



EaP Media Freedom Watch

MOLDOVA

Fifth Reporting Period

April–June 2014

The Media Freedom Index, report and expert recommendations are edited as part of the ENP East Media Freedom Watch project implemented by the Independent Journalism Center (IJC) in partnership with Internews Ukraine and with support from the European Union.

This publication has been produced with the assistance of the European Union. The contents of this publication are the sole responsibility of its authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the European Union.



Contents:

- 1. Introductory Note**
- 2. Panel of Experts**
- 3. Brief Overview**
- 4. Media Freedom Index**
- 5. Conclusions**
- 6. Roadmap**



1. Introductory Note

The Media Freedom Index and expert recommendations provided in the report are the product of the ENP East Media Freedom Watch project implemented with support from the European Union (EU). The two-year project focuses on rating media freedom in the six Eastern Partnership countries (EaP) based on quarterly questionnaires on four broad topics (politics, practice, broadcasting and Internet and new media) completed by media experts in each of the six countries. The experts rate 55 indicators from 0 to 30 for a possible total of 1,650 points. Based on the total, each country is ranked from 1 to 7 on the Index. The project is intended to contribute to media freedom and to freedom of expression by increasing regional and international awareness about the state of press freedom and journalists' rights in all EaP countries.



2. Panel of Experts

1. **Petru Macovei**, Director, Association of Independent Press
2. **Ludmila Andronic**, Chair, Press Council
3. **Ion Bunduchi**, media expert, Electronic Press Association APEL
4. **Nadine Gogu**, Director, Independent Journalism Center
5. **Olivia Pirtac**, media law expert
6. **Doina Costin**, media law expert
7. **Lucia Bacalu**, Director, *Expresul* newspaper
8. **Vladimir Soloviov**, Editor-in-chief, *Kommersant.md*
9. **Alina Radu**, Director, *Ziarul de Garda* newspaper
10. **Ion Terguta**, Director, *Mir TV* channel



3. Brief Overview

This analysis of the general political, economic and legal conditions influencing mass media is organized by the chapter headings in the questionnaire.

Chapter 1: Politics

The socio-political and geopolitical context during the reported period (April–June 2014) was dominated by two major events that influenced the political agenda of the country's authorities on the one hand and the public agenda of media outlets on the other hand. These events were the signing on 27 of June of the Association Agreement with the EU and the escalation of the armed conflict in eastern Ukraine. The two events generated intensification of the political struggle in the country, essentially amplified by the forthcoming parliamentary elections planned for 30 of November 2014. The different viewpoints on the significance of the two events divided the society largely into Euro-optimists and Euro-skeptics, into sympathizers of the EU and sympathizers of the Customs Union (CU), thus giving the political struggle shades of antagonism, which were also strongly felt in the media.

Central authorities faced new challenges from the Transnistrian region and especially from the territorial-administrative unit Gagauz-Yeri, which early this year (in February) held a referendum on the country's foreign policy. Chisinau, however, found the action illegal and anti-constitutional.


Tensions were also fueled by the information war which Russia started against Ukraine and the Eastern Partnership countries (Georgia and Moldova) around the time when the Association Agreement with the EU was signed. Its effects cannot be neglected in Moldova, whose information space continues to be dominated primarily by Russian television channels. Besides, over the past decade television has been the most credible source of information for about 80% of the country's citizens.

Concerns made some voices in society to call for appropriate actions, and a Member of Parliament (Ana Gutu) even asked the broadcasting regulator (the Broadcasting Coordinating Council, BCC) to prohibit broadcasting Russian channels on the territory of the country. The BCC announced that it would monitor the content of Russian channels rebroadcast in Moldova. The results were to be made public at the meeting on 20 of June, on the eve of the envisaged signing of the Association Agreement with the EU. The BCC, however, postponed the examination of the issue because "broadcasters asked for more time to examine the results." Some analysts expressed doubts in the truthfulness of the argument claimed by the BCC.

In late May the BCC announced that it would begin monitoring broadcasters in order to identify those who fail to abide by the obligation to have at least 30% of the weekly broadcasting given to domestic programs in the Romanian language during prime time. The "law of the 30%" was to enter into force on 1 of April 2013, but 11 televisions and 2 radio stations challenged it in court. In May 2014 the Chisinau Court of Appeal dismissed the complaint, allowing the monitoring.

In May, the Government, after an unjustifiably long time, approved the program of transition from analog television to digital terrestrial television. The approved text of the program, however, has not been publicized.

In June, the Parliamentary Committee on Culture, Education, Research, Youth, Sport and Media ended the dispute between the BCC and the StarNet company, which had been going on since 2011.



The BCC considered StarNet as a provider of broadcasting services (activity regulated by the legislation), and the company considered itself as a provider of Internet services (activity not regulated by the legislation). At the Committee meeting on 11 of June, arguments and evidence were brought confirming that StarNet is only provider of Internet services. MPs found that the dispute was generated by the ambiguity of the broadcasting legislation, which allowed the BCC to mistakenly apply the phrase “retransmission by any means” (term used in analog and digital cable systems) to client-server technologies and distribution of the media content in the Internet, where users do not receive signals, but access the media content themselves. Based on findings, the Committee members imposed a moratorium on the conflict of the two parties and unanimously decided to create a representative working group that would develop proposals for removing imperfections from the national legislation on this segment. At the same time, the Committee members decided to develop and propose for approval an official Parliament statement, stipulating that the Internet in Moldova cannot be regulated and that it should remain free and uncensored. It should be noted that by the end of the reported period the statement had not been produced.

In the reported period the specialized parliamentary committee again failed to appoint 6 out of the 9 members of the Supervisory Board (SB) of the public broadcaster Teleradio-Moldova. The Committee meeting was postponed at the request of Democrat MPs, who decided to firstly discuss this issue within their parliamentary group. The proposal raised discontent among Liberals and Communists, who considered that it was an obvious proof of the political affiliation of future SB members. Later, Chiril Lucinschi, the Committee chairman, was asked about when members of the SB would be appointed, and he claimed that it would happen after the Easter holidays (after 20 of April), invoking the need to more carefully examine the candidates’ CVs. However, the Committee did not return to the issue by the end of the spring–summer Parliament session.

In June, the Legal Committee of the Parliament approved a draft law on equal opportunities for men and women. The draft includes modifications to the media law aiming to prohibit gender discrimination. According to the draft produced by the Government, two paragraphs of article 4 of the law are to be supplemented, prohibiting gender discrimination. In this context, we shall remind that media experts have been speaking for several years about either annulling the law on media or adopting a new law, since the current law (adopted in 1994) had been found obsolete and dysfunctional. The draft law has not been debated by the plenum.

In early June, the Agreement between the governments of Moldova and Romania on collaboration in the area of rebroadcasting the program services of their public broadcasters was published in the Official Monitor. By signing the Agreement, Moldova committed itself to ensuring the freedom to receive and rebroadcast on its territory the program services of the Romania Television Society without imposing any conditions and without any license or prior authorization. At the same time, Romania is to rebroadcast the program services of the national public broadcaster Teleradio-Moldova.

During the reported period, the third attempt to appoint the director of television at the regional public broadcaster Teleradio-Gagauzia failed. The first two attempts were made in September and December 2013. It should be mentioned that one of the candidates was the chairperson of the Supervisory Board Ecaterina Terzi-Barladean, who resigned from her position for this purpose but received the support of only one SB member during voting. Thus, since May 2014 Teleradio-Gagauzia has been working without a director of television and without the chairperson of the SB.

During the reported period, neither the Parliament, nor the Government or the specialized central authorities acted in a way that might jeopardize media freedom and the right to freedom of expression. However, some experts found that the guarantees provided by the national

legislation do not ensure true freedom. For this reason, the first indicator obtained 22 points out of 30 possible, which is 4 points less than in the previous report (26 points).

Just like in the previous period, experts noticed the need to improve the legislation on access to information, so as to exactly and accurately stipulate the cases when access to some types of information can be restricted in a well-reasoned and justified manner. The imperfection of legislation is a reason why media during the reported period had limited access to plenary Parliament meetings (the problem that remained unsolved since the end of 2013), as well as the reason of a case of restricted access to a public event, notified about by journalists from the Gagauz news portal www.gagauzinfo.md. Since the law remained unchanged, the score referring to its quality remained the same as earlier – 21.

Despite actual practice, the current regulatory acts establish exactly, but not exhaustively, the cases when restriction of access to official information is justified. For this reason, experts rated the existing situation with 19 points out of 30 possible – 4 points more than in the previous report.

Since defamation was decriminalized back in 2004 and the current judicial practice confirms a reasonable threshold of fines, the next criterion obtained maximum points (30), which is 2 points more than in the previous period.

The situation with registration of print media outlets, licensing of broadcasters and official censorship remained the same as during the previous period, so that the scores remained the same, too: 10, 20 and 30, accordingly.

During the reported period authorities did not act, either in decision making or in issuing statements, in a way that would restrict media freedom or freedom of expression. Moreover, in public statements, intentions have been voiced to broaden these freedoms. For this reason, the criterion obtained 27 points (compared to 25 points in the previous report).

Overall, experts rated this chapter of the Questionnaire with 179 points, with an insignificant increase of 4 points compared with the previous score. This fact itself is indicative of a relatively constant situation in media policies, which neither improved, nor deteriorated.


Chapter 2: Practice

- *Assaults, threats, arrests*

No journalists were killed in connection with their jobs in Moldova. It is the reason why experts every time mark this criterion with the highest score – 30.

In June, the employees of the Ministry of Internal Affairs (MIA) detained for 72 hours an intern of the informational portal Deschide.md, Vadim Ungureanu. The portal described the incident as “a well-thought and well-executed act of revenge” by the MIA for the reason that the portal published investigations concerning the ministry. They also said that “the case against Mr. Vadim Ungureanu is an attempt to intimidate the editorial office of Deschide.md”. The MIA, in its turn, issued a press release announcing that it detained in the act “a 24-year-old man from Chisinau, who blackmailed officials to obtain compromising information about famous Moldovan artists” and that his detention was “the completion of an operation that included documentation of the blackmailing and controlled delivery of false compromising material, which was subsequently published by the suspect in a media outlet.”

In other case, journalist Oleg Brega of the TV portal Curaj.tv was allegedly attacked in the evening of 21 of June this year by a group of masked persons, who sprayed him in the eyes and hit him with their feet. The following day, on Sunday, he was allegedly insulted and physically assaulted by the driver of the official car of an MP (head of the Communist



Parliamentary group Maria Postoico), who was disturbed by the fact that the journalist was filming the car used for the MP's personal needs.

These cases, as well as others when authorities started investigations that had, however, no finality, determined a score for this section of chapter 2 that is much lower than the score in the previous assessment. Thus, if in the previous report the criteria in this section obtained 275 points, now they obtained 255.

- *Prosecution*

There have been no major changes referring to this section. Although there still are cases under investigation that were, like earlier, initiated especially by big businesses, no new cases were initiated during the past 3 months. There have been no incidents other than the detention of intern Vadim Ungureanu for 72 hours. Similarly to the previous assessment period, no cases were registered when courts had a discriminatory attitude in judging cases that involved media outlets. In this context, the general opinion of experts is that the situation improved, and this section was rated with 133 points, with an increase of 12 points compared to previous results.

- *Access to information*

Experts again mentioned that the problem of access to information remains unsolved. They invoked the case of limited access of media to plenary parliamentary meetings; the case of journalists from www.gagauzinfo.md, who had been asked to leave the meeting room so that they could not film a fight between MPs during the meeting of the People's Assembly of Gagauzia on 3 of June.

Public bodies still happen to issue incomplete data at the media outlets' requests for information. For this reason the score for the section is 85, which is seven points less than the previous one.


- *Censorship and self-censorship*

Experts have been unanimous about the fact that during the past 3 months there were no cases of media censorship or confiscation of media products, so they rated the first two criteria with 30 points each, 2 more than the previous time.

As to self-censorship, they reiterated that the phenomenon exists and that in the election year it is growing, as well as the amount of names and topics that media owners make taboo for their outlets. For this reason, the last two criteria of this section obtained 9 and 24 points, accordingly (compared to 10 and 30 points, accordingly). Overall, this section obtained 93 points, which is 5 less than in the previous report.

- *Monopoly*

In Moldova, state monopoly over mass media began disappearing in the first years of independence. Since 2006, with the adoption of the Broadcasting Code, only radio stations and TV channels could be public or private, and after the law on denationalization of the press enters into force, the state will lose control over periodicals as well. However, the state had and keeps having enough levers to influence the media market, especially in broadcasting. The above situation explains the fact that changes in the political power always entailed a reconfiguration of media outlets, which eventually led to a dominant position of the media outlets influenced by the power. Therefore, despite legal prescriptions, the essence of the situation has not changed. The only difference was in the ways in which media outlets and information offers to the public were "subdued". In recent years, when the *de facto* peaceful connection of politics and big businesses took place, the state formally has not even needed to be a monopolist: it exercises this function



through the tycoons that are in power. For these reasons experts rated the first 2 criteria of this section with 25 and 22.5 points, accordingly. The previous time the score was 27.5 and 28.5 points, accordingly. So, since officially there is no state monopoly on media or on printing facilities, experts again rated the first 2 criteria of the section with high points – 25 and 22.5, accordingly, although this score is smaller than for the previous period (27.5 and 28.5 points, accordingly).

The remaining three criteria of this section obtained a score nearly similar to the previous period: 14.5 points for monopolization of the print media distribution market; 26.5 for access of the opposition to public media; and 8.5 points for the transparency of media ownership and owners.

Overall, the section obtained 97 points, which is 7 less than in the previous period.

- *Economic conditions*

Criteria in this section, like in previous reporting periods, obtained high scores, given that there had actually been no changes able to disrupt the normal work of media. Thus, the amount of points varied between 30 (in two cases) and 22 (one case) and it is similar to the earlier situation. Since the fines imposed on media outlets, according to the current legislation, are not a great danger for them, and since the checks conducted by specialized bodies do not lead to serious consequences for the further work of media, experts rated the first 2 criteria with 30 and 28 points, accordingly (to compare with the previous situation: 27 and 29 points, accordingly).

Authorities' control over the advertizing market has been assessed with 22 points, exactly like the previous time. It does not mean that there is no control over the market. It is simply not officially controlled by the state, but by private companies that are managed in a shaded manner by public officials or politicians.

There are no advertising market researches in the country. The exact value of the advertising market is unknown. The overall public budget for advertising and, especially, the distribution of that budget are also unknown. The imperfection of the law on advertising, adopted back in 1997, and delays in the approval of the law on funding for parties maintained the earlier chaos in this segment, and in an election year this situation is being used by advertising agencies and some political parties.

Currently, Moldova has no public programs aimed at supporting media, and for this reason we cannot judge to what extent the state budget could encourage anyone, even if there are other levers for such purposes, which are used without being declared or transparent, but with enough efficiency, especially for ideological and political purposes. However, since such cases of favoritism cannot be proven, experts rated this criterion with 29 points.

During the reported period, there were no cases of confiscation, forceful takeover or pressure exercised to give up media businesses, so the respective indicators were rated about the same as previously – between 30 and 28 points.

Overall, the section obtained 195 points, which is two less than in the previous report.

Generally, experts found a degradation of the situation in terms of media *Practice*. The chapter obtained 857 points, which is 56 less than in the previous reporting period (913 points). The situation is mostly explained by the fact that 2014 is an election year in Moldova, and so far media have not been sufficiently capable to resist in front of factors of influence, primarily political and economic, at such specific times. And because political struggle is going to intensify, we cannot expect the situation in mass media to improve before the end of the year.

Chapter 3: Broadcasting

There are two public broadcasters in the country: Teleradio-Moldova (TRM) at the national level and Teleradio-Gagauzia (TRG) at the regional level. During the reported period, two events occurred at TRM that should be mentioned: employment of an ombudsman for the institution on 1 of April, and launch of the first radio program on 29 of June together with Radio 1 (Tiraspol) as part of a project supported by the Council of Europe, which is a first for the country. We shall specify, however, that the ombudsman has not publicly manifested himself within 3 months, and the institution has been without a functional Supervisory Board (SB) since December 2013, while the responsibility for this situation rests with the specialized parliamentary committee.

The work of TRG, however, has been affected by the problems that persisted for years. The institution remained under strong political influence, and its leadership has been taken by Ana Harlamenco, former chairperson of the People's Assembly (local parliament); the work of the SB, whose members, just like in Chisinau, were chosen for political reasons, has been defective; TV Gagauzia has been without a director for a long time, which has been raising serious questions throughout the year that is to be marked, along with parliamentary elections, by elections of the bashkan (head) of the Gagauz autonomy. For all these reasons experts rated this criterion with 21 points, which is one less than in the previous report.

The only change in the broadcasting landscape during the reported period was the disappearance, since 1 of June, of the private channel MuzTV. The channel's administration did not offer details, but it is known that its owner Iulian Bercu has been for several months employed as director of the Publika TV channel. Experts did not consider this fact as a consequence of political pressures, and left the score for this indicator unchanged – 20 points.

During the reported period, the work of the national broadcasting regulator (Broadcasting Coordinating Council, BCC) was not used, in the experts' opinion, as a tool for political pressure or control over the content of programs. The period has also been marked by the fact that a moratorium was reached in the conflict between the BCC and the StarNet company, with the mediation of the specialized parliamentary committee, and that the BCC monitored the programs of Russian channels rebroadcast in the country, but the presentation of monitoring results has been delayed. Thus, this criterion obtained 21 points, like previously.

The absolute majority of experts had no doubt about equal access of political parties to airtime during election periods and political campaigns, and the indicator was rated with 29 points (30 points in the previous report).

After a long time, in May the Government finally adopted the program of transition to digital terrestrial television. Experts, however, were not optimistic about the Government's action, finding it unjustifiably delayed and non-transparent, given that the final text of the document had not been made public. In addition, during this period no measures were taken to acquaint the public with the benefits of digital television. It creates the impression that the authorities themselves do not know what domestic broadcasting will look like after June 2015. Thus, the criterion obtained 13 points, which is 7 less than in the previous evaluation.

The total score of the chapter of broadcasting is 104 points, being smaller than the previous score (113 points).

Chapter 4: Internet and New Media

This chapter obtained high scores every time, which, in fact, reflects the real situation in the country. This report is not an exception.

During the reported period, the results of a survey by the Center for Sociological Researches of Moldova were made public, confirming the truth that over the recent years the Internet has been maintaining the second position, after television, in the top of the most preferred sources of information for respondents. It is also definitely the reason why the online environment continues growing. Thus, the emergence of a new electronic newspaper, *Justice Journal*, was announced in June; the publication is to “address major problems of the justice sector from the point of view of the rule of law, independence of justice and the right to opinion of the academic community.” Also, during this period, with the support of the Soros Foundation-Moldova, preparation started for the launch of two platforms in support of the journalistic community: one for discussions on the opportunity of ethical journalism as a solution to professional problems in the field, and one for creation of a specialized library for journalists.

In fact, such appearances are a direct consequence of the lack of Internet regulation by public authorities. And so, it seems logical that experts assessed this indicator with 28 points, which is 3 more than the previous time.

In the past 3 months there were no objectionable cases involving bloggers or active Internet users. However, experts find that some bloggers abuse the freedom of the Internet and that the phenomenon will intensify as we approach elections. This indicator obtained 29 points, which is one less than in the previous evaluation.

There was and is no state or market monopoly over Internet services in the country. This fact made experts to give the maximum score of 30 points to this indicator.

Over the past 3 months there were no cases when online media were blocked or Internet access was suspended, so this criterion was rated with 29 points, just like the previous time.

Also, most experts found that prices for Internet access are accessible, especially considering the quality (speed) compared with neighbor countries and other countries of the world.

Thus, this indicator obtained 28 points, which is 3 more than previously, and the overall score for the chapter is 144 points, compared with 139 in the previous evaluation.

Media Freedom Index

According to the methodology, each indicator is assessed by experts on a scale of 0 to 30 points, with 30 indicating the highest level of press freedom. All scores are summed up for every chapter. The country's index for individual chapters is then calculated based on the ratings indicated in the following tables showing the scores for Moldova.

Chapter 1. Politics (8 indicators, 240 maximum points)

Rating (number of points)	Moldova's score	Index
0–49		1
50–79		2
80–109		3
110–139		4
140–169		5
170–199	179	6
200–240		7

Chapter 2. Practice (37 indicators, 1110 maximum points)

Rating (number of points)	Moldova's score	Index
0–179		1
180–329		2
330–479		3
480–629		4
630–779		5
780–929	857	6
930–1110		7

Chapter 3. Broadcasting (5 indicators, 150 maximum points)

Rating (number of points)	Moldova's score	Index
0–29		1
30–49		2
50–69		3
70–89		4
90–109	104	5
110–129		6
130–150		7

Chapter 4. Internet and New Media (5 indicators, 150 maximum points)

Rating (number of points)	Moldova's score	Index
0–29		1
30–49		2
50–69		3
70–89		4
90–109		5
110–129		6
130–150	144	7

Finally, the points for all four chapters are summed up to calculate the overall index.

Overall score (55 indicators, 1650 maximum points)

Rating (cumulative number of points for all 4 chapters)	Moldova's score	Index
0–250		1
260–470		2
480–690		3
700–910		4
920–1130		5
1140–1350	1284	6
1360–1650		7

4. Roadmap


Experts' recommendations for building an independent public service of radio and television.

At the legislative level:

1. To be approved the draft of the new Broadcasting Code providing sufficient legal framework to support the existence of a true public broadcaster, or:
2. To introduce amendments to the current broadcasting legislation, which would:
 - a) Ensure the independence of the public broadcaster by means of secure and sufficient funding, and not only declarative support. For the transition period it would be sufficient to have legal provisions that would either require that public broadcasters be funded by a certain fixed share of the country's GDP or stipulate the exact expenditure items covered from the state budget (salaries, broadcasting facilities, membership fees for European/international organizations, re-equipment, etc.);
 - b) Ensure medium-term funding (for 3-5 years), so as to provide real opportunities for development and implementation of major projects, either technical and/or creative, which a public broadcaster should have;
 - c) Stipulate concrete time limits for appointment of members of the public broadcaster's SB;
 - d) Require observance of the principle of periodical renewal of the SB and the BCC by one third of their members;
 - e) Exclude the current situation, when the public broadcaster is supervised by two bodies – SB and BCC;
 - f) Exclude appointment of members of the SB and the BCC according to political criteria;
 - g) Grant to the directors of radio and television real duties and powers in terms of financial and employment policy;
 - h) Provide for the existence of two separate entities – the public service of radio and the public service of television, with separate budgets and much smaller administrative staff;
 - i) Prohibit existence of cultural and artistic ensembles within public broadcasters (it is the competence of the Ministry of Culture).
3. To introduce amendments to the labor legislation so as to facilitate termination of labor contracts with the employees whose incompatibility with their positions is determined by the evaluation committee.
4. The specialized standing parliamentary committee to initiate an external (international) audit of the public broadcaster, and the results to be debated in a public meeting.

At the level of the regulatory authority (the BCC):

1. Members of the BCC to be fully aware of the importance of a viable public service of radio and television for democracy;
2. To support by all legal means the strengthening of the public service of radio and television;


- 
3. To abandon the outdated practice of granting frequencies in a competition by considering the influence of the political or economic factors rather than the quality of application files;
 4. To find more ways of interacting with the public broadcaster (e.g. joint meetings with the SB) and not only monitor its program services;
 5. To contribute to preparing broadcasters, including public broadcasters, for successful transition to digital terrestrial television;
 6. To use the resources of the broadcasters support fund for professional training and for the training of employees of public radio and television.

At the level of institution (public broadcaster):

1. Members of the SB to become aware of the essence of a public service of radio and television on the one hand and of their role in building that service on the other hand;
2. To organize a deep analysis of the implementation process of the Development Strategy objectives, with relevant conclusions and lessons learned;
3. To develop a new Development Strategy for the following 5 years, considering transition to digital terrestrial television and its consolidation in the local conditions;
4. To review, adjust and, if necessary, supplement the internal regulatory framework so that it corresponds to new realities;
5. To gradually give up the activities that are foreign to the nature of a public service of radio and television (including management of musical ensembles and commercial advertising);
6. To decisively capitalize on the capacities of IT, to develop multimedia platforms and facilitate public access to its own media products through all routes;
7. *Moldova 1* to rethink its technical strategies. To implement 2 strategies for development of the channel, namely:
 - eTV – which consists of computerization of all television activities: production, planning, records, archive, decision making, etc.;
 - iTV – which consists of intensive implementation of Internet technologies for promotion of the image or activities of *Moldova 1* and collection of public preferences through automated data mining mechanisms.

Over the short and medium term, eTV and iTV will allow reaching the following objectives:

- Total digitalization of production, broadcasting and archiving at *Moldova 1*;
 - Transition to HDTV (high-definition television) and the 16:9 format;
 - Computerization of planning, monitoring, control and decision making;
 - Automated identification of loyal and potential viewers' preferences;
 - Optimization of expenses related to procurement and management of technical equipment.
8. For large amounts of data storage and processing (digital archive, TV portal, etc.), to stop procuring hardware and involving qualified technical personnel in its management and use the resources and assistance of the Electronic Governance Center instead (through the M-Cloud platform);



9. Digitalization of television to be conducted in parallel with the portfolio sub-reform, which would provide a general view of the production tasks, necessary equipment and number of employees;

10. To create a new program schedule after a detailed study of the market and of competition. The audience measurement offered by TV MR MLD can serve as a field of qualitative and quantitative analysis;

11. In terms of internal organization, *Moldova 1* to be divided into departments. The functional part of the organizational structure, in addition to programming and technical departments, to obligatorily contain economic and marketing departments, whose basic function should be budget planning and management. The production part to be composed of the news, documentaries, entertainment and IT departments;

12. To develop a network of correspondents in the country and abroad;

13. To develop, over time, its own services of monitoring content and professional staff training;

14. To review the institution's organization chart, increase the efficiency of broadcasting and adjust the new salary system so as to motivate and encourage professional performance;

15. To cooperate with specialized national, regional, European and international organizations for the transfer of experience and good practices concerning public services of radio and television;

16. To revitalize the work of the Ethics Committee; to activate the work of the ombudsman service at TRM, so that it can truly influence the quality of media products;

17. To ensure sufficient visibility of its own work in society by means of greater openness to the public.

7. Conclusions

Between April and June 2014, experts found clear degradation in some segments of Moldovan media in comparison with the previous reporting period. Thus, while the Politics and Internet and New Media chapters showed insignificant progress (an increase of scores with 4 and 5 points, accordingly), then the Practice and Broadcasting chapters showed clear regress (of 56 and 9 points, accordingly). Overall, the difference in points between the current period (1,284) and the previous period (1,340) is 56 points – the largest since the media freedom index has been measured in the Eastern Partnership countries.

This discrepancy is explained by the high pressure of the political factor on media during political campaigns on the one hand and by the so far small ability of media to resist such pressure in a fragile democracy on the other hand.

In fact, the situation was predictable, since, according to experts, the current administration fulfilled its promises concerning media in a proportion of not more than 20 percent. Thus, such extremely important segments for independent and viable media as ownership and its transparency (especially in broadcasting), advertising, diversification of distribution services for print media and radio and television, independence and autonomy of the electronic media regulator, funding of the public service of radio and television, etc., are still only declared intentions. This fact will definitely keep leaving its objectionable prints on the work of media, at least until the parliamentary elections.