2. SALW SURVEY

2.1 Distribution Survey

The section summarises data and findings from the SALW survey conducted in Moldova. The survey focused on the distribution of firearms held by civilians and private entities. Key findings include:

- The majority of firearms are held by private citizens.
- Trade and illicit trafficking in firearms is considered a significant issue.
- Enforcement of gun control laws is seen as ineffective.

Moldovaems does not have a dedicated law enforcement agency responsible for collecting and disseminating information on the illegal trade of firearms.
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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In 2017, with support from the South Eastern and Eastern Europe Clearinghouse for the Control of Small Arms and Light Weapons (SEESAC), the Small Arms and Light Weapons (SALW) Commission in the Republic of Moldova coordinated the collection of data on the distribution and impact of SALW in Moldova. In parallel, SEESAC conducted an online public opinion survey on perceptions on the use, possession and dangers of firearms in Southeast Europe, including in Moldova.

The purpose of this general survey process was threefold: to identify trends in the distribution of SALW, particularly in relation to the type, quantity, possession, distribution, legal/illegal trade, production and movement of SALW; to identify trends in relation to the impact of SALW on citizens of Moldova, particularly with regards to firearm-related incidents and their characteristics; and to gauge public perception regarding firearms use, ownership, violence and community safety.

This report analyzes the survey data collected for the 2012 to 2016 period, and outlines recommendations for policy makers and practitioners aimed at improving the safety, effectiveness and efficiency of interventions that address the illicit SALW trade, uncontrolled proliferation and/or misuse. The following is a brief summary of the survey’s key findings.¹

• SMALL ARMS AND LIGHT WEAPONS/FIREARMS DISTRIBUTION IN THE REPUBLIC OF MOLDOVA

1 The publication of the report only in 2019 is due to a long process of data collection which involved coordination from a number of institutions, agencies and private entities as well as feedback on the survey findings and recommendations from the authorities involved.
The number of firearms held collectively by civilians and private entities in the Republic of Moldova between 2012 and 2016 increased by 13.7%, from 63,151 firearms in 2012 to 71,820 by 2016. Data on the firearm holdings of state agencies authorized to carry firearms was classified by law and therefore not available, while the number of firearms held by sales shops was also not available. Of the 71,820 firearms held by civilians and private entities in 2016, civilians held the overwhelming majority at 97.2% (or 69,826 firearms), while private entities collectively held only 2.8% (or 1,994 firearms).

The number of firearm license-holders increased by 9.7% from 51,386 in 2012 to 56,365 in 2016, 99% of whom were male. There was also a steady rise in the number of registered firearms from 61,464 in 2012 to 69,826 by 2016, an increase of 13.6%. In 2016, 94.4% of all firearm license-holders held licenses for category B firearms, 5.4% held licenses for category C firearms and only 0.2% were for category D firearms.

In 2016, 59.7% of all firearm license-holders were 36 to 60 years of age, while 32.8% were aged 18 to 35 and 7.5% were aged 61 or older. In 2016, the majority of firearm license-holders (60.6%) cited hunting as the reason for possession, while 27.5% cited self-protection.

Between 2012 and 2016, the number of firearm license applicants increased overall by 20.3% from 2,187 in 2012 to 2,632 by 2016. While the number of rejected firearm license applicants also increased during this period, the number of revoked licenses fell.

Between 2012 and 2016, there were 839 illegal firearm and ammunition possession cases reported, with 200 cases in 2012, which fell to 175 cases by 2016. The number of confiscated firearms remained low during this period, with only one firearm confiscated in 2013 and 2015 each, and no temporarily confiscated firearms.
Data on the firearm holdings of the Ministries of Defense and Interior as well as the police was unavailable. The total number of personnel employed by state agencies authorized to hold firearms (for which data was available) fell by 2.8% between 2012 and 2016, from 12,165 in 2012 to 11,825 in 2016, with reductions in both female (10.3%) and male (4.4%) personnel.

The total number of firearms held by private entities increased steadily from 1,687 in 2012 to 1,994 by 2016, an increase of 18.2%. Private security companies held 1,908 firearms or 95.7% of all firearms held by private entities in 2016. While the number of private security companies increased from 128 in 2012 to 135 by 2016, the number of personnel authorized to carry firearms fell from 1,887 in 2012 to 1,603 in 2016. In 2016, private shooting clubs held 38 firearms, shooting associations held 2 firearms, and ranges held 46 firearms. Visitors to private shooting clubs increased significantly, while visitors to shooting ranges remained minimal throughout the five-year period.

During the survey period, firearm possession, ownership and use in the Republic of Moldova was male-dominated. Men were overwhelmingly employed by state agencies and authorized to carry firearms in comparison to women. The majority of firearm owners, license-holders and license applicants were men, as were the majority of staff, visitors and members of private entities that handled firearms.

No firearms held by state agencies or private entities were reported lost or stolen between 2012 and 2016. A total of 57 civilian owned firearms were reported lost, while 93 civilian owned firearms were reported stolen.

A total of 891 firearms were legalized and 4,102 SALW were voluntarily surrendered between 2012 and 2016, for which no domestic or international tracing was undertaken.
Between 2012 and 2016, 4,436 SALW were destroyed and the Ministry of Defense carried out security upgrades to arms and ammunition storage areas to enhance security and strengthen stockpile management.

There were no arms brokers operating in the Republic of Moldova during this period. A total of 212 arms import authorizations and 4 arms export authorizations were granted between 2012 and 2016. Data was not available for the number of import and export authorizations that were realized. The number of ML1 category imports fell considerably during this period. While no ML2 category items were imported, approximately 32 million ML3 category items were imported during this period. The main destination source country within the European Union for arms imports was Austria, while the main destination countries for arms and ammunition exports were Belarus, Germany, Romania and Ukraine.

Only two firearm trafficking cases were reported between 2012 and 2016, with a total of two firearms trafficked during the five-year period. No firearms were reported seized or traced. Despite the very low number of detected firearms reported, the EU Border Assistance Mission to Moldova and Ukraine reported firearm and ammunition trafficking over the Republic of Moldova-Ukraine border.²

• IMPACT OF SMALL ARMS AND LIGHT WEAPONS

Firearm misuse in the Republic of Moldova remained consistently low between 2012 and 2016, increasing slightly over the five-year period. There was an average of 68 criminal offenses per year. Firearms were most frequently misused to commit criminal acts related to threat by dangerous implement in a brawl or quarrel, accounting for almost one third of all criminal offenses registered during the survey period. Furthermore, the number of cases of firearm-related threats more than doubled between 2014 and 2016.

Even if firearms were not the most prevalent means of committing homicides, they were the weapons of choice for almost one quarter (24.2%) of all homicides. The overall number of firearm-related homicides increased between 2014 and 2016. Men represented the vast majority of homicide victims, accounting for 84.6% of all victims. More than 1 in 4 murdered men and over 1 in 7 murdered women were killed with firearms.

Men also accounted for the absolute majority of perpetrators of firearm homicides. In all, 95.7% of the perpetrators were men, while women only exceptionally committed homicides with firearms. Men aged 36 to 60 were the most likely to commit firearm-related homicide, while men aged 19 to 35 were predominantly the victims.

While domestic violence threatened the safety of both women and men, this type of violence disproportionately affected women. Approximately every seventh woman and every twentieth man who were killed during the survey period were killed within the domestic context. Firearms, however, were rarely the weapons of choice when homicide was committed in the domestic context, with other means having significantly higher prevalence.

Victims of firearm-inflicted injuries, by sex and age

Assault rifles and light machine guns were the most widely used firearms in incidents with a fatal outcome, accounting for almost every third death. Firearm-related homicides most frequently took place in homes, apartments and yards, followed by forests, fields and uninhabited areas. Women were predominantly more at risk in their private spaces. The period March-June had the highest incidence of firearm-related murders, particularly for men.

Data regarding the type of firearm ownership in relation to criminal offenses and data on the number of suicide victims were not available, which hindered the possibility of understanding the extent to which legal and illegal firearms represented a risk to the safety of citizens and the prevalence of firearm misuse in committing suicides.
• **PUBLIC PERCEPTIONS REGARDING USE, POSSESSION AND DANGERS OF FIREARMS**

Based on the main findings of the online perception survey in the Republic of Moldova, approximately 68% of respondents reported they had never had an experience with a gun, while 25% had personally experienced the use of a gun to some degree. Men (34%) were significantly more likely than women (19%) to have experienced gun use, e.g. used a gun, had a gun directed at them, or both.

Respondents’ most frequent experience with a gun was in a hunting/sport setting (15%), followed by “armed conflict” (12%) and celebratory shooting, “assault” and “professional reasons” (each 7%).

Respondents most frequently identified the police/military (17%) and partners/ex-partners (16%) as those who had committed the most recent act of gun violence.

Of the respondents who had experienced gun use, 28% aged 16-24 and 65 and over said the most recent gun violence occurred within the last year, compared to an average of only 13% amongst the other age groups.

Seventy percent of respondents said they would not own a gun. Women were more likely than men to not own a gun (78% and 62% respectively). Of these respondents, 51% said they did not need one (no differences between women and men), and 24% of women and 20% of men said they would not own a gun because it was unsafe.

Slightly more respondents felt that the presence of a gun at home would make them feel less safe (52%) rather than safer (48%). While men were more likely to feel safer with a gun at home than without, the majority of women (54%) reported they would feel less safe in those circumstances.

Respondents living in suburbs and the capital city (36% and 33% respectively) were slightly more likely to say they would own a gun than those living in towns or villages (28% and 25% respectively).

Respondents (35%) with a higher monthly income (more than EUR 500 and EUR 200 to 500) were most likely to respond they would own a gun, compared to 27% of those with a monthly income of less than EUR 300 or those without an income, while respondents with only primary school education reported more often (38%) than others (from 26% to 31%) that they would own a gun.

The main driver of firearm possession was the desire to improve one’s safety, with 43% of the respondents who would own a gun stating they would do so for “protection/safety” reasons. If respondents had any previous gun experience, it immediately increased the likelihood that they would own a gun.

The readiness to acquire a gun also correlated with the period when the gun violence had happened. Hunting was another key driver of gun possession with 18% of respondents reporting hunting/sport as a reason to own a gun.

The dominant respondents who would not own a gun were women aged 25-44 (82%), while the dominant respondents who would own a gun were men aged 16-24 (44%).
Eighty-three percent of respondents in Moldova said they were aware of the penalties for illegal possession of guns. Those respondents who were the least aware of these penalties lived in the suburbs, had a lower level of education, and reported either a monthly household income of more than EUR 500 or no income.

Only 7% of respondents believed that “more people owning guns to protect themselves” would be most effective to making communities safer followed by: “more police or authorities’ presence”, “weapons risk education” and “stricter gun control regulations”. All age groups blamed the following for promoting gun use: social media, videos and news on gun related incidents.

Respondents who would own a gun by sex and age
1. INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this Small Arms and Light Weapons (SALW) survey report is to provide a comprehensive and up-to-date understanding of the arms control challenges in the Republic of Moldova and propose recommendations for improving the safety of citizens and the effectiveness and efficiency of interventions that address illicit SALW trade, uncontrolled proliferation and/or misuse. This report summarizes the main findings and recommendations resulting from the SALW distribution and impact surveys carried out in Moldova for the period 2012-2016 as well as a perception survey conducted by SEESAC in 2017. This report is aimed at policy makers and practitioners and is intended to inform the design and formulation of Moldova’s SALW control strategies, policies, legislation and activities.

Between 2004 and 2011, a series of national SALW surveys were carried out by different organizations\(^3\) in the Western Balkan region using a mix of methods to obtain data on small arms distribution and impact as well as public perception with regards to SALW. The methods that were used varied according to the organizations involved and were often not based on a standardized data collection approach that allowed for comparison of findings across the region. The timing of these surveys also preceded, in most cases, the establishment of the different SALW commissions in the region. Since these studies were conducted, no further national small arms surveys had been undertaken.\(^4\) In order to close this gap and facilitate the development of evidence-based SALW control policies and decision-making in the region, SEESAC has worked in collaboration with seven SALW Commissions to carry out a series of SALW distribution, impact and perception surveys, using a standardized methodology.

This SALW survey report promotes SALW policies based on more accurate and updated data, disaggregated by sex and age. It also contributes to improving the standardization, systematization and coherency of firearm data collection practices and, ultimately, the development of evidence-based policies that effectively tackle SALW misuse, proliferation and trafficking.

---

3 This includes Saferworld, SEESAC, Small Arms Survey and UNDP, among others.
4 SEESAC has continued to produce thematic national and regional research reports on different SALW-related issues.
1.1 Methodology

In 2017, SEESAC established a Regional Working Group, comprised of representatives from seven SALW commissions in the region. The Regional Working Group was tasked with developing and agreeing on a methodology for a regional SALW survey. At a regional meeting held in Sabac, Serbia in September 2017, the Working Group discussed, reviewed and adopted the methodology for conducting the SALW distribution and impact surveys. Data on the distribution and impact of SALW in the Republic of Moldova was collected and analyzed using the standardized SALW distribution and impact questionnaires agreed upon at the regional meeting (see Annex A and B). The questionnaires included standardized questions to facilitate the collection of accurate and up-to-date data on the distribution and impact of SALW and improve the coherency, standardization and comparison of data across the region. The data collection process was coordinated by Moldova’s Ministry of Foreign Affairs in the absence of the national SALW commission and with technical support from SEESAC.

In addition to an analysis of the quantitative survey data, relevant literature was reviewed and analyzed. This included previous survey reports on relevant topics (e.g. civilian firearm possession, SALW trafficking, gender and SALW, etc.). A review of Moldova’s legislation on weapons and export controls was undertaken to assess the provisions regulating firearm possession as well as trade. Relevant regional and international agreements, standards and conventions were also consulted.

SEESAC commissioned RIWI Corp., a global trend-tracking and prediction technology firm, to carry out a series of SALW perception surveys across the region, including Moldova. RIWI used its patented Random Domain Intercept Technology™ (RDIT) to collect data on public perceptions regarding the use, possession, and dangers of firearms in Southeast Europe using an online survey. RIWI and SEESAC collaboratively drafted the perception survey instrument (see Annex C).

1.2 Small Arms and Light Weapons Context

In 2006, SEESAC published a survey undertaken in the Republic of Moldova on the small arms and light weapons situation in the country. The survey estimated that at the time there were approximately 289,000 SALW in the country, which included 53,000 unregistered/illicit firearms.

As part of efforts to address concerns in relation to SALW, in 2012 the government passed Law 130 on the regime of firearms and ammunition for civilian use (herein referred to as Law 130/12), which regulates civilian firearm possession and ownership and which took effect in 2013. Law 130 replaced Law 110, dated May 1994, which was the Republic of Moldova’s first law regulating SALW possession by civilians and companies. Law 1163 on the control of export, re-export, import

and the transit of strategic goods was passed in July 2000 and includes regulations and procedures for SALW export, re-export, import and transit of SALW.\(^7\) Law 451 dated July 2001 covers business activities that require licensing, and includes the licensing for the import, export, sale, repair and collection of SALW, as well as the use of SALW for hunting and sports. Research conducted by Saferworld in 2008 on the country’s implementation of the United Nations Programme of Action on SALW noted that at the time, the country had no known SALW production, very few SALW imports and exports and a well-developed legal framework for controlling SALW exports, imports and transit.\(^8\)

The Republic of Moldova’s arms export legislation was passed prior to the introduction of the EU Council Common Position (2008/944/CFSP), which defines common rules governing the control of exports of military technology and equipment. Article 10 of the EU-Moldova Association Agreement stipulates that “…the parties agree to continue to cooperate in the area of conventional arms export controls, in light of the Council Common Position…”\(^9\) In March 2018, the government announced the formation of a new SALW Commission, with the State Secretary from the Ministry of Internal Affairs as the President. The Ministry of Internal Affairs is the lead government ministry responsible for SALW control.\(^10\) The National Commission also involves representatives from the Ministries of Justice, Finance, and Economics and Infrastructure, the General Police Inspectorate, the Information and Security Service and the Customs Service.

---

2. SMALL ARMS AND LIGHT WEAPONS SURVEY: KEY FINDINGS AND TRENDS

Section 2 of this report presents the findings from the SALW distribution and impact surveys carried out in the Republic of Moldova for the period 2012 to 2016 and a perception survey conducted by SEESAC in 2017.

2.1 Distribution Survey

This section summarizes the main findings from the SALW distribution survey covering the years 2012-2016. The number of firearms held by civilians and private entities is analyzed, in addition to the SALW collection and destruction activities undertaken by the government of Moldova. Findings regarding Moldova’s SALW production, trade and illicit trafficking are also presented. Data on the firearm holdings of state agencies authorized to carry firearms was classified by law and therefore not available, while the number of firearms held by sales shops was not available.

Table 1: Total firearm holdings by state agencies,11 civilians and private entities, 2012–2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Firearms held by state agencies</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firearms held by civilians</td>
<td>61,464</td>
<td>64,033</td>
<td>66,190</td>
<td>68,149</td>
<td>69,826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firearms held by private entities</td>
<td>1,687</td>
<td>1,677</td>
<td>1,700</td>
<td>1,887</td>
<td>1,994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual totals</td>
<td>63,151</td>
<td>65,710</td>
<td>67,890</td>
<td>70,036</td>
<td>71,820</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: As the annual totals do not include the firearm holdings of state agencies, due to confidentiality reasons, and sales shops as not available, these totals are underestimates.

Between 2012 and 2016, the combined firearm holdings of civilians and private entities, for which data was available, increased from 63,151 firearms in 2012 to 71,820 by 2016. In 2016, of the 71,820 firearms held by civilians and private entities, civilians held the overwhelming majority at 97.2% or 69,826 firearms, while private entities collectively held only 2.8% (1,994 firearms).

11 Data on the firearm holdings of state agencies was classified by law and therefore unavailable.
During the survey period, firearm possession and use in the Republic of Moldova was male-dominated. Men were overwhelmingly employed by state agencies and authorized to carry firearms in comparison to women. The majority of firearm owners, license-holders, license applicants and staff, visitors and members of private entities handling firearms were men.

According to Law 130/2012, the loss and theft of firearms must be reported within 24 hours. No firearms held by state agencies or private entities were reported lost or stolen between 2012 and 2016. A total of 57 civilian owned firearms were reported lost, 13 of which were reported lost in 2016, while 93 civilian firearms were reported stolen.
2.1.1 State possession of Small Arms and Light Weapons

As mentioned earlier, data on the firearm holdings of the Ministries of Defense and Interior as well as the police was unavailable. This section is therefore restricted to an analysis of data on the personnel employed by the state agencies authorized to hold firearms.

### Table 2: Number of personnel employed by state agencies authorized to hold firearms, 2012-2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATE AGENCY</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Defense</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>770</td>
<td>7,368</td>
<td>1,007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Internal Affairs</td>
<td>1,244</td>
<td>9,013</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>690</td>
<td>361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest Guards</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>563</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>564</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customs</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Justice</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrections</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>1,119</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>1,091</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total by sex</td>
<td>1,336</td>
<td>10,829</td>
<td>1,210</td>
<td>9,856</td>
<td>1,453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12,165</td>
<td>11,066</td>
<td>12,578</td>
<td>12,418</td>
<td>11,825</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The total number of personnel employed by state agencies authorized to hold firearms (for which data was available) fell from 12,165 in 2012 to 11,825 in 2016, with reductions in both female (10.3%) and male (4.4%) personnel. The data indicates that of the state agencies for which data was provided, the majority of the personnel employed were male. For example, in 2016, men comprised 100% of customs personnel, 99.5% of forest guards, 87.8% of the police and 72.7% of Ministry of Internal Affairs personnel.

The overwhelming majority of personnel authorized to carry firearms were also men. While all female police officers were authorized to carry firearms, only 48.8% of female Ministry of Internal Affairs staff, 16.6% of female correctional services staff, and 0.5% of female forest guards were authorized to carry firearms. No female customs staff were authorized to carry firearms.
2.1.2 Legal Civilian Possession of Firearms

Law 130/12 regulates civilian possession including the conditions for purchase, transfer, disposal, carrying and use. According to Law 130/12, civilians can own firearms for self-protection, target shooting, hunting and arms collection, and are permitted to store these weapons at home.

Table 3: Civilian firearm license-holders by sex and license category, 2012-2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>49,021</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>49,970</td>
<td>365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>1,906</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>2,209</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>50,960</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>52,220</td>
<td>528</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Data for the Ministry of Defense was classified by law. As the Ministry of Justice personnel do not carry firearms, data was not provided.
The number of firearm license-holders increased from 51,386 in 2012 to 56,365 in 2016, 99% of which were male. Over the five-year period, an average of 95.5% of all firearm license-holders held licenses for category B firearms, 4.9% held licenses for category C firearms and only 0.4% were for category D firearms.

Of the few female license-holders in 2016 (642 in total), 68.3% held category B licenses and 30.5% held category C licenses, while 94.7% of men had category B licenses and 4.8% held licenses for category C firearms.

In 2016, 59.7% of all firearm license-holders were aged 36 to 60, while 32.8% were aged 18 to 35 and 7.5% were aged 61 or older.
In 2012, 47.9% of firearm license-holders cited hunting as the reason for possession, 26.9% cited ‘other’, 22.1% cited self-protection and only 2.9% cited sport. No data was available regarding the number that cited ‘for collection purposes’ in 2012.

In 2016, a larger proportion of firearm license-holders cited hunting (60.6%) and self-protection (27.5%). The number of firearm collectors increased from 9 in 2013 to 72 by 2016, 95.8% of which were male that year.

In 2012, 50.4% of women cited ‘other’ as a reason for possession, while 38.7% cited self-protection, which shifted slightly by 2016. In 2016, 61.2% of male firearm license-holders cited hunting as a reason for possession, while 27.5% cited self-protection.

The number of female firearm license-holders, while very much in the minority, increased by 50.7% during this period from 426 in 2012 to 642 by 2016. In comparison, the number of male license-
holders increased more slowly at 9.3%; however, in real terms, they increased from 50,960 in 2012 to 55,723 by 2016.

There was a steady rise in the number of registered firearms from 61,464 in 2012 to 69,826 in 2016, an increase of 13.6%. Of the total number of registered firearms in 2012, 94.5% were category B firearms and 5.3% were category C. By 2016, the distribution remained largely the same.

In 2016, 87.4% of firearm owners owned only one firearm, while 11% owned between two and five firearms and 1.6% owned six or more. Approximately 93.8% of female firearm owners had only one (1) firearm compared to 87.3% of male firearm owners.
In 2016, 60.6% of firearms were held for hunting purposes, 24.8% for self-protection and 6.8% for ‘other’ reasons. A total of 1,814 firearms were held for collection purposes in 2016. There was a 27.9% increase in the number of firearms held for self-protection, from 13,509 in 2012 to 17,286 in 2016. The number of firearms held for hunting also increased from 38,523 in 2012 to 42,329 by 2016, while the number that held firearms for sport increased by 26.6% from 2,886 to 3,654 in 2016.

The number of inherited firearms fluctuated but increased overall during the five-year period, from 16 in 2012 to 33 by 2016. In 2015, a total of 86 inherited firearms were held for collection purposes.

Between 2012 and 2016, the number of applicants for new firearm licenses, permits and authorizations fluctuated, but increased overall by 20.3% from 2,187 in 2012 to 2,632 by 2016. In 2016, 56.1% of firearm license applicants were aged 36 to 60, with 27.9% aged 18 to 35 and 16% aged 61 and older.

Throughout this five-year period, very few applicants were female. Of the female license applicants, 62.7% were aged 18 to 35 in 2016, while 31.4% were aged 36 to 60 and 5.9% were 61 and older.

Of the total applicants, 1.8% (39 out of 2,187) were rejected in 2012, while 4.1% (108 out of 2,632) were rejected in 2016. A total of 754 applications were rejected during this five-year period, of which 38 were rejected on the grounds of domestic violence.

Despite the widespread incidence of domestic violence in the Republic of Moldova, Law 130/2012 makes no explicit reference to domestic violence when it comes to the criteria for firearm possession and license applications. In 2016, Article 18 of Law 130/2012 was amended in order to prohibit firearm ownership and possession in cases where the individual “is the person to which restriction measures for protection of a domestic violence victim have been applied”. The amendments were part of broader efforts to harmonize the national legal framework on preventing and combating domestic violence with the Council of Europe Convention on Preventing and Combating Violence against Women and Domestic Violence.

---

The number of revoked firearm licenses fell by 51.9% over the five-year period, with a gradual reduction from 845 in 2012 to 297 in 2015, and then a slight increase to 415 in 2016. Of the revoked licenses, 95.9% belonged to men between 2012 and 2016, with only a minority of revoked licenses belonging to women.

The number of licenses revoked due to criminal records fell by 1.9% over the five-year period, while the number revoked for misdemeanors increased by 27.1%. In 2016, 67.7% of licenses were revoked for ‘other’ reasons. Those revoked on the grounds of domestic violence remained modest in number, increasing from 2 licenses in 2012 to 9 by 2016.

Box 1: Violence against women in the Republic of Moldova: A snapshot

- A 2011 study found that 63.4% of women aged 15 years and older had experienced physical, psychological or sexual violence from their intimate partners during their lifetime.  
  A 2016 survey found that seven out of ten women experienced some form of violence from their partners.
- The Republic of Moldova has a relatively high femicide rate, one that is four times the European rate; the use of firearms to perpetrate femicide in the country is low.
- The Republic of Moldova’s Criminal Code sanctions all levels of domestic violence. For example, Law 45 on Preventing and Combating Family Violence includes 10 types of protection measures to be carried out within 24 hours of a domestic violence court order.

13 Advocates for Human Rights and Women’s Law Centre. Moldova: Submission to the Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination Against Women for the Adoption of the List of Issues during the 54th Session, October 2013.
14 “Putting laws into action, police officers respond to violence against women in Moldova”, UN Women, 15 November 2017.
ruling. One of the 10 measures includes prohibiting the aggressor from keeping or handling firearms.\textsuperscript{16}

However, enforcement by prosecutors and the police is weak, and victim blaming, minimizing violence and accusing victims of lying to manipulate the system is common. The police also typically lack knowledge about legal provisions and mechanisms in relation to domestic violence.\textsuperscript{17} Despite the legislative framework in place to protect victims of domestic violence, enforcement and oversight of protection orders remains weak.\textsuperscript{18}

2.1.3 Estimated Illegal Civilian Possession of Firearms

Between 2012 and 2016, there was a total of 839 illegal firearm and ammunition possession cases reported, with 200 cases in 2012 which fell 12.5\% to 175 cases by 2016. The number of confiscated firearms was very low, with only one firearm confiscated in 2013 and 2015 each. There were no temporarily confiscated firearms during this period. The authorities did not have data for the estimated number of illicit firearms in civilian possession.

2.1.4 Firearms Holdings by Private Entities

The total number of firearms held by private entities for which data was made available increased steadily from 1,687 in 2012 to 1,994 by 2016, an increase of 18.2\%. Private security companies held the overwhelming majority of these firearms at 95.7\% in 2016.

Table 5: Total number of firearms held by private entities, 2012-2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Private Security Companies</td>
<td>1,634</td>
<td>1,619</td>
<td>1,640</td>
<td>1,807</td>
<td>1,908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Shooting Clubs</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shooting Associations</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranges</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales Shops\textsuperscript{19}</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,687</td>
<td>1,667</td>
<td>1,700</td>
<td>1,887</td>
<td>1,994</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{16} Advocates for Human Rights and Women’s Law Centre, 2013; Božanić, 2016.

\textsuperscript{17} “Putting laws into action, police officers respond to violence against women in Moldova”, UN Women, 15 November 2017.

\textsuperscript{18} Centrul de Drept al Femeilor. Framework for increased access to justice for women victims of violence in Moldova: Women’s Law Center Experience, October 2016.

\textsuperscript{19} Centrul de Drept al Femeilor. Framework for increased access to justice for women victims of violence in Moldova: Women’s Law Center Experience, October 2016.
Private Security Companies

The number of private security companies increased from 128 in 2012 to 135 by 2016. While the number of private security companies increased, the number of personnel authorized to carry firearms fell by 15.1%, from 1,887 in 2012 to 1,603 in 2016. The number of firearms they held fluctuated but increased overall from 1,634 in 2012 to 1,908 in 2016, an increase of 16.7%.

Private Shooting Clubs

The Republic of Moldova had one private shooting club in operation in 2012, but this increased to five by 2016. There were 36 members in 2014 which increased to 198 by 2016 (five of which were female).

In 2014, there were a total of 940 visitors to private shooting clubs, which increased to 2,320 in 2016, an increase of 146.8%. While the number of women who visited private shooting clubs increased by 52.3%, the number of male visitors increased by a significant 156.6% over a three-year period.

By 2016, 55.6% of visitors were aged 36 to 60, 24.1% were aged 18 to 35, and 20.3% were 61 and older. Among female visitors, while 61.9% were aged 36 to 60 in 2016, 33.6% were aged 18 to 35, and for male visitors, 55.2% were 36 to 60, while 23.5% were aged 18 to 35.
Shooting Associations

Between 2012 and 2016, there was one shooting association in operation, which held two firearms throughout this period, and employed 44 personnel who were authorized to carry firearms. Almost all staff were male. There were 13,529 shooting association members (99.8% of which were male in 2016). The low number of firearms held by shooting associations likely reflected the fact that members used their own firearms.

Table 6: Total combined members and visitors to private shooting clubs, shooting associations and ranges, 2012-2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Private shooting club members and visitors</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>976</td>
<td>2,025</td>
<td>2,518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shooting associations members</td>
<td>13,849</td>
<td>14,277</td>
<td>14,637</td>
<td>14,424</td>
<td>13,529</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranges members and visitors</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ranges

A total of 5 shooting ranges were in operation in 2012 and this fell to 4 by 2016. They collectively held 51 firearms in 2012, which fell to 46 by 2016. In 2012, 9 personnel were employed, but this fell to 7 for the remaining years, one of which was a woman. In 2012, there were 9 visitors to shooting ranges but the number of visitors also fell to 7 by 2016. The majority of shooting range visitors were men throughout this period.
Sales Shops

The number of firearm sales shops almost doubled, from 7 in 2012 to 13 in 2016. Data was unavailable regarding the number of firearms and units of ammunition held by firearm sales shops during the survey period. A total of 12,355 firearms were reported as sold to civilians. In 2012, 88.6% of the firearms sold to civilians were category B, with 2.7% category C and 8.7% category D. There was a slight shift in 2016, with fewer category B weapons sold (63.2% of the total) and an increase in the proportion of category C and D firearms (10.4% and 26.4% respectively).

A total of 1,433 firearms and 200,545 units of ammunition were reported as sold to legal entities during this five-year period. Between 2012 and 2013, all firearms sold were category B, while in 2014, 99.7% of those sold were category D. In 2016, 82% of the firearms sold to legal entities were category B, 10.9% were category C and 7.1% were category D.

The annual turnover of sales shops was 17,137 Moldovan Leu (MDL) in 2012 but peaked at MDL 46,656 in 2013 and then fell gradually to MDL 13,370 in 2016. The annual turnover fell despite a similar number of firearms sold in 2012 and 2016, which may reflect a fall in the value of firearms and/or a reduced demand for firearms over time.

2.1.5 Collection and Destruction

A total of 891 firearms were legalized between 2012 and 2016. The number of weapons legalized annually fell over the five-year period, from 228 legalized weapons in 2012 to 126 by 2016. No tracing was undertaken for any of the legalized firearms throughout the five-year period.

During the survey period, 3,977 small arms were voluntarily surrendered in total. The number of small arms handed over voluntarily each year increased overall from 562 small arms handed over in 2012 to 1,257 in 2016.

In total, 125 light weapons were handed in, with 19 surrendered in 2012 and 41 in 2016. No tracing was undertaken for any of the surrendered weapons. From November to December 2016, the government of Moldova organized a voluntary surrender campaign with UNDP SEESAC support, entitled “Help Moldova to Become a Safer Country”, in order to encourage civilians to surrender their illegally held arms and ammunition, and inform them about the risks associated with SALW.20 The campaign was launched along with changes to the law on possession and storage of firearms, which introduced heavier punitive measures for those holding smooth bore firearms without licenses, as well as illicit pneumatic weapons.21

Large stocks of Soviet-era obsolete arms and ammunition reportedly remain in the country. The size of the stockpiles is unknown as the authorities did not report the number of SALW in active use, in reserve and which are surplus. During the fourth quarter of 2015, the Ministry of Internal

21 “Police is asking people to voluntarily surrender illegal weapons”, publika.md, 2 November 2016.
Affairs and the General Police Directorate of the Republic of Moldova destroyed 1,436 SALW.\textsuperscript{22} In addition, SEESAC reported that the Moldovan police destroyed 3,000 weapons in 2013, which had been voluntarily surrendered, confiscated, damaged, deemed unusable or which had undergone unauthorized alterations.\textsuperscript{23} In addition to the destruction of surplus arms and ammunition, the Ministry of Defense carried out security upgrades in arms and ammunition storage areas to enhance the security of surplus SALW and ammunition stocks and contribute to more efficient management of stockpiles.\textsuperscript{24}

\subsection*{2.1.6 Production and Legal Trade}

No legal production of firearms took place between 2012-2016, and there was no evidence of illegal production.

**Brokering**

No arms brokers operated in the Republic of Moldova during the survey period and no brokering licenses were issued.

**Imports**

In 2012, the authorities granted 51 arms import authorizations, which fell to 37 by 2016. A total of 212 arms import authorizations were granted between 2012 and 2016. Data was not available for the number of realized import authorizations or the value of arms imports on the civilian market.

**Table 7: Arms and ammunition imports by quantity and type, 2012-2016**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ML1</td>
<td>8,193</td>
<td>4,104</td>
<td>5,163</td>
<td>3,197</td>
<td>2,518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ML2</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ML3</td>
<td>4,432,500</td>
<td>3,940,700</td>
<td>11,827,168</td>
<td>3,501,876</td>
<td>8,312,080</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The number of ML1 category items imported fluctuated between 2012 and 2016, with a high of 8,193 items imported in 2012 and a low of 2,518 items in 2016. A total of 23,175 ML1 items were imported during the five-year period.

While no ML2 category weapons were imported, ML3 imports fluctuated and increased overall, from approximately 4.4 million items imported in 2012 to 8.3 million items by 2016. Approximately 32 million ML3 items were imported over the five-year period.

\textsuperscript{22} SEESAC. Support of SEESAC Arms Control Activities in Southeast Europe: Final Report, 2014-2016, internal (unpublished).

\textsuperscript{23} OSCE. “3,000 confiscated weapons destroyed in Chisinau”, Press Release, 20 November 2013.

Table 8: Arms and ammunition imports by type, number of licenses and EU-specific source countries, 2012-2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ML1</td>
<td>3 licenses:</td>
<td>3 licenses:</td>
<td>3 licenses:</td>
<td>8 licenses:</td>
<td>4 licenses:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>Austria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ML2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ML3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4 licenses:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Austria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All EU-specific ML1 imports came from Austria, through a total of 21 arms import licenses issued over the five-year period, while four import licenses were realized for the import of ML3 category items, also from Austria.

**Exports**

The Republic of Moldova passed arms export control legislation in 2000 and 2002 to control transfers of military and dual goods.\(^{26}\) The extent to which the legislation is fully compliant with the 2008 EU Council Common Position warrants further examination.\(^{27}\) No arms export authorizations were granted between 2012 and 2014; however, two were granted in 2015 and in 2016. No data was available on the number of realized export authorizations, the value of exports, exporting companies or the number of temporary imports and exports. However, the main destination countries for firearms exports were Belarus and Ukraine in 2015 and Germany and Romania in 2016. No data was available for the quantity and type of arms and ammunition exported, transited and transshipped.

### 2.1.7 Illicit Small Arms and Light Weapons Transfers

A total of two firearm trafficking cases were reported between 2012 and 2016, one of which took place in 2012 and the other in 2016. Two firearms were reported trafficked during this period, one of which was a rifle and the other a pistol. No units of ammunition were reported trafficked. There were two indictments for firearm trafficking, one in 2012 and the other in 2015, both of which were men. No firearms were seized or traced during this period.

\(^{25}\) Data is based on European Union annual reports (for years 2012 to 2016) according to Article 8(2) of the Council Common Position 2008/944/CFSP defining common rules governing the control of exports of military technology and equipment.

\(^{26}\) Isbister (2008), p.2.

\(^{27}\) One of the medium-term priorities identified in the EU-Moldova Association Agenda agreed upon in 2017 was to “continue to cooperate in the area of conventional arms export control, in light of the European Union’s Common Position on the control of exports of military technology and equipment.” Source: European Commission. High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy. Annex to the Joint Proposal for a Council Decision on the Union position within the Association Council established by the Association Agreement between the European Union, the European Atomic Energy Community and its Member States, of the one part and the Republic of Moldova, of the other part with regard to the adoption of the EU-Republic of Moldova Association Agenda. Brussels, 8 March 2017. JOIN (2017) 8 final.
The low number of trafficked firearms raises questions regarding both the capacity of law enforcement officers, including border authorities, to effectively detect and intercept trafficked firearms.

Much of the green border between the Republic of Moldova and Ukraine remains difficult to fully monitor and control. In 2005, the EU Border Assistance Mission to Moldova and Ukraine (EUBAM) was established to harmonize border control, customs and trade standards and procedures and improve cross border cooperation. Firearm trafficking was initially not a EUBAM priority, as it was not believed to be a significant problem.28 For example, according to EUBAM, between 2014 and 2015 there were no significant cases reported of trafficking in firearms, ammunition or explosives between the Republic of Moldova and Ukraine and weapons seizures remained low.29 However, reports emerged in 2014 that organized criminal groups in the Republic of Moldova were selling Soviet-era weapons and ammunition to pro-Russia separatists in Ukraine.30 Journalists carried out an investigation in 2015 and were able to easily purchase ammunition from Transnistria.31

### Table 9: Summary of firearm and ammunition trafficking, 2012-2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TRAFFICKING</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of cases of firearm trafficking recorded</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of firearms trafficked</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of firearm ammunition trafficked</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of border crossing points where firearm trafficking was reported</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of firearms trafficked on border crossing points</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EUBAM has since noted that arms and ammunition trafficking is a rising problem on the Moldova-Ukraine border in light of the conflict in Ukraine. In April 2017, a joint operation carried out by EUBAM with the authorities on both sides of the border led to the seizure by Ukrainian officials of 578 firearms, 776 units of ammunition, five pieces of explosives and one package of radioactive material.32 EUBAM has therefore been working with the authorities to improve the detection and interdiction of firearms and ammunition. The EU-Moldova Association Agenda also emphasizes key priorities in relation to cross-border trafficking which include:

- Developing ways of working to address illicit arms trafficking and the destruction of stockpiles;
- Developing ways of working together and exchanging information on detection and tracing of illegal weapons; and

---

30 “Moldovan mafia selling Russian weapons”, Euronews, 4 July 2014.
31 “Transnistria’s explosive inheritance from the Soviet era”. DW, 1 December 2015.
2.2 Impact Survey

The following is a summary of the main findings resulting from an analysis of the data collected through the questionnaire on SALW impact in Moldova. This section includes an analysis of the use of SALW to carry out criminal offenses, homicides, injuries, accidental deaths and domestic violence. Data on the perpetrators of these crimes is provided, as well as the characteristics of the incidents.

2.2.1 Firearm-related Criminal Offenses

Between 2012 and 2016, 340 criminal offenses inflicted with firearms were registered in the Republic of Moldova. While the recorded number of criminal offenses was relatively low, the number increased slightly over the five-year period, apart from 2014 when the number of firearm-related criminal offenses fell to a low of 50.

Figure 12: Number of criminal offenses inflicted with firearms, by year

---

34 Firearm-related criminal offenses refer to offenses in which a firearm was used to commit an offense (for example murder, injury, domestic violence) or was a subject of an offense (such as unlawful manufacture, possession or sale of firearms).
The most frequent criminal offense35 inflicted with firearms was threat by dangerous implement in a brawl or quarrel, which accounted for slightly less than one third (31.2%) of all criminal offences. This criminal offense included cases of aggravated hooliganism, which according to the Criminal Code of the Republic of Moldova, is punishable by 3 to 7 years in prison if a firearm was used or was attempted during the act. Light bodily injury came second at 24.4% of cases. These two criminal offenses accounted for more than one half of the total number of criminal offenses each year. Robbery and murder were the following most frequently encountered criminal offenses in the Republic of Moldova, accounting for every tenth offense each. The firearm-related offenses related to unlawful manufacture, possession, carrying, and sale of firearms and explosives, seriously bodily harm, aggravated murder, and attempted murder accounted for 5% to 6.2% each.

The cases of threat by dangerous implement in a brawl or quarrel and light bodily injury significantly outnumbered the next most frequent cases of criminal offenses in each year of the survey period. Of concern is the fact that the number of cases of firearm-related threats, which included aggravated hooliganism, more than doubled between 2014 and 2016 from 13 to 31. Similarly, the number of light bodily injuries more than doubled between 2015 and 2016, from 10 to 23 cases.

35 The typology of criminal offenses used in this survey refers to criminal offenses that are common to most of the criminal codes in South East Europe. However, respondents were given opportunity to add or change the list according to their criminal code.
### Table 10: Criminal offenses committed with firearms, 2012-2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRIMINAL OFFENSES</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Murder</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attempted Murder</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggravated Murder</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serious Bodily Harm</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light Bodily Injury</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threat by Dangerous Implement in Brawl or Quarrel, including hooliganism</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic Violence</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burglary</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggravated Theft</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illegal Trade</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trafficking</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Causing of General Danger</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plotting of Offenses against the Constitutional Order and Security</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preventing an Official in Discharge of Duty</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attack on an Official in Performance of Duty</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making and Obtaining Weapons and Tools intended for Committing an Offense</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unlawful Manufacture, Possession, Carrying, and Sale of Firearms and Explosives</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Criminal Offenses</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>340</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Republic of Moldova’s Ministry of Interior did not record the type of firearm ownership (legal/illegal) used in criminal offenses during the survey period. As a result, data disaggregated by type of firearm ownership was not available.

2.2.2 Misdemeanors Inflicted with Firearms

The legislation of the Republic of Moldova does not recognize the category of misdemeanor committed with firearms.

2.2.3 Homicides

Firearm homicides represented 24.2% of the total number of homicides\(^{36}\) (247 out of 1,022) committed in the Republic of Moldova during the survey period.

---

\(^{36}\) The total number of homicides includes all cases of intentional murders, with or without premeditation, committed with firearms, sharp forces and all other means. It does not include accidental deaths.
The lowest number of firearm-related homicides was recorded in 2012 and then fluctuated the following three years and peaked at 69 homicides in 2016.

Throughout the survey period, men represented the vast majority of victims of firearm-related homicides, accounting for 84.6% of all victims. This translated into 209 reported cases of firearm-related homicides in which the victim was a man, compared to 38 cases of a woman being murdered.
The lowest number of victims among both women and men was recorded in 2012. The number of female victims followed a constant trajectory between 2013 and 2015, i.e., below 10 female victims per year, with a steep increase in 2016, to 14 female victims.

Overall, firearms caused proportionately more deaths among men than among women. More than 1 in 4 murdered men and over 1 in 7 murdered women were killed with firearms.
Over half of the firearm-related victims were aged 19-35 among both female and male victims, followed by women and men aged 36-60.

Of the total number of firearm-related homicides, men aged 19-35 accounted for slightly less than every second victim (45.7%), indicating the substantial risks these men were exposed to in relation to firearms. Together with men aged 36-60, they made up more than three quarters of all victims of firearm-related homicides.
Table 11: Victims of homicide inflicted with firearms, by sex and age

<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>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-35</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-60</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total W/M per year</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.2.4 Injuries

Between 2012 and 2016, a total of 44 people suffered injuries inflicted with firearms. The highest number of injuries was recorded in 2015 at 13, which was more than four times the number of injuries registered in 2012, which was 3.
Men represented the overwhelming majority of victims injured by firearms – more than 9 out of 10 people injured during the survey period were men, while only 3 women were reported as injured by firearms, representing 6.8% of all cases. As with homicides, men aged 19 to 35 were at particular risk and accounted for more than half of all injured victims, followed by men aged 36 to 60 at 34.1%.

Table 12: Victims of injuries inflicted with firearms, by sex and age of victim

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-35</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-60</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total W/M per year</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.2.5 Accidental Deaths

Between 2012 and 2016, there were 31 accidental deaths\(^3\) inflicted with firearms; the number of accidental deaths fell between 2012 and 2016 to a low of 4, but then rose to 7 by 2016.

Most of the victims (27) of firearm-related accidents were men (87.1%). At the same time, there were 4 cases of women accidentally killed during the survey period, accounting for 12.9% of the cases.

2.2.6 Domestic Violence

Homicides by Family Members

During the survey period, 72 people were killed by family members, whether by firearm or by other means, accounting for 7% of all murders in the Republic of Moldova. Domestic violence affected both women and men, with women accounting for slightly over half of all victims of family member homicides, at 54.2%.

\(^3\) Accidental death is defined as any death that occurs as the result of an accident. It refers to a death resulting from an event that was unanticipated by everyone involved. It is not intended, expected, or foreseeable. Firearm-related accidental deaths refer to situations when one or more persons is accidentally shot and killed. Accidental death does not include murder or suicide.
At the same time, domestic violence disproportionately affected women. One in seven women who were killed during the survey period was a victim of domestic homicide, while murder by family members accounted for less than 5% of the male victims of homicide.

**Figure 25:** Persons killed by family members, by sex

- Women: 45.8%
- Men: 54.2%

**Figure 26:** Share of homicides committed by family members in the total number of homicides, by sex

- Women: 15.1%
- Men: 4.3%
- Total: 7%

**Homicides by Intimate Partner**

Out of all murders committed by family members, almost two thirds were committed by intimate partners. Intimate partner violence with a lethal outcome disproportionately affected women, accounting for 63% of all persons killed by their current or former partner.
Women were predominantly more at risk from their intimate partners. During the survey period, 74.4% of women killed in the domestic context were killed by their former or current partners, compared to 51.5% of men.

**Figure 27:** People killed by their intimate partner, by sex

![Pie chart showing 63% for Men and 37% for Women]

**Figure 28:** Share of victims killed by intimate partner in the total number of people killed by family members, by sex

![Bar chart showing 74.4% for Women, 51.1% for Men, and 63.9% for Total]
Table 13: Number of persons killed in the period 2012-2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total number of murders</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>764</td>
<td>1,022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of persons killed by family members</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of persons killed by family members with firearms</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of persons killed by their intimate partners</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of persons killed by their intimate partners with firearms</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Firearms misuse in domestic violence

During the survey period, there was only one victim of firearm-related domestic homicide reported, a woman who was killed by her intimate partner. The extremely low number of firearm-related homicides committed in the domestic environment did not allow for an analytical assessment of this phenomenon. It may reflect a worrisome case of under-reporting or mis recording.

Institutional response to the misuse of firearms in domestic violence

Out of the 754 firearm license applications that were rejected during the survey period, only 38 or 5% were rejected on the grounds of domestic violence. All of the rejected applicants were men. The number of permits revoked on the grounds of domestic violence followed a similar pattern, with 37 revoked licenses out of a total of 275 revoked licenses for criminal offenses (13.5%). All of the 37 licenses revoked on the grounds of domestic violence belonged to men.

Figure 29: Share of licenses rejected and revoked on the grounds of domestic violence
Looking at the reported cases of domestic violence and crimes against sexual freedom, it is evident that the presence of firearms was rarely reported. Out of the 8,072 cases of domestic violence that were registered in the period 2012-2016, the misuse of firearms was reported in merely two cases, while the misuse of firearms was reported in only one of the 3,153 cases of criminal offenses against sexual freedom.

### Figure 30: Number of criminal offenses of domestic violence, by year

![Graph showing the number of criminal offenses of domestic violence, by year](image)

- Reported cases of the criminal offence of domestic violence
- Cases of the criminal offence of domestic violence in which the misuse of firearms was reported

### 2.2.7 Perpetrators

The number of perpetrators of firearm-related criminal offenses fluctuated between 2012 and 2016, but increased overall, with a notable increase in 2016, following a significant decrease in 2014 and 2015.

### Figure 31: Perpetrators of firearm-related criminal offenses, by year

![Graph showing the number of perpetrators of firearm-related criminal offenses, by year](image)

**38 Crimes against sexual freedom include the following criminal offenses: rape, sexual assault, sexual harassment, sexual intercourse with a helpless person, sexual intercourse with a child, sexual intercourse through abuse of position, mediation in prostitution and other prohibited sexual acts.**
Men made up the absolute majority of perpetrators of firearm-related criminal offenses, while women only exceptionally misused firearms in this regard.

**Figure 32: Perpetrators of criminal offenses committed with firearms, by sex**

In 17 out of the 18 categories of criminal offenses, all perpetrators were men, while in one category, *light bodily injury*, men accounted for 97.8% of the perpetrators (44 out of 45 perpetrators).

**Table 14: Perpetrators of criminal offenses, by sex and type, 2012-2016**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRIMINAL OFFENSES</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Murder</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attempted Murder</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggravated Murder</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serious Bodily Harm</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light Bodily Injury</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threat by Dangerous Implement in Brawl or Quarrel</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic Violence</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burglary</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggravated Theft</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illegal Trade</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trafficking</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Causing of General Danger</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plotting of Offenses against the Constitutional Order and Security</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preventing an Official in Discharge of Duty</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attack on an Official in Performance of Duty</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making and Obtaining Weapons and Tools intended for Committing an Offense</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unlawful Manufacture, Possession, Carrying, and Sale of Firearms and Explosives</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Men also dominated among perpetrators of firearm-related homicides and accounted for 95.7% of perpetrators of murders, that is 22 out of 23 perpetrators. Only one female perpetrator was recorded in 2012. Of the male perpetrators, 12 were aged 36 to 60, while 8 were aged 19 to 35. These two age groups together accounted for over 91.3% of the perpetrators of firearm-related homicides.

Figure 33: Perpetrators of firearm-related homicides, by age

![Bar chart showing age distribution of perpetrators of firearm-related homicides (2012-2016)]

- 0-18: 4.3%
- 19-35: 34.8%
- 36-60: 56.5%
- 61+: 4.3%

While this trend held true for the whole survey period, the data did not necessarily indicate that the same was valid on an annual basis. Thus, while in 2012 and 2013, young men aged 19-35 represented the highest percentage of perpetrators, in 2015 and 2016, the ranking was reversed.

Figure 34: Gender differentiated effect of firearms on women and men

![Bar chart showing gender distribution of firearm-related incidents (2012-2016)]

- Women:
  - Firearm-owners: 1%
  - Perpetrators of firearm-related criminal offences: 0.5%
  - Perpetrators of firearm-related homicides: 4.2%
  - Victims of firearm-related homicides: 15.4%

- Men:
  - Firearm-owners: 99%
  - Perpetrators of firearm-related criminal offences: 99.5%
  - Perpetrators of firearm-related homicides: 95.8%
  - Victims of firearm-related homicides: 84.6%
The figure above shows how the effect of firearms on women and men was differentiated along gender lines. Men made up 99% of firearm owners, committed 99.5% of firearm-inflicted criminal offenses and 95.6% firearm homicides. They also accounted for the majority of victims of firearm-related homicides (84.6%) but were proportionately more frequently perpetrators than victims of firearms misuse. Women, on the other hand, owned only a minor share of firearms (1%), made up 0.5% of perpetrators of firearm-related criminal offenses and 4.2% of homicide perpetrators but were disproportionately represented among victims (15.4%).

**2.2.8 Suicides**

The Ministry of Interior of the Republic of Moldova did not collect and record data regarding suicides, including suicides committed with firearms.

**2.2.9 Characteristics of the Incidents**

Assault rifles and light machine guns were the most widely used firearms in incidents with a fatal outcome, accounting for almost 2 in 3 deaths between 2012 and 2016. Revolvers and self-loading pistols and submachine guns came second and accounted for approximately 18.2% and 12.1% of deaths respectively.

![Figure 35: Share of deaths, by type of firearm and by year](image)

Firearm-related homicides were most frequently committed in homes, apartments and yards, followed by forests, fields and uninhabited areas. Slightly less than 1 in 3 individuals were murdered in private spaces, and over 1 in 5 individuals were killed in forests, fields or uninhabited areas. The following most frequent spaces were the category of cafes, restaurants, clubs and hotels and the category of public buildings, offices and banks, both accounting for 6.1% of homicides each.

---

39 In the period 2012-2016, there were 33 deaths registered for which the type of firearm used was known.
Women were predominantly more at risk in private spaces (homes, apartments, yards), followed by streets, sidewalks and parking lots. An equal number of men were victims of firearm-inflicted murder both in homes, apartments and yards, and in forests, fields and uninhabited areas.

During the survey period, the highest incidence of firearm-related murders occurred in June, followed by March and May. Overall, the period March-June had the highest incidence of firearm-related murders. This particularly held true for men, while with respect to women no clear trend was documented due to a low number of cases reported. The highest number of injuries was reported in January, followed by April, March and September.
Figure 38: Firearm-related homicides, by month

Figure 39: Firearm-related homicides, by month and sex of victim
2.3 Perception Survey

The perception survey was conducted online and asked a range of questions relating to exposure to firearms use, possession and community safety. The following is a summary of the key findings from the SALW perception survey in Moldova.

2.3.1 Demographic Breakdown

A total of 9,785 respondents accessed the online perception survey in Moldova, and 1,367 completed it in full. The majority (21%) of respondents were aged 25 to 34. The male/female breakdown was roughly equal (48% and 52%). Forty-two percent of all respondents were employed full time, 15% were students, and 13% were looking for work. Approximately 36% of respondents were from the capital region, while 31% were from towns, 26% from villages and 7% from suburbs. Regarding socio-economic status, 33% of respondents reported a monthly household income of “no income”, 29% stated that they earned less than EUR 200/month, and 25% stated that they earned EUR 200-500/month. The majority of respondents (40%) had Bachelor’s degree and 13% had secondary school education.

2.3.2 Experience of Gun Use

Sixty-eight percent of respondents reported they had never had an experience with a gun, while 25% had personally experienced the use of a gun to some degree.
Men (34%) were significantly more likely than women (19%) to have experienced the use of a gun, e.g. used a gun, had a gun directed at them, or both. The differences were particularly significant in terms of firearm usage: 16% of men had used a gun compared to 7% of women.
Respondents’ most frequent experience with a gun was in a hunting/sport setting (15%). This was followed by “armed conflict” (12%) and celebratory shooting, “assault” and “professional reasons” (each 7%). Sixty-seven percent of respondents had most frequently experienced gun use in a violent or perceptibly unsafe manner.

**Figure 42: Situations most frequently associated with experience of gun use**

Which of the following best describes the situation in which you have most frequently experienced gun use?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Situation</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Armed robbery</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accidental shot</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armed conflict</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assault</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Celebration shooting</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic violence</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnically motivated</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunting sport</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intimidation and threats</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It’s part of my job</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property issues</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riot protest</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual violence</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thirty-one percent of respondents did not provide information on when the violent act occurred. Apart from this, gun violence was equally reported by respondents to have happened across the timeline of gun experience, from the current year to more than 15 years ago.
Respondents most frequently identified the police/military (17%) and partners/ex-partners (16%) as those who had committed the most recent act of gun violence. The majority of men and women reported police and military personnel as perpetrators of the most recent acts of gun violence. Women were more likely to say it was someone close to them—partners, family, friends. Men were more likely to say it was the police or military, thieves, or neighbors. Thirty-three percent of gun violence carried out by the police/military was reported as taking place more than 15 years ago, while 23% of the violence committed by a partner or ex-partner had happened in the past year.
“Hunting and sport” were reported by both women (12%) and men (16%) as the primary situation when a gun was used, followed by “armed conflict” (both 12%). Men were more likely than women to say that the most frequent incidence of gun violence was either “hunting or sport” or “part of my job”, while women were more likely than men to say “sexual violence”.

The majority of respondents had no experience with a gun at all across all age groups, but exposure to violence increased with the age of a respondent. Twenty-two percent of respondents aged 65 and over had had a gun directed at them, compared to an average of 9% amongst other age groups.

Of respondents who had experienced the use of a gun, 28% of respondents aged 16-24 and 65 and over said the most recent gun violence had occurred within the last year, compared to an average of only 13% amongst other age groups. Otherwise, generally older respondents said the most recent act of gun violence had occurred further ago in time.

### 2.3.3 Firearms Possession

Seventy percent of respondents in Moldova said they would not own a gun. Women were more likely than men to not own a gun (78% and 62% respectively). Of these respondents, 51% said they did not need one (no differences between women and men), and 24% of women and 20% of men said they would not own a gun because it was unsafe. The respondents most likely to say they would not own a gun were women aged 25-44 (82%), while men aged 16-24 years were the most likely to say they would own a gun (44%).

![Figure 45: Perceptions regarding guns at home](image)

Slightly more respondents felt that the presence of a gun at home would make them feel less safe (52%) rather than safer (48%). While men were more likely to feel safer with a gun at home than without, the majority of women (54%) reported they would feel less safe in those circumstances.
The respondents that were most likely to feel safer with a gun at home were men aged 16-24 (63%) and men aged 55-64 (65%), while the respondents who were less likely to feel less safe with a gun at home were women aged 25-34 (60%).

Respondents living in suburbs and the capital city (36% and 33% respectively) were slightly more likely to say they would own a gun than those living in towns or villages (28% and 25% respectively). Respondents (35%) with a higher monthly income (more than EUR 500 and EUR 200 to 500) were most likely to report they would own a gun, compared to 27% of those with a monthly income of less than EUR 300 or those without an income.

Respondents with primary school education only reported more often (38%) than others (from 26% to 31%) that they would own a gun.

Factors linked with the demand for firearms

Thirty percent of respondents reported they would own a gun. The following factors were identified as being positively correlated with the demand for firearms:

- **Protection/safety**: A key driver of firearm possession was the desire to improve one’s safety, with 43% of the respondents that reported they would own a gun stating they would do so for “protection/safety” reasons. As the perceived level of safety in the neighborhood decreased, the probability of a respondent personally owning a gun increased. Fifty-five percent of respondents in Moldova who lived in a “very unsafe” neighborhood would own a gun, compared to 24% of those who perceive their neighborhood as very safe. Readiness to acquire firearms increased if a respondent believed it would improve safety. Forty-six percent of the respondents who stated they would feel safer at home with a gun, would own one and 54% would not. Of those who felt less safe with a gun at home, 87% would not own a gun.

![Figure 46: Gun ownership vs. perceptions of neighborhood safety](image)
• **Previous experience of gun use**: If respondents had any previous gun experience, it immediately increased the likelihood that they would own a gun. Sixty-two percent of respondents who had had a gun directed at them would own a gun. Only 20% of respondents would own a gun among those that had no experience with a gun at all. The readiness to acquire a gun also correlated with the period when the gun violence had happened. Seventy-three percent of respondents who had experienced the use of a gun in the past year would own a gun, compared to 46% of those who had experienced gun violence 6 to 15 years ago.

![Graph showing gun ownership vs. experience of gun use](image)

**Figure 47**: Gun ownership vs. experience of gun use
Would you personally own a gun vs Have you ever experienced the use of a gun?

• **Hunting**: Hunting was another key driver of gun possession with 18% of respondents reporting hunting/sport as a reason to own a gun.

![Graph showing gun ownership by sex and age](image)

**Figure 48**: Gun ownership by sex and age
Respondents who would own a gun by sex and age
• **Gender and age:** Men were far more likely than women to report they would own a gun (38% and 22% respectively). The dominant respondents who would not own a gun were women aged 25-44 (82%), while the dominant respondents who would own a gun were men aged 16-24.

### 2.3.4 Community Safety

Eighty-three percent of respondents in Moldova said they were aware of the penalties for illegal possession of guns, while those who were the least aware lived in the suburbs, had a lower level of education, and reported either a monthly household income of more than EUR 500 or no income. There was little difference in awareness between women and men; both were well aware of the penalties.

**Figure 49: Community safety perceptions**

Response to the question “Which of the following would be most effective to making your community safer?”

- More police or authorities present: 24%
- Violence awareness campaigns: 24%
- Stricter gun control regulations: 12%
- More people owning guns so that they can protect themselves: 23%
- Weapons risk education: 7%
- People giving up their guns: 10%

Only 7% of respondents believed that “more people owning guns to protect themselves” would be most effective to making communities safer followed by: “more police or authorities present”, “weapons risk education” and “stricter gun control regulations”.

Most of the male respondents believe that increased police/authority presence would be the most effective way to making their community safer from gun violence, while a majority of women believed that stricter gun control would be the most effective way to making their community safer. Men were more likely than women to address the issue in terms of the presence of guns, whether by giving up or owning more guns. Women were more likely than men to think in terms of awareness, education, and regulation.

Respondents aged 45-54 were much less likely than other age groups to say that “people giving up their guns” would be the most effective way to make communities safer, but were more likely than other age groups to select either “stricter gun control regulations” or “more people owning guns to protect themselves”.
All age groups blamed social media, videos and news on gun-related incidents for promoting gun use. Women were more likely to blame news on firearm-related incidents (44%) and videos (41%), while men were most likely to blame social media (40%), followed by news on firearm-related incidents (38%).

Figure 50: Factors that promote gun use
Response to question “Which of the following most promotes the use of guns?”
3. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR POLICY MAKERS AND PRACTITIONERS

Firearm misuse, proliferation and trafficking remain important issues in the Republic of Moldova, especially given links to wider problems with organized crime and concerns about future stability and reconciliation. While important steps have already been taken to try and address SALW proliferation, misuse and trafficking in the country, the following recommendations are intended to spur and promote more concrete action by policy makers and practitioners.

Data Collection, Analysis and Transparency

In order to ensure that the policy and legislative framework for SALW control in the Republic of Moldova is informed by data and in-depth analysis, it is necessary to undertake a set of comprehensive activities to improve the availability and quality of data on the distribution and impact of SALW. The following are recommended:

− Declassify data on the SALW holdings of state agencies in order to facilitate analysis and develop evidence-based SALW control policies and programs. Follow the example of national authorities elsewhere in the region, who have demonstrated considerable transparency in this regard.

− Build on the efforts undertaken through this survey and continue to ensure the regular collection and analysis of data on small arms and security trends in the Republic of Moldova and reflect these in the new SALW Control Strategy. Draw upon available technical expertise to further strengthen capacity in systematic SALW data collection and to facilitate the sharing of experiences and good practice within the region.

− Conduct in-depth research into SALW trafficking within the country in order to obtain accurate data on trafficking dynamics, actors and trends, and put in place evidence-based policies and programs that will stop illicit SALW trafficking, particularly in border areas. Work closely in collaboration with EUBAM and the Ukrainian authorities.

− Conduct an extensive review of the current administrative data-recording and data-keeping practices to identify gaps in the availability of data on firearms.

− Develop data-collection methodology and adopt standard operating procedures, including templates for data keeping and recording on each firearm-related incident, and provide training of professionals in charge of data keeping and recording. The data collection methodology and accompanying standard operating procedures should be based on regional good practices, which are aligned with International Small Arms Control Standards/MOSAIC.
and Regional Micro-Disarmament Standards and Guidelines so that coherent and comparable data is generated.

− Ensure that data on the means, whether firearms or other, used to commit criminal offenses is regularly collected and provided for each criminal offense.

− Ensure that collected data fully captures the type of firearm and the type of ownership of firearms (legal/illegal) used to commit each firearm-related incident, as well as location and time of the incident.

− Ensure that data on the means, whether by firearm or other means, is provided for suicides and accidental deaths. This data should also capture the type of firearm and the type of ownership of firearms (legal/illegal).

− Produce firearm-related risk analysis based on the collected data and trends documented in this report and develop, in a consultative manner, hands-on recommendations for decision/policy makers as well as first line responders in order to improve the operational response to identified risks and enhance prevention efforts.

− Fully integrate the activities above in the action plan for the implementation of the SALW control strategy and ensure budgeting for the implementation of the activities mentioned above.

− **Threat by dangerous implement** in brawl or quarrel: Identify the factors leading to the misuse of firearms to commit aggravated hooliganism and other threats by dangerous implement in a brawl and quarrel, as well as the reasons for the significant increase of these cases recorded in 2015 and 2016.

− Homicides and accidental deaths:
  
  • Establish standard operating procedures to regularly review each homicide and accidental death based on fatality review methodologies in order to identify factors leading to firearm misuse in such incidents.
  
  • Identify reasons behind the steady increase in firearm-related homicides in the period 2014-2016.
  
  • Follow the trends in the number of female victims of firearm-inflicted homicides to determine whether the increase in 2016 is maintained in the following years.

− Domestic and intimate partner violence:
  
  • Assess whether the figures provided on homicides committed by family members and intimate partners with firearms, as well as the reported cases of firearm-related criminal offenses of domestic violence and against sexual freedom correctly reflect the reality or if there is a case of under-reporting or misrecording of data.
  
  • Establish standard operating procedures to conduct domestic violence fatality reviews of each domestic and intimate partner homicide committed with firearms to identify possible gaps in the institutional response leading to the lethal outcome. In this sense, ensure that data on the number of revoked licenses on the grounds of domestic violence is all gathered and properly recorded.
Identify the factors for the prevalence of assault rifles and light machine guns in committing murder.

**Awareness-raising**

- Given the fact that men account for the overwhelming majority of both perpetrators of firearm-related criminal offenses and victims of firearm misuse, that civilian firearm possession is male dominated, particularly among young and middle-aged men, and that the number of firearm license-holders, firearms sold and ownership of registered firearms are all increasing, develop and implement SALW awareness-raising and behavior change programs that specifically target this segment of the population, in addition to the wider population. Promote societal dialogue regarding firearm use and misuse among men, conceptions of masculinity and cultural norms, as well as the links to domestic violence.

- Bearing in mind the disproportionate exposure of young men to risk-taking behavior, develop and pilot specific and contextualized preventive programs that specifically address young men.

- Given the increasing popularity of private shooting clubs and shooting associations in the Republic of Moldova, target their staff, members and visitors with focused campaigns to raise awareness of the risks associated with SALW misuse and proliferation, and offer training on anger management and conflict resolution. Monitor enforcement of regulations with regards to the safe storage of SALW and ammunition held by these private entities, as well as sales shops.

**Legislation**

- Carry out an assessment of the country’s arms export legislation to assess compliance with the EU Common Position on arms exports. Implement the recommendations of this assessment.

**Enforcement**

- Improve the capacity of law enforcement authorities to effectively and systematically send trace requests both domestically and internationally for voluntarily surrendered, seized, confiscated and legalized firearms. Conduct an assessment to determine if training, resources and/or equipment are needed and implement the recommendations of this assessment.

- Given the low number of trafficked firearms reported between 2012 and 2016, the low number of trafficking convictions and of confiscated and seized firearms, strengthen the capacity of law enforcement officials, particularly border authorities, to detect, confiscate and seize illicit SALW and follow procedures required to ensure successful convictions.

- Given the rising number of private security companies and the increasing number of firearms that they held between 2012 and 2016, conduct an assessment to determine whether sufficient oversight of their procedures and operations is in place.
− An increasing number of firearm license-holders and owners of registered firearms cited self-protection as the reason for firearm possession, which reflects an increasing sense of insecurity. This may reflect rising crime as well as falling confidence in security providers to ensure community safety. Design and implement programs that focus on building trust, dialogue and collaboration between communities and their security providers, particularly the police. These initiatives should ensure the inclusion of both women and men, as well as specifically target youth.

− Given the fact that state and private entities reported no lost or stolen weapons for the entire five-year period, conduct research to determine whether this is the case and implement the recommendations.

− Review current risk assessment tools and train front line officers to ensure they duly address the specific risks related to the presence of firearms in the context of domestic and intimate partner violence.

− Review the firearm license application process and provide training to competent officials to ensure that security vetting and background checks fully take into account the specificities and gender-based nature of domestic and intimate partner violence.
4. GAPS IN THE SURVEY DATA

This survey aimed at presenting a comprehensive picture of the distribution and impact of firearms on the citizens of the Republic of Moldova, based on data provided by the Moldovan authorities. Despite significant efforts undertaken by authorities to provide reliable information, some data was missing or inconsistent, thus limiting the extent of the analysis. The lack and hindered access to data on the distribution and misuse of firearms presented major challenges in understanding the specific threats that SALW proliferation poses to society, communities and individuals, both women and men. It consequently hinders the development of evidence-based polices, intelligence-led policing and effective policy solutions.

There were several areas for which data was unavailable or classified by the authorities. This included the estimated number of firearms (if any) illicitly held by civilians, the firearms held by key state agencies, in particular the Ministry of Internal Affairs, the Ministry of Defense and the police. Data was also unavailable for the value of firearm imports and exports, the number of import and export authorizations realized and the number of firearms that were brokered, exported, transited and transshipped.
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ANNEX A:
STRUCTURE OF SMALL ARMS AND LIGHT WEAPONS DISTRIBUTION QUESTIONNAIRE

The following is a list of the questions contained in the SALW Distribution Questionnaire circulated to the Moldova SALW authorities.

1. CIVILIANS
   1.1 Number of firearm license holders under each category of available licenses, disaggregated by sex of license holder
   1.2 Total number of firearm license holders (natural persons) (cumulative until 31 December 2016), disaggregated by sex and age of license holder
   1.3 Number of registered firearms from natural persons under each category of available licenses/permits/authorizations
   1.4 Number of firearm license holders categorized by reason for acquiring weapons (natural persons), disaggregated by sex of license holder
   1.5 Number of firearms categorized by reason of possession (natural persons)
   1.6 Number of firearms inherited categorized by reason of possession (natural persons) – OPTIONAL
   1.7 Number of firearms inherited categorized by reason of possession (natural persons) – OPTIONAL
   1.8 Number of rejected applicants disaggregated by sex
   1.9 Number of persons whose license/permit/authorization was revoked, for each year and on what grounds, disaggregated by sex
   1.10 Number of firearms per person (only categories B and C) disaggregated by sex of firearm owner
   1.11 Estimated number of firearms (if any) illicitly held by civilians

2. STATE AGENCIES
   2.1 Ministry of Internal Affairs
      2.1.1 Total number of personnel disaggregated by sex
      2.1.2 Number of personnel authorized to carry firearms disaggregated by sex
      2.1.3 Number of firearms held by MoI in active use
      2.1.4 Number of firearms held by MoI in reserve
      2.1.5 Number of surplus firearms
      2.1.6 Number of surplus firearm ammunition
      2.1.7 Number of surplus firearms destroyed
      2.1.8 Number of surplus firearm ammunition destroyed
   2.2 The Police
      2.2.1 Total number of personnel disaggregated by sex
      2.2.2 Number of personnel authorized to carry firearms disaggregated by sex
2.2.3 Number of firearms held by the Police in active use
2.2.4 Number of firearms held by the Police in reserve
2.2.5 Number of surplus firearms
2.2.6 Number of surplus firearm ammunition
2.2.7 Number of surplus firearms destroyed
2.2.8 Number of surplus firearm ammunition destroyed

2.3 Ministry of Defense
2.3.1 Total number of personnel disaggregated by sex
2.3.2 Number of personnel authorized to carry small arms and light weapons (SALW) disaggregated by sex
2.3.3 Number of SALW held by MoD in active use
2.3.4 Number of SALW held by MoD in reserve
2.3.5 Number of surplus SALW
2.3.6 Number of surplus SALW ammunition
2.3.7 Number of surplus SALW destroyed
2.3.8 Number of surplus SALW ammunition destroyed

2.4 Forest Guards
2.4.1 Total number of personnel disaggregated by sex
2.4.2 Number of personnel authorized to carry firearms disaggregated by sex

2.5 Customs
2.5.1 Total number of personnel disaggregated by sex
2.5.2 Number of personnel authorized to carry firearms disaggregated by sex

2.6 Ministry of Justice
2.6.1 Total number of personnel disaggregated by sex
2.6.2 Number of personnel authorized to carry firearms disaggregated by sex

2.7 Correctional Services
2.7.1 Total number of personnel disaggregated by sex
2.7.2 Number of personnel authorized to carry firearms disaggregated by sex

3. PRIVATE SECURITY COMPANIES
3.1 Number of private security companies in operation
3.2 Number of personnel in private security companies authorized to carry firearms during their work duties disaggregated by sex
3.3 Number of firearms held by private security companies
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4. PRIVATE SHOOTING CLUBS
   4.1 Number of PSC
   4.2 Number of firearms held by PSC
   4.3 Number of personnel in PSC authorized to carry firearms, disaggregated by sex
   4.4 Number of members of PSC, disaggregated by sex
   4.5 Number of visitors to shooting clubs, disaggregated by age and sex

5. SHOOTING ASSOCIATIONS
   5.1 Number of associations
   5.2 Number of firearms held by shooting associations
   5.3 Number of personnel in shooting associations authorized to carry firearms, disaggregated by sex
   5.4 Number of members of shooting associations, disaggregated by sex

6. RANGES
   6.1 Number of Ranges
   6.2 Number of firearms held by ranges
   6.3 Number of personnel in ranges authorized to carry firearms, by sex
   6.4 Number of members of ranges, by sex
   6.5 Number of visitors to shooting ranges, by age and sex

7. SALES SHOPS
   7.1 Number of sales shops
   7.2 Number of firearms possessed by sales shops
   7.3 Number of firearm ammunition possessed by sales shops
   7.4 Number of firearms sold by sales shops to natural persons by category
   7.5 Number of firearms sold by sales shops to legal entities by category
   7.6 Annual turnover

8. MANUFACTURE
   8.1 Legal manufacture
      8.1.1 Number of authorized firearm manufacturers
      8.1.2 Number of firearm ammunition (cartridges) produced
      8.1.3 Value of annual turnover for all manufactures in ML1
      8.1.4 Total number of persons employed by all authorized firearm manufacturers
   8.2 Illegal firearm production
      8.2.1 Number of reported cases of illegal firearm production
      8.2.2 Number of firearms illegally produced and confiscated
      8.2.3 Number of illegal firearm production workshops discovered
      8.2.4 Number of illegal firearm conversion workshops discovered
8.2.5 Locations of illegal firearm production workshops
8.2.6 Locations of illegal firearm conversion workshops

9. INTERNATIONAL TRANSFERS
9.1 Number of registered firearm brokers
9.2 Number of brokering licenses for firearm trade agreements issued
9.3 Number of import authorizations granted
9.4 Number of import authorizations realized
9.5 Value of imports (civilian market)
9.6 Number of export authorizations granted
9.7 Number of export authorizations realized
9.8 Value of exports
9.9 Number of temporary imports
9.10 Number of temporary exports
9.11 Main destinations of exports
9.12 Main exporting companies (top 3 among producers according to the annual turnover)
9.13 Quantity and types of firearms and ammunition brokered, ML1, ML2, ML3, 2012-2016
9.14 Quantity and types of firearms and ammunition imported ML1, ML2, ML3, 2012-2016
9.15 Quantity and types of firearms and ammunition exported ML1, ML2, ML3, 2012-2016
9.16 Quantity and types of firearms and ammunition transited ML1, ML2, ML3, 2012-2016
9.17 Quantity and types of firearms and ammunition transshipped ML1, ML2, ML3, 2012-2016

10. LOST AND STOLEN FIREARMS
10.1 Lost by state agencies
10.2 Stolen from state agencies
10.3 Lost by legal entities
10.4 Stolen from legal entities
10.5 Lost by natural persons
10.6 Stolen from natural persons

11. ILLEGAL POSSESSION OF FIREARMS AND CONFISCATION
11.1 Number of cases of illegal possession of firearms
11.2 Number of confiscated firearms
11.3 Number of temporarily confiscated firearms

12. TRAFFICKING
12.1 Number of cases of firearm trafficking recorded
12.2 Number of firearms trafficked
12.3 Number of firearm ammunition trafficked
12.4 Number of border crossing points
12.5 Number of border crossing points where firearm trafficking was reported
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12.6 Number of firearms trafficked on border crossing points
12.7 Number of green border crossing points
12.8 Number of green border crossings where firearm trafficking was reported
12.9 Number of firearms trafficked over green borders
12.10 Number of blue border crossing points
12.11 Number of blue border crossings where firearm trafficking was reported
12.12 Number of firearms trafficked over blue borders
12.13 Number of airports
12.14 Number of trafficking incidents at airports
12.15 Number of firearms trafficked at airports
12.16 Number of persons indicted for firearm trafficking
12.17 Number of firearms trafficked by type

13. SEIZED AND TRACED FIREARMS
13.1 Total number of seized firearms
13.2 Number of seized firearms traced domestically – trace request sent but no match/hits identified
13.3 Number of seized firearms traced domestically – trace request sent with match/hits identified
13.4 Number of seized firearms traced internationally – trace request sent but no match/hits identified
13.5 Number of seized firearms traced internationally – trace request sent with match/hits identified

14. LEGALIZED FIREARMS
14.1 Total number of legalized firearms
14.2 Number of legalized firearms traced domestically – trace request sent but no match/hits identified
14.3 Number of legalized firearms traced domestically – trace request sent with match/hits identified
14.4 Number of legalized firearms traced internationally – trace request sent but no match/hits identified
14.5 Number of legalized firearms traced internationally – trace request sent with match/hits identified

15. VOLUNTARILY SURRENDERED
15.1 Total number of voluntarily surrendered small arms
15.2 Number of voluntarily surrendered light weapons
15.3 Number of voluntarily surrendered SALW traced domestically, trace request sent but no match/hits identified
15.4 Number of voluntarily surrendered SALW traced domestically, trace request sent with match/hits identified
15.5 Number of voluntarily surrendered SALW traced internationally, trace request sent but no match/hits identified
15.6 Number of voluntarily surrendered SALW traced internationally, trace request sent with match/hits identified
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1. INCIDENTS INFLECTED BY FIREARMS- AND THE TYPE OF OWNERSHIP
   1.1 Criminal offenses inflicted by firearm by the type of firearm ownership: Legal and/or Illegal
   1.2 Misdemeanor inflicted by firearm by year

2. FIREARM-RELATED INCIDENTS
   2.1 Total number of murders (not only with firearms) disaggregated by sex of victim
   2.2 Number of murders inflicted with firearms disaggregated by sex and age of victim
   2.3 Number of injuries inflicted with firearms disaggregated by sex and age of victim
   2.4 Number of accidental deaths inflicted with firearms disaggregated by sex and age of victim
   2.5 Intimate partner murders disaggregated by sex of victim
   2.6 Misuse of firearms in the context of domestic violence and crimes against sexual freedom

3. PERPETRATORS
   3.1 Number of perpetrators disaggregated by sex of perpetrator and type of firearm-related criminal offense
   3.2 Number of perpetrators of firearm-related murders disaggregated by sex and age of perpetrator
   3.3 Number of criminal offenses inflicted with firearms by members of state agencies, disaggregated by sex of perpetrator

4. SUICIDES
   4.1 Suicides disaggregated by sex and age

5. CHARACTERISTICS OF INCIDENTS
   5.1 Number of deaths by type of firearm used for each year
   5.2 Number of individuals murdered with firearms by location and disaggregated by sex of victim (for each year)
   5.3 Number of firearm-related incidents resulting in murder and injury disaggregated by month when they were committed and sex of victim.
# ANNEX C: FIREARMS ONLINE PERCEPTION SURVEY INSTRUMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QUESTION</th>
<th>ROMANIAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Your opinion is important to us. Thank you for your participation.</td>
<td>Opinia dumneavoastră este importantă pentru noi. Vă mulțumim pentru cooperare.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q0</th>
<th>What is your age and gender?</th>
<th>Menționați vârsta și sexul Dvs.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16+</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Bărbat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Femeie</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Module A

**Q1** Anchored  
Generally, do you feel that your neighborhood is:  
În general, considerați cartierul Dvs. ca fiind:

- Very safe | Foarte sigur
- Safe | Sigur
- Somewhat unsafe | Oarecum periculos
- Very unsafe | Foarte periculos

**Q2** Anchored  
Over the last 4 years, has the level of safety in your community:  
Pe parcursul ultimilor 4 ani, nivelul de siguranță din comunitatea Dvs.:

- Improved | S-a îmbunătățit
- Stayed about the same | A rămas același
- Become worse | S-a înrăutățit

## Module B

**Q3a** Q3a+b+c randomized order  
Are you currently employed? | Sunteți angajat în prezent?

- Yes, full-time | Da, cu normă deplină
- Yes, part-time | Da, cu normă redusă
- No - I am looking for work | Nu- caut de lucru
- No - I am not looking for work | Nu- nu caut de lucru
- Student | Sunt student
- Retired | Sunt pensionar

**Q3b** Q3a+b+c randomized order  
What is your marital status? | Mentionați starea Dvs. civilă

- Single, never married | Necăsătorit(ă), nu am fost căsătorit/ă niciodată
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Married</th>
<th>Căsătorit(ă)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>Văduv(ă)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced/Separated</td>
<td>Divorțat(ă)/separat(ă)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q3c</th>
<th>Q3a+b+c randomized order</th>
<th>Where do you live?</th>
<th>Unde locuiți?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>În capitală</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Town</td>
<td>În oraș</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Village</td>
<td>În sat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Suburb</td>
<td>În suburbie</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Module C**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q4a</th>
<th>anchored at beginning of Module C</th>
<th>Have you ever experienced the use of a gun?</th>
<th>Ați avut vreo experiență legată de utilizarea unei arme de foc?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes, I have had a gun directed at me</td>
<td>Da, am fost amenințat(ă) cu o armă de foc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes, I have used a gun</td>
<td>Da, am folosit o armă de foc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes, I have both used a gun and had one directed at me</td>
<td>Da, am folosit o armă de foc și am fost amenințat(ă) cu o armă de foc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes, but indirectly (witnessed)</td>
<td>Da, dar indirect (martor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>go to 4b</td>
<td>No, but someone close to me has</td>
<td>Nu, dar cineva apropiat a fost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No, not at all</td>
<td>Nu</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q4b</th>
<th>only if experienced (first 3 options in 4a)</th>
<th>Which of the following best describes the situation in which you have MOST FREQUENTLY experienced gun use?</th>
<th>Care dintre exemplele de mai jos descriu cel mai bine situația în care ați avut o experiență legată de utilizarea unei arme de foc?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(or)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Which of the following best describes the situation in which you have MOST FREQUENTLY witnessed gun use?</td>
<td>Care dintre exemplele de mai jos descriu cel mai bine situația în care ați fost martor FRECVENT la folosirea unei arme de foc?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4c</td>
<td>Armed robbery</td>
<td>Jaf armat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4c</td>
<td>Riot or protest</td>
<td>Revoltă sau protest</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4c</td>
<td>Ethnically motivated</td>
<td>Etnic motivat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4c</td>
<td>Intimidation and threats</td>
<td>Intimidări și amenințări</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4bb</td>
<td>Domestic Violence</td>
<td>Violență domestică</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4c</td>
<td>Sexual violence</td>
<td>Violență sexuală</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4d</td>
<td>Accidental shot</td>
<td>Foc de armă accidental</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4d</td>
<td>Celebration shooting</td>
<td>Foc de armă de sărbătorire</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4c</td>
<td>Assault</td>
<td>Asalt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4c</td>
<td>Property Issues</td>
<td>Probleme legate de bunuri materiale</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4c</td>
<td>Armed Conflict</td>
<td>Conflict armat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4d</td>
<td>Hunting or Sport</td>
<td>Vânătoare sau sport</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4c</td>
<td>It’s part of my job</td>
<td>Ca parte a serviciului meu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4c</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Altele</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**ANNEX C: FIREARMS ONLINE PERCEPTION SURVEY INSTRUMENT**

**Q4bb**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Response Options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Who committed the gun violence?</td>
<td>Cine a comis acest act de violeță cu armă de foc?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4b partner Husband or Boyfriend</td>
<td>Soț sau iubit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4b partner Wife or Girlfriend</td>
<td>Soție sau iubită</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4d Father</td>
<td>Tată</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4d Mother</td>
<td>Mamă</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4d Brother</td>
<td>Frate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4d Sister</td>
<td>Soră</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4d Female Relative</td>
<td>Rudă/de sex feminin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4d Male Relative</td>
<td>Rudă/de sex masculin</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Q4b partner**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Response Options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Which best describes what the gun was used for:</td>
<td>Ne puteți spune dacă arma de foc a fost folosită la:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assault</td>
<td>Asalt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual violence</td>
<td>Intimidare și amenințare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impose financial control</td>
<td>Impunerea controlului financiar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limit movement and contacts</td>
<td>Limitare mișcării și a contactului</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intimidate and threaten</td>
<td>Violeță sexuală</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Altele</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Q4c**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Response Options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Who committed the MOST RECENT act of gun violence?</td>
<td>Cine a fost implicat cel mai recent într-un act de violeță cu armă de foc?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close family/relative</td>
<td>Membru al familiei/rudă apropiată</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbor</td>
<td>Vecin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thief</td>
<td>Hoț</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police or military</td>
<td>Poliție sau militari</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal</td>
<td>Alți infractori</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner</td>
<td>Partener</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex-partner</td>
<td>Fost-partener</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friend / Acquaintance</td>
<td>Prieten/cunoștință</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown / Don’t know</td>
<td>Necunoscut/Nu știu</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Q4d**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Response Options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>When was it?</td>
<td>Când s-a întâmplat?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within this year</td>
<td>Anul acesta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 to 5 years ago</td>
<td>1- 5 ani în urmă</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 to 15 years ago</td>
<td>6- 15 ani în urmă</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 15 years ago</td>
<td>Mai mult de 15 ani în urmă</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know / can’t remember</td>
<td>Nu știu/nu țin minte</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Q4e**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Response Options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Who do you feel is committing more gun crimes in your community?</td>
<td>De către cine credeți că sunt comise cele mai multe atacuri cu arme de foc în comunitatea Dvs.?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juveniles</td>
<td>Minorii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adults</td>
<td>Adulții</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Module D

**Q5a** Randomize Q5a + b + c  
Which of the following would be most effective to making your community safer?  
Care din următoarele măsuri ar fi cele mai eficiente pentru a face comunitatea Dvs. mai sigură?

- More police or authorities present  
  Prezența mai mare a poliției sau a autorităților
- Violence awareness campaigns  
  Campanii de conștientizare a violenței
- Stricter gun control regulations  
  Reglementări mai stricte cu privire la controlul armelor de foc
- More people owning guns so that they can protect themselves  
  Mai multe persoane deținători de arme de foc pentru a se putea proteja
- Weapons risk education  
  Educație despre riscul armelor
- People giving up their guns  
  Persoane care renunță voluntar la arme de foc

**Q5b** Randomize Q5a + b + c  
Would having a gun at home make you feel:  
Dacă ați avea o armă de foc acasă, cum v-ar face să vă simțiți?

- Safer  
  Mai în siguranță
- Less safe  
  Mai puțin în siguranță

**Q5c** Randomize Q5a + b + c  
Would you personally own a gun?  
Ați dori să dețineți o armă de foc?

If yes go to Q5d  
Yes  
Da

If no go to Q5e  
No  
Nu

**Q5d** anchor behind Q5c. If Q5c = yes  
What would be the main reason for owning a gun?  
Care ar fi motivul principal pentru care ați dori să dețineți o armă de foc

- For protection/safety  
  Pentru protecție/siguranță
- Everyone has one  
  Toată lumea deține una
- IF A MAN  
  A man should carry a gun  
  Bărbatul trebuie să poarte armă de foc
- IF A WOMAN  
  A woman should carry a gun  
  Femeia trebuie să poarte armă de foc
- It inspires fear in others  
  Insuflă frică în alte persoane
- Hunting and sport  
  Pentru vânătoare și sport
- Tradition  
  Tradiție
- Other  
  Altele

**Q5e** Anchor behind Q5c. If Q5c = No/Unsure  
What is the main reason you would not own a gun?  
Care este motivul principal pentru care nu ați dori să dețineți o armă de foc

- Not legal in my country  
  Nu este legal în țara mea
- Don’t need one  
  Nu am nevoie
- It’s unsafe to have a gun  
  Este periculos să deții o armă de foc
- Can’t afford one  
  Nu-mi permit
- Don’t know how to get one  
  Nu știu cum să obțin o armă de foc
- Don’t know how to use one  
  Nu știu cum să folosesc o armă de foc
- Other  
  Altele
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q5f</th>
<th>Anchor at end of Module</th>
<th>Are you aware that there are penalties for illegal possession of weapons?</th>
<th>Știați că există sancțiuni pentru portul ilegal de arme de foc?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Da</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Nu</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Module E**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q6</th>
<th>MULTISELECT</th>
<th>Which of the following most promotes the use of guns? (Select the top two)</th>
<th>Care din următoarele promovează cel mai mult folosirea armelor de foc? Vă rugăm selectați cele mai importante două opțiuni.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pictures or posters of guns</td>
<td>Fotografii sau postere cu arme de foc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Social media</td>
<td>Mass media</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Videos showing guns, incl. movie trailers and music videos</td>
<td>Spoturi video ce arată arme de foc, inclusiv filme și videoclipuri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Music lyrics about guns</td>
<td>Versurile despre arme de foc din cântece</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>News on firearm-related incidents</td>
<td>Știri cu privire la incidentele cu arme de foc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Seeing friends or other people with guns</td>
<td>Prieteni sau alte persoane care dețin arme de foc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pro-Gun lobby groups</td>
<td>Grupuri de lobby pro-arme</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Module F**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q7a</th>
<th>Randomize Q7a+b+c</th>
<th>What is the highest level of education you have completed?</th>
<th>Care este ultimul nivel de studii obținut de Dvs?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Primar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>Secundar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Post-secondary vocational training</td>
<td>Formare profesională post-secundară</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bachelor’s degree</td>
<td>Diplomă</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Master’s degree or higher</td>
<td>Masterat sau mai înalt</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q7b</th>
<th>Randomize Q7a+b+c</th>
<th>Including yourself, how many people live in your home?</th>
<th>Câte persoane locuiesc în casa Dvs., inclusiv Dvs.?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6+</td>
<td></td>
<td>6+</td>
<td>6+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q7c</th>
<th>Randomize Q7a+b+c</th>
<th>In Euros, what is your monthly household income?</th>
<th>Care este venitul lunar al gospodării Dvs. în Euro?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No income</td>
<td>Nu am venit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Less than 200 EUR</td>
<td>Mai puțin de 200 EUR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>200-500 EUR</td>
<td>200-500 EUR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>More than 500 EUR</td>
<td>Mai mult de 500 EUR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Thank you</td>
<td>Mulțumim</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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