



Outcome Evaluation Governance Programme in Suriname

Final Report

Presented by Claudia Pineda. 7 may 2013.

Table of Contents

0.	Executive summary	2
1.	Introduction	4
1.1.	Background.....	5
1.2.	Approach and Methodology	6
2.	Development context of the country.....	8
3.	Description of UNDP’s work.....	9
3.1.	The planned Governance Programme 2008-2011	10
3.2.	The Governance Programme implemented between 2008-2011	13
3.2.1.	Project: Strengthening of the Parliament	13
3.2.2.	Project: Strengthening of the Electoral Process 2010.....	14
3.2.3.	Project: Implementation of the Human Rights Protection Plan, Legal Support and Anti-Corruption.	15
3.2.4.	Project: Reduction of disparities of the access to information and services through ICT	16
3.2.5.	Other initiatives within the Governance Programme:.....	16
	The Caribbean Human Development Report 2012: Human Development and the shift to better citizen security.....	16
3.3.	Planning, monitoring and evaluation system.....	18
3.4.	Coordination of cooperation with other agencies	19
3.4.1.	With other agencies of the system:	19
3.4.2.	With other donors and international partners:	19
4.	Development results	19
4.1.	Relevance	19
4.2.	Effectiveness	20
4.3.	Efficiency	20
4.4.	Sustainability	21
4.5.	Cross-cutting themes	21
4.5.1.	Gender.....	21
4.5.2.	Human rights.....	21
4.5.3.	Capacity Development	22
4.5.4.	Institutional Strengthening	22
4.5.5.	Innovation and value added to national development.....	22
5.	Conclusions	23
6.	Lessons learnt.....	25
7.	Recommendations	25
8.	Annexe.....	28

0. Executive summary

The objective of this Outcome Evaluation is to review the UNDP Suriname Governance Programme (United Nations Development Assistance Framework-UNDAF 2008-2011), the status of the outcome and the key factors that have affected its achievement. Also seek to assess the performance and effectiveness of the implementation arrangements, partnerships, and relation with stakeholders. At the same time this document provides recommendation to improve the implementation of the Democratic Governance Programme and its contribution to the outcomes under the UNDAF 2012-2016.

2

The subject of this outcome evaluation is selected projects implemented within the framework of the Democratic Governance portfolio. The evaluation assesses the overall result and contribution of the projects towards the UNDAF, Country Programme Action Plan -CPAP and Country Programme Document -CPD. For the period 2008-2011, the democratic governance portfolio was based on UNDAF outcome 2: **“Good governance through decentralized, participatory policy planning and monitoring, legal reform and effective protection system will be enhanced”**. The rationale for this basis lies in the fact that the multi-annual development plan identified effective public sector administration as a key to sustainable human development processes.

The evaluation assessed the design, performance and the capacity of each project to fulfill their objectives and their contribution (positive or negative) to the correspondent outcome. So this evaluation is based on an inductive process, putting the emphasis on the assessment of results at output and outcome levels.

According to the CPD 2008 – 2011, and the projects associated with the Outcome 2, the priorities for this period were, i) Support the formulation of a national public sector reform programme and enhancing the capacity of government and non-state actors to formulate and implement policies that ensure effective public services; ii) Strengthened participatory planning and monitoring are national priorities in the area of good governance; iii) Supported building capacity for promotion and protection of human rights and strengthening democracy; iv) With special funds received, UNDP Suriname started the implementation of a programme aimed at reducing disparities in access to information between the coastal and hinterland areas through the use of ICTs (Information and Communication Technologies).

The outcome is based on two pillars: reform of the public sector and the institutionalization of participation mechanisms in decentralized planning. None of the processes took place and both pillars were not materialized, and therefore governance wasn't strengthened, based on these two elements.

So, the real portfolio associated with the Governance Programme consists of four projects completed or in progress:

No	Project	Period	Budget 2008-11 ¹	Expenditure	%
1	Implementation of the Human Rights, Legal Aid and Anti-Corruption (HR Project)	01/2009-12/2011	617,801.21	329,383.64	54%
2	Strengthening of the Electoral Process 2010 (Elections Projects)	03/2010-12/2011	330,066.00	273,780.31	83%
3	Reduction of disparities of the access to information and services through ICT (ICT Project)	04/2011-12/2013	100,000.00	31,975.00	32%
4	Strengthening of the Parliament	08/2011-07/2015	50,000.00	23,142.00	46%

Failing the attempts to push the public sector reform and participative planning, the real implementation was based on politically possible speaking initiatives and the compromise was achieved for the two most recent initiatives, the strengthening of the Parliament, convened with its Speaker, and the project aimed at reducing disparities through the use of ICTs, also an offer from UNDP which was taken on by the MTCT (Ministry of Transport, Communication and Tourism) and the MDR (Ministry of Regional Development).

The HR Project and the Elections Projects were implemented quite well during the former government, but the HR Project suffered stagnation when the current government came into the power. The late implementation of two of the Parliament and the ICT projects hinders the assessment of their real contribution to the evaluated outcome.

It is recognized that all projects were in line with the national priorities and were also in line with important governance processes. UNDP was a fair partner for its programme counterparts and its major contributions according to its counterparts were: provision of high level technical assistance, inclusion of human rights approach, and innovative ideas.

UNDP is not perceived as a financing agency, it is recognized a role for technical support in sustainable human development themes and of human rights. This recognition gives it an opportunity for advocating for United Nations unique themes, beyond a relationship within the framework of the project's implementation. Some of the interviewed stakeholders expressed that UNDP should advocate for specific human rights themes in front of public actors.

Although the planned program was not executed as expected for reasons beyond the control of the office of UNDP Suriname, there are windows of opportunity to continue supporting Governance processes in this country, for which the UNDP has comparative

¹) Budget and expenditure for the period 2008-2011.

advantage, based on the recognition of professionalism, capacity and seriousness that the actors identified in the UNDP.

The evaluator wants to thank the personnel of the UNDP Office in Suriname and wants to thank interviewed stakeholders for the time and information provided.

1. Introduction

The purpose of the outcome evaluation is to provide substantive direction to the formulation of programme and project strategies; support greater UNDP accountability to national stakeholders and its partners in Suriname; serve as a means of quality assurance for UNDP interventions at the country level, and contribute to learning at corporate, regional and country levels.

The objectives of the outcome evaluation are:

- Improve the implementation of the Democratic Governance Programme and its contribution to the outcomes under the UNDAF/UNDAP 2012-2016, identifying opportunities in support of the Democratic Governance outcomes as formulated in the UNDAF and the Development Plan of Suriname (Ontwikkelings Plan), proposals for synergies with other practice areas such Poverty and Social Development as well as with the Energy and Environment Programme.
- Review the UNDP Suriname Governance Programme with a view to understanding its relevance and contribution to national priorities, for stock taking and lesson learning, and recommending corrections that may be required for enhancing effectiveness of UNDP’s development assistance;
- Review the status of the outcome and the key factors that have affected (both positively and negatively, contributing and constraining) the outcome;
- Assess the extent to which UNDP outputs and implementation arrangements have been effective for building capacities of key institutions which implement government schemes and policies (the nature and extent of the contribution of key partners and the role and effectiveness of partnership strategies in the outcome);
- Review and assess the Programme’s partnership with the government bodies, civil society and private sector and international organizations in Programme;
- Review links/joint activities with other UNDP Programmes and UN Agencies and how these have contributed to the achievement of the outcome
- Provide strong recommendations for future country programme regarding ways in which the UNDP resources can most strategically impact change in capacities of key institutions of the country so that the delivery mechanisms of the Government are

better designed, suit their purpose, and that governance systems put inclusion at the centre of Government efforts, capacity of demand-side local institutions (community, CBOs) to seek accountability is enhanced.

- Through this evaluation UNDP Suriname seeks to understand and articulate the key contributions that the Governance programme has made in the programmes on democratic governance processes, a rigorous analysis of the areas of synergy between the various capacity development strategies adopted within the programme and with other practice areas of UNDP Suriname and recommendations to strengthen UNDP’s interventions in this critical area of engagement with the Government of Suriname.

5

This evaluation will be oriented to provide elements to the Suriname UNDP Office, in order to improve its work in governance issues.

1.1. Background

Democracy in Suriname is young. The country has been independent since 1975, and has had only five electoral processes. The political model is a combination of the Presidential and Parliamentary system. The President is elected by the Parliament, whose members are elected by the people. The President is accountable to the Parliament, but he is also Head of State and the Government. The current Government was sworn-in in August 2010, and as the former, consists of a coalition of diverse political parties and coalition groups, from different ethnical and ideological background. The President and his Cabinet are responsible for the development policies of the country.

The main challenges regarding Governance in Suriname, are improving the public’s sector efficiency and transparency, especially the sector’s reform for guaranteeing rights to indigenous people, diminish violence towards women and increasing awareness and civic participation based on human rights.

The international community with presence in the country is limited and therefore the flow of resources for projects and aid programmes is also limited. In the Governance area, multilateral aid comes through the IADB (Inter-American Development Bank), which has presence with a portfolio related to projects for the modernization of public administration and through the European Union, however Suriname will be excluded from the European Union’s direct aid in 2014; the World Bank does not have a programme with the country. Bilateral aid is also limited, the main donors have been the Netherlands, France, China and India, but since 2010 the Netherlands has significantly decreased its support for development project, claiming political reasons.²

² The current president was accused of crimes against humanity during his previous mandate and the case was kept open until the promulgation of an amnesty law (2012) during his current mandate.

The presence of the United Nations System in the country is limited; it is represented by the UNDP, PAHO/WHO, UNFPA and UNICEF. The UN organizations worked together to develop the first 2008-2012 UNDAF (United Nations Development Assistance Framework). UNDP participated for the first time as independent office.³

The National Development Plan for the period 2006-2011 was the framework for the UNDAF. This Plan identified as a national priority the strengthening of democratic governance, particularly focusing on a legal reform including legal protection in conformity with human rights standards and obligations; and on a public sector reform, including enhanced public participation in decision-making processes and the achievement of the Millennium Development - MDGs.

6

1.2. Approach and Methodology

The subject of this outcome evaluation is selected projects implemented within the framework of the Democratic Governance portfolio. The evaluation assesses the overall result and contribution of the projects towards the UNDAF, Country Programme Action Plan -CPAP and Country Programme Document -CPD. For the period 2008-2011, the democratic governance portfolio was based on UNDAF outcome 2: **“Good governance through decentralized, participatory policy planning and monitoring, legal reform and effective protection system will be enhanced”**. The rationale for this basis lies in the fact that the multi-annual development plan identified effective public sector administration as a key to sustainable human development processes.

Furthermore, this evaluation seeks to improve the implementation of the governance programme and its results under the UNDAF/UNDAP 2012 – 2016. The evaluation tries to identify opportunities to improve the Governance outcomes as formulated in the UNDAF, CPD and National Development Plan of Suriname; to proposed synergies with the other practice areas such as Poverty and Social Development as well as with the Energy and Environment Programme; identify recommendations for future programming in order to improve the UNDP capacities to strengthen institutional performance of public institutions for the formulation and implementation of socially oriented sound policies, and increment social participation and demand-side of communities to seek accountability.

According to the Results Chain, the resources and activities of the projects are inputs to achieve the outputs, and the outputs to achieve outcomes, and outcomes to achieve impacts. However, it is important to understand that the outcomes are not the sum of outputs, but include other elements such as other contributions, policy environment, alliances etc. that should be taken into account when assessing the state of the outcome.

³ Until 2008 the UNDP office depended of the Representation located in Trinidad and Tobago.

The evaluation assessed the design, performance and the capacity of each project to fulfill their objectives and their contribution (positive or negative) to the correspondent outcome. So this evaluation is based on an inductive process, putting the emphasis on the assessment of results at output and outcome levels.

Methodological route will be: INPUTS → ACTIVITIES → OUTPUTS → OUTCOME

7

Criteria and Evaluation questions

The evaluated outcome is: **"Good governance through decentralized, participatory policy planning and monitoring, legal reform and effective protection system will be enhanced"**.

The central question of the evaluation is to what extent UNDP actions have contributed to the state of the governance system in Suriname at the end of 2011, and if the situation was better than in 2008 because of its contribution. In addition, the evaluation will also assess if there were other contributors to the outcome.

The evaluated criteria are the relevance, efficiency, effectiveness and sustainability of the results of the selected programmes and changes in the expected outcome obtained.

Relevance: The extent to which assistance is suited to the priorities and policies of the target group, recipient and donors. This is an assessment of the design of the evaluated subject.

Effectiveness: A measure of the extent to which the expected results (outputs, outcomes) have been achieved. It's an identification of the positive or negative factors that have influenced and identification of possible unexpected results. For outcome evaluation purposes, the effectiveness assessment should concentrate on the key contributions of UNDP.

Efficiency: An economic term which signifies that development aid uses the least costly resources possible in order to achieve the desired results; and generally requires comparing alternative approaches to achieving the same outputs, to see whether the most efficient process has been adopted, comparing experiences in the programme.

Sustainability: Assessing the probability that the benefits of an activity are likely to continue after the programme cycle.

The cross cutting issues assessed are: i) Human rights; ii) Gender Equality; iii) Capacity development; iv) Institutional strengthening; v) Innovation or added value to national development.

Methodological approach:

The evaluation was done in line with the key UNDP and UN evaluation guidance. As established by the UNDP Companion guide for Outcome Evaluations, the UNDP Handbook for planning, monitoring and evaluating development results, and UN standards and norms for evaluations, this evaluation is not to assess projects, but **the contribution of the projects to the expected results and their relationship to the effect of the programme of UNDP Democratic Governance in Suriname.**

Methods of data collection

The evaluation obtained information through primary and secondary sources, a combination of quantitative and qualitative methods: i) Supporting documents were reviewed; ii) Working meetings with management and UNDP Suriname officials, both current and those who were in charge of some of the initiatives; and, iii) Open interviews and / or semi-structured with related partners and stakeholders.

Limitations during the evaluation

As it was foreseen in the inception report, the second half of December was not a good time to schedule meetings with public officials; this, added to the short time dedicated to field work, has meant the absence of some relevant information for the analysis based on triangulated information.

Another important restriction is that neither the programme, nor the projects have progress reports, which reflect the activities and the financial execution performed by year.

An attempt was made to collect more information through an online survey during the month of February 2013, but only two responses were received.

Even though we had the documents of the UNDAF, the CPD and the PRODOCs, there is no overall Governance Strategy document that could explain the logic and the strategies that were planned by UNDP, in order to achieve the evaluated outcome, neither the used strategies. The projects lack clear objectives, results and indicators with baseline. This situation, as it was manifested by UNDP officers responds to the demand of information that is requested by UNDP's automatized system.

The consultant interviewed the UNDP team in order to reconstruct the achievements in each project during the period 2008-2011, and collected written information that confirm the information provided by the UNDP team.

2. Development context of the country

Suriname is a country with fairly young democracy and according to the Barometer of the Americas of the year 2010; its society considers it a stable democracy. Some international

recognized Governance indicators (as the World Bank Governance Indicators) identify Surinam as a democratic country.

The country’s political system is complex; approximate 40 political parties exist within a population of approximately 500 thousand inhabitants, whose population concentration is found in the capital and along the coastal area. In the electoral processes, the political parties participate through coalitions; in 2010 the main opposing coalition triumphed. Through direct voting, 51 members of the parliament were elected and these at the same time elected the President of the Republic, once elected he becomes Chief of State and Government.

The current president Desiré Delano Bouterse, was elected through large parliamentary majority, he had already been previously at the head of the government, during a period identified in some documents and by interviewed people, as a military dictatorship, and it is recognized-by these same sources-as an authority with a great control over the country’s political events.

The main challenges regarding governance in Suriname as identified by the interviewed parties, both public and civil society, are: public sector reform, protection of the rights of indigenous and maroons, violence against women, the improvement of the electoral processes, the transparency of the public management (anti-corruption) and the civic participation based on better awareness of citizen’s rights.

The reform of the public sector has been a pending aspect in the national agenda since a decade, however the solutions that have been presented to the different governments, included the reduction of the number of public employees (the State is the country’s main employer and covers 40% of the total employment). Some interviewees recognize public employment as a mechanism for the redistribution of national rent, but the immobility of employment generates supernumerary staff which lack functions, and therefore lack of efficiency and management effectiveness.

Recognition of the indigenous and maroon people’s rights and also the fight against corruption constitute another complex political challenge, expressed by various development stakeholders; however, there is no consensus on the strategies to follow.

3. Description of UNDP’s work

What is expressed in this paragraph has been collected in interviews, conducted with various project partners, included in this programme and to the UNDP officers, which follow up on this programme. Unfortunately we were not able to interview everyone involved, particularly the Ministry of Home Affairs and the Inter-American Bank for Development, neither do we have a technical or financial reporting system, which support in greater detail the progress of work of UNDP in Suriname.

Taking into consideration that the key questions of this evaluation are: i) To what extent UNDP actions have contributed to the state of a governance system in Suriname at the end of 2011, and if the situation was better than in 2008 because of its contribution? And ii) What has been the underlying logic of the governance programme 2008-2011?.

3.1. The planned Governance Programme 2008-2011

The Outcome 2 of the CPD was planned in 2007, in order to be reached through different initiatives during the period 2008-2011. If the preparation activities previous to 2008 are taken into consideration, it can be stated that UNDP produced relevant and sufficient information for arguing the selection of the programme’s pillars. The foreseen programme’s pillars were the public sector reform and the creation of participative mechanisms in the decentralized planning and the monitoring of policies.

Both pillars required a real commitment and political will on behalf of the government, and although at first it was so, when the costs of the political reform where taking into consideration and due also to the proximity of the electoral process, this official support didn’t happened, as was expressed in the undertaken interviews and prevented the materialization of the reform.

The selection of the outcomes obeyed the convergence of the governmental priorities on that period, with development agencies such as IADB and UNDP⁴. It is recognized by different interviewees that the reform to the public sector and the improvement of the planning and participation system constitute priorities for the country’s Governance.

The logic behind the evaluated Outcome is not written in any document known by the present team; it is rather a deduction of the outcomes and outputs associated to it and of the previewed and undertaken initiatives. The affirmation expressed in the terms of reference of this evaluation, as the programme’s logic can be taken: According to the CPD 2008 – 2011, and the projects associated to the Outcome 2, the priorities for this period were:

1. Support the formulation of a national public sector reform programme and enhancing the capacity of government and non-state actors to formulate and implement policies that ensure effective public services. In conjunction with other United Nations organizations, the programme would support national efforts to address human security, legal reform and protection issues.
2. Strengthened participatory planning and monitoring are national priorities in the area of good governance. UNDP intended to support efforts to develop effective

⁴ The Development Plan of Suriname 2006-2011, as well as the UNDAF 2008-2011, and according to some sources, the programme of the IADB, coincides in the priorities for Governance.

participatory mechanisms in development policy formulation and monitoring. These would focus on enhancing the capacity of local and traditional authorities and non-state actors to participate in policy-making and monitoring; generate and disseminate information on the MDGs and development plans and policies; and plan and implement development projects.

3. Supported building capacity for promotion and protection of human rights and strengthening democracy. This included training and awareness-raising activities among non-governmental and grassroots organizations to better prepare them to promote human rights and education among their constituents. It also included access-to-justice outreach campaigns for the general public, campaigns that focused on legislation and recourse to the law. There was a voter education programme and training for officials responsible for conducting elections 2010, as well as technical briefings for parliamentarians and institutional strengthening of the Parliament to help it undertake its legislative, oversight and representational functions.
4. With funds received out of the DGTTF, UNDP Suriname also started implementation of a programme aimed at reducing disparities in access to information between the coastal and hinterland areas through the use of ICTs.

According to the CPD 2008-2011, the expected results framework, was as follows:

<p>CPD Outcome 2.</p> <p>"Good governance through <u>decentralized</u>, participatory policy planning and monitoring, legal reform and effective protection system will be enhanced".</p>
<p>Indicators:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Adoption of PRS programme by Council of Ministers ○ Implementation mechanism in place ○ Existence and extent to which the capacity strengthening programme has been implemented ○ Percentage of key documents (Plan, regional Multi-Annual Development and district development plans) in which there has been demonstrable citizens participation
<p>Outcome 2.2</p> <p>The public sector will be strengthened to effectively and efficiently fulfill its role of policy guidance, coordination and facilitation of sustainable human development processes.</p>
<p>Outputs</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ A programme for public sector reform formulated and being implemented based on a process of broad stakeholder consultation and on national ownership and leadership ○ Government and non-state actors have formulated and started to implement and

monitor policies, legislation, standards and budgetary processes that ensure more effective and efficient public services, focusing on development results for all citizens, particularly disadvantaged groups
Outcome 2.3 Citizens participate more effectively in decentralized planning, decision making, implementation and monitoring
Outputs <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Mechanisms are in place to ensure the participation of rights-holders and stakeholders in the development, implementation and monitoring of the MDGs, national and other development plans and policies, and local level development projects. ○ Demonstrable input of local authorities, traditional authorities, private sector, NGO and other civil society actors in policy- making processes and in the planning, monitoring and implementation of development projects and programmes.

According to this information obtained from the UNDAF and the CDP 2008-2011, and according to the interviews with UNDP officers, it can be confirmed that it had been foreseen to achieve those purposes, through the following initiatives: i) a public sector reform; ii) a support Project to set up a mechanism to enable coordination of international aid; iii) a support Project for citizen participation in the planning and the monitoring of policies at decentralized level; iv) a support project regarding the electoral process and v) a Human Rights legal aid and anti-corruption project (hereinafter as Human Rights Project). Only the elections project⁵ and sector public reform were in coordination with IADB. Only the projects that support the electoral process and human rights could be executed. According to diverse interviewed sources, the non-execution of the projects whose implementation was suspended was due to changes in the political priorities of the government on-duty.

During the evaluated period, two projects were incorporated which initiated in the year 2011: the strengthening of the Parliament and the reduction of disparities in the access to public information and services through ICT. Furthermore, it was also possible to participate in a regional initiative, the Human Development Report of the Caribbean, dedicated to the citizen security subject matter.

⁵ IADB financed through UNDP mechanism some communications activities in the Elections Project.

3.2. The Governance Programme implemented between 2008-2011

The portfolio associated to the Governance Programme consists of four projects completed or in progress, and one identified initiative previous to the beginning of this evaluation. Next we will present a summary of the achievements of each associated project.

3.2.1. Project: Strengthening of the Parliament

13

The project's implementation period is from August 2011-July 2015. Within the evaluated period, only the undertaken activities between august and December 2011 are valued, and the preparatory activities in the year previous to the project's start (2010). The partner of UNDP is the Parliament and the Project is directed directly by the President of Parliament.

The project seeks: *Enhanced legislative, oversight and representative function of parliament; stronger administration in parliament, institutional strengthening framework and gender policy in place.*

Within the project's framework, four work sessions with members of the parliament and experts provided by UNDP and UN System were undertaken in the following themes: Climate change, Housing, Doing Business in Suriname and Non communicable diseases.

In this same period the Parliament was equipped with desktop, laptop and multimedia for the plenary hall. A field visit was organized so that parliamentarians could confirm in situ the impact of mercury in the environment.

It is too early to know if these provisions for parliamentary work would have a direct effect in the quality of legislation, but it constitutes a Project with a high potential due to the role played by the parliament in the system and the political model of the country, due to the strong support of the Speaker of the Parliament and for having resources from the Government for its implementation.

According to what was collected from the opinion of diverse actors, themes about human rights, indigenous and maroon people, public sector reform, anti-corruption, should be integrated in the agenda of the Parliament.

We were able to interview the Speaker of the Parliament and the project's technical partner.

The Budget implementation of the year 2011 was of USD 23,000 from a Budget of USD 50,000.00 for a minor implementation to 50%.

3.2.2. Project: Strengthening of the Electoral Process 2010

The implementation process was from March 2010 to December 2011. This project was implemented in co-financing with IDB and had three Project partners, the Ministry for Home Affairs (MHA) and the Independent Electoral Council, and the Democracy Unit of the University of Suriname.

The Independent Electoral Council with support from UNDP was able to train 45 public officers and 683 electoral observers for improving their performance during the electoral process of 2010.

A media campaign-directed by the same MHA- through newspaper articles and paid advertisements in newspapers, TV and radio provided information to citizens about the electoral process.

An analysis of the feasibility of the electronic vote was undertaken, also a visit to Brazil, in order to get to learn about the experience of this country. The government decided that it wasn't possible to install that technology in Suriname for the elections of 2010. The MHA requested visiting India's experience, but it wasn't approved.

Two seminars were undertaken at the University of Suriname, on behalf of the Democracy Unit, which produced two Reports on the discussion on post electoral strengthening: "Election 2010: A more In Depth Study (10 and 11 December 2010)", this two-day seminar was undertaken after elections in 2010 in collaboration with the Democracy Unit. The seminar was aimed at evaluating the role of political parties and the media during the elections.

The seminar on Anti-Corruption which this booklet refers to was held in commemoration of Democracy Month in 2010. The seminar was organized by the Democracy Unit and UNDP also gave technical assistance from UNDP. The report was named "Crusade against corruption: An interesting perspective or fighting windmills? (5 November 2010)". Both seminars were attended by representatives of political parties, media and the academy.

The following studies were undertaken: i) Needs Assessment report for electoral process- 2009; ii) Recommendation for National ID Cards; iii) Recommendation for Suriname voters list. The recommendations of these studies, up to what was known, were not taken into consideration by the government.

We were not able to interview the counterpart of this project.

The implemented Budget was of USD 273,780.00, from an estimated of USD 330,066.00, for an implementation of 83%.

3.2.3. Project: Implementation of the Human Rights, Legal Aid and Anti-Corruption.

This is the Project with the highest implementation period, since it started in the year 2009 and was finalized in the year 2012. It has three components; out of which-according to the interviewees-one was the most advanced one. However, in the interview with the institution in charge, the amount of activities in the evaluated period was limited.

With regards to Human Rights, the project aims to increase knowledge, awareness and skills of decision makers dealing with human rights and international conventions of the United Nations system and enhanced public awareness of their human rights.

- UNDP supported the Human Rights Bureau of the Ministry of Justice and Police. This office has few personnel and its functions are concentrated in elaborating the reports for the human rights treaties, signed by Suriname. An inter-ministerial committee was constituted that follows-up on the treaties.
- An annual work plan was drafted and approved for the Human Rights Bureau in 2009, and a postgraduate study in human rights was organized for public officers.
- A communication strategy on human rights was elaborated, but not implemented.
- Training was provided to NGO's and journalists on the Human Rights theme.

The component of Access to Justice aims to increase knowledge of the general public and vulnerable groups of their rights under the law and their enhanced capacity to access the justice system and claim those rights.

- Support was provided to the legal aid office, through a study for improving its organizational development. The recommendations have not been fully implemented.
- The Anticorruption component has as objective strengthening effective public institutions for the prevention and management of corruption, and the public sensitized to the negative development impacts and mechanisms for preventing and managing corruption.
- Training in corruption awareness was undertaken for representatives of communication media.

The Project partner of this project is the Ministry of Justice and Police, and an implementing unit was created in charge of the implementation conformed by officers of diverse engaged agencies. Starting in 2011, this project has diminished its implementation rhythm due to changes in authorities and the Ministry's personnel. We were not able to obtain an interview with the authorities of the Ministry, but we interviewed the Human Rights Bureau which is an agency of the Ministry.

The implemented Budget in the period was of USD 329,383.64, for a planned total of 617,801.21, for an implementation of the 54%.

3.2.4. Project: Reduction of disparities of the access to information and services through ICT.

According to the programme document, this project is related to Outcome 1, but it is being implemented within the portfolio of Outcome 2. It is a project financed by UNDP's democracy fund.

The purpose of the Project is to provide quality public information to communities within the country, through electronic media and reduce gaps for the access to information. The implementation period is from April 2011 to December 2013.

The only result for 2011 was: A strategy for service provision too difficult to reach hinterland communities using ICTs as a delivery modality;

According to the undertaken interviews, in the period the formulation of the strategy initiated in 2011 and finalized in 2012. The strategy is currently the reference framework of the actions undertaken by the MTCT in the project. We were able to obtain interviews with the Ministry of Transport, Communication and Tourism, and the Ministry of Regional Development and we were able to confirm that both Ministries are very interested in the Project, but that serious problems exist with regards to the coordination and the communication between them.

The implemented Budget in the period was of 31,975.00, from an estimate of USD 100,000.00, for a 32% of its implementation.

3.2.5. Other initiatives within the Governance Programme:

The Caribbean Human Development Report 2012: Human Development and the shift to better citizen security.

It is a regional study based on national studies of the different participating countries. The elaboration of the national study implied the development of consultations to different social actors, which promoted a debate on the country's challenges about the security topic. According to one interviewed officer, the President of the Republic agree with the findings of the study and it is expected that the Ministry of Justice and the Police takes up the recommendations of the same one.

In summary, the result of the implementation of the initiatives versus the planned results is the following:

CPD Outcome 2.

"Good governance through decentralized, participatory policy planning and monitoring, legal reform and effective protection system will be enhanced".

Indicators	Advance
Adoption of PRS programme by Council of Minister	No adoption of PRS by Council of Minister
Implementation mechanism in place	No mechanism implemented
Existence and extent to which capacity strengthening programme has been implemented;	No programme PRS implemented
Percentage of key documents (Multi-Annual Development Plan, regional and district development plans) in which there has been demonstrable citizens participation	No action with UNDP support to guarantee citizen participation in national, regional or district planning.
Outcome 2.2	Results
The public sector will be strengthened to effectively and efficiently fulfill its role of policy guidance, coordination and facilitation of sustainable human development processes.	The public sector has been slightly strengthened through the implemented initiatives by the UNDP, but at the end of the period, two projects were initiated with high potential. Especially because they have political and technical support of the public actors involved and have as a focus for important processes such as governance of the country's legislation and access to public information.
Output	Results
A programme for public sector reform formulated and being implemented based on a process of broad stakeholder consultation and on national ownership and leadership	There was not a programme for the public sector reform. The explanation that was received on behalf of some of the interviewed people is that in the previous or in the present government, no political will existed for taking over the consequences of an eventual reduction of the positions in the public sector.
Output	Results
Government and non-state actors have formulated and started to implement and monitor policies, legislation, standards and budgetary processes	Strategy for broadening the access to public information through the internet and radio programmes in native languages (2011). Strengthening of an electoral observation

that ensure more effective and efficient public services, focusing on development results for all citizens, particularly disadvantaged groups	network. (2010) Strengthening the capacity of the parliamentarians for legislating with a rights focus. (2011)
Outcome 2.3	Results
Citizens participate more effectively in decentralized planning, decision making, implementation and monitoring	There is no effective citizen participation in the planning, decision making, etc. In this period, product of the programme.
Output	Results
Mechanisms are in place to ensure the participation of rights-holders and stakeholders in the development, implementation and monitoring of the MDGs, national and other development plans and policies, and local level development projects.	There are no installed mechanisms for guaranteeing participation in this period, product of the programme.
Output	Results
Demonstrable input of local authorities, traditional authorities, private sector, NGO and other civil society actors in policy-making processes and in the planning, monitoring and implementation of development projects and programmes.	There is no input on behalf of the local and traditional authorities, private sector or OSC in processes of formulation of policies etc., in this period, product of the programme.

3.3. Planning, monitoring and evaluation system

The planning, monitoring and evaluation system of the UNDP office of Suriname responds to the demands of the UNDP's institutional system. This results in that there are no comprehensive annual plans of all the work of the office of UNDP, but what it shares with other agencies. In the annual work plan of the years 2010 and 2011, the activities of the outcomes appear shared between the agencies of the UN System, the AWP 2008 and 2009 couldn't be revised.

There is a monitoring report with general information at the outcome level, which consists in the Report (ROAR), where internal valuations are found on the advancements undertaken during the year, but the achievement of the activities is not detailed. This

means that the projects included in this evaluation don’t have annual reports that describe the undertaken activities.

At the project level, coordination spaces and follow-up of the implementation of projects are also needed, most notably when there is more than one executor engaged. Many a time no follow-up committee was in place to track the progress of the projects.

3.4. Coordination of cooperation with other agencies

19

3.4.1. With other agencies of the system:

The perception of the different people interviewed, is that in effect the United Nations System works in a coordinated way. The formulation process of the UNDAF, the Annual Work Plans, and the conjoint activities such as the support to Parliament, confirms it. The partners of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and of the Parliament, they expressed that working with UNDP is working with the UN System and this is a factor which gives seriousness to the initiatives. It was also affirmed that through UNDP it is viable to access the other agencies of the SNU, for example to UNICEF, PAHO, and UNFPA.

3.4.2. With other donors and international partners:

Throughout the period, a larger coordination with the IDB was searched for, which was only achieved in the Project for the strengthening of the electoral process, the World Bank doesn’t have presence in the country. There are a few bilateral donors, the most important one has been the Dutch aid, which has reduced its support due to political reasons and because it’s reorienting its external relations, so that the capacity for mobilizing resources and for coordinating actions with traditional bilateral agencies, is very limited. There is no evidence of south-south cooperation linked to UNDP.

4. Development results

4.1. Relevance

The planned programme -although not implemented- was aligned to the priorities of the country’s Development Plan, even-though the conditions for its implementation changed, the themes continued to be important in the national agenda.

In relation to the implemented programme, each initiative is being or was implemented in the institutional plans of each one of the entities. The Parliament, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the Ministry of Transport, Communications and Tourism, the Ministry of Justice and Police have incorporated the activities in their institutional implementation and those inputs that are not considered feasible to resume, are obviated and not taken into consideration.

The Government of Suriname has reinforced its role as coordinator of all the initiatives that will be undertaken during its administration by the different aid agencies.

4.2. Effectiveness

Out of the four implemented projects, only one was finalized in the evaluated period. Two recently initiated in the second semester of 2011 and one had an acceptable implementation period until the change of government in the year 2010. The finalized project consisted in supporting the electoral process of 2010, especially the performance of the electoral observers, in this case what was planned, was performed. The other project that initiated its implementation in 2009 is the one on human rights, legal assistance and anti-corruption, whose objective was to increase the citizen consciousness over their rights, unfortunately it was only partially implemented when undertaking training activities and the public awareness activities were not implemented.

The set of implemented initiatives results insufficient, given to other partner's actions (or lack thereof) to assuring that there was an achievement of results, in function of Outcome 2.

4.3. Efficiency

We had access to general data on the financial implementation of the initiatives.

Project	2009		2010		2011		Total	
	Budget	Expenditure	Budget	Expenditure	Budget	Expenditure	Budget	Expenditure
HR and Anticorruption	222,016.00	106,083.64	283,689.21	171,593.00	112,096.00	51,707.00	617,801.21	329,383.64
Elections	-	-	330,066.00	273,780.31	-	-	330,066.00	273,780.31
Parliament	-	-	-	-	50,000.00	23,142.00	50,000.00	23,142.00
ICT	-	-	-	-	100,000.00	31,975.00	100,000.00	31,975.00
TOTAL	222,016.00	106,083.64	613,755.21	445,373.31	262,096.00	106,824.00	1097,867.21	658,280.95

According to these data, the degree of the project's financial implementation was of the 60%, with some differences between projects. The intervention with a good level of implementation was the Elections project, those two projects that began in 2011 have the opportunity to improve their performance, but the Human Rights project is finishing with a 53% of financial implementation.

To this information, another problem of inefficiency is added and it is that an important investment of resources exists in previous studies to the projects that were not undertaken, communication strategies of the ongoing projects that were not implemented, reports with recommendations for different processes in the public sector, that were never taken into consideration. It would be an interesting exercise that the

office of Suriname would take a recount of the prepared documents and of the ones not utilized in the evaluated and in the current period, and the cost of the same ones. The investment in a huge number of non-used studies and written proposal was inefficient.

We didn't obtain any data on the financial implementation of each one of projects by year; therefore we are not able to value the efficiency of the different actions, for example of the training actions and of capacity-building, which occupied an important place in each Project.

4.4. Sustainability

When there exists a high degree of appropriation on behalf of the government, the probability that the actions are held in time, is real. However, many of the recommendations haven't been adopted and the personnel assigned by the government to the various projects have been changed since the new government came into office, especially with the case of the Project on Human Rights, legal assistance and anti-corruption, which has occasioned that the project's historic memory is lost and its results. The projects do not have exit strategies or any agreements that may sustain the achieved results.

4.5. Cross-cutting themes

4.5.1. Gender

The gender topic doesn't appear as relevant in the logic of the outcome. We find a specific mention in the Project on the strengthening of the Parliament, but for future activities. The theme of women and politics was widely mentioned as a strategy for the strengthening the country's governance. Here exists a very relevant opportunity for improvement. In the project documents this topic was not taken into account, except in the already mentioned project.

In the Human Rights project document (PRODOC), is mentioned the necessity to protect Women Rights, but in the results and activities was not integrated.

4.5.2. Human rights

Human Rights have been the main topic of the Project that has been implemented in the evaluated period. Additionally, during the previous government the project had been at the center its agenda and was part of a public policy. However, the awareness towards citizenship, for incorporating to their citizen practices the exercise of their human rights, was never implemented due to fear in increasing a demand that could not be attended, which implies that the support to Human Rights issues was more at the level of the

reporting capacities and for the focus of public officers, than for the increase of the active citizenship in the defense of their rights.

The Human Rights approach as such was not in the design of the other interventions, but the main focus in all of them in the social inclusion and to assist vulnerable groups.

4.5.3. Capacity Development

One strategy of all the projects associated to this Outcome is the development of capacities of the relevant actors of each initiative through *Training*. The Human Rights Project planned and undertook capacity-building activities with journalists, public officers, on human rights and anti-corruption. Even-though most of the events were undertaken in the year 2012, in the evaluated period one event with journalists took place, which is considered as the first one of a series of training activities.

The strengthening project of the electoral process consisted in training officers and electoral observers with manuals provided for improving their performance. The strengthening of the Parliament has focused its effort in strengthening capacities of the staff of the Parliament and the parliamentarians through briefing sessions and a legislative training course. The project for the reduction of disparities hasn't implemented activities in this sense, but they are already planned according to the PRODOC.

It can be affirmed that the strengthening of capacities of the actors through training activities, has been a common strategy to all implemented or undertaken initiatives.

4.5.4. Institutional Strengthening

The Human Rights project tried to strengthen institutionalism dedicated in addressing these issues, which was worked on intensively in the year 2010, such as strengthened the Human Right Office, Legal Aid Office, and Anticorruption Unit. However the advancements have weakened since the change of authorities and the recommendations of the main studies haven't been taken up by Ministry of Justice and Police. With regards to the project on the reduction of disparities of the access to information, it is expected that the strategy will be the roadmap of the government's actions in that topic. The project on the Parliament has initiated and has a lot of potential with regards to strengthening the processes of that institution, because the conditions of political and technical support are –so far- guaranteed. The support project to the electoral process has already supported the institutionalization of electoral observation, for a second time, as a practice that improves the transparency of the electoral process.

4.5.5. Innovation and value added to national development

Without any doubt, the Project for the reduction of disparities of the access to information and services through ICT is very innovative; that it is how it is recognized by

the partners and by the UNDP. The project for the strengthening of the parliament has added value to the results of the law formation process, when incorporating new approaches to the knowledge heritage of the current congressmen. Electoral observation constitutes an idea that adds value to the development of political processes.

5. Conclusions

The outcome is based on two pillars: reform to the public sector and the institutionalization of participation mechanisms in decentralized planning. Two processes depending on the will of the executive power and of the legislative at its highest level. None of the processes took place and both pillars were not materialized, and therefore governance wasn't strengthened, based on these two elements.

The proposed outcomes and outputs for the period 2008-2011 include solid preparation processes. Two document projects: one for the implementation of the public sector reform and another for evaluating the capacities of the development actors of Suriname, were designed. The implementation project of the reform was never implemented, but the capacity-building project resulted in three documents: an analysis of the public institutions, an analysis of the private sector and an analysis of the OSC. Non-of them used by the Government, but the OSC Assessment was used in a European Union project.

Due to political reasons, the public sector reform never initiated. A shared worry existed between public actors, the IADB and UNDP, in searching for options to that reform, however the solutions that were proposed to the Government on behalf of a study hired by the IDB, involved political costs, which the Government was unwilling to pay.

Despite countless attempts in resuming the theme on behalf of IDB and UNDP, the previous government wasn't consenting in continuing the dialogue and in the pre and electoral years, there was no possibility for reinitiating this challenge. The new government hasn't integrated the reform to his immediate priorities.

The UNDP Governance agenda in 2008 was shared with IDB, also the reform and the eventual participation system for the decentralized planning, constituted themes for a tripartite dialogue. The agenda as a whole did not prosper. The IDB reoriented his efforts for the modernization of the public finances and the UNDP to human rights, legal assistance and anti-corruption projects and also in supporting the electoral process of 2010. The emerging agenda of the UNDP was centered on themes related to the access of public information, strengthening of the parliament and the regional report on citizen security, all the initiatives that initiated in the middle and at the end of the evaluated period.

Failing the attempts to push the public sector reform and participative planning, the real implementation was based on politically possible speaking initiatives and the compromise

was achieved for the two most recent initiatives, the strengthening of the Parliament, convened with the president of the same one, and the one for the reduction of access to information disparities, through the ICT, also an offer from UNDP which was taken on by the MTCT and the MDR.

The late implementation of the four projects hinders evaluating its real contribution to the evaluated outcome.

It is recognized that all projects were in line with the national priorities and were also in line with important governance processes. UNDP was a fair partner for its programme counterparts and its major contribution according to its counterparts were: provision of high level technical assistance, inclusion of human rights approach, and innovative ideas.

UNDP is not perceived as a financing agency, it is recognized a role for technical support in sustainable human development themes and of human rights. This recognition gives it an opportunity for advocating for United Nations unique themes, beyond a relationship within the framework of the project's implementation. Diverse actors expect that UNDP will advocate for specific human rights themes in front of public actors.

UNDP's work in the Governance theme includes many challenges:

- How to guarantee the sustainability of the political will in a diverse environment of political stakeholders that take part in decision-making regarding structural reforms in the country.
- How to take advantage of the windows of opportunities, of temporary consensus between these collective actors.
- How to integrate its fundamentals and principles in a conjoint agenda with the government
- How to advocate for stakeholders to be included in the setting of the national agenda?
- How to identify and take advantage of opportunities in the political/developmental context with normally ear-marked resources.
- How to improve its strategic and operational system of planning and monitoring, taking into account that it's a small office.
- How to mobilize resources for its programme in a middle income country with small donor communities.
- How to improve the internal and external coordination in each project and in the programme.

6. Lessons learnt

Due to the observed setbacks in the negotiation of projects that didn't had good success, it could be affirmed that in the political culture of Suriname, real politics constitutes a strong practice, which hinders that the agreements last, or that they last as long as they are useful to the officers.

Temporary windows of opportunities exist while the commitments between the official political actors and of opposition last. These political moments cannot be lost in very lengthy preparations, because the political opportunity is lost.

Without the compromise of different relevant political entities it is not viable to initiate structural reforms or political reforms. This makes reference to the fact that it is necessary to have the approval of the council of ministers and of the President of the Republic, knowing beforehand that they are not willing to pay the reform costs.

A good experience has been the co-financed projects, because the participation of the government is guaranteed and with little resources, financial resources are mobilized in the country, in sustainable initiatives and definitely in line with the priorities of the country.

All initiatives have been based on previous studies, which provide solidity to the interventions. These studies have been coordinated and accepted by the public institutions and represent a heritage of knowledge and strategies to follow for the different selected themes.

7. Recommendations

For guaranteeing the sustainability of the political will in a diverse environment of political stakeholders that take part in decision-making regarding structural reforms in the country.

According to some of the interviewed people, UNDP needs to negotiate a support agenda for the country with the highest level of the government, in this sense with the President of the Republic; otherwise it won't be possible to establish any initiative which would imply structural changes in the country's Governance.

In order to take advantage of the temporary windows of opportunities between these collective actors, it should be possible to establish a flexible fund for resources that would allow initiating actions in a fast pace, while carefully mobilizing resources of the Suriname government.

It is important to establish political dialogue with the government coalition, but also maintaining communication with the opposing coalitions in order to measure the level of consensus that would be achieved by any initiative that wants to be set forth.

How to integrate its fundamentals and principles in a common agenda with the government?

UNDP can have a very important role as a merging point for different actors, around the unique themes of the United Nations. Celebration of democracy fairs, conferences regarding human rights, indigenous and maroon people, women, youth, can constitute scenarios where public-private dialogues can be promoted, engaging the University, NGO's, the international community, the private sector and also the governmental institutions.

For the political dialogue with the government, UNDP needs to establish with clarity which are its work principles so that no mistrust exists with regards to the defense of principles such as transparency, participation, rights of vulnerable groups, etc.

How to advocate for stakeholders to be included in the setting of the national agenda?

Just like the previous recommendation, UNDP can organize discussion meetings with social actors, the academy, the private sector, in order to obtain inputs for its own work and for promoting the prioritized themes in the common agenda that should have with the government. UNDP can contribute to build an inclusive and participatory national agenda.

How to identify and take advantage of opportunities in the political/developmental context with normally ear-marked resources?

Processes exist that are farther away from the agenda of the political elite, which are fundamental for sustainable human development. Particularly, two can be mentioned: the initiatives for incrementing the access of citizenry to public information and the decentralization process. Both are located in the Ministries which are already implementing an initiative of the Governance programme and are willing to continue working with UNDP. Both issues give the great opportunity to link activities with the other UNDP programmes.

How to improve its strategic and operational system of planning and monitoring, taking into account that it's a small office?

A strategy will have to be designed, aimed at analyzing the country's governance/political situation and determining a programmatic strategy for UNDP, taking into account the global and national priorities. In no document it is stated, which strategy it is. The problem of lacking a strategic document is that the historic memory of the programme will be lost with change of officers of UNDP.

It is necessary to have annual plans per Project and their respective advancement reports, which will have to be elaborated by the partner projects in charge of its implementation.

How to mobilize resources for its programme in a middle income country with a small donor community?

The mobilization of resources of the same Government of Suriname is presented as a good lesson and election. When the Government places own resources in an initiative, it is a good sign that it is part of its priorities. Such is the case of the support project to the Parliament, where head of the Parliament (the Speaker) is the one in charge of directing the project's activities.

IADB, World Bank may be interested in the project with the Parliament. This is a very important entry point for many donors that want to assure political sustainability for their aid.

There are traditional and non-traditional donors for Suriname, such as Korea, China, and India which could be financial partners for UNDP.

How to improve the internal coordination in each project and in the programme?

It would be that coordination committees are conformed and for the follow-up of each Project, especially when there is more than one implementing institution, as is the case of the Project for the reduction of disparities in the access for information and services through the ICT. Based on an annual plan, trimestral follow-up meetings can be established.

How to improve the implementation of the Democratic Governance Programme under the UNDAF/UNDAP 2012-2016: *Outcome 2: By 2016, government formulates and implements harmonized, equity focused, and gender sensitive MDG-oriented key legislation, policies, and budgets in accordance with the Government's commitments to international human rights conventions and other internationally agreed development goals.*

The outcome has been elaborated in a way that it can give place to diverse initiatives that take into account favorable political moments. This flexibility in the writing needs to be accompanied by flexible intervention mechanisms, such as a Project for the strengthening for the formulation and follow-up of public policies, particularly those that promote the reduction of social disparities. A mechanism as such can be linked and can be shared with the other programmes derivate from the UNDAF 2012-2016 such as the one on Poverty and Social Development as well as with the Energy and Environment Programme.

Some initiatives that promote enabling environments for an active citizenship at decentralized level can be very convenient for the programme’s synergy. With the project for the access to information, a huge step has been taken in that sense.

8. Annexe

- ToRs
- List of actors interviewed or consulted
- List of supporting documents reviewed
- Brief CV/biography of evaluator
- Code of Conduct signed by the evaluator
- Internal protocol conduct
- Evaluation Matrix

Annex 1: Terms of Reference for Outcome Evaluation Democratic Governance - UNDP Suriname

A. Background and Context

UNDP’s corporate policy is to evaluate its development cooperation with the host government on a regular basis in order to assess whether and how UNDP-funded interventions contribute to the achievement of agreed outcomes, i.e. changes in the development situation and ultimately in people’s lives. This implies that, in evaluating the country office performance, there is a need to ascertain whether and how UNDP assisted in bringing changes in human development conditions. This includes changes in individuals, institutions and systems that have been targeted. It is also intended to clarify underlying factors affecting the development situation, identify unintended consequences (positive and negative), generate lessons learned and recommend actions to improve performance in future programming and partnership development.

The subject of this outcome evaluation will be selected projects implemented within the framework of the Democratic Governance portfolio as summarized in Annex D. The evaluation should assess the overall result and contribution of the projects towards the UNDAF, CPAP and CPD. For the period 2008-2011, the democratic governance portfolio was based on UNDAF outcome 2: **governance systems are enhanced through participatory planning and monitoring, public sector reform, legal reform and protection**. The rationale for this basis lies in the fact that the multi-annual development plan identified effective public sector administration as key to sustainable human development processes.

As indicated in the CPD 2008 – 2011, support would be provided to formulation of a national public sector reform programme and would focus on enhancing the capacity of government and non-state actors to formulate and implement policies that ensure effective public services. In conjunction with other United Nations organizations, the programme would support national efforts to address human security, legal reform and protection issues.

Strengthened participatory planning and monitoring are national priorities in the area of good governance. UNDP intended to support efforts to develop effective participatory mechanisms in development policy formulation and monitoring. These would focus on enhancing the capacity of local and traditional authorities and non-state actors to participate in policy-making and monitoring; generate and disseminate information on the MDGs and development plans and policies; and plan and implement development projects.

Under the DG portfolio, UNDP supported building capacity for promotion and protection of human rights and strengthening democracy. This included training and awareness-raising activities among non-governmental and grassroots organizations to better prepare them to promote human rights and education among their constituents. It also included access-to-justice outreach campaigns for the general public, campaigns that focused on legislation and recourse to the law. There was a voter education programme and training for officials responsible for conducting elections 2010, as well as technical briefings for

parliamentarians and institutional strengthening of the Parliament to help it undertake its legislative, oversight and representational functions. With funds received out of the DGTTF, UNDP Suriname also started implementation of a programme aimed at reducing disparities between the coastal and hinterland areas through the use of ICTs.

B. Scope of the Evaluation

The purpose of the outcome evaluation is to:

- Provide substantive direction to the formulation of programme and project strategies
- Support greater UNDP accountability to national stakeholders and partners in Suriname
- Serve as a means of quality assurance for UNDP interventions at the country level; and,
- Contribute to learning at corporate, regional and country levels.

The outcome evaluation seeks to:

- Improve the implementation of the Democratic Governance programme and its contribution to the outcomes under the UNDAF/UNDAP 2012-2016, identifying opportunities in support of the Democratic Governance outcomes as formulated in the UNDAF and the Development Plan of Suriname (Ontwikkelings Plan), proposals for synergies with other practice areas such Poverty and Social Development as well as with the Energy and Environment programme.
- Review the UNDP Suriname Governance Programme with a view to understanding its relevance and contribution to national priorities for stock taking and lesson learning, and recommending corrections that may be required for enhancing effectiveness of UNDP’s development assistance;
- Review the status of the outcome and the key factors that have affected (both positively and negatively, contributing and constraining) the outcome;
- Assess the extent to which UNDP outputs and implementation arrangements have been effective for building capacities of key institutions which implement government schemes and policies (the nature and extent of the contribution of key partners and the role and effectiveness of partnership strategies in the outcome);
- Review and assess the Programme’s partnership with the government bodies, civil society and private sector and international organizations in Programme;
- Review links/joint activities with other UNDP Programmes and UN Agencies and how these have contributed to the achievement of the outcome
- Provide recommendations for future country programme regarding ways in which the UNDP resources can most strategically impact change in capacities of key institutions of the country so that the delivery mechanisms of the Government are better designed, suit their purpose, and that governance systems put inclusion at the centre

of Government efforts, capacity of demand-side local institutions (community, CBOs) to seek accountability is enhanced.

- Through this evaluation UNDP Suriname seeks to understand and articulate the key contributions that the Governance programme has made in the programmes on democratic governance processes, a rigorous analysis of the areas of synergy between the various capacity development strategies adopted within the programme and with other practice areas of UNDP Suriname and recommendations to strengthen UNDP's interventions in this critical area of engagement with the Government of Suriname.

31

The outcome evaluation will analyse:

Relevance:

- Review the UNDP Suriname Democratic Governance Programme with a view to understanding its relevance and contribution to national priorities;
- To what extent is UNDP's engagement a reflection of strategic considerations, including UNDP's role in a particular development context and its comparative advantage?
- To what extent was UNDP's selected method of delivery appropriate to the development context?

Effectiveness

- Review the status of the outcome and the key factors that have affected (both positively and negatively, contributing and constraining) the outcome this with a view of the current relevant outcome for 2012 - 2016;
- For stock taking and lesson learning, and recommending corrections that may be required for enhancing effectiveness of UNDP's development assistance;
- Review and assess the Programme's partnership with the government bodies, civil society and private sector and international organizations in Programme(the nature and extent of the contribution of key partners and the role and effectiveness of partnership strategies in the outcome);

Efficiency

- To what extent have the programme or project outputs resulted from economic use of resources?
- Review links/joint activities with other UNDP Programmes UN Agencies and other delivery partners and how these have contributed to the achievement of the outcome
- Through this evaluation UNDP Suriname seeks to understand and articulate the key contributions that the Democratic Governance portfolio has made in the enhancement of sustainable natural resources planning and management system.

Sustainability

- What indications are there that the outcomes will be sustained, e.g., through requisite capacities (systems, structures, staff, etc.)?

C. Evaluation products (Deliverables)

- a. The evaluator will conduct a preliminary scoping exercise and design an inception report (containing an evaluation matrix, evaluation protocols for different stakeholders, and a description of the methodology), to be discussed with the UNDP Country office and other stakeholders, before the evaluation can be conducted.
- b. A draft report for discussion with the stakeholders; feedback received from these sessions should be used to prepare the final report
- c. The suggested table of contents of the main final report could be as follows:
 - Executive summary
 - i. Introduction (Background and approach/methodology)
 - ii. Development context of the country
 - iii. Description of UNDP's work
 - iv. Development results (Presentation of findings based on the evaluation criteria and other cross-cutting issues).
 - v. Conclusions and Recommendations
 - Annexes

32

D. Methodology

The evaluators will visit select project sites to meet the local stakeholders and beneficiaries including government officials, civil society organizations, local authorities, academics and subject experts, and community members etc.

All evaluation questions should include an assessment of the extent to which programme design, implementation and monitoring have taken the following cross cutting issues into consideration:

- Human rights: To what extent do the poor, indigenous and tribal peoples, women and other disadvantaged and marginalized groups benefit?
- Gender Equality: To what extent did UNDP support positive changes in terms of gender equality and were there any unintended effects?
- Capacity development: Assess the extent to which UNDP outputs and implementation arrangements have been effective for designing policies and strategies as well as building capacities of key institutions towards achievement of the outcome
- Institutional strengthening: Assess the extent to which UNDP outputs and activities have strengthened institutions for designing policies, strategies and the implementation towards achievement of the outcome

- Innovation or added value to national development: How is the role of UNDP perceived in innovating and adding value in enhancing national systems for democratic governance and protection and promotion of human rights

The outcome evaluation will include the following key activities:

- Evaluation design and workplan
- Desk review of existing documents
- Briefing with UNDP
- Field visits
- Interviews with partners
- Drafting of the evaluation report
- Debriefing with UNDP
- Finalization of the evaluation report (incorporating comments received on first draft)

Though the evaluation methodology to be used will be finalized in consultation with the UNDP Suriname Country office, the following elements should be taken into account for the gathering and analysis of data:

- Pre-assessment of data availability
- Desk review of relevant documents including Country Programme Document (CPD), Country Programme Action Plan (CPAP), Project Documents/ Briefs, project evaluations, reports of relevant flagship projects, etc.
- Discussions with the Senior Management and programme staff of UNDP Suriname
- Presentation of an inception report and discussion of the content with UNDP management and partners
- Semi-structured Interviews: with key partners and stakeholders both at central and field levels.
- Focus group discussions: within UNDP and external parties both at central and field levels. Gaining consensus on key issues.
- Participation and providing guidance to an Outcome Board Meeting of the Democratic Governance outcome
- Field visits to select key projects, if necessary to verify to what extent the outputs contribute to the outcome or with a forward looking view
- Regular consultation meetings with the UNDP staff, project staff and senior management as appropriate

E. Implementation Arrangements

This impartial and rigorous evaluation exercise will be undertaken by an Evaluation Expert. The Evaluation Expert will be reporting to the Country Director of UNDP Suriname. The Country Office Evaluation focal point will arrange the introductory meetings within UNDP and will establish the first contacts with the government partners and project staff. The expert will then set up his/her own meetings and conduct his/her own methodology upon approval of the methodology submitted in the inception report.

The draft and final reports will be submitted in English. The expert will work home/office-based with presence in UNDP premises as needed for the desk reviews, and will make their own travel arrangements for the site visits.

The Evaluation Expert shall arrange all the resources he/she needs to complete the assignment, if needed, at his/her own cost. The resources to be used by the expert shall be subject to UNDP approval.

Evaluation Expert will have the overall responsibility for the conduction of the evaluation exercise as well as quality and timely submission of the final evaluation report to UNDP. S/he will specifically undertake the following tasks:

- Lead and manage the evaluation mission,
- Design the detailed evaluations scope, methodology and approach,
- Conduct the outcome evaluation in accordance with the proposed objective and scope of evaluation
- Draft, communicate and finalize the evaluation report as per the comments from UNDP,

The Evaluation Expert shall base its methodology on the UNDP Handbook for Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation for Development Results and the Outcome-Level Evaluation Guide (attached). The methodological proposal shall be submitted to and discussed with the Suriname UNDP CO Democratic Governance Area.

Required Qualifications

- Minimum Masters degree in economics, public administration, regional development/planning or any other social sciences related to governance issues and with a specific focus on human rights
- At least 5 years of experience in conducting outcome evaluations in the Democratic Governance Thematic Area or evaluations of programmes focused on accountability, capacity development and human rights or a number of at least 5 evaluation processes
- Strong working knowledge of UNDP and its mandate, the civil society and working with government authorities
- Extensive knowledge of results-based management evaluation, as well as participatory M&E methodologies and approaches,

- Experience in applying SMART (S Specific; M Measurable; A Achievable; R Relevant; T Time-bound) indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios,
- Minimum 10-15 years of professional experience in the area of development, including democratic governance, poverty reduction, regional development, gender equality and social policies,
- Strong reporting and communication skills
- Excellent communication skills with various partners including donors
- Knowledge on mainstreaming Gender and Human rights in projects and programmes desired
- Previous experience on UNDP outcome evaluations desired

The Evaluation Expert will be logistically and financially responsible for arranging his/her travel to and from relevant project sites and arranging interviews. This will also be included in the proposal including the travel costs to mission sites and daily subsistence allowance (DSA), with explicit information presented with the proposal and the methodology.

The work is expected to take 20 working days over a period of 3 months (November 2012 – January 2013).

The outcome evaluation should be completed by the 3rd week in January 2013, with the draft report presented to stakeholders by the first week in December.

The Evaluation shall be carried out in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation' and sign the Ethical Code of Conduct for UNDP Evaluations.

F. Payments

The consultant will be paid in USD.

The payments shall be realized upon acceptance and approval by UNDP of the deliverables.

G. Application Procedures

This is a Request for Quotation for an individual contract.

The application should include the following documents:

- A letter confirming interest and availability;
- Detailed CV of the expert indicating suitability to the TOR above;
- Detailed budget including daily consultancy fees, travel costs and all other related costs.

DOCUMENTS FOR REVIEW BY THE EVALUATORS

1- UNDP Corporate Policy Documents

- Handbook on Monitoring and Evaluation for Results

- UNDP Guidelines for Evaluators
- Ethical Code of Conduct for UNDP Evaluations
- Outcome-level evaluation; a companion guide to the handbook on planning monitoring and evaluating for development results for programme units and evaluators

2- UNDP Suriname CO Documents

- Country Programme Document (CPD) of Suriname for 2008 – 2011
- Country Programme Document (CPD) of Suriname for 2012 – 2016
- Country Programme Action Plan (CPAP)
- Project documents and Final Reports
- Other documents and materials related to the outcome as far as these are available

Annex 2: List of actors interviewed or consulted

List of interviews

No	Name	Position
1	Mr. Thomas Gittens	Country Director UNDP Suriname
2	Mrs. Meriam Hubard	Programme Officer for Governance. UNDP
3	Mr. Ruben Martoredjo	Evaluation Officer - UNDP
4	Mrs. Jennifer Geerlings- Simons	Speaker of Parliament (The Parliament)
5	Ms. Reina Raveles	Policy Advisor of the Parliament
6	Ms. Helianthe- Lucretia Redan	Permanent Secretary Ministry of Foreign Affairs MFA
7	Ms. Jaqueline Warso	Desk Officer in International Development Cooperation Division MFA
8	Mrs. Genia Corinde	Permanent Secretary Ministry of Regional Development
9	Mrs. Peggy Panka	International Relation Officer MRD
10	Mr. Johannes Tojo	Communication Officer MRD
11	Mrs. Simona Boldewyn	Citizen participation and Communication MRD
12	Ms. Thea Smith	Deputy Director Ministry of Transport, Communication and Tourism. MTCT
13	Ms. Juanita Mc Lean	Senior Officer for Governance MTCT
14	Mr. August Boldewijn	Democracy Unit- University of Suriname
15	Mr. Chandrikapersad Santokhi	Ex - Ministry of Justice and Police
16	Mr. Max	Former UNDP Governance Officer/VIDS
17	Ms. Jornell Vinkwolk	Coordinator Human Rights Bureau
18	Mrs Jennifer Van Dijk- Silos	Independent Electoral Bureau
19	Ms. Sharda Ganga	Director of Projekta Stichting
20		Netherlands Embassy

Annex 3: List of supporting documents reviewed

Government of Suriname: “Cross roads: together towards better times”. Statement of government policy 2010-2015.

- Report on the Evaluation of the UNDAF 2007-2011.

FHR/BDO. Assessment of Key Capacity Gaps and Challenges in Public Sector Organizations Projekta. Multiannual Capacity Strengthening Programme. Civil Society Component.

38

UNDP Suriname

- Private Sector Capacity Assessment in Suriname
- PRODOC: Assistance to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs 2012-2013.
- PRODOC: Strengthening of the Election Administration, Democracy and Governance in Suriname 2009-2011.
- PRODOC: Reducing disparities in access to information and services among hinterland communities in Suriname through the use of ICT's 2011-2013.
- PRODOC: Support for Implementing the Policy Plan for Protection of Legal Rights and Safety – Legal Protection and Human Rights, and Anti-Corruption 2009-2011.
- PRODOC: Strengthening the National Assembly of Suriname 2011-2015.
- PRODOC: Strengthening National Capacities for Aid Coordination and Monitoring of Development Plans and MDG Achievements
- PRODOC: Support on capacity assessment in Suriname and formulation of a capacity strengthening programme.
- PRODOC: Strengthening dialogue on Land Rights in Suriname

UNDP/Democracy Unit. “Election 2010. A more in depth study”.

UNDP/Democracy Unit. “Crusade against corruption”.

UNDP/MTCT. Design of strategy for e-delivery of government services to the Interior of Suriname

United Nations Organization.

- Handbook on Monitoring and Evaluation for Results
- Norms for Evaluation in the UN System
- Standards for Evaluation in the UN System
- Ethical Code of Conduct for UNDP Evaluations

- Outcome-level evaluation; a companion guide to the handbook on planning, monitoring and evaluating for development results for programme units and evaluators
- Needs Assessment Mission. Final report electoral assistance Division / Department of political affairs United Nations Suriname.

United Nation Suriname.

- Annual Work Plan 2008.
- Annual Work Plan 2010.
- Annual Work Plan. 2011.
- Country Programme Document (CPD) of Suriname for 2008 – 2011
- Country Programme Document (CPD) of Suriname for 2012 – 2016
- Country Programme Action Plan (CPAP)
- Draft country programme document for the Republic of Suriname (2012-2016).
- Independent Evaluation of the UNDAF 2007-2011.
- UNDAF 2012-2016.
- UNDAF 2012-2016. Action Plan.
- UNDAF 2008-2011.

The Governance Network. “Roadmap for Public Sector Reform in Suriname”. 2006.

Annex 4: CV/biography of evaluator

Claudia Pineda Gadea, SOCIOLOGIST – claudiapinedag@hotmail.com

Sociologist with 20 years of experience working on issues related to Governance and Development, with an emphasis on Democratic, Secure and Equitable Development. Related experience in policy dialogue, donor coordination, formulation and evaluation of policies and programs, capacity building with public and civil society institutions, and policy/program monitoring and evaluation systems. Has worked as a consultant for different cooperation agencies in participatory processes aimed at state reform and decentralization, and has played a technical and political role in coordination and dialogue between the Government of Nicaragua, the international donor community, and national development actors in formulating and evaluating the National Development Plan (PRSP II), and in the Concerted Development process in Panama. Mother tongue: Spanish; working knowledge of English. Since 2009 Executive Director on the Institute for Strategic studies and public policies, a think tank dedicated to study public affairs in Security, Governance and Social Inclusion..

40

SINCE 08/2009	EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF THE INSTITUTE FOR PUBLIC POLICIES AND STRATEGIC STUDIES. (TEAM: 23; BUDGET 2012: 1.0 MIO USD) Lead research, advocacy actions and technical assistance in issues such as: security, defense, governance and social inclusion.
2010-2013	<p>FORMULATION AND EVALUATION: 3 outcome evaluation of the Governance Programs for UNDP- Suriname. UNDP-Panamá and UNDP-Honduras. (2010, 2011 and 2012). Identification of a new Human Rights Regional Program for Central America. Danish Cooperation. Design the evaluation of the Afro descendant Regional Program. UNDP Regional Office for LAC. Identify and formulate part of a Governance Program for Finnish Cooperation in Nicaragua.</p> <p>MONITORING, ADVISING AND FACILITATION: Technical Assistance for ICCO CA&Haiti. Building the future: Vision ICCO 2020</p> <p>TEACHING: UCA- Module: Regional Security Policies in Central America in a regional master on regional integration. (February-March) . ETEA/AECID Panamá. Course: Aid of Development actual challenges (5 hours)</p>
2009	<p>FORMULATION AND EVALUATION: Evaluation of 22 projects for de Common Fund for Good Governance. OXFAM GB; Evaluation of the Public Sector Technical Assistance Credit- 40 mio USD. World Bank/PEM Consultant; Identification of successful experiences in ODM achievement in Nicaragua .CEPAL</p> <p>RESEARCH: The impact of the reforms on the Governance in Nicaragua (1990-2006). A study for GTZ; Design the study: Diagnosis of the corruption in Nicaragua.</p>
2008	<p>FORMULATION AND EVALUATION: Design a new Governance Program for Nicaragua. Danish Embassy and evaluation of the Danish Decentralization Program in Nicaragua. Evaluation of the inclusion of crosscutting issues in Finland's official cooperation program. Specialist in Governance for the evaluation team for Nicaragua, Zambia and Nepal. Production of the Nicaragua case study. Ramboll Finnconsult. (April-September). Partner Satisfaction Survey for GTZ, Nicaragua.</p> <p>MONITORING, ADVISING AND FACILITATION: Study about sources of financing for Diakonía in Nicaragua. Managua. Facilitation of the strategic planning process of the Center for Communications Research (CINCO). Managua, Nicaragua.</p> <p>TEACHING: Module: Influencing Public Policies. Masters Program in Rural Development. UCA. Managua (24 hours).</p>

2007	<p>FORMULATION AND EVALUATION: Midterm evaluation of the National Democracy and Human Rights Program, and definition of a Common Governance Program resulting from the fusion of three of the Danish Embassy's current programs. Evaluation of International Transparency's program for Central America. Development of a country study on Nicaragua: "Harmonization of donors and its impact on democratization: searching for the links between efficacy and democracy."</p> <p>MONITORING, ADVISING AND FACILITATION: Improvement of the monitoring system of the Regional Democracy and Human Rights Program, conducted jointly with its ten partners in Guatemala, Honduras, Nicaragua and Costa Rica, for the Embassy of Denmark. Assistance to the UNDP and the Government of Panama in organizing a Regional Consult, "The Concerted Development Process in Panama," the objective of which is defining national and territorial strategies for eliminating poverty. Coordination, design and organization of the consult with public and civil society organizations on the Country Assistance Strategy for the 2006-2012 cycle, in Managua and six other Nicaraguan cities, for the World Bank. Monitoring and assistance to the Embassy of Denmark in its Democracy and Human Rights Program, and for the Support Fund for Civil Society and Governance in Nicaragua. US\$5 million in multi-donor competitive funds for 3 years.</p> <p>TEACHING: Module for degree program in Coordinating and Aligning Cooperation. UCA. (10 hours). Module on Local Development Management, for graduate program in Rural Management and Administration Issues. UAM (20 hours). Thesis advisor for two thesis projects.</p>
2006	<p>FORMULATION AND EVALUATION: Evaluation of the degree of alignment of GEF and EFA "vertical" programs (international initiatives) with the country strategies and operational frameworks. For GTZ and the WB.</p> <p>MONITORING, ADVISING AND FACILITATION: Assistance to the UNDP and the Government of Panama in organizing the Regional Consult, "The Concerted Development Process in Panama," the objective of which is defining national and territorial strategies for eliminating poverty. (November 06-September 07). Monitoring and assistance to the Embassy of Denmark in its Democracy and Human Rights Program, and for the Support Fund for Civil Society and Governance in Nicaragua. US\$5 million in multi-donor competitive funds for 3 years. (May 06-December 06).</p> <p>For the Presidency of the Republic: Design of coordination and communication mechanisms to support the operations of the Governance Roundtable (State Reform, Decentralization, Justice, Citizen Security, Accountability, Citizen Participation, Human Rights, Institutional Policies). Support to the public sector in its dialogue with the international donor community in relation to governance, support to the preparation of sector programs, support to defining indicators for monitoring budget support to good governance, and member of the Citizen Participation and Decentralization team.</p> <p>TEACHING: Module for degree program in Coordinating and Aligning Cooperation. UCA. (10 hours). Module on Local Development Management, for graduate program in Rural Management and Administration Issues. UAM (20 hours). Thesis advisor for two thesis projects.</p>
2005	<p>FORMULATION AND EVALUATION: Preparation of the baseline document for setting up the Multi-Donor Support Fund for Civil Society and Democratic Governance in Nicaragua. Various donors. Preparation of additional sector support from the Governments of Sweden, Switzerland and Finland to the Expanded PND/PRORURAL Program. (US\$30 million for 4 years). Preparation of the</p>

framework document for the second phase of the Anti-Corruption Fund and production of the final reports for Phase 1 and the Bridging Phase. Presidency of the Republic. Proposed strategy to fuse three governance programs for the Embassy of Denmark and Midterm evaluation of the Support Program for Decentralization and Local Development in Nicaragua. Embassy of Denmark.

MONITORING, ADVISING AND FACILITATION: For the World Bank: Facilitation of the consult on the WB's Interim Country Strategy for Nicaragua; facilitation of the workshop about the Social Audit experience in Nicaragua, and presentation of five Social Audit cases promoted by the public sector; methodological support for the working sessions of CONPES; facilitation of a workshop about Civil Service and Administrative Career Law. Facilitation of the planning process for Harmonizing and Aligning cooperation, and coordination mechanisms for the Productive Rural Development Sub-Roundtable in MAGFOR. Implementation of coordination and communication mechanisms within the Production and Competitiveness Cabinet, with other public sector cabinets (inter-institutional teams), with the private sector (sector councils), with the international donor community (coordination roundtable and sub-roundtable), and for relationships with the territories and their development plans (departmental cabinets and councils). Monitoring of institutional coordination of the formulation of sector wide programs (Swaps).

TEACHING: Module on Local Development Management, for graduate program in Rural Management and Administration Issues. UAM (20 hours). Thesis advisor for two thesis projects.

2004 FORMULATION AND EVALUATION: Feasibility study of the Embassy of Denmark's new program to support Democracy and Human Rights in Nicaragua. Preparation of projects in Honduras for COSUDE: Monitoring of implementation of the water law, and evaluation of local governance. Preparation of the chapter on Governance and Decentralization for the National Development Plan. Evaluation of the project, "Training human resources for the National System on Disaster Prevention, Attention and Mitigation." Evaluation of the territorial attention model, and recommendations of institutional changes to the Emergency Social Investment Fund (Decentralized management of FISE's public investment cycle in the territories). Field work in 13 municipalities. Planning of the COSUDE Project, "Participatory monitoring of public policies in the municipal arena," in Honduras.

MONITORING, ADVISING AND FACILITATION: Design and implementation of coordination and communication mechanisms within the Production and Competitiveness Cabinet, with other public sector cabinets (inter-institutional teams), with the private sector (sector councils), with the international donor community (coordination roundtable and sub-roundtable), and for relationships with the territories and their development plans (departmental cabinets and councils). Monitoring of institutional coordination of sector wide programs (Swaps). Improvement of Departmental Development Plans of Masaya and Granada.

TEACHING: Module on Local Development Management, for graduate program in Rural Management and Administration Issues. UAM (20 hours).

2003 FORMULATION AND EVALUATION: Evaluation of the use of the concept Sustainable Human Development in National Plans (ERCERP, PND) and Public Policies in Nicaragua. For the UNDP. Development of institutional modernization agendas for 10 governmental ministries of Nicaragua. Proposal for

linkage to territorial planning. For the Decentralization Commission of the Presidency of the Republic. Systematization and analysis of the current government's macro policies in the areas of state modernization, reform and decentralization. For the GTZ. Systematization of experiences formulating municipal budgets in a participatory manner. Case studies in Nicaragua: Estelí, Nandaime, Santo Tomás. For the World Bank Institute. Inclusion of the topic of decentralization and local development in the first draft of the National Development Plan. Presidency of the Republic. Conceptualization of DFID's governance and social participation program to reduce poverty in Nicaragua and Honduras. Design of initiatives to support civil society organizations, co-financing proposal for PSTAC, dialogue with the government.

MONITORING, ADVISING AND FACILITATION: Monitoring of the coordination of international cooperation in Nicaragua, and management of the Embassy's small project fund; monitoring of programs financed with Dutch funds (PSTAC, SIGFA, Transparency in state procurements and hiring, budget support, contributions to FSS, Anti-Corruption Fund). For the Embassy of the Netherlands.

TEACHING: Module on Local Development Management, for graduate program in Rural Management and Administration Issues. UAM (20 hours).

2002

PRESIDENTIAL SECRETARIAT ON COORDINATION AND STRATEGY, SPECIALIST IN SOCIAL POLICY

Participation in the Institutional Planning of the SECEP; Coordination of participatory and inter-institutional formulation of social protection policies; Creation of the inter-institutional network on social protection public programs; Coordination of designing the territorial system for coordinating citizen participation in the implementation, monitoring and evaluation (PASE) of the Economic Growth and Poverty Reduction Strategy (ERCERP), the current PND (National Development Plan); Organization of the dialogue with the donor community on topics related to the ERCERP (Monitoring roundtable on poverty).

08/1995–
03/2002

EMBASSY OF AUSTRIA, REGIONAL TECHNICAL COOPERATION OFFICE FOR CENTRAL AMERICA. ADVISOR FOR SOCIAL PROGRAMS (HEALTH, EDUCATION, GENDER, HUMAN RIGHTS, DEMOCRACY, AND ETHNIC ISSUES)

Formulation and monitoring of three-year cooperation programs: social development, local development, and indigenous peoples in Nicaragua, El Salvador and Guatemala. Project planning with partners; Technical monitoring of programs and projects (social and good governance) being implemented with civil society organizations; Responsible for relations with the Government, donors, and civil society in relation to the issues of governance, poverty, indigenous peoples, health, education, and gender; Responsible for coordinating emergency projects.

1994/95

Training of rural women in the topics of gender and citizen participation. Cenzontle. Regional Coordinator for Central America and Nicaragua, for the Democracy and Local Development Network.

1992/93

Researcher in the area of Decentralization, Municipalities, Local Power and in issues related to Gender. Nitlapan, UCA. Responsible for providing attention to Tsunami victims in the Rivas Department, for GVC, Italy.

EDUCATION

AMERICAN COLLEGE (2008). GRADUATE STUDIES: REGIONAL INTEGRATION IN CENTRAL AMERICA

UNIVERSITY OF CENTRAL AMERICA, NICARAGUA (2006-2007). GRADUATE STUDIES: COORDINATING INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION.

POMPEU FABRA UNIVERSITY, BARCELONA. (1999-2002). MASTER'S DEGREE IN SOCIAL SERVICES AND PUBLIC POLICIES.

UNIVERSITY OF CENTRAL AMERICA, NICARAGUA (1998). GRADUATE STUDIES IN GENDER AND DEVELOPMENT.

UNIVERSITY OF CENTRAL AMERICA, NICARAGUA (1990- 1995). BACHELOR’S DEGREE IN SOCIOLOGY (GRADUATED WITH HONORS)

KARL MARX SCHOOL, BERLIN, GERMANY (1987-1989). DIPLOMA IN SOCIAL SCIENCES

Annex 5: Code of Conduct signed by the evaluator

Annex 6: Evaluation Matrix

Criteria	Evaluation questions	Sources
Central questions	To what extent UNDP actions have contributed to the state of a governance system socially oriented in Suriname at the end of 2011, and if the situation was better than in 2008 because of its contribution What has been the underlying logic of the governance programme 2008-2011?	Reports reviews Interviews with staff, stakeholders and targets groups
Relevance	Was the programme aligned with national strategies and is it consistent with human development needs and development challenges in the country? Are approaches, resources, models, conceptual framework relevant to achieve the planned outcome? Comprehensive situation analysis prior to design Are the resources allocated sufficient to achieve the objectives of the programme?	Reports reviews Interviews with staff, stakeholders and targets groups
Effectiveness	Did each project and the interventions under the governance programme as a whole and the advances in the expected outcomes, contribute towards the stated outcome? What changes can be observed in the expected outcome(s)? Which of these changes can be argued to be a result of the outputs (contribution)? What positive or negative factors have influenced the achievement of the results (outcomes, outputs)? Did UNDP take advantage of its comparative advantage? Did the program receive enough resources to achieve the outcome?	Reports reviews Interviews with staff, stakeholders and targets groups
Efficiency	Were resources (human, financial) focused on the set of activities that were expected to produce significant results? Was UNDP's partnership strategy efficient to achieve the expected results? Were the projects implemented within the deadline and cost estimates? Effective mechanism for monitoring implementation Are resources focused on critical activities or are they spread too thinly?	Reports reviews Interviews with staff, stakeholders and targets groups
Sustainability	Were the results appropriate by national institutions Were initiatives designed to have sustainable results given the identifiable risks? Did they include an exit strategy? Is there a threat to sustainability?	Reports reviews Interviews with staff, stakeholders and targets groups

	<p>How has UNDP approached the scaling up of successful initiatives?</p> <p>Has government taken on these initiatives?</p> <p>What corrective measures did UNDP take?</p>	
Human Rights	<p>Are the projects HRB oriented</p> <p>Did the project take into account disadvantaged groups?</p> <p>Was there any technical support in order to introduce HRB approach in the institutional planning?</p>	<p>Reports reviews</p> <p>Interviews with staff, stakeholders and targets groups</p>
Gender equality	<p>To what extent did UNDP support positive changes in terms of gender equality and were there any unintended effects?</p> <p>Can the results of the programme be disaggregated by sex? Were they taken into account in the project and programme design?</p>	<p>Reports reviews</p> <p>Interviews with staff, stakeholders and targets groups</p>
Capacity development	<p>Which capacities where improved?</p> <p>Are these capacities important for the stakeholders?</p> <p>Are appropriate for their functions/role/ missions</p>	<p>Reports reviews</p> <p>Interviews with staff, stakeholders and targets groups</p>
Institutional strengthening	<p>What kind of institutional changes where achieved?</p> <p>Are these in line with planned improvement?</p> <p>Are the strengthened actors still working on their own mission?</p>	<p>Reports reviews</p> <p>Interviews with staff, stakeholders and targets groups</p>
Innovation or added value to national development	<p>What kind of innovative approach was introduced?</p> <p>Did UNDP provide any innovative technical assistance?</p> <p>Are there examples of added value initiatives?</p>	<p>Reports reviews</p> <p>Interviews with staff, stakeholders and targets groups</p>