



REPUBLIC OF SURINAME

REPORT ON THE EVALUATION OF THE UNITED NATIONS DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE FRAMEWORK 2008-2011

“PEOPLE ARE THE REAL WEALTH OF NATIONS”

Paramaribo, January 2011

Contents

| | |
|--|------|
| LIST OF ACRONYMS..... | iii |
| ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS | v |
| EXECUTIVE SUMMARY | vi |
| UNDAF OUTCOME 1..... | viii |
| UNDAF OUTCOME 2..... | ix |
| UNDAF OUTCOME 3..... | ix |
| Summary of Recommendations | x |
| 1. INTRODUCTION | 1 |
| 1.1 Country Context | 1 |
| 1.2 UN context and the UNDAF | 3 |
| 2. FINDINGS..... | 6 |
| 2.1. UNDAF: The Programme Content..... | 6 |
| Relevance of the UNDAF..... | 6 |
| Role of the UN | 7 |
| 2.2. Government Engagement and Leadership..... | 7 |
| 2.3 Effectiveness/Programme Results | 8 |
| 2.4 Sustainability and Impact..... | 16 |
| The Changing Development Cooperation and Funding Context..... | 16 |
| 2.5 UNDAF: The underlying processes | 18 |
| 2.5.1 Capacity Issues and the UNDAF | 19 |
| 2.5.2 Efficiency of the UNDAF..... | 19 |
| 2.5.3 The AWP's | 20 |
| 2.5.4 Operational Issues | 20 |
| 2.5.5 Communication | 20 |
| 2.5.6 Monitoring and Evaluation (M and E) of the UNDAF | 21 |
| 2.6 The Contribution of the Non-Resident UN agencies in the UNDAF | 21 |
| 2.7 Collaboration with NGOs/CBOs, other development partners and the private sector..... | 22 |
| 2.8 UNDAF and Aid Effectiveness..... | 23 |
| 3. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS | 24 |
| 3.1 UNDAF Strategic and Programme Content..... | 24 |
| 3.1.1 Recommendations at the upstream level | 25 |
| 3.1.2 Recommendations at the downstream level..... | 25 |
| 3.2 Government Engagement and Leadership..... | 26 |
| 3.3. Capacity Building..... | 26 |

| | |
|---|----|
| 3.4 Sustainability | 27 |
| 3.5 UNDAF Underlying Processes | 27 |
| 3.5.1 Upstream Recommendations | 27 |
| 3.5.2 Downstream Recommendations | 28 |
| OVERALL CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION | 30 |
| ANNEX 1 COUNTRY FACTS | 31 |
| ANNEX 2 LIST OF ORGANISATIONS INTERVIEWED | 32 |
| ANNEX 3 BIBLIOGRAPHY | 34 |

LIST OF ACRONYMS

| | |
|----------|--|
| ABS | General Bureau of Statistics |
| ATM | Ministry of Labour, Technology and Environment |
| AWP | Annual Work Plan |
| BiZA | Ministry of Home Affairs |
| BOG | Bureau of Public Health |
| BuZA | Ministry of Foreign Affairs |
| CARICOM | Caribbean Community |
| CBO | Community Based Organisation |
| CCPAP | Common Country Programme Action Plan |
| DaO | Delivering as One (UN) |
| ECD | Early Childhood Development |
| ECLAC | Economic Community for Latin America and the Caribbean |
| EPI | Expanded Programme of Immunisation |
| ExCom | Executive Committee agencies |
| FAO | Food and Agriculture Organisation |
| GEF | Global Environment Facility |
| GBS | General Bureau of Statistics |
| GNI | Gross National Income |
| GNP | Gross National Product |
| HACT | Harmonised Cash Transfers |
| HDI | Human Development Index |
| J&P | Ministry of Justice and Police |
| IDB | Inter-American Development Bank |
| ILO | International Labour Organisation |
| LVV | Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Husbandry and Fisheries |
| MDG | Millennium Development Goal |
| MICS | Multi-Indicator Cluster Survey |
| MINOV | Ministry of Education and Community Development |
| MoF | Ministry of Finance |
| M and E | Monitoring and Evaluation |
| MOU | Memorandum of Understanding |
| NGO | Non-Government Organisation |
| NIMOS | National Institute for Environment and Development |
| NCCR | National Centre for Disaster Management |
| NSDS | National Strategy for Development of Statistics |
| NVB | National Women's Movement |
| PAHO/WHO | Pan-American Health Organisation/World Health Organisation |
| PHC | Primary Health Care |
| RC | Resident Coordinator |
| ROGB | Ministry of Physical Planning, Land Management and Housing |
| RO | Ministry of Regional Development |
| MARPS | Most at Risk Populations |

| | |
|------------------------|--|
| MYAS | Ministry of Youth Affairs and Sports |
| ODA | Official Development Assistance |
| OECD/DAC | Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development/Development Assistance Committee |
| PMTCT | Prevention of Mother to Child Transmission |
| SoZaVo | Ministry of Social Affairs and Housing |
| SMART (for indicators) | Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant, Time-bound |
| TA | Technical Assistance |
| TOR | Terms of Reference |
| UNAIDS | UN AIDS Programme |
| UNCT | UN Country Team |
| UNDOCO | UN Development Operations and Coordination Office |
| UNDP | UN Development Programme |
| UNESCO | UN Education, Scientific and Cultural Organisation |
| UNGASS | UN General Assembly's Special Session on HIV/AIDS |
| UNICEF | UN Children's Fund |
| UNFCC | UN Fund for Climate Change |
| UNFPA | UN Population Fund |
| UNIFEM | UN Women's Fund |
| VOG | Ministry of Health |
| VVOB | Flemish Development Cooperation (Belgium) |

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This evaluation was conducted at the request of the Government of Suriname and the UN Country Team. This was the consultant's third visit to Suriname since 2008 and it was a pleasure to work with government, UN colleagues and other individuals in carrying out this task. The time frame was very tight i.e. 3 work weeks in-country, which included the continuous review of documents, stakeholder consultations and writing and presenting the first draft on December 3, 2009.

Although the initial start to the stakeholder meetings was slow, this speeded up rapidly and become a full schedule. This Report reflects the consensus opinions of a range of stakeholders representing the Government, the UN, other development partners and civil society about the content and implementation of the UNDAF. Based on the findings of this evaluation, a set of recommendations is given as input for the design of the next UNDAF in January 2011. It is hoped that the Government and the UNCT will strongly consider the key recommendations of this evaluation, especially in light of the new Government's aspirations for Suriname's development in the coming years.

The consultant would like to take this opportunity to sincerely thank the resident UNCT members and their staff- UNDP, UNICEF, UNFPA, PAHO/WHO- and the RC's Coordination Analyst for their quick action to organise and facilitate the stakeholder meetings. In addition, the consultant is very appreciative of their joint support for the logistical arrangements and to the UN receptionist and drivers for organising and arranging transport. Their support and commitment to this exercise enabled the consultant to complete the in-country work efficiently and hopefully produce a high-quality product that meets everyone's expectations.

This report was done independently and the opinions, suggestions and interpretations of this evaluation report do not represent the official position of the United Nations System in Suriname, including the UN Agencies, Funds and Programmes, or that of the Government's. The consultant is solely responsible for the content of the report and the opinions put forward therein.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

At the request of the Government of Suriname and the UN Country Team an evaluation of the UN Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) for the period 2008-2011 was carried out in November/December 2010. The main objectives were firstly, to evaluate in programmatic terms the achievements or progress being made towards the UNDAF outcomes and secondly, to evaluate the underlying processes for the planning, coordination, implementation and monitoring of the UNDAF.

The information and data for the evaluation were collected from a desk review of documents/reports/surveys, extensive stakeholder consultations and participation in the annual review of the Common Country Programme Action Plan (CCPAP).

Over the past year the country has been affected by two major events. One was the national elections in May 2010 which heralded in a new Government coalition. This resulted in an institutional change for UN development assistance with the former Ministry of Planning and Development Cooperation being disbanded and the responsibility for UN affairs being tentatively placed under the Ministry of Finance¹. Secondly, the effects of the global financial recession are impacting on Suriname's economy with growing inflation in consumer prices, rising unemployment and especially in the urban centres.

In terms of progress towards the MDGs and the priorities in its Multi-Annual Development Plan for 2006-2011, Suriname has made progress in some key *national-level* social indicators over the last ten years such as a reduction in the infant mortality rate and the maternal mortality rate and an increase in primary school enrolment. However these national figures mask wide disparities among the urban areas, the urban coastal areas and the rural interior.

The role of the UN as an "honest broker" and advocate for the MDGs and vulnerable groups, for bringing attention to inequities and injustice, for setting and promoting international norms and standards, for exposing Suriname to best practices and technological innovations is very relevant to Suriname's development efforts. This role is very much appreciated by government, non-government and development partner representatives. However, there is also a concern that in some sensitive areas e.g. HIV/AIDS, human rights, the UN does not "listen enough" and is "pushing" its own agenda.

Concerning government leadership and engagement in the UNDAF, at the start of the UNDAF in 2008 the engagement and leadership of the Government at the national level was very apparent. At the sectoral level the engagement and leadership were not so evident largely because the UNDAF process was new to most stakeholders at the sectoral level. In 2009 the UN Desk (representing the Government for the practical, daily work on the UNDAF/CCPAP) played an active "hands-on" role in supporting the Annual Work Plan, Mid-term Review and Annual Review processes.

¹ After the evaluation was completed, the Government formally informed the UNCT in late December that the responsibility for UN affairs and the UN Desk would be placed under the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. The planning function would remain under the Ministry of Finance.

The holding of the national elections in May 2010 which led to both the disbanding of the Ministry of Planning and Development Cooperation and a reduction of staff at the UN Desk created a temporary vacuum in the leadership and engagement of the national coordinating body for the UNDAF/CCPAP. Now that the UNCT has been formally informed that UN affairs will be placed under the responsibility of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs the lines of command and responsibility will become clearer in 2011. The UNCT now has an exciting opportunity to build up a revitalised partnership with the new leaders and staff of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the Ministry of Finance (which retains the national development planning function), the sectoral ministries and the Parliament.

With regard to the role of the non-resident UN agencies², all the non-resident UN agencies are committed to the UNDAF as a mechanism for joint planning, coordination, policy coherence and information sharing. Their contribution in terms of technical advisory services is genuinely demand-driven and responds to the priorities of their constituent partners. However, at the programme implementation level, activities are implemented by the individual UN agencies reflecting their respective mandates, areas of expertise and target groups. Only UNAIDS and UNIFEM regularly attend most of the UNCT meetings. Several justifiable reasons are given in the body of this report for their inability to participate more actively in the UNDAF/CCPAP.

There is unanimous consensus that the UNDAF and its strategic priorities address the national development priorities in the Government's MOP. There is also a general consensus that the UNDAF is a useful and appropriate *mechanism for joint country analysis, planning, coordination, and prioritisation over the long-term. In this sense it is a broad development framework for all UN assistance to Suriname.* The UNDAF is also a good mechanism for avoiding duplication and overlap of development efforts and for creating increased coherence among the activities of the UN agencies.

In support of the three UNDAF development outcomes, the Government/UN identified 11 programme outcomes. These were operationalised into 8 individual Annual Work Plans (AWPs). All the AWP are implemented by multiple government and non-government partners and supported by multiple UN agencies.

The *main general finding* is that the formulation of several of the programme outcomes is too broad and ambitious (in some cases nation-wide). This has created the impression among government respondents that *all* UN-funded activities have been "forced" into the UNDAF/CCPAP and has resulted in its being too "spread out" and unfocussed (even though most of them address the MDGs).

The second general finding is that at the programme implementation level and through the AWP mechanism, there is a *jointly coordinated approach* to the interventions supported by different agencies but these are not formal "joint UN-supported programmes". This view is supported by several government/non-government stakeholders who commented that the project activities were

² UNAIDS, UNIFEM, UNESCO, ECLAC, ILO, FAO, WFP, UNIC

implemented individually with the support of one UN agency and that they had little interaction with other projects in the AWP.

A third major finding is that the broad and over-ambitious results framework for the UNDAF did not include measurable results, baselines and targets, making it difficult, if not impossible to measure the impact of the UNDAF outcomes. An attempt has been made in March 2010 by the UN to develop a Monitoring and Evaluation (M and E) framework and tool for the UNDAF and CCPAP which if used correctly, should help to measure overall results by the end of the current UNDAF cycle in 2011.

Despite these constraints, the evaluation did attempt to extract data and information on the progress towards achievement of the UNDAF programme outcomes and mid-level results. However, it needs to be stressed that these are *a product of the joint and combined efforts of the Government partners, the UN, the involved NGOs/CBOs and other development partners*. Given the relatively small financial contribution from the UN (an average of about 10mUSD per UNDAF year) the UN's contribution should be seen as a "seed investment" within a much larger national development effort.

UNDAF OUTCOME 1

By 2011 pro-poor policies in place to ensure vulnerable groups benefit from growth

Significant support has been given by the UN through four interventions: advocacy and awareness-raising for the MDGs and vulnerable groups e.g. the poor, women and children, people living with HIV/AIDS, un-employed youth; policy advice; capacity building and institutional strengthening ; and the provision of technical assistance and exposure to international best practices.

In support of the Government's National Strategy on Development of Statistics (NSDS), a multi-sectoral process was initiated to reach consensus on the need for higher quality disaggregated social data and a new and consistent poverty measurement for Suriname. The UN is also in discussion with the Government about modernising and making more effective its social safety net programme for vulnerable groups.

This combined UN effort has resulted in the MDGs and the constraints facing vulnerable groups (lack of access to resources, basic social services, legal services, participation etc.) being placed squarely in the country's development agenda. Secondly, they have sensitised Government partners to the need to modernise and update their data collection and analysis systems.

Regarding sustainable development, the work of the UN in environment, climate change and disaster management has placed environmental conservation on the "front burner". It has also facilitated the preparation of frameworks and strategies for biodiversity conservation and climate change. Public education and awareness on environment and sustainable practices have increased. Capacity building in various ministries and entities is ongoing. As a result, Suriname has gained in capacity and confidence to engage in negotiating fora at both regional and international levels.

UNDAF OUTCOME 2

By 2011 governance systems are enhanced through increased participation, public sector reform, legal reform and protection

As a result of systematic UN support, the following key legislations were approved during 2008-2010: the Domestic Violence Act, revision of the Moral Code and the Marriage Act; law for the installation of a child “ombudsbureau”. In addition, other key legislation including the “Raamwet Opvang” and legislation on child care reflecting Early Childhood Development standards, have been drafted and are waiting for approval by the Parliament. At the same time the capacities of various groups e.g. judges, lawyers etc. have been strengthened in the Convention on the Rights of the Child and outreach activities have raised the awareness of schools and parents about their rights under these laws and conventions.

The concept of mainstreaming gender and women’s rights, human rights and child rights and the importance of adhering to international conventions have been introduced widely to government and non-government institutions, the public and the media. As a result a significant level of awareness has been raised among these target groups on these critical aspects.

One of the greatest strengths of the UN is its participatory and inclusive approach to development. The UN has both collectively and individually facilitated a participatory inclusive approach to planning, decision-making, implementation and monitoring. The AWP’s themselves are a reflection of this approach and several government and non-government stakeholders commented positively that “it was the first time they worked together with other organisations on a project”. There has been no progress on governance/public administration reform. The Government takes a clear leadership role in this area and is yet to define a role for the UN. This will hopefully emerge in the next MOP period.

UNDAF OUTCOME 3

By 2011, there is improved access to quality education, health care, legal and social protection services

This outcome is implemented by a very broad AWP which includes several components: vaccination coverage, family health, water and sanitation, education, HIV/AIDS and disaster preparedness (for diseases) and therefore it has been extremely difficult to synchronise UN assistance into a cohesive, coordinated approach. The main interventions are focussed on policy guidance, service delivery, institutional strengthening and capacity building and encouraging leadership of a multi-sectoral approach. Some support is also provided for technical and other urgently needed equipment and health education materials. The formulation of the outcome is so broad and consists of so many components that it is very difficult to monitor and measure results. Therefore it is also extremely difficult to extract results attributable to a *common* UN approach. UN collaboration on the Expanded Programme on Immunisation (EPI) and support to the vaccination system has probably contributed to the increase in vaccination

coverage for children in Suriname from 83.9% in 2006 to 86.7% in 2008 for DPT3 and from 82.6% in 2006 to 88.9% in 2009 for Measles/Mumps/Rubella. Regarding education, the UN's focus is on introducing "child-friendly approaches" in schools. This is undertaken through substantive policy and programme guidance, sensitisation and capacity building of ministry staff, district administrators, teachers and parents.

The topic of HIV/AIDS continues to be a sensitive one in Suriname where the Government/Ministry of health shows strong leadership. The UN has actively supported and advocated for a multi-sectoral response to HIV and AIDS which is reflected in the new National Strategic Plan on HIV for 2009-2013. The UN also takes an active role in raising awareness on HIV-related aspects with particular attention to most at risk populations, workers in the workplace and advocating for preventive approaches. This is accompanied by capacity building of both government and non-government partners in a variety of technical and non-technical areas.

The evaluation also presents various findings concerning the underlying processes (programmatic and operational) which affect the effectiveness and efficiency of the UNDAF and the sustainability of the CCPAP outcomes. The key findings are:

- A major area of weakness is the lack of use of a Monitoring and Evaluation tool that includes baselines and targets in order to measure the higher-level results and possible development impact of the current UNDAF at the end of 2011.
- The AWP and their related projects are seen by government stakeholders as being *outside of their daily work* and are therefore seen as an additional layer. The projects within an AWP are implemented individually by a particular UN agency and there is little interaction among the projects. As a result the AWP team members consider the project implementation, monitoring and reporting and financial accountability processes quite burdensome.
- As a result of the widespread content of the UNDAF and natural staff changes, communication on a variety of aspects (policy, programmatic, operational) at all levels-among UN agency staff, between Government and the UN, within the Government agencies, among AWP team members- is still inadequate and can lead to mis-information.

Summary of Recommendations

Based on the findings this report presents a set of recommendations for serious consideration by the Government and the UNCT. These are summarised as follows:

At the upstream level

- **It is strongly recommended that the next UNDAF should continue to focus on the MDGs and human rights. Outcomes should be formulated around a maximum of 3 core development issues that are also currently important development priorities for Suriname. Outcomes should also**

be formulated in a clear and specific way, focussing on specific target groups of the population. They should reflect areas and services where the UN has a clear comparative advantage and can deliver effectively.

- It is strongly recommended to discuss individually with the non-resident UN agencies how they wish to participate in the next UNDAF; if their future funding support to Suriname is limited or if they do not see a major benefit to participation in programmatic terms, it is recommended that the UNDAF serve them solely as a coordination and information sharing mechanism. (the existing theme groups could be also helpful in this arrangement)
- It is strongly recommended that a set of process indicators and targets be included for the UNDAF and that these should be part of the recently developed M and E framework and tool e.g. incidences of overlap/duplication, reduction in number of small projects, increased examples of jointly-funded activities/studies/field visits etc.
- It is strongly recommended that the UNCT take urgent action to facilitate the implementation of the M and E tool with all the stakeholders in the UNDAF/CCPAP in order to collect the necessary evidence for an in-depth end evaluation of the UNDAF.

Engagement with the Government

- It is recommended that the UNCT take more time in the first quarter of 2011 to invest in briefing the new government leaders and their staff on the DaO and UNDAF processes. If administratively possible, the formulation of the next UNDAF should be re-scheduled until the second quarter of 2011.
- It is recommended that the UNCT and the Government explore a new way of working and collaborating together, especially given the evolving development and investment situation in Suriname in the coming years. In plain words the UN approach should be more “this is what we are and what we do-how can we help you achieve your priorities?”

Engagement with NGOs/CBOs and other development partners

- It is recommended that the UN make more effort to involve those larger NGOs/CBOs in policy dialogues (as opposed to using them as project implementers) with the Government and Parliament, especially on sensitive issues such as the situation of most at risk populations.
- It is recommended that the UN take steps to learn more about the activities of other new/non-traditional development partners to Suriname.
Even though opportunities for practical joint work may be very limited, this will create opportunities to advocate for the principles, norms and standards that the UN stands for.

At the downstream level

- **It is strongly recommended that programme outcomes should be kept to a manageable number and that they should be formulated in a specific, measurable, achievable, relevant and time-bound way, with baseline data and targets to be achieved.**
- **It is recommended that a programme outcome should be financially or technically support by at least 2 UN agencies, otherwise it cannot be considered a “joint UN programme”.**
- **It is recommended that the UN agencies (especially the resident ones) reduce the number of projects they support which will give the entire programme a more strategic and focussed image. An indicator for this could be included in the M and E tool.**

It will take a bold and possibly radical move for the Government of Suriname and the UN Country Team to formulate the next UNDAF along the key recommendations made in this Report. Although there may be some organisational hurdles to overcome, the UNCT has demonstrated that it has the commitment, in-house knowledge and capacity to work with the new Government to develop a new UNDAF for 2012-2016. This UNDAF has the potential to be more strategic, focussed and relevant to the evolving country context, resulting in an stronger overall development impact for Suriname.

1. INTRODUCTION

At the request of the Government of Suriname (GoS) and the UN Country Team (UNCT) and in line with the UNDAF process requirements, an evaluation of the UN Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) for the period 2008-2011 was carried out in November/December 2010. The Terms of Reference (TOR) for the evaluation are attached as Annex 1 to this report. In summary form, the main objectives are 1) to evaluate in programmatic terms the achievements or progress being made towards the UNDAF outcomes and 2) to evaluate the underlying processes for the planning, coordination, implementation and monitoring of the UNDAF. In short, the evaluation asks the question: is the UNDAF mechanism contributing to more effective and visible development results and is these results being delivered in a more efficient, cost-effective way?

The evaluation was carried out by one international consultant with the backing of the UNCT, the Resident Coordinator's Office (RCO) and a UN Evaluation Team that included a representative from the UN Desk in the Government/Ministry of Finance³. The following tools were used to inform the consultant about the progress of the UNDAF: extensive review of key documents and reports (see Annex 4); and extensive stakeholder consultations with representatives from the Government, the UN, non-government organisations (NGOs), and the international development community. The list of organisations/persons interviewed is attached as Annex 3.

Because of time constraints, the evaluation also had to rely on written narratives and inputs especially from the UN agencies which could not be verified "in the field" e.g. by visiting the numerous projects, interviewing beneficiaries of training. Nevertheless the stakeholder consultations and documents generated a significant amount of interesting qualitative and to a lesser extent, quantitative information that enabled the consultant to extrapolate common findings and reach common conclusions.

1.1 Country Context

A country data sheet is attached as Annex 2 to the report. For the purpose of this evaluation there are a few important contextual points that need to be mentioned.

Suriname held general elections on 25 May 2010 and Mr. Desiree Delano Bouterse was elected as the new President of the country and a new coalition came into power. This naturally led to many Cabinet changes and some re-organisation of ministries. The previous Ministry of Planning and Development Cooperation (PLOS-which was the key national coordinating partner for the UN and other development partners) has been disbanded and the UN Desk (responsible for UN affairs) has been merged into the Ministry of Finance (MoF). Additionally, the responsibility for youth affairs has been taken out of the Ministry of Education and placed within the new Ministry of Sport and Youth Affairs. At the

³ This team never met during the course of the evaluation but was kept informed through email communication

same time, major policy statements about a variety of national interest issues are expected in the coming months.

The contraction of global demand and consumer spending has impacted negatively on the Caribbean region's tourism, energy and mining sectors and on net remittances from abroad. Because of Suriname's relatively conservative financial sector and continued strong performance in the gold, oil, construction and infrastructure sectors, the impact of the global recession has been relatively limited. However, there are signs that the economy is feeling the impact of the global recession. Over the UNDAF period Suriname's annual growth rate averaged at about 5% per year. In 2009 real GDP has fallen from 6.5% in 2008 to 4.8%.⁴ The consumer price inflation rate has risen noticeably and unemployment has risen from 9.5% in 2004⁵ to about 15%.⁶ Out of this total it is most worrying that young people in the years 15-29 make up about 28% of total⁷ unemployment. Additionally, given the uncertainty about the speed at which the global economy will recover, close monitoring and anticipatory measures will need to be built into the next Multi-Annual Development Plan for 2012-2016.

Finally, in terms of human development Suriname falls into the "medium human development" category of countries, and has held a fairly static position on the human development index (HDI) as shown below, with a slight improvement in ranking during the UNDAF period.

Table 1

| Year | HDI | RANK |
|-----------|-------|------|
| 2007/2008 | 0.769 | 97 |
| 2009 | 0.642 | 97 |
| 2010 | 0.648 | 94 |

Source: www.hdrstats.undp.org

There has been progress made in some key *national-level* social indicators over the last ten years such as a reduction in the infant mortality rate and the maternal mortality rate and an increase in primary school enrolment. However these national figures mask wide disparities between the urban and urban coastal areas and the rural interior.

Given it's abundance of natural resources and it's small population the majority of whom are well-educated, it is often expressed that Suriname has not yet reached its full potential in terms of socio-economic development. This will be the greatest challenge for the new Government, the private sector and the country's citizens in the next decade.

⁴ IMF World Economic Outlook Database, October 2008

⁵ ABS Use of 2004 Census Data

⁶ ILO Regional Office for Latin America and the Caribbean, 2008 Labour Overview

⁷ Suriname MDG Progress Report, 2008

1.2 UN context and the UNDAF

There are two important international contextual points that need to be made to preface this section. Firstly, the UN is collectively committed to promoting the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) and other international commitments in Suriname by 2015. Secondly, the UN is also committed to working towards the principles of the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness⁸. These two sets of international goals are fully in line with Suriname's own efforts to promote sustainable human development and to encourage greater efficiency and effectiveness of its external development assistance.

There are 12 UN agencies supporting Suriname's development efforts that make up the UN Country team (UNCT): UNICEF, PAHO/WHO, UNDP, UNFPA, UNAIDS, UNIFEM, FAO, ECLAC, ILO, UNESCO, UNIC and WFP.⁹ Out of these, only 4 UN agencies are resident in Suriname: UNICEF, PAHO/WHO, UNDP and UNFPA. These resident agencies have the largest programmes in financial terms and because of their in-country presence, are most active and proactive in the UNDAF.

With the change of Government, the Ministry of Finance was tentatively made responsible for the overall coordination and monitoring of UN-supported programmes. The former UN Desk (consisting of 1 Coordinator and 3 Policy Officers) was moved to the Ministry of Finance and continues to be the responsible operational unit, under the supervision of an Acting Director of Planning.¹⁰

The current UNDAF is the second one for Suriname but is the first UNDAF to be part of the "Delivering as One" (DaO) process that was initiated in Suriname in 2007. This is an important point to note because it was as a result of *the Government's urging to eliminate the fragmentation and duplication of UN-supported activities that Suriname became a self-starter DaO country in the DaO process*. Therefore the current UNDAF and the subsequent Common Country Programme Action Plan (CCPAP) were and still are seen as *the* central mechanisms to improve the planning, coordination, implementation and monitoring of UN-supported activities in Suriname.

Preparatory work for the current UNDAF and the next one for the period 2012-2016 have been both intensive and extensive. A great deal of excellent analytical work and brainstorming was done and relevant training implemented for both UN and government partners. The process was very participatory involving government representatives from national and sectoral levels, UNCT members and their staff, and a smaller number of representatives from the donor community, the non-government sector/civil society and the private sector.

⁸ March 2005

⁹ See list of acronyms for full names.

¹⁰ While finalising this report, the UNCT was formally notified in late December 2010 that UN affairs will come under the responsibility of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and that the UN Desk will be moved to that Ministry.

The table below summarise the key events and milestones in the preparation and implementation of the current UNDAF 2008-2011.

| ACTIVITY/MILESTONE | TIMING |
|--|---|
| Formulation of a Common Country Assessment by the UNCT and partners | Completed in August 2006 |
| Strategic Prioritisation Retreat for UN and Government | September 2006 |
| Formulation of UNDAF | October 2006- January 2007 |
| UNDAF Stakeholder Review and Validation Meeting | February 2008 |
| Signing of the UNDAF between Government and the UN | 3 April 2007 |
| Formulation of the Common Country Programme Action Plan (CCPAP) 2008-2011 | 2007-early 2008 |
| Signing of the CCPAP between the Government and the UN | 3 April 2008 |
| Formulation and Implementation of Annual Work Plans for each UNDAF outcome | Continuous from 2008 to present |
| Mid-Term review of the UNDAF | March-April 2010 |
| Annual Review Meetings | December 2008 December 2009 Held on 3 December 2010 |
| Evaluation of the UNDAF | November-December 2010 |
| UNDAF Implementation | Continuous in 2011 |
| Final review of the UNDAF/Final Evaluation of the UNDAF | October-December 2011 |

The following table summarises the preparatory actions for the next UNDAF 2012-2016 and the actions needed for its final approval.

| ACTIVITY/MILESTONE | TIMING |
|--|-----------------------|
| UNCT Regional UNDAF Training | March 2010 |
| UN Programme Staff Retreat | March 2010 |
| GoS and UNCT meeting to agree on the Road Map | May 2010 |
| Government/UN RBM Workshop New M and E tool introduced | April 2010 |
| Workshop on Assessment of UN Comparative Advantages | July 2010 |
| Road Map submitted to Regional Offices and Hqs. for approval | August 2010 |
| Meetings between UNCT and new Government Ministers to introduce UNDAF etc. | August-September 2010 |
| UNCT with all UN agencies Meeting on | October 2010 |

| | |
|--|----------------------------|
| CCA/UNDAF | |
| Workshop on Human Rights-Based Programming/Results-based Management | November 2010 |
| Updating of the Common Country assessment (CCA) | November-December 2010 |
| UNDAF/CCPAP Annual Review | December 2010 |
| Presentation of Evaluation and CCA Results at Government/UN High-Level Meeting | 9 December 2010 |
| UN/Government Retreat to kick-off Formulation of the UNDAF | Third week of January 2011 |
| Formulation of the UNDAF | January-March 2011 |
| UN Strategic meeting on new UNDAF | January 2010 |
| GoS/UN Strategic Planning Retreat to finalise UNDAF Priorities | January 2010 |
| Submission of the UNDAF to Government for approval | March 2011 |
| Submission of the UNDAF to the UN's Executive Board for approval | 31 March 2011 |

Regarding the Government's own national planning process, the current Multi-Annual Development Plan 2006-2011 (MOP) provides the overall development framework for the development priorities identified in the current UNDAF. The Government will start discussions and formulation of its new MOP 2012-2016 during the course of 2011. Although the planning and formulation of the UNDAF is somewhat earlier than the planning for the new MOP, the expectation is that the current national and sectoral development priorities in the MOP will not change radically and that there will be a continued emphasis on MDG-related areas coupled with economic growth.

It is expected that the UNDAF 2012-2016 will remain broad (at the outcome level) allowing for more specificity to be developed in the UNDAF Action Plan (formally known as the CCPAP) in line with the next MOP 2012-2016.

2. FINDINGS

The findings of this evaluation are presented under two broad headings, one which deals with the *substantive programme content of the UNDAF* and one which deals with *underlying process aspects*. In addition, the findings are examined against the main criteria identified in the TOR i.e. relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact. Although every effort has been made to avoid duplication this may still occasionally appear as many findings are cross-cutting.

An important point needs to be made here about the availability of data. Statistical trends and data are mostly available up to 2008 which was the first year of UNDAF implementation. This year new data and statistical trends are being collected, for example MICS 4 and the next Census will be carried out in 2011. In this respect the timing of this evaluation was rather unfortunate.

2.1. UNDAF: The Programme Content

Relevance of the UNDAF

There is unanimous consensus that the UNDAF and its strategic priorities address the national development priorities in the Government's MOP 2006-2011¹¹. The UNDAF has three core outcomes which are:

- a) By 2011 pro-poor policies are in place to ensure that vulnerable groups in society benefit from growth and have equitable access to opportunities, assets and resources.
 - This corresponds to policy priority 1.3 on Fair Distribution
- b) By 2011 governance systems are enhanced through participatory planning and monitoring, public sector reform, legal reform and protection
 - This corresponds to policy priority 1.3 on Good Governance.
- c) By 2011, improved access of the population to quality education, health care, legal and social protection services
 - This corresponds to policy priority 1.2 on Social Security (includes education, health, legal services)

In addition regular mention is made of the MDGs as a “guideline” for national development strategies. Similarly, gender equality and the rights-based approach are also explicitly referred to as “principles” of the national development strategy. At the sectoral level there is also general agreement that the UNDAF priorities are well aligned with sectoral priorities. Stakeholders at the programme/project implementation level conveyed that when they receive a project proposal they first check whether it fits into the priorities of the participating government ministries before it is taken up in the Annual Work Plan (AWP).

¹¹ MOP 2006-2011 pages 9-14

Role of the UN

The role of the UN as an “honest broker” and advocate for the MDGs and vulnerable groups, for bringing attention to inequities and injustice, for setting and promoting international norms and standards, for exposing Suriname to best practices and technological innovations is very relevant to Suriname’s development efforts. This role is very much appreciated by government, non-government and development partner representatives.

2.2. Government Engagement and Leadership

As mentioned in section 1.2 above, it was at the strong urging of the Government in 2007 that the UNCT came together under the leadership of the Resident Coordinator (RC) to find ways and means to work more cohesively together. The UNDAF and DaO processes were essential elements of this response. At the start of the UNDAF in 2008 the engagement and leadership of the Government at the national level was very apparent. It was at the sectoral level that the engagement and leadership was not so evident largely because the UNDAF process was new to most stakeholders at the sectoral level¹².

Initially, the UNCT staff with the support of the RCO, were generally taking the initiative to implement various day-to-day actions. This was understandable given that the process was extremely new to everyone, UN and government staff alike. It was therefore not surprising that in the first year of AWP implementation (2008) the UNCT and their staff had to play a very active supportive and guiding role towards their respective government partners. Operational tools for common fund management and reporting such as the Harmonised Approach for Cash Transfers (HACT) and Fund Authorisation and Certificate of Expenditures (FACE) were also introduced and these were also (and still are) considered complicated.

In 2009, Government leadership was much stronger than in the initial stages and they had indeed begun to own the process much more fully. The UN Desk coordinated quarterly implementers meetings and financial reviews. At the 2009 UNDAF Annual review the UN Desk produced a financial overview of the UNDAF CCPAP implementation. This formed the basis of discussions with the RC and the then Minister of PLOS for future planning in 2010/ signing of the AWP for 2010.

The holding of national elections in May this year has had a major impact on the level of leadership and engagement of the national coordinating body for the UNDAF, which is quite common in an election year. From the beginning of 2010 the Government was occupied with election preparations and was cautious about making commitments beyond May. After the elections, there was also a lull in activity while the new Government was being formed and a new Cabinet was appointed in August. The professional staff at the UN Desk was reduced from about 7-8 officers in 2008 to 4 in 2010. This situation has had a delaying impact on the coordination and implementation of the UNDAF. As mentioned earlier, the Minister of Finance¹³ is now responsible for UN affairs and strong efforts will need

¹² See DaO Report “Lessons Learned and Next Steps Forward”, July 2009

¹³ Since 1 January 2011 the Ministry of Foreign Affairs

to be made by the UNCT to engage this Minister and other high-level partners in the next UNDAF to ensure continued strong collaboration and government engagement in the UNDAF process.

At the sectoral level engagement with the UNDAF and CCPAP implementation has increased since 2008. Although it varies among ministries, there is a generally strong commitment by the different implementing agencies to the projects that they are responsible for, partly reflected in their willingness to allocate additional time to the work involved. However, again, because all the ministries have new ministers (except the Ministry of Health) the AWP's do not yet benefit from high-level leadership and support.

2.3 Effectiveness/Programme Results

In support of the three UNDAF development outcomes mentioned above, the Government/UN identified 11 programme outcomes. These were operationalised into individual AWP's and currently 8 (out of the total 11) AWP's are being implemented. All the AWP's are implemented by multiple government and non-government partners and supported by multiple UN agencies.

The key general finding is that the formulation of several of the programme outcomes is too broad and ambitious (in some cases nation-wide). This has created the impression among government respondents that *all* UN-funded activities have been "forced" into the UNDAF/CCPAP and has resulted in it's being too "spread out" and unfocussed (even though most of them address the MDGs). As a result, in many cases it is not possible to measure the contribution of these UN-supported activities to the programme outcome. In order to substantiate this finding, some examples are noted below:

CP 2.3 *Citizens* participate more effectively in decentralised planning, decision-making, implementation and monitoring

CP 3.1 *All* people have access to quality health care, including universal access to sexual and reproductive health services, to maintain the state of health for the entire population

CP 3.2 *All* children have access to quality education

The second general finding is that at the programme implementation level and through the AWP mechanism, there is a *jointly coordinated approach* to the interventions supported by different agencies but these are not formal "joint UN-supported programmes". This view is supported by several government/non-government stakeholders who commented that the project activities were implemented individually with the support of one UN agency and that they had little interaction with other projects in the AWP's.

A third major finding was that the broad and over-ambitious results framework for the UNDAF did not include measurable results, baselines and targets, making it difficult, if not impossible to measure the impact of the UNDAF outcomes. An attempt was in March 2010 by the UN to develop a Monitoring and Evaluation (M and E) framework and tool for the UNDAF and CCPAP which if used correctly, should help to measure overall results by the end of the UNDAF cycle in 2011.

This section attempts an analysis of the progress achieved so far towards these programme outcomes. In so doing, some critical points need to be stressed.

Firstly, given the very tight timeframe for in-country work, the consultant had to rely heavily on narrative inputs from UN agencies, the study of various reports and the stakeholder consultations. It was therefore not possible to verify information by visiting projects, interviewing beneficiaries of training etc. Secondly, as mentioned above, the formulation of several of the programme outcomes is so broad that it is not possible to measure the sole contribution of the UN. Thirdly, it cannot be overly stressed that the results achieved or progress made against these outcomes are a product of *the joint and combined efforts of the Government partners, the UN, the involved NGOs/CBOs and other development partners. Given the relatively small financial contribution from the UN (an average of about 10mUSD per UNDAF year) the UN's contribution should be seen as a "seed" investment within a much larger national development effort.*

Despite these constraints, it has been possible to extract programme results at different levels i.e. "micro" and "macro", and make general statements about progress towards each outcome. Please note that the outcomes have been paraphrased for easy reading purposes.

UNDAF OUTCOME 1 By 2011 pro-poor policies in place to ensure vulnerable groups benefit from growth

Outcome 1.1 National authorities have the capacity to articulate, implement and monitor evidence-based pro-poor policies and strategies

Significant support has been given by the UN through four broad interventions : firstly, advocacy and awareness-raising for the MDGs and vulnerable groups e.g. the poor, women and children, people living with HIV/AIDS, un-employed youth; secondly, policy advice; thirdly, capacity building and institutional strengthening ; and fourthly, the provision of technical assistance and exposure to international best practices.

Some noteworthy highlights are: an MDG Progress Report¹⁴ was prepared in 2009 as a "flagship" document for MDG advocacy; a National Action Plan for Children has been developed which incorporates the key roles of each ministry regarding the implementation of the Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC); all government partners have been trained in Results-Based Monitoring, and the implementation of the Secretary General's "Unite to End Violence Against Women" Campaign".

In support of the Government's National Strategy on Development of Statistics (NSDS), a multi-sectoral process was initiated to reach consensus on the need for higher quality disaggregated social data and a new and consistent poverty measurement for Suriname. This poverty measurement should include an income/monetary component and a multi-dimensional component (i.e. reflecting best practice). This consensus was reached at a regional Conference on Poverty

¹⁴ A Suriname Baseline MDG Report was prepared in 2006.

Measurement held in Paramaribo in August 2010 where several UN agencies brought in expertise and regional experiences¹⁵. Complementary to this, national capacities have been enhanced through their participation in several data collection and analytical exercises: Multi-Indicator Cluster Survey (MICS) 3 and the field work and data entry for MICS 4, baseline assessment of social statistics, an in-depth study on child vulnerability, a knowledge, attitude, practices baseline on child rights, capacity building on DEVInfo and the creation of ABSInfo, the Situation Analysis on Children and support for the Agricultural Census.

Another result is that the concept of gender mainstreaming and the importance of collecting sex-disaggregated data have been introduced in the Bureau of Gender Affairs under the Ministry of Home Affairs. As a follow-up, the new Minister of Home Affairs is supportive of continued training/capacity building of gender focal points in all the ministries in 2011, with UN support. Out of a UN-supported workshop in February 2010 on a “Quotum Policy” a recommendation has been made to the GoS to introduce a quota system to advance the participation of women in politics and decision-making.

This combined UN effort has resulted in the MDGs and the situation facing vulnerable groups (lack of access to resources, basic social services, participation etc.) being placed squarely in the country’s development agenda. Secondly, they have sensitised the Government partners to the need to modernise and update their data collection and analysis systems and the Government is taking action on this front.

Outcome 1.2 Credit and employment facilities improved especially for vulnerable groups

There has been no action taken on this outcome. Part of the reason appears to be that the Government is implementing a large micro-credit programme of its own and the role of the UN in the area of micro-credit is unclear.

Outcome 1.3 Employment and labour policies in place to promote employment and decent work for all

UN interventions focus on sensitising the Government/Ministry of Labour, Technology and Environment (ATM), Employers Organisations and Workers Associations to the enabling environment factors needed to promote a Decent Work Agenda. Through facilitating South-South cooperation and capacity building Suriname has learned about up-to-date labour legislation and how to set minimum wages¹⁶ as “best practice”. In an effort to improve the situation of boys and girls who drop out of school (a vulnerable group), the UN has supported an inventory of second chance/vocational programmes to identify gaps and needs and an alternative approach as necessary.

¹⁵ ILO, ECLAC, UNDP

¹⁶ A workshop was held in March 2010 with the support of ILO/IDB

Outcome 1.4 A sustainable and participatory natural resources planning and management system in place.

There are several government agencies (ATM, LVV, ROGB, MoF, NCCR, SCF, NIMOS) participating in this outcome which makes it somewhat difficult to assess collective progress and results. The evaluation broadly concludes that the work of the UN in environment, climate change and disaster management has had some higher-level impact. The Suriname Conservation Foundation (SCF) project has placed environmental conservation on the “front burner”, and facilitated the preparation of frameworks and strategies for biodiversity conservation and climate change. Public education and awareness on environment and sustainable practices have increased. Capacity building in various ministries and entities such as ATM, ROGB, NIMOS, LVV, Natural Resources is ongoing. As a result, Suriname has gained in capacity and confidence to engage in negotiating fora at the regional and international levels.

A major component of this outcome is the UN’s support to the SCF in strengthening its capacities in the management of protected areas and biodiversity conservation.¹⁷ The UN facilitates access to high quality international expertise, ensures accountability and has a quality assurance role. A second major component of this outcome is the Global Environment Facility (GEF) where the UN again facilitates and supports the development of project proposals and enabling environment activities such as the formulation of a Biodiversity Strategy (2003) and a second National Communications Plan for the UN Fund for Climate Change (UNFCCC); and education on sustainable environmental practices for the general public. There has also been UN cooperation on pesticide management, phase-out of persistent organic pollutants, biodiversity conservation and phase-out of ozone depleting substances. In addition, a project on coastal protected areas management is being developed with the Ministry of Physical Planning, Land and Housing (ROGB). An initiative in the framework of the global UN REDD programme was recently formulated that has the potential to lead to a larger partnership involving participating UN agencies, the World Bank and others in the context of the Cancun agreement on the new climate fund.

UNDAF OUTCOME 2 By 2011 governance systems are enhanced through increased participation, public sector reform, legal reform and protection

Outcome 2.1 Legal frameworks are in conformity with international human rights standards (ref. women and children’s rights, environment, work etc.)

As a result of UN support, the following key legislations were approved during 2008-2010: the Domestic Violence Act, revision of the Moral Code and the Marriage Act; law for the installation of a child “ombudsbureau”. In addition, other key legislation including the “Raamwet Opvang” and legislation on child care including Early Childhood Development (ECD) standards, have been drafted and are waiting for approval by the Parliament.

¹⁷ UNDP administers 3.6m USD allocated from Dutch Treaty Funds for this project.

UN support has been very visible in raising awareness and sensitising all parts of the population to the importance of human-rights and human rights-based programming and the importance of adhering to international conventions e.g. the Convention on the Rights of the Child, the Convention on the Elimination of all forms of Discrimination against Women etc.

The main interventions have been: awareness raising activities such as joint UN campaigns e.g. a child rights campaign in 25 pilot schools and thereafter expanded to all 329 primary schools, analytical surveys,¹⁸ capacity building e.g. judges and lawyers have been trained in the practical application of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, support to the involvement of NGOs and Foundations in grassroots activities e.g. Foundation for the Supervision and Management of Creches (SBEC) organised a 6-month training for 244 day care workers and 120 parents in low-income areas of Paramaribo.

The UN has also supported the sensitisation of staff from the Ministries of Home Affairs (BiZA) and Justice and Police (J&P) and the media on the importance of mainstreaming human rights into their work. However, so far the impact of this exposure is not evident in the public arena because the enabling environment is not conducive to such an approach. For example, after journalists were trained in human rights-based reporting they were asked if they were using it in writing their articles. Their response was that their newspaper bosses did not think it was “newsworthy” enough.

Outcome 2.2 Public sector strengthened in policy guidance, coordination and facilitation of sustainable human development

In 2006 the Inter-American Development Bank (IDB) prepared an extensive report entitled a “Road Map for Public Sector Reform in Suriname” but there has been no action from the Government to initiate a public sector administration reform programme (PAR). This is clearly a development aspect for the Government’s leadership and it is hoped that interest in the PAR will be renewed with the development of a new MOP in 2011. The UN stands ready to assist the Government when and if this materialises.

Outcome 2.3 Citizens participate more effectively in decentralised planning, decision-making, implementation and monitoring

The AWP for this outcome has not been initiated. However, one of the greatest strengths of the UN is its participatory and inclusive approach to development. Therefore, the essence of this outcome has been mainstreamed into all the other outcome areas that the UN is working in. The UN has both collectively and individually facilitated a participatory inclusive approach to planning, decision-making, implementation and monitoring. The AWPs themselves are a reflection of this approach and several government and non-government stakeholders commented positively that “it was the first time they worked together with other organisations on a project”.

¹⁸ MICS 2009

In general NGOs/CBOs have been more involved at the programme/AWP implementation level than at the national policy-making level. One example of their involvement at the national level was in the preparation of the second MDG progress report.

However, as a result of facilitating the involvement of NGOs/CBOs in projects dealing with such sensitive issues as gender-based violence, HIV/AIDS, human rights, youth at risk, poor and isolated communities, their grassroots experiences have been brought by the UN to the policy-making level. Through these projects significant capacity building is also provided to many different groups working on a variety of issues ranging from childcare, health education, family planning etc. to project management, proposal writing, external communications etc.

Another intervention that has significantly raised the participation of the country's citizens has been the UN's support (together with that of the IDB) on capacity strengthening to manage the May 2010 elections. This involved a needs assessment, training of MOHA staff, and training personnel recruited by the OKB for monitoring the voting process. Technical advice on more secure identity cards and an improved voters list has been provided but these are still to be implemented. The success of this jointly funded set of activities was reflected in the report of the Independent Observer Mission that these elections "had been conducted in a good and fair way".

UNDAF OUTCOME 3 By 2011, there is improved access to quality education, health care, legal and social protection services

Outcome 3.1 All people have access to quality health care, including universal access to sexual and reproductive health services

This outcome is implemented by a very broad AWP which includes several components: vaccination coverage, family health, water and sanitation, HIV/AIDS and disaster preparedness (for diseases) and therefore it has been extremely difficult to synchronise UN assistance into a cohesive, coordinated approach. The main interventions are focussed on service delivery, institutional strengthening and capacity building and encouraging leadership of a multi-sectoral approach. Some support is also provided for technical and other urgently needed equipment and health education materials.

In terms of policy guidance the UN has supported the development of a new health sector plan 2011-2015 and a sexual and reproductive health policy; however both policies are yet to be formally approved by the Government.

The UN has collaborated on the expanded programme of immunisation (EPI), the adaptation of protocols on integrated primary health care (PHC), a comprehensive primary healthcare plan for the interior and an Integrated Management of Childhood Approach. Complementary capacity building has been carried out such as the training of health workers in the interior in coaching/management/surveillance and of Health Ministry staff in health systems, data collection and analysis, monitoring, community participation etc. In 2008 PAHO/UNICEF/UNFPA jointly supported a Safe Motherhood Needs Assessment

and a National Plan which has been finalised but not yet approved for implementation.

The conclusion for this outcome is that it is so broad and consists of so many components and was lacking an M and E plan, that it is very difficult to monitor and measure results. Therefore it is also extremely difficult to extract results attributable to a common UN approach.

One noteworthy higher-level result has been the UN's collaboration on the Expanded Programme on Immunisation (EPI). About 75% of children in Suriname had received all recommended vaccinations by 29 months.¹⁹ PAHO and UNICEF support to the vaccination system and particularly to vaccination week in the Americas, could be one factor among many others, for increased vaccination coverage for children in Suriname from 83.9% in 2006 to 86.7% in 2008 for DPT3 and from 82.6% in 2006 to 88.9% in 2009 for Measles/Mumps/Rubella.

Outcome 3.2 All children have access to quality education

The UN²⁰, together with the Belgian Flemish Development Cooperation (VVOB) has supported the Ministry of Education (MINOV) in strengthening the capacities of school teachers and district administrators in the implementation of child friendly practices in schools. By the end of 2010 all teachers at 100% of primary schools throughout Suriname have received in-depth in-service training in child friendly education and a training on these child friendly approaches has also been extended to all central-level MINOV staff. In addition, special consideration and guidance is being provided to school teams in the interior, to strengthen the capacity of non-qualified teachers in the application of child friendly education principles. This training is part of a long-term capacity development process which aims to increase the quality of primary education throughout the country.

The UN has also supported a detailed mapping of all schools in the interior which will enable MINOV to conduct detailed planning for improving the quality of education in the interior where education indicators are especially poor. In an effort to improve the situation of girls and boys who have dropped out of school, the UN has also supported an inventory of the current second chance/vocational programmes to identify gaps and needs for new/alternative models of education for different age groups who drop out of school in the interior. This is being conducted under the joint leadership of MINOV and ATM.

Outcome 3.3 People are using adequate legal services and have improved access to decent work and social safety nets

Systematic efforts are being made to improve the juvenile justice system and child protective services in Suriname. These include a range of capacity building interventions such as the training of Opa Doelie²¹ staff in planning, monitoring and evaluation; 7% of Suriname's judges, public prosecutors and lawyers have been trained in the CRC; NGOs and the victims support unit of the Ministry of Justice

¹⁹ MDG Progress Report, 2009

²⁰ UNICEF is the lead agency

²¹ A juvenile pre-detention centre

and Police have been similarly trained; and continued support to the Child Helpline. These are combined with outreach activities for schools and parents on moral offenses and violence against children and the strengthening of quality referral systems for vulnerable and abused children. As mentioned in the section on Outcome 2.1 above, the UN has also supported various legislations incorporating international standards and principles to improve Suriname's enabling environment for its most vulnerable groups.

At the national policy level the UN has facilitated South-South cooperation on small and medium enterprise development methodologies and training as a source of employment²². It has also recently started collaboration with the Ministry of Social Affairs and Housing (SoZaVo) on how to make the current social safety nets more effective and better targeted to the most deserving groups. SoZaVo staff have received training in leadership and management; a review of social policies is soon to be completed and a meeting with all development partners and NGOs to present the results is planned soon.

The UN has also supported the piloting of a monitoring mechanism for school drop-outs in five schools and the development of a national policy paper on compulsory school education based on the pilot results.

At the grassroots level the UN has supported NGOs/CBOs who address the problems of vulnerable groups by raising these groups' awareness to their rights and by assisting them with alternative livelihoods. For example, the Foundation Maxi Linder addresses the problems of commercial sex workers (most of them are female). The UN provided funding support to train 10 female sex workers in sewing (as an alternative income source) and now 6 of those women are working as seamstresses and have left the streets. Some may consider this as a small achievement but it is not; the challenge is how to upscale this "grassroots achievement" to reach the entire target group and as part of national programme.

Outcome 3.4 A well-coordinated decentralised national multi-sectoral response to HIV/AIDS continues to be operational until 2011

The long existence of UNAIDS at the global level has already established an effective coordination mechanism at country level for the coordination of UN-supported activities relating to HIV and AIDS.

HIV/AIDS continues to be a sensitive topic in Suriname and is an area where the Government/Ministry of Health shows strong leadership. The UN has actively supported and advocated for a multi-sectoral response to HIV and AIDS as reflected in the new National Strategic Plan on HIV for 2009-2013.

With the UN's support, a national HIV Council and secretariat were established in 2009 and the National AIDS Programme (NAP) was re-structured as a Project Executing Unit (PEU). Three technical working groups- on treatment and care, prevention stigma and discrimination, monitoring and evaluation- were set up. The Government's focus is primarily on treatment and care and in terms of

²² ILO is the lead agency

prevention, Prevention of Mother to Child Transmission (PMTCT) has been a strong priority since 2009.

Based on a National Strategic Plan, a national M and E plan has also been developed with results-based indicators and relevant staff has been trained in results-based M and E. The UN has also supported government partners in preparing the UN General Assembly's Special Session on HIV/AIDS (UNGASS) Country Report for Suriname in 2010.

With regard to awareness raising, HIV prevention campaigns focussing on youth in the urban areas and the interior took place in 2009 and 2010 and on PMTCT in 2010. These were organised with joint UN support. Over 20,000 women of reproductive age were reached with information on HIV prevention as part of the MICS fieldwork in 2010. The UN has also supported the sensitisation of workers in the workplace to HIV/AIDS as this clearly has a spill-over effect in family life. Finally, three UN agencies are working together to support a capacity building training of NGOs who are working with Most at Risk Populations (MARPS) in project management and results-based M and E.

Theme Groups

As part of the overall UNDAF framework the following UN theme groups were set up during the course of 2009:

- Social Data-led by UNDP
 - Health-led by PAHO/WHO
 - Development of the Interior-led by UNICEF
 - HIV and AIDS- led by PAHO/WHO (led by UNFPA in 2009). In addition to the UN Theme Group consisting of the heads of agencies, cooperation in the field of HIV is also coordinated by a Joint UN Team on AIDS (JUNTA) consisting of the technical officers and HIV focal points in the UN agencies.²³
- A theme group on gender is envisaged-to be led by UNFPA

Some theme groups are more active than others and at the moment, the ones on social data and HIV and AIDS are generating the most interest and joint activity. At the moment the membership of the theme group is only UN staff but this could change in the future once the link between these theme groups and the new UNDAF become clear.

2.4 Sustainability and Impact

The Changing Development Cooperation and Funding Context

In order to place the UNDAF in an up-to-date context, there are some important points to note about the changing development cooperation context. Firstly, according to the OECD/DAC, net official development assistance (ODA) has fallen from 151m USD in 2007 to 102m USD in 2008. The share of net ODA to

²³ This is a globally determined structure.

Gross National Income (GNI) has also fallen from 6.2% in 2007 to 3.7% in 2008.²⁴ Secondly, the MOP was costed at US\$2.8 billion for the 5-year period, of which only 10% would be donor financed, and the remaining 90% would come from national resources including government, private and foreign direct investments²⁵. Thirdly, there are many new countries and development partners interested to support Suriname's development efforts in the coming decade e.g. China, India, Brazil, the World Bank, the Islamic Development Bank etc.²⁶ These figures only serve to emphasise that UN funds need to be viewed as catalytic "seed" investments, focussing on technical assistance for capacity building, within a much larger national development effort.

The total costing of the UNDAF was 40.8 million USD, an average of about 10 million USD per year. In the UNDAF document there is no specific mention made of a Government contribution. This is specified in the Common Country Programme Action Plan (CCPAP) which operationalises the UNDAF; in this document it was anticipated that the GoS would contribute 17.3 million USD towards the implementation of the CCPAP. However, a large part of this contribution for the implementation of *the programme* has not materialised.²⁷

The sustainability of the UNDAF interventions will depend on the willingness and commitment of the different government stakeholders to ensure that the numerous policies, legislations, strategies and plans that have been developed with UN support are taken on board by the respective government stakeholders and implemented as part of their own long-term strategies (this also includes budget allocation). At the moment there is little evidence of this process as all the AWP teams are focussed on individual project implementation in the short term.

Two examples were found where a government agency is using Dutch Treaty funds to co-fund UN-supported projects. An amount of 3.6m USD under the coordination of ATM is being used to co-finance projects in the environment sector; the other is a contribution by the Ministry of J&P to an UNDP-supported project on Justice, Access to Human Rights and Anti-Corruption. It was also learned that small but significant amounts of in-kind contributions are being made by all the government partners in the AWP. For example, the salaries of the government team members, communications, reproduction of documents and sometimes logistics for meetings are being financed by each government ministry. Secondly, examples were given where the UN supports activities e.g. capacity strengthening, data analysis as part of a nation-wide government effort e.g. the yearly school mapping updating exercise under MINOV.

Regarding impact, the M and E framework developed in March 2010, is not yet being fully used by the UN nor by the AWP teams and as mentioned earlier, there is not enough data to measure trends and higher level results. Relevant data will become available to some extent with MICS4 in 2011 and the Census in 2011. Therefore there is very little that this evaluation can say in concrete measurable terms about the UNDAF's development impact at this point of time.

²⁴ Source: www.oecd.org/dac/stats

²⁵ Economist Intelligence Unit–Country Profile Suriname–Main Report June 2007

²⁶ The World Bank is currently preparing an interim country strategy from 2011 with TA for 1.5mUSD.

²⁷ A significant part of this was for a PAR programme

As a general comment, one may be able to link the improved position of Suriname in the human development ranking²⁸ as a reflection of the country's increased attention to MDG-related aspects but again, this cannot be attributed to the sole efforts of the UN. What can be said is that the UNDAF has raised awareness on and ensured that the MDGs are taken into consideration in the Government's development plans, policies and strategies at national and sectoral levels. *Given the significantly increased investments expected from other sources in the coming years, the role of the UN in advocating for equal distribution and access of resources and services for the most vulnerable populations will take on even more importance.*

Secondly, a critical mass of government, non-government and UN actors has been sensitised to mainstreaming the human rights-based approach and the gender-based approach and the importance of sustainable development in their work. Thirdly, the UN's Government partners have been sensitised to the importance of more inclusive participation especially of non-state actors in the planning, implementation and monitoring of development projects. Fourthly, in several sectors and thematic areas, the UN has sensitised government and non-government partners (to a lesser extent) to the benefits of a multi-sectoral and integrated approach to addressing complex development problems; this approach was not commonly used in the Surinamese context.

2.5 UNDAF: The underlying processes

As a general finding, there is general consensus that the UNDAF is a useful and appropriate *mechanism for joint country analysis, planning, coordination, and prioritisation over the long-term. In this sense it is a broad development framework for all UN assistance to Suriname.* The UNDAF is also a good mechanism for avoiding duplication and overlap of development efforts and for creating increased coherence among the activities of the UN agencies.

However, there is still a common view among some government partners at both national and sectoral levels that the UN is not "listening enough" to their priorities when it comes to identifying project interventions and that it approaches such discussions with already pre-conceived ideas. Some government stakeholders conveyed the view that sometimes the UN "pushes" too much especially where sensitive topics are concerned e.g. HIV/AIDS, human rights, maternal mortality. This is an extremely difficult viewpoint to redress because it is precisely the role of the UN to advocate on such sensitive topics.

Another important point that was constantly made is that the programme coordinators within the ministries and other team members do not see the UNDAF/CCPAP as *integrated* into their own work; rather it is a layer that is *additional* to their regular duties.

At the programme implementation and monitoring levels, projects and activities are implemented and monitored individually by different agencies. Therefore, at this level, the image of a "joint UN" is not visible; this is not necessarily a problem

²⁸ Refer to Table 1 on page 8

for the government partners who generally understand that each UN agency has different mandates and areas of expertise.

The UNDAF is also a good mechanism for avoiding duplication and overlap of development efforts and for creating increased coherence among the activities of the UN agencies, while working towards common development results. In the past year some cases of overlap e.g. in the health sector have become evident, but these have already been addressed, in this case through a health mapping exercise to identify “who is doing what”.

2.5.1 Capacity Issues and the UNDAF

There is unanimous agreement that there are serious capacity constraints across-the-board in the implementation of the UNDAF. This point was re-emphasised at the Annual Review Meeting of the AWP held on 3 December 2010. Capacity constraints exist in government, non-government and UN agencies in a variety of aspects: coordination, operational aspects (e.g. selection of good consultants and their supervision), communication, results-based monitoring and financial management and reporting (HACT and FACE).

2.5.2 Efficiency of the UNDAF

This is a criteria that touches on both the programme and the underlying processes but it was felt that it fitted best in this section.

The UNDAF is expected to result in efficiency gains through increased collaboration, coordination and coherence within the UN system. Up to now, no-one has developed a tool and indicators to determine this and therefore one can only make general observations.

Firstly, the interactions of individual UN agencies with government agencies have probably reduced since many activities are done jointly and therefore transaction costs for the Government should have reduced. On the other hand, 3 of the resident UN agencies still have to prepare their own country programme documents (in PAHO's case a 2-year strategy) for government approval and as a result, the net benefit may not be significant. Secondly, since the outcomes are achieved through the implementation of individual UN-agency supported projects, the level of effort from both sides has probably remained unchanged.

Regarding the UN agencies, in the first year of the UNDAF, they had to allocate increased amounts of staff resources to mentoring and guiding government/non-government partners on the UNDAF and CCPAP implementation. This may now be lower; however this year they are intensively involved in many events for the preparation of the next UNDAF so again the overall level of effort may be unchanged.

In terms of harmonisation of UN agency procedures, the Harmonised Approach to Cash Transfer-HACT-being used by UNICEF, UNDP and UNFPA has been introduced and is being used. This has simplified procedures for the government

partners in their financial transactions with these three UN agencies²⁹; however, UN staff still have to enter the data into their own agency financial reporting systems. Some government and non-government stakeholders also observed that UN procedures were not as simple as those of other development partners e.g. the Dutch government.

2.5.3 The AWP

During 2009 the AWP teams became more comfortable with the AWP process and procedures and programme/project implementation was smoother. The engagement of the UN Desk in coordinating and organising the quarterly implementers meetings was very visible. One Policy Officer was dedicated to do this task and this officer has since left which has had a negative impact on the regularity of the implementers meetings. This reduced level of engagement is reflected in the fact that the AWP teams (which are planned to meet every quarter) met only 1 to maximum 2 times in 2010. This is not a reflection of lack of government commitment to the UN-supported programmes. Rather, it reflects the current uncertain institutional responsibilities and the fact that these government representatives have many other tasks and responsibilities besides their UN-related work.

It was also noted that the Project Coordinator's role was not always clear when more than one ministry is involved in the implementation and monitoring of an AWP.

2.5.4 Operational Issues

Several AWP stakeholders observed that the UNDAF and CCPAP implementation involved many rules and procedures that were new to them and which they did not always understand easily. Many of the forms and formats are in the English language, not in their native Dutch. Sometimes NGO implementers communicated directly with UN staff about their project proposals and without keeping the Project Coordinator informed.

Many government/non-government partners are still not clear on the HACT reporting of funds and require the assistance of UN staff to fill in the forms. As mentioned, the work of UN staff has probably not been reduced as a result of introducing the HACT.

There is still a great deal of coaching being done by UN staff on a variety of operational aspects in the UNDAF.

2.5.5 Communication

As also mentioned in the 2008 DaO assessment report there are still gaps in information-sharing and communication about the UNDAF and the processes

²⁹ PAHO/WHO does not participate in HACT

underlying it. This exists at all levels: among UN staff, among the AWP partners, between the national coordinating agency and the AWP and the UN etc. Given the wide scope and coverage of the UNDAF and the arrival of new staff on all sides this is not surprising and to be expected.

The Annual Review of the UNDAF (CCPAP/AWP Review and planning meeting) was a mechanism that strengthened the communication lines among the partners. The AWP implementers meeting (though they occurred infrequently in 2010), was also a mechanism that strengthened communications within the ministries and between the Ministries and the UN in the implementation of the UNDAF. It allowed all stakeholders to take stock, share common problems and find solutions to improve the implementation of the UNDAF.

Meetings between the RC/UN Coordination Analyst and the Minister of PLOS/UN Desk also contributed to strengthening communications. These monthly meetings focussed on updating government partners on the implementation of the CCPAP and the identification of gaps and issues. Many of the issues that were being addressed at this high level were also raised and discussed between the UN Coordination Analyst and the UN Desk throughout the UNDAF implementation.

2.5.6 Monitoring and Evaluation (M and E) of the UNDAF

Despite some specific efforts made by the UNCT over the past two years, this is still the weakest element of the UNDAF process. As mentioned earlier, the most recent effort to enhance the ability of the UN and the Government to monitor and evaluate the UNDAF was made in March 2010 when the UN held a workshop to develop a results-based M and E tool for the CCPAP, including baselines and annual targets, which is now ready for use. The M and E tool covers all the programmes with the exception of health and HIV which were planned separately but which are also not yet implemented.

A main finding of the evaluation has been that the majority of stakeholders in the UNDAF, especially the AWP team members, are focussing largely on the monitoring of activities and internal process aspects of the UNDAF. Insufficient attention is being given by both the UNCT and by the Government to discussing and analysing *the substance* of the UNDAF/CCPAP and thereby giving attention to *programme results*. This is clearly reflected in the reports of the two Annual Review Meetings³⁰ and in the stakeholder consultations in this evaluation³¹.

This task is not made any easier by the broad, ambitious and all-encompassing formulation of most of the eleven programme outcomes.

2.6 The Contribution of the Non-Resident UN agencies in the UNDAF

The findings on this aspect are very similar to those from the 2008 DaO Assessment Report.

³⁰ Report of Annual Review Meeting, 2008

Report of Annual Review Meeting, 2009

³¹ The consultant attended the annual review meeting of AWP on 3 December

All the non-resident UN agencies are committed to the UNDAF as a mechanism for joint planning, coordination, policy coherence and information sharing. Their contribution in terms of technical advisory services is genuinely demand-driven and responds to the priorities of their constituent partners. However, at the programme implementation level, activities are implemented by the individual UN agencies reflecting their respective mandates, areas of expertise and target groups. Only UNAIDS and UNIFEM regularly attend most of the UNCT meetings. In addition UNIFEM has allocated a gender focal point for the UNDAF/CCPAP to strengthen the interaction.

The reasons given for their limited involvement are noted as follows. Firstly, several of the specialised UN agencies work in different ways with their partners and with different target groups which may not fit in with the UNDAF; secondly their lack of an in-country presence prevents them from participating regularly in all the important events; thirdly, several of these agencies have regional responsibilities and are part of their agency's regional strategy which has much wider priorities than a country strategy. As a consequence they are allocated funds on a regional basis and not on a country-specific basis. Finally, there is justified perception among some of the non-resident UN agencies that the UNDAF and CCPAP have generated so many meetings focussing on process aspects that there is insufficient time to actually implement activities and achieve results.

Given the above factors, it has also been observed by some non-resident Agencies that it may not be necessary to reflect *all* UN-supported activities in an UNDAF, only those where there is real co-programming, co-funding and/or in-kind support.

The challenge of involving non-Resident UN agencies in the UNDAF (and DaO) is common to most countries and the reasons given above are justifiable. However, both the resident and non-resident UN agencies (with the support of the RCO) could be more proactive in exchanging information on policy development, country/thematic analyses and reporting on progress in the AWP. This would particularly enhance policy coherence in joint UN-supported areas.

2.7 Collaboration with NGOs/CBOs, other development partners and the private sector

The involvement of NGOs/CBOs has been adequately described in section 2.3 on programme results. It is estimated that there are some 3,000 Foundations/NGOs/CBOs working in Suriname and many of them are extremely small. In general and up to now, the UN has cooperated with them as "implementing agencies" and involved a few larger ones in the strategic discussions on the UNDAF.

As mentioned in section 2.4, Suriname is not a major recipient of official development assistance. However the development cooperation context is likely to change with the increasing presence of new development partners (e.g. the World Bank) and countries/investment partners (e.g. China). Currently the scope for UN/donor cooperation and jointly-funded programmes is very limited because each has their own focus of assistance and different ways of operating. VVOB

has a good cooperation with UNICEF in the education sector and there is a donor group on education that meets once a month. IDB has been recently co-funding with UNDP activities under the election monitoring project.

There has been no significant involvement of the private sector in the planning and implementation of the UNDAF.

2.8 UNDAF and Aid Effectiveness

The main principles of the Paris Declaration are: ownership, alignment, harmonisation, results-based and mutual accountability. Although both the Government of Suriname and the UN are working towards these principles there is much more to be done. The UNDAF is indeed one mechanism that promotes these principles but at the moment it is too “UN led”.

Ownership: The leaders/decision-makers of the new Government are not yet sufficiently aware of the DaO and UNDAF processes and therefore their engagement is not strongly visible at both national and sectoral levels.

Alignment: in programmatic terms, the UNDAF goals are fully aligned with MOP and sectoral goals. However, with regard to financial reporting and accountability there is no alignment with government systems.

Harmonisation: The three Executive Committee (ExCom) agencies- UNICEF, UNDP, UNFPA- have harmonised their programming cycles. PAHO/WHO operates on a biennium basis within a 5-year regional strategy. The next UNDAF 2012-2016 will also be in alignment with the Government's next MOP for 2012-2016.

Results-based: refer to section 2.3 above. More work and effort is needed to move from monitoring of activities to monitoring of results of the UNDAF and CCPAP.

Mutual accountability: this concept is not clearly understood *in practice*. There is financial accountability between project implementers and the AWP Coordinators and between the UN agencies and their headquarters. The HACT approach consisting of one common form for financial reporting to the three ExCom agencies was introduced to reduce the reporting burden for Government.

The DaO mechanism, if implemented to its full extent and well coordinated, should help to improve some of the above challenges, especially with regard to mutual accountability, harmonisation and results-based management.

About two years ago an UN-funded project on aid coordination and management was approved for co-funding under the Dutch Treaty Funds and the UN. This project would be an ideal mechanism for establishing clear protocols, procedures and a division of labour among all stakeholders towards improving aid effectiveness. Due to the change in Government and changing priorities, it is not sure if and when this project will be implemented.

3. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the findings, this section presents a set of recommendations for consideration by the GoS and the UNCT in the final year of the current UNDAF and in the preparation of the next UNDAF. The conclusions can also be considered as “lessons learned” and the recommendations are presented in a logical sequence in line with the findings. It should also be noted that some of the recommendations are obviously cross-cutting.

3.1 UNDAF Strategic and Programme Content

Suriname has made good progress in MDG indicators in the period 2005-2008. The infant mortality rate (IMR) trend has been falling (admittedly flattening off) to 20 per 1000 live births in 2008. The maternal mortality ratio (MMR) has also fallen from 18 deaths per 10,000 births in 2007 to 8 deaths in 2008.³² Child malnutrition has declined in all age: weight categories. However, the significant point for future UN support is the wide geographical disparities especially between the urban coastal area and the rural interior. Some telling indicators are for example: although the national literacy rate for females aged 15-24 years is 91.9% the figure for the same group in the interior is only 45%. Similarly, nationally 92% of children attend primary school but in the interior 1 of 3 children aged 6 years do not attend school.³³

The great challenge for the Government and the UN agencies will be to address the most difficult “pockets of poverty” in the remote rural interior and the urban areas. Therefore, in terms of its overall development focus and strategic direction, the UNDAF’s concentration on the MDGs and human rights has been highly appropriate within the Government’s national development plan. The UNDAF’s focus on addressing the problems of vulnerable groups in the urban and interior areas is also highly appropriate. Given the expected increases in foreign and other investments, it is essential that this focus be maintained in the future. In line with Suriname’s own aspirations, there are also new development priorities emerging such as Non-Communicable Diseases (NCDs), climate change and disaster-related issues which are worthy of consideration for the next UNDAF.

As mentioned in previous sections, the formulation of the CP outcomes in the current UNDAF is too broad and ambitious. In addition, the lack of a detailed M and E mechanism with baselines and targets established at the *start* of the UNDAF/CCPAP has made it very difficult to measure results and the overall impact of the UN contribution. Therefore, there is a critical need to specify the CP outcomes in the next UNDAF in measurable and more specific terms in order to make it more strategic and focussed.

³² Source; Ministry of Health 2009

³³ All figures are obtained from MDG Progress Report, 2009 and MICS 2006

3.1.1 Recommendations at the upstream level

- It is strongly recommended that the next UNDAF should continue to focus on the MDGs and human rights. Outcomes should be formulated around a maximum of 3 core development issues that are also currently important development priorities for Suriname. It is recommended that one core development outcome could be formulated around “Safe Motherhood” in which several UN agencies have an interest. Consideration should be given to including the new areas of climate change and disasters.
For the time being, there should be no inclusion of an outcome on Public Administration Reform.
- It is recommended that it should not be mandatory for UN agencies, including the non-resident UN agencies, to try and fit *all* their activities into the UNDAF. However, it is essential that the UNDAF should remain the *coordination and information sharing mechanism* for activities outside of the UNDAF to ensure policy coherence, avoid duplication and overlap and create synergies.
- It is recommended that the UNDAF remain a flexible framework within which outcomes and activities can be removed and added according to changing priorities and needs. The mid-term review allows for this.
- It is recommended that the GoS and UNCT consider piloting another kind of model (within the UNDAF) for a joint UN programme which starts from the “bottom-up” and where each of the UN agencies comes to the drawing board with a certain amount of un-earmarked funds (e.g. the joint UN programme addressing the Avian flu epidemic developed by the UN in Vietnam).
The theme groups will be a good source of ideas for such a joint UN programme.
- The 4 (+5) theme groups that have been set up over the past 18 months should be revisited to see if they are relevant priorities within the UNDAF and continued only if they have committed and active leadership. If UN agency heads do not have time to lead a theme group they can delegate this task to one of their subject matter programme staff.
These theme groups are an ideal mechanism for coordination and information sharing within the UN agencies and could become even more important if the second recommendation above is pursued.

3.1.2 Recommendations at the downstream level

- It is recommended that the outcomes be formulated in a specific, measurable, achievable, relevant and time-bound (SMART) way. For example, an outcome could be formulated around out-of-school youth or gender-based violence i.e. focussing on one vulnerable group rather than on several as is the present case.
- It is recommended that each CP outcome should be funded or technically supported by at least 2 UN agencies, otherwise it cannot be considered a “joint UN support programme”.

- **There are too many small projects under the UNDAF and it is recommended that the participating UN agencies make concerted attempts to merge their future activities into bigger projects. This will enhance the focus of the UNDAF and reduce transaction costs for both sides.**

3.2 Government Engagement and Leadership

As a result of the change in Government and the appointment of new leaders, the UNCT has new partners at both national and sectoral levels, with which it will need to engage and build a new interactive partnership and find “champions” for its work.

- **It is recommended that the UNCT continue their efforts to raise awareness about the UNDAF and the DaO among the newly elected policy-and decision-makers and strengthen the capacities of the staff of the UN Desk that are operationally responsible for the UNDAF.**
- **Consideration should be given to exposing senior officials and operational staff to other UNDAF/DaO countries to learn about the different models in order to gain an understanding of what is expected of them.**
- **Joint Government/UNCT visits to interesting UN-supported projects should be organised once a year.**
- **The UN needs to find a new way of working with the Government at national and sectoral levels, to strengthen the engagement in the UNDAF and CCPAP (this will be further elaborated in the recommendations on underlying processes)**

3.3. Capacity Building

As part of a capacity building approach, the UNDAF places heavy emphasis on numerous training activities, many of which are “one- time” events. Experience shows that this form of training may expose participants to new approaches and skills but does not necessarily lead to the creation of institutional capacity. Another issue raised was that although training may raise an individual’s capacity he/she still has to function in an unchanged work or enabling environment. For example, teachers have been well trained in the child-friendly approach to education, yet the environment and conditions in which they teach remain the same e.g. the quality of school premises and facilities remained poor and unattractive, their housing and remuneration conditions stay the same. Therefore there was little motivation to try a new approach.

- **It is recommended that all the UN agencies need to take a more *holistic* approach to training by discussing with government partners the enabling environment factors that will impact on its usefulness and finding solutions to deal with these**
- **Efforts should also be made to group similar trainings into one package and to have reiterative training activities as an element of long-term capacity building. More consideration should also be given to on-the-job training and regional/international exposure to best practices.**

3.4 Sustainability

Except for a few examples, there is little evidence that the Government will incorporate the UN-supported activities into its own planning, implementation and budgeting processes, upon completion of the UN support. It is also unlikely that the funds committed by the Government for the CCPAP implementation will be forthcoming in the last year of the UNDAF. A positive sign of commitment is that the Government has agreed and is currently negotiating for a property in central Paramaribo for a “UN house”.

- **There is no new recommendation for this aspect except that the UNCT should continue to lobby for the funding commitment made by the Government for the implementation of the CCPAP.**
- **The UNCT should collectively continue looking for innovative new sources of funding for example, from the private sector, other friendly countries e.g. China, India Venezuela, Malaysia and Brazil and other development partners e.g. the World Bank and the Islamic Development Bank.**

3.5 UNDAF Underlying Processes

3.5.1 Upstream Recommendations

Given what is said in section 2.5, **the UN needs to find a new way of working with the Government which reflects a more contemporary, updated approach in line with Suriname’s current level of development and future aspirations³⁴. This particularly applies to the three ExCom agencies that are located in Suriname: UNICEF, UNDP and UNFPA.**

The elements of such a new way of working should consist of the following:

- Finding a balance between taking on board government/national priorities and needs and the UN’s responsibility to advocate internationally mandated norms and standards of human development.
- A closer connectivity with the partner ministries. PAHO/WHO seems to have an approaching model by being physically next to the Ministry of Health and being able to respond quickly to requests for specific technical assistance.
- All UN programme staff should spend more time in *substantive* discussions with their government partners and not only on processes. This should involve obtaining detailed information about current policies, programmes, funding, target groups/areas, capacities (staffing etc.) and even visiting programme/project sites together.
- Rather than the UN’s traditional “project approach”, the UN should move increasingly to a *facilitating role* by creating mechanisms for the sharing of best practices within and outside of the region. One such example is the South-South Global Assets and Technology Exchange System launched by UNDP in May 2006 (SS-Gate) and the Global South-South Development Network also administered by UNDP. Suriname is very interested to learn about the development experiences of many Asian countries e.g. China,

³⁴ Reference has been made to the UN’s way of working in Brazil and India

Indonesia, Vietnam, Malaysia and some African countries e.g. Botswana, south Africa, Malawi, through various means.

3.5.2 Downstream Recommendations

*The AWP*s

- The principle of inclusive participation is a positive element of the AWP mechanism as it enables the sharing of common problems and common solutions. Given that they have not been very active in 2010 it is important that they be reactivated in 2011 which is the final year of the UNDAF.

It is therefore recommended that UNCT staff be more proactive in 2011 to ensure that the AWP's meet regularly (at least quarterly).

- In this last year the AWP teams *must* give attention to obtaining programmatic results and discussing how to sustain key activities.
- Organise a joint government/non-government/UN staff project monitoring visit once a year.

Operational Issues

- Since there are so many stakeholders involved in the UNDAF and there is a constant turn-over of both UN and government staff, UNCT staff need to continue their coaching and mentoring of government and non-government partners in the many operational aspects of UNDAF implementation.

Communications

The same comment made in b. applies here. The RCO is to be augmented with one Communications Analyst and one Communications Intern and therefore there is no additional recommendation to make at this point of time.

Monitoring and Evaluation

- It is recommended that the M and E tool developed in March for monitoring the AWP's be used from January 2011 and that an M and E plan be established for Health and HIV. In connection with this, the AWP teams will need further training in the tool and it is recommended that an M and E specialist be brought in to assist with this. This should be organised in January 2011. Strong efforts will need to be made by both the UNCT and their staff and the AWP teams to focus on *programme results* as opposed to monitoring the implementation of activities. This will require a major shift in attitude on the part of all stakeholders, UN and government/non-government implementers alike.

Non-Resident UN agencies

After 3 years of implementation it is time to be realistic about the participation of non-resident UN agencies and accept that the participation of some non-resident UN agencies will continue to be ad hoc within the UNDAF framework.

However, if the recommendations in 3.1.1 are accepted those non-resident UN agencies that can actively participate and at the same time bring funds to the UNDAF, should be given the opportunity to do so.

- **Even though some non-resident UN agencies may not participate in the next UNDAF it is very important, however, for the UNCT to be kept abreast of any policy or sectoral analysis work that they may do. In order to promote improved information sharing on their missions and activities in Suriname it is recommended that the Coordination Analyst in the RCO be assigned the task of designing a simple matrix to collect and circulate this information once a month. This mechanism may identify opportunities for joint survey or analytical work, including from a regional perspective.³⁵**

Collaboration with NGOs/CSOs, Development Partner and Private Sector

As mentioned earlier, there are too many NGOs/CBOs being supported by small amounts of funding and often for a “one-off” activity”. However, these organisations are doing good work at the grassroots and community levels and need continued support from the UN.

- **It is recommended that the UNCT consider setting up one joint fund for NGO support with a focus on addressing the problems of vulnerable groups in the urban and rural interior and on capacity building.**

Resident Coordinators Office

It has been observed that the volume of process work around coordination has increased significantly over the past two years. As a result the Coordination Analyst hardly has time to do any substantive work.

- **It is recommended that a national “logistics assistant” be recruited to support the work of the Coordination Analyst and the Communications Analyst. This position could be co-funded among the 4 resident UN Agencies and RC funds.**

³⁵ This is common practice in many other countries.

OVERALL CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

A great deal of high-quality analytical work and widespread participation went into the preparation of the current UNDAF. However, in the translation of that analytical work into the UNDAF document, the content of the UNDAF (and later the CCPAP) has become much too broad and all-encompassing. Be that as it may, this evaluation concludes that there *is* progress towards many of the UNDAF outcomes though it is difficult to measure higher-level results with available data and information from the AWP's and existing reports.

It will take a bold and possibly radical move for the Government of Suriname and the UN Country Team to formulate the next UNDAF along the key recommendations made in this Report. Although it may not be administratively or organisationally possible to implement some of the key recommendations regarding the content of the UNDAF, the UNCT and the Government should be able to formulate the next UNDAF for 2012-2016 in a more focussed and measurable way.

If the GoS and the UN seriously wish to develop a new way of working together that will reflect a changing development cooperation context, this evaluation also concludes that all the stakeholders need more time to analyse and brainstorm how that cooperation would be shaped and how that would impact on the next UNDAF. Government partners have also commented that it would make more sense to formulate the next UNDAF at the same time that the next MOP for 2012-2016 will be formulated as policy directives are expected to be presented by mid-2011. Therefore, it is recommended to postpone the formulation of the UNDAF until at least the second quarter of 2011 if this is practically and organisationally possible. This will also allow the current AWP teams to focus on what needs to be done to obtain higher-level results from the UNDAF, which surely is the reason for the UN presence in Suriname.

ANNEX 1 COUNTRY FACTS

| Official Name | Republic of Suriname | |
|--|---|---------|
| Location | Northern south America, bordering the north Atlantic ocean, between French and British Guyana | |
| Area and Topography | 163,820 sq.kms mostly rolling hills; narrow coastal plain; rain forest in the south | |
| Climate | Tropical with 2 rainy seasons | |
| Main towns | Paramaribo (capital), Nickerie, Albina, Brownsberg | |
| Form of Government | Presidential democracy based on 1987 constitution | |
| Total Population | 492,829 persons | |
| Population density | 3 per sq. Km | |
| GDP per capita (PPP US\$) (2009 est.) | 9,500 | |
| Real GDP growth rate 2006 | 5.8% | |
| Human Development Index (2010) | 0.646 | |
| HDI ranking (2010) | 94th out of 196 countries | |
| % of Women in Parliament | 25% | |
| Life expectancy at birth | Males: | Female: |
| Infant mortality rate/1000 live births (0-12 months) | 20 | |
| Under 5- mortality rate/1000 | 25 | |
| Maternal mortality ratio/100,000 births(2008) | 79.2 (8 maternal deaths per 10,000 births in 2008) | |
| Adult literacy rate (2008) | 91% Males: 92% Females: 87.2% | |
| % of net enrolment in primary school (2008) | 92% | |
| Children underweight for age (% ages 0-5) | 9.9% | |
| % of population with access to improved water sources (2006) | 91% (the figure is 44.8% for the population in the rural interior) | |
| Adult HIV/AIDS prevalence rate (2007 est.) | 2.4% | |
| Ethnic groups | Hindustani | 27% |
| | Creole | 17.7% |
| | Maroon | 14.7% |
| | Javanese | 14.6% |
| | Mixed | 12.5% |
| | Indigenous | 3.7% |
| | Chinese | 1.8% |
| | White | 0.8% |
| | Other | 0.5% |
| | Unknown | 6.6% |

Sources: ABS 2006, Population Census Data 2004
 Bureau of Public Health, Ministry of Health
 UN Human Development Reports, 2008/2009/2010
 Suriname MDG Second Progress Report
 MICS 2006
 CIA Fact Book 2010

ANNEX 2 LIST OF ORGANISATIONS INTERVIEWED

| Name of Organisation | Name and Designation of Interviewee |
|--|--|
| UN | Dr. Marcia de Castro, UN Resident Coordinator for Trinidad and Tobago and Suriname |
| UN | Ms. Narissa Seegulam, UN Coordination Analyst |
| UNICEF | Ms. Mary-Louise Eagleton, Chief of Field Office |
| PAHO/WHO | Dr. Geri Eijkemag, Country Representative |
| UNDP | Mr. Thomas Gittens, Country Director |
| UNFPA | Ms. Judith Brielle, Assistant Representative |
| UNESCO (telcall) | Dr. Kwame Boafo, Director and Representative, Kingston Cluster Office for the Caribbean |
| FAO (telcall) | Ms. Marion Alleyne, Officer-in-Charge |
| ILO (telcall) | Ms. Ana Theresa Romero, Director Mr. Giovanni di Cola, Deputy |
| UNDP | Ms. Paula Hidalgo-Sanchis Poverty Specialist |
| UNDP | Ms. Meriam Hubbard, Programme Officer Governance |
| UNDP | Mr. Bryan Drakenstein, Energy and Environment Specialist |
| UNICEF | Ms. Claudine Hammen, Health and Nutrition Officer |
| UNICEF | Ms. Ksenia Glebova, HIV Officer |
| PAHO/WHO | Ms. Elly van Kanten, Technical Officer Ms. Marisa Valdes, Public Health Systems Adviser |
| UNFPA | Ms. Ingrid Caffé, HIV Programme Officer |
| FAO | Ms. Ashmie Jairan, FAO National Correspondent |
| Ministry of Justice and Police | Ms. Geeta Nanden-Harpal Project Coordinator AWP 10 Ms. Winter Charion, AWP 10 |
| Ministry of Education | Ms. Priya Hirasingh, Project Coordinator AWP9 |
| Ministry of Education | Ms. Rita Graauw Les, Deputy Director Youth Centre |
| Ministry of Youth Affairs and Sports | Ms. Margo Biervliet, Manager Int. Youth Affairs |
| Ministry of Social Affairs and Housing | Ms. Anita Forst, Project Coordinator, AWP 5 |
| Ministry of Labour, Technology and Environment | Ms. Henna Uiteloo, Coordinator, Environment Section Ms. Ivette Patterzon, Project Coordinator AWP 4 |
| Ministry of Health | Dr. Marthelise Eersel Director of Public Health |

| | |
|---|--|
| Ministry of Health | Dr. Malti Algae, Project Coordinator AWP 11 |
| Inter-American Development Bank | Mr. Barrington Bryce, Operations Specialist |
| Netherlands Embassy/Government | Mr. Rogier Verstraeten, Senior Policy Adviser, Economic Affairs and Governance |
| European Union | Mr. Darrell Sexstone, Economic Policy Officer |
| Stichting Maxi Linder | Ms. Diana van der Leende, Director (new) |
| Stichting Moiwana | Mr. Pike, Project Coordinator |
| Stichting Lobi | Dr. Glenn Leckie, Director |
| Stichting "Stop Violence Against Women" | Ms. Margo Bean, Office Manager/Board member |
| Stichting de Stem (the Voice) | Mr. Olmsberg, Head |
| Ilaco Suriname NV | Mr. Ravi Patandin, Director |

Note: In addition the consultant attended the Annual Review Meeting of all the AWP's held on 3 December 2010 and the presentation of UNFPA's Country Programme on 10 December 2010

ANNEX 3 BIBLIOGRAPHY

UN Development Assistance Framework 2008-2011
Common Country Programme Action Plan 2008-2011
DaO Progress Assessment Report, July 2009
Reports of the CCPAP Annual Review Meetings, 2008 and 2009
Report of the Programme Staff Retreat on DaO, March 2010
Report on the Suriname Strategic and Teambuilding Workshop, August 2010
Draft Report on the Mid-Term Review of the UNDAF, August 2010
Multi- Indicator Cluster Survey Report, UNICEF, 2006
Multi-Purpose Development Plan, Government of Suriname, 2006-2011
Suriname MDG Progress Report, 2008
8 Annual Works Plans
Draft Health Sector Policy 2012-2015 (in Dutch), Ministry of Health
UNDP Results Oriented Annual Reports, 2008 and 2009
FAO Rural Sector Review, October 2009
Draft M and E guidelines for the CCPAP, November 2008
New M and E Tool, March 2010
Report of Highlights of ILO's Work in the Caribbean, May 2007-March 2010
Information from various websites: UNDP, ILO, World Bank, IMF, OECD/DAC