



Project Team Cash, SDC Humanitarian Aid  
 www.sdc-cashprojects.ch / e-mail: cash.program@deza.admin.ch  
 Fact sheets on Cash Transfer Projects

## Cash for vulnerable Villagers

Moldova



Implementation period:	November 2003 – May 2004
Credit proposal:	7F-03351.01
Budget:	CHF 1'000'000
Personnel in MD:	Stela Rusu Leonid Mazilu Tatiana Rizov Tatiana Dzhalo Sergei Lodosan Tom Meyer

### Situation

A severe frost period end of 2002 and an exceptionally dry spring 2003 have compromised more than ¾ of autumn and summer grains. Vulnerable villagers and peasants would not have been able to cover even their most basic needs. The average monthly income of farmers was estimated at USD 30. Subsistence farmers suffered directly from the drought and lost their in-

puts, there were strong indications, that many landless and already vulnerable villagers were affected subsequently.

### Aim of the project

The project aimed to identify the most vulnerable beneficiaries and to pay them a one-fold cash contribution to cover their basic needs. The contribution was unconditional. Beneficiaries had clear priorities and reasons on how to use a cash contribution.

### Provided assistance

Target groups: most needy persons affected by the summer drought in 10 Rayons in the south of Moldova covering 196 villages. Beneficiaries in 2 categories: Villagers not cultivating any land and individual peasants. The goal to enable the beneficiaries to decide themselves on what they need most – be it to purchase food supply or urgently needed goods - was fully achieved.

### Lessons learnt

The theory that beneficiaries will focus on the most urgent needs was confirmed. Any earmarking of the cash contributions would have been useless. A comprehensive project document was of great importance for the project management. Experiences of a test phase allowed adjusting the procedures for the selection of beneficiaries in other regions. Individual style of announcements needed special attention, especially in poor re-

gions. SDC improved the quality of data by intensifying briefings of humanitarian committees at village level.

### Strengths

Sizing the amount of the contribution was carefully done. The experience showed that both, the objectivity and a broad acceptance of these criteria were equally important. The support provided by COOF was a helpful basis for analysis and assessment. Negotiations with different institutions for the payments showed

to be very valuable. Good results were achieved by attending Mayor's official meetings on regional levels.

### Weaknesses

Style of briefing the local humanitarian committees was underestimated during project design. The formulation of all relevant documents in only Romanian and English was not sufficient. Consequently the respective translations in Russian needed to be composed.



## Implementation issues

### **Assessment/Project Start-up**

The assessment took place from November 12 to 21, 2003. Participants: responsible desk officer at HQ, 1 COOF member, 1 cash expert and the project manager. All key elements of the project were mutually discussed and agreed with COOF Chisinau and authorities as excellent basis for the implementation of the CfvV.

### **Registration**

Based on criteria and quota, local humanitarian committees at village level selected potential beneficiaries. Missing data were screened and completed by SDC; XL files merged and entered into the database. CfvV guidelines for the selection of beneficiaries were explained to the committees. Criteria, procedures and the forms for registration were useful, clear and well appreciated by beneficiaries and authorities.

### **Verification**

Based on random samples, verifications of beneficiary lists were executed by a national NGO prior to payments to the beneficiaries. Their reliable fieldwork was crucial for the progress of implementation.

### **Announcement**

The finalised lists of beneficiaries were sent to local authorities to be published in the premises of the Primaria of each village. In very poor Rayons – where public announcement was considered to be risky – SDC informed the beneficiaries individually by letters.

Press releases were published and distributed nationwide via

various news agencies. National TV stations and Radio broadcasted news reports with reference to the CfvV project as well as SDC activities in the Republic of Moldova.

### **Complaints**

SDC has treated all complaints seriously and checked them individually case-by-case in cooperation with the humanitarian committees on village level. All complaints and doubtful cases were settled by the end of CfvV. If complaints or requests were justified, persons were included in the list of hardship cases.

### **Payments**

Payments were transferred through the Banca de Economii branches and agencies in each village. Beneficiaries had to identify themselves with ID cards or passports. Bank agents delivered the cash contribution to the domicile of beneficiaries in cases of sickness or disability.

### **Monitoring**

A post payment monitoring as well as the use of cash contribution was performed by a national NGO. Most beneficiaries confirmed the assessed needs. Monitoring proved that the humanitarian committees at village level respected all criteria. Announcements of beneficiaries were not always applied by Primarias.

### **Supporting measures**

Cost efficient management allowed a 2<sup>nd</sup> phase of the project: 1'475 additional beneficiaries received a one-fold cash contribution of MDL 500.

10% of the budget was reserved for small actions: 28

institutions received support for social and educational needs. Moreover, 546 pupils received a one-fold cash contribution for stationary and school supply.

### **Documentation**

- 031001 PRC Preconditions CfvV
- 031205 KA 7F-03551.01
- 040304 Verification Report
- 040628 Final Report
- 040506 Monitoring report

### **Infrastructure**

CfvV rented a small office with a 24 hrs security system. The team consisted of 1 Assistant PM, 1 Database manager, 1 Administrative assistant, 1 Typist/Interpreter and 1 driver. The team members were very skilled and highly motivated to work for SDC.

### **Security measures**

Travel Security Rules and Guidelines of COOF were applied. Data security measures were established (e.g. back up procedures)

### **Partners**

SDC was implementing the project based on a general agreement with the "Ministry of Labour and Social Protection" and in collaboration with Rayon authorities and local humanitarian village committees. Partner for verifications and monitoring was the national NGO "CIVIS".

Project implementation and overall results of CfvV would not have been such a success without the reliable cooperation with Banca de Economii.

### **Special remarks**

none