

Best Practices/Constraints and Lessons Learned

At the mid-point in implementation some areas of the UNDAF need to be flagged so that adjustments can be made and/or promising practices can be promoted during the two years remaining.

Policy

Social protection: Key pieces of social protection legislation have been passed (National Health Insurance, Minimum Wage and Institutional Child Care) and allocations for Pensions and Child Support and have been increased.

Programme

Computer Aided Learning (CAL): The education sector's computer aided learning (CAL) pilot project influenced government policy, and provided the IDB with a model to replicate and upscale for 18 schools. Also, the Ministry of Education has established an ICT Unit, and developed an ICT strategy paper.

Data

The Data PCG has made some good progress on collecting data for the publication of various reports (Household survey, MDG report, etc.). However, for the final two years the PCG should focus on making a link between data collection and the formulation of evidence-based policies, and overall sector planning.

Management and Coordination

The meeting of PSs prior to the JSC is an important addition to the UNDAF coordination structure as it provides an opportunity for government to exercise strong leadership and ownership by preparing a consolidated "One Government" response. However, there is still a need for a forum to have high-level discussion among UN heads of agencies and government *Final MTR Report on Suriname UNDAF 2012-2016* decision makers. PCGs have introduced a multi-sectoral, multidisciplinary approach into the programmes and ministries, and are creating a dialogue within and between ministries. To the extent possible, this collaboration should be extended beyond UN programmes as this dialogue can introduce a more integrated approach to the delivery of government services and transcend the traditional "silo approach" practiced by sector ministries.

Recommendations/Way forward

The MTR team is recommending the following revisions to the current UNDAF outputs. These involve some areas that need programming, a few outputs that were not placed in the correct place, and some vital areas associated with programming planning and management.

- a) Add a new output for "Livelihoods" (output #11) in the programme level Outcome #1. The rationale for this is based on the fact that there is a need for a Livelihoods output to meet the government's economic diversification goals and in particular to boost the competitiveness of the informal sector, which at 20.8% is the largest contributor to GDP. This can include a full range of key actions by various UN agencies, such as UNESCO's cultural heritage projects (tourism), FAO's projects aimed at enhancing production and income generation and Youth. This will complement output #9 of the policy level Outcome #2.
- b) Now that the agreement between government and ILO on Decent and Productive Work has been signed, there is an urgent need to develop a programme and start implementation. Unemployment and especially youth unemployment is one of the major challenges facing development in Suriname. This should be programmed in Output #9 along with Trade Policy
- c) The output for Youth/Adolescents (#10) is very weak, with only two key actions identified. This should be developed into a full joint programme with a number of relevant UN agencies, combining a number of interventions into an "integrated approach", including government priorities such as youth employment and empowerment, skills development, entrepreneurship, etc.
- d) The Trade Policy output (#9) in the policy level Outcome #2 needs to be programmed to meet the government's economic diversification goals. No key actions have been identified and the only entry is the UN agency (UNDP) and lead government ministry namely the Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

e) Output #7 of Outcome #2 (*Enhancing national capacity for forestry management and forestry livelihoods in processing non-timber forest products*) involves community level interventions (not policy), so it should be moved to Outcome #1 and placed under the new Livelihood output #11.1

f) Some thought should be given to whether the REDD+ intervention has been placed in the most appropriate place (output #8, key action #4). Currently it is in the policy Outcome #2, but if the main key actions are at the community level, it might be more appropriately placed under the programme Outcome #1, along with the other community-based environmental interventions (output #8). Like most programs, REDD+ will respond to an overall policy goal (capacity strengthening of NGOs, human rights), but its placement in the UNDAF should be based on the direct results of the intervention, whether they will be felt at the community and NGO levels, or the policy level. Generally, in RBM logic, an activity responds to the next level up the hierarchy, which is the most immediate result and not the ultimate result.

g) Outcome #3 (Data) has an implicit link between data collection and the need for evidence-based policies. However, the link to the policy Outcome #2 needs to be made more explicit in order to improve the focus of the data being collected and generated. Its key actions and targets should be revised to include links to evidence-based policy-making in the relevant ministries.

h) To improve the quality of results and targets of the data being collected in Outcome #3, output #2 (Improved national capacity for monitoring development outcomes), there is a need to introduce a system of project cycle management (PCM) centrally within the Planning Bureau and throughout all government ministries, involving PCM and RBM training. But more than mere capacity building, there is a need to institute an M&E system at the national and sector levels to monitor the Development Plan, and the contribution of donor agency programmes (like the UNDAF) to national goals.

i) It might be an idea to develop an overall goal statement for the UNDAF. This will focus individual UN agency programmes on the overall goal: "Align UN programming to support the government's policy and planning objectives and contribute to its national development goals". Currently, the intervention logic does not provide a link between outputs and outcomes to an overall goal. It may be implicit, but it needs to be explicit.

activity responds to the next level up the hierarchy, which is the most immediate result and not the ultimate result.

g) Outcome #3 (Data) has an implicit link between data collection and the need for evidence-based policies. However, the link to the policy Outcome #2 needs to be made more explicit in order to improve the focus of the data being collected and generated. Its key actions and targets should be revised to include links to evidence-based policy-making in the relevant ministries.

h) To improve the quality of results and targets of the data being collected in Outcome #3, output #2 (*Improved national capacity for monitoring development outcomes*), there is a need to introduce a system of project cycle management (PCM) centrally within the Planning Bureau and throughout all government ministries, involving PCM and RBM training. But more than mere capacity building, there is a need to institute an M&E system at the national and sector levels to monitor the Development Plan, and the contribution of donor agency programmes (like the UNDAF) to national goals.

i) It might be an idea to develop an overall goal statement for the UNDAF. This will focus individual UN agency programmes on the overall goal: “Align UN programming to support the government’s policy and planning objectives and contribute to its national development goals”. Currently, the intervention logic does not provide a link between outputs and outcomes to an overall goal. It may be implicit, but it needs to be explicit.

Priority areas to be developed (2015-2016)

The following areas were left out of the initial UNDAF design, and need to be programmed to make sure there is some progress during the final two years of i