

**Interreg
Danube Region**



Co-funded by
the European Union


Circular DigiBuild

CircularDigiBuild

DRP0200309

D.3.3.3 Regional Outlines on Pilots – Consolidated Report

Regional Outlines on Pilots

Consolidated report of partner feedback for the Working Group Piloting – Deliverable D.3.3.3

Deliverable	D.3.3.3 – Regional outlines on pilots (Activity 3.3 – Promotion of pilots in Danube region, Period 5)
Description	Short reports with suggestions on possible improvements of the three CDB pilots, provided to the Working Group Piloting (WGP) as input for the Plan for up-scaling (Activity 3.4, D.3.4.1)
Consolidated by	LP01 BAA – Business Agency Association, Bulgaria
Sources	Regional outlines of all 13 CDB partner countries, based on RMSG feedback and promotional round tours
Date	30.06.2026; updated 09.10.2026 (regional outlines of Austria, Bulgaria and the Republic of Moldova added)

1. Introduction

Within Activity 3.3 the partners presented the three Circular DigiBuild pilots to its Regional Multi-Stakeholder Group (RMSG) and in promotional "round tours", collected feedback on their relevance, transferability and possible improvements, and summarised it in a regional outline for the Working Group Piloting. This updated version includes the regional outlines of all 13 partner countries. This report consolidates the regional outlines and translates them into common recommendations for the WGP and for the Plan for up-scaling (D.3.4.1).

The three pilots assessed were:

- **Pilot 1 – Urban Mining Screener (Austria, PP3 AWS / revitalize FlexCo, TU Graz):** open-source tool estimating material quantities in existing buildings from archetype models and OpenStreetMap 3D data.
- **Pilot 2 – Digital Identifiers for Construction Elements (Bulgaria, PP2 ReCheck / Varna Municipality):** unique digital identifiers (UUObject protocol) for construction and infrastructure elements, enabling traceability and lifecycle management of municipal assets.

- **Pilot 3 – AI/ML for Smart Building Sensor Minimisation (Croatia, PP15 ICENT / University of Zagreb FER):** machine-learning "soft sensors" replacing physical sensors, reducing investment, maintenance and electronic waste.

2. Overview of the regional feedback

Country / partner	Activities used to collect feedback	Most relevant pilot
Austria PP03 aws	Graz Open Architecture, TU Graz 27.06.2025; Impact Awards at EXPO REAL, Munich 6–8.10.2025; Stammtisch Perspektive Bau, Salzburg 03.12.2025; discussions with two federal ministries	Pilot 1 – developed and validated in Austria (Innsbruck district: ~55,061 t of materials and 8,610 t CO ₂ e estimated; >90% accuracy; ~80% time saving)
Bosnia and Herzegovina PP11 SERDA	Stakeholder consultation with questionnaires (May–June 2026); online meeting 11.06.2026	Pilot 2 – addresses fragmented infrastructure records and asset traceability
Bulgaria PP17 EDIHCS	Pilot promotional event, Pravets 24.06.2026 (16)	Pilot 2 – implemented and accepted by Varna Municipality; open source, no licence fees, data under municipal control
Croatia PP14 TERA, PP15 ICENT	Innovation Forum, Rijeka 27.10.2025 (~15); Job Fair, Zagreb 13.05.2026 (~15); TERA Club Coffee, Osijek 08.06.2026 (11)	Pilot 3 – highest transferability, no country-specific adaptation needed
Czech Republic PP05 INCIEN	Joint CZ–SK RMSG 15.04.2026 (Miro); Partnership For 29.04.2026; Reconmatic conference 27.05.2026; CZGBC SUSMAT 16.06.2026	All three relevant; Pilot 1 most highlighted (demolition planning, material estimation)
Germany PP04 HSH	Three presentations integrated into existing events: VHS Hof 25.04.2026; University of Bayreuth 28.04.2026; BauPuls360 (TU Munich, hybrid) 24.06.2026 – 45 participants in total	Pilot 1 – open-source code on GitHub, strongest perceived applicability
Hungary PP08 PBKIK	RMSG 13.05.2026 (11); Industry Days trade exhibition 19.05.2026 (~18)	Pilot 3 – energy efficiency and operating costs are the most pressing market need
Moldova PP16 BAC	Stand at the PRIA conference, Chişinău 22.05.2026 (25); RMSG workshop, Chişinău 11.06.2026 (9); online event with live demo of Pilot 1, 29.06.2026 (25), back-to-back with RMSG 8	Pilot 1 – fastest and cheapest to adopt, no data on the building stock and CDW; Pilot 2 a close second as the best fit for local authorities
Montenegro PP13 ZWMNE	Round tours 22, 23 and 24.04.2026 (2 on site, 1 online); RMSG 6 29.04.2026 (9)	Pilot 2 – first step to an infrastructure cadastre and a materials/components bank
Romania PP09 IRCCEM, PP10 ADR Vest	Stakeholder meeting and BIM workshop for local public administration (RMSG 7), ADR Vest, Timișoara 23.06.2026 (39 registered)	Pilot 2 – structured asset information and material traceability; matches the TAP objective on digital platforms for material tracking and waste management

Country / partner	Activities used to collect feedback	Most relevant pilot
Serbia PP12 STP NS	Pilot Round Tours (90-min workshops) at STP Novi Sad 04.05.2026, STP Belgrade 14.05.2026 (8) and STP Niš 22.05.2026; national RMSG (TAP)	Pilot 1 – lack of data on material stocks, supports TAP measures and the 40% CDW recovery target; Pilot 2 a close second
Slovakia PP06 SBA	Joint CZ–SK RMSG 15.04.2026; 3GON TechDays 20.04.2026 (~160 at event); SAPIE Forum 21.04.2026 (300+ at event); SMEnergy stakeholders 14.05.2026 (6)	All three relevant; strong interest in Pilot 2 (municipal asset management) and Pilot 3
Slovenia PP07 UL	Promotional event 15.06.2026 and presentations to siBIM, the Institute for the Revitalization of Degraded Areas and the Chamber of Commerce	Pilot 2 – actionable framework for public asset managers; national push towards Digital Product Passports

Most relevant pilot: Pilot 1 was chosen by Austria, Germany, Moldova and Serbia, Pilot 2 by Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Montenegro, Romania and Slovenia, Pilot 3 by Croatia and Hungary, while the Czech Republic and Slovakia assessed all three as relevant. The preference reflects national priorities: fragmented public asset data, missing construction-waste systems and the policy push towards material tracking and Digital Product Passports point to Pilot 2, energy costs and efficiency programmes point to Pilot 3, and Pilot 1 was preferred where its open-source availability (Germany) or the lack of material-stock data and the national CDW recovery target (Serbia) were decisive. In Serbia, Pilot 3 was also seen as the most market-oriented solution for the ICT sector. In Austria and Bulgaria the choice also reflects the validated results of the pilots in their own country; in Moldova, Pilot 1 was preferred because there are no data on the building stock and CDW, while Pilot 2 was seen as the best institutional fit for local public authorities.

3. Pilot 1 – Urban Mining Screener (Austria)

Assessment

- Seen as a simple, practical tool for early-stage decisions on renovation and demolition: estimating material volumes, reuse and recycling potential and demolition costs (CZ, SK, BiH, HU, RO, RS, SI).
- Addresses a common gap: no systematic information on material stocks in the existing building stock (BiH, HR, ME, RO, RS); linked to national ESG and circular economy goals (HU), national roadmaps for digital building passports (SI) and planned municipal as-is BIM and material inventories, pre-demolition audits and the 40% CDW recovery target (RS).
- Validated at district level in Austria: for the Eichhof district in Innsbruck (30,783 m³ of built volume) the tool estimated about 55,061 t of materials and 8,610 t CO₂e, with more than 90% accuracy for the total mass balance, less than 3% deviation for mineral materials and about 80% time saving compared with manual calculation; it was also discussed with two federal ministries (AT).
- Seen as the fastest and cheapest pilot to adopt in early-stage countries: free, open-source code can give a first estimate of material stocks and future CDW flows where no reliable statistics exist; after a live demonstration, the Ministry of Environment showed interest in such a map for the national building stock (MD).
- In Serbia, participants noted that material assessments are usually made late, when demolition is already planned; earlier assessment could reduce costs and create business in material reuse (RS).

- Main limitation: building archetypes are Austrian. Local building types differ strongly by period and region (HU – panel buildings, "Kádár cube", historic centres; HR – Mediterranean coast and Italian/Yugoslav-era buildings in Zadar; ME – heterogeneous new construction; RS – masonry, prefabricated concrete and post-war residential typologies; MD – masonry and prefabricated concrete buildings).
- German stakeholders questioned the reliability of model-based estimates instead of exact measurements and asked for validation (DE).
- OpenStreetMap 3D coverage is uneven (full only for Zagreb in HR; varies by region in HU); building data are siloed or uneven across municipalities (RO, RS, SI); GIS skills in SMEs and municipalities are limited (HU, ME); 3D, cadastre and GIS data are incomplete and there is no structured database of the building stock (MD).
- Stakeholders found the tool interesting but could not yet see practical workflows for using it in daily operations (SI).

Recommendations

- **Local archetype databases:** develop national/regional archetypes by construction period and climate zone, validated with universities, including a Serbian/Western Balkan archetype library and adjustments for refurbishment, and Eastern European prefabricated typologies (HU, ME, BiH, HR, DE, RO, RS, SI, MD, AT).
- **Validation and transparency:** validate the estimates across regions and be transparent about data quality and the accuracy of the modelled results (DE).
- **Archetype sharing across the Danube region:** reuse and calibrate archetypes from neighbouring partner countries for similar building stock; add a dedicated workstream for Mediterranean/coastal building types (HR).
- **Element-level output:** move from aggregate material masses to dimensions and quantities of elements (structural elements, façade components, timber sections) so results can drive reuse decisions on site (HR, MD).
- **Integration with public data:** link to real estate cadastres, municipal GIS, spatial planning and permitting, and national BIM initiatives; use open regional spatial and cadastre data to reduce reliance on OpenStreetMap coverage (SK, CZ, HU, BiH, RO, RS, SI); documented interfaces to BIM, GIS, cadastral and portfolio-management workflows (AT).
- **Usability and workflows:** a graphical interface with automated report exports for pre-demolition audits, hands-on training for municipal planners and waste managers (SI); show the link between screener outputs, BIM-based material inventories and pre-demolition audits (RS).
- **Replication package:** local archetypes, minimum data requirements, a validation methodology and guidance for integration with municipal GIS and planning systems; a short replication guide for municipalities; further real-world applications documented with consistent indicators for accuracy, time savings and environmental benefits, and synergies with Austria's "3D Bestandserfassung" initiative (RO, AT, MD).
- **Phased roll-out:** start with public buildings and standardised older neighbourhoods or municipal and regional demonstrations, e.g. through a network of pilot municipalities starting with Novi Sad; offer simplified approaches for municipalities with low digital capacity and show the economic benefit of material recovery (ME, BiH, RO, RS); in Moldova, start with Chişinău and Bălţi and the GreenBuild Lab foreseen in the TAP, feeding the national CDW baseline (MD).

4. Pilot 2 – Digital Identifiers for Construction Elements (Bulgaria)

Assessment

- Most relevant and immediately applicable pilot in BiH and Montenegro: responds to fragmented infrastructure records, missing infrastructure cadastres and weak coordination between institutions.
- Also the most relevant pilot in Romania and Slovenia: matches the TAP need for digital platforms for material tracking and waste management (RO) and the push towards Digital Product Passports, where municipal asset managers lack unified systems for material provenance, maintenance histories and end-of-life potential (SI).
- Implemented and formally accepted by Varna Municipality: installed in the municipality's own IT environment with real data on the municipal road network; open source, no licence or subscription fees and data under municipal control, so replication can start with one clearly scoped use case and expand gradually (BG).
- Best institutional fit for local public authorities in Moldova, matching the TAP action to pilot digital CDW tracking on at least two demolition or renovation projects by 2028; relevant in Austria for material passports, public asset management and circular procurement, where readiness depends on standards, interoperability and governance rather than technology (MD, AT).
- Valued for transparency, traceability, interoperability and lifecycle management of municipal assets; relevant for smart city initiatives (SK), ESG reporting (HR, HU) and for linking BIM data with material passports and the national waste register (RS).
- Strong interest from ICT companies and local self-governments, e.g. in Niš, as a bridge between BIM models, municipal asset management and material flows (RS).
- Barriers: manual registration and lifecycle data entry create an operational burden (HR); low digital maturity of construction SMEs (HU); no binding rules for data collection and no construction-waste management system (ME); interoperability, data governance and consistent updating procedures (RO, RS); risk-averse public authorities that do not adopt new digital solutions bottom-up (SI); low digital maturity of local authorities and only partly digital permitting; the key question was who maintains the data over time (MD).
- Seen in Germany as promising but still abstract: open questions on infrastructure, operation, ownership, governance, liability and harmonisation across Europe (DE).
- Risk of fragmentation: without standardisation, IT companies may build their own versions (HR). Quantified results from Varna were not clear enough to stakeholders (HR).

Recommendations

- **Quantified benefits:** publish results from Varna – reuse rates, resource-flow indicators, lifecycle cost figures – and explain the added value compared with existing identifier schemes (HR).
- **Standardisation:** agree a common minimum framework – identifier rules, minimum data set, interoperability principles – at consortium/Danube level to prevent fragmented re-implementations and support cross-border use; align with openBIM/IFC, ISO 19650, national BIM guidelines (e.g. siBIM) and the EU Digital Product Passport framework; agree common definitions for objects, materials, activities and lifecycle states before implementation (HR, ME, DE, RO, RS, SI, BG).

- **Implementation guidelines:** governance models, data ownership, responsibilities for maintaining identifiers and updating data, integration with BIM, GIS, asset registers, material passports and CDW tracking; a governance model template covering data owners, platform administrators, contractor obligations, update frequency, data quality and cybersecurity (BiH, RO, RS, AT, BG, MD).
- **Lower the entry barrier:** automate object registration and data capture; provide role-specific dashboards and mobile apps for contractors and inspectors, simplified municipal dashboards and standard API connectors for public asset management software (HR, HU, SI).
- **BIM and physical tagging:** native compatibility with BIM software (IFC/Revit exports) and national building registers; a physical tagging standard (QR, RFID or NFC tags resilient to construction sites) linking materials on site to their identifiers (SI).
- **Legal clarity:** clarify legal responsibilities, liability and governance for data ownership, operation and maintenance (DE).
- **Regulatory anchoring:** integrate data collection into building permits, construction execution, public procurement and maintenance workflows; make it part of BIM delivery requirements after the 2028 BIM mandate (RS); link use to green public procurement or green financing criteria (ME, HU, SI).
- **Start small:** pilot in one municipality, new urban district or selected public assets, then scale; plan recycling infrastructure in parallel so that data leads to actual reuse, e.g. a materials and components bank (ME) or the CDW tracking pilots and material reuse hub foreseen in the TAP (RS); a demonstrator for an Austrian public asset portfolio (AT); one well-scoped municipal case in Chişinău, Bălţi or Cahul following the 90-day replication cycle (MD).
- **Replication package for municipalities:** minimum data requirements and standardised data structures, implementation steps, organisational roles involving technical, administrative and ICT departments from the start, technical prerequisites, a core set of indicators for material flows, reuse and environmental impact, and training in national languages (BG, MD).

5. Pilot 3 – AI/ML for Smart Building Sensor Minimisation (Croatia)

Assessment

- Most relevant pilot in Croatia and Hungary: energy efficiency with low hardware investment and quick return (10–20% savings expected in HU; eligible under the Hungarian Energy Efficiency Obligation System).
- Relevant for energy-efficient operation of public buildings, campuses and technology parks (RO, RS) and for legacy public building retrofits and NZEB under EU energy performance targets (SI).
- Relevant for the modernisation of public, commercial and institutional buildings in Austria (AT) and for Moldova's large stock of old public buildings with high energy costs, building on the EMIS energy management system that covers more than 5,400 public buildings; strong interest from IT companies and energy specialists (MD).
- Seen in Serbia as the most market-oriented pilot: strong interest from ICT companies and start-ups, several of which want to develop software-based sensing services (RS). Elsewhere seen as more specialised, with a narrower short-term audience (RO).
- High transferability: only a building automation system with logged operational data is needed (HR, RO, RS, SI); strong interest from facility managers, office and public building operators (HU, ME, SK).

- Limitations: many buildings lack BMS and historical data (BiH, ME, RO, RS, MD); data validation and filtering still needs expert effort (HR); sensor installation costs remain a concern (CZ/SK); participants lacked the technical profile to assess building automation software (SI).
- Questions on reliability: share of usable data and risk of losing information when physical sensors are replaced (DE); limited familiarity with ML control and doubts about data reliability compared with physical sensors (SI).
- The circular-construction contribution should be made more explicit (BiH, RO, RS, AT).

Recommendations

- **Automated end-to-end workflow:** automate data validation, identification of zone thermodynamic models and generation/deployment of control algorithms, so integrators can apply it without per-building research (HR).
- **Transparency on accuracy:** document model accuracy, validation procedures and limitations of AI-generated sensor values to build user trust (DE); a validation dashboard comparing soft-sensor values with reference hardware sensors in real time (SI); published technical validation criteria, minimum data requirements and performance indicators (AT).
- **Plug-and-play deployment:** package the models as modules or open APIs compatible with standard commercial BMS, so non-specialist facility managers can use them; bring software developers together with facility engineers (SI).
- **Measurement and verification module:** generate verified savings data for energy-efficiency obligation schemes and ESG reports (HU).
- **Target buildings:** prioritise newer or digitalised buildings with BMS and centralised heating/cooling – public buildings, schools, administrative centres, university and technology-park buildings, offices, hotels (BiH, ME, HU, RO, RS, SI, AT, MD).
- **Transfer guides and validation:** regional guides for different climate and tariff regimes, local training datasets and model calibration, and a common Danube validation framework for soft sensors (HU, RS, SI).
- **Business model:** develop a commercially sustainable model attractive to private investors (ME), ROI calculators and case studies, and use in ESCO energy performance contracts (SI); offer a low-data / low-cost replication pathway for public buildings (RO).
- **Circular benefits:** quantify reductions in hardware, maintenance, energy use and e-waste and show lifecycle benefits (BiH, RO, RS); show how soft-sensor data link to digital twins and BIM models (RS).
- **Guidance for less digitally mature buildings:** minimum instrumentation, a data-collection protocol (e.g. controller sampling every 5–15 minutes) and a cost-benefit estimate for retrofitting controllers, demonstrated on a building without an existing smart system (MD).

6. Cross-cutting barriers

Type	Barriers reported
Data	Incomplete and fragmented datasets; data silos across spatial and municipal registers; uneven interoperability between information systems; no infrastructure cadastre; uneven 3D/GIS coverage; no standard protocols or data governance frameworks (most partners)

Type	Barriers reported
Regulatory	No binding standards for construction data; digital data not formally accepted in construction processes; legal uncertainty on data responsibility and liability; selective demolition rules and CDW obligations not enforced; no mandatory requirements for material passports, pre-demolition audits or circularity criteria in public procurement; ongoing legislative changes; in Moldova no CDW targets or end-of-waste criteria and BIM not mandatory (ME, HU, DE, SK, CZ, RO, RS, SI, MD, BG)
Trust	Limited trust in AI-driven or model-based results; need for explainability and validation (DE, CZ/SK, SI)
Institutional	Limited IT and institutional capacity of municipalities; limited staff capacity; slow digitalisation of permitting; complex public procurement; unclear responsibilities, including for long-term data maintenance (SK, CZ, ME, BiH, RO, RS, AT, BG, MD)
Financial	Integration and consulting costs for Pilots 1 and 2; high initial costs and limited municipal budgets without a guaranteed return; limited dedicated funding for replication; insufficient investment in recycling infrastructure; lack of incentives; virgin materials cheaper than secondary ones (HU, ME, BiH, RO, RS, SI, AT, BG, MD)
Market and culture	Low digital maturity and limited BIM capacity of SMEs; shortage of digital/AI skills among facility managers; cost minimisation over quality; risk aversion and preference for linear workflows; low awareness of reuse potential; underdeveloped secondary materials market; lack of good-practice examples; too few demonstrators embedded in routine planning and procurement (HU, ME, SK, RO, RS, SI, AT, BG, MD)

7. Consolidated recommendations to the WGP

- 1. Practical replication guidelines per pilot:** with preparation steps, minimum technical requirements, data-governance guidance, cost/benefit examples, timelines and pilot-specific deployment paths, adapted to different levels of digital maturity; non-technical guides, video tutorials and user manuals for planners and facility operators (BiH, CZ/SK, HR, RO, RS, SI, AT, BG, MD).
- 2. Cross-regional validation and explainability:** validate results in different regions, e.g. through joint multi-region trials benchmarking the tools under different national data environments; explain the logic behind outputs and define accountability for incorrect data (DE, SI).
- 3. Quantified benefit reporting:** a uniform template to report environmental, operational and economic results for all three pilots, starting with the Varna results, to support decision-making, procurement and investment planning (HR, BiH, RO, RS).
- 4. Common data standards and interoperability:** minimum data sets, identifier rules and data exchange standards in line with openBIM/IFC, ISO 19650 and the EU Digital Product Passport framework; open APIs; integration with cadastres, GIS, BIM, asset registers and national waste registers (ME, BiH, SK, RO, RS, SI, AT, BG, MD).
- 5. Localisation of Pilot 1:** shared archetype databases across partner countries, including coastal/Mediterranean and Western Balkan building types (HR, HU, ME, RO, RS, SI, MD, AT).

6. Phased implementation: start in controlled settings – public buildings, one municipality, new urban districts – with demonstrations in early-stage countries and clear criteria for expansion (ME, BiH, RO, RS, BG, MD).

7. Policy and finance links: embed pilot outputs in permitting, spatial planning, waste management, BIM delivery requirements, green public procurement and national action plans such as the TAPs; present results to banks and ESG funds; package pilot results as ready-to-use project concepts for funding such as Interreg, Horizon Europe and EU4Green Recovery East (ME, HU, RS, SI, AT, MD).

8. Capacity building and contacts: training for municipalities, public procurement officers and SMEs; share pilot materials and expert contacts with interested stakeholders (SK: 9 participants requested contacts at TechDays 2026; CZ/SK: interest from UCEEB and FAD STU Bratislava; RS and SI: participants requested materials and partner contacts, SI also hands-on testing of the tools); use the DANUBE CiDiCon cluster and the CDB B2B platform to keep the pilot partners available for technical support after the project, including access to code, documentation and contacts (RS, MD).

9. Cross-country demonstrators: joint replication pilots in early-stage countries (Moldova, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Montenegro, Serbia), e.g. a shared archetype library for similar building typologies, and a structured exchange between pilot owners and potential replicators (AT, MD).

8. Input for the Plan for up-scaling (D.3.4.1)

- Legal responsibilities, governance models and validation methodologies, with practical implementation examples (DE).
- A framework for moving from pilot to systemic municipal and national implementation, with phased options for municipalities and regions at different levels of digital maturity and clear roles for public authorities, utilities and private actors (ME, BiH, RO, RS).
- Minimum data standards, interoperability requirements, governance and data ownership arrangements, and validation methodologies (BiH, ME, HU, RO, RS).
- Integration with BIM, GIS, asset registers, CDW/material-tracking and waste reporting systems, and links to BIM delivery requirements and public procurement (RO, RS).
- Localisation roadmaps for mapping national building registers, BIM standards (siBIM) and cadastre data into the pilot tools; green public procurement model clauses and municipal guidelines for digital tracking and circular material audits (SI).
- A methodology for connecting existing building automation systems to AI software without disruption, and step-by-step guidance for local IT developers adapting the open-source code (HU).
- Identification of gaps the consortium cannot close alone: Mediterranean archetypes (Pilot 1), a standardisation framework (Pilot 2), downstream automation (Pilot 3) (HR).
- Training needs and clear economic, environmental and operational indicators (RO, RS).
- Long-term sustainability: financing models, business models showing cost savings and mobilising private investment, market incentives for circular materials and capacity-building measures (ME, SI); potential funding sources such as IPA III, Horizon Europe, Interreg follow-up calls and the Serbia Innovation Fund (RS).
- Phased deployment pathways with minimum technical and data requirements, stakeholder roles, validation and KPI frameworks, interoperability with existing systems, open-source maintenance, financing routes and suitable first-use cases in cities, public buildings and renovation or deconstruction projects (AT).

- A use-case-driven approach for municipalities and public infrastructure operators: start with a limited but meaningful case, define the minimum viable dataset and the data governance model (ownership, data entry, validation, updating, platform administration, contractor obligations) before implementation, and expand once the operational value is demonstrated (BG, MD).
- National vehicles for testing and scaling: in Moldova the GreenBuild Lab or the GreenTech Hub at the Technical University of Moldova (indicative pilot budget of about EUR 500,000, focus on Cahul and Bălți), and a data-collection protocol in public buildings connected to EMIS as a precondition for Pilot 3 (MD).