NBS.
### Table 38: Number of stable population by sex and age (end-of-year counts) 2008 and 2013 (persons)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>2013</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3,567,512</td>
<td>1,714,931</td>
<td>1,852,581</td>
<td>3,557,634</td>
<td>1,711,506</td>
<td>1,846,128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0–4</td>
<td>188,420</td>
<td>96,981</td>
<td>91,439</td>
<td>194,464</td>
<td>100,351</td>
<td>94,113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5–9</td>
<td>187,085</td>
<td>96,135</td>
<td>90,950</td>
<td>187,726</td>
<td>96,613</td>
<td>91,113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10–14</td>
<td>233,916</td>
<td>119,281</td>
<td>114,635</td>
<td>187,052</td>
<td>96,238</td>
<td>90,814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15–19</td>
<td>311,371</td>
<td>158,489</td>
<td>152,882</td>
<td>233,733</td>
<td>119,341</td>
<td>114,392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20–24</td>
<td>359,072</td>
<td>182,437</td>
<td>176,635</td>
<td>310,612</td>
<td>158,297</td>
<td>152,315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25–29</td>
<td>305,936</td>
<td>155,389</td>
<td>150,547</td>
<td>256,077</td>
<td>128,966</td>
<td>124,111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30–34</td>
<td>263,607</td>
<td>131,741</td>
<td>131,866</td>
<td>256,577</td>
<td>124,459</td>
<td>132,118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35–39</td>
<td>233,245</td>
<td>114,822</td>
<td>118,423</td>
<td>259,480</td>
<td>128,966</td>
<td>130,514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40–44</td>
<td>232,865</td>
<td>112,349</td>
<td>120,516</td>
<td>229,431</td>
<td>111,924</td>
<td>117,507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45–49</td>
<td>278,555</td>
<td>132,256</td>
<td>146,299</td>
<td>226,912</td>
<td>108,065</td>
<td>118,847</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50–54</td>
<td>258,964</td>
<td>120,754</td>
<td>138,210</td>
<td>267,690</td>
<td>124,589</td>
<td>143,110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55–59</td>
<td>223,987</td>
<td>101,552</td>
<td>122,435</td>
<td>243,191</td>
<td>110,083</td>
<td>133,108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60–64</td>
<td>124,959</td>
<td>55,078</td>
<td>69,881</td>
<td>202,378</td>
<td>88,194</td>
<td>114,184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65–69</td>
<td>120,120</td>
<td>49,295</td>
<td>70,825</td>
<td>108,518</td>
<td>45,863</td>
<td>62,655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70–74</td>
<td>102,908</td>
<td>39,793</td>
<td>63,115</td>
<td>97,036</td>
<td>37,113</td>
<td>59,923</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75–79</td>
<td>74,471</td>
<td>27,246</td>
<td>47,225</td>
<td>74,769</td>
<td>26,455</td>
<td>48,314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80–84</td>
<td>44,858</td>
<td>14,275</td>
<td>30,583</td>
<td>45,661</td>
<td>15,232</td>
<td>30,429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85 and over</td>
<td>23,173</td>
<td>7,058</td>
<td>16,115</td>
<td>31,123</td>
<td>9,361</td>
<td>21,762</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Of the total population:**

- Persons below WA (0–15 years): 666,223 persons
  - Men: 341,338
  - Women: 324,885
  - Of the total: 610,012
  - Of the total: 314,120
  - Of the total: 295,892
- Persons of WA (16–56/61 years): 2,364,603 persons
  - Men: 1,206,443
  - Women: 1,158,160
  - Of the total: 2,349,170
  - Of the total: 1,213,225
  - Of the total: 1,135,945
- Persons over WA (57/62 + years): 536,686 persons
  - Men: 167,150
  - Women: 369,536
  - Of the total: 598,452
  - Of the total: 184,161
  - Of the total: 414,291

**Source:** NBS.

**Note:** WA = working age.

### Table 39: Comparison of urban and rural population, 2008–2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1.3.1. Size of urban population (thousand persons)</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.3.2. Urbanization rate (%)</td>
<td>41.4</td>
<td>41.4</td>
<td>41.6</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>41.9</td>
<td>42.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3.3. Growth rate of urban population (%)</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.3</td>
<td>100.3</td>
<td>100.4</td>
<td>100.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3.4. Proportion of persons aged under 15, in urban areas (%)</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>13.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 40: Demographic composition of the population of foreign background, 2008–2013 (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3.3.1. Proportion of foreigners in the total population aged under 15</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of foreigners in the total population aged under 15</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3.3.2. Proportion of foreigners in the total population aged 65 and over</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of foreigners in the total population aged 65 and over</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3.3.3. Sex ratio for foreigners</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex ratio for foreigners</td>
<td>105.1</td>
<td>100.1</td>
<td>101.8</td>
<td>102.5</td>
<td>110.4</td>
<td>114.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: MITC/SE SIRC "Registru".

### Table 41: Global economic indicators, 2008–2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1.6.1. GDP (thousand MDL)</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GDP (thousand MDL)</td>
<td>62,921.6</td>
<td>60,429.8</td>
<td>71,849.2</td>
<td>82,349.0</td>
<td>87,847.0</td>
<td>100,510.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1.6.2. Growth rate of GDP (%)</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Growth rate of GDP (%)</td>
<td>107.8</td>
<td>94.0</td>
<td>107.1</td>
<td>106.8</td>
<td>99.2</td>
<td>109.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1.6.3. GDP per capita (MDL)</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GDP per capita (MDL)</td>
<td>17,625</td>
<td>16,948</td>
<td>20,171</td>
<td>23,132</td>
<td>24,680</td>
<td>28,252</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1.6.4. Growth rate of GDP per capita (%)</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Growth rate of GDP per capita (%)</td>
<td>108.0</td>
<td>94.1</td>
<td>107.2</td>
<td>106.9</td>
<td>99.2</td>
<td>108.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1.6.7. Human Development Index</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Human Development Index</td>
<td>0.644</td>
<td>0.638</td>
<td>0.644</td>
<td>0.649</td>
<td>0.660</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: NBS.
Table 42: Impact of remittance on the welfare of households, 2008–2013 (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.7.5. Proportion of households receiving remittances</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>22.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>19.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>25.1</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>25.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7.6. Proportion of remittances in the disposable income of the households depending on remittances</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>55.7</td>
<td>55.2</td>
<td>54.3</td>
<td>52.9</td>
<td>56.9</td>
<td>58.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>48.4</td>
<td>49.4</td>
<td>47.7</td>
<td>49.1</td>
<td>52.1</td>
<td>52.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>60.7</td>
<td>59.8</td>
<td>58.7</td>
<td>55.7</td>
<td>60.4</td>
<td>61.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7.7. Proportion of households which would be under the poverty line if not receiving remittances</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>23.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>14.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>40.8</td>
<td>35.3</td>
<td>31.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: NBS.

Table 43: Distribution of migrants by average monthly amount sent back to the family, by age and sex (according to the LFM Study 2012)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex/Average monthly amount sent to the family</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15–24</td>
<td>25–39</td>
<td>35–44</td>
<td>45–54</td>
<td>55–64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USD 0</td>
<td>99.0</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Up to USD 500</td>
<td>146.8</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>49.4</td>
<td>37.3</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USD 501–800</td>
<td>50.8</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USD 801–1,000</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USD 1,001 and over</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undeclared</td>
<td>82.1</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USD 0</td>
<td>70.8</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Up to USD 500</td>
<td>94.9</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USD 501–800</td>
<td>36.5</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USD 801–1,000</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USD 1,001 and over</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undeclared</td>
<td>51.6</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USD 0</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Up to USD 500</td>
<td>51.9</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USD 501–800</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USD 801–1,000</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USD 1,001 and over</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undeclared</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: NBS.
Table 44: Dynamics of poverty indicators, 2008–2013 (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.6.5.1. Share of population under the absolute poverty line, total</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6.6. Proportion of children under 18 years old living in households under the poverty line</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6.5.2. Share of population under the relative poverty line</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>32.9</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: NBS.

Table 45: Economically active population, 2008–2013 (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economically active population (thousand persons)</td>
<td>1,303</td>
<td>1,265</td>
<td>1,235</td>
<td>1,258</td>
<td>1,215</td>
<td>1,236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth rate of the economically active population (%)</td>
<td>99.2</td>
<td>97.1</td>
<td>97.6</td>
<td>101.9</td>
<td>96.6</td>
<td>101.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity rate (%)</td>
<td>44.3</td>
<td>42.8</td>
<td>41.6</td>
<td>42.3</td>
<td>40.7</td>
<td>41.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: NBS.

Table 46: Working-age population main indicators, 2011–2013 (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.4.1.1. Proportion of working-age population (national definition)</td>
<td>66.6</td>
<td>66.4</td>
<td>66.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4.1.2. Proportion of working-age population (international definition)</td>
<td>73.9</td>
<td>74.0</td>
<td>74.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4.2.1. Growth rate of working-age population (national definition)</td>
<td>99.8</td>
<td>99.7</td>
<td>99.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4.2.2. Growth rate of working-age population (international definition)</td>
<td>100.4</td>
<td>100.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4.3. Demographic labour pressure index</td>
<td>94.3</td>
<td>88.4</td>
<td>84.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4.4. Age structure index for the working-age population</td>
<td>77.7</td>
<td>78.7</td>
<td>80.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4.5. Femininity ratio for the population aged 15–39</td>
<td>97.7</td>
<td>97.4</td>
<td>97.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4.6. Femininity ratio for the population aged 40–64</td>
<td>115.2</td>
<td>115.5</td>
<td>115.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: NBS.

Table 47: Foreign population of working age, 2011–2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.5.1. Number of working-age foreigners (15–64 years old)</td>
<td>18,174</td>
<td>18,661</td>
<td>18,803</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5.2. Growth rate of working-age foreigners (15–64 years old) (%)</td>
<td>103.9</td>
<td>102.7</td>
<td>100.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5.3. Proportion of working-age foreigners (%)</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5.4. Age structure index for working-age foreigners (40–64 years reported to 15–39 years) (%)</td>
<td>71.4</td>
<td>72.5</td>
<td>97.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5.5. Femininity ratio for foreigners aged 15–39 (%)</td>
<td>97.9</td>
<td>89.7</td>
<td>83.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5.6. Femininity ratio for foreigners aged 40–64 (%)</td>
<td>91.5</td>
<td>85.7</td>
<td>85.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: MITC/SE SIRC “Registru”.
### Table 48: Labour force indicators, 2011–2013 (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.5.1.1. Labour force participation rate (national definition)</td>
<td>49.7</td>
<td>47.0</td>
<td>48.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5.1.2 Labour force participation rate (international definition)</td>
<td>47.0</td>
<td>40.7</td>
<td>46.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5.2.1. Employment rate of population aged 15 and over (national definition)</td>
<td>39.4</td>
<td>38.4</td>
<td>39.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5.2.2. Employment rate of population aged 15–64 (international definition)</td>
<td>43.8</td>
<td>42.7</td>
<td>43.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5.3. Unemployment rate</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5.4. Youth unemployment rate</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5.5. Female unemployment rate</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5.6. Unemployment gender gap</td>
<td>-2.1</td>
<td>-2.5</td>
<td>-1.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: NBS.

### Table 49: Number of left-behind children, 2009, 2012 and 2013*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>54,592</td>
<td>42,886</td>
<td>41,976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Including with:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One parent abroad</td>
<td>34,145</td>
<td>32,258</td>
<td>31,482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both parents abroad</td>
<td>20,447</td>
<td>10,628</td>
<td>10,494</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Ministry of Education.

Note: *School census data.

### Table 50: Number of left-behind children, 2009–2013*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012**</th>
<th>2013**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total left-behind children, including with one or both parents abroad</td>
<td>17,656</td>
<td>16,441</td>
<td>15,157</td>
<td>7,235</td>
<td>5,803</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Ministry of Labour, Social Protection and Family.

Notes: *Data provided by the territorial social assistance units.
**Only children left by parents who left abroad.

### Table 51: Gross enrolment rate for compulsory general education, 2008–2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Primary education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>93.6</td>
<td>93.5</td>
<td>93.6</td>
<td>93.8</td>
<td>93.8</td>
<td>93.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>101.6</td>
<td>102.4</td>
<td>104.0</td>
<td>105.0</td>
<td>107.4</td>
<td>107.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>89.4</td>
<td>88.9</td>
<td>88.0</td>
<td>87.5</td>
<td>86.1</td>
<td>84.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gymnasium</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>89.3</td>
<td>88.8</td>
<td>88.1</td>
<td>87.5</td>
<td>86.7</td>
<td>87.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>95.1</td>
<td>95.8</td>
<td>95.6</td>
<td>96.0</td>
<td>96.2</td>
<td>97.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>86.3</td>
<td>85.3</td>
<td>84.3</td>
<td>83.2</td>
<td>81.8</td>
<td>81.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: NBS.
Table 52: Medical staff in the health-care system, 2008–2013*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Doctors, total</td>
<td>10,757</td>
<td>10,761</td>
<td>10,619</td>
<td>10,657</td>
<td>10,570</td>
<td>10,560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical personnel with secondary</td>
<td>22,658</td>
<td>23,141</td>
<td>23,003</td>
<td>22,885</td>
<td>22,788</td>
<td>22,608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffing rate with doctors per</td>
<td>30.1</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td>29.9</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>29.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 population (%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>64.4</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>63.7</td>
<td>63.8</td>
<td>63.0</td>
<td>62.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffing rate with medical</td>
<td>63.5</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>64.6</td>
<td>64.2</td>
<td>64.0</td>
<td>63.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>personnel with secondary education per 10,000 population (%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>117.8</td>
<td>121.3</td>
<td>125.6</td>
<td>119.3</td>
<td>119.0</td>
<td>118.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>25.1</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>23.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Ministry of Health.

Note: Data is from the Ministry of Health only. This does not include other ministries.
Annex 3. Institutional framework for policies on migration and asylum

Office of the President (www.president.md)
- Rights of citizenship
- Grants political asylum

Parliament (www.parliament.md)
- Passes laws and ratifies international treaties in the field of migration

Bureau for Diaspora Relations
- Ensures coordination of policies and programmes for the diaspora at the government level

Government (www.gov.md)
- Ensures management and coordination of activities of the ministries and other government agencies for migration policy implementation

Ministry of Information Technology and Communications (www.mtic.gov.md)
- Print and issues residence permits for migrants
- Maintains the National Population Register

Ministry of Interior (www.mai.gov.md)
- Primarily responsible for controlling and managing migration processes

Ministry of Labour, Social Protection and Family (www.mpsfc.gov.md)
- Analyses migration flows and labour migration needs
- Provides social services

Ministry of Foreign Affairs and European Integration (www.mfa.gov.md)
- Issues visas (via missions abroad)
- Responsible for maintaining relations with third countries
- Ensures citizen protection abroad

Commission for Coordination of Certain Activities Related to the Migration Process
- Serves as the permanent advisory board
- Coordinates and monitors activities in the field of migration, and ensuring interaction between local and central public authorities

Border Police Department (www.border.gov.md)
- Responsible for border control
- Responsible for control and evidence of aliens entering the Republic of Moldova
- Responsible for combating illegal migration and human trafficking
- Promotes policies

Bureau on Migration and Asylum (www.mai.gov.md/birou-migratie)
- Responsible for control and monitoring of migration legislation, evidence and issuing of residence permits, migration management, fighting illegal staying, running centre for temporary placement of foreigners

Centre for Combating Trafficking in Persons
- Responsible for preventing and combating trafficking in human beings

National Employment Agency (www.anofm.md)
- Issues work permits to foreigners
- Implements policies in the field of labour migration

National Committee to Combat Trafficking in Human Beings
- Consultative body of the Government
- Coordinates activities in the field of anti-trafficking.

National Commission for Population and Development
- Analyses and coordinates the sector policies that have an impact on demographic situation
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