2023 Safety Assessment of Refugee Accommodation Centres in Moldova

Regional Refugee Response For the Ukraine Situation

UNHCR The UN Refugee Agency

March 2024

Safety Assessment of Refugee Accommodation Centres in Moldova - 2023

Contents

Overview of the Safety Assessment of Refugee Accommodation Centers in Moldova 3
Safety Access Index Thematic Areas 4
Access of visitors, media, volunteers, and humanitarian personnel 5
Availability, accessibility, and visibility of information 7
Accessibility for Persons with Disabilities 9
Disclosure and reporting mechanisms for Sexual Exploitation and Abuse (SEA) and other forms of misconduct and violence 11
Child Protection and Child Friendliness 13
Staffing 15
Lighting (indoor and/or outdoor areas) 17
Privacy Arrangements 18
Availability and Accessibility of Specialized Services for Victims/Survivors of GBV, including SEA 20

Overview of the Safety Assessment of Refugee Accommodation Centers in Moldova

The Safety Assessment of Refugee Accommodation Centers (RACs) is part of the Moldova Joint PSEA (Protection from Sexual Exploitation and Abuse) Risk Assessment. It was conducted by UNHCR on behalf of the aid community in Moldova. The aim of this safety assessment was to evaluate various PSEA safety measures within the RACs. Based on the collected data, each RAC was assigned a safety index that measures overall compliance with PSEA safety measures. This index serves as a tool for planning and prioritizing interventions. It also guided the development of a plan for the consolidation of RACs, prioritizing the closure of RACs with a higher risk of SEA. Data collection took place in May and June 2023.

Prior to visiting the facilities, data collectors were trained in the use of the assessment tool. The data collection teams were comprised by UNHCR Protection, Field and Inter-Agency/PSEA colleagues, all previously trained on PSEA, including assistance to survivors/referrals and PSEA reporting mechanisms. The assessment tool contained 69 indicators covering a range of areas, including access control, information availability, disability inclusion, safe disclosure and reporting procedures, staffing protocols, lighting, privacy settings and service accessibility. To validate the results, some facilities were assessed twice by different team members. The assessment covered 39 RACs, with the following geographical distribution: 12 in the north, 7 in the south, 8 in the center and 12 in Chisinau. The total capacity of the assessed RACs is 2,470 places. The methodology used for collecting information was safety/observational walks in assessed RACs.

The safety index was calculated by summing the scores for the above areas (covering all 69 indicators) and assigning a composite safety score to each RAC. This approach facilitates comparison and benchmarking between different facilities.

The scoring mechanism was based on assigning a weight between 1 and 3 to each indicator based on its importance to the overall safety of the facility. Answers were categorized as 'yes', 'no' or 'could not be observed' during the site visits. The safety index was calculated by summing the weighted scores for each area and converting them into a percentage relative to the highest possible score. A higher percentage indicates a safer facility. This quantitative measure, combined with qualitative feedback from UNHCR teams, provides a comprehensive view of the safety profile of each facility.

The assessment revealed regional disparities in safety levels, with RACs in the South region scoring the highest safety index of 67%, above the national average of 55%. This was primarily due to strengths in staffing, information accessibility and service availability. Conversely, the RACs in

the Central region had the lowest Safety Index at 47%, largely due to weaknesses in staffing and child protection capacities. Below is an overview of the thematic areas assessed, which will help to prioritize efforts to prevent and reduce the risk of SEA in refugee accommodation centers.

Methodological limitations: The findings were primarily based on observation walks and interviews with RAC management and staff. While these methods provide valuable insights, they are also subject to bias and may not fully capture the experiences and perspectives of the refugees residing in these centers. The results should therefore be interpreted with caution, and complementary methods such as direct interviews with residents could enhance the validity of future assessments.

To access the **data collection tool** used to assess Refugee Accommodation Centres, please click here.
To access the full report of the **Moldova 2023 Inter-Agency SEA Risk Assessment**, please click here.

Safety Access Index Thematic Areas

Access Control: Evaluates regulated access and identity verification for facility visitors, media, service providers and staff.
Information Availability: Assesses availability and visibility of key humanitarian service information, inc. PSEA.
Accessibility for Persons with Disabilities: Measures physical facility accessibility, inclusive information dissemination and tailored support to persons with disabilities.
Safe Disclosure: Assesses access to safe and confidential reporting channels and communication channels.
Child Protection: Examines child-friendly information provision, reporting channels, child friendly spaces, and staff capacities on child protection.
Staffing Protocols: Considers staff vetting procedures, adherence to code of conduct, staff awareness of code of conduct, and gender balance among staff.
Lighting: Assesses adequacy of lighting within the facility and surrounding areas.
Privacy Arrangements: Measures privacy respect in sleeping arrangements, bathroom facilities, and breastfeeding areas.
Availability and Access to Services: Evaluates availability of/accessibility to services for GBV/SEA victims and survivors.

Access of visitors, media, volunteers, and humanitarian personnel

The overall index for compliance of refugee accommodation centers with access control measures for visitors, media, volunteers and humanitarian personnel is 67% indicating considerable room for improvement of safety in the process of access and identity verification for facility visitors, media, service providers and staff. The North Region slightly outperforms the Centre, Chisinau and South Regions in this respect.

Strict access control measures reduce the risks of unauthorized or unsupervised interactions between RACs' residents and external parties. This in turn helps to create a safe and secure environment that minimizes the potential for abuse, including SEA.

Key areas for improvement include:

1. **Strengthening access controls in the Central Region RACs:** It's essential to put in place mechanisms for people entering RACs to identify themselves and register upon arrival. This includes procedures for verifying identification.

2. **Enforcement of visibility protocols:** With only 25% of RACs with staff and volunteers wearing vests or badges, there's a need to standardize identification protocols across the Central Region.

3. **Eliminate potential hiding places:** Securing – including through enhanced illumination - or removing potential hiding places, such as large bushes, unused rooms and unlocked areas, including attics, basements and storage rooms, can significantly reduce the likelihood of unauthorized or harmful acts, thereby increasing the overall safety and security of everyone in RACs. This is especially relevant for RACs in Chisinau.

		General	North	Center	Chișinău	South	NGO	State
Access of visitors, media, volunteers, and humanitarian personnel etc.	Are visitors, media, volunteers, etc. obliged to 'check in' or announce themselves to reception/staff?	74%	83%	50%	75%	86%	63%	77%
	Is there a system in place to verify their identities upon arrival e.g. provision of I.D., staff badge, letter of purpose etc.?	72%	83%	50%	58%	100%	63%	77%
	Are staff and volunteers obliged to make themselves identifiable e.g. vests, visible name-badge/ID?	69%	75%	25%	83%	86%	63%	70%
	Are there entry points which unauthorized individuals could use to gain entry to the building e.g. side doors, parking lots etc.?	77%	67%	88%	83%	71%	50%	83%
	Is the facility located in a busy area?	62%	50%	75%	83%	29%	50%	67%
	Is it easy to be seen and/or be heard in the facility?	62%	75%	75%	58%	29%	50%	63%
	Is there clear visibility from the streets to the facility? [Check for any tall bushes or shrubs that may obstruct visibility.]	54%	58%	63%	42%	57%	50%	53%
	Are there hiding places around the facility e.g. large bushes, non-utilized rooms/spaces which are unlocked, attic, basement, storage room, garages?	69%	75%	100%	50%	57%	63%	70%

Availability, accessibility, and visibility of information

The overall index for the availability, accessibility and visibility of information in refugee centres varies significantly between regions. While the Southern Region stands out in many indicators, such as the presence of signage about humanitarian partners (86%) and information about PSEA reporting (71%), the Central Region generally lags behind, particularly in the display of information about services (50%) and the consistent operation of information/complaint desks (25%).

Key areas for improvement include:

1. **Improving signage:** RACs in the Central Region should improve signage to outline services, timescales and responsible organizations. This will ensure that residents have a clear understanding of the presence of organizations in the centre and the support available.

2. **Improve authorization to display information:** With rates ranging from 58% in Chisinau to 100% in the south, there's a need to standardize the process of obtaining authorization to display information across all RACs. In some centres, little or no oversight leads to a large amount of information being displayed without adequate quality control. This not only makes it difficult for residents to navigate through the information, but also increases the risk of harmful content being displayed, such as suspicious/unsafe job opportunities.

3. **Improve the visibility and accessibility of PSEA Information:** Information on PSEA needs to be better placed and should be offered in multiple languages and accessible formats, especially in RACs in the Centre and North regions where visibility is as low as 38% and availability of multilingual materials is 25%.

		General	North	Center	Chișinău	South
Availability, accessibility, and visibility of information/	Is there signage of humanitarian partners active in the site with their contacts?	82%	83%	63%	92%	86%
	Is there signage about “who does what, when, for what purposes to whom” services being provided in the site?	51%	42%	50%	50%	71%
	Does authorisation to display information need to be obtained?	74%	83%	63%	58%	100%
	Are there posters/info materials without a clear logo/name of an organisation present?	79%	83%	88%	67%	86%
	Is there signage about how to ask for information/present a complaint about humanitarian services/assistance?	59%	50%	38%	58%	100%
	Are there posters/visibility material explaining about PSEA and where to go for reporting?	54%	50%	50%	50%	71%
	Is PSEA information materials in visible areas, such as near entrances, exits, and high-traffic areas?	51%	50%	38%	50%	71%
	Is PSEA information materials provided in multiple languages?	36%	25%	25%	33%	71%
	Is PSEA information materials available in formats accessible for persons with disabilities?	28%	33%	13%	33%	29%
	Is there an information/complaint desk operating in the site?	49%	33%	25%	67%	71%

Accessibility for Persons with Disabilities

The data on accessibility for persons with disabilities in refugee accommodation centres shows that overall accessibility is poor in all regions. Even the best performing region, the South, has much room for improvement. This lack of accessibility poses a significant risk to SEA.

Persons with disabilities are often more vulnerable to exploitation and abuse due to the barriers they face in accessing support services and reporting mechanisms. Poor accessibility to facilities, services, and information further exacerbates this vulnerability by making it difficult for them to reach safe spaces, access specialized services, or communicate their needs and concerns. Limited accessibility may also isolate them from community members and humanitarian staff who could otherwise provide protection or assistance.

In environments where accessibility is a challenge, there is an increased risk that persons with disabilities may become targets of exploitation or abuse, including sexual exploitation, as they may be perceived as "easier targets" who are less likely to report incidents, and who may be more vulnerable and at greater risk of marginalization. Improving accessibility is therefore a critical component of any effective Shelter PSEA strategy.

Key areas for improvement include:

1. **Pathway Conditions:** While all regions need improvement, the Centre region, with only 25% compliance, requires urgent attention to ensure pathways are wide, even, and accessible.

2. **Wheelchair Accessibility:** Enhancing wheelchair accessibility is a challenge across all RACs, especially in the North and Centre regions with 17% and 25% compliance respectively. Despite accessibility assessments carried out in all RACs, infrastructure restrictions prevent some from being adapted for people with disabilities. While some RACs have been modified to accommodate people with disabilities, others cannot be feasibly adapted due to the complexity of repairs and limited funding. Some centres have been adapted to meet the needs of people with disabilities.

3. **Multi-Format Information:** Only 5% of RACs offer information in multiple channels and formats. Incorporating a variety of formats such as printed, audio, and digital messages, as well as sign language interpretation, is essential for disability inclusion.

4. **Increasing Availability of Accessibility Focal Points:** RACs in the Centre and Chisinau regions show very low rates of 13% and 8% availability of focal points, respectively. Accessibility focal points serve as key resources to ensure disability inclusion and mainstreaming in the management of RACs.

5. **Providing Sign Language Interpreters:** The low availability of this service, particularly in the RACs in the northern and central regions, has a serious impact on the ability to communicate effectively and creates barriers for persons with disabilities to access information, services and reporting mechanisms.

		General	North	Center	Chișinău	South
Accessibility for Persons with Disabilities	Pathways leading to the facility are flat, even, hard, and large enough to allow circulation of multiple persons at the same time (1,200 mm / 1,500 preferred width)	44%	42%	25%	50%	57%
	Pedestrian pathways leading to the facility are free of steps or equipped with kerb ramps (at least 1000m wide)/ gentle slopes and handrails.	21%	17%	13%	17%	43%
	The main entrance (or an alternative entrance) of the building is wheel-chair accessible (e.g. ramps with gentle slopes and handrails are available)	26%	17%	25%	25%	43%
	Doors within the facility are easy to enter (no less than 800mm in width, without lip or stair)	49%	50%	38%	50%	57%
	An accessibility / disability focal point is available upon request.	21%	25%	13%	8%	43%
	At least one private room and one bathroom are wheelchair accessible (doors with L handles, routes and corridors that lead to these spaces are stepless and wide enough for wheelchair use, minimum width 1,200 mm.	21%	17%	13%	17%	43%
	Information is available in multiple channels and formats: Printed messages, audio messages, digital messages/QR codes, posters, video with subtitles / sign language, using plain language and illustrations?	5%	0%	0%	8%	14%
	Sign language interpreter is available upon request (in person / video conference)?	5%	0%	0%	8%	14%

Disclosure and reporting mechanisms for Sexual Exploitation and Abuse (SEA) and other forms of misconduct and violence

The data on the availability of disclosure and reporting mechanisms for sexual exploitation and abuse and other forms of misconduct and violence show considerable room for improvement in all regions. The absence or inadequacy of reporting and disclosure mechanisms not only hinders accountability and transparency measures, but also has a direct impact on the safety and protection of residents from SEA.

Key areas for improvement include:

1. **Access to emergency phones:** Only 36% of centres have emergency phones, with the Chisinau region lagging behind at 25%. The availability (and awareness) of emergency phones for residents to communicate with is essential for immediate reporting and assistance in emergency situations, including GBV and SEA.

2. **Confidential reporting spaces:** Although the South Region has an 86% compliance rate, the North and Centre Regions lack adequate confidential spaces for residents. Such spaces are essential for safe and confidential reporting of SEA incidents and disclosure of sensitive situations to mitigate further risks for survivors/victims. The lack of these spaces can contribute to the barriers that prevent survivors from disclosing incidents and may result in break of confidentiality and lead to safety concerns.

3. **General telephone availability:** Across all regions, only 21% of centres provide telephones for residents to make calls. The low availability in the Centre Region, at 13%, is particularly worrying. This limitation hampers residents' ability to communicate and report abuse, particularly for those with limited access to phones or plans that allow calls within Moldova. This is particularly relevant given that the preferred channels for reporting incidents by Ukrainian refugees includes the telephone. The majority of centres with telephones have not installed them in areas that guarantee privacy.

4. **Internet and computer access:** While there is a high level of compliance with the provision of free internet and/or computers, the privacy of these computer stations is limited, especially in the North, Centre and Chisinau regions. The lack of privacy affects the ability to disclose sensitive information, report abuse and seek support safely and confidentially.

		General	North	Center	Chișinău	South
Disclosure / Reporting of Sexual Exploitation and Abuse and other types of Misconduct and/or violence	Are there emergency phones to call for help?	36%	33%	38%	25%	57%
	Is there a confidential space where residents can speak with staff if they wish to do so? (e.g. they cannot be seen or heard by others in the facility)	67%	58%	50%	75%	86%
	Are there phones available for residents to place calls?	21%	25%	13%	17%	29%
	Are phones placed in areas which cannot be overheard?	13%	17%	13%	0%	29%
	The facility provides free internet and/or computers to guests?	90%	100%	88%	75%	100%
	Are computers placed in areas offering adequate privacy (e.g. screens are protected from external view) ?	28%	17%	25%	17%	71%

Child Protection and Child Friendliness

The data on child protection and child friendliness in Refugee Accommodation Centers highlights discrepancies across regions in ensuring a safe and protective environment for children. From a protection perspective, children are especially susceptible to Sexual Exploitation and Abuse. Ensuring child-friendly reporting and protection mechanisms must be a priority by partners when working with RACs.

Key areas for improvement include:

1. **Accessible Information for Children:** With only 23% of centers generally providing child-friendly information, this area needs urgent attention, particularly in the Center and Chisinau regions where the percentages are even lower.
2. **Child-friendly Spaces:** The South region has ensured 100% compliance. However, the Chisinau region, at 33%, needs considerable improvements to provide children with safe spaces, including to report concerns. The presence of child-friendly spaces in any given RAC represented higher levels of compliance with indicators related to child protection, including the availability of child-friendly reporting channels.
3. **Child Reporting Channels:** A significant disparity exists between the Southern Region, in which assessed RACs had 100% compliance, and the other regions. The Central Region is the least compliant, with only 13% compliance. Overall, there is a need for more child-friendly reporting channels in RACs in the North, Center and Chisinau.
4. **Child-friendly PSEA and Reporting Materials:** The overall low percentage of 10% in the provision of child-friendly PSEA materials and an insufficient 5% for child-friendly materials on reporting mechanisms underlines the urgent need for improvement. This situation is a symptom of a widespread lack of child-friendly PSEA materials.
5. **Staff Training on Child Protection:** While RACs in the Northern region excel, with 83% of them having trained staff, the Central and Chisinau regions lag behind and need targeted training sessions. These sessions should equip RAC staff with the skills to handle child-sensitive information, safe referrals and to communicate with children in a respectful and empathetic way.
6. **Guidelines for handling sensitive information in the context of case management:** While the South region leads with 71%, other regions, especially the Centre and Chisinau, need to establish or reinforce clear guidelines for staff and volunteers for handling and responding to child-protection and reports in the context of child protection case management.

		General	North	Center	Chișinău	South
Child Protection and Child Friendliness	Is the information provided in the facility in formats accessible to children?	23%	25%	13%	8%	57%
	Is there a designated child-friendly space or location where children can safely report concerns or incidents?	64%	75%	63%	33%	100%
	Are there channels available for children to report issues?	44%	42%	13%	33%	100%
	Are materials related to PSEA available in child-friendly language and formats, including visual aids and illustrations?	10%	8%	0%	8%	29%
	Are materials related to the reporting process available in child-friendly language and formats, including visual aids and illustrations?	5%	8%	0%	0%	14%
	Is there staff trained in handling child-sensitive information and communicating with children in a respectful and empathetic manner?	67%	83%	50%	58%	71%
	Is there clear guidelines in place for staff and volunteers on how to handle and respond to child-sensitive information and reports?	59%	67%	50%	50%	71%

Staffing

The data shows that the level of adherence to best practice in staffing refugee accommodation centers varies between regions. The Southern Region consistently excels in staffing measures such as adherence to a code of conduct (100%) and screening for past incidents of sexual exploitation and abuse (100%). However, the Centre region lags significantly, particularly in terms of adherence to a code of conduct, which is only 13%.

Key areas for improvement include:

1. **Strengthening adherence to codes of conduct:** A very low percentage (13%) of RACs in the Centre region reported that all staff, volunteers and partners adhere to a code of conduct. Steps need to be taken to address this gap. Ensuring that staff and volunteers are aware of, and committed to, the code of conduct is not only good practice, but also crucial to safeguarding against SEA.

2. **Standardizing Vetting Processes Across RACs:** With rates ranging from 13% in the Centre to 100% in the South, there is a clear need for standardized vetting procedures when recruiting staff. A comprehensive, consistent vetting process can mitigate the risks associated with hiring staff with a history of inappropriate behavior, thereby improving the safety of residents.

3. **Expanding SEA Capacity Building:** Data suggests that staff training on prevention, risk mitigation and response to SEA is inconsistent across RACs. Trainings should be prioritized particularly in the Central Region, where only 13% of RACs report that their staff received such training. Trainings ensure staff are equipped with the necessary knowledge and tools to thoroughly prevent, and timely and efficiently mitigate and respond to SEA risks.

4. **Improving Gender Balance:** Although there is reasonable gender balance among staff in the RACs of the South and Chisinau regions, there is room for improvement in the North and Centre regions. Improving gender balance is key for PSEA as it promotes a more inclusive environment, while also helping residents to feel comfortable reporting incidents of abuse to staff of the same gender.

		General	North	Center	Chișinău	South
Staffing	All staff, volunteers, and partners working in the facility sign and adhere to a code of Conduct?	69%	83%	13%	75%	100%
	All staff, volunteers and partners working in the facility are vetted and screened to identify any previous incidents of sexual exploitation and abuse or other inappropriate behaviour??	56%	42%	13%	75%	100%
	Have all staff, volunteers and partners working in the facility received training training on SEA prevention, risk mitigation, and response, including on the importance of their role in preventing and responding to SEA?	56%	58%	13%	67%	86%
	Is there gender balance among staff, volunteers and partners working in the facility?	56%	50%	38%	58%	86%
	Is there a female staff member present and available to speak to at the facility 24/7?	74%	58%	63%	92%	86%

Lighting (indoor and/or outdoor areas)

The national average for adequate lighting in Refugee Accommodation Centers stands at 71%. Overall, RACs are well-illuminated, reflecting the engagement of UNHCR and its partners in improving the infrastructure of RACs. While some regions like Chisinau and the South score well in certain metrics, achieving 100% adequacy in lighting for bathroom and hygiene facilities, other regions have room for improvement.

Key areas for improvement include:

1. **Improving street lighting:** 62% of RACs have adequate lighting in the vicinity of the facility. Despite scoring high on many other indicators, the South region scores only 43% on street lighting. Improving this could significantly increase the safety of and mitigate risks for residents travelling to and from RACs, particularly at night.

2. **Improve stairwell and corridor lighting:** RACs in the Central Region are particularly poor in terms of lighting in stairwells and corridors, with only 50% meeting adequate standards. Improving these areas in all RACs will make indoor facilities more accessible and safer for residents.

3. **Standardizing lighting in common areas:** While scores for adequate lighting in common areas range from 58% in the North to 86% in the South, there is room for improvement in all regions. Adequate lighting in these areas is critical for community interaction and personal safety, especially at night.

		General	North	Center	Chișinău	South
Lighting (indoor and/or outdoor areas)	Is there sufficient lighting throughout the common areas of the facility?	69%	58%	63%	75%	86%
	Is there sufficient lighting on the streets around the facility?	62%	67%	63%	67%	43%
	Is there sufficient lighting in the bathroom/hygiene facilities?	95%	92%	88%	100%	100%
	Is there sufficient lighting to and from bathroom/hygiene facilities?	79%	75%	75%	75%	100%
	Is there sufficient lighting on stairs and corridors?	72%	75%	50%	75%	86%
	Is there sufficient lighting at bus stops/terminals/train platforms in the surrounding area?	51%	50%	50%	58%	43%

Privacy Arrangements

The national average for maintaining privacy arrangements in Refugee Accommodation Centers is 55%, with significant variations between different indicators and regions. The South region generally leads in areas such as bathroom privacy, with a score of 100% for bathrooms with working locks. In contrast, the Central region is less compliant.

These gaps in privacy pose a significant risk to PSEA. Inadequate privacy arrangements can exacerbate vulnerabilities and create opportunities for exploitation and abuse. For example, the lack of functioning locks on bathroom doors or unavailability of gender-segregated sleeping arrangements can make residents more vulnerable to intrusion and potential abuse.

Key areas for improvement include:

1. **Improving gender-specific sleeping arrangements in the centre region:** While 79% of RACs have gender-segregated sleeping accommodation (while still allowing families to stay together), only 50% of RACs in the Central Region offer gender-segregated sleeping accommodation. This is well below the national average of 79%. Of those RACs that do provide gender-segregated dormitories, only 31% do so based on gender identity rather than sex assigned at birth. This is a barrier for transgender and non-binary refugees who may be accommodated in these centres.

2. **Improve safety in women's sleeping areas:** The national average for measures in place to monitor access to women's sleeping areas is just 54%, with the Centre region performing worst at 38%. Ensuring secure access to these areas is an important aspect of PSEA risk mitigation and overall security of residents.

3. **Regulation of staff/volunteer access to sleeping areas:** With a national average of 64% and an extremely low 25% in the Centre region, there is a need to improve the regulation of staff and volunteer access to sleeping areas to ensure the privacy and safety of residents.

4. **Provide private places for breastfeeding:** The national average for private breastfeeding facilities stands at 15%. Given the profile of the refugee population in Moldova, it is crucial to provide spaces that ensure privacy for breastfeeding mothers and their infants. This is particularly relevant in RACs with higher capacity where shared bedrooms are common. While these spaces do not necessarily need to be

dedicated solely for breastfeeding, they should offer sufficient privacy for the well-being of mothers and infants alike. However, the dataset does not specify whether these spaces are in common areas or within individual bedrooms.

		General	North	Center	Chișinău	South
Privacy Arrangements	Are sleeping arrangements segregated by gender? (note: families should be given the option of remaining together, where relevant).	79%	92%	50%	92%	71%
	If so: is segregation based on gender identity as opposed to sex assigned at birth?	31%	8%	13%	50%	57%
	Do sleeping arrangements have adequate privacy e.g. curtains, screens, locks on private rooms etc.?	85%	92%	63%	83%	100%
	Are there measures in place to monitor access in and out of women's' sleeping areas e.g. secure door, female security etc.?	54%	50%	38%	58%	71%
	Are there measures in place to ensure regulated access of staff/volunteers to sleeping areas?	64%	58%	25%	83%	86%
	Are bathrooms/showers/changing rooms segregated by gender?	36%	42%	13%	33%	57%
	If so: is segregation based on gender identity as opposed to sex assigned at birth?	3%	33%	13%	33%	0%
	Are gender neutral bathrooms available?	21%	42%	13%	8%	14%
	Are bathrooms fitted with working locks?	90%	92%	88%	83%	100%
	Are bathrooms located close to sleeping areas?	95%	92%	88%	100%	100%
	Is it possible to see into hygiene facilities/changing rooms from the outside?	90%	83%	75%	100%	100%
	Are there private locations for breastfeeding?	15%	0%	25%	8%	43%

Availability and Accessibility of Specialized Services for Victims/Survivors of GBV, including SEA

The national average for the availability and accessibility of specialized services for victims/ survivors in RACs is 71%. This overall good performance is largely due to the widespread presence of Refugee Coordination Forum partners in RACs across the country through initiatives such as safe spaces and mobile teams, including Blue Dot and Orange Safe Spaces, as well as nearby government facilities, such as hospitals, social assistance offices, among others.

The South region stands out for its exceptional performance on many indicators, such as the availability of legal aid services (100%) and trained staff to deal with GBV/SEA issues (86%). Conversely, the North Region has some gaps, particularly in medical and psychosocial support services, with a score of only 58%. The Centre region performs well in the provision of medical and psychosocial support services, with 100% of RACs ensuring availability and accessibility of these services. However, the same region could improve in terms of trained staff able to provide informed counselling and referrals to victims/survivors of GBV/SEA, where it scored only 50%.

Key areas for improvement include:

1. **Strengthening medical and psychosocial support in the RACs in the Northern Region:** While MHPSS services were available and accessible at all the RACs in the Centre Region, the North Region lags behind with 58%. Partnerships with local health facilities could be a quick way to improve access to essential medical and psychosocial support services, as well as identifying partners capable of providing such services in these RACs.

2. **Improve signage for victim/survivor services:** The overall level of signage about available services for victims/survivors is 62%. The North region in particular needs attention with a low score of 42%. Better signage will help inform residents about the support available and how to access it. This is in line with the results of the Perception Survey among beneficiaries, which showed that 43% of respondents were aware of the services available for victims/survivors of GBV.

3. **Training of staff for safe referrals:** The percentage of RACs with staff trained to safely refer individuals to services varies from 86% in the South to 50% in the Centre. Standard training modules on victim support and a victim-centred approach should be implemented to prepare staff in all RACs to provide informed advice and support safe referrals for victims/survivors of GBV/SEA.

		General	North	Center	Chișinău	South
Availability and accessibility of specialized services for victims and survivors	Are medical and psychosocial support services available and accessible to beneficiaries within the facility or nearby, including through partnerships with local health facili	72%	58%	100%	67%	71%
	Are legal assistance services available and accessible to individuals accessing the facility, including through partnerships with local legal aid organizations or government	87%	92%	63%	92%	100%
	Is there signage about available services for victims/survivors of GBV/SEA?	62%	42%	75%	58%	86%
	Is there personnel trained to provide information and//or safely refer individuals to available services for victims/survivots of GBV/SEA?	62%	58%	50%	58%	86%

Safety Index of Refugee Accommodation Centres

In this table one can find the scores for each of the assessed RACs according to each area, as well as the Safety Index in the last column. The identification of individual RACs is not disclosed, as this assessment is not intended to monitor or evaluate the work of individual RAC management. Instead, it aims to provide elements for the planning of PSEA intervention in Moldova within the context of shelter interventions. Moreover, by doing so, we aim to maintain and continue building trust with RAC managers to ensure that similar assessments can be carried out in the future, and partnerships can be fostered to support capacity building and risk mitigation measures. This approach also helps us to ensure that the information shared is transparent and not conditional on concerns that may arise from the identification of gaps in an individual RAC.

Region	Access	Information	Accessib.	Disclose.	Child Prot.	Staffing	Lighting	Privacy	Services	Safety
South	94%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	99%
North	100%	88%	75%	92%	78%	92%	100%	84%	100%	90%
North	76%	100%	38%	50%	100%	100%	79%	84%	100%	81%
South	82%	88%	13%	75%	78%	100%	100%	68%	100%	78%
South	71%	88%	50%	75%	61%	100%	100%	76%	80%	78%
North	94%	92%	38%	42%	67%	100%	100%	64%	100%	77%
North	76%	88%	25%	67%	78%	77%	100%	84%	100%	77%
Chișinău	100%	92%	0%	42%	67%	100%	100%	88%	100%	77%
South	94%	88%	13%	92%	44%	100%	79%	56%	100%	74%
Chișinău	88%	88%	0%	42%	67%	100%	100%	76%	100%	73%
Chișinău	65%	80%	63%	67%	72%	54%	100%	80%	70%	72%
Chișinău	88%	100%	25%	42%	50%	77%	86%	88%	80%	71%
Center	47%	92%	63%	67%	78%	8%	86%	88%	100%	70%
Center	65%	80%	38%	75%	33%	77%	100%	60%	100%	70%
Chișinău	76%	28%	38%	50%	33%	100%	79%	68%	100%	64%
Chișinău	41%	60%	38%	75%	33%	77%	93%	68%	70%	62%
South	24%	32%	75%	50%	67%	77%	79%	88%	50%	60%
North	94%	88%	13%	42%	33%	92%	79%	64%	20%	58%
South	65%	40%	25%	25%	67%	92%	43%	60%	100%	57%
North	59%	28%	0%	67%	67%	54%	100%	72%	70%	57%
South	53%	80%	0%	42%	61%	77%	79%	52%	70%	57%
Chișinău	41%	80%	50%	67%	0%	31%	100%	68%	70%	56%
Chișinău	47%	28%	25%	42%	33%	100%	86%	72%	70%	56%
Chișinău	65%	56%	25%	17%	17%	100%	36%	72%	100%	54%
Center	59%	8%	0%	42%	33%	54%	100%	56%	100%	50%
North	82%	8%	63%	67%	0%	23%	93%	44%	50%	48%
North	24%	56%	0%	67%	50%	23%	43%	40%	70%	41%
Center	41%	60%	25%	75%	0%	23%	79%	20%	40%	40%
North	94%	28%	0%	17%	50%	31%	43%	44%	40%	39%
Center	47%	16%	0%	42%	17%	0%	100%	32%	80%	37%
Center	88%	52%	0%	17%	50%	8%	36%	28%	50%	37%
Center	94%	28%	0%	17%	0%	8%	43%	36%	70%	33%
North	100%	20%	0%	17%	33%	31%	0%	52%	40%	33%
Chișinău	35%	8%	6%	58%	0%	77%	43%	44%	0%	30%
North	29%	28%	0%	17%	33%	54%	36%	44%	20%	29%
North	71%	0%	0%	17%	0%	23%	93%	44%	0%	27%
Chișinău	59%	20%	0%	0%	0%	23%	93%	24%	20%	27%
Chișinău	94%	20%	0%	0%	0%	8%	21%	32%	20%	22%
Center	41%	16%	0%	0%	33%	0%	0%	24%	20%	15%

UNHCR, the UN Refugee Agency, is a global organization dedicated to saving lives, protecting rights and building a better future for people forced to flee their homes because of conflict and persecution. We lead international action to protect refugees, forcibly displaced communities, and stateless people. We deliver life-saving assistance, help safeguard fundamental human rights, and develop solutions that ensure people have a safe place called home where they can build a better future. We also work to ensure that stateless people are granted a nationality. We work in over 130 countries, using our expertise to protect and care for millions.

UNHCR is grateful for the support provided by donors who have contributed to this operation as well as those who have contributed to global UNHCR programmes with broadly earmarked and unearmarked funds. Top donors supporting UNHCR Moldova:

Austria I Australia for UNHCR | Canada | Czech Republic | Denmark | European Union | Finland | France I Germany I Iceland | Ireland | Italy I Japan | Liechtenstein I Norway I Republic of Korea | Switzerland | Sweden | United States of America I Private donors.

UNHCR Moldova is also thankful for the cooperation of Moldovan authorities at all levels, other UN agencies, the private sector and civil society organizations.

CONTACT US

UNHCR Moldova Inter-Agency Coordination / PSEA Unit
Email: mdachrcf@unhcr.org