

My main take away from the case

+

how has the GE been taken into account?

This is in my view a good example of a project focusing on social inclusion through active involvement of civil society

Working directly with local/existing networks and groups of interests pays off (as opposed to funding solutions upfront to crowd in civic participation)

very inclusive

very interesting project set up to promote citizen participation and building trust

Possible application(s) to my own context

+

When pandemic us allows ... it might be inspiring for other interested colleagues to have field visit in Moldova and learn about this experience

The principle/approach is of interest for the entire OZA region. The degree of applicability depends on the political environment of the moment... It will require some political economy analyses in certain contexts (thinking of Central Asia) to evaluate applicability

My emerging question(s)

+

Are professional associations (doctors, teachers, etc.) working on this similar principle and/or aligning with the work of these CSOs to make cases stronger?

What effect has the presentation of the NVR?

How much personality of CSO leaders influence the "drive" of these groups? (i.e. are they strong because they are led by extremely charismatic people... so when this person leaves, it is hard to find replacement, or are they inclusive also at the level of the CSOs themselves, internally?)

I wonder how the emergence of good but sometimes isolated local initiatives can lead to systemic (scaling up) and sustainable change?

What does the Moldova law say about rights and access of local NGOs to foreign funds (inspired by Russian law or not?)?

How do we ensure that involved interest groups do take into consideration issues of socially excluded people that might not have managed to organize themselves into CSOs?