Geopolitical Implications of the Transnistrian Conflict

John Yuhas

PhD candidate at the University of Ljubljana in Slovenia, U.S. Marine Corps, the Department of the Navy, or the U.S. State Department

Corresponding author: John Yuhas, PhD candidate at the University of Ljubljana in Slovenia, U.S. Marine Corps, the Department of the Navy, or the U.S. State Department.

Abstract
Transnistria remains a geopolitical flashpoint, deeply connected with Russia's strategic interests, Moldova's EU aspirations, and larger security concerns in Eastern Europe. This paper explores the role of Russia's military presence, the implications of Moldova's EU accession bid, and the potential for regional conflict. The Colbasna ammunition depot is underscored as a major security risk, while NATO's cautious engagement is also explored. The analysis presents several conflict resolution scenarios, including diplomatic negotiations, a continued frozen conflict, or potential integration within the EU framework. Understanding these dynamic forces is crucial to assessing the future stability of Moldova and the broader region.

Keywords: Frozen Conflict, Russia, Transnistria, Colbasna.

Introduction
The Transnistrian conflict is one of the longest-standing frozen conflicts in Eastern Europe, rooted in the disintegration of the Soviet Union and Moldova's post-independence political path. Since declaring independence in 1990, Transnistria has functioned as a de facto state with robust. Russian support but continues to be internationally recognized as part of Moldova. The region's status is fundamental to Moldova's geopolitical orientation, particularly as the country seeks closer ties with the European Union and NATO while traversing Russian influence. This analysis assesses the overarching security, economic, and diplomatic aspects of the Transnistrian issue, focusing on Russian military presence, Moldova's EU integration aspirations, and the broader regional security implications.

Theoretical Framework and Methodology
This analysis has used a neorealist international relations framework to assess the geopolitical dynamics of the Transnistria conflict. Neorealism posits that states operate in an anarchic international system where survival and power are the principal concerns [1]. Viewed within this context, "frozen conflicts" are not only local disputes, but are also "tools in the box" of more powerful states, which use them strategically to assert influence, constrain rival alliances, and maintain spheres of influence [2]. In the post-Soviet space, Russia's support for breakaway regions such as Transnistria, Abkhazia, and South Ossetia exemplifies the use of unresolved conflicts as leverage to obstruct Euro-Atlantic integration by neighboring states [3].

This theoretical lens clarifies how Transnistria serves Russia's broader strategic interests by deterring Moldova's EU and NATO alignment. The situation reflects a classic security dilemma, in which Moldova's Western-oriented reforms and partnerships provoke counter-responses from Russia, thereby perpetuating regional instability [4]. The analysis also draws comparisons from other post-Soviet frozen conflicts to identify patterns of contested sovereignty, militarized deterrence, and external patronage.

Methodologically, this paper utilizes qualitative analysis, and uses official publications, strategic communications, and policy papers/assessments. Primary sources include reports and statements from various international organizations, to include the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE),

North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), and the European Union (EU). These are supplemented by in-depth analytical work from leading think tanks, including the Center for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS), the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace and the German Marshall Fund.

The selection of documents was based on four criteria:

1. Institutional credibility—sources were drawn from organizations and research bodies with recognized influence on European security policy;

2. Topical relevance—materials were selected for their direct focus on Transnistria, Moldova's EU accession, or Russia's regional strategy;

3. Timeliness—documents published primarily between 2022 and 2025 were prioritized to reflect the evolving geopolitical landscape after Russia's invasion of Ukraine;

4. Perspective diversity—sources include both official governmental/multilateral publications and independent expert analyses to provide a balanced view.

This analysis attempts to point out converging themes but also attempts to account for the relative positioning of sources. EU and NATO publications, for example, mainly focus on the threat perceptions of Russian activity, while OSCE reports may emphasize mediation and conflict resolution efforts. This methodological transparency enhances the analytical rigor and provides a foundation for applying findings to comparable cases across the post-Soviet space.

Historical Context of the Transnistrian Conflict

The origins of the Transnistria question lie in the late Soviet period. In the 1940s, Stalin's government combined the mainly Russian/Ukrainian-populated left bank of the Dniester (Transnistria) with Romanian-speaking regions (Bessarabia) to create the Moldavian SSR. As the Soviet Union began to dissolve in the late 1980s, ethnic and political tensions grew in Moldova. Moves by the Moldovan majority to assert Romanian language and identity alarmed the largely Russophone population in Transnistria. When Moldova declared independence from the USSR in 1991, Transnistria's authorities – backed by elements of the Soviet 14th Army – refused to integrate into the new country. These rising tensions erupted into open conflict in March 1992, shortly after Moldovan independence.

Armed clashes between Moldovan forces and Transnistrian militia (reinforced by volunteers and some Russian 14th Army units) raged for several months in 1992. The fighting was the heaviest around the city of Bendery and resulted in several hundred deaths. In July 1992, Russia brokered a ceasefire agreement, which fixed the front lines and created a joint peacekeeping apparatus. This truce ended active hostilities and effectively established Transnistria's de facto separation.

Transnistria's Status Within the Context of Russia–West Contentions

Transnistria's unresolved status is closely tied to Russia's wider clash with the West. Moscow uses the breakaway region as a strategic toehold to project influence and hinder Moldova's Western integration. Officially, even Russia acknowledges Transnistria as part of Moldova, yet it maintains troops and leverages the region to pressure Chișinău [5, 6]. Senior Russian security official Nikolai Patrushev recently warned that Moldova could "cease to exist" or be absorbed by another country due to its pro-Western policies. Such rhetoric amplifies tensions and indicates that the Kremlin views any westward drift on the part of Moldova as a direct threat to its interests. Western governments, for the most part, support Moldova's authority and denounce Russia's military presence in Transnistria. Since Russia's full-scale invasion of Ukraine in 2022, Transnistria has been on alert as a potential flashpoint, though active conflict there has been avoided (National Defense Academy of Ukraine, 2024).

The war in Ukraine initially sparked fears of a Russian push toward Odessa that could link up with Transnistria, but Russia's campaign stalled [7, 8]. Still, Moscow continues to destabilize Moldova through political pressure and propaganda rather than overt military action [9, 10]. Western capitals have "closely followed developments" in Transnistria and insist that Russia withdraw its troops in line with international commitments [11, 12]. However, there is also a degree of "conflict fatigue" – experts note that the Transnistrian issue has long been peripheral for major powers and has faded further from priority since the Ukraine war began [13, 14].

Russia's Strategic Interests in Transnistria

Transnistria is a linchpin of Moscow's strategy in Eastern Europe. Since the 1992 ceasefire, about 1,500 Russian troops have remained stationed in Transnistria "ostensibly in a peacekeeping capacity" [15]. This contingent (known as the Operational Group of Russian Forces alongside peacekeepers) effectively represents an illegal military exclave on Moldovan territory. By backing the separatist authorities in Tiraspol, Moscow retains leverage over Moldova's foreign policy and blocks its full Western integration. The Kremlin has long viewed frozen conflicts like Transnistria as tools to maintain influence in post-Soviet states. Even today, Russia refuses to withdraw its troops and periodically uses the conflict to threaten or pressure Chișinău. The continued presence of Russian forces emboldens the Transnistrian regime and signals that Moscow can destabilize Moldova or Ukraine from this foothold. Overall, Transnistria serves Russia's strategic interest by undermining Moldova's sovereignty, deterring NATO/EU expansion, and projecting power on NATO's eastern flank.

Military Threats and Russian Force Posture

The Russian 14th Army, located in Transnistria, played a decisive role in the 1992 war between Moldova and Transnistrian separatists. During the conflict, the 14th Army provided logistical, military, and artillery support to Transnistrian forces, significantly tipping the balance in favor of the separatists [3-16].

The 1992 ceasefire agreement, brokered by Russia and Moldova, established a Joint Control Commission (JCC) that included Russian, Moldovan, and Transnistrian representatives to oversee the ceasefire. However, the continued presence of Russian troops in Transnistria, particularly elements of the former 14th Army, has remained a major sticking point in Moldova-Russia's relations and a broader security concern for the region [11]. Today, approximately 1,500 Russian troops remain in Transnistria, operating under two official designations:

1. The Operational Group of Russian Forces (OGRF) – the 14th Army's successor responsible for securing Russian military interests in the region, particularly the Colbasna ammunition depot [12].

2. Russian "peacekeeping forces" – deployed under the 1992 ceasefire agreement, though Moldova and international observers consider their presence illegal and a violation of Moldovan sovereignty [17].

While Russia claims that these forces are necessary to maintain stability, their presence effectively acts as a deterrent against Moldovan military action to reclaim Transnistria. Additionally, the Russian military presence serves as a geopolitical tool, giving Moscow leverage over Moldova's foreign policy and preventing further integration with NATO [6]. Additionally, these forces are supplemented by Transnistria's paramilitary forces, which have 5,000–7,500 personnel and are heavily armed with Soviet-era equipment [7-18]. These forces frequently conduct joint exercises with Russian troops, contributing to their operational readiness. In addition, Transnistria maintains a large stockpile of armored vehicles, artillery, and air defense systems, many inherited from the Soviet 14th Army [19].

For Moldova, the continued Russian military presence presents a national security risk, especially in the context of Russia's aggressive military actions in Ukraine. There is growing concern that Russia could use Transnistria as a staging ground for hybrid warfare operations or even open a second front against Ukraine [20]. Moldovan officials have repeatedly demanded Russia withdraw its troops, but Moscow continues to ignore OSCE resolutions and international pressure [11-21].

The Risk of Military Escalation
Given the ongoing war in Ukraine, there is an increasing risk that Transnistria could be drawn into a wider conflict. Possible escalation scenarios include:
• Russian attempts to militarize Transnistria further – potentially using the region as a launchpad for attacks on Ukraine's southern flank [11].
• Ukrainian preemptive strikes against Russian military assets in Transnistria, especially if Moscow attempts to transfer weapons from Colbasna to the front lines [20].
• Moldova being pressured into closer NATO alignment, triggering a Russian diplomatic or even military response [17].
While open conflict remains unlikely for now, the continued military entrenchment of Russia in Transnistria poses a persistent destabilizing factor for Moldova and the broader Eastern European security landscape.

The Colbasna Ammunition Depot – A Volatile Stockpile
The Colbasna ammunition depot remains one of the largest and most contentious Soviet-era military stockpiles in Eastern Europe, located in Transnistria near the Ukrainian border. It contains an estimated 20,000 tons of aging Soviet-era munitions, including artillery shells, explosives, and small arms ammunition [11]. Originally designated for the Soviet 14th Army, the depot has been under Russian military control since the dissolution of the USSR. While the depot's strategic importance to Russia remains high, international organizations and Western governments have long pushed for the safe removal and disposal of these munitions, citing both security and environmental risks [12].

Strategic Importance and Russian Control
Moscow views the Colbasna depot as a key strategic asset, giving it leverage over Moldova and Ukraine. In spite of numerous international calls for closing the facility, Russia has refused to remove the stockpiles, claiming the need for security guarantees [6]. Russian forces in Transnistria use the depot as a justification for their continued military presence in the region, arguing that troops are needed to safeguard the munitions from looting or sabotage [11]. In reality, the facility serves as a geopolitical tool, allowing Russia to maintain a foothold in Moldova while reinforcing its influence in the breakaway region [18].

Security and Environmental Risks
The age and deteriorating condition of the Colbasna ammunition stockpiles have raised alarms among defense analysts and environmental advocates. Some of the ammunition dates back to the 1950s and 1960s, making it susceptible to corrosion, chemical instability, and accidental detonation [12]. The risk of an explosion at the facility poses not only a real-time security threat but also a broader environmental disaster, given the fact that an uncontrolled detonation could release toxic agents into the air, soil, and local water systems [16].

Additionally, as Russia's war in Ukraine continues, concerns have grown that the depot might become a military target. Ukrainian officials have warned that Russian forces might attempt to mobilize Transnistrian forces and access the weapons stockpiles for military use, or that Ukraine itself could be forced to preemptively strike the site to eliminate a potential threat [7-19]. NATO officials have also acknowledged the risk that Russia could leverage the depot as a bargaining tool, threatening to escalate tensions in Moldova if pressured on other geopolitical fronts [22].

The Colbasna depot remains a ticking time bomb in Eastern Europe, with far-reaching security, environmental, and geopolitical implications. Addressing this issue will require coordinated diplomatic pressure and security guarantees that accommodate both regional stability and Russia's strategic considerations. If left unaddressed, the Colbasna depot could catalyze future crises in Moldova and beyond [7-12].

NATO/EU Strategy Regarding Transnistria and Moldova
NATO's approach to Transnistria is constrained by Moldova's military neutrality and the risk of provoking Russia. Officially, NATO has no direct role in the Transnistria conflict's resolution. Nevertheless, the Alliance supports Moldova's sovereignty and repeatedly calls on Russia to honor its 1999 pledge to withdraw troops [22]. NATO members, particularly neighboring Romania, are wary of the security threat posed by a Russian-backed enclave on the alliance's border. Since the Ukraine war, NATO has enhanced its presence in the Black Sea region (e.g., troop rotations in Romania) as a deterrent signal to Moscow (National Defense Academy of Ukraine, 2024; Pleșca, 2025).

Moldova's EU Aspirations
In spite of this, Moldovan leadership under President Maia Sandu is firmly oriented toward Europe. Moldova was accorded EU

candidate status in June 2022 and has made EU membership a constitutional "strategic objective [17]." In a 2023 national survey, over 60% of Moldovans supported joining the EU (Kaiser, 2023). The government in Chișinău sees EU accession as vital to securing the country's democratic reforms, economic development, and long-term security. However, officials are acutely aware that the Transnistria dispute could complicate this path. Moldova remains militarily neutral (with no NATO bid) but is deepening partnerships with NATO members, especially Romania, underlining that EU membership is its preferred security anchor. Moldova's westward pivot is proceeding in spite of the Transnistrian impasse, as Chișinău wagers that EU integration can be achieved even if the conflict endures in the short term.

Regional Security Risks of an Unresolved Conflict
The protracted standoff in Transnistria poses latent risks to regional stability. While major fighting ceased in 1992, the conflict remains a flashpoint that could reignite under the wrong circumstances. Transnistria borders Ukraine, and Russia's full-scale invasion of Ukraine in 2022 starkly increased these risks. NATO officials have warned that Russia could attempt to destabilize Moldova if its war aims in Ukraine were achieved [23]. Beyond military scenarios, the ongoing division undermines broader security too: it creates a corridor for smuggling and organized crime, complicates border management, and has, as stated previously, spawned one of Eastern Europe's largest ammunition depots (the Colbasna stockpile), which remains under Russian guard and is a lingering safety hazard.

Can Moldova Join the EU with the Transnistria Issue Unresolved?
A central question is whether Moldova's EU accession can proceed without first resolving Transnistria's status. Precedent suggests it is possible. The EU has admitted a divided country before – Cyprus, which joined the EU in 2004 despite the unresolved division of the island. European officials now explicitly cite the "Cyprus model" when discussing Moldova. Moldova's path is independent of what is happening in Transnistria [24]. This indicates an important shift in the EU's stance: Brussels will not make reintegration of Transnistria an absolute prerequisite for membership.

EU Stance and International Responses
The European Union's official position on Transnistria has consistently supported Moldova's sovereignty and a peaceful settlement to the conflict. The EU (as well as the U.S. and OSCE) does not recognize the Tiraspol regime and regards Transnistria as part of Moldova. It has called for the withdrawal of Russian forces and the resumption of negotiations without preconditions. Politically, the EU since 2005 has participated as an observer in the 5+2 talks, aligning with the OSCE-led process (5+2 is Transnistria, Moldova, Russia, Ukraine, and the OSCE, with the EU and the USA as "observers"). The EU's willingness to consider a Cyprus-style accession for Moldova is a message to Moscow that the conflict will no longer serve to bar Moldova's European integration.

Comparative Analysis: Transnistria and Post-Soviet Frozen Conflicts
The geopolitical situation surrounding the Moldova–Transnistria conflict shares significant commonalities with other unresolved territorial disputes in the post-Soviet space—namely, Abkhazia, South Ossetia, and Nagorno-Karabakh—while also presenting unique challenges for European security architecture and EU/NATO strategic interests. These conflicts, which have their genesis in the breakup of the Soviet Union, share overlapping issues of ethnic identity, territorial sovereignty, and historical grievances [25, 26].

Transnistria functions as a breakaway republic with a semi-presidential system, backed by a persistent Russian military presence of approximately 1,500 troops, despite its location within Moldova's internationally recognized borders [17-27]. In contrast, Abkhazia and South Ossetia, which seceded from Georgia following the early 1990s wars and the Russo-Georgian conflict of 2008, maintain stronger military and political dependencies on Russia [3-28]. Both are formally recognized only by Russia and a handful of allied states, while Russian military bases and border forces maintain full operational control.

Up until 2023, Nagorno-Karabakh operated under a self-declared Armenian-supported administration. But, following Azerbaijan's military campaign in 2020 and a final offensive in 2023, Baku reestablished control over the region, prompting the withdrawal of Russian peacekeepers and the displacement of the ethnic Armenian population [29]. This shift significantly altered the security dynamics in the South Caucasus and diminished Armenia's historical reliance on Russia, opening the door to deeper engagement with Western institutions [30, 31].

All of these conflicts, from a strategic standpoint, represent tools of leverage for Moscow, and are designed to limit the Euro-Atlantic integration of neighboring states. Moldova and Georgia, both aspiring members of the EU and NATO, find their accession pathways obstructed in part by the unresolved status of these separatist regions. The proximity of Transnistria to the EU-NATO border, particularly Romania, makes it especially significant in the current geopolitical climate following Russia's full-scale invasion of Ukraine [17, 28].

Nagorno-Karabakh, although geographically less central to Europe, plays an important role in energy transit corridor security linking the Caspian to Southern Europe. Renewed Azerbaijani control of the region, along with Turkish involvement and reduced Russian influence, signals a broader shift in regional alignments that may impact EU foreign energy policy and its neighborhood approach [32]. In sum, these "frozen" conflicts not only exemplify the enduring legacy of Soviet disintegration but also highlight the strategic vulnerabilities that Europe faces along its eastern periphery. Addressing them requires a calibrated mix of diplomatic engagement, security assistance, and long-term conflict resolution strategies that consider both local dynamics and great power competition [3-26].

Conclusion
The Transnistria Question remains a critical geopolitical challenge, balancing between frozen conflict and the real possibility of escalation. Russia's continued military presence in the region is a major destabilizing factor, which strengthens Moscow's leverage over Moldova while at the same time complicating its European integration goals. Moldova's EU accession bid presents both opportunities and constraints, as the unresolved status

of Transnistria raises questions about its feasibility under current conditions. NATO's limited involvement in the situation illustrates the complexity of international actors' roles in the conflict. Meanwhile, security threats, including the Colbasna ammunition depot and broader Russian force posture, continue to pose risks for regional stability. Several scenarios could develop when considering the issues discussed in this analysis. These might include:

• Reintegration with Moldova. A negotiated reintegration remains the preferred diplomatic solution, though it would require Russian cooperation, which seems unlikely under current geopolitical conditions [11-21]. One possible framework for reintegration involves granting Transnistria a form of special autonomy within Moldova, a solution favored by international mediators but opposed by nationalist factions in both Moldova and Transnistria [8-10].

• Alternatively, Moldova could continue pursuing EU integration while leaving the Transnistrian issue unresolved, following the Cyprus precedent. However, this could prolong the frozen conflict and leave Moldova vulnerable to continued Russian influence, particularly through economic dependence and hybrid warfare tactics [7-18]. Some analysts suggest that prolonged instability could eventually lead to a gradual reintegration process, facilitated by economic incentives and EU-backed confidence-building measures [33, 35].

• In a worst-case scenario, increased tensions could escalate into a broader conflict, particularly if Russia seeks to destabilize Moldova as part of its wider regional strategy [6-20]. Given Russia's military setbacks in Ukraine, some security experts argue that Moscow may escalate hybrid operations in Moldova, including cyberattacks and disinformation campaigns, to maintain leverage in the region [11-22].

Despite multiple diplomatic initiatives, no resolution framework has emerged as a workable path forward, leaving Moldova and its allies to juggle political negotiations, economic integration, and military deterrence. The possibility of maintaining the status quo, a negotiated reintegration, or a Cyprus-style EU integration with Transnistria each carries significant implications [36-38]. As the geopolitical landscape develops —especially considering Russia's actions in Ukraine and Moldova's strategic readjustments —the outcome of the Transnistrian issue will remain an important test for European stability and security [39-42].

References
1. Waltz, K. N. (1979). Theory of international politics. McGraw-Hill.
2. Mearsheimer, J. J. (2001). The tragedy of great power politics. W. W. Norton.
3. Lynch, D. (2004). Engaging Eurasia's Separatist States: Unresolved Conflicts and De Facto States. Washington, DC: United States Institute of Peace Press.
4. Walt, S. M. (1987). The origins of alliances. Cornell University Press.
5. King, C. (2000). The Moldovans: Romania, Russia, and the Politics of Culture. Stanford: Hoover Institution Press
6. RIAC. (2022). Transnistria in the Context of Russia's Foreign Policy. Moscow: Russian International Affairs Council. Retrieved from https://russiancouncil.ru/en/analytics-and-comments/analytics/moscow-s-painful-adjustment-to-the-post-soviet-space/?sphrase_id=182740851
7. CSIS. (2025). The Strategic Implications of Transnistria's Energy Crisis. Retrieved from https://www.csis.org/analysis/energy-crisis-provides-opportunity-moldova.
8. Swedish UI. (2022). The Transnistrian Conflict: 30 Years Searching for a Settlement. Stockholm: Swedish Institute of International Affairs. Retrieved from. (202The Transnistrian Conflict: 30 Years Searching for a Settlement. Stockholm: Swedish Ins.
9. Davis Center. (2024). A Russian Destabilization Campaign Put Moldova in the News. Retrieved from https://daviscenter.fas.harvard.edu/insights/russian-destabilization-campaign-put-moldova-news.
10. European Parliament. (2022). European Parliament Resolution on the Implementation of the EU Association Agreement with Moldova. Retrieved from https://www.europarl.europa.eu/doceo/document/A-9-2022-0143_EN.html
11. OSCE. (2023). Reports on the Transnistrian Settlement Process. Vienna: OSCE.
12. United States Mission to the OSCE. (2024). On Lack of Transparency in Russian Military Convoys in Moldova's Security Zone. Retrieved from https://osce.usmission.gov/
13. Business Insider. (2025). Transnistria Shut Down Industry Due to Russian Gas Halt. Retrieved from https://www.businessinsider.com/transnistria-shut-down-industry-economy-russia-natural-gas-ukraine-halt-2025-1
14. RFE/RL's Moldovan Service. (2022). Moldova's Separatist Transnistria Claims, 'Drones Seen, Shots Fired' Near Huge Ammo Depot. Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty. Retrieved from https://www.rferl.org/a/moldova-transdniester-ammo-depot-cobasna/31823423.html
15. Harward, C. (2023). Russia Poses Long-Term Threats to Moldova's European Integration Beyond the October Elections. Institute for the Study of War. Retrieved from https://www.understandingwar.org/backgrounder/russia-poses-long-term-threats-moldova%E2%80%99s-european-integration-beyond-october-elections
16. The Armed Conflict of the Dniester: Three Decades Later. (2023). Kyiv: East European Press.
17. European Parliament. (2022). EU Support for Moldova in the Context of the Ukraine War. Retrieved from https://www.europarl.europa.eu
18. Samorukov, M. (2024). In Odesa's Shadows: What is Russia's Strategy in Moldova? Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. Retrieved from https://carnegieendowment.org/research/2024/10/moldova-russia-strategy?lang=en
19. The Devil's Advocate: An Argument for Moldova and Ukraine to Seize Transnistria. (2023). Journal of Advanced Military Studies. Retrieved from https://www.usmcu.edu/Outreach/Marine-Corps-University-Press/MCU-
20. Kyiv Independent. (2025). Putin Aide Claims Moldova Could Cease to Exist. Retrieved from https://kyivindependent.com/putin-aide-claims-that-moldova-will-become-part-of-another-state-or-cease-to-exist-chisinau-responds/
21. Pleșca, L. (2025). How Should Moldova Leverage EU Support for Transnistria? German Marshall Fund. Retrieved from https://www.gmfus.org/news/how-should-moldova-leverage-eu-usmcu.edu/Outreach/Marine-Corps-University.
22. NATO's Engagement with Moldova. (2024). NATO Pub-

lic Affairs. Retrieved from https://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/news_231273.htm?selectedLocaleres

23. Solovyov, V. (2023). A Resolution to the Transnistria Conflict Is More Distant Than Ever. Carnegie Politika. Retrieved from https://carnegieendowment.org/russia-eurasia/politika/2023/12/a-resolution-to-the-transnistria-conflict-is-more-distant-than-ever?lang=enm

24. Borrell, J. (2023). Press remarks at the European Political Community Summit, Chişinău. EEAS. Retrieved from https://www.eeas.europa.eu/eeas/european-political-community-press-remarks-high-representativevice-president-josep-borrell-upon_en

25. Coppieters, B. (2001). Federalism and Conflict in the Caucasus. Royal Institute of International Affairs.

26. Cornell, S. E. (2002). Autonomy and Conflict: Ethnoterritoriality and Separatism in the South Caucasus – Cases in Georgia. Department of Peace and Conflict Research, Uppsala University.

27. Popescu, N. (2006). Outsourcing de facto Statehood: Russia and the Secessionist Entities in Georgia and Moldova. CEPS Policy Briefs.

28. s/ NATO. (2023). Relations with Georgia. Retrieved from https://www.nato.int

29. De Waal, T. (2023). After the Fall: The End of the Nagorno-Karabakh Conflict. Carnegie Europe.

30. Broers, L. (2019). Armenia and Azerbaijan: Anatomy of a Rivalry. Edinburgh University Press

31. De Waal, T. (2010). The Caucasus: An Introduction. Oxford University Press.

32. MC2828 ICG. (2023). Nagorno-Karabakh: Seizing the Chance for Peace. International Crisis Group. Retrieved from https://www.crisisgroup.org

33. GMFUS. (2024). Frozen Conflicts and Geopolitical Contests: The Case of Transnistria. Retrieved from https://www.gmfus.org

34. Całus, K. (2023). Transnistria in the New International Reality. OSW Commentary, Warsaw: Centre for Eastern Studies (OSW). Retrieved from https://www.osw.waw.pl/en/publikacje/osw-commentary/2023-12-2ernational-reality

35. U AS. (2025). Patrushev: Moldova Risks Disappearing Amid Ukraine Conflict. Retrieved from https://www.intellinews.com/russian-presidential-adviser-warns-moldova-may-cease-to-exist-361566/ as-news.com

36. European Parliament. (2022). Grant EU candidate status to Ukraine and Moldova without delay. Retrieved from https://www.europarl.europa.eu/news/en/press-room/20220616IPR33216/grant-eu-candidate-status-to-ukraine-and-moldova-without-delay-meps-demand

37. How Russia Tries to Counter Moldova Separatist Region's Westward Drift. (2024). Retrieved from https://www.voanews.com/a/how-russia-tries-to-keep-moldova-separatist-region-from-elses drifting-toward-west/6561813.

38. Kaiser, J. (2023). Moldova's path to EU membership could follow the Cypriot blueprint. The Parliament Magazine. Retrieved from https://www.theparliamentmagazine.eu/news/article/could-moldovas-path-to-eu-membership-follow-the-cypriot-bluep

39. Moldova's EU Integration and the Special Case of Transnistria. (2024). Retrieved from https://freepolicybriefs.org/2024/10/14/moldovas-eu-integration/

40. National Defense Academy of Ukraine. (2024). Regional Security Challenges in the Context of the Ukraine Conflict. Kyiv.

41. Republic of Moldova. (2024). National Security Strategy of Moldova.

42. World Bank. (2023). Moldova Economic Update