

Annex E. Right to Water and Sanitation

Link to the following SDGs:



1. Right to water and sanitation prior to the COVID-19 pandemic

According to the VNR progress report, between 2014 and 2018, the access of the population to water sources gradually increased by 9%, to 82.1% in 2018. The proportion of the rural population enjoying access to water supply sources increased from 56.9% in 2014 to 71.2% in 2018. Access to sanitation increased mainly due to the expansion of the sewerage system in urban areas. At national level, in 2018 29.3% of the stable population of the Republic of Moldova was connected to a centralized sewerage system, including 64.1% of the population in urban areas but only 2.8% in rural areas¹. There are major discrepancies concerning the connection to water supply and sewerage between urban and rural localities, and between regions. The degree of connection to water supply and sewerage exceeds 85% in urban localities, while in rural localities its average is only about 36%².

Around 44% of people in the country do not have access to safe potable water. The national sanitation authority estimates that around 80% of the wells, often the main source of water in villages, do not meet safety norms due to natural or human-made factors.³ Water resources are polluted and scarce, increasing the risk of competition between different uses and users. Current investments are insufficient and streamlined to localities that are already covered with infrastructure⁴.

2. The impact of the pandemic of COVID-19 on the right to water and sanitation

Access to safe water and sanitation is key in the context of protection against COVID-19. Given inequalities based on factors such as area of residence, ethnicity, culture and socio-economic status, significant numbers of people in Moldova still do not have access to these basic human rights. Limited access to water and poor sanitation lead to a vicious cycle of increased infection risk, poor health outcomes and a poor standard of living.

a) Perceptions of the rights holders

According to the data of the OHCHR survey, 23.6% of respondents (7.9% for the Left bank) mentioned that they did not have access to centralized water supply systems/aqueduct. Respondents with incomplete general education (40.1% for the Right bank and 18.2% for the Left bank), people with low socio-economic status (40.9% for the Right bank and 19.8% for the Left bank) and people from rural areas (33.5% for the Right bank and 14.9% for the Left bank) were more affected.

Other important water supply sources, as mentioned by the respondents, were: fountain in the yard (40.2% for the Right bank and 23% for the Left bank); public fountains (35.3% for the Right bank and 9.2% for the Left bank); surface water, such as rivers, lakes or other natural pools (21% for the Right bank and 2.3% for the Left bank); and automatic system through a tanker (16.8% for the Right bank and 5.3% for the Left bank). Also, 31.9% of respondents (31.6% for the Left bank) stated that bottled water was also a source of water supply.

Access to warm water: Despite the fact that washing the hands frequently is key to protect oneself against COVID-19, OHCHR data shows that 14% of the respondents (7.9% for the Left bank) did not

¹ National Voluntary Review, Progress report available at: [26346VNR 2020 Moldova Report English.pdf \(un.org\)](https://www.md.undp.org/content/moldova/en/home/sustainable-development-goals/goal-6-clean-water-and-sanitation.html#:~:text=In%20cities%20and%20towns%2C%20only,access%20to%20safe%20potable%20water.), p. 12.

² Ibid, p. 91.

³ <https://www.md.undp.org/content/moldova/en/home/sustainable-development-goals/goal-6-clean-water-and-sanitation.html#:~:text=In%20cities%20and%20towns%2C%20only,access%20to%20safe%20potable%20water.>

⁴ http://apasan.skat.ch/wp-content/uploads/2017/11/Concept-note-for-National-WSSP_ENG.pdf

have access to warm water to wash their hands frequently. Those more affected include people with low socio-economic status (34% for the Right bank and 18.8% for the Left bank), incomplete general education (24.8% for the Right bank and 19.7% for the Left bank), persons with disabilities/reduced activity capacities (24.4% for the Right bank), persons from rural areas (19.3% for the Right bank and 12.8% for the Left bank), economically inactive people (18.7% for the Right bank and 9% for the Left bank) and people of the age group 60+ (18.5% for the Right bank).

Adequate sewage disposal: 55.8% of respondents (24.7% on the Left bank) informed that their house was not connected to centralized sewerage. The access to centralised systems is different in urban and rural areas, which shows the significant difference between the Right and Left bank. This share was higher in case of the age group 60+ (64.5% for the Right bank and 30.4% for the Left bank), for people with incomplete general education (76.3% for the Right bank and 31.8% for the Left bank); persons with disabilities/reduced activity capacities (64.8% for the Right bank and 33.3% for the Left bank); economically inactive people (65% for the Right bank and 28% for the Left bank); people with low economic status (82.8% for the Right bank and 39.6% for the Left bank) and people from rural areas (83.8% for the Right bank and 58.5% for the Left bank).

At the same time, 34% of respondents mentioned that they did not have the toilet inside the house. This share being higher for people with incomplete general studies (59%), persons with disabilities/reduced activity capacities (45.2%), persons with low socio-economic status (75.7%) and persons from rural area (54.4%). As in case of access to sewerage, the situation with regards to the disposal of the toilets in-house is better in case of the Transnistria region, with 11.5% of the respondents mentioning that they did not have a toilet within the house.

3. Impact on vulnerable groups

One of the most vulnerable groups in the realisation of the right to water and sanitation are **people living in rural areas**⁵, **households with persons with disabilities** (only 6.1% of households with persons with disabilities have access to sewerage compared to 17.7% of households without persons with disabilities) and **people living in poverty** (only 10% of households are connected to sewerage compared to 36.8% in more affluent households)⁶.

While there has been a positive trend over the last seven years, significant disparities persist in terms of access to public water supply and access to a sewerage system. The Council of Europe also highlighted the limited access to water and sanitation, notably in rural areas⁷. However, while it appears that inequalities in access to public water supply and sewerage between rural and urban areas is decreasing because of the increasing income of people from rural areas, and because authorities and development partners have invested more in rural areas⁸, more needs to be done.

Roma. Regardless of community services, the households of Roma benefit less from services and utilities than non-Roma. The data of the study on inequalities outlines discrepancies with regards to

⁵ Council of Europe, Report on Needs Assessment in the area of Social Rights in the Republic of Moldova, see: <https://rm.coe.int/moldova-needs-assessment-31-12-2020-final/1680a18a35>

⁶ East European Foundation, Partnership for Development Center, Study on inequalities, see: https://www.eef.md/media/files/files/study-inequalities-final_5833871.pdf

⁷ Council of Europe, Report on Needs Assessment in the area of Social Rights in the Republic of Moldova, available at: <https://rm.coe.int/moldova-needs-assessment-31-12-2020-final/1680a18a35>

⁸ East European Foundation, Partnership for Development Center, Study on inequalities, available at: https://www.eef.md/media/files/files/study-inequalities-final_5833871.pdf

access to aqueducts (73.8% Roma households vs 80.4% non-Roma), and sewerage (28.2% Roma households vs 39.3% non-Roma)⁹.

According to the OHCHR survey, Roma households have a much lower access to **sewerage at home or to a flushing toilet** than non-Roma. In particular, only 18.7% Roma households are connected to sewerage compared to 44.2% non-Roma, and 39.3% of respondents indicated that they had a toilet inside the house versus 66% non-Roma. Significant discrepancies were identified within Roma communities along the socio-economic lines and place of residence, and vis a vis non-Roma. According to the survey, just 2.7% of low-income Roma and none of the respondents from rural areas had access to sewerage. Even high-income Roma had twice-lower access to sewerage than the general population with 34.2% vs 64.5%. Only 4.1% of low-income Roma reported having a flushing toilet compared to 24.3% non-Roma; and Roma in rural areas - 23.2% versus 45.6% non-Roma.

Warm water was accessible for 56.2% of Roma population and 86% non-Roma during the lockdown. The biggest disparity in access to warm water was found among low-income Roma with 27.4%, which was considerably lower than of middle-income Roma – 52.1%, and high-income Roma – 89%, and low-income non-Roma - 66%. Roma in rural areas also had one of the lowest percentages of access to warm water - 42.9% compared to Roma in urban areas – 60.7% and non-Roma in rural areas – 80.7%.

Prisoners. Prisons on both banks have preserved the former-Soviet water and sewage infrastructure and prisons number 1 in Glinoe (Left bank), number 8 in Bender and female prison number 7 in Rusca (Right bank) have poor water quality. Limited access to soap, which is allocated to prisoners on a monthly basis in a set quantity, and disinfectants in prisons in general, constitute a challenge.

4. Conclusion

A significant number of people in Moldova, especially those from rural areas, Roma, and people with low socio-economic status have limited access to safe water and sanitation.

⁹ Ibid

Table 1. What are the sources of your family's water supply? (The Right bank)

		Centralized water supply/water pipes		Well in the yard		Public well – outside the yard		Surface water (river, lake or other natural water body)		Automatic system via tanker truck		Bottled water	
		Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
Total		76.4%	23.6%	40.2%	59.8%	35.3%	64.7%	21.0%	79.0%	16.8%	83.2%	31.9%	68.1%
Respondent's gender:	Male	77.9%	22.1%	39.7%	60.3%	33.9%	66.1%	21.0%	79.0%	16.2%	83.8%	35.2%	64.8%
	Female	75.2%	24.8%	40.6%	59.4%	36.3%	63.7%	20.9%	79.1%	17.4%	82.6%	29.4%	70.6%
Respondent's age:	18-29 years old	76.6%	23.4%	26.6%	73.4%	36.7%	63.3%	17.9%	82.1%	15.7%	84.3%	35.6%	64.4%
	30-44 years old	76.7%	23.3%	38.5%	61.5%	28.4%	71.6%	19.8%	80.2%	18.3%	81.7%	36.0%	64.0%
	45-59 years old	75.4%	24.6%	47.8%	52.2%	35.5%	64.5%	23.1%	76.9%	16.2%	83.8%	28.8%	71.2%
	60+ years old	76.8%	23.2%	44.7%	55.3%	41.9%	58.1%	22.4%	77.6%	16.5%	83.5%	27.4%	72.6%
Respondent's education:	Post-primary	59.9%	40.1%	45.6%	54.4%	45.1%	54.9%	25.0%	75.0%	18.7%	81.3%	25.3%	74.7%
	General secondary	75.8%	24.2%	47.3%	52.7%	40.5%	59.5%	24.1%	75.9%	21.5%	78.5%	29.6%	70.4%
	Vocational	73.8%	26.2%	44.4%	55.6%	37.5%	62.5%	22.1%	77.9%	18.5%	81.5%	29.0%	71.0%
	Higher	85.8%	14.2%	30.1%	69.9%	26.1%	73.9%	16.4%	83.6%	11.3%	88.7%	38.5%	61.5%
Reduced working capacity:	Yes	73.6%	26.4%	47.5%	52.5%	42.4%	57.6%	24.1%	75.9%	18.1%	81.9%	25.3%	74.7%
	No	77.4%	22.6%	37.5%	62.5%	32.6%	67.4%	19.8%	80.2%	16.4%	83.6%	34.4%	65.6%
Language of communication:	Moldavian/Romanian	73.2%	26.8%	44.4%	55.6%	37.2%	62.8%	21.2%	78.8%	16.2%	83.8%	32.4%	67.6%
	Russian or other	83.8%	16.2%	30.3%	69.7%	30.8%	69.2%	20.5%	79.5%	18.3%	81.7%	30.7%	69.3%
Occupational status:	Economically active	81.8%	18.2%	32.9%	67.1%	30.1%	69.9%	17.4%	82.6%	16.2%	83.8%	38.2%	61.8%
	Economically inactive	72.6%	27.4%	45.2%	54.8%	38.8%	61.2%	23.4%	76.6%	17.3%	82.7%	27.7%	72.3%
Socioeconomic status:	Low level	59.1%	40.9%	45.6%	54.4%	51.6%	48.4%	23.1%	76.9%	12.9%	87.1%	21.7%	78.3%
	Average level	79.3%	20.7%	41.5%	58.5%	29.6%	70.4%	20.2%	79.8%	15.3%	84.7%	29.3%	70.7%
	High level	87.5%	12.5%	34.7%	65.3%	27.4%	72.6%	19.9%	80.1%	21.4%	78.6%	42.5%	57.5%
Locality:	City	86.7%	13.3%	23.2%	76.8%	25.3%	74.7%	15.7%	84.3%	14.6%	85.4%	41.0%	59.0%
	Village	66.5%	33.5%	56.4%	43.6%	44.8%	55.2%	25.9%	74.1%	18.9%	81.1%	23.2%	76.8%

Table 2. What are the sources of your family's water supply? (The Left bank)

		Water pipes		Well in the yard		Public well – outside the yard		Surface water		Automatic system via tanker truck		Bottled water	
		Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
Total		92.1%	7.9%	23.0%	77.0%	9.2%	90.8%	2.6%	97.4%	5.3%	94.7%	31.6%	68.4%
Respondent's gender:	Male	93.9%	6.1%	28.8%	71.2%	11.4%	88.6%	2.3%	97.7%	6.1%	93.9%	40.2%	59.8%
	Female	90.7%	9.3%	18.6%	81.4%	7.6%	92.4%	2.9%	97.1%	4.7%	95.3%	25.0%	75.0%
Respondent's age:	18-29 years old	95.4%	4.6%	24.1%	75.9%	9.2%	90.8%	2.3%	97.7%	6.9%	93.1%	42.5%	57.5%
	30-44 years old	93.0%	7.0%	22.1%	77.9%	5.8%	94.2%	2.3%	97.7%	4.7%	95.3%	44.2%	55.8%
	45-59 years old	88.5%	11.5%	25.0%	75.0%	11.5%	88.5%	3.8%	96.2%	5.8%	94.2%	15.4%	84.6%
	60+ years old	89.9%	10.1%	21.5%	78.5%	11.4%	88.6%	2.5%	97.5%	3.8%	96.2%	16.5%	83.5%
Educational level:	Post-primary / Secondary	81.8%	18.2%	30.3%	69.7%	15.2%	84.8%	3.0%	97.0%	9.1%	90.9%	22.7%	77.3%
	Vocational	94.4%	5.6%	23.2%	76.8%	7.2%	92.8%	4.0%	96.0%	2.4%	97.6%	22.4%	77.6%
	Higher	97.3%	2.7%	17.1%	82.9%	8.1%	91.9%	0.9%	99.1%	6.3%	93.7%	47.7%	52.3%
Reduced working capacity:	Yes	82.2%	17.8%	24.4%	75.6%	8.9%	91.1%	8.9%	91.1%	4.4%	95.6%	24.4%	75.6%
	No	93.8%	6.2%	22.8%	77.2%	9.3%	90.7%	1.5%	98.5%	5.4%	94.6%	32.8%	67.2%
Occupational status:	Economically active	95.7%	4.3%	20.4%	79.6%	6.5%	93.5%	2.2%	97.8%	8.6%	91.4%	45.2%	54.8%
	Economically inactive	90.5%	9.5%	24.2%	75.8%	10.4%	89.6%	2.8%	97.2%	3.8%	96.2%	25.6%	74.4%
Socioeconomic status:	Low level	80.2%	19.8%	32.7%	67.3%	15.8%	84.2%	6.9%	93.1%	4.0%	96.0%	16.8%	83.2%
	Average level	97.5%	2.5%	17.5%	82.5%	6.3%	93.8%	1.3%	98.8%	2.5%	97.5%	33.8%	66.3%
	High level	98.4%	1.6%	18.7%	81.3%	5.7%	94.3%	0.0%	100.0%	8.1%	91.9%	42.3%	57.7%
Locality:	City	95.2%	4.8%	8.6%	91.4%	1.9%	98.1%	1.0%	99.0%	5.2%	94.8%	29.0%	71.0%
	Village	85.1%	14.9%	55.3%	44.7%	25.5%	74.5%	6.4%	93.6%	5.3%	94.7%	37.2%	62.8%

Table 3. What are the sources of your family's water supply? (Roma)

		Centralized water supply/water pipes		Well in the yard		Public well – outside the yard		Surface water (river, lake or other natural water body)		Automatic system via tanker truck		Bottled water	
		Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
Total		75.8%	24.2%	16.0%	84.0%	32.9%	67.1%	0.5%	99.5%	0.9%	99.1%	21.9%	78.1%
Respondent's gender:	Male	69.7%	30.3%	18.4%	81.6%	34.2%	65.8%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	21.1%	78.9%
	Female	79.0%	21.0%	14.7%	85.3%	32.2%	67.8%	0.7%	99.3%	1.4%	98.6%	22.4%	77.6%
Respondent's age:	18-29 years old	65.9%	34.1%	17.1%	82.9%	41.5%	58.5%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	31.7%	68.3%
	30-44 years old	72.6%	27.4%	19.4%	80.6%	37.1%	62.9%	0.0%	100.0%	1.6%	98.4%	19.4%	80.6%
	45-59 years old	70.9%	29.1%	18.2%	81.8%	32.7%	67.3%	1.8%	98.2%	1.8%	98.2%	27.3%	72.7%
	60+ years old	90.2%	9.8%	9.8%	90.2%	23.0%	77.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	13.1%	86.9%
Respondent's education:	Primary education or without	75.2%	24.8%	7.7%	92.3%	28.2%	71.8%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	17.9%	82.1%
	Secondary or incomplete education	76.5%	23.5%	25.5%	74.5%	38.2%	61.8%	1.0%	99.0%	2.0%	98.0%	26.5%	73.5%
Reduced working capacity:	Yes	80.3%	19.7%	13.6%	86.4%	31.8%	68.2%	1.5%	98.5%	1.5%	98.5%	19.7%	80.3%
	No	73.9%	26.1%	17.0%	83.0%	33.3%	66.7%	0.0%	100.0%	0.7%	99.3%	22.9%	77.1%
Socioeconomic status:	Low level	54.8%	45.2%	9.6%	90.4%	42.5%	57.5%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	8.2%	91.8%
	Average level	82.2%	17.8%	16.4%	83.6%	28.8%	71.2%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	26.0%	74.0%
	High level	90.4%	9.6%	21.9%	78.1%	27.4%	72.6%	1.4%	98.6%	2.7%	97.3%	31.5%	68.5%
Locality:	City	75.5%	24.5%	14.1%	85.9%	25.8%	74.2%	0.6%	99.4%	0.6%	99.4%	22.1%	77.9%
	Village	76.8%	23.2%	21.4%	78.6%	53.6%	46.4%	0.0%	100.0%	1.8%	98.2%	21.4%	78.6%

Table 4. Your house: (The Right bank)

		is connected to the central sewerage system		Toilet in the house	
		Yes	No	Yes	No
Total		44.2%	55.8%	66.0%	34.0%
Respondent's gender:	Male	45.0%	55.0%	69.2%	30.8%
	Female	43.6%	56.4%	63.4%	36.6%
Respondent's age:	18-29 years old	50.5%	49.5%	69.4%	30.6%
	30-44 years old	50.3%	49.7%	70.5%	29.5%
	45-59 years old	41.4%	58.6%	60.9%	39.1%
	60+ years old	35.5%	64.5%	62.9%	37.1%
Respondent's education:	Post-primary	23.7%	76.3%	41.0%	59.0%
	General secondary	35.2%	64.8%	52.7%	47.3%
	Vocational	38.9%	61.1%	60.5%	39.5%
	Higher	62.9%	37.1%	88.5%	11.5%
Reduced working capacity:	Yes	35.2%	64.8%	54.8%	45.2%
	No	47.5%	52.5%	70.1%	29.9%
Language of communication:	Moldavian/Romanian	38.9%	61.1%	60.7%	39.3%
	Russian or other	56.6%	43.4%	78.4%	21.6%
Occupational status:	Economically active	57.6%	42.4%	78.5%	21.5%
	Economically inactive	35.0%	65.0%	57.4%	42.6%
Socioeconomic status:	Low level	17.2%	82.8%	24.3%	75.7%
	Average level	45.6%	54.4%	72.3%	27.7%
	High level	64.5%	35.5%	93.4%	6.6%
Locality:	City	73.7%	26.3%	87.4%	12.6%
	Village	16.2%	83.8%	45.6%	54.4%

Table 5. Your house/apartment is connected to/has ... (The Left bank)

		centralized sewerage		Do you have a toilet in your house?		During the pandemic, did you have access to hot water for frequent hand washing at home?	
		Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
Total		75.3%	24.7%	88.5%	11.5%	92.1%	7.9%
Respondent's gender:	Male	74.2%	25.8%	89.4%	10.6%	93.2%	6.8%
	Female	76.2%	23.8%	87.8%	12.2%	91.3%	8.7%
Respondent's age:	18-29 years old	85.1%	14.9%	92.0%	8.0%	93.1%	6.9%
	30-44 years old	73.3%	26.7%	88.4%	11.6%	93.0%	7.0%
	45-59 years old	71.2%	28.8%	84.6%	15.4%	90.4%	9.6%
	60+ years old	69.6%	30.4%	87.3%	12.7%	91.1%	8.9%
Educational level:	Post-primary / Secondary	68.2%	31.8%	74.2%	25.8%	80.3%	19.7%
	Vocational	71.2%	28.8%	89.6%	10.4%	92.0%	8.0%
	Higher	85.6%	14.4%	95.5%	4.5%	99.1%	0.9%
Reduced working capacity:	Yes	66.7%	33.3%	84.4%	15.6%	86.7%	13.3%
	No	76.8%	23.2%	89.2%	10.8%	93.1%	6.9%
Occupational status:	Economically active	82.8%	17.2%	92.5%	7.5%	94.6%	5.4%
	Economically inactive	72.0%	28.0%	86.7%	13.3%	91.0%	9.0%
Socioeconomic status:	Low level	60.4%	39.6%	69.3%	30.7%	81.2%	18.8%
	Average level	85.0%	15.0%	96.3%	3.8%	96.3%	3.8%
	High level	81.3%	18.7%	99.2%	0.8%	98.4%	1.6%
Locality:	City	90.5%	9.5%	94.8%	5.2%	94.3%	5.7%
	Village	41.5%	58.5%	74.5%	25.5%	87.2%	12.8%

Table 6. Your house is connected to ... (Roma)

		centralized sewerage		Toilet in the house	
		Yes	No	Yes	No
Total		18.7%	81.3%	39.3%	60.7%
Respondent's gender:	Male	21.1%	78.9%	32.9%	67.1%
	Female	17.5%	82.5%	42.7%	57.3%
Respondent's age:	18-29 years old	29.3%	70.7%	48.8%	51.2%
	30-44 years old	17.7%	82.3%	37.1%	62.9%
	45-59 years old	14.5%	85.5%	32.7%	67.3%
	60+ years old	16.4%	83.6%	41.0%	59.0%
Respondent's education:	Primary education or without	17.9%	82.1%	38.5%	61.5%
	Secondary or incomplete education	19.6%	80.4%	40.2%	59.8%
Reduced working capacity:	Yes	16.7%	83.3%	34.8%	65.2%
	No	19.6%	80.4%	41.2%	58.8%
Socioeconomic status:	Low level	2.7%	97.3%	4.1%	95.9%
	Average level	19.2%	80.8%	37.0%	63.0%
	High level	34.2%	65.8%	76.7%	23.3%
Locality:	City	25.2%	74.8%	44.8%	55.2%
	Village	0.0%	100.0%	23.2%	76.8%

Table 7. During the pandemic, did you have ...? (The Right bank)

		access to hot water for frequent hand washing at home?		delays in paying for utilities (water, electricity, natural gas) due to lack of money?	
		Yes	No	Yes	No
Total		86.0%	14.0%	19.9%	80.1%
Respondent's gender:	Male	88.0%	12.0%	15.2%	84.8%
	Female	84.4%	15.6%	23.6%	76.4%
Respondent's age:	18-29 years old	88.8%	11.2%	24.1%	75.9%
	30-44 years old	88.4%	11.6%	27.3%	72.7%
	45-59 years old	85.8%	14.2%	16.7%	83.3%
	60+ years old	81.5%	18.5%	11.5%	88.5%
Respondent's education:	Post-primary	75.2%	24.8%	20.4%	79.6%
	General secondary	78.7%	21.3%	21.6%	78.4%
	Vocational	85.9%	14.1%	22.8%	77.2%
	Higher	94.7%	5.3%	15.3%	84.7%
Reduced working capacity:	Yes	75.6%	24.4%	20.1%	79.9%
	No	89.8%	10.2%	19.9%	80.1%
Language of communication:	Moldavian/Romanian	83.9%	16.1%	21.5%	78.5%
	Russian or other	90.7%	9.3%	16.2%	83.8%
Occupational status:	Economically active	92.7%	7.3%	19.4%	80.6%
	Economically inactive	81.3%	18.7%	20.3%	79.7%
Socioeconomic status:	Low level	66.0%	34.0%	24.6%	75.4%
	Average level	90.8%	9.2%	16.9%	83.1%
	High level	97.5%	2.5%	19.0%	81.0%
Locality:	City	91.5%	8.5%	21.4%	78.6%
	Village	80.7%	19.3%	18.5%	81.5%

Table 8. During the pandemic, did you have to delay payments for utilities (water, electricity, natural gas) due to lack of money? (The Left bank)

		Yes	No
Total		22.0%	78.0%
Respondent's gender:	Male	19.7%	80.3%
	Female	23.8%	76.2%
Respondent's age:	18-29 years old	20.7%	79.3%
	30-44 years old	38.4%	61.6%
	45-59 years old	13.5%	86.5%
	60+ years old	11.4%	88.6%
Educational level:	Post-primary / Secondary	21.2%	78.8%
	Vocational	23.2%	76.8%
	Higher	20.7%	79.3%
Reduced performance:	Yes	26.7%	73.3%
	No	21.2%	78.8%
Occupational status:	Economically active	20.4%	79.6%
	Economically inactive	22.7%	77.3%
Socioeconomic status:	Low level	33.7%	66.3%
	Average level	17.5%	82.5%
	High level	15.4%	84.6%
Locality:	City	21.4%	78.6%
	Village	23.4%	76.6%

Table 9. During the pandemic, did you have... (Roma)

		Access to hot water for frequent hand washing at home?		Delays in paying for utilities (water, electricity, natural gas) due to lack of money?	
		Yes	No	Yes	No
Total		56.2%	43.8%	49.8%	50.2%
Respondent's gender:	Male	51.3%	48.7%	40.8%	59.2%
	Female	58.7%	41.3%	54.5%	45.5%
Respondent's age:	18-29 years old	65.9%	34.1%	43.9%	56.1%
	30-44 years old	51.6%	48.4%	59.7%	40.3%
	45-59 years old	50.9%	49.1%	47.3%	52.7%
	60+ years old	59.0%	41.0%	45.9%	54.1%
Respondent's education:	Primary education or without	51.3%	48.7%	50.4%	49.6%
	Secondary or incomplete education	61.8%	38.2%	49.0%	51.0%
Reduced working capacity:	Yes	45.5%	54.5%	59.1%	40.9%
	No	60.8%	39.2%	45.8%	54.2%
Socioeconomic status:	Low level	27.4%	72.6%	56.2%	43.8%
	Average level	52.1%	47.9%	46.6%	53.4%
	High level	89.0%	11.0%	46.6%	53.4%
Locality:	City	60.7%	39.3%	47.2%	52.8%
	Village	42.9%	57.1%	57.1%	42.9%

