

**Final Evaluation of the Building Support to the  
Suriname Conservation Foundation Project**

(Nov 2011 to January 2012)

Prepared by Dean Pallen and National Consultant  
Shanti Adhin

For: United Nations Development Programme and  
the Ministry of Finance of the Government of  
Suriname

Date: January 24, 2011

## Table of Contents

Acronyms.....	4
Acknowledgements .....	5
1.0 Executive Summary.....	6
2.0 Introduction.....	16
2.1 Purpose of the Evaluation.....	16
2.2 Methodology of the Evaluation.....	16
2.2.1 Scope of the evaluation.....	16
2.2.2 Evaluability.....	17
2.3.3 Data Collection Methods.....	17
2.3.4 Analytical Approaches.....	18
2.3.5 Risks and Potential Limitations of the Methodology and Coping Strategy.....	18
2.3 Evaluation Team and Responsibilities.....	19
3.0 The Project and its Development Context.....	19
3.1 Project Start and its Duration.....	19
3.2 Problems that the Project Sought to Address.....	19
3.3 Immediate and Development Objectives of the Project.....	21
3.4 Main Stakeholders and Partners.....	22
3.5 Expected Results.....	22
4.0 Findings and Conclusions.....	23
4.1.1 The CSNR.....	25
4.1.2 Institutional Relationships and Project Management Issues.....	26
4.1.3 The Suriname Conservation Foundation.....	29
4.1.4 The UNDP.....	30
4.2 Project Formulation.....	31
4.2.1 Conceptualization/Design.....	31
4.2.2 Logical Framework Analysis.....	34
4.2.3 Ownership.....	34
4.2.4 Replicability.....	35
4.3 Project Implementation.....	35
4.4 Technical Capacities and Training.....	35
4.5 Monitoring and Evaluation and Project Reporting.....	37
4.6 Partner Relations and Stakeholder Participation.....	38
4.7 Financial Planning.....	39
4.8 Sustainability, Effectiveness and Efficiency and Relevance.....	40
4.8.1 Sustainability.....	40
4.8.2 Effectiveness.....	41
4.8.3 Efficiency.....	42
4.8.4 Relevance.....	42
5.0 Conclusions.....	43
5.1 Short Term Priorities.....	45
5.2 Long Term Priorities and a 100 Year Plan.....	45
6.0 Recommendations.....	49
6.1 Recommendation for Immediate Consideration.....	49
6.2 General Recommendations for all Stakeholders.....	49

6.2.1 Recommendations for the Preparatory Stage and CSNR Task Force Committee.....49  
6.3 Recommendations for the SCF.....50  
6.4 Recommendations for the UNDP.....51  
6.5 Recommendations of the Ministry of Finance.....51  
6.6 General Recommendations for the Government of Suriname.....52  
7.0 Lessons Learned and Good Practices.....53  
7.1 On Project Management.....54  
7.2 On the Operational Context.....54  
7.3 On Partnerships and Relationships.....55

## Evaluation Report Annexes

**Annex I Terms of Reference**

**Annex II Evaluation Matrix**

**Annex III List of SCF Administered Grant Projects**

**Annex IV List of Documents and Websites Reviewed**

**Annex V List of Individuals Interviewed**

**Annex VI Mission Itinerary**

**Annex VII Summary of Field Visits by National Consultant Shanti Adhin**

**Annex VIII: Ethical Code of Conduct for UN evaluations**

## Acronyms

ATM	Ministry of Labour, Technological Development and Environment
BOSNAS	National Forest Management and Nature Conservation Authority
CBD	Convention on Biological Diversity
CCDS	Climate Compatible Development Strategy
CI	Conservation International
CSNR	Central Suriname Nature Reserve
CSR	Corporate Social Responsibility
GEF	Global Environment Facility
GPPAM	Global Partnership for Professionalizing Protected Area Management
HDI	Human Development Index
IUCN	International Union for the Conservation of Nature
LASPA	Latin American School of Protected Areas
LFA	Logical Framework Analysis
NEX	National Execution Modality
MEA	Multilateral Agreements on the Environment
MRGB	Ministry of Physical Planning, Land and Forest Management
MUMA	Multiple Use Management Area
NCD	Nature Conservation Division
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
OC	Oversight Committee
PIU	Project Implementation Unit
PLOS	Ministry of Planning and Development Cooperation
RedLAC	Red de Fondos Ambientales de Latinoamérica y el Caribe (Latin American and Caribbean Network of Environmental Funds)
RBM	Results Based Management
SCF	Suriname Conservation Foundation
STINASU	Foundation for Nature Conservation Suriname (Stichting Natuurbehoud Suriname)
SNR	Sipaliwini Nature Reserve
TEAM	Tropical Ecology Assessment and Monitoring Network
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNEG	United Nations Evaluation Group
UNESCO	United Nations Educational Scientific Cultural Organisation
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
USD	United States Dollar
WCPA-IUCN	World Commission on Protected Areas
WWF	World Wildlife Fund

### Abbreviations:

Capacity Building Support to the Suriname Conservation Foundation Project (*SCF Project*)  
*Grant agreement between the Suriname Conservation Foundation and the Ministry of Physical Planning, Land and Forest for effective Management of the Central Suriname Nature Reserve (CSNR Grant)*

## **Acknowledgements**

The evaluation team would like to thank all the project stakeholders and organizations that participated in the evaluation. Their time and efforts are greatly appreciated as the information they provided enabled this evaluation to come to a successful completion. Special recognition is in order for Bryan Drakenstein from UNDP Suriname for organizing the evaluation and the additional support and coordination provided by Ashwinie Boedhoe from the Suriname Ministry of Finance. Deepest appreciation goes to the Embassy of the Netherlands, for meeting with the evaluation team and sharing with us their valuable views and experiences in relation to the project. The evaluation team would like to directly thank the executive directors of Conservation International, the World Wildlife Fund, and STINASU for spending time with the evaluation team. A special thank you should go to Leonard Johanns and the rest of the Suriname Conservation Foundation team for their time and efforts in support of the evaluation. The evaluation team would also like to thank Inka Matilla and the UNDP regional office in Panama for its guidance and organizational support. The evaluation team met or spoke extensively with UNDP Suriname's country representative Thomas Gittens and this was critical to the evaluation process. Finally, the team leader would like to personally thank Shanti Adhin for her assistance, guidance and openness to take the extra time necessary with this challenging evaluation.

## **Disclaimer**

Please note the analysis and recommendations of this report do not necessarily reflect the views of the United Nations Development Programme, its Executive Board or the United Nations Member States. This publication reflects the views of its authors.

## 1.0 Executive Summary

The “*Capacity Building Support to the Suriname Conservation Foundation*” herewith referred to as the “*SCF Project*,” was intended to strengthen the long-term environmental management capacity of the Suriname Conservation Foundation (SCF) to enable the organization to effectively support conservation management, research, awareness raising, advocacy, and ecotourism activities in Suriname. The “*SCF Project*” was signed in September 2004 and its implementation started in January 2005. The “*SCF Project*” had an operation budget of 3.6 million USD that was provided by the Government of Suriname through funds from the Dutch Treaty Fund. The project end date was December 2010 but was extended by an additional six months without the allotment of any further funding. The project was preceded by the Global Environment Facility (GEF) funded “Conservation of Globally Significant Forest Ecosystems in Suriname’s Guyana Shield Bio-region” that had the objective of engendering sustainable long-term conservation management of the Guayana Shield tropical forest wilderness and to address institutional weaknesses restricting the ability to manage an expanded protected areas system.

The “*SCF Project*” aimed to strengthen government agencies responsible for protected area management through the provision of financial and technical capacity building support with an additional objective of facilitating the maturation of a SCF Permanent Conservation Trust Fund, that was created to reach a capitalization target of 15 million USD as a means of providing long-term sustainable financing for biodiversity conservation activity in Suriname. The main implementing partners of the project were: Ministry of Planning and Development Cooperation (PLOS), that was transferred to the Ministry of Finance as of 2009, the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), the SCF, and the Nature Conservation Division (NCD) and the Foundation for Nature Conservation in Suriname (STINASU) of the Ministry of Physical Planning, Land and Forest management (MRGB) and the Ministry of Labour, Technological Development and Environment (ATM).

The “*SCF Project*’s objectives were to be accomplished through a clearly defined set of interventions. The main efforts and funds US\$ 1,139,000 (33.2 %) were scheduled for institutional strengthening and capacity building of the SCF and the government institutions responsible for protected area management. An almost equal amount: US\$ 1,130,000 (33 %) was allocated for protected area management in particular to implement the Central Suriname Natural Reserve (CSNR) and Sipaliwini Nature Reserve (SNR) management plans. The remaining funds were available for ‘SCF administrative services’ and ‘other grants’ (research, awareness building and education), PLOS project management, and project audits and evaluation. The centrepiece of the project was to be the establishment of a viable management system including field level staff with logistical capabilities for the CSNR. The establishment of the CSNR and the creation of the SCF and the endowment fund are closely intertwined. One of the four main statues of the SCF is to work towards the successful management of the CSNR and SNR.

Originally a mid-term evaluation was scheduled to take place but in response to a recommendation made in the final evaluation of the GEF UNDP Project, the Project’s Oversight Committee (OC) decided to have a management support mission. The management support mission was carried out in 2007 making a series of recommendations to the SCF and PLOS on how to improve their day to day operations.

The project design foresaw the UNDP providing full execution support while building capacity to go to a full National Execution Modality (NEX). The NEX formula calls for the UNDP to provide operational and advisory support to its national partners. One of the defining characteristics of the preceding GEF project was the more pro-active role played by UNDP in the day to day project management through a project coordinator assigned by the UNDP.

The field work for the final evaluation was undertaken in the fall of 2011 and finalised in the early part of 2012. The overall objective of the final evaluation was to assess the achievements made in delivering the specified objectives, outputs and outcomes during the project's implementation period. The evaluation was a joint Government of Suriname and UNDP evaluation. Although the evaluation considered information from all periods since the establishment of the SCF and CSNR over ten years ago, the bulk of the focus was placed on the activities and achievements of the "*SCF Project*" occurring in the aftermath of the completion of the GEF final evaluation in 2007. The analysis of the evaluation was broadly guided by establishing lines of evidence in relation to the evaluation criteria including sustainability, effectiveness, efficiency and relevance. The analytical approach was mostly qualitative, and the validation of the findings was done using triangulation.

It should be recognized that the "*SCF Project*" was implemented in a challenging environment. Keeping this in mind, **the evaluation team came to a number of conclusions that in the end, depicts a mixed picture of the achievements of the "*SCF Project*."** There are for example, aspects of the project that demonstrate sustainability and effectiveness and efficiency but there are also many elements of the project that disappoint in relation to these criteria. In some cases failure is attributable to the difficult implementation environment but in many instances, this was not the case.

**The project obtained some clear tangible outputs and first among them would be the SCF Conservation Trust Fund meeting its objectives of building a 15 million USD financial base.** From a sustainability standpoint, the SCF Conservation Trust Fund is in a position to support interventions related to biodiversity and natural resource management over the long term that could result in a variety of positive outcomes. Since reaching the 15 million USD capitalization target, roughly twenty grants have been disbursed through the SCF Conservation Trust Fund. Another key accomplishment is the entrenchment of the SCF as a Suriname institution with a strong environmental mandate that has built a national profile. Internationally, SCF appears to have successfully integrated itself into entities such as the conservation finance alliance, Latin American and Caribbean Network of Environmental Funds (RedLAC) that works with conservation funds to help reduce the need for donor assistance. **In addition, SCF was able to carry-out outreach activity with the Suriname business community that resulted in the establishment of partnerships with some of Suriname's leading companies that in turn provide support to the SCF.** It was nevertheless concluded that SCF should withdraw from any further involvement in "business greening" activities. The evaluation concluded that SCF should concentrate on making every effort possible to improve the organization's ability to provide technical support and manage conservation related projects rather than spreading itself too thin.

On the question of the effectiveness of the grants disbursement, it should be noted that the evaluation team was not able to meet with all grant recipients to fully assess the effectiveness of each grant project. **It was possible to determine that there were some clear successes notably in supporting the Ministry of Environment and its efforts to comply with the CBD by facilitating the finalization of Suriname's National Biodiversity Strategy.** The support provided to the University of Suriname in launching a mangrove rehabilitation project eventually met with success after some trial and error. The evaluation team was able to determine that grants related to research and policy development appear to have had more success than those grants involving ground-level implementation. The largest grant project supported by the project, to the CSNR, is discussed in greater detail throughout the report and is noted from the standpoint of its lack of success.

In terms of the capacity building component of the project, funds were disbursed to purchase equipment like computers and vehicles and a large number of individuals from the different ministries were trained.

It is recognized by project stakeholders that the strategic benefits from the training activity did not have the desired impact with the possible exception of the training for SCF in support of its financial activities and international relations building. This is due in part to turnover in government staff, policies changes and the impact of elections and Surinamese politics on the day to day functioning of government.

### **Institutional Relationships and Project Management Issues**

There were clearly factors that were largely beyond the control of project stakeholders that adversely affected the project. They are seen as:

- Limited pool of in-country expertise from which the project could draw from to facilitate project activity. Suriname is a small country and as such, the available expertise is very restricted. For the “*SCF Project*” this resulted in an undesirable movement of project stakeholders/local expertise between employment positions related to the “*SCF Project*”. For example, routinely key individuals would move from one position in government to another or a post with a non-governmental institution all the while never gravitating too far away from having involvement in the project. This was the norm as opposed to a healthier situation whereby new individuals would enter into the project and possibly bring fresh ideas and enthusiasm.
- Lack of a pertinent legislative framework. Project stakeholders consistently underlined the need to have the Suriname Conservation Act updated so as to better reflect current circumstances that would allow for different types of management structures, working relationships, and approaches to such matters as eco-tourism. At one point the project contemplated this as a project activity but the idea lost momentum.
- Lack of clear government support at the most senior levels to help overcome bottle necks encountered by the project. The government of Suriname deserves full credit for creating the CSNR and ensuring that it has remained in its largely untouched state. However, as the project encountered one challenge after another, there was a need for stronger guidance at a strategic governmental level to steer the project towards a more constructive direction.
- Ongoing limitations of concerned government departments in terms of their technical and human resource capabilities and financial resources and how this impacts on the motivation of Government staff. NCD for example, is a relatively small government unit with limited technical capability tasked with enormous responsibility beyond the CSNR.
- Turnover of Government staff in concerned government departments and the ability to attract new staff.
- Slow bureaucratic system that paralyzes the decision making process.
- Fragmentation or overlap of government responsibilities that resulted in the project having in hindsight, an unrealistic expectation of involving a number of government departments in the project. This project needed a simpler governmental context in which to operate within.
- At one time the government intended to create the Forest Management and Nature Conservation Authority (BOSNAS) that would include the foundation for Forest Management & Control and the NCD, both part of the Natural Resources Ministry. This would have led to the modernization



and improved operations of both organizations in line with the renewed national forest policy. Due to objections of the private timber sector and the creation of the RGB Ministry after the 2005 elections, the establishment of BOSNAS was never realized.

There are nevertheless, other concerns that are more directly attributable to how the project was managed and the comportment of key project stakeholders:

- The lack of a project manager to work more directly with project partners on technical matters and building better relations between the different project partners. The closest the project came to having this was the hiring of a project facilitator who according to all sources, for six months did strong work on matters like standardizing reporting practices. The hiring of the project manager to lead the PIU for the CSNR would have been helpful in this regards but this particular arrangement ended badly. A project manager could have provided this project with badly needed leadership and technical guidance had stakeholder institutions been open to the presence of such an individual.
- Lack of an independent project monitoring system whereby possibly a neutral third party with experience in relevant fields might have been able to assist in indentifying and proposing solutions to overcome obstacles encountered by the project in a constructive manner.
- The absence of consistent goodwill and cooperation and a shared vision between key project stakeholder institutions (NCD, SCF and the Forest Service). Despite efforts by the Ministry of Finance to mediate between the groups, problems persisted. It is unfortunate that this came to dominate as there were periods where there were actually good relations between project partners.
- As it relates to the CSNR, project stakeholders demonstrating behaviour that is very difficult to comprehend. A good example of this would be the handling of the PIU where after going to great lengths to establish the PIU, it seemed everything was done to ensure that the PIU was unable to carry out its responsibilities.
- Poor communication between project stakeholders. The inability of project partners to actually talk and listen to each other was brought up constantly as an undermining factor.
- Providing feedback, approvals and signing off on other matters too often would occur in a less than punctual manner.
- Personal issues between key project stakeholders in critical areas. Although this did not permeate all project activity, a great deal was shared or suggested to the evaluation team on this matter. It is difficult to determine how much of an influence this had but as far as a being a problem, it appears to be the case.
- An absence of a critical amount of innovation in thinking and practices. A project support mission was completed that resulted in successful workshops. A result of this was a much higher frequency of the Oversight Committee meetings. There was room for more creativity. This project did not require high levels of thoughtfulness but it was necessary for stakeholders to take some time to try and imagine how matters might be handled differently. The possibility to learn

and feed off better circumstances and the expertise of individuals was within reach of the project.

- Not making a stronger connection between a broad range of project activities and the ultimate objective of improving the management practices for protected areas in a substantive manner. The project did support a lot of project activity but in the end, what did it all mean for improving protected area management practices? This is very unclear.
- The marginalization of the UNDP in terms of its involvement in the SCF and the project. It is felt that UNDP allowing the Ministry of Finance to directly manage the project from the perspective of being the Executing Implementing Agency and the SCF and other government departments assuming the roles of project implementers was correct in terms of respecting local autonomy. However, the UNDP could have been more active in providing support on technical matters and issues related to project management. Although the UNDP Suriname office is small, it is not without its ability to call upon resources and information. It is also important to note that one of the key recommendations to the UNDP through the evaluation of the previous GEF project was the need for the UNDP to assign a strong technical and managerial coordinator to what would become the “*SCF Project*”.
- Although meetings were regularly held, largely through the project’s Oversight Committee, where the challenges faced by the “*SCF Project*” were examined, rarely if ever did this self-reflection result in steps to resolve problems. The Dutch embassy was aware of some of the problems the project was facing and met with officials with the Suriname Government to express its concern.
- Less than satisfactory reporting practices and project documentation. Tardiness was an ongoing concern but this was partially due to the project structure where four project implementers routinely had to provide input on reporting. There were other issues such as the content of reports not saying much about what was actually happening with the project.

## **Recommendations**

### **Short-Term Priorities**

Steps should be taken immediately to improve the appearance and conditions at the visiting centre of the CSNR. What is taking place with the reserve is not in step with what was envisaged when the CSNR was declared a World Heritage site and project partners should take this situation very seriously.

### **Recommendation for Immediate Consideration**

- It is recommended that steps be taken immediately to improve the appearance and standards at the visiting centre of the CSNR and the research centre.

### **Long-Term Priorities**

There is a need to establish a completely different approach to building protected area management capacity in Suriname especially as it relates to the CSNR. It has been over ten years since the CSNR was established and it is still without a proper management system and luckily, it remains largely

undisturbed. There is a need for fresh ideas and approaches that are supported and carried out by well trained and committed individuals. A different approach to human resource development in the conservation sector is also critical. The future direction of SCF should be contemplated alongside that of the CSNR's. At the same time, with the Conservation Trust Fund now established it enables stakeholders in Suriname to think long term and realize a thoughtfully implemented strategy. The evaluation process concluded that the recommendations of this report should promote a longer term vision that is anchored in encouraging systemic innovation that will allow stakeholders to move away from the unproductive circumstances and behaviours that are making significant progress impossible. Working on these fronts over the next one to three years will help set the stage for a reinvigorated and more substantive attempt to establish more appropriate circumstances for managing the CSNR.

### **General Recommendations for all Stakeholders**

- It is recommended that a 100 year plan be developed for the management of the CSNR. The 100 year is to be carried out in a slow incremental manner through 20 consecutive five-year plans. Long term strategizing is becoming more common place in business, and environment and municipal planning among other areas. The formulation of the 100 year plan will not commence before circumstances are improved through an initial preparatory stage of 18 months to three years that will allow for the development of a foundation of human resources, constructive international relationships and planning capabilities. After which the first of 20 successive five-year plans will be initiated taking into consideration current circumstances, and capacities.
- It is recommended that a four-person Task Force committee be established to oversee the initial preparatory stage and the recommendations outlined below. The work of the Task Force Committee would be undertaken based on the availability of funding. The Task Force Committee would be comprised of a representative from the Ministry of Finance, two international experts in the field of the management of protected areas, and an additional representative from the Government of Suriname from the Forest Service. The SCF, and UNDP and other organizations should hold observer status. However, these organizations should be represented by new individuals with no previous involvement in the CSNR. The involvement of the Dutch Embassy as an observer should be encouraged as well as other potential donor agencies. The Task Force should not be encumbered with the agendas or bureaucracy of any particular organizations governmental or otherwise or the management of a project per se. It is for this reason the involvement of too many government departments should be avoided. The Task Force should be primarily composed of professional individuals who can provide a fresh perspective on how to proceed with the CSNR and other related matters. The Ministry of Finance would be involved not for its technical expertise but its ability to oversee the Task Force Committee. The international experts on the committee will primarily be responsible for identifying and facilitating contact with outside organizations, and channelling ideas and innovations that could potentially benefit Suriname. The anticipation is that the capacity developed during the preparatory stage will enable the development of the first five-year plan of the 100 year management plan for the CSNR.

### **Recommendations for the Preparatory Stage are as follows:**

- It is recommended that in-depth training is carried out to develop a cadre of young or youngish professionals through internships and other more profound means that will create a group of individuals who will eventually be able to assume leadership roles with CSNR, SCF and other

strategic positions in the conservation field. The training would take place in countries dealing with similar circumstances found in Suriname.

- It is recommended that steps be taken to begin the process of revising the regulatory framework for the management of protected areas with the CSNR serving as a testing ground for new ideas and practices that can inform a revised legislation or amended Suriname Conservation Act.
- It is recommended that as a means to encourage new ideas and practices that stronger relationships with international organizations in the conservation fields be established through twinning programmes and other means. The first priority would be building relationships with organizations operating in similar conditions. The SCF and UNDP and other international partners such as CI and WWF could be helpful in building these relations.
- It is recommended that higher operational standards and transparency be encouraged through the introduction of eco-tourism certification programmes and other voluntary standard schemes such as Fair Trade through the work of the Task Force Committee.
- It is recommended that a contribution be made to the clarification and encouragement of sustainable economic strategies in the form of carbon offset agreements and other means that can help ensure the protection of the CSNR and other parts of Suriname's tropical forest.
- It is recommended that trust building exercises be carried out with the key project partners that struggled on matters related to building positive working relationships. Part of this exercise should evolve around examining the obstacles and incentives for establishing more constructive working relationships.

**Recommendations for the SCF:**

- It is recommended that the SCF retain its current management practices that have guided the management of the SCF Conservation Trust Fund.
- It is recommended that the SCF document its experience and practices in managing the SCF Conservation Trust Fund as an example of Best Practice and share it with the Government of Suriname and donors who may be interested in repeating this experience in Suriname.
- It is recommended that SCF participate in and support the work of the CSNR Task Force through the SCF Conservation Trust Fund.
- It is recommended that SCF along with the UNDP acts as conduits for the CSNR Task Force in terms of facilitating contacts with other natural reserves and Trust Fund Management teams of other Conservation Trust Funds that present opportunities for training and twinning.
- It is recommended that the SCF make a concerted effort to identify and recruit and develop young professionals with relevant backgrounds to gradually assume greater responsibility within the organization at the management level and in relation to technical matters.
- It is recommended that an individual is assigned as observer to the CSNR Task Force Committee. As part of the change process, this individual should not be a current staff member.

Another individual(s) should be targeted to participate in internship training with another endowment fund as part of a long term strategy to assume a high level position with the SCF.

- It is recommended that an independent evaluation be undertaken of the grant programme and a proper assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of grant activity and developmental impacts that has occurred to date. This is a key misgiving of this evaluation process that this level of detail was not possible due to a number of limitations. A list of projects in SCF's grant programme is included in Annex III.
- It is recommended that SCF take the necessary steps to ensure that the grant process is viewed as being transparent as possible with a strong emphasis on communicating to stakeholders the grant application and selection process.
- It is recommended that SCF studies in greater detail the practices of other Conservation Trust Funds especially those operating in equally difficult contexts to learn how grant money can be used to address complex issues.
- It is recommended that SCF examine the role and make-up of the SCF's Board of Directors to determine how it can become more effective in terms of facilitating the SCF relations with the Government and providing technical guidance.
- It is recommended that SCF contemplate and understand how it can play a stronger leadership role within Suriname in the environment field.

**Recommendations for the UNDP:**

- It is recommended that UNDP supports the participation of one individual in the CSNR Task Force Committee. UNDP's participation could also include sponsoring the participation of one of the international expert positions.
- It is recommended that UNDP facilitates the building of international relations between Suriname and international partners in support of the management of the CSNR through the CSNR Task Force
- It is recommended that Suriname UNDP explores how UNDP's Global Learning Network and other forums could facilitate the work of the CSNR Task Force.
- It is recommended that the UNDP examine how it can re-establish a more pro-active presence with the SCF and in particular on the SCF board of directors.
- It is recommended that the UNDP continue to work with the Government of Suriname to establish a pragmatic approach towards the NEX/NIM concept as it relates to conservation and environment matters.

**Recommendations for the Ministry of Finance:**

- It is recommended that the Ministry of Finance assume the role of CSNR Task Force Committee Coordinator to assist with the setting up of meetings and other organizational matters.

- It is recommended that the Ministry of Finance make every effort to use the experience of “*SCF Project*” to improve its future contribution to conservation related projects in Suriname.

**General Recommendations for the Government of Suriname:**

- It is recommended that the Government of Suriname reconfirms its commitment to the CSNR.
- It is recommended that the Government of Suriname endorses and takes the necessary measures to facilitate the work of the CSNR Task Force Committee.
- It is recommended that the Government of Suriname establishes strong lines of communication with the Task Force that will enable a quick turnaround for decisions on critical matters.
- It is recommended that the Government of Suriname do the utmost to restore/establish good working relations with the local communities in the CSNR project area.

**Lessons Learned**

**On Project Management:**

- Managing an important entity such as the CSNR is a special responsibility. It takes long term commitment and sacrifice but perhaps most of all, a shared vision and cooperation between key partners.
- A project such as the “*SCF Project*” requires a very concise strategic plan focused on achieving realistic objectives.
- The benefits of a strong project manager should never be underestimated.
- A complex management system should only be established when good conditions exist for its successful implementation.
- A project can lose its momentum and focus when administrative practices delay project implementation.
- A closer monitoring and adjustments to apparent project design flaws are necessary to avoid more serious situations of project failure.
- The management of SCF’s Conservation Trust Fund demonstrated that by paying close attention to details, maintaining constant communication and monitoring circumstances good results can be expected.
- A balance has to be achieved between respecting autonomy while ensuring that projects have the proper technical and managerial capacity.
- Although participating in an evaluation can be a challenging experience, it is also a chance to learn and to address project difficulties in a constructive manner.

- Issues such as discrepancies between employee salaries have to be managed closely.

#### **On the Operational Context**

- Complex projects implemented in difficult environments that seek to promote institutional reform can be challenging and need to be carefully planned with potential obstacles appropriately acknowledged.
- In a context where there is limited institutional capacity and relevant experience, miracles should not be expected. Nevertheless, at all times project stakeholders should conduct themselves in a positive and constructive manner.
- Laws and policies such as Suriname's Nature Conservation Act must reflect the circumstances in which they are to be applied and not too define or limit what is currently possible.
- A large budget is not necessarily a panacea for success.

#### **On Partnerships and Relationships**

- Working with partners including local community groups can require a significant investment of time but it will result in strong benefits. In the case of the CSNR, working with the Maroon and local indigenous communities required this type of care.
- Positive relations between project partners are built on trust and openness and the ability to collectively examine obstacles to project implementation in an open and honest manner. When this does not occur there is little hope for project success.

## 2.0 Introduction

### 2.1 Purpose of the Evaluation

In accordance with the UNDP Monitoring & Evaluation policies and procedures, all projects with long-term implementation periods (e.g. over 5 years) are encouraged to undergo evaluation to support accountability and to identify the key lessons learnt. This provides a valuable tool to enhance future planning and knowledge generation. The main focus of all UNDP evaluation activity is to assess contributions to results at the outcome level.

The overall objective of the “*SCF Project*” final evaluation was to assess the achievements made in delivering the specified objectives, outputs and outcomes during the project’s implementation period. The aim of this report is to establish the relevance, performance and success of the project in terms of effectiveness and efficiency and the sustainability of results. The evaluation team was tasked with identifying specific lessons pertaining to the strategies employed, and implementation arrangements, which may be of relevance to other projects that support the establishment of environment trust funds, institutional strengthening and grant making. Given the importance of the SCF in Suriname, learning from the SCF experience is a valuable opportunity for stakeholders in the broader environmental field in the country. Thus, the intention was to arrive at recommendations that could build on the accomplishments of the SCF’s in support of biodiversity and conservation management in Suriname.

Although the evaluation considered information from all periods since the establishment of the SCF and CSNR, the bulk of the focus was placed on the activities and achievements of the “*SCF Project*” occurring in the aftermath of the completion of the GEF final evaluation that was completed in January 2007 and that was conducted as per the requirements of all joint UNDP and Global Environment Facility projects.

The document is organized according to guidelines suggested by the UNDP for evaluation reports. The evaluation report begins by establishing the project’s context and understanding the project’s ambitions. The report proceeds to analyze the project’s accomplishments before concluding with its findings, conclusions and recommendations for follow up.

### 2.2 Methodology of the Evaluation

#### 2.2.1 Scope of the evaluation

The analysis of the evaluation was broadly guided by establishing lines of evidence in relation to the following evaluation criteria:

- **Project Sustainability:** This relates to reporting on matters such as financial viability, stakeholder ownership, institutional relationship, attitudinal disposition of stakeholders, long-term influence on practices in the conservation and biodiversity fields.
- **Effectiveness:** This refers to analyzing the degree to which the project made progress towards its stated objectives and establishing a perspective on the project’s accomplishments at the output and outcome levels.



- **Efficiency:** This implies examining the management and administrative arrangements created by the project to facilitate project activity, build capacity and establish networks, partnerships and effective relationships.
- **Relevance:** To examine the degree to which the project is thought to have significance for Suriname.
- **Strategic Implications:** To analyze the degree to which the project helped establish practices, standards and capacity, in short a foundation, for designing, implementing and managing interventions in support of managing Suriname's biodiversity and natural resources.

### **2.2.2 Evaluability**

The evaluation team worked with the Ministry of Finance, UNDP Suriname, and other project stakeholders to ensure that the Results Framework and project's monitoring system were properly understood and the degree to which these tools could assist in facilitating the evaluation. Further guidance was sought on relevant matters and the evaluation team relied on UNDP Suriname to provide the necessary logistical support to carry out the assignment. The UNDP office in Suriname and the regional office in Panama provided ongoing support to the evaluation team on matters related to the development and completion of the draft and final evaluation reports, and other technical matters related to this evaluation. What also influenced the evaluation were the project's reporting practices, general reliability of information sources and other factors that hindered or enabled an impartial evaluation process. For example, the quality of the LFA and the related indicators was a factor that required adjustments in terms of determining a more precise way of looking at the project and evaluating its impact.

### **2.2.3 Data Collection Methods**

The evaluation relied mostly on qualitative data collection methods with some quantitative presentation of the project's accomplishments. The main data collection methods were as follows:

- Desk review of project documentation (see Annex IV for a complete listing of all project documents)
- Key informant interviews through semi structure interviews. The questions were drawn from the evaluation matrix that is found in Annex II. The key stakeholders groups, from which interviewees were identified but not limited to, include:

- Ministry of Finance (Department Planning and Development Cooperation)
- Dutch Embassy in Paramaribo,
- UNDP CO – Suriname: Country Director and Environment Programme Manager
- Ministry of Physical Planning Land and Forest Management, the NCD,
- STINASU,
- Suriname Conservation Foundation,
- Ministry of Labour, Technological Development and Environment,
- Other organizations: Conservation International Suriname, World Wild Life Fund Guianas,
- Oversight Steering Committee members.

- Field visits and observation were carried to the Central Suriname Nature Reserve (CSNR) with a visit to Raleigh Falls and a visit was also completed to Bigi Pan MUMA along the coast. The CSNR was a key focus of the project. The visit to Bigi Pan offered an opportunity to explore some of the secondary

project activity and further understand the conservation management field in Suriname. The complete mission itinerary can be found in Annex VI and a summary of the field visits in Annex VII.

- Continuous informal dialogue with project stakeholders was maintained
- Stakeholder meetings and review of the evaluation findings report (for quality assurance)
- Incorporating comments before finalizing the evaluation report.

#### 2.2.4 Analytical Approaches

This evaluation was guided analytically by the evaluation matrix that can be found in Annex 1. The priority questions found in the Matrix include:

- a) Do the “*SCF’s Project’s* objectives respond to the challenges (needs and priorities) faced by Suriname in relation to biodiversity and conservation?
- b) To what extent has the “*SCF Project*” made progress towards its stated objectives?
- c) What contribution have “*SCF Project’s* partners (institutional and non-governmental) made in terms of achieving the project’s results?
- d) How efficient have the management and administrative arrangements supporting the “*SCF Project*” been?
- e) What is the likelihood that financial and economic resources will be available so that the project outcomes/benefits will be sustained once the SCF project ends?
- f) Stakeholder ownership: Do the various key stakeholders perceive a continue flow of benefits to be in their interest? This line of evidence will require a different approach for each stakeholder group i.e. institutional stakeholders versus community based organisations.
- g) Institutional framework and governance. Are the legal frameworks, policies and governance and public administration structures and processes in place to support the objectives of the project and the continued flow of benefits?
- h) Attitudinal Change: To what degree are attitudes and practices (politicians, government officials, industry and the general public) are supportive of SCF’s mandate? To what degree is the SCF contributing to changing perceptions and practices?

Triangulation of information sources was employed by which is meant that in every circumstance possible, information and opinions expressed by participants in the evaluation were validated by considering other lines of evidence.

#### 2.2.5 Risks and Potential Limitations of the Methodology and Coping Strategy

A key concern was the short time period for commencing and completing the evaluation, in particular the field work. The lack of knowledge of the initial LFA created challenges as did the absence of monitoring information collected during the life of the project. Another concern that only emerged during the information gathering stage was trying to overcome the lack of an evaluation culture in Suriname where it is not commonly accepted that the evaluation process is meant to improve project performance and not serve as an opportunity to point fingers although if there are problems with the project, they have to be addressed in a constructive manner. In order to overcome these difficulties the evaluation team sought alternative sources of information including interviewing additional individuals who were not originally expected to be contacted. All stakeholders were given an opportunity to express their opinions either through interviews, Skype or electronic correspondence. Also, the permanent presence of one of the evaluation team members in Suriname allowed for the follow up interviews and

information gathering. Eventually it was deemed necessary to provide additional time to gather information and conduct a small number of supplementary interviews.

There were some challenges that could not be properly addressed. The most notable in this regard was examining in sufficient detail SCF grant activity. Every effort was made to ensure that a representative number of grant projects were considered but in the end, the evaluation concluded that at some point SCF grant activity and grant procedures should be subject to a separate evaluation process in the very near future.

### **2.3 Evaluation Team and Responsibilities**

The evaluation team was comprised of two consultants with Dean Pallen acting as the team leader. Mr. Pallen was supported by national consultant Shanti Adhin who has a strong background in natural resource management. Combined, the team possessed a wide range of skills, including evaluation experience, expertise in biodiversity conservation and protected area management and eco-tourism. Mr. Pallen assumed overall duties for directing the evaluation, establishing the tone in interviews and taking on the responsibility for liaising with UNDP's Regional Office in Panama. He coordinated the evaluation, and took the lead in writing up the final report. Ms. Adhin completed the evaluation process by tracking supplementary technical information, arranging additional interviews, asking supplemental questions during interviews, reviewing documents, consulting with Mr. Pallen, translating documents from Dutch and providing input into the draft and final versions of the evaluation report. The evaluation team was committed to apply the ethical and quality principles of the United Nations Evaluation Group throughout the evaluation process.<sup>1</sup>

## **3.0 The Project and its Development Context**

### **3.1 Project Start and its Duration**

The Building Support to the Suriname Conservation Foundation Project ("*SCF Project*") was signed in September 2004 and its implementation started in January 2005. The "*SCF Project*" had an operation budget of 3.6 million USD that was provided by the Government of Suriname through financing available through the Dutch Treaty Fund. The project end date was December 2010 but was extended by an additional six months without the allotment of any further funding.

### **3.2 Problems that the Project Sought to Address**

Suriname gained independence from the Netherlands in 1975. It is one of the least densely populated countries in the world, with a human population of about 480,000. Roughly 87- 90% of the population is concentrated in the capital city of Paramaribo and along the coastal region where almost all the economic activity in country is concentrated. The remaining 10-13 % of the population lives in the interior mostly in small villages. The varied population includes Creoles, Indians, Javanese, Maroons - who represent the only intact communities descended from runaway slaves in the New World - Amerindians and Chinese.

Suriname's economy remains dominated by the mining and oil sectors. In 2008, alumina, gold, and oil amounted to 55 percent of GDP and accounted for some 95 percent of total exports of goods. Bauxite

---

<sup>1</sup> <http://www.unevaluation.org/ethicalguidelines>

mining is the oldest sector, and the production of alumina dates back to the early 20th century. Oil production began in 1980 by Staatsolie, a state-owned company, while gold production by the formal sector started in 2004. The production of alumina sharply contracted in 2009. Gold production has become the main source of export earnings. Agricultural production, which is concentrated in the coastal zone, consists mainly of rice and bananas, and accounts for 10 % of export earnings and 12 % of employment.

As of 2011, Suriname was ranked 154<sup>th</sup> in terms of Gross Domestic Production, 159<sup>th</sup> in external debt. In 2010, the Human Development Index (HDI) ranked Suriname 94 out of 182 countries. This is down from 2005 when Suriname placed 86<sup>th</sup>. Suriname is considered a “Medium Human Development country”. Since gaining independence in 1975, Suriname has remained relatively isolated geographically, politically and economically. Suriname is also a highly ethnically, culturally and linguistically diverse country and these factors play a role in how the country is governed.

The CSNR comprises 1.6 million ha of primary tropical forest in west-central Suriname. It protects the upper watershed of the Coppename River and the headwaters of the Lucie, Oost, Zuid, Saramacca, and Gran Rio rivers and covers a range of topography and ecosystems of notable conservation value due to its untouched state. It represents the largest protected block of the Guiana Shield tropical wilderness biota. The CSNR contains a high diversity of plant life with more than 5,000 vascular plant species collected to date and a wide variety of animals including jaguars and 400 bird species. A recent world-wide study of seven protected areas by the Tropical Ecology Assessment and Monitoring Network (TEAM) of large mammals found that the CSNR has the highest number of species diversity. The CSNR is the only natural site in Suriname to hold the distinction of being declared a World Heritage Site by the United Nations Educational Scientific Cultural Organisation (UNESCO).

Although Suriname has been able to retain 75% of its natural vegetation and most of its biodiversity is largely protected, much of the credit for this is due to low population density and poor accessibility to densely forested areas. With the majority of the population living in and around the capital Paramaribo, there are not the pressures on Suriname’s forests had the settlements patterns of Suriname been different. This is not to say that there are no threats to Suriname’s forests and biodiversity. Across the country, the practice of illegal gold mining is having an increasingly devastating impact on Suriname’s environment. Along the edges of the rainforest coverage, chips are appearing in the armour as illegal miners implant patterns of destructive extraction practices that lead to the clear cutting of forests, the pollution of local waterways and other unwanted environmental and social impacts. This brand of small-scale mining is growing as it represents a good income generation opportunity for poor sectors of Suriname’s population.

Logging is another threat to the rainforests of Suriname. In the 1990s, the government began conceding logging concessions to foreign timber and mining interests. Close to 25% of the country was designated for logging by Malaysian and Indonesian timber firms. The terms of these concession agreements led to broad protests that helped to halt a lot of the logging activity although some did carry on. In 1997, the Surinamese government established a forestry project to monitor and control logging and to work towards among other objectives, setting aside new protected areas. Eventually this project was one of the developments that contributed to the creation of the CSNR. Nonetheless even today, the CSNR and other areas of the country where dense rainforest exist, there is motivation from business interests to exploit raw resources as opposed to following a path of conservation that presents its own path of economic potential but requires more planning and is done through a process involving the building of consensus amongst stakeholders.

While Suriname has garnered praise both internationally and domestically for placing limits on logging and establishing the CSNR and the SNR, it has never been able to create and maintain effective management structures for either nature reserve or elsewhere in the country. There have been some pockets of success but generally the situation is not encouraging. This is regrettable as Suriname has not always struggled in this regard. In 1969, STINASU was established with a mandate to promote nature education, scientific research and to improve conservation and support tourism in protected areas. In the 1970s and early 1980s, both STINASU and Suriname's Forest Service were robust and effective organizations with strong reputations. The country broke ground by being one of the first to establish a sea turtle conservation programme. However, in the mid-eighties as the war in the interior destroyed most of the conservation infrastructure and institutions, Suriname's capabilities in this area began to deteriorate. Since the glory days, adequate funding, effective and abundant human resource capabilities backed up by an appropriate administrative structure and policy framework have largely been non-existent.

Although there is not a lot of human population living in or around large reserves like the CSNR and SNR, these communities have to be front and centre in the management strategies of protected areas. In relation to the CSNR, there are the tribal communities to consider. The Kwinti Maroon tribe (Maroons are descendants of runaway African slaves) live in the villages of Witagron and Kaaimanston that are approximately 30 kilometres to the Northern border of the reserve. There are indigenous communities (Trio tribe) close to the CSNR in the south who in some cases, claim historical hunting rights within the CSNR as the Kwinti currently do. It can be a challenge to establish effective collaboration with local communities indigenous or otherwise but doing so is essential in creating a good operational context for nature reserves.

There has been strong international involvement in Suriname in the conservation field with the most notable participation coming from CI and the WWF. Both organizations, and especially CI, have had a long history working on key conservation issues in Suriname including the CSNR. Over the years, rightly or wrongly, the working relationship between international environmental organizations and national government bodies has not always been as positive as one would hope. In some ways the creation of the SCF was meant to play the role that international organizations have previously held in Suriname. This placed responsibilities on the SCF in terms of not only promoting conservation management in Suriname but also in terms of being responsible for reaching out and collaborating with the Suriname Government and other stakeholders in the country.

Internationally, there are enormous economic opportunities to be leveraged through a strong commitment to conservation. This can come in the form of carbon trading agreements, eco-tourism or through investing in establishing other patterns of sustainable income generation through rainforest resources. The worldwide ecological movement that is closely intertwined with economic practices such as Fair Trade, present alternatives for assisting low income populations to improve their well being by introducing new patterns of employment. To a large extent, Suriname has yet to find its place in the world on these matters.

### **3.3 Immediate and Development Objectives of the Project**

The "*SCF Project*," was intended to strengthen the long-term environmental management capacity of the SCF to enable the organization to effectively support conservation management, research, awareness raising, advocacy, and ecotourism activities in Suriname. The "*SCF Project*" aimed to strengthen government agencies responsible for protected area management through the provision of financial and technical capacity building support with an additional objective of facilitating the maturation of a SCF

Conservation Trust Fund as they are known internationally, that was created to reach a capitalization target of 15 million USD as a means of providing long-term sustainable financing for biodiversity conservation activity in Suriname. The “*SCF Project*’s” objectives were to be accomplished through a clearly defined set of interventions. The main efforts and funds US\$ 1,139,000 (33.2 %) were scheduled for institutional strengthening and capacity building of the SCF and the government institutions responsible for protected area management. An almost equal amount: US\$ 1,130,000 (33 %) was allocated for protected area management in particular to implement the Central Suriname Natural Reserve (CSNR) and Sipaliwini National Reserve (SNR) management plans. According to the project document, about 30 % of the financial resources were allocated for protected area management. This included activities other than the implementation of the CSNR management plan. To enable NCD and STINASU to build capacity to successfully improve protected area management, almost 50 % of the institutional strengthening budget (USD 539,000) was allocated to these agencies and to this amount some SCF grant money was added.

The remaining funds were available for ‘SCF administrative services’ and ‘other grants’ (research, awareness building and education), PLOS project management, and project audits and evaluation. The centrepiece of the project was to be the establishment of a viable management system including field level staff with logistical capabilities for the CSNR. Historically, the establishment of the CSNR and the creation of the SCF and the endowment fund are closely intertwined.

### **3.4 Main Stakeholders and Partners**

The principal and direct beneficiary of assistance provided by UNDP to strengthen SCF’s institutional capacity will be SCF’s Board, SCF Staff and SCF Committees. Directly and indirectly the Governments Conservation Institutes, Research institutes, NGO’s and Community Based Organizations will benefit through improved technical and financial support provided through the SCF. The main implementing partners of the project were: Ministry of Planning and Development Cooperation (PLOS), that was transferred to the Ministry of Finance as of 2010, the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), the SCF, and the Nature Conservation Division (NCD) and the Foundation for Nature Conservation in Suriname (STINASU) of the Ministry of Physical Planning, Land and Forest management (MRGB) and the Ministry of Labour, Technological Development and Environment (ATM). The key partner in terms of providing technical oversight and liaising with project stakeholders was the SCF that also directly managed important project components such as the grant programme. The SCF was also targeted for much of the capacity building support undertaken by the project. The principal government partner at an implementing level was the NCD that worked with STINASU on the CSNR file. As implementing partner of the project, the Ministry of Finance had the responsibility of coordinating meetings, and taking the lead on administrative and financial matters. The UNDP role was largely focussed on administrative and financial procedures.

### **3.5 Results Expected**

In the Country Programme Document for Suriname 2008 to 2011, the “*SCF Project*” is expected to contribute to achieving objective 1.4 “an enhanced sustainable natural resources planning and management systems is in place”. According to the most current Logical Framework Analysis (LFA), that serves to establish a structure for assessing programming activities, the project’s specific objectives were as follows prioritized by evaluation team:

**Key Objectives:**

1. SCF Conservation Trust Fund reaches its full initial targeted capitalization to the amount of US\$ 15 million.
2. The SCF Secretariat is operating sustainably and is capable to carry out its core tasks effectively.
3. Institutional capacity for policy formulation and implementation, and management capacity relating to protected area management and biodiversity conservation in Government institutions are strengthened at national and local level.
4. Management of CSNR made operational through the implementation of the approved management plan.

**Additional Objectives:**

5. SCF has a significantly raised profile as independent organization, and is recognized and supported nationally and internationally.
6. Enhanced grant-making capability of SCF combined with a strong project portfolio that demonstrates a substantive contribution to the building of capacity for protected area management and biodiversity conservation.
7. The Biodiversity Focal Point at the Ministry of Labour, Technological Development and Environment has been strengthened; the National Biodiversity Strategy is updated and implementation of the Action Plan has commenced; the preparatory work for the establishment of a national biodiversity information network system has been carried out.
8. SCF is actively supporting the management of other protected areas.
9. Implementation of other activities such as research, biological surveys, education and awareness building.
10. NGOs, CBOs and other organizations play a significant role in biodiversity conservation in protected areas and buffer zones.
11. The project is properly managed, audited and evaluated.

**4.0 Findings**

The project obtained some clear tangible outputs with the most prominent being the SCF Conservation Trust Fund meeting its capitalization objective of 15 million USD. Since reaching the 15 million USD target, roughly twenty grants have been disbursed through the SCF Conservation Trust Fund (see Annex III for a complete list of grants). Table 4.0 outlines the path of the Conservation Trust Fund since 2007. Another key accomplishment is the entrenchment of the SCF as a Suriname institution with a strong environmental mandate that has built a national profile. Internationally, SCF appears to have successfully integrated itself into entities such as the Conservation Finance Alliance, RedLAC that works with conservation funds to help reduce the need for donor assistance for funding conservation related activity and the International Union for the Conservation of Nature (IUCN).

**Table 4.0 Trajectory of the SCF Conservation Trust Fund Since 2007**

2007	Reach the Target Capitalization level of \$15 million
2009	9% Decrease in fund due to the worldwide crisis
2010	\$14,615,486 at the beginning of 2010. In September 2010 the 15 million dollar line was passed again
2011 – First Half	Year fund began at \$16,025,907 reaching \$17,081,000 at its peak
2011 – Second Half	The economic problems in Europe resulted in fund dropping to \$16,229,000 between May and June. By the fall of 2010, the fund had dipped below the \$15,000,000

In addition, SCF was able to carry-out outreach activity with the Suriname business community that resulted in the establishment of partnerships with some of the country’s leading companies that in turn supported the SCF. SCF conducted business greening sessions with Suriname businesses. While the support of Suriname’s business community is welcome, the evaluation found that the SCF must be placing every effort possible into improving its ability to develop conservation related technical capacities and manage conservation related projects and avoid spreading the organization too thin. In order to provide substantive assistance in the area of greening business operation requires considerable technical capabilities on matters like Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) and cleaner production. Connecting the business community to conservation activities as donors, as partners in conservation and sensitizing business interest to the need for stronger conservation practices in Suriname is already a monumental challenge that stays closer to SCF’s mandate.

On the question of grant disbursements, the evaluation team was not able to meet with all grant recipients to fully assess the effectiveness of a good majority of the grant projects. It was possible to determine that there were some clear successes notably in supporting the Ministry of Environment in its efforts to comply with the CBD by facilitating the finalization of Suriname’s National Biodiversity Strategy. The support provided to the University of Suriname in launching a mangrove rehabilitation project eventually met with success after some trial and error. During a field mission the evaluation team was able to note the haul way at Bigi Pan that was constructed with SCF grant resources that now facilitates waterway travel at Bigi Pan. Based on interviews and feedback from grant recipients the evaluation team was able to determine that grants related to research and policy development appear to have had more success than grants involving ground-level project implementation. The largest grant project supported by the “**SCF Project**”, support to the CSNR, is discussed in greater detail throughout the report and is noted from the standpoint of its lack of success.

In terms of the capacity building component of the project, funds were disbursed to purchase equipment like computers and vehicles and a large number of individuals from the different implementing ministries were trained in a variety of professional areas. The detailed information regarding training activity is examined in section 4.4. It is recognized by project stakeholders that the strategic benefits from the training activity are not apparent. This is due in large part to turnover in government staffing,



changes in policies and the impact of elections and Surinamese politics on the day to day functioning of government. The exception to this would appear to be the SCF that has benefited from the training in terms of gaining capacity related to general administrative practices, and financial management. The international networking activity has been beneficial to SCF but it is not clear how project activities like the CSNR have been enhanced through these international connections. The Management Support Mission is also recognized by all stakeholders as being beneficial to the SCF as a number of recommendations from the mission's final report were acted upon.

#### **4.1.1 The CSNR**

The CSNR was held in deep regard by all individuals interviewed during the course of the evaluation. It is a source of national pride and given its World Heritage site designation, the CSNR is not viewed as just another project component. Hence, it is of little surprise that the evaluation process revealed that there are feelings of sadness and disappointment about what has taken place with the CSNR. Most interviewees saw what happened with the CSNR as the criteria for measuring the success of the “*SCF Project*” and rightly point out that the SCF and the SCF Conservation Trust Fund are largely by-products of the creation of the CSNR.

The project supported a number of CSNR related capacity building activities through and/or for the NCD, and STINASU and the belated and short lived CSNR Project Implementation Unit (PIU) in the hopes of building a management structure for the CSNR with corresponding capabilities in areas such as eco-tourism. Yet at the time of the evaluation, there was little evidence of any CSNR management capacity or auxiliary capabilities. There was once a management plan that was endorsed by all stakeholders that was to be overseen by the CSNR Management Authority with a board composed of relevant stakeholders including the local communities surrounding the CSNR and meetings were held. Yet at one point in time, the Government modified the plan without conducting any further consultations. The modification implied that the Government would be the Management Authority (based on the Nature Conservation Law of 1954) and relevant stakeholders would be brought together in a CSNR Consultation and Advisory Body. For this reason the local community groups withdrew their support and any further participation in the project and in the end, the CSNR consultation committee never materialized.

In addition to the lack of dialogue between local community groups and the project team, there is no evidence of the establishment of conservation compatible livelihoods as part of a process to engage local people into supporting the CSNR. In January 2011, a draft of a business management model for the CSNR was developed by NCD and eventually shared informally with a SCF staff member but as of February 2012, there has been no further movement to advance the plan.

There is no on-site project management crew with the exception of a skeleton crew that is largely in place to respond to the needs of independent tour operators bringing tourist groups into the CSNR. There are a few game wardens and some building infrastructure but overall, the CSNR exists without a proper management team with corresponding infrastructure. The main site or visiting centre within the CSNR where the PIU unit should have been operating from is in dire need of stronger management, architectural and layout design improvements and an overall higher level of professionalism that would be in step with a World Heritage Site. A research centre located in the CSNR appears to have at one point been highly operational and well equipped but now stands in disarray. There is controversy surrounding building designs that were developed for the site yet the designs that the evaluation team were able to see would indicate that credible designs were developed for consideration but like many matters related to the CSNR, there is a lack of clarity as to why nothing actually happened.

The PIU was problematic in terms of how well project partners NCD, the Forest Service and SCF did or did not enable the PIU to fulfill its mandate. This is after the SCF, and NCD apparently went to great lengths to recruit the PIU project manager. Resources such as the PIU office were transferred over to the Forest Service but the transfer began while the PIU was still operational. The PIU project manager's tenure ended in controversy and is now before the courts of Suriname as the project manager seeks compensation for the last months of his salary while withholding some of the project's equipment which is sad but somehow symbolic of what has happened in relation to the CSNR.

Although the CSNR remains intact without any serious deterioration of its dense forest coverage through logging or illegal gold mining, the main threats to Suriname's forests, a shadow hangs over the CSNR until proper management capabilities are established guided by a long-term vision deeply rooted in a strong belief in conservation.

#### **4.1.2 Institutional Relationships and Project Management Issues**

It is very difficult to completely analyze every element that acted to derail some of the important parts of the "**SCF Project**". It was largely a mixture of factors and their interaction. There were clearly factors that were largely beyond the control of project stakeholders that would adversely impact any similar type of project. They are seen as:

- Limited pool of in-country expertise from which the project could draw from to facilitate project activity. Suriname is a small country and as such, the available expertise is very restricted. For the "**SCF Project**" this resulted in an undesirable movement of project stakeholders/local expertise between employment positions related to the "**SCF Project**". Routinely key individuals would move for example, from one position in government or a post with a non-governmental institution all the while never gravitating too far away from having involvement in the project. This was the norm as opposed to a healthier situation whereby new individuals would enter into the project and possibly bring fresh ideas and enthusiasm.
- Lack of a pertinent legislative framework. Project stakeholders consistently underlined the need to have the Suriname Conservation Act updated so as to better reflect current circumstances that would allow for different types of management structures, working relationships, and approaches to such matters as eco-tourism. At one point the project contemplated this as a project activity but the idea lost momentum.
- Lack of clear government support at the most senior levels to help overcome bottle necks encountered by the project. The government of Suriname deserves full credit for creating the CSNR and ensuring that it has remained in its largely untouched state. However, as the project encountered one challenge after another, there was a need for stronger guidance at a strategic governmental level to steer the project back towards a more constructive direction.
- Ongoing limitations of concerned government departments in terms of their technical and human resource capabilities and financial resources and how this impacts on the motivation of Government staff. NCD for example, is a relatively small government unit that is not well equipped and is tasked with enormous responsibility in addition to the CSNR.
- Turnover of Government staff in concerned departments.

- Slow bureaucratic system that paralyzes the decision making process.
- Fragmentation or overlap of government responsibilities that resulted in the project having in hindsight, an unrealistic expectation of involving a number of government departments in the project.
- At one time the government intended to create the Forest Management and Nature Conservation Authority (BOSNAS) that would include the foundation for Forest Management & Control and the NCD, both part of the RGB Ministry. This would have led to the modernization and improved operations of both organizations in line with the renewed national forest policy. Due to objections of the private timber sector and the creation of the RGB Ministry after the 2005 elections, the establishment of BOSNAS was never realized.

There are nevertheless, other concerns equally worrisome that are more directly attributable to how the project was managed and the comportment of key project stakeholders:

- The lack of a project manager to work more directly with project partners on technical matters and building better relations between the different project partners. The closest the project came to having this was the hiring of a project facilitator who according to all sources, for six months did strong work on matters like standardizing reporting practices. The hiring of the project manager to lead the PIU for the CSNR would have been helpful in this regards but this particular arrangement ended badly. A project manager could have provided this project with badly needed leadership and technical guidance provided stakeholder institutions would have been open to the presence of such an individual.
- Lack of an independent project monitoring system whereby possibly a neutral third party with experience in relevant fields might have been able to assist in identifying and proposing solutions to overcome obstacles encountered by the project in a constructive manner.
- The absence of consistent goodwill and cooperation and a shared vision between key project stakeholder institutions (NCD, SCF and the Forest Service). Despite efforts by the Ministry of Finance to mediate between the groups, problems persisted. It is unfortunate that this came to dominate as there were periods where there were actually good relations between project partners.
- As it relates to the CSNR, project stakeholders demonstrating behaviour that is very difficult to comprehend. A good example of this would be the handling of the PIU where after going to great lengths to establish the PIU, it seemed everything was done to ensure that the PIU was unable to carry out its responsibilities.
- Poor communication between project stakeholders. The inability of project partners to actually talk and listen to each other was brought up constantly as an undermining factor.
- Providing feedback, approvals and signing off on other matters too often would occur in a less than punctual manner.

- Personal issues between key project stakeholders in critical areas. Although this did not permeate all project activity, a great deal was shared or suggested to the evaluation team on this matter. It is difficult to determine how much of an influence this had but as far as a being a problem, it appears to be the case.
- An absence of a critical amount of innovation in thinking and practices. A project support mission was completed that resulted in successful workshops. A result of this was a much higher frequency of the Oversight Committee meetings. There was room for more creativity. This project did not require high levels of thoughtfulness but it was necessary for stakeholders to take some time to try and imagine how matters might be handled differently. The possibility to learn and feed off better circumstances and the expertise of individuals was within reach of the project.
- Not making a stronger connection between a broad range of project activities and the ultimate objective of improving the management practices for protected areas in a substantive manner. The project did support a lot of project activity but in the end, what did it all mean for improving protected area management practices? This is very unclear.
- The marginalization of the UNDP in terms of its involvement in the SCF and the project. It is felt that UNDP allowing the Ministry of Finance to manage the project from the perspective of being the key oversight agency and the SCF and other government departments assuming the roles of project implementers was correct in terms of respecting local autonomy. However, the UNDP could have been more active in providing support on technical matters and issues related to project management. Although the UNDP Suriname office is small, it is not without its ability to call upon resources and information. It is also important to note that one of the key recommendations to the UNDP through the evaluation of the previous GEF project was the need for the UNDP to assign a strong technical and managerial coordinator to what would become the “*SCF Project*”.
- Although meetings were regularly held where the challenges faced by the project were examined, rarely if ever did this self-reflection result in steps to resolve problems. The Dutch embassy was aware of some of the problems the project was facing and met with officials with the Suriname Government to express its concern. More importantly, project partners met on regular basis through the Oversight Committee and commitments were made to follow up and address bottlenecks but rarely did anything actually happen.
- Less than satisfactory reporting practices and project documentation. Tardiness was an ongoing concern but this was partially due to the project structure where four project implementers routinely had to provide input on reporting. There were other issues such as the content of reports not saying much about what was actually taking place with the project.

Based on all these findings the challenges faced by the project may be illustrated as follows:



#### 4.1.3 The Suriname Conservation Foundation

The findings of the evaluation regarding the SCF are similar to the mixed conclusions regarding the project. The recommendations of the Management Support Mission were taken to heart on matters like improving the branding of the SCF that included moving to a new more visible office. At the same time the SCF achieved many of the objectives outlined in the project’s LFA such as supporting the Environment Ministry to develop a biodiversity strategy for Suriname. The work of the SCF on the Conservation Trust Fund has been outstanding. It reached its objective of 15 million USD and weathered the storm of uncertain financial markets and fared much better compared to similar funds. This was accomplished through a strong sense of dedication, professionalism and constant attention to detail guaranteeing that the fund was never excessively damaged by market volatility. The management of the SCF Conservation Trust Fund should be studied as a model for other similar funds that might be considered for Suriname.

With the exception of the Conservation Trust Fund, many of SCF’s achievements are not the most substantive measuring sticks on how to evaluate the organization’s role in the project. A more critical measurement is SCF’s work on the CSNR and its role as a partner in this project and on these more complex matters, the SCF does not score as well. The SCF failed to build constructive relationships with the key government departments involved in the implementation of the CSNR. It is recognized that the concerned government departments share in the blame on this matter. It is also appreciated that this was not always an easy task for the SCF but at the end of the day, in order to make more profound and meaningful impacts, these are the sorts of challenges that have to be dealt with by the SCF in a thoughtful and productive way. These are the government departments that share the same core conservation mandate as the SCF.

Tension existed between representatives of government and the SCF. The evaluation found that a source of this problem was the uneven relationship between the SCF and the Government. For decades government departments tasked with conservation management have been under resourced and unable to carry out their mandate effectively. Now, these same departments are expected to work with and in some circumstances, rely on the SCF that is comparatively well equipped and on a strong financial ground. It is easy to see how unproductive feelings could creep into these circumstances. As such, it was found that the SCF could have been more constructive even if the organization was facing unreasonable circumstances.

In Suriname, there is respect for the SCF and what the organization has accomplished but at the same time, the perspective of the SCF appears to be evolving. The SCF is no longer seen as a young organization finding its way. After ten years of operation the SCF is now perceived as being part of the establishment and as such, there is a feeling of disappointment about how SCF conducts itself. It is felt that in relation to this project and in more general terms, the SCF should be a much more positive and pro-active force. There are serious issues facing Suriname in relation to conservation management most notably in regards to the government and its ability in ensuring the country's rich natural resources are managed in a responsible manner. Enabling the government to work effectively on this mandate requires patience, vision and external guidance. While the SCF is seen as being good at generating publicity for itself and its causes, project stakeholders expect the SCF to be playing a clearer leadership role in terms of setting an example by influencing government for the better and by establishing a more healthier environment for all organizations operating in Suriname whether they are domestic, international or governmental in the conservation field.

The SCF has successfully integrated itself into RedLAC and has established other international partnerships through vehicles like membership in the IUCN. What does not appear to be happening on critical matters like the CSNR, is the SCF using its international connections and access to knowledge for the betterment of the project. The SCF could be an incredible source of knowledge and ideas on conservation matters that lead to innovation and creativity in Suriname. Instead, the organization is seen by some as being overly conservative.

At the same time, although it is recognized by stakeholders that there have been some recent improvements, there remains a criticism that the SCF lacks transparency on matters such as how grants are disbursed and how applicants are informed about the grant allocation process. The Management Support Mission identified this issue as a concern in 2007. The SCF disagrees with this perception and it is in the organization's interest to clarify this matter with stakeholders.

The evaluation process identified that the executive director of the SCF in possessing a business background has successfully put the organization on a strong financial footing and should be commended for this. However, the evaluation also found that there are other aspects of the SCF that need to be brought up to the same standards as the Conservation Trust Fund and this will take different forms of leadership and nurturing.

#### **4.1.4 The UNDP**

The UNDP's decision to encourage national partner organization to assume greater autonomy over project management is deemed by all as the appropriate direction to take in Suriname. This is not to say that there are some who have the opinion that the "*SCF Project*" suffered as a result of this. The UNDP is an international agency with a great deal of experience in managing and supporting projects similar to the "*SCF Project*." Therefore it might be appropriate to see how the UNDP can more pro-actively work

with the Suriname Government on future projects to help ensure they are not undermined in the ways the “*SCF Project*” was.

The evaluation found that the project could have benefited from a stronger UNDP project presence that went beyond administrative matters. From managerial difficulties to technical concerns, there was a need for a more robust UNDP involvement in this project. In hindsight, regardless of the motivation behind the decision for UNDP to withdraw from the Board of Directors of SCF, this too was perhaps a strategic error as many stakeholders believe that the presence of the UNDP on the board could have been helpful to the SCF in developing a stronger operational capability. Presently, a seat remains open on SCF’s Board of Directors that is reserved for an international donor organization. In the future, there is a need for the UNDP in agreement with the Government of Suriname to use pragmatism to assess how much technical and managerial involvement the UNDP has in future projects.

The “*SCF Project*” has been the flagship of UNDP’s programming in Suriname. Climate change and other global environmental issues will be front and centre for UNDP’s programming in Suriname moving forward. Being able to provide strong guidance to environmental projects would seem to be important and the UNDP could have gained a great deal more organizationally by being more involved in the “*SCF Project*” and this ultimately would have better served the long term interests of Suriname.

## 4.2 Project Formulation

### 4.2.1 Conceptualization and Design

The project identified the proper issues to address; long term financial sustainability to support conservation activity, institutional capacity building of both the government and SCF and support for the CSNR and the project was designed to achieve a variety of objectives with varying degrees of difficulty. The “*SCF Project*” was designed to build capacity including nurturing the financial capabilities of the Conservation Trust Fund, the capacity of SCF to assist with national conservation efforts and to act internationally, and enable government departments to carry out their agenda to do among other duties, work effectively with indigenous and other minority community groups. Other organizations were also targeted for support by the project through grant activity for capacity building whether it came in the form of facilitating the development of new policies or field level pilot work.

When one considers these objectives collectively, **the project appears to have been overly ambitious.** As early as 2007, based on the recommendation of the Management Support Mission, the implementation of the SNR Management Plan was postponed till after the “*SCF Project*” was completed to allow the project team to focus its efforts on the CSNR. **This was perhaps one of the first clear signs that the project required a more concise strategic plan that was concentrated on achieving realistic objectives.** This type of approach was not the case other than as it related to the Conservation Trust Fund and some grant activity that was for the most part, self contained and not subject to a lot of the difficult variables such as changes in government that the project team could not control.

What was also needed with the “*SCF Project*” but was completely absent in the design, was a strong day to day management structure and a “constant care” approach to guide all project components. Without this type of attention and nurturing, such an ambitious project was unlikely to succeed and that is what occurred in good part.

The terminal evaluation of the UNDP GEF project identified a number of key issues that arose during that project that needed to be properly acknowledged and addressed to ensure that the “*SCF Project*” succeeded. As the terminal evaluation rightly points out, the distinction between the UNDP GEF project and the recently terminated “*SCF Project*” is in many ways artificial. What has largely taken place in relation to the CSNR has been a ten-year long process that was facilitated over the last six years by the money from the Dutch Treaty Fund covering the cost of project activities while the Conservation Trust Fund was allowed to mature and strengthen. The Terminal Evaluation noted the following: “In designing the SCF Capacity Building Project (the SCF Project), the partners acknowledged the need for the continuation of support in several project segments where few project results had been achieved yet, as well as support to institutions crucial for strengthening Suriname’s long term environmental management capacity”<sup>2</sup>. The Terminal Evaluation identified the following reasons for the difficulties encountered by the UNDP-GEF:

- Lack of strong project guidance
- Absence of constant technical support
- The lack of a strong independent project coordinator
- Not making the CSNR the priority
- Modest programme of institutional support

For the most part, these problems have carried over to this current phase. **Issues of suitable institutional arrangements, strong project management, leadership, knowledge and accountability have burdened the “*SCF Project*” throughout its lifetime.** It is true that these are issues that should have been more concisely considered during the conceptualization stage but in certain instances, there were factors that were out of the control of the project team or difficult to acknowledge in the project’s design. The most obvious in this regard was the political context in which the project was implemented. The Terminal Evaluation expressed the opinion that a ten-year time frame would be more suitable for implementing this type of project. In the end, ten years was taken but unfortunately, some of the key objectives were still not met largely in relation to the CSNR.

In some instances the project team would put in motion what can only be described as good project management and/or design practices. For example, in the early days of the CSNR project component, efforts were made to include representatives from local CSNR stakeholder groups such as the Kwinti people in the development of the project’s management plan. Eventually though the Government of Suriname modified the management plan and the perception then became that the consultation process was not comprehensive enough and resulted in indigenous groups withdrawing from the project.

The PIU in support of the CSNR clearly was problematic from a design standpoint but as always, many factors have to be considered as to why the PIU did not work out. There appears to have been little motivation emanating from key project stakeholders to see the PIU succeed. At the same time the PIU manager may not have had the political acumen that was required. Yet, the idea of establishing a PIU of relatively well paid “outsiders” more or less within a government department to help that same department carry out its duties is nothing if not a hard sell. The PIU was critical to making the CSNR component of the project succeed but what appears to have happened, the PIU became emblematic of many of things that were wrong with this project.

---

<sup>2</sup> Kloss, D., Mitchell, E., Jan. 2007. Terminal Evaluation Report of the GEF/UNDP Project “Conservation of Globally Significant Forest Ecosystems in Suriname’s Guyana Shield Bio-Region” Page 8



The difficult circumstances in which this project was implemented have to be recognized and hopefully at some point they can be dealt with in a constructive manner. During the life of the project there was never the leadership attached to the project team to address these matters to the degree that a single project could. Although there were some favourable elements in place that facilitated the project's ambitions such as SCF's connection to the business community, there was so much from the ongoing political situation to less than constructive individual relationships that served to undermine the project. There was a complexity to this working context that could not be overcome and would be difficult to reconcile in the project's design. As an example of one variable that the project team had to work through, Table 4.2.1 provides an overview of Suriname political developments and the overlap with changes in the project.

<i>Date</i>	<i>Change/Action/event</i>
September 2004	Signature of the project document.
January 2005	First transfer of funds to UNDP.
May 2005	Forest and Nature Conservation Authority (BOSNAS) establishment not realized prior to Elections. Existing organizations continue based on mandate a decision on restructuring forest and Nature Conservation Management entities still to be taken.
May 2005	General Elections in Suriname.
August 2005	Establishment Ministry of ROGB (Forest Management transferred from Ministry of NH to Ministry of PLOS. This resulted in a change in the whole leadership at the Forest Department.
March 2006	National Biodiversity Strategy Finalized
August 2006	Submission of project document CSNR management to SCF Foundation.
November-December 2006	Final Evaluation mission Conservation of Globally Significant Forest Ecosystems in Suriname's Guyana Shield Bio-region.
December 2006	Approval project document CSNR management by Board of SCF Foundation.
Jan 2007	Final Evaluation Report Conservation of Globally Significant Forest Ecosystems in Suriname's Guyana Shield Bio-region.
June 2007	Project manager CSNR management position advertised. Symbiont contracted to advertise and facilitate selection process Project manager. Interview panel consisting of Symbiont, STINASU and NCD finalize and select candidate around Oct 2007. Contract PM signed in Aug 2008.
September 2007	Signage of financial agreement CSNR project management by ROGB and SCF.
November 2007	Management support mission report.
March 2008	UNDP no longer member Board member of SCF. As a board member UNDP had a good view of developments within SCF foundation through the regular board meetings and could also give direction.
July 2008	Project transfers from assisted NEX to HACT/ full NEX with the Ministry of PLOS taking on more responsibility for project management. This coincided with project facilitator whom provided support to facilitate this process.
July 2008	Project facilitator SCF capacity building project to support PLOS in going to full Nex and other activities.
September 2009	Change in UNDP Environment & Energy Programme officer.
25 May 2010	General Elections in Suriname.
September 2010	Abolishment Ministry of Planning and SCF project transferred to Ministry of

#### 4.2.2 Logical Framework Analysis

The Logical Framework Analysis (LFA) was revised during the course of the project and the evaluation team was not provided access to the original LFA. The current document was appropriate in that it did identify achievable targets. However the most current LFA was ultimately more a mixture of outcomes, output and even activity level issues. At the same time the LFA was not truly reflective of key contextual issues such as the institutional circumstances and the regulatory setting of the project in the detail that was required. The LFA should have been more directed at these issues with realistic indicators of progress. The success of this project cannot be measured solely on matters like the quality of SCF's international relations as long as progress is not being made on more substantive issues. There is no indication that the LFA is reflective of best practices in any area with the noted exception of the Conservation Trust Fund where what was undertaken and carried out in terms of meeting targets is praise worthy.

#### 4.2.3 Ownership

The process was clearly driven by Surinamese stakeholders. National partners were front and centre in designing the project and carrying out its implementation. It is also true that the project was focused on national interests as they relate to the environment and broader developmental issues. During the GEF UNDP project there was stronger participation by the UNDP and international NGOs than the current project and this was done by design. There was nonetheless, some consternation expressed during the evaluation that the project was “donor driven” both in relation to the CSNR component and the overall project. However, the project's money was controlled by the Suriname Government and the SCF and there was no real involvement by international organizations in driving the direction of the project on a consistent basis. The issue of ownership and who dictated the direction of the project was deemed to be more of an internal Suriname matter.

Suriname is a small country that is relatively closed off from the rest of the world. It is also a comparatively poor country and facing great challenges in terms of establishing and legitimizing transparent and effective public institutions. In this context, while at the same time ensuring that Suriname stakeholders were in the driver's seat of the project, there might have been room for greater support and guidance from international organizations if only on a controlled basis.

A comment made by one project stakeholder was that the CSNR seemed to be a “hot potato” with no one really wanting to take ownership of the reserve. Other people also suggested the problems related to the CSNR were about ownership in the sense of competing visions and interests about what should happen with the CSNR. Neither of these scenarios would be very constructive.

One would be amiss not to comment on the degree to which the government did or did not assume ownership of this project. There was consistent discussion as to whether or not the project was ever truly fully embraced by the Government of Suriname. When a strong definitive voice was required from the government on difficult issues the Government was too often silent. It may be that as far as the Government is concerned, the analogy of the CSNR being a “hot potato” fits.

#### **4.2.4 Replicability**

The project demonstrated practices and approaches that should be promoted in Suriname and in some cases, internationally but it also exemplified other tendencies that are not worthy of emulation. The example of the Conservation Trust Fund should be studied by stakeholders in Suriname in all spheres of activity as to how to establish a strong financial foundation to support development and environment activities. It is also as pointed out by the fund's international manager, an example for other similar funds in the world to follow.

Paying close attention to details, maintaining constant communication and monitoring market conditions are the qualities that guided the Conservation Trust Fund and are highly worthy of replication. Unfortunately, while these attributes were highly present with the Conservation Trust Fund, they were noticeably absent in most other components of the project. SCF's relationship with the Ministry of the Environment might be noteworthy in terms of deserving of replication but the working conditions were not comparable in terms of the depth and seriousness of the relationship and complexity of the assignment between for example, SCF and NCD on the matter of the CSNR.

#### **4.3 Project Implementation**

As noted before, many of the recommendations made by the management support mission were accepted and implemented. However, where a more significant recommendation was made such as to deemphasize the SNR to put on a strong push to kick start the CSNR only the SNR side of the equation was carried out. It was on matters such as the CSNR where a more adaptive management style was required to make adjustments as challenges arose. While OC meetings were held and other meetings took place related to the CSNR and problems were acknowledged, this did not result in a more iterative approach to managing the project's implementation. At some point an alarm needed to go off that the project's key activities were not succeeding with stakeholders acting together to establish an alternative approach to project implementation.

The difficult relationship between the central partners was a key obstacle that impeded the implementation of project activities. While it is recognized that there were periods of constructive cooperation, the difficult relationships needed to be acknowledged in a constructive manner and steps taken to improve the situation. Had this occurred it might have been the most strategic accomplishment over the last ten years. It is agreed that this is easier said than done. Between the SCF and the Ministry of the Environment, there were healthy relations and this resulted in success. It needed to be acknowledged that regardless of the investment of time and effort, making this type of situation the norm was critical.

#### **4.4 Technical Capacities and Training**

The human resource capacities to be found in a country have a great bearing on what is feasible from an implementation standpoint. It is on this matter that one has to have a lot of empathy for the project stakeholders. Suriname has a very limited human resource capacity in relation to the management of protected areas. The relative isolation of the country and the lesser role played by international environmental NGOs in the country means that sources of information and expertise that can stimulate best practices are not easily accessible. A limited number of professional people, who may not always have access to the best training and information, circulate from one key position to another. This situation has proven to be detrimental to the project. The project did train people. However, there was no noticeable boost in the project's access to trained and motivated people due to a number of factors but

most notably the unstable political situation and turnover of government staff. Some project stakeholders did question the suitability of certain training programme participants citing an apparent lack of motivation.

The project provided training for staff of all implementing agencies. For the NCD a capacity assessment was carried out that resulted in the development of an elaborate training plan that covered staff from all NCD sections. The training included sessions on management (general, strategic, results based, project level), leadership, policy development, writing of proposals, effective participation in national and international research networks, research methodologies, communication techniques, computer skills, team building and some other types of training. The table 4.4 below outlines the training sessions for NCD staff during the course of the “*SCF Project*” and the number of participants.

**Table 4.4 the Training of NCD Staff**

Year	Training/Workshop for NCD personnel funded by the SCF Project	Number of participants
2007	Participation Lowland Tapir Conservation Workshop; Population and Habitat Viability Assessment	1
	Training Effective Personal Leadership	1
2007-2008	Computer training MS Office	16
2008-2009	Game warden Training	About 35
2008	Customer management training	8
	Public Relations and Information Training	2
	Financial management Training	4
	Course systems specifications and estimations(calculating and planning regarding building)	1
	Participation 10 <sup>th</sup> Meeting of COP 10 Ramsar Convention on Wetlands	1
	Participation Annual Meeting of the Association of Tropical Biology and Conservation	4
	Participation 9 <sup>th</sup> meeting of COP Biodiversity Convention	1
2009	RBM Training	About 15
2010	Participation COP 15 Convention on International Trade of Wild Flora and Fauna (CITES)	1
2011	Training in 4 modules: Customer Service and Communication Presentation and Reporting Skills	10
	Training ArcGis and ArcPad	5

In total, there were over a hundred participants in all training sessions together. The evaluation team was not able to determine to what degree the knowledge and skills acquired through these training sessions ended up being used on daily basis or in how many cases the training effectively contributed to better job performance. Less detailed information was made available to the evaluation team on training sessions for the staff of other implementing agencies. Some ATM staff members were trained in basic matters such as writing terms of reference. SCF staff participated in a number of seminars and short training sessions pertaining to the management of the Conservation Trust Fund, and in workshops or meetings related to networking (RedLAC, IUCN). As much as can be determined, the training of SCF staff appeared to have been more beneficial as it was centered on financial and administrative matters and enabling SCF to establish itself as an international partner.

SCF is an organization that is directed by professionals for whom overall, their strongest assets are their business acumen and inclination towards solid administrative practices and one can also note that a number of staff members having experience working on community level projects. This enables the SCF to work effectively with the international financial adviser assigned to their fund and to cultivate relationships with Suriname's leading businesses. It also has enabled the SCF to manage the finances of the Conservation Trust Fund in a responsible and strategic manner. However, it might very well be that what enables the SCF to be effective in one area is a detriment in other spheres of activities. Many stakeholders currently question SCF's ability to be an effective entity in the conservation field mostly due to its limited in-house technical capabilities. The number of people at SCF having a truly conservation background is limited mostly concentrated in fact, with one individual. Project management is another area where many feel that stronger capabilities would be an asset.

SCF is at a crossroads in terms of needing to reaffirm its identity as a conservation organization as part of a general rejuvenation of the organization. While the organization has made efforts to improve its project management capabilities, SCF still needs to be concerned about its ability in this area while also needing to improve its ability to interact constructively, as best as possible, with all partners and contribute to promoting better protected area management practices in Suriname. If one looks at the question of technical capacity in the broadest sense, some of SCF's problems may stem from the organization's Board of Directors that is seen as being "too laid back" and lacking in the gumption necessary to assist the organization in dealing with the incredible obstacles faced by the country in moving the conservation agenda forward. Perhaps if there were more people on staff and on the Board of SCF with strong conservation and project management backgrounds, some of the questions surrounding the organization's technical capability would disappear.

#### **4.5 Monitoring and Evaluation and Project Reporting**

This project suffered from a lack of periodic independent oversight and more generally from effective monitoring tools. There was no indication that the monitoring responsibilities were clearly defined and carried out in such a manner that it resulted in needed changes in project activity. It could have come in the form of a project monitor with a strong technical background who could have observed and reported on critical issues and provide input on how to overcome difficulties or by project stakeholders taking it upon themselves to acknowledge challenges and address them.

There was the Management Support Mission that was deemed by all project stakeholders to have been a success in terms of providing the SCF and PLOS with suggestions on where corrective measures could be taken. Project stakeholders did meet on a regular basis through the project Oversight Committee (OC) to examine critical issues facing the project and to take pertinent decisions. It was at this level that more could have been accomplished in terms of keeping the project on track. The exact content of what was discussed in the OC meetings was not available to the evaluation team as the OC reports are scant on details but assurances were given that problems were identified and solutions proposed. If the project stakeholders were meeting and discussing problems openly and the Dutch embassy was expressing its concern to the Surinamese Government and no corrective steps were undertaken it is difficult to say that a project monitor would have fared any better. He or she would have at least been able to bring issues to light in a transparent and objective manner.

Despite the tardiness in completing and sharing reports and the reports not always documenting in a transparent manner the difficult issues that the project was facing, reporting is not seen as an issue in terms of having a pronounced negative impact on the project. It has to be noted that given the time

required in addressing other issues related to this complicated evaluation, not much time was spent looking at the reporting practices of the project in great detail.

#### **4.6 Partner Relations and Stakeholder Participation**

**The evaluation found that there existed serious problems of communication and collaboration between project stakeholders and that this made the establishment of functional partnerships and relationships very difficult.** Apparently this was not always the situation as there were moments where good relations existed but by the time of the evaluation, there was nothing overly positive in terms of how partners worked together. On relatively minor matters involving partners in the periphery of the project, the situation was not as bad but for those partners at the centre of the project, relations needed to be more constructive.

**In terms of the involvement of governmental institutions in project implementation, and the extent of governmental support of the project, this in many ways is the crux of the problem with this project.** Concerned government departments did not participate in this project in a constructive manner. There were issues of trust, perceptions of jurisdiction, and an overall lack of communication. It should also be pointed out that while the Government was meant to be a beneficiary of the project, it is also true that it could have been much more constructive from the standpoint of enabling partnerships and in some cases the participation of important project stakeholders such as the Kwinti and local indigenous communities surrounding the CSNR. Engaging local people can be very challenging but at the end, a very good learning opportunity was lost that could have been applied to other circumstances in Suriname. There are so many important matters this project could have accomplished and properly involving the Maroon community north of CSNR and the indigenous community in the south would be near the top of the list.

Stakeholder participation is one area where it would have been useful for the evaluation to have had a chance to look in greater detail at some of the different grant activity of the project to gather a proper perspective on local communities and NGO engagement in the “*SCF Project*” but this was not possible. It seemed that at least in some circumstances the SCF was able to establish good working relations with grant recipients but this could not be confirmed unequivocally. It is hoped that the relations established with grant recipients will lead to fruitful collaboration in the future.

**SCF has been very successful in establishing partnerships on the international scene.** Through their involvement in RedLAC which culminated this year in SCF hosting the network’s annual conference, the SCF has solidified an international niche that hopefully will begin to benefit a broader range of stakeholders in Suriname. SCF also was able to build successful partnerships with the Suriname business community that should also prove beneficial over the long term. In terms of national implementing partners, SCF has a very good working relationship with the Ministry of the Environment. What eluded the SCF was establishing productive partnerships with the most important government departments involved in this project. Given the problems being encountered by the project, it was wondered if the SCF could not have used its international relations to greater advantage on matters such as the CSNR.

In terms of reaching out to the general public there were regular newsletters, television interviews, newspaper articles, press briefings, and brochures were made available through the project. A documentary on the SNR remains in the pipeline. Last year, SCF celebrated its ten year anniversary with a documentary on the CSNR (Pristine Treasures) that is shown from time to time on national television. A photo competition for young people (theme 'biodiversity in Suriname) took place that

included an open house and exhibition with photos and other visual material of SCF's activities. A seminar on 'greening the economy' was followed by a three-day training on the subject for the private sector aimed at enhancing awareness regarding the benefits of greening business operations and a network of companies was established to support sustainable use and protection of biodiversity.

There are also indirect ways to communicate information. For example, SCF grant projects also helped to sensitize the public as grant recipients provided information to the media (newspaper, television) about their activities.

#### 4.7 Financial Planning

Generally speaking, the evaluation team found that the project was well managed from a financial standpoint. There were no concerns expressed by the Dutch embassy, the Ministry of Finance or UNDP regarding any gross financial mismanagement of the project's resources. There are issues however, as to how effective project activity was in terms of providing a good return on investment but this is a complicated matter that has more to do with implementation than financial management. By and large, the money invested in capacity building activity and the CSNR did not achieve its intended purpose. A good percentage of the money earmarked for the CSNR, over \$300,000 was transferred to support SCF grant activity.

There are some issues that need to be addressed. The office that was built for the PIU for the CSNR at the Forest Service Headquarters has been appropriated for other uses and this started while the PIU was still active. It is also unclear what purpose some of the materials that were purchased for the project such as an outdoor motor are now serving. There is also the issue of some project equipment that is being withheld by the former PIU manager pending solving issues with the Forest Services.

It should also be noted that there were differences of opinion between the NCD, STINASU and SCF about how the project's financial resources were managed. The Government departments wanted more control over the funds and the SCF was reluctant to do this adhering to the financial agreement signed between SCF and the ministry of RGB and the standard conditions that go with this agreement. Below is the most recent financial report.

<b>Activities</b>	<b>Budget per year end Dec 2011</b>
1. SCF admin services	730,069.09
2. Institutional strengthening	1,097,823.83
3. Protected area management	761,190.47
4. Other Grants	703,197.01
5. PLOS project management en Project audits and evaluations	136,219.60
6. UNDP costs	171,500.00
<b>Total</b>	<b>3,600,000.00</b>

## 4.8 Sustainability, Effectiveness and Efficiency and Relevance

### 4.8.1 Sustainability

Analyzing the sustainability, effectiveness, efficiency and relevance of the various project elements of the “*SCF Project*” is a rather complex matter. From an evaluation standpoint, there is a constant tug of war between success on these matters and less than satisfactory results. The results in relation to sustainability are as good as place as any to begin examining this dilemma. In relation to sustainability, the evaluation sought concrete evidence that the project was helping to put in place key capacity that would benefit Suriname and the conservation management field over the long term.

Financial stability is a key component of the overall discussion regarding sustainability and it is in this area that the project was a clear success. The project established the key medium of the Conservation Trust Fund that should be able to fund and sustain activities in support of the CSNR, the SCF and other conservation initiatives well into the future. Over the long term, various programming scenarios and capacity building activity can be contemplated due to the ongoing presence of the Conservation Trust Fund.

It is unfortunate though that the Conservation Trust Fund will not be nurturing much of the project activity that was initiated through the “*SCF Project*.” There were not a lot of solid project outputs that can be guided towards results at the outcome level where for example, well trained individuals by the project work in positions of increasing responsibility with resulting improvements in the conservation field. There are exceptions to this of course. It is clear that the SCF as an organization did achieve a number of institutional benefits through the project in terms of building organizational capacity in the financial and administrative spheres that should serve the organization well into the future. The SCF has also built international relations that have to be maintained and nurtured but could be very beneficial. The grant activity most certainly contributed to the long-term sustainability of conservation activity in Suriname as well. Facilitating the completion of the biodiversity strategy of Suriname is notable in this regard. Other grant activity might prove to have constructive long influences as well but as already mentioned, the evaluation team was not afforded the opportunity to examine the grant activity in great enough detail to be able to speak with any authority on this subject.

The project did not make strong inroads in terms of having a positive influence on matters related to institutional capacity. The legal framework, policies and governance and public administration structures and processes remain largely unchanged and this is not what was hoped for. The institutions that oversee the conservation field in Suriname needed to begin through the project, a process towards a substantive and positive transformation. Unfortunately, the transformative potential of training, the acquisition of material resources and additional technical capacities did not have the desired impact. The decision to not seek to reform the Nature Conservation Act through the project means there remains a challenge to developing more modern and forward thinking approaches to conservation management because the appropriate legislative structures is not in place. It would have been too much to expect the project to make substantive change in all critical areas related to institutional capacity but it was legitimate to have hoped that the project could have established a more constructive direction for Suriname on institutional and legislative matters.

On the question as to whether or not the SCF project had a long term and positive influence on practices in the conservation field in Suriname, the answer would have to be no. There were some new and strategic accomplishments such as the completion of Suriname’s biodiversity strategy that should have a



positive influence on the conservation field. Given the opportunities that were lost to learn from and establish new standards in conservation related practices through the CSNR, the project fell short in this regard.

It is hard to say how the project contributed to the people of Suriname, and its institutions feeling a stronger sense of stakeholder ownership in entities such as the CSNR and SNR. The public awareness activity of the “*SCF Project*” would have to be been beneficial but there is no rigorous way to assess its impact. However, it is doubtful that the project contributed in a substantial way to a strong change in attitudes and practices in relation to the project’s mandate. It will be interesting to see how the SCF follows up on its work with Suriname’s business community that is one of the positive outputs of the project. It is hoped that this can result in a stronger engagement of Suriname businesses in the conservation field.

#### 4.8.2 Effectiveness

As discussed extensively in this report, there are areas of effective programming and most prominent in this regard is the Conservation Trust Fund. However, much of the training and capacity building did not have the effects that were hoped for. Generally speaking, the project failed to establish the necessary baseline conditions or enabling environment in relation to practices, policy and institutional reform, and partnerships that would have facilitated subsequent conservation activity. Activities surrounding the CSNR were especially ineffective but the physical isolation of the CSNR means that in the end, the CSNR was not unduly negatively impacted upon.

The project’s funds appear for the most part to have been managed effectively with a small number of issues brought to the attention of the evaluation team. Yet, at the same time, after a lot of project’s funds were directed at training, capacity building and the purchase of equipment, **the results in terms of contributing to sustainable and effective institutional capacity were not as one would have hoped.** The issue of financial planning can be viewed from a number of perspectives. Essentially the key accomplishment of this project was to establish a long-term financial foundation through the Conservation Trust Fund to support conservation activity well into the future and this has been accomplished. To date, the SCF has approved 20 grant projects since the Conservation Trust Fund reached its capitalization objective. The ultimate effectiveness of these grants in terms of furthering the conservation agenda in country could not be properly assessed given the limits of the scope of the evaluation.

One of the factors that undermined the potential success of the project was the lack of effectiveness of the alliances and partnerships between key members of the project. Without strong partnerships it would be difficult to imagine how a project of this nature could have success and this is what has occurred. Beyond the relations between the key implementing partners, there is also the question of the effectiveness of each partner’s contribution. In this regard the biggest question surrounds the UNDP’s contribution to the project as a partner and guiding institution. More could have been contributed by the UNDP as a partner but the expectations were so low that in essence the UNDP did what was expected.

The project did not present any concerns from the standpoints of gender, equality and the empowerment of women. Nor did it lack in sensitivity towards a human rights based approach through the design, execution and achievements of the project. Women held key positions throughout the project and were the beneficiaries of project training activity and were grant recipients. How effective gender and human rights values were incorporated into project activity and led to improvements in the project is not noteworthy. There is no real evidence of this occurring. The project did fail to successfully engage

minority groups and had there been successful participation by groups like the Maroon people, the perspective and image of the project would have been altered for the better. To achieve this, a much more earnest attempt was required from the project team and Suriname Government in gaining and retaining the support of minority groups.

#### **4.8.3 Efficiency**

The project was not improved by the management and administrative arrangements surrounding its implementation. The NCD for example was expected to directly oversee the implementation of the CSNR component of the project but was undermined by a lack of technical capability, insufficient human and financial resources and a suitable institutional culture supported by appropriate legislation. Also the NCD was unfortunately, front and centre in many of the controversies surrounding this project and it is felt this is due in part to its weakened state as a technical department.

The PIU of the CSNR should have been the well deserved boost that the NCD needed to carry out the CSNR mandate. Instead it was an opportunity lost to bureaucracy, project politics and the general awkwardness of having outsiders that are better paid than their civil servant counterparts carry out work that is seen as being part of the Government's mandate. Many of the findings regarding the NCD hold true for STINASU too. It was difficult during the evaluation process to truly determine how the project benefited from STINASU's involvement given that agency's difficulties. At the same time, it was difficult to determine how STINASU benefited significantly from the project.

This report has stressed how this project suffered from not having a viable project coordinator who could provide consistent technical support to the project and the intangible of leadership. In conducting this evaluation it was impossible to identify a single individual who possessed the necessary combination of strong technical knowledge, political savvy, and leadership who could have guided the project in a substantive manner. The Ministry of Finance did what it could to lead in terms of trying to mend fences and maintain organization and continuity but it lacked the technical background and mandate to provide more aggressive leadership. In hindsight, the UNDP could have contributed more on the question of leadership and by providing more acute technical support but there were limits placed on its ability to intervene and participate in the project.

This project was not managed in an iterative manner where roadblocks, issues and risks were identified and dealt with through contingency planning. The project stakeholders could easily identify where mistakes were being made but were unable to make the necessary adjustments. The limited environmental and conservation capacity in Suriname was a concern as it related to efficiency. It is normal in most labour forces to have some depth and options for organizations looking to recruit and develop competent individuals. However, in Suriname this is not the case.

As stressed constantly in this report there were many ways that circumstances in Suriname worked against this project and although the intention of the project was to address some of these concerns, the extent of the situation made any meaningful accomplishment highly difficult.

#### **4.8.4 Relevance**

The '*SCF Project*' was designed to respond to the critical challenges faced by Suriname in relation to conservation both in terms of aiming to build capacity at the administrative and managerial levels while nurturing new practices at the field level. The project was conceptualized to address the right issues from a conservation standpoint. There would be no argument about this. There is no real point of comparison

between the “*SCF Project*” and other conservation projects in Suriname. The SCF was the most important conservation project in the country.

The objectives and desired results of the program constituted a significant milestone in relation to the "without project situation". The problem with the project was at the implementation level. As the project went on, it struggled to remain relevant with stakeholders in the conservation field due to the problems it was encountering. It was meant to set a tone in the country and establish a change in direction with Suriname stakeholders completely in charge of carrying out a significant conservation project. The SCF as an organization has enormous potential to play a strong leadership role and nurture the capabilities of other institutions both in the private and public spheres but the SCF must work harder at being relevant to all stakeholders. This is one of the most important challenges facing the organization.

The project was strongly in line with the current and future mandate of the UNDP in Suriname that is clearly focussed on global environmental concerns such as climate change and biodiversity. The “*SCF Project*” was the centrepiece of UNDP’s programming in Suriname.

## 5.0 Conclusions

The evaluation found that the “*SCF Project*” was able to achieve a number of key accomplishments, most notably, the creation of the Conservation Trust Fund. There was also effective outreach activity with the business community of Suriname and the general public although the evaluation process was unable to determine the exact impact of these activities. Although the evaluation concluded that the outreach work with the Suriname business community was positive, it was also concluded that the SCF should reconsider its future involvement in “business greening” activities as a means of attracting support. There is a need for the SCF to entrench its profile and capacity as a conservation organization and to avoid becoming too spread out.

Some of the grant activity has also been successful such as the mangrove project with the University of Suriname and the support provided to finalize Suriname’s national biodiversity strategy. It is also true that SCF as an organization is much better off today due to the support provided by the “*SCF Project*”. However, there remain areas within the organization that require strengthening, most notably in terms of project management and in-house conservation related technical capacity.

The successes of the project occurred in the backdrop of some critical failures such as what took place with the CSNR, the inability to noticeably improve the institutional capacity of government to manage protected areas, improved regulatory environment for protected areas and building strong partnerships and consensus on critical matters such as the CSNR.

It is not clear that the project achieved enough at either the output or outcome level to be considered successful. One has to keep in mind that in addition to the problems of the CSNR, an important objective related to creating a management support system for the SNR fell to the wayside. The “*SCF Project*” was very much an extension of the previous GEF UNDP project and after ten years with the CSNR as a programming focus, serious progress towards establishing a viable project management system for the CSNR still eludes project stakeholders. It has been over ten years since the CSNR was established and luckily, it remains largely undisturbed. However, blindly believing that this will always be the case is bordering on foolish. The moment someone determines how to extract the natural resources from the CSNR on a large scale in an economically advantageous manner, there will be a much larger dilemma facing the caretakers of the CSNR. It is not recommended to wait for this situation to arrive.

The project's funds appear for the most part to have been managed effectively with only a small number of issues brought to the attention of the evaluation team. The most notable accomplishment from a financial standpoint would be the SCF Conservation Trust Fund. However at the same time, after a lot of funds were directed at training, capacity building and the purchase of equipment, **the results in terms of contributing to sustainable and effective institutional capacity were not as one would have hoped.**

Suriname is a difficult operational environment and as such, implementing an ambitious project like the "*SCF Project*" is a monumental task. The limited human resource pool, challenging administrative and managerial capabilities were among a number of challenges that were difficult for the project to overcome and for these reasons it is hard to be overly critical of the key project partners. Yet, there were also opportunities for project stakeholders to be more constructive and to reflect on how to proceed differently. The findings of the Management Support mission that extensively reviewed the capacities and tendencies of key project partners emphasized the need to develop stronger coordination and improve communication between partners and to establish stronger capabilities to guide more modest project goals. Although a number of the recommendations made by the Management Support Mission were acted upon, the advice on these critical matters was not heeded and this turned out to be very detrimental.

Given the ongoing institutional challenges and the problematic relations between institutional stakeholders, the evaluation process has concluded there is a need to seriously contemplate how to proceed into the future with the CSNR and more broadly on how the conservation agenda can best be moved forward in such a way to benefit the people of Suriname while protecting Suriname's incredible natural environment. Furthermore, the SCF as an organization should reflect upon what role it wants to play in the conservation field in Suriname. Suriname needs the SCF to be a serious pro-active force that to the greatest degree possible operates with high standards in all areas with a strong commitment to conservation. The SCF was created to make a difference on critical and substantial matters and in particular, the CSNR. To do this the SCF has to find a way to work more effectively with all government counterparts that admittedly can be challenging due to their weak capacity and political pressures they face from time to time.

A key conclusion of the evaluation was the need for the Government of Suriname to come out strongly in support of the conservation movement in Suriname and in particular, for the CSNR. The support of the Government is also critical in helping to facilitate the establishment of a new direction for the conservation field in Suriname that appears to be stagnating in certain regards. New ways have to be found for the Government to better develop its capacity while becoming a stronger and clearer advocate for conservation in Suriname based on a belief that this is what is in the best interest of the people and institutions of Suriname and natural environment of the country.

The evaluation process concluded in believing that something fundamentally positive can come from the experience of the "*SCF Project*". To this end, this report makes recommendations for the creation of a small Task Force Committee in the aftermath of the project that can oversee a number of strategic interventions that will help to guide a new era in conservation management in Suriname. Part of the process of change should involve creating the space for new voices to be heard in the conservation field in Suriname, and the cultivation of new circumstances that help stakeholders veer away from the problems that troubled the "*SCF Project*" such as trying to navigate projects through government institutions that are struggling for a number of reasons.

### **5.1 Short Term Priorities**

Immediate steps should be taken to improve the appearance and conditions at the visiting centre of the CSNR. It is the understanding of the evaluation team that there has been some discussion to do this but no concrete information was presented in terms of what has been planned. Despite its attractive location and strong scenic attributes, the visiting centre is far from an asset at this moment. There is debris and no sense of any waste management system being in place. The water and sanitation services are unpredictable and tourists arrive already fully aware of potential hygienic problems with the bedding. Overall, the visiting centre appears to be cluttered with a mishmash of housing styles including a few makeshift shelters. The valid original idea to have architecture inspired by traditional indigenous values has been lost. This is unfortunate because it appears to the outsider as a valid approach to enhance the touristic experience while remaining respectful of local culture, and building linkages with the surrounding communities.

The research centre in the reserve deserves attention as well. It could be a strong asset for attracting international and national researchers to the CSNR. One of the comments made to the evaluation team was that there is reluctance on the part of Suriname nationals to make a strong commitment to field research. Having a well kept research facility in a great protected area such as the CSNR would make it easier to attract and encourage local researchers. In short, what is taking place is not in step with what was envisaged when the CSNR was declared a World Heritage site and project partners should take this situation very seriously. Improvements to the site must be carried out without further aggravating relations with the local people.

### **5.2 Long Term Priorities and a 100 Year Plan**

Conservation stakeholders in Suriname are currently fatigued by what has been taking place and whether it has yet to have been formerly recognized or not, they are looking for another way to move forward. It is the conclusion of this evaluation that a simpler approach is beckoning that can more directly address key challenges. At the same time a respite is needed from attempting to achieve key objectives through the vehicle of a large project involving multiple partners overseeing a budget with pressures to disburse money on items that may not always be critical. It may be a blessing that there is currently no significant donor financing on the horizon to support a next phase of the project.

With the Conservation Trust Fund now established, it enables stakeholders in Suriname to think long term and realize a thoughtfully implemented capacity building strategy knowing that some funding is available that can be complemented by other sources of financing.

While on one level simplicity is in order, a long-term vision is also required that is anchored in promoting systemic innovation that will eventually allow stakeholders to move away from the unproductive circumstances and behaviours that are currently making significant progress towards protecting the CSNR and SNR in a more certain manner impossible.

Generally speaking, there is a need for fresh ideas and approaches that are supported and carried out by well trained and committed individuals. Solid background work is required to understand what is possible for a country like Suriname in terms of developing its conservation management capacity. Currently throughout the world there is a lot of experimentation taking place in trying to develop better conservation practices that are suitable to countries like Suriname. The situation with the CSNR is not unique and there are certainly experiences regarding how to establish a management model that would address the current situation with the CSNR. Suriname should be as open as any country in this regard.

In the past this might have meant establishing linkages with European or North American counterparts. However today, there are greater options regarding which country one chooses to learn from. A key in this regard is to learn more from the experiences of other nature reserves and perhaps how other Conservation Trust Funds are managed to support entities such as the CSNR.

It is also felt that the interests of Suriname would be well served by cultivating partnerships and relationships with organizations and individuals in the Americas and if deemed appropriate, Africa and Asia where similar circumstances prevail. Research conducted as part of this evaluation revealed that Colombia, Costa Rica, Tanzania, and Malawi may be countries of interest in terms of learning and where useful partnerships could be developed. The SCF and the UNDP could facilitate networking.

A different approach to human resource development in the conservation sector is very critical. Given the need for exceptionally well trained people, an emphasis should be placed on targeting a smaller number of individuals and investing more heavily in their development and finding ways to ensure their commitment over an acceptable period of time whether that is two, three or four years. These individuals need to be highly motivated both in terms of being compensated properly and believing strongly in the mandate of their work. There is little point in pursuing a general approach to building capacity when there is a lack of people in key positions who are able to provide leadership and who one day, could effectively oversee more general capacity building. A few individuals in key positions with strong leadership qualities can make a world of difference. The individuals to be recruited could be currently associated with academic departments, the private sector, within government or who are presently outside the country. These individuals should be dynamic, self-motivated and the ability to demonstrate leadership and act as conduits for introducing new ideas and practices that would be learned through substantive internship type training possibly to be completed outside of Suriname. This new wave of individuals should respect local Suriname practices but be able to work with new concepts. Training could be envisaged in a number of areas like preparing someone to manage the CSNR like the world class natural heritage site it is, managing an international standard research facility within the CSNR, managing the main centre within the CSNR. Other critical areas of training to be considered include facilitation skills to work with Maroon and Indigenous peoples (tribal communities), and other stakeholders, and establishing high eco-tourism standards.

As part of the process of developing the recommendations for this report, research was also conducted on potential partnerships and training options. Discussions were held with representatives from the Latin American Conservation Council and the Latin American School of Protected Areas (LASPA). The most important conclusion from this research is that Suriname has options in terms of how it might want to use the outside world to improve the situation with the CSNR. According to LASPA, there are currently numerous countries in the Americas that have embarked on capacity building exercises catering to their specific needs while partnering with other institutions in the Americas. This is part of a general movement towards professionalizing the field of protected area management. According to LASPA, a plan to professionalize protected area management worldwide received consensus endorsement in May 2011 at a meeting of the Convention on Biological Diversity, the World Commission on Protected Areas (WCPA-IUCN), German Federal Agency for Nature Conservation, and other major protected area management institutions. Accordingly, the new Global Partnership for Professionalizing Protected Area Management (GPPAM) will:

- 1) Develop leading-edge open source curricula to professionalize training for three essential PA staff categories;

2) Implement advanced training through accreditation of exceptional training institutions and creation of a scholarship trust fund for trainees;

3) Establish a certification program that assesses and certifies on the job performance of PA professionals based on core competences and coordinate existing PA professional associations so that services for the entire career of PA professionals can be ensured.

It is in the interest of Suriname to better understand how it can become a part of the movement to professionalize the field of protected areas management. LASPA is one organization that conducts training and oversees capacity building in this area. Suriname could also benefit greatly by taking steps to more pro-actively introduce voluntary certification schemes like the Sustainable Tourism Network of the Americas that can help establish benchmarks for eco-tourism and business operation standards. Other voluntary certification programmes could also be explored like in relation to livelihood activity associated with the CSNR such as Fair Trade certification. Voluntary certification programmes are very popular in that they often create business opportunities while improving labour and environmental practices and provide instruction regarding issues such as transparency.

The Suriname Conservation Act has to be either revised or replaced with legislation that can enable situations rather than hinder them. At the same time the SCF should be front and centre in this preparatory stage in terms of transitioning the organization for its long term participation in protecting the CSNR, the SNR and other protected areas in the country. Over the longer term, the success Suriname will have in making strides in the conservation field will be closely tied to the growth of the SCF as a conservation organization. The SCF has to start to grow and develop other capabilities beyond a strong capacity to manage financial resources. It has to act as a leader in other spheres while acting as a funnel for promoting best practices, and creating goodwill in the conservation community.

The SCF and those most directly concerned with conservation in Suriname need to find a way to work constructively together. Being constructive has to come from both sides. As already noted, the Government of Suriname at the highest level possible, needs to express its desire to see the CSNR remain a World Heritage Site. A strong vote of confidence will help set the stage for exploring a lot of different scenarios for the people of Suriname to benefit economically from the CSNR and it needs to be demonstrated how a strong conservation capability could serve as a platform for contributing to the economic prosperity of the country like is currently happening in other countries.

It is suggested that an 18 month to three-year preparatory stage be contemplated to work on these fronts that would enable the transition to a more substantive effort to building capacity and most specifically the creation of a 100-year plan for the CSNR. The 100-year plan or strategy would be comprised of 20 five-year plans that are developed every five years and are based on the best available knowledge and current practices as to the most effective way to manage the CSNR. The use of 100-year plans can be found throughout the business world, the environmental field and is used for the purpose of municipal planning. The 100-year plan allows for forward thinking, visioning, and to recognize that what is taking place currently should be placed in a larger context. Stakeholders are not expected to map out what the management structure is supposed to look like. What is required is establishing a shared consensus surrounding a vision of the CSNR should and the role it should serve in ensuring the wellbeing of Suriname. The preparatory stage will provide the time to properly establish this vision along with an appropriate work plan for the first five years of the 100-year plan.

The 18 month to three-year preparatory stage would be overseen by a Task Force Committee made up a combination of government representatives and technical experts. The CSNR can act as a focal point for

the Task Force but it is hoped that the work during the preparatory stage would broadly serve the interests of the Suriname conservation field and the SCF. The preparatory stage should be about imagining how to make progress while avoiding a lot of the problems that the “**SCF Project**” encountered. Below is a suggested work plan for the CSNR Task Force:

- Develop the work plan for the preparatory stage with reasonable objectives and time lines for achieving specific activities.
- Securing sources of revenue to facilitate capacity building activities. The objective is not to identify a large sum of money but smaller pockets that can finance defined activities.
- Work with the SCF to identify its needs and to determine how the organization could benefit from the work of the Task Force.
- Identify and cultivate relationships with one or possibly two other nature reserves in Latin America and/or Africa that have faced similar challenges with the expectation of establishing a twinning programme.
- Oversee steps to establish a viable management structure for the CSNR that will serve as learning platform for informing changes to the Nature Conservation Act.
- Contribute to developing the 100-year plan for the CSNR.
- Contribute to developing the first five-year work plan for the CSNR
- Oversee a preliminary study to begin the process of amending or replacing the Nature Conservation Act of Suriname.
- Developing a training and staff retention strategy involving a significant commitment to training a smaller number of individuals.
- Oversee the revitalization of the CSNR as a tropical research centre.
- Undertake the groundwork to establish long term and healthy relationships with local indigenous groups living in proximity of the CSNR.
- Explore and initiate options for completion of certification programmes such as Sustainable Tourism Certification Network of the Americas and possibly Fair Trade Certification as it pertains to local economic development.

Each of these activities would represent a small project. Donor agencies, the SCF and the Government of Suriname would be approached to support each individual activity. There would be an overriding strategy but no project per se. The recommendations made in the next section have been developed in a spirit that recognizes the importance of this project to Suriname and its rich biodiversity and environmental complexion and that the “**SCF Project**” is eventually meant to mean something even if key aspects of the project did not work out. The recommendations are made with little sense of what financial resources might be available over the next three years. The SCF Conservation Trust Fund is



assumed to be one viable source of funding. It is hoped that in support of the recommendations outlined in the next section a logical and cost effective approach to building capacity can be established as there should not be the need for a budget to support a large project.

## **6.0 Recommendations**

### **6.1 Recommendation for Immediate Consideration**

- It is recommended that steps be taken immediately to improve the appearance and standards at the visiting centre of the CSNR and the research centre.

### **6.2 General Recommendations for all Stakeholders**

- It is recommended that a 100 year plan be developed for the management of the CSNR. The 100 year is to be carried out in a slow incremental manner through 20 consecutive five-year plans. Long term strategizing is becoming more common place in business, and environment and municipal planning among other areas. The formulation of the 100 year plan will not commence before circumstances are improved through an initial preparatory stage of 18 months to three years that will allow for the development of a foundation of human resources, constructive international relationships and planning capabilities. After which the first of 20 successive five-year plans will be initiated taking into consideration current circumstances, and capacities.
- It is recommended that a four-person Task Force committee be established to oversee the initial preparatory stage and the recommendations outlined below. The work of the Task Force Committee would be undertaken based on the availability of funding. The Task Force Committee would be comprised of a representative from the Ministry of Finance, two international experts in the field of the management of protected areas, and an additional representative from the Government of Suriname from the Forest Service. The SCF, and UNDP and other organizations should hold observer status. However, these organizations should be represented by new individuals with no previous involvement in the CSNR. The involvement of the Dutch Embassy as an observer should be encouraged as well as other potential donor agencies. The Task Force should not be encumbered with the agendas or bureaucracy of any particular organizations governmental or otherwise or the management of a project per se. It is for this reason the involvement of too many government departments should be avoided. The Task Force should be primarily composed of professional individuals who can provide a fresh perspective on how to proceed with the CSNR and other related matters. The Ministry of Finance would be involved not for its technical expertise but its ability to oversee the Task Force Committee. The international experts on the committee will primarily be responsible for identifying and facilitating contact with outside organizations, and channelling ideas and innovations that could potentially benefit Suriname. The anticipation is that the capacity developed during the preparatory stage will enable the development of the first five-year plan of the 100 year management plan for the CSNR.

#### **6.2.1 Recommendations for the Preparatory Stage and CSNR Task Force Committee**

- It is recommended that in-depth training is carried out to develop a cadre of young or youngish professionals through internships and other more profound means that will create a group of individuals who will eventually be able to assume leadership roles with CSNR, SCF and other

strategic positions in the conservation field. The training would take place in countries dealing with similar circumstances found in Suriname.

- It is recommended that steps be taken to begin the process of revising the regulatory framework for the management of protected areas with the CSNR serving as a testing ground for new ideas and practices that can inform a revised legislation or amended Suriname Conservation Act.
- It is recommended that as a means to encourage new ideas and practices that stronger relationships with international organizations in the conservation fields be established through twinning programmes and other means. The first priority would be building relationships with organizations operating in similar conditions. The SCF and UNDP and other international partners such as CI and WWF could be helpful in building these relations.
- It is recommended that higher operational standards and transparency be encouraged through the introduction of eco-tourism certification programmes and other voluntary standard schemes such as Fair Trade through the work of the Task Force Committee.
- It is recommended that a contribution be made regarding the clarification and encouragement of sustainable economic strategies in the form of carbon offset agreements and other means that can help ensure the protection of the CSNR and other parts of Suriname's tropical forest.

### **6.3 Recommendations for the SCF**

- It is recommended that the SCF retain its current management practices that have guided the management of the SCF Conservation Trust Fund.
- It is recommended that the SCF document its experience and practices in managing the SCF Conservation Trust Fund as an example of Best Practices and share it with the Government of Suriname and donors who may be interested in repeating this experience in Suriname.
- It is recommended that SCF participate in and support the work of the CSNR Task Force through the SCF Conservation Trust Fund.
- It is recommended that SCF along with the UNDP acts as conduits for the CSNR Task Force in terms of facilitating contacts with other natural reserves and Trust Fund Management teams of other Conservation Trust Funds that present opportunities for training and twinning.
- It is recommended that the SCF make a concerted effort to identify and recruit and develop young professionals with relevant backgrounds to gradually assume greater responsibility within the organization at the management level and in relation to technical matters.
- It is recommended that an individual is assigned as observer to the CSNR Task Force Committee. Another individual(s) should be targeted to participate in internship training with another endowment fund as part of a long term strategy to assume a high level position with the SCF.
- It is recommended that an independent evaluation be undertaken of the grant programme and a proper assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of grant activity and developmental impacts

that has occurred to date. This is a key misgiving of this evaluation process that this level of detail was not possible due to a number of limitations. A list of projects in SCF's grant programme is included in Annex III.

- It is recommended that SCF take the necessary steps to ensure that the grant process is viewed as being transparent with a strong emphasis on communicating to stakeholders the grant awarding process.
- It is recommended that SCF studies in greater detail the practices of other Conservation Trust Funds especially those operating in equally difficult contexts to learn how grant money can be used to address complex issues.
- It is recommended that SCF examine the role and make-up of the SCF's Board of Directors to determine how it can become more effective in terms of facilitating the SCF relations with the Government and providing technical guidance.

#### **6.4 Recommendations for the UNDP**

- It is recommended that UNDP supports the participation of one individual in the CSNR Task Force Committee. UNDP's participation could also include sponsoring the participation of one of the international expert positions.
- It is recommended that UNDP facilitates the building of international relations between Suriname and international partners in support of the management of the CSNR through the CSNR Task Force.
- It is recommended that Suriname UNDP explores how UNDP's Global Learning Network and other forums could facilitate the work of the CSNR Task Force.
- It is recommended that the UNDP examine how it can re-establish a more pro-active presence with the SCF and in particular on the SCF board of directors.
- It is recommended that the UNDP continue to work with the Government of Suriname to establish a pragmatic approach towards the NEX concept as it relates to conservation and environment matters.

#### **6.5 Recommendations of the Ministry of Finance**

- It is recommended that the Ministry of Finance assume the role of CSNR Task Force Committee Coordinator to assist with the setting up of meetings.
- It is recommended that Ministry of Finance make every effort to use the experience of "*SCF Project*" to improve its future contribution to conservation related projects in Suriname.

#### **6.6 General Recommendations for the Government of Suriname**

- It is recommended that the Government of Suriname reconfirms its commitment to the CSNR.
- It is recommended that the Government of Suriname endorses and takes the necessary measures to facilitate the work of the CSNR Task Force Committee.
- It is recommended that the Government of Suriname establishes strong lines of communication with the Task Force that will enable a quick turnaround for decisions on critical matters.
- It is recommended that the Government of Suriname do the utmost to restore/establish good working relations with the local communities in the CSNR project area.

## 7.0 Lessons Learned and Good Practices

### 7.1 On Project Management

- Managing an important entity such as the CSNR is a special responsibility. It takes long term commitment and sacrifice but perhaps most of all, a shared vision and cooperation between key partners.
- A project such as the “*SCF Project*” requires a very concise strategic plan focused on achieving realistic objectives.
- The benefits of a strong project manager should never be underestimated.
- A complex management system should only be established when good conditions exist for its successful implementation.
- A project can lose its momentum and focus when administrative practices delay project implementation.
- A closer monitoring and adjustments to apparent project design flaws are necessary to avoid more serious situations of project failure.
- The management of SCF’s Conservation Trust Fund demonstrated that by paying close attention to details, maintaining constant communication and monitoring circumstances good results can be expected.
- A balance has to be achieved between respecting autonomy while ensuring that projects have the proper technical and managerial capacity.
- Although participating in an evaluation can be a challenging experience, it is also a chance to learn and to address project difficulties in a constructive manner.
- Issues such as discrepancies between employee salaries have to be managed closely.

### 7.2 On the Operational Context

- Complex projects implemented in difficult environments that seek to promote institutional reform can be challenging and need to be carefully planned with potential obstacles appropriately acknowledged.
- In a context where there is limited institutional capacity and relevant experience, miracles should not be expected. Nevertheless, at all times project stakeholders should conduct themselves in a positive and constructive manner.
- Laws and policies such as Suriname’s Nature Conservation Act must reflect the circumstances in which they are to be applied and not too define or limit what is currently possible.
- A large budget is not necessarily a panacea for success.

### **7.3 On Partnerships and Relationships**

- Working with partners including local community groups can require a significant investment of time but it will result in strong benefits. In the case of the CSNR, working with the Maroon and local indigenous communities required this type of care.
- Positive relations between project partners are built on trust and openness and the ability to collectively examine obstacles to project implementation in an open and honest manner. When this does not occur there is little hope for project success.

## Annex 1 Evaluation Terms of Reference

### Terms of Reference

#### Final Project Evaluation

Project: Capacity building support to the Suriname Conservation Foundation (SCF)  
UNDP Project Number: TTO10 **00036896** and award number **00034614** and  
SUR10 **00070446** and award number **00057117**



### 1. Introduction

The project “Capacity building support to the Suriname Conservation Foundation (SCF)” is Suriname’s co-financing component of US\$ 3.6 million for the project: “Conservation of Globally Significant Forest Ecosystems in Suriname’s Guyana Shield Bio-region “as was implemented in the period 2000-2006.

The project “Capacity building support to SCF” was signed in September 2004 and the actual implementation started in January 2005. This project is financed by the Government of Suriname with resources from the Dutch Treaty Fund, and scheduled for 6 years. The project is being implemented for 6 years now. The originally scheduled mid-term evaluation was changed into a management support mission support to the project. This was due to the fact that the Final evaluation of the Conservation of Globally Significant Forest Ecosystems in Suriname’s Guayana Shield Bio-region project took place at the end of 2006 and the final report was released in April 2007 and included also recommendations with regard to the SCF capacity building support project. The recommendations to have a management support mission for the “Capacity Building Support to the SCF” project and not another evaluation, was agreed and supported by the Oversight Committee.

#### 1.1. Background/Rationale for the Project

The Republic of Suriname lies on the north coast of South America, bordered by Brazil, Guyana and French Guiana. Forests cover 90% of Suriname, including 80% of pristine forest totalling approximately 118,000 km<sup>2</sup>. The forest ecosystems are intimately linked to the freshwater ecosystems. They also provide habitat to a wide variety of wildlife species. The interior of the country has witnessed little development.

As a former Dutch colony, it gained independence from the Netherlands in 1975. Suriname is one of the least densely populated countries in the world, with a human population of about 480,000. Roughly 87-90% of the population is concentrated in the capital city of Paramaribo and along the coastal region, while the remaining 10-13 % of the population lives in the interior, mostly in small villages. The varied population includes Creoles, Indians, Javanese, Maroons - who represent the only intact communities descended from runaway slaves in the New World - Amerindians and Chinese. Almost all-economic activities are concentrated along the coastal zone.

Suriname’s economy remains dominated by the mining and oil sectors. In 2008, alumina, gold, and oil amounted to 55 percent of GDP and accounted for some 95 percent of total exports of goods. Bauxite mining is the oldest sector, and the production of alumina dates back to the early 20th century. Oil production began in 1980 by Staatsolie, a state-owned company, while gold production by the formal sector started in 2004. The production of alumina sharply contracted in 2009. Gold production has

become the main source of export earnings. Agricultural production, which is concentrated in the coastal zone, consists mainly of rice and bananas, and accounts for 10 % of export earnings and 12 % of employment. Per capita income is estimated at US\$ 5,791 (2008).

## **2. Project objectives**

The main objectives of the project are to strengthen the long-term environmental management capacity of the Suriname Conservation Foundation (SCF) to enable SCF to support conservation management, research, awareness, advocacy, and ecotourism activities. As a result SCF will be able to carry out its functions to a higher degree of quality and relevance that meet internationally accepted standards and the requirements of the GEF, UNDP and other donors. At the same time the government agencies responsible for protected area management will be strengthened through the provision of financial and technical capacity building support under this project. Through this capacity strengthening the SCF Endowment fund will reach its initial capitalization target of USD \$15 million to provide long-term sustainable financing for biodiversity conservation.

These project results will contribute to the goal as formulated for the project "Conservation of Globally Significant Forest Ecosystems in Suriname's Guayana Shield Bio-region outcome, formulated as "To engender sustainable conservation of the globally significant Guayana Shield tropical forest wilderness biota".

The major achievements of the project to date have been:

- Support to the SCF's Administrative costs;
- Renewal of SCF's vision, mission and goals;
- The establishment of a monitoring and reporting system.
- A SCF Strategic Plan 2007-2012, training plan, branding and outreach activities, were developed and implemented;
- Strengthening of the Nature Conservation Division with technical assistance, training and goods, specifically by increasing number of game wardens with 100%
- Strengthening of the Biodiversity Focal point: development of the biodiversity Strategy and draft Action Plan;
- Preparation for design of Biodiversity Information Network.
- Financing of several grants as approved by the SCF Board for Protected Area management, research, awareness, advocacy, and ecotourism activities.
- The SCF Endowment fund reached the targeted amount of USD 15 million in 2007.

## **3. OBJECTIVES OF THE EVALUATION**

In accordance with the UNDP M&E policies and procedures, all projects with long-term implementation period (e.g. over 5 years) are encouraged undergo final evaluation at the end of the project to support accountability and to identify the key lessons learnt for future planning and knowledge generation. The overall objective of the final evaluation is to assess the achievements made by the project to deliver the specified objectives, outputs and outcomes during its implementation period. It will establish the relevance, performance and success of the project in terms of effectiveness and efficiency, including the sustainability of results. The evaluation team should identify specific lessons pertaining to the strategies employed, and implementation arrangements, which may be of relevance to other projects that provide



for establishment of environment trust funds, institutional strengthening and grant making. This evaluation will focus on the following priority issues:

1. Assessing project achievements and shortcomings at the product and outcome level.
  - Where the stated products and outcomes achieved?
  - What are the main contributions to outcome level results for which the SCF project is recognised?
  - What factors have contributed to achieving or not achieving the intended results?
  - To what extent the project incorporated gender and human right issues to enhance effectiveness? What other factors have contributed to the effectiveness?
  - Has the partnership strategy been effective?
2. Sustainability, in terms of:
  - Financial resources. What is the likelihood that financial and economic resources will be available so that the project outcomes/benefits will be sustained once the SCF project ends?
  - Stakeholder ownership. Do the various key stakeholders perceive a continued flow of benefits to be in their interest?
  - Institutional framework and governance. Are the legal frameworks, policies and governance and public administration structures and processes in place to support the objectives of the project and the continued flow of benefits? While responding to this question the evaluators should consider if the required systems for accountability and transparency and the required technical know-how are in place.
3. The effectiveness of the project's M&E system, including the use of the logical framework for implementation management, the use of measurable indicators and related targets to guide progress, and the measurement of progress towards targets.

#### **4. PRODUCTS EXPECTED FROM THE EVALUATION**

1. Inception Report -

An inception report should be prepared by the evaluation team before going into the full fledged evaluation exercise. The report should contain an evaluation matrix that displays for each of the evaluation criteria, the questions and sub questions that the evaluation will answer, and for each question, the data that will be collected to inform that question and the methods that will be used to collect that data<sup>3</sup>. In addition, the inception report should make explicit the underlying theory or assumptions about how each data element will contribute to understanding the development results—attribution, contribution, process, implementation and so forth—and the rationale for data collection, analysis and reporting methodologies selected. It should also include a proposed schedule of tasks/activities and deliverables, designating a team member with the lead responsibility for each task or product. The inception report will be presented during the initial briefing in the beginning of the field mission.
2. Draft evaluation Report

---

<sup>3</sup> UNDP Handbook, p. 172

3. The final product of the evaluation will be the Final Evaluation Report.

A detailed breakdown of the evaluation report into sections and ratings is given in Section 7.

#### 4.1 Notes on the Terminal report

Formatting:	Times New Roman – Font 11; single spacing; paragraph numbering and table of contents (automatic); page numbers (centred); graphs and tables and photographs (where relevant) are encouraged.
Length:	maximum 50 pages in total excluding annexes
Timeframe of submission:	First draft within 2 weeks of completion of the country mission
Should be submitted to:	Ministry of Finance and UNDP Country Office- Suriname
Should be circulated for comments to:	all key stakeholders and participants of the project including governmental agencies involved in the project implementation, UNDP country office, project team, Dutch Embassy and other partners.

If there are discrepancies between the impressions and findings of the evaluation team and the aforementioned parties these should be explained in an annex attached to the final report.

#### 4.2 METHODOLOGY OR EVALUATION APPROACH

An outline of the evaluation approach is provided below. However, it should be made clear that the evaluation team is responsible for revising the approach as necessary and present its methodological proposal as part of the inception report. Evaluation methods should be selected for their rigor in producing empirically based evidence to address the evaluation criteria, to respond to the evaluation questions, and to meet the objectives of the evaluation. Any changes should be in line with international criteria and professional norms and standards as adopted by the UN Evaluation Group<sup>4</sup>). The proposed methodology should be in line with the UNDP Manual for Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation for Development Results (2009)<sup>5</sup>. They must also be cleared by UNDP before being applied by the evaluation team.

- (i) **Documentation review** (desk study): the list of documentation is included in Annex 2. All the documents will be provided in advance by the Ministry of Finance and by the UNDP CO. The evaluator should consult all relevant sources of information, including but not limited to the following list of documentation: the project document, project reports, OC minutes and decisions, project budgets, project work plans, progress reports, project files, UNDP guiding documents, national legislation relevant to the project and any other material that they may consider useful.
- (ii) **Interviews** will be held with the following organizations and persons as a minimum:
  - Ministry of Finance (Department Planning and Development Cooperation)
  - Dutch Embassy in Paramaribo
  - UNDP CO – Suriname: Country Director and Environment Programme Manager

---

<sup>4</sup> [www.uneval.org](http://www.uneval.org)

<sup>5</sup> <http://www.undp.org/evaluation/handbook/>

- Ministry of Physical Planning Land and Forest Management
  - Stinasu
  - Suriname Conservation Foundation,
  - Ministry of Labour, Technological Development and Environment,
  - Other organizations: Conservation International Suriname, World Wild Life Fund Guianas,
  - Oversight Steering Committee.
- (iii) **Field Visits** should be made to CSNR : (Raleigh falls) and Bigi Pan
- (iv) **Semi-structured interviews** – the team should develop a process for semi-structured interviews to ensure that different aspects are covered. Focus group discussions with project beneficiaries will be held as deemed necessary by the evaluation team. Please add if you want specific discussions with local communities.
- (v) **Questionnaires**
- (vi) **Participatory Techniques and other approaches for the gather and analysis of data**

Although the evaluator should feel free to discuss with the authorities concerned all matters relevant to his/her assignment, they are not authorized to make any commitment on behalf of UNDP or the project management. It is recommendable that the evaluation process supports planning, monitoring and evaluation capacity building. The evaluation should apply the ethical and quality principles of the United Nations Evaluation Group<sup>6</sup>.

## 5. COMPOSITION OF THE EVALUATION MISSION

The evaluation will be performed by a two person team. The team will comprise one international consultant (Team Leader) with expertise in Monitoring and Evaluation of Biodiversity related projects and one national consultant in Natural Resource Management. The team will have a wide range of skills, including prior evaluation experience, expertise in biodiversity conservation and related activities, and experience with economic and social development issues.

### Team Qualities:

- Recent experience with result-based management evaluation methodologies
- Experience applying participatory monitoring approaches
- Recent knowledge of UNDP's results-based evaluation policies and procedures
- Knowledge of logical framework methodology
- Experience in monitoring and evaluation of projects in forest ecosystems
- Recognised experience with Environmental Trust Funds and grants making
- Knowledge of the administrative and reporting systems of projects similar in focus, area, scope and complexity
- Competence in Adaptive Management, as applied to conservation or natural resource management projects

---

<sup>6</sup> <http://www.unevaluation.org/ethicalguidelines>

- Recognized expertise in the management and sustainable use of natural resources in South America
- Experience working in countries with small economies, and in particular, knowledge of Suriname and its political, social and economic context
- Familiarity with protected area policies and management structures in South America, and in particular, in the Guyana Shield region
- Demonstrable analytical skills

The consultants will be responsible for preparing the final evaluation report and its completion in accordance with UNDP Monitoring and Evaluation guidelines. The Team Leader will have overall responsibility for the delivery and quality of the evaluation products. Team roles and responsibilities will be reflected in the contract.

The evaluators must be independent from both the policy-making process and the delivery and management of assistance. Therefore applications will not be considered from evaluators who have had any direct involvement with the design or implementation of the project. This may apply equally to evaluators who are associated with organizations, universities or entities that are, or have been, involved in the project. Any previous association with the project, the relevant government counterparts, UNDP-Suriname or other partners/stakeholders must be disclosed in the application. The team members are expected to sign the Code of Conduct for Evaluators in the UN System as part of their contract<sup>7</sup>.

If selected, failure to make the above disclosures will be considered just grounds for immediate contract termination, without recompense. In such circumstances, all notes, reports and other documentation produced by the evaluator will be retained by UNDP.

## **6. IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS**

### **6.1. Management arrangements**

The evaluation is a joint evaluation by the Government of Suriname (Ministry of Finance) and UNDP. The evaluation is being solicited by UNDP, but the Ministry of Finance has the responsibility as implementing partner of the project, has overall responsibility for the coordination and logistical arrangements of the evaluation as well as day-to-day support to the evaluation team (travel, accommodation, office space, communications, etc) with support from the UNDP Country Office in Suriname. The evaluation team will be briefed by the Ministry of Finance and the UNDP Country Team, upon the commencement of the assignment, and will also provide a terminal briefing. Other briefing sessions may be scheduled, if deemed necessary.

The evaluators will be contracted directly from the project budget. The quality of the evaluators' work will be assessed by the Ministry of Finance and UNDP-Suriname in consultation with oversight Committee. If the quality does not meet standard GOS or UNDP expectations and requirements for the UN evaluations, the evaluators will be required to re-do or revise (as appropriate) the work before being paid final instalments. The evaluation team is ultimately responsible for the quality of the evaluation report. The evaluator must clear input from other contributors before final payment is given.

These Terms of Reference follow the UNDP policies and procedures, and together with the final agenda will be agreed upon by the Ministry of Finance, The Dutch Embassy and UNDP Country Office. These

---

<sup>7</sup> <http://www.unevaluation.org/uneqcodeofconduct>

three parties will receive a draft of the final evaluation report and provide comments on it prior to its completion. Although the final report must be cleared and accepted by UNDP before being made public, the UNDP Evaluation Policy underlines that the evaluation function should be structurally independent from operational management and decision-making functions in the organization. The evaluation team will be free from undue influence and has full authority to submit reports directly to appropriate levels of decision-making. UNDP management will not impose restrictions on the scope, content, comments and recommendations of evaluation reports. In the case of unresolved difference of opinions between any of the parties, UNDP may request the evaluation team to set out the differences in an annex to the final report.

## **6.2. Timeframe, resources, logistical support and deadlines**

The total duration of the evaluation will be 22 days in the period Oct to Dec 2011 according to the following plan:

### Preparation before field work: (5 days)

- Acquaintance with the project document and other relevant materials with information about the project (GEF final evaluation report, half year and yearly progress reports, Oversight committee OC minutes Mission support report and other report, etc);
- Familiarization with overall development situation of Suriname (based on reading of CCA and other agency reports on the country).
- Detailed mission programme preparation in cooperation with the Ministry of Finance, UNDP Country office and the Project partners.

### Field mission: Paramaribo (5 days)

- Meeting with the Ministry of Finance;
- Meeting with UNDP Country office team;
- Meetings with relevant national project partners and other stakeholders in Paramaribo (as detailed in Section 4)
- Joint review of all available materials with focused attention to project outcomes and outputs

### Project site – Raleigh falls and Bigi Pan (4 days)

- Observation and review of completed and ongoing field activities,( capacity development, awareness /education, sustainable use demonstration activities, community development, etc)
- Interviews with key beneficiaries and stakeholders, including representatives of local authorities, local environmental protection authorities, local community stakeholders, etc.

Briefing on the preliminary finding and conclusions (after the field visits).

### Draft report (6 days): To be provided within two weeks of mission completion

- Final interviews / cross checking with UNDP CO, Ministry of Finance and Project partners.
- Drafting of report in proposed format
- Telephone review of major findings with UNDP CO and the Ministry of Finance
- Completing of the draft report and presentation of draft report for comments and suggestions
- Comments will be provided within 10 working days. These comments will focus on providing any requisite factual corrections but will not question the Evaluation Team's findings.

### Final Report (2 days)

- Presentation of final evaluation report

Detailed work plan clearly indicating submission dates of reports and response from project partners within the period Oct – Dec 2011 will be agreed upon and part of the contract.

## **7. SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION – SPECIFIC ISSUES TO BE ADDRESSED**

This section describes the categories that the evaluation will look into in line with the evaluation report outline included in section III. It also highlights specific issues to be addressed under each broad category. These categories are the minimum required by UNDP. For further reference, see Annex 7 of the UNDP Handbook

### **1. Executive summary**

- Brief description of project
- Context and purpose of the evaluation
- Main conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned

### **2. Introduction**

- Purpose of the evaluation
- Key issues addressed
- Methodology of the evaluation
- Structure of the evaluation

### **3. The project(s) and its development context**

- Project start and its duration
- Problems that the project seek to address
- Immediate and development objectives of the project
- Main stakeholders
- Results expected

### **4. Findings and Conclusions**

#### **4.1. Project Formulation (approx 3 pages)**

Conceptualization/Design. This should assess the approach used in design and an appreciation of the appropriateness of problem conceptualization and whether the selected intervention strategy addressed the root causes and principal threats in the project area. It should also include an assessment of the logical framework and whether the different project components and activities proposed to achieve the objective were appropriate, viable and responded to contextual institutional, legal and regulatory settings of the project.

Logical Framework Targets. It should assess the indicators defined for guiding implementation and measurement of achievement and whether lessons from other relevant projects (e.g., same focal area) were incorporated into targets.

Country-ownership/Drivenness. Assess the extent to which the project idea/conceptualization had its origin within national, sectoral and development plans and focuses on national environment and development interests.

Replication approach. Determine the ways in which lessons and experiences coming out of the project were/are to be replicated or scaled up in the design and implementation of other projects (this also related to actual practices undertaken during implementation).

## 4.2. Project Implementation

Implementation Approach (R). This should include assessments of the following aspects:

- (i) The use of the logical framework as a management tool during implementation and any changes made to this as a response to changing conditions and/or feedback from M and E activities if required.
- (ii) Other elements that indicate adaptive management such as comprehensive and realistic work plans routinely developed that reflect adaptive management and/or; changes in management arrangements to enhance implementation.
- (iii) The project's use/establishment of electronic information technologies to support implementation, participation and monitoring, as well as other project activities.
- (iv) The general operational relationships between the institutions involved and others and how these relationships have contributed to effective implementation and achievement of project objectives.
- (v) Technical capacities associated with the project and their role in project development, management and achievements.

Monitoring and evaluation (R). Including an assessment as to whether there has been adequate periodic oversight of activities during implementation to establish the extent to which inputs, work schedules, other required actions and outputs are proceeding according to plan; whether formal evaluations have been held and whether action has been taken on the results of this monitoring oversight and evaluation reports.

Stakeholder participation (R). This should include assessments of the mechanisms for information dissemination in project implementation and the extent of stakeholder participation in management, emphasizing the following:

- (i) The production and dissemination of information generated by the project.
- (ii) Local resource users and NGOs participation in project implementation and decision making and an analysis of the strengths and weaknesses of the approach adopted by the project in this arena
- (iii) The establishment of partnerships and collaborative relationships developed by the project with local, national and international entities and the effects they have had on project implementation.
- (iv) Involvement of governmental institutions in project implementation, the extent of governmental support of the project.

Financial Planning: Including an assessment of:

- (i) The actual project cost by objectives, outputs, activities
- (ii) The cost-effectiveness of achievements
- (iii) Financial management (including disbursement issues)

Sustainability. Extent to which the benefits of the project will continue, within or outside the project domain, after it has come to an end. Relevant factors include for example: development of a sustainability strategy, establishment of financial and economic instruments and mechanisms, mainstreaming project objectives into the economy or community production activities. Execution and implementation modalities. This should consider the effectiveness of the selection, recruitment, assignment of experts, consultants definition of tasks and responsibilities; quantity, quality and timeliness of inputs for the project with respect to execution responsibilities, enactment of necessary legislation and budgetary provisions and extent to which these may have affected implementation and sustainability of the Project; quality and timeliness of inputs by UNDP and Government of Suriname and

other parties responsible for providing inputs to the project, and the extent to which this may have affected the smooth implementation of the project.

#### **4.2 Key findings in terms of Relevance, Effectiveness and Sustainability**

**Effectiveness: Contribution to Outcomes/ Achievement of objectives (R):** Including a description of the extent to which the project's objectives (environmental and developmental) were achieved. If the project did not establish a baseline (initial conditions), the evaluators should seek to determine it through the use of special methodologies so that achievements, results and impacts can be properly established. This section should also include reviews of the following:

**Sustainability:** Including an appreciation of the extent to which benefits continue, within or outside the project domain after external assistance in this phase has come to an end. Has the project contributed to improve the enabling environment through effective policies, institutional capacity building, increased public awareness, appropriate stakeholder involvement, promoting conservation and sustainable use research, leveraging resources and providing incentives for conservation? Explain.

### **5. Conclusions**

### **6. Recommendations**

- Actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project
- Proposals for future directions underlining main objectives

### **7.0 Lessons learned**

This should highlight the best and worst practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance and success.



### Annex II Evaluation Matrix

Evaluation Criteria	Relevance
<b>Key Evaluation Questions</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) Do the SCF's project objectives respond to the challenges (needs and priorities) faced by Suriname in relation to biodiversity and conservation?</li> <li>j) Is the SCF in line with the current UNDP mandate in Suriname? Subsequently, is the SCF aligned with Suriname national development and environmental policies?</li> <li>k) As designed is the SCF Project's logic model adequate? Are performance indicators coherent and adequate?</li> <li>l) Is the SCF's strategy relevant?</li> <li>m) Is the project design adequate given the objectives that the SCF hoped to achieve and the project's field of implementation?</li> <li>n) The objectives and desired results with the program were a significant milestone in relation to the "without project situation"?</li> <li>o) Were there other objectives and results of significance that the SCF could have considered?</li> <li>p) How does the SCF compare to other conservation activities in the country?</li> <li>q) Is there a need for follow up UNDP programming to build on the accomplishments of the current programming activity?</li> </ul>
<b>Information Sources.</b>	<p>Project Documentation                      Key Stakeholders (institutional partners and project beneficiaries)                      Project Staff                      Ongoing Dialogue with SCF stakeholders in particular Project staff.                      Field Visits</p>
<b>Methods/ Information gathering tools</b>	<p>Document review                      Key Stakeholder interviews using semi-structured questionnaires                      Focus group discussion groups if deemed appropriate                      Ongoing informal dialogue with SCF stakeholders                      Field observation                      If necessary Questionnaires to be administered via the Internet (this is considered to be a last resort)</p>
<b>Indicators of success</b>	<p>Quantity and quality of information generated.</p>
<b>Key methods of analysis</b>	<p>Triangulation of information sources                      The use of standardized and complimentary lines of questioning</p>

Evaluation Criteria	Effectiveness
Key Questions	<p>a) To what extent has the SCF made progress towards its stated objectives? How have the SCF’s project outputs influenced success at the output level and how effective has the relationship been between the two elements?</p> <p>b) What contribution have the SCF’s partners (institutional and non-governmental) made in terms of achieving the project’s results? How effective have the alliances and partnerships facilitated by the project in terms of facilitating results?</p> <p>c) To what degree has the SCF considered the issues of gender, equality and the empowerment of women and UNDP’s human rights based approach through the design, execution and achievements of the SCF? How effectively have these values been incorporated into project activity and where applicable, have led to improvements in the SCF?</p> <p>d) What are the main factors facilitating the success (i.e. political support, policy environment) in terms of output and outcome level results for which the SCF project is recognised?</p> <p>e) What are the factors hampering the effectiveness of project activity?</p> <p>f) How effective has the project been in responding to the recommendations of the Terminal Evaluation of 2006?</p> <p>g) How effective has project been in making inroads on matters like business outreach?</p> <p>h) Having reached the project’s objective of capitalization of 15 million USD in support of the endowment, how effective is this as operating model?</p> <p>i) How effective is the system established for administering and monitoring grant activity?</p> <p>j) How effective have been the coordination and cooperation between SCF’s partners and how could improvements be made?</p> <p>k) How effective has the SCF in relation to Institutional strengthening of all partner organizations?</p> <p>l) What impact has turnover in government staff in the concerned departments on the project’s effectiveness?</p>

Final Evaluation of the Capacity Building Support to the Suriname Conservation Foundation Project

Evaluation Criteria	Efficiency
Key Questions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) How efficient have the management and administrative arrangements supporting SCF been?</li> <li>b) Have there been - during the execution of the program - some problems or limitations that have adversely affected the efficiency (in terms of performance per unit of expenditure or delays in the execution)?</li> <li>c) To what extent monitoring systems and risk management direction provided evidence-based program and allowed him to generate learning and make adjustments accordingly?</li> <li>d) Has the limited environmental expertise capacity in Suriname limited the ability to carry out project activity in an efficient manner?</li> <li>e) Have the capabilities of the UNDP been put to efficient use?</li> </ul>
Information Sources	<p>Project documentation (Revised logical Framework)                      Key Stakeholders (institutional partners and project beneficiaries)                      Project Staff                      Ongoing Dialogue with SCF stakeholders in particular Project staff.                      Field Visits</p>
Methods and Information Gathering tool	<p>Document review                      Key Stakeholder interviews using semi-structured questionnaires                      Focus group discussion groups if deemed appropriate                      Ongoing informal dialogue with SCF stakeholders                      Field observation                      If necessary Questionnaires to be administered via the Internet (this is considered to be a last resort)</p>
Standard of Success	Quantity and quality of information gathered
Information analysis methodology	<p>Triangulation of information sources                      The use of standardized and complimentary lines of questioning</p>

Evaluation Criteria	Sustainability
Key Questions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) What is the likelihood that financial and economic resources will be available so that the project outcomes/benefits will be sustained once the SCF project ends?</li> <li>b) Stakeholder ownership: Do the various key stakeholders perceive a continue flow of benefits to be in their interest? This line of evidence will require a different approach for each stakeholder group i.e. institutional stakeholders versus community based organisations.</li> <li>c) Institutional framework and governance. Are the legal frameworks, policies and governance and public administration structures and processes in place to support the objectives of the project and the continued flow of benefits? While responding to this question the evaluators should consider if the required systems for accountability and transparency and the required technical know-how are in place.</li> <li>d) Attitudinal Change: To what degree are attitudes and practices (politicians, government officials, industry and the general public) are supportive of SCF's</li> </ul>

Final Evaluation of the Capacity Building Support to the Suriname Conservation Foundation Project

Evaluation Criteria	Sustainability
	<p>mandate? To what degree is the SCF contributing to changing perceptions and practices?</p> <p>e) Do what degree has the SCF had a long term and positive influence on practices in the bio-diversity field in Suriname?</p>
Information Sources	<p>Project Documentation Key Stakeholders (institutional partners and project beneficiaries) Project Staff Ongoing Dialogue with SCF stakeholders in particular Project staff. Field Visits</p>
Methods and information gathering techniques	<p>Document review Key Stakeholder interviews using semi-structured questionnaires Focus group discussion groups if deemed appropriate Ongoing informal dialogue with SCF stakeholders Field observation If necessary Questionnaires to be administered via the Internet (this is considered to be a last resort)</p>
Indicators of Success	Quantity and quality of interviews, utility of document review and field visits and informal discussions
Key method for information analysis	Triangulation of information sources through the investigation of different lines of evidence

Evaluation Criteria	Impacts
Key Questions	<p>a) What has been the impact of respective project activities? This refers to institutional capacity building activity, community level programming, training, eco-tourism, branding and all outreach activities.</p> <p>b) What are some of the key impacts of the SCF at both the output and outcome level?</p> <p>c) What factors have contributed to the success at the project activity level?</p> <p>d) What have been some of the challenges in achieving desired impacts?</p>
Information sources	<p>Project Documentation Key Stakeholders (institutional partners and project beneficiaries) Project Staff Ongoing dialogue with SCF stakeholders including project staff. Field Visits</p>
Information gathering tools	<p>Document review Key Stakeholder interviews using semi-structured questionnaires Focus group discussion groups if deemed appropriate Ongoing informal dialogue with SCF stakeholders Field observation If necessary Questionnaires to be administered via the Internet (this is considered to be a last resort)</p>
Standards of excellence	Quantity and quality of interviews, utility of document review and field visits and

Final Evaluation of the Capacity Building Support to the Suriname Conservation Foundation Project

Evaluation Criteria	Impacts
	informal discussions
Data Analysis methodology	Triangulation of information sources through the investigation of different lines of evidence

Evaluation Criteria	Lessons Learned
Key Questions	<p>a) What aspects of the early stages of the project (design, selection of partners, capacity assessment in relation to implementation) positively or negatively influenced the final results of the SCF?</p> <p>b) What were the principal obstacles during the execution of the Project and how were they overcome and what lessons can be drawn and that stand out as being transferrable to similar projects?</p> <p>c) What does the project's organizational model indicate as successful practices to emulate and those to avoid for future UNDP supported project activity?</p> <p>d) What are the key lessons learned in relation to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-sustainability</li> <li>-coordination and cooperation amongst Suriname partners</li> <li>- Defining a role for the UNDP in future project activity.</li> <li>- promoting institutional reform in Suriname</li> <li>- promoting improved conservation and bio-diversity practices in Suriname</li> <li>- For the UNDP in terms of administrative and programming practices</li> <li>- Managing a successful endowment fund</li> <li>- operating in a context where finding local technical support can be a challenge</li> </ul>

**Annex III List of SCF Administered Grant Projects**

<b>Code</b>	<b>Project Name</b>	<b>Applicant/implementer</b>
SCF.2002.002	Research Tafelberg	University of Suriname, National Zoological Collection
SCF.2002.007	Documentaries CSNR and SNR	Media Vision
<u>SCF.2004.001*</u>	Bigi Pan – Biodiversity and Economics Assessment of the Wetlands	Center for Agricultural Research in Suriname (CELOS)
SCF.2004.004	Exposition World Food day 2004	National Institute of Environment and Development in Suriname
SCF.2005.001	Participation in “ Regional Cooperation in Contamination by Mercury in the Amazon Basis”	Ministry of Natural Resources; Geological Department
SCF.2005.003	Support Children’s book festival 2006	Foundation Protestant Christian Education Suriname
SCF.2005.007	Ecotourism for Sustainable Community Development of Bigi Poika	Stichting KAMARAWARE
<u>SCF.2005.012*</u>	Mapping Indigenous Occupation and Traditional Use of Land in the Wayambo	Association of Indigenous Village Leaders (VIDS)
SCF.2005.016	Ecosystem restoration Coronie (Assembly of Waters)	The Caribbean Institute
<u>SCF.2006.003*</u>	Stress Factors and Ecological Conditions of the Mangrove	Biologist/PhD research
SCF.2006.006	Training program for Foresters for Sustainable forest management	Foundation for Forest Management and Production Control (SBB)
SCF.2006.010	Participation in International Conference Economics of Poverty, Netherlands.	University of Suriname
SCF.2006.011	Participation in Conference of the Parties (COP), CBD, Curitiba, Brazil. (2006)	Ministry of Physical planning , Land and Forest Management
SCF.2006.012	Participation in Global Symposium 2006 (Madagascar)	Ministry of Physical planning , Land and Forest Management
SCF.2006.013	Participation in Flora of the Guianas, Berlin, Germany.	University of Suriname ,National Herbarium (BBS)
<u>SCF.2006.014*</u>	Expedition to the Coronie Swamp	Center for Agricultural Research in Suriname (CELOS)

SCF.2006.016*	Effective Management of the Central Suriname Nature Reserve (CSNR)	Ministry of Physical planning , Land and Forest Management
SCF.2006.020	Children’s books about Environment	Author Children’s books
SCF.2007.001	Support Children’s book festival 2007 (Biodiversity & Water)	Foundation Protestant Christian Education
SCF.2007.004*	Baseline Profile for mercury concentrations in Suriname	University of Suriname
SCF.2007.010	The establishment of buffer zones West of the CSNR	Biologist/consultant
SCF.2007.011	Support to the Srefidensi Marathon 2007	Marathon commission
SCF.2008.001	Participation in the 19th World Orchid Conference, Miami, USA.	University of Suriname ,National Herbarium (BBS)
SCF.2008.002*	Improving management of Wayana Traditional Lands in Southeastern Suriname	Amazon Conservation Team Suriname (ACT) – (WAYANA)
SCF.2008.003	Train the trainers: Development of organic agriculture in Commewijne	Stichting Agrarische Vrouwen
SCF.2008.004*	Cultuurtuin: “Biodiversiteitspoort Suriname”	Suriname Trade and Industry Association (VSB)
SCF.2008.005	Sustainable Development of Women and Families in The Interior of Suriname	National Women’s Movement
SCF.2008.006	Children’s books about Environment “ Jong geleerd.....”	Stichting KLIMOP
SCF.2008.007	Women and Sanitation (Caribbean Regional Workshop)	National Women’s Movement
SCF.2008.008	Expedition to the Coronie Swamp, extension	Center for Agricultural Research in Suriname (CELOS)
SCF.2008.009	Co-Finance M.Sc. Fellowship	Ministry of Labour, Technological Development and Environment
SCF.2008.010	Healthy Drinking Water Community GAKABA	Samo GAKABA (Community)
SCF.2008.011	Commemoration 200 year Coronie (October 2008)	Ministry of Regional Development /District Commissioner Coronie
SCF.2009.004	Publication of 2 children’s books (Titles: 1. “.... Marc huilde” en ” Gotong Royon”.	Author children’s books

<u>SCF.2009.005*</u>	Slipway Jamaerkanaal/Nickerierivier (Bigipan)	Ministry of Regional Development /District Commissioner Nickerie
<u>SCF.2009.008*</u>	Open Space (clustering lodge holders Upper Suriname)	Stichting Lodge holders Upper Suriname
<u>SCF.2009.009*</u>	Legal Framework for Nature Management (Development of Reader)	Law Firm Schurman
<u>SCF.2009.011*</u>	Enhancing Resilience of the Coastline; Rehabilitation and Mangrove Planting	University of Suriname
<u>SCF.2010.001</u>	Establishment of a research center for Biodiversity, Energy and Development	University of Suriname,IGSR
<u>SCF.2010.002*</u>	Participation in the 2nd International Congress on Biodiversity of the Guyana Shield	University of Suriname,IGSR



## **Annex IV List of Documents and Websites Reviewed**

### DOCUMENTS

- Adams, John S & Victurine Ray (Feb 2011) Permanent Conservation Trusts: A Study of the Long-Term Benefits of Conservation Endowments
- Ahumada, J.A., et al, 2011. Community structure and diversity of tropical forest mammals: data from a global camera trap network. *Phil. Trans. R. Soc. B*, 366, 2703-2711
- Fagon, G., Jan.-March 2009. Technical Project Report "Effective Management of the Central Suriname Nature Reserve"(Dutch)
- Fagon, G., Apr. 2009-May 2011. Personal Notes on Relevant moments in the CSNR Project (Dutch)
- Government of Suriname (Apr. 1954). Nature Conservation Law (Dutch)
- Government of Suriname, Aug. 2005. Project document "Establishment of and Operational Plan for the Forest Management and Nature Conservation Authority (BOSNAS) (Dutch)
- Government of Suriname/Conservation International, Dec. 2005. Management Plan 2004-2008 for the Central Suriname Nature Reserve
- Governments of Suriname and the Netherlands, August 2004. Resolution of Commitment of funds for the project "Capacity Building Support to the Suriname Conservation Foundation" (Dutch)
- Governments of Suriname and the Netherlands, January 2012. Addendum to the Resolution of Commitment of funds for the project "Capacity Building Support to the Suriname Conservation Foundation" (Dutch)
- Kloss, D., Mitchell, E., Jan. 2007. Terminal Evaluation Report of the GEF/UNDP Project "Conservation of Globally Significant Forest Ecosystems in Suriname's Guyana Shield Bio-Region"
- Meddens, L, Apr. 2011. Local Government and Global NGO in a struggle to protect the jungle: a case study of CI and the Central Suriname Nature Reserve (MSc thesis)
- Ministry of Labour, Technological Development and Environment, 2006. National Biodiversity Strategy

Ministry of Labour, Technological Development and Environment, May 2011. Reports on data analysis, strategy and operational plan, and legal analysis for the Design of a National Biodiversity Information Network System

Ministry of Finance, 2005. Terms of Reference SCF Project's Oversight Committee

Ministry of Finance, 2005-2011. Minutes of the SCF Project Oversight Committee meetings: 7 of 2005, 4 of 2006, 1 of 2007, 2 of 2008, 3 of 2009, 3 of 2010, 1 of 2011 (Dutch)

Ministry of Finance/UNDP/SCF Project Oversight Committee, 2007. Revised Logical Framework for the SCF Project

Ministry of Finance, 2009-2010. SCF Project Quarterly Monitoring sheets: 4 of 2009, 3 of 2010

Ministry of Physical Planning, Land- and Forest Management, 2005. Plan of Operations for the Central Suriname Nature Reserve (Dutch)

Ministry of Physical Planning, Land- and Forest Management, December 2006. Project document "Effective Management of the Central Suriname Nature Reserve" (Dutch)

Ministry of Physical Planning, Land- and Forest Management, Jan. 2011. Final draft Business Plan Central Suriname Nature Reserve

Ministry of Planning and Development Cooperation, 2005-2008. Standard Bi-annual Progress Reports SCF Project: 1 of 2005, 2 of 2006, 1 of 2007, 2 of 2008

Mitchell, E., den Hartog-Parisius, J., Nov. 2007. Final Report of the Management Support Mission to the SCF Project

Muller, Eduard (2012) Training for effective protected area management.

Muller, Eduard (2012) Global Partnership for Professionalizing Protected Area Management. Concept Paper

UNDP, 2006. Project document "Capacity Building Support for the Suriname Conservation Foundation Project" (SCF Project)

Suriname Conservation Foundation, 2000. SCF Statutes (Dutch)

Suriname Conservation Foundation. Manual for Making Financial Requests (Dutch)

Suriname Conservation Foundation, June 2011. SCF Annual Report 2010

Suriname Conservation Foundation, 2011. SCF Newsletter Nov.-Dec. 2011 (Dutch)

Symbiont Consulting, ..... Capacity Building and Trainings Plan for the Nature Conservation Division of the Suriname Forest Service (Dutch)

UNDP Headquarters, June 2011. Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results

UNDP Suriname, (2008) Country Programme Document for Suriname 2008 to 2011.

## WEBSITES

Suriname Conservation Foundation

<http://www.scf.sr.org>

Tropical Ecology Assessment and Monitoring Network

<http://www.teamnetwork.org>

UNDP Ethic Guidelines for Evaluation

<http://www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct>

<http://www.unevaluation.org/ethicalguidelines>

Latin America Conservation Council

<http://www.nature.org/aboutus/governance/latin-america-conservation-council/index.htm>

Rainforest Alliance (Sustainable Tourism Certification)

<http://www.rainforest-alliance.org/>

Latin American School of Protected Areas (LASPA)

<http://www.uci.ac.cr/en/associated-programs/47-elap-escuela-latinoamericana-de-areas-protegidas>

**Annex V List of persons interviewed**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Organization</b>
Mr. John Adams	SCF Portfolio Manager	Senior Vice President – Investments, the Arbor Group
Ms. Sheila Bhairoo	Consultant Temporary SCF Project Facilitator	APK Consultants
Ms. Sandra Bihari	Specialist Environment	Dutch Embassy
Ms. Ashwinie Boedhoe	Chair SCF Project Oversight Committee	Ministry of Finance SCF Project Executing Agency
Mr. Bryan Drakenstein	Programme Specialist Environment	UNDP Country Office
Mr. Hesdy Esajas	Head Forest Service	Ministry of RGB
Mr. Glen Fagon	Former Head PIU CSNR Project	NCD/Ministry of RGB
Mr. S. Fokké	Director	Suriname Built Heritage Foundation
Mr. Thomas Gittens	Director	UNDP Country Office
Ms. Janine den Hartog-Parisius	Managing Director	Symbiont Consulting
Ms. Ineke de Hoog	Head of Economic Development and Economic Affairs	Dutch Embassy
Mr .Leonard Johanns	Executive Director	SCF
Mr Frans Kasantaroeno	Director	STINASU/Ministry of RGB
Mr. Earl Koendjibiharie,	Staff Member NCD	NCD/Ministry of RGB
Ms. Estrella Kromodihardjo - Madngisa	Staff Member	Ministry of ATM
Ms. Sagita Lakhisaran	Co-Chair SCF Project Oversight Committee	Ministry of Finance SCF Project Executing Agency
Mr. Stanley Malone,	Programme Manager	SCF
Mr. Eduard Muller	Vice President & Rector of	Centroamérica, Comisión Mundial de Áreas Protegidas - UICN
Mr. Naipal	Implementer Mangrove Project	University of Suriname
Mr. Dominiek Plouvier	Regional Representative	WWF Guianas
Ms. Rachêle Rijker	Staff Member	Ministry of ATM
Ms. Christine de Rooij	Operations Manager	SCF
Ms. Claudine Sakimin	Head NCD	NCD/Ministry of RGB
Ronald Sanabria	Vice President	Rainforest Alliance Sustainable Tourism Division, Costa Rica
Ms. Annet Tjon Sie Fat	Director	CI Suriname
Ms. Henna Uiterloo	Director Environment	Ministry of ATM
Ms. Natascha Wong A Ton	Former SCF Finance Committee Member/Treasurer	Business Manager Newmont Goldmines



**Annex VI Mission Itinerary November 21 to 30 2011**

Date	Time	Activity	Venue
Monday 21 November	03.00	Arrival Mr. Pallen	
	09.00	Meeting Ms Adhin with Mr. Drakenstein	UNDP
	09.45	Meeting Mr. Pallen and Ms. Adhin	Royal Torarica Hotel
	10.30	Meeting with Mr. Drakenstein	UNDP
	11.30	Meeting with Ms. Boedhoe	Ministry of Finance
	15.00	Meeting with Mr. Gittens	UNDP
Tuesday 22 November	10.00	Meeting with Mr. Johanns and Ms. de Rooij	SCF
	11.30	Meeting with Ms. Kromodihardjo and Ms. Rijker	Ministry of ATM
	13.00	Meeting with Ms. Sakimin and Mr. Koendjibharie	NCD/ Ministry of RGB
	14.15	Meeting with Ms. De Hoog	Ditch Embassy
	15.00	Meeting with Ms. Sakimin and Mr. Koendbiharie continued	NCD/ Ministry of RGB
Wednesday 23 November	09.00	Meeting with Mr. Kasantaroeno	Stinasu/Ministry of RGB
	11.15	Meeting with Ms. Tjon Sie Fat	CI Suriname
	13.00	Scheduled Meeting with SCF Green Partner, De Surinaamse Bank cancelled	
	afternoon	Planning and scheduling additional meetings	
Thursday 24 November	09.00	Scheduled Meeting with Mr. S. Naipal cancelled	University of Suriname
	10.30	Meeting with Ms. Boedhoe and Ms. Lakhisaran	Ministry of Finance
	12.00	Meeting with Mr. Plouvier	WWF Guianas
	13.30	Meeting with Mr. Esajas	Forest Service/ Ministry of RGB
	14.30	Scheduled Meeting with SCF Finance Committee cancelled	
	15.00	Meeting with Mr. Malone	SCF
Friday 25 November	Independance Holiday		
	11.00	Meeting with Mr. Fagon	't Vat
Saturday	06.00	Departure to Raleighvallen, CSNR	UNDP

Final Evaluation of the Capacity Building Support to the Suriname Conservation Foundation Project

26 November	11.00	Walk through Witagron (Kwinti Village) and courtesy visit to Village Head	Witagron
	14.00	Departure by boat to Raleigh Falls	
Sunday 27 November	morning	Visits to sites in the area	Raleigh Falls
	14.00	Departure to Paramaribo	
Monday 28 November	09.00	Meeting with Mr. Fokké	Suriname Heritage Foundation
	10.30	Meeting with Ms. Bhairoo	APK Consultants Gravenbergstraat
	13.00	Meeting with Ms. de Rooij	SCF
	14.45	Meeting with Ms. den Hartog-Parisius	Symbiont Consulting
Tuesday 29 November	06.00	Departure to Nieuw Nickerie	
	10.30	Boat trip to Bigi Pan MUMA	
	13.30	Visit to District Commissioner's Office	Nieuw Nickerie
	14.30	Meeting with Mr. S Naipal	Nieuw Nickerie
	15.30	Departure for Paramaribo	
Wednesday 30 November	09.00	Meeting with Ms. De Hoog and Ms. Bihari	Dutch Embassy
	10.00	Meeting with Mr. Gittens	UNDP
	11.00	Meeting with SCF Project Oversight Committee	SCF
	14.00	Meeting with Ms. Uiterloo	Ministry of ATM
	15.30	Meeting with Mr. Gittens and Mr. Drakenstein	UNDP

## **Annex VII Summary of Field Visits by National Consultant Shanti Adhin**

### **1) Field Visit to Raleighvallen to the CSNR November 26 to 27**

The purpose of the visit was to provide the evaluation team with some insight regarding the management of the reserve. Protected areas management especially of the CSNR is a large SCF/NCD project. With a size of approximately 1.6 million ha CSNR is the largest protected area in the country created in 1998 by bringing together 3 existing reserves. As of 2000 it has the international status of an UNESCO world heritage site. From Paramaribo the evaluation team travelled by bus to Witagron, a Kwinti Maroon village along the Coppename River, where a courtesy visit was paid to the Chief and a walk was taken through the village. From here we traveled to Fungu Island by boat. At a short distance from Witagron is the only other Maroon village close to the CSNR, Kaaimanston.

Stinasu has several cabins at Fungu Island and one at Lolopasi (near the main rapids). All accommodations are in varying degrees in need of maintenance and repair. There are several trails in the area. The evaluation team walked the trail to the Moedervallen, the main rapids. Stinasu has guides and boats available.

The evaluation team visited the TEAM research site where there are three buildings that are not being used anymore and are neglected. These were set up with support of CI Suriname to facilitate research and monitor biodiversity and to collect climate data. TEAM stands for Tropical Ecology, Assessment and Monitoring Network. The longest trail in the CSNR leads to the Voltzberg where there is a lodge for researchers. The evaluation team was not able to visit that part of the research facility due to time constraints.

The main building at the main visitors centre was not finished. This building dominates the immediate view upon arrival at the visiting centre by boat. Stinasu has a facility manager at the site and NCD game wardens visit the reserve from time to time. Management of the facilities is minimal. The river, rapids and the forest are as splendid as ever. However, the neglected buildings are a sorry sight.

### **2) Field visit Bigi Pan Area 29 November**

Bigi Pan is a Multiple Use Management Area (MUMA) and the largest wetland expanse in the coastal area with an approximate size of 68.000 ha. It is one of the largest fishing grounds and harbours huge populations of numerous bird species including North-American migrating species. To protect the fauna and the mangrove vegetation the area was declared a MUMA in 1987. It is bordered by rice cultivation lands. Through the Jamaer Kanaal the Bigi Pan is entered. A new haul way to move the boat from the canal into the lagoon was constructed with SCF support.

The NCD has a work station in the lagoon. There are also a few private owned lodges. Tour operators organize trips to the Bigi Pan. No entrance fee is required. The government is



responsible for the management of the area including maintenance of infrastructure. There is some damage already to the haul way and the landing stage and the steps are in a deplorable state and even dangerous. Upon return from the lagoon a brief visit was paid to the District's Commissioners Office in Nieuw Nickerie.

A meeting was held with Prof. Naipal of the University of Suriname who is implementing the Mangrove Project supported by SCF: "Enhancing resilience of the coastline through removing stress, rehabilitation and mangrove planting". The overall goal is to enhance and support the natural growth of mangrove by planting seedlings and next to increase and sustain the services of mangrove vegetation along the coastline, to the benefit of the livelihoods of the coastal communities. The local community participates in the project by producing the seedlings in a nursery. Experiments focus on planting seedlings further than the natural regeneration zone so stress factors such as high salinity, high waves can be studied. Locals are also trained to participate in the ongoing study.

NCD is implementing a GEF financed project "Suriname Coastal Protected Areas Management" for which a project coordinator was just hired. Three MUMAs are included: the Bigi Pan, North Coronie and North Saramacca MUMUAs.

## **Annex VIII Ethical Code of Conduct for UN Evaluations**

### United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) Ethical Guidelines

#### **Independence**

9. Evaluation in the United Nations systems should be demonstrably free of bias. To this end, evaluators are recruited for their ability to exercise independent judgement. Evaluators shall ensure that they are not unduly influenced by the views or statements of any party. Where the evaluator or the evaluation manager comes under pressure to adopt a particular position or to introduce bias into the evaluation findings, it is the responsibility of the evaluator to ensure that independence of judgement is maintained. Where such pressures may endanger the completion or integrity of the evaluation, the issue will be referred to the evaluation manager and, where necessary, the director of evaluation, who will discuss the concerns of the relevant parties and decide on an approach which will ensure that evaluation findings and recommendations are consistent, verified and independently presented (see below Conflict of Interest).

#### **Impartiality**

10. Evaluations must give a comprehensive and balanced presentation of strengths and weaknesses of the policy, program, project or organizational unit being evaluated, taking due account of the views of a diverse cross-section of stakeholders. Evaluators shall:

- a. Operate in an impartial and unbiased manner at all stages of the evaluation.
- b. Collect diverse perspectives on the subject under evaluation.
- c. Guard against distortion in their reporting caused by their personal views and feelings.

#### **Credibility**

11. Evaluation shall be credible and based on reliable data and observations. Evaluation reports shall show evidence of consistency and dependability in data, findings, judgements and lessons learned; appropriately reflecting the quality of the methodology, procedures and analysis used to collect and interpret data. Evaluation managers and evaluators shall endeavour to ensure that each evaluation is accurate, relevant, and timely and provides a clear, concise and balanced presentation of the evidence, findings, issues, conclusions and recommendations.

#### **Conflicts of Interest**

12. Conflicts of interest shall be avoided as far as possible so that the credibility of the evaluation process and product shall not be undermined. Conflicts of interest may arise at the level of the Evaluation Office, or at that of individual staff members or consultants. Conflicts of interest should be disclosed and dealt with openly and honestly.

13. Evaluators are required to disclose in writing any past experience, of themselves, their immediate family, close friends or associates, which may give rise to a potential conflict of interest.

14. Evaluators engaged by a UN agency shall not have had any responsibility for the design, implementation or supervision of any of the projects, programs or policies that they are evaluating.

15. Under exceptional circumstances, it may be necessary to engage an evaluator who has a past connection with the object of the evaluation, for example where there is very small pool of competent experts. In such a case, measures to safeguard the integrity of the evaluation shall be adopted and such measures shall be disclosed in the evaluation report. The director of evaluation shall ensure that the evaluator in question is not appointed as evaluation manager or evaluation team leader.

16. The Evaluation Office shall avoid any conflict of interest, which might arise, or appear to arise, as a result of the acceptance of any form of external support or assistance. For example, the acceptance of supplementary funding for any of its activities, from bilateral or multilateral agencies or other parties shall be carefully considered and managed. Such funding must not lead to any bias in the evaluation approach, opinion, or findings. The director of evaluation shall carefully assess any offer of assistance to ensure the necessary independence of judgement from any contributing parties and to prevent any undue influence over the work of the Office.

### **Honesty and Integrity**

17. Successful evaluation depends on the honesty and integrity of the entire evaluation process. Evaluators shall:

- a. Accurately represent their level of skills and knowledge and work only within the limits of their professional training and abilities in evaluation, declining assignments for which they do not have the skills and experience to successfully complete.
- b. Negotiate honestly the costs, tasks to be undertaken, limitations of methodology, scope of results likely to be obtained, and uses of data resulting from the evaluation
- c. Accurately present their procedures, data and findings, including ensuring that the evaluation findings are not biased to make it more likely that the evaluator receives further commissions from the Client
- d. As far as possible, prevent or correct misuse of their work by others.
- e. Decline evaluation assignments where the client is unresponsive to their expressed concerns that the evaluation methodology or procedures are likely to produce a misleading result. (If declining the assignment is not feasible, the evaluator shall record his/her dissent either in the evaluation report or otherwise).

### **Accountability**

18. Evaluators are accountable for the completion of the evaluation as agreed with the Client. Specifically, evaluators shall:

- a. Complete the evaluation deliverables within the timeframe and budget agreed
- b. Exercise prudence and probity in fiscal decision-making so that evaluation expenditures are properly accounted for and the client receives value for money.

c. Give the evaluation manager early notice of any change to the evaluation plan or any risks to the successful completion of the evaluation and record the reasons for any changes made to the evaluation plan.

### **Obligations to Participants**

19. Evaluators shall respect people's right to provide information in confidence and make participants aware of the scope and limits of confidentiality. Evaluators must ensure that sensitive information cannot be traced to its source so that the relevant individuals are protected from reprisals.

### **Respect for Dignity and Diversity**

20. Evaluators shall:

- a. Respect differences in culture, local customs, religious beliefs and practices, personal interaction, gender roles, disability, age and ethnicity, and be mindful of the potential implications of these differences when planning, carrying out and reporting on evaluations, while using evaluation instruments appropriate to the cultural setting
- b. Keep disruption to a minimum while needed information is obtained, providing the maximum notice to individuals or institutions they wish to engage in the evaluation, optimizing demands on their time, and respecting people's right to privacy.

### **Rights**

21. In including individuals or groups in the evaluation, evaluators shall ensure:

- a. **Right to Self-Determination.** Prospective participants should be treated as autonomous agents and must be given the time and information to decide whether or not they wish to participate and be able to make an independent decision without any pressure or fear of penalty for not participating.
- b. **Fair Representation.** Evaluators shall select participants fairly in relation to the aims of the evaluation, not simply because of their availability, or because it is relatively easy to secure their participation. Care shall be taken to ensure that relatively powerless, 'hidden', or otherwise excluded groups are represented.
- c. **Compliance with codes for vulnerable groups.** Where the evaluation involves the participation of members of vulnerable groups, evaluators must be aware of and comply with legal codes (whether international or national) governing, for example, interviewing children and young people.
- d. **Redress.** Stakeholders receive sufficient information to know a) how to seek redress for any perceived disadvantage suffered from the evaluation or any projects it covers, and b) how to register a complaint concerning the conduct of an Implementing or Executing Agency.

### **Confidentiality**

22. Evaluators shall respect people's right to provide information in confidence and make participants aware of the scope and limits of confidentiality. Evaluators must ensure that sensitive information cannot be traced to its source so that the relevant individuals are protected from reprisals.

### **Avoidance of Harm**

23. Evaluations can have a negative effect on their objects or those who participate in them. Therefore evaluators shall seek to: minimize risks to, and burdens on, those participating in the evaluation; and seek to maximize the benefits and reduce any unnecessary harms that might occur from negative or critical evaluation, without compromising the integrity of the evaluation.

### **Evaluation Process and Product Accuracy, Completeness and Reliability**

24. Evaluators have an obligation to ensure that evaluation reports and presentations are accurate, complete and reliable. In the evaluation process and in the production of evaluation products, evaluators shall:

- a. Carry out thorough inquiries, systematically employing appropriate methods and techniques to the highest technical standards, validating information using multiple measures and sources to guard against bias, and ensuring errors are corrected.
- b. Describe the purposes and content of object of the evaluation (programme, activity, strategy) clearly and accurately.
- c. UNEG Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation - Draft
- d. Present openly the values, assumptions, theories, methods, results, and analyses that significantly affect the evaluation, from its initial conceptualization to the eventual use of findings.
- e. Examine the context in enough detail so its likely influences can be identified (for example geographic location, timing, political and social climate, economic conditions).
- f. Describe the methodology, procedures and information sources of the evaluation in enough detail so they can be identified and assessed
- g. Make a complete and fair assessment of the object of the evaluation, recording of strengths and weaknesses so that strengths can be built upon and problem areas addressed.
- h. Provide an estimate of the reliability of information gathered and the replicability of results (i.e. how likely is it that the evaluation repeated in the same way would yield the same result?).
- i. Explicitly justify judgements, findings and conclusions and show their underlying rationale so that stakeholders can assess them.

j. Ensure all recommendations are based on the evaluation findings only, not on their or other parties' biases.

### **Transparency**

25. Transparency and consultation with the stakeholders are essential features of evaluation. The Evaluation Office and the evaluation team leader shall clearly communicate to stakeholders the purpose of the evaluation, the criteria applied and the intended use of findings.

26. Stakeholders shall be consulted on the Terms of Reference (TOR) for the evaluation and their views taken into account in the final TOR. The Evaluation Manager shall carefully balance the views and requirements of stakeholders, ensuring that the evaluation retains a clear focus and that sound evaluation principles are not compromised by the wishes of stakeholders.

27. Evaluation methodology shall be disclosed in advance of the evaluation and clearly described in the evaluation report, including the assumptions and values underlying the evaluator's judgements. Evaluation documents shall be easily readable and specify their information sources and approaches.

28. Evaluation reports shall make the link between evidence, findings, conclusions and recommendations transparent, persuasive and proportionate to the body of evidence collected.

### **Reporting**

29. The formal parties to an evaluation should ensure that the full set of evaluation findings along with pertinent limitations are made accessible to the persons affected by the evaluation, and to any others with legitimate claims or rights to receive the results, in relevant language(s).

30. As a norm, all evaluation reports shall be made public. Evaluation reports will only be withheld from publication for compelling reasons and in accordance with relevant rules within each agency. The director of evaluation shall ensure high standards in accessibility and presentation of published reports and use a range of channels to reach audiences through, for example, electronic and interactive channels, knowledge networks, communities of practice, presentations at relevant conferences, as well as appropriate publications.

31. At country level, evaluation findings shall be presented and discussed at the appropriate national or local level, to enable stakeholders to respond to them, and ideally before the evaluation report is complete.

32. All materials generated in the conduct of the evaluation are the property of the agency and can only be used by permission. Responsibility for distribution and publication of evaluation results rests with the Evaluation Office. With the permission of the agency, evaluation consultants may make briefings or unofficial summaries of the results of the evaluation outside the agency.

33. Original data, including interview records and meeting notes will be retained in confidential files until completion of the evaluation. The director of evaluation shall determine an appropriate time for further retention, after which such data shall be securely disposed of in accordance with any Agency policy on the disposal of records. Databases of unpublished information on individual project activities shall be securely stored in the Evaluation Office and available for use only by the Office's staff and consultants, and only released to consultants in a manner which will maintain confidentiality and evaluation integrity.

### **Omissions and Wrongdoing**

34. Where evaluators find evidence of wrong-doing or unethical conduct, they are obliged to report it, whether or not such conduct relates directly to the evaluation Terms of Reference. Evaluators shall inform the Evaluation Manager who will in turn agree with the Evaluation Director on the most appropriate channel for reporting wrong-doing. Details of any wrong-doing, including names or events, shall only be divulged to the proper oversight authority.