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Delivering as one UN in Suriname

Foreword by the Minister of Planning and Development Cooperation and the UN Resident Coordinator

Dear reader,

On behalf of the Government of the Republic of Suriname and the UN Country Team Suriname, it is our pleasure to present to you a first review of Suriname’s Delivering as One process to enhance UN coherence, relevance and impact in the achievement of both the national and millennium development goals.

Since 2005 the UN Country Team in Suriname and the key partners in the Government of Suriname have been working together to enhance UN coordination and coherence at the country level in support of the priorities of the Multi-Annual Development Plan 2006-2011. The Delivering as One process started with the formulation and signing of a UN Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) in April 2007 which set the broad development priorities for UN assistance to Suriname.

Efforts to address these priorities culminated with the preparation of the first Common Country Programme Action Plan (CCPAP) for 2008-2011. This document was signed by the Government of Suriname and twelve resident and non-resident UN Agencies on 3 April 2008¹ and put into action the development objectives set earlier.

The purpose of this study is to take stock of what has been happening since the CCPAP was signed and how this unique joint programme framework is contributing to improved coordination between the Government and the UN, within the UN Agencies and with other major stakeholders in the country.

We trust that this report will generate much “food for thought”, debate and discussion and that we can continue to work together to identify the most effective way to enhance UN coherence and relevance in Suriname.

A special word of appreciation goes out to the Government, non-government and civil society organisations and UN partners, who are closely involved and contribute to this process. We would also like to convey our appreciation to our colleagues in the Ministry of Planning and Development Cooperation, the members of the UN Suriname country team, especially those resident in Suriname, for their substantive contribution, logistical and administrative support all of which enabled the successful completion of this report.

Dr. Ricardo van Ravenswaay
Minister of Planning and Development Cooperation
Suriname

Dr. Marcia de Castro
UN Resident Coordinator

¹ UNICEF, PAHO / WHO, UNDP, UNFPA, UNAIDS, FAO, UNIFEM, ECLAC, UNESCO, ILO, UNIC, WFP
Executive Summary

The 2000 Summit and approval of the eight Millennium Development Goals by the member states of the United Nations were a turning point in the global development debate. They called for a renewed commitment to reform the UN development system towards achieving greater coherence, relevance and effectiveness.

The Rome Declaration on the Harmonisation of Aid (2003) and the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness (2005), which have been signed by Suriname’s major development partners, further emphasized the need for a greater reform process in the United Nations system. Subsequently, in November 2006, the UN Secretary General’s High-Level Panel on System-wide Coherence of the UN issued the “Delivering as One” report articulating the following five strategic directions for the UN system of agencies

- coherence and consolidation of UN activities in line with the principle of country ownership
- establishment of appropriate governance, managerial and funding mechanisms to empower and support consolidation
- overhaul business practices of the UN system to ensure focus on outcomes, measured against the MDGs
- ensure opportunities for consolidation and effective delivery of One UN through an in-depth review
- implementation should be urgent yet not hastily undertaken to compromise permanent and effective change

The Secretary General’s report further recommended specific country level measure to increase UN effectiveness referred to as the four “Ones: One Programme, One Leader, One Budget and where, appropriate, One Office.

With the aim of achieving the MDGs by the year 2015, the key elements of this process in the Suriname context are:

- national ownership, leadership and commitment
- partnership between international development agencies and their client governments
- comparative advantages of the UN system
- a coherent, effective and efficient UN system at the country level
- a focus on development results, impact and accountability
- inclusiveness of all stakeholders

Suriname is a small middle income country that is relatively rich in natural, human and financial resources. The country’s main development objectives and challenges are articulated in the current Meerjaren Ontwikkelingsplan (MOP), or Multi-Annual Development Plan (2006-2011), which was approved in July 2006. The Plan proposed spending US$2.8 billion over the whole period, of which one tenth will be donor financed, and the remaining 90% will come from national resources including government, private and foreign direct investments.²

² Economist Intelligence Unit - Country Profile Suriname - Main Report June 2007
There are twelve UN agencies supporting Suriname’s development efforts; these are PAHO/WHO, UNICEF, UNDP, UNFPA, FAO, UNIFEM, UNAIDS, UNECLAC, ILO, UNESCO, UNIC and WFP. Only PAHO/WHO, UNICEF, UNDP and UNFPA are resident in the country. The Ministry of Planning and Development Cooperation (PLOS) is the national level body for the coordination and overall monitoring of development assistance to ensure that it meets the national development priorities. Each sectoral or line ministry is also responsible for coordinating and monitoring its sectoral plans, programmes and projects.

The process of working towards increased UN coherence in Suriname started in 2005 with the drafting of a Common Country Assessment (CCA). The CCA paved the way for the preparation of a UN Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF), signed in April 2007, and a year later, the approval of a Common Country Programme and Action Plan (CCPAP) for 2008-2011. The CCPAP is the joint programme implementation framework for the UN in Suriname. Its implementation opened the way for innovative approaches to bring together stakeholders to manage, debate and discuss the different development priorities and projects. For the purpose of the report, the CCPAP and the programme priorities outlined in it are the most appropriate entry point and framework for a Delivering as One approach in Suriname.

Findings and Lessons Learned

Based on a qualitative and quantitative assessment of the Delivering as One process in Suriname, the following findings and conclusions are presented in this report.

1. Government leadership / ownership / commitment

The Ministry of Planning and Development Cooperation has played a key role in the formulation and approval of the UNDAF and the CCPAP, and the development of M&E guidelines to track progress in the implementation of the CCPAP. The successful experience of convening multiple agencies to work together in support of the national development plan and to produce top quality programme documents led to discussions with senior UN officials to include Suriname in the One Pilots programme, and ultimately as one of the new “self-starter countries” to pilot innovative Delivering as One approaches. The approval of the CCPAP brought together a number of sectoral ministries to discuss and implement development programmes. These ministries are increasingly taking the lead to coordinate the UN-supported projects in the CCPAP. However, the level of involvement of different line ministries in the process and their awareness of the programmes and the role of the UN varies significantly. Government commitment to providing matching funding to a number of projects under the CCPAP is not yet secured and may in the long run negatively affect some of the CCPAP outcomes.

2. Agency involvement / teamwork / leadership

The DaO process and the formulation of the CCPAP has progressed well partly because the number of UN resident agencies is manageable. In addition they share common programme interests and, very importantly, staff members in these agencies were willing to explore new ways of working together and to innovate. The monthly visits of the Resident Coordinator have provided the right level of support and information on latest developments from headquarters. This arrangement has also allowed the in-country team to work flexibly and at their own pace.
Although the non-resident UN agencies gave substantive comments on the various drafts of the CCPAP most were not able to participate in the reiterative consultative process. One year into the implementation of the CCPAP, the involvement of non-resident agencies in the process remains marginal.

3. One Programme

The CCPAP comprises eleven AWPs, eight of which have been approved and are active. Every AWP is co-led by a Government appointed team leader and one or two UN agencies. The implementation of the CCPAP has brought together different stakeholders including government, non-government and UN to find common solutions to a particular development challenge. It has contributed to a greater level of understanding of the different roles and responsibilities of the parties involved and have helped minimise duplication of efforts and redundancies.

At the same time, the AWPs cannot be considered proper “joint” programmes. Within a defined thematic area they remain a collection of stand-alone UN agency-supported initiatives rather than real joint programmes between the Government and the UN. The first year review of the CCPAP exposed the need for more convergence and cohesion among the different projects and a much greater involvement of the non-resident agencies in the process.

The CCPAP is therefore primarily a UN programme planning instrument and while it has been formulated on the basis of the Government’s MOP 2006-2011, it is not integrated with other international development assistance programmes operating in Suriname.

4. One UN Fund

Suriname is not a major recipient of international development assistance and UN financial programme resources are equally modest. The formulation of the CCPAP called for mobilisation of USD 17.3 million from non-UN sources to complement the UN’s own seed investments in order to deliver on expected results. Other multilateral and bilateral donors including IADB and EC work independently and opportunities for joint collaboration among donors are limited. The Ministry of Planning and Development Cooperation is mandated as the lead coordinating body for international development assistance. This function is shared with different line ministries including the Ministry of Finance regarding budget matters. A stronger system is needed for the coordination of aid flows and investments, coupled with more strategic pooling of financial resources to support national priorities.

5. Common Premises and Services

UNDP, UNICEF and UNFPA share common premises in Paramaribo and PAHO/WHO is housed in accommodations provided by the Ministry of Health (VG). The UN system would like to move into shared accommodation to maximise the use of its human and financial resources and also to generate additional substantive and technical synergies in support of the CCPAP goals. In early 2007, the Government of Suriname indicated its interest to support the establishment of a UN house in Paramaribo and requested a detailed report on UN space requirements. Discussions ensued but have not been conclusive. Government leadership to address the accommodation needs of the UN and continued commitment of the leadership of the individual UN agencies are needed to enhance the management and coordination of operational resources.
The three UN agencies which are housed together have done a great deal of work towards sharing common services and this is reflected in a recently signed Memorandum of Understanding. They will continue consultations in 2009 to increase the efficiency of their operations in Suriname.

6. Communications and Advocacy

One of the most critical aspects that emerged across the board was the need for better and wider communication at all level, i.e. between government and non-government stakeholders; within the UN agencies; and between the Government and the UN agencies. This is to be expected given that this is a very new process, involving a multi-sectoral approach, with a large number of stakeholders.

Next Steps Forward

Efforts to date to improve coordination between the Government of Suriname and the UN system to deliver on the goals outlined in the MOP and the UN programme planning documents of UNDAF and CCPAP are laudable and should be continued.

The successful completion of the first CCPAP annual review in December 2008 identified a number of programme and process issues to be addressed in the years to come to ensure that the ambitious objectives set out in these documents are achieved. Here are some of the most salient:

- The leadership role of the Ministry of PLOS is a critical factor and should be continued. Efforts should be made to continue to refine existing instruments to ensure the impact of the ongoing UN-supported development activities is greater than the present collection of projects.

- While Suriname is not a major recipient of aid, the little it receives can be better coordinated and managed. PLOS is one of the key ministries involved in the management and oversight of international assistance from the UN, the EC, the IADB and other bilateral donors. The recent approval of an aid coordination project to be funded with Dutch assistance should provide further support to strengthening the role of the Government to effectively plan, lead and coordinate the earmarking and use of aid resources.

- The goals set out in the CCPAP require a significant level of resource mobilisation. The UN contribution includes technical and seed financial assistance and needs to be complemented with significant government funding.

- The role of the Resident Coordinator to bring together resident and non-resident agencies around programmatic goals needs to continue. The same level of leadership is required from within each agency working in Suriname to move from project-centred interventions to selected joint programmes.

- UN agencies need to continue to work together to harmonise and simplify programme guidelines, procedures and practices. The multitude of different instruments and regulations of different agencies generates unnecessary transaction costs and continues to draw attention to different agencies and not the UN as a whole.
• There are further opportunities for non-resident UN agencies to participate in the DaO and CCPAP processes but it requires a stronger commitment from them in terms of interest, time and staff.

• All stakeholders in the CCPAP process, particularly the UN country team and its staff members and the PLOS team, will need to be even more proactive in improving the information and communication flows at all levels and on all aspects of the Programme.

• Continued efforts need to be made by the UN country team to obtain common accommodation from the Government and to share common services and operational costs in order to improve the efficiency of the UN system in Suriname.

In concluding, the process of building up UN coherence in Suriname through the Common Country Assessment, the UN Development Assistance Framework and currently the CCPAP has been a country-driven process. It has also been a step-by-step approach and is still new to many stakeholders, especially within the Government.

It is clear that the implementation of the CCPAP has had a noticeably positive impact, in that all stakeholders have gained a better understanding of the UN system of agencies working in Suriname and their respective mandates and expertise. This has increased the potential for additional collaboration, cooperation and funding. Secondly, by sharing information about projects and experiences in implementation, the possibility for overlaps and duplication is being reduced and thereby scarce development resources are saved and can be redirected to other priorities.

After only one year of implementation it is too early to say whether the CCPAP as the major component of the DaO process will not only improve programme delivery but also eventually result in higher development outcomes. This will depend on many factors and actions that will need to be initiated and strengthened in the coming year and that will lead to a full-scale evaluation of the Programme in 2010.
1. Introduction
The International Context³

At the Millennium Summit in 2000 world leaders recommitted themselves to eradicating global poverty by the year 2015. The eight millennium development goals (MDGs) that emerged from this Summit provided the long-term development vision that governments and their development partners were expected to achieve in their respective countries. Bearing in mind the uncertain environment for development aid, there was added pressure on the UN development system to bring more coherence, relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and accountability into its country-level efforts.

The Rome Declaration on the Harmonisation of Aid (2003) and the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness (2005), which have been signed by Suriname’s major development partners, set the international scene for a major reform process in the United Nations system. The Paris Declaration identifies five key dimensions to successful development partnerships:

- **Ownership**: partner countries exercise effective leadership over their development policies and strategies and coordinate development actions.
- **Alignment**: donors base their overall support on partner countries’ national development strategies, institutions and procedures.
- **Harmonisation**: donors’ actions are more harmonised, transparent and collectively effective.
- **Managing for results**: managing resources and improving decision-making for results
- **Mutual Accountability**: donors and partners are accountable for results.

In November 2006 the Secretary General’s High-Level Panel on System-wide Coherence of the UN issued the “Delivering as One” report which recommended the following five strategic directions for the UN system of agencies:

- coherence and consolidation of UN activities in line with the principle of country ownership
- establishment of appropriate governance, managerial and funding mechanisms to empower and support consolidation
- overhaul business practices of the UN system to ensure focus on outcomes, measured against the MDGs
- ensure opportunities for consolidation and effective delivery of One UN through an in-depth review
- implementation should be urgent yet not hastily undertaken to compromise permanent and effective change

The Secretary General’s report further recommended country level measures to increase UN effectiveness referred to as the four “Ones: One Programme, One Leader, One Budget and where appropriate, One Office

³ Reference Bibliography in Annex 5
In 2004 and 2007 the UN General Assembly conducted its Triennial Comprehensive Policy Review of Operational Activities (TCPR) of the UN development system which also stressed the following:

- Enhanced development impact of the UN development system
- Improved functioning of the UN development system
- Increased supply and improved management of resources (funding and human resources)

All these consultations and resulting instruments are part of a process that has put increasing pressure on the international development community- of which the UN plays an important role- to work with partner countries and with each other in a very different way than in the past.

With the aim of achieving the MDGs by the year 2015, the key elements of this process relevant to Suriname are:

- national ownership, leadership and commitment
- partnership between international development agencies and their client governments
- comparative advantages of the UN system
- a coherent, effective and efficient UN system at the country level
- a focus on development results, impact and accountability
- inclusiveness of all stakeholders

Based on the panel’s recommendation, the UN initiated work on piloting the “Delivering as One” (DaO) approach in eight countries (Albania, Cap Verde, Mozambique, Pakistan, Rwanda, Tanzania, Uruguay, Vietnam). Furthermore, in the spirit of the successive TCPRs, programme countries have come forward and begun working to increase the coherence and efficiency of the UN at country level. Countries that have begun this effort include Suriname, Fiji, Samoa, Papua New Guinea and Botswana.

THE COUNTRY CONTEXT (see Annex 1 for country facts)

Suriname is a small, middle income country which is part of the South American land mass but has close socio-cultural-economic ties to the Caribbean region-hence its active membership in the Caribbean Community (CARICOM). It’s most unique feature is its very diverse society comprising eight main ethnic groups speaking some fifteen different languages. About 88% of the population lives in the urban and semi-urban areas situated along the coastal belt and the remaining 12% (64,993) lives in the remote interior land. Suriname’s modern development path began with its independence from the Netherlands in 1975. In 2005 the country held its fifth fair elections and today democracy enjoys solid popular support and is promoted by a stable coalition government.

Suriname is ranked at 89 out of 179 countries in the UNDP’s Human Development Index (HDI) with an HDI value of 0.770 in 2008 placing it in the “Medium Human Development” country category. The MDG baseline report for Suriname (2005) indicated that progress has been made towards the attainment of universal primary education (MDG2), child mortality (MDG4) and HIV/AIDS, malaria, other diseases (MDG6). However, progress remains uneven in terms of poverty levels.

---

4 Census Report 2005
5 Human Development Report 2008
(MDG1), gender equality (MDG3), maternal mortality (MDG5) and environmental sustainability (MDG7). Qualitative studies show that the most vulnerable groups live in the interior and in high-risk urban neighbourhoods. One of Suriname’s main development challenges is to provide economic opportunities and basic social services to these two vulnerable sections of the population.

In terms of economic progress, Suriname has been averaging an annual growth rate of about 4.4% between the period 2000-2005. It is a country rich in natural resources with gold, bauxite and oil extraction accounting for a major part of the country’s gross national income. In its Multi-Annual Development Plan, an annual average growth rate was predicted at about 6%; however, with the ongoing world recession which will have serious consequences on foreign and domestic investment, this prediction may not be realistic.

The Multi-Annual Development Plan (MOP) provides the country’s development vision for the period 2006-2011 and is the first of its kind in that it was formulated in a much more participatory manner. Consultations were held with non-government organisations, community-based organisations and with the private sector to elicit their views on the country’s future development. Secondly, it identifies by sector and thematic area a set of activities to be achieved and indicators to measure the development outcomes. The Plan states the country’s development mission as being “a just society with the guarantee of enjoyment of human rights and basic social security for every citizen”. This is to be achieved by focusing on the following four pillars of national development:7

- governance (including democracy, constitutional state and security)
- economic development
- social and human development (especially education and social security)
- fair distribution of wealth

It also identifies three cross-cutting issues as being gender and development, youth and the environment. The human rights approach is reflected in the introductory statement “In the development strategy the aspect of fairness and the enjoyment of human rights are the focal point” and is mentioned in several sections of the Plan. The MOP is therefore the development backdrop for the UN system of agencies working in Suriname towards increased UN coherence, relevance, development impact and efficiency.

The MOP is costed at USD2.8 billion and official development assistance (ODA) comprises only one tenth of this, amounting to USD280 million. The allocated programme resources of the UN agencies covering the same period is estimated at around USD18-20 million, which is a relatively small contribution to the country’s total development budget.

The top ten donors are the Netherlands, European Commission (EC), Inter-American Development Bank (IADB), Global Fund, Italy, France, Belgium, Arab Agencies and Canada.

From this scenario it is evident that the UN’s share in the overall development assistance programme in Suriname is relatively small.

---

6 Signed CCPAP 8 April 2008
7 MOP document 2006-2011
8 EIU Suriname Country Profile, June 2007
2. Report Methodology

After nearly three years of implementation of a country-led process to enhance UN coherence, relevance, effectiveness and efficiency which is synonymous with the widely accepted term, “Delivering as One” in Suriname, the UN Country Team and the Government agreed to conduct a review of the process. The objective of the present review was to identify positive and negative factors that have contributed, or not contributed to greater UN coherence and operational efficiency, and based on the findings, propose additional steps to improve the process.

This review focused on six broad dimensions used to evaluate the eight pilot countries on DaO\(^9\) and how they have been observed in Suriname. The six dimensions are:

A web-based survey sent to sixty seven UN staff members working for twelve UN agencies who have signed the CCPAP and other agencies that have activities in the country. Forty five staff members visited the survey and twenty five completed the questionnaire with a 46% response rate. Twelve UN agencies responded, four of which are resident and eight are non-resident. The survey largely collected basic facts about the UN Agencies offices and their programmes. It collected information on their staffing and programme resources, country programming cycles, main development partners and their contributions to the DaO process in the form of missions, funding, projects, etc.\(^{13}\)

---

\(^9\) Include reference too the evaluation of the 8 pilots document of Dec 2007
\(^{10}\) See Annex 5 for detailed list of documents
\(^{11}\) See Annex 2 for list of persons met
\(^{12}\) See Annex 2
\(^{13}\) See website [www.zoomerang.com](http://www.zoomerang.com)
3. Delivering as One UN in Suriname

a. Organisational Structure for the DaO process

The DaO process brings together the Government and the UNCT in a partnership towards increasing UN coherence, effectiveness and efficiency in Suriname. Diagram 1 presents the government organisational structure supporting the DaO process and CCPAP implementation.

Diagram 1 Organigram for the Government Structure for CCPAP Implementation
(Source: PLOS/UN Desk, November 2008)
The UNCT comprises twelve agencies, four of which are resident in Suriname and the remaining eight are located in the Caribbean and Central America regions. A number of other UN agencies have relationships with Suriname but they are not part of the country team process and they have not participated in the formulation of the CCPAP. The United Nations Resident Coordinator (UN RC) is based in Trinidad and Tobago and covers Suriname, Aruba and the Netherlands Antilles. The total UN workforce in Suriname is forty five staff members. The UNCT structure is presented in Diagram 2 below.

Diagram 2 Organigram for the UN Country Team
b. The DaO Process

The process of the Government and the UNCT working together in partnership to improve UN programme coherence, relevance and impact began in 2005 with the implementation of a CCA in 2006 and the subsequent formulation of the UNDAF for 2008-2011. It was a conscious decision of PLOS and the UNCT to “internalise” the process by working together with their own staff resources in teams to ensure a maximum level of ownership and commitment.

These exercises involved an in-depth analysis of the country situation and the development priorities of the MOP and were formulated in a series of intensive consultations with a wide range of stakeholders inclusive of the government, UN, Non-Government Organisations (NGOs), Community-Based Organisations (CBOs), other donors and the private sector. The UNDAF was signed by the Government and twelve UN agencies at a “Joint Strategic Meeting” on 4 April 2007.

The positive experience of the Government and the UN working together to produce the CCA and UNDAF paved the way for discussions on including Suriname as a “self starter” pilot country for the DaO process. This participation also received impetus from the visits to the UN in New York and meetings with the Regional Directors of the UN agencies by the Minister of PLOS during 2007 and 2008. The Minister stressed the need for the UN at country level to work in a more coherent, coordinated way and to reduce the current fragmentation and duplication of activities.

As a result, the CCPAP (2008-2011) was developed and signed by the Government of Suriname and the twelve UN agencies on 3 April 2008.

The CCPAP is a unique document for Suriname and is intended to eventually change the way the UN system does business in Suriname. It was formulated based on extensive consultations with different stakeholders such as government, UN agencies, civil society and the private sector. The same UNCT “Writing Team” which collaborated on the CCA and UNDAF continued the formulation of the CCPAP and there were several reiterations of the draft document before it was finalised in an acceptable form.

The CCPAP introduces a new way of providing assistance from the UN agencies to the country’s development process in the spirit of Delivering as One UN. The overall aim is firstly, to ensure that UN priorities are clearly aligned with national priorities, secondly, to create a more effective programme in terms of development results and thirdly, to improve programme efficiency by harmonising and simplifying operational and reporting procedures in order to reduce transaction costs.

The CCPAP identifies the following three broad developmental outcomes which are in line with the outcomes of the MOP:

- **Fair distribution of wealth and equal opportunities for all:** by 2011, policies for sustainable human development are in place to ensure that vulnerable groups in society benefit from growth and have equitable access to opportunities, assets and resources

---

14 UNICEF/UNDP/UNFPA/ PAHO/WHO with inputs from government/non-government & non-resident UN agencies
• **Strengthening democratic governance:** by 2011 governance systems are enhanced through participatory planning and monitoring, public sector reform, legal reform and protection

• **Improved social services:** by 2011, improved access by the population to quality education, health care and legal and social protection services

These outcomes are captured in eleven Annual Work Plans (AWPs) which are presented in diagram 3 below. Eight of the eleven plans have been signed and are being implemented and monitored. The remaining three AWPs covering micro-credit, public sector reform and citizens participation have not been pursued. AWP 2 on micro-credit has not been implemented since it overlaps with a 6-million Euro micro-credit programme from the Government of the Netherlands. AWP 6 regarding public sector reform is not signed as the timing is not yet opportune. There are some issues regarding AWP 7 on citizens’ participation which the Government still needs to resolve. At this point in time the role of the UN system in these important development areas is therefore not an active one. For each AWP a government and UN team leader have been appointed for ensuring and monitoring its implementation towards the CCPAP.

Diagram 3

Source: CCPAP, April 2008
c. Findings and Lessons Learned

This section examines the Suriname experience of Delivering as One UN against the same dimensions that were used for the evaluation of the eight One UN Pilot countries.\textsuperscript{15} It should be noted that some findings cross-cut these major aspects of the DaO process but every effort has been made to avoid too much repetition.

1. Government Leadership / Ownership / Commitment

The Government of Suriname has been a driving force in initiating and supporting the DaO process. Over the past two years, the Ministries of Planning and Development Cooperation (PLOS) and Foreign Affairs (BuZa) have continuously emphasized the need for a more coherent and coordinated UN presence in Suriname and to eliminate the current “fragmentation”. Across the broad, there is clear evidence of a strong interest and commitment to the DaO process given the enormous amount of work such as planning meetings, review meetings, orientation/training sessions, etc. that has been carried out since the CCPAP was signed. Another positive feature is the improved interaction between the UN agencies as a group and the government partners, resulting in improved information sharing and strengthened communication channels.

PLOS is the ministry that is mandated with coordinating and monitoring all development assistance to Suriname to ensure that it is aligned with the development priorities of the MOP and has therefore assumed the leadership role for the DaO process. It is performing this role actively and conscientiously. PLOS emphasizes a “One UN Programme” and the need for all UN agencies to keep them informed of their development activities in Suriname, yet at the same time maintaining their respective strong links with constituent national bodies. However, since this is a very new way of working for PLOS as well as for other stakeholders, their staff capacities and skills in planning, facilitating and communicating in respect of a large multi-sectoral programme, are on a “learning curve”.

At the sectoral level, it is noteworthy that seven ministries have approved and taken the lead to implement the AWPs for the eight thematic areas mentioned in diagram 3. These ministries are Public Health; Education and Community Development; Justice and Police; Labour, Technological Development and Environment; Social Affairs and Housing; Agriculture, Animal Husbandry and Fisheries, Planning and Development Cooperation.\textsuperscript{16} They are also responsible for coordinating and monitoring UN-supported activities as part of their sectoral plans and policies.

These ministries stressed that the CCPAP is a very new process and more time was needed for all parties to adjust. Even though senior and top managers in the line ministries may not be fully aware of the details of the DaO process, they are unanimously supportive of this initiative that will make the UN in Suriname more coherent, effective and efficient. This is because they still see a great deal of overlap and duplication of UN and other donor supported activities that do not seem to fit into their own priorities. They recognise the need to take a stronger leadership role in the coordination of UN agencies working in their sector and

---

\textsuperscript{15} Report Delivering as One Stocktaking Exercise, UNDG, 2007

\textsuperscript{16} PLOS is also a lead implementing agency for AWP 1
thematic areas but in order to do so, the ministries would need to build capacity and strengthen their planning mechanisms.

The government, non-government and UN as implementing partners, are naturally aware of and committed to the DaO process since they are responsible for the implementation of individual projects under the AWPs. However, it was observed that they are generally more concerned about project activities, procedures and funding than about the “bigger picture”, i.e. implementation issues and development impact.

Both the UNDAF and the CCPAP indicate clearly the funding requirements for achieving their stated objectives. As Suriname is a middle income country, it was the intention that the Government, including the sectoral ministries, would come forth with matching programme funds for the CCPAP with the UN system providing technical assistance, expertise and catalytic funding.\(^{17}\)

An amount of USD 17.3 million has been allocated by the Government for the implementation of projects in the CCPAP and these funds are forthcoming. It is noted that PLOS and the line ministries have provided in-kind support in the form of staff time, transport and travel costs in relation to the projects, meetings, communications and office costs. However, the bulk of the commitment is for programmes and projects and if these funds are not yet secured there is a danger that some of the CCPAP outcomes may not be achieved. Another related point is that the Ministry of Finance is not yet on board with this process which could be an obstacle to obtaining funds for the Programme. Together with the respective line ministry, the Ministry of Finance needs to give the final approval for the annual government budget which includes the development component.

### Lessons Learned

**Positive:**

- The leadership role and commitment of the Government has been essential in the DaO process and this has been clearly demonstrated at national, regional and international levels

- To ensure effectiveness and efficiency, the Ministry of PLOS established a United Nations Desk (UN Desk). The UN Desk is comprised of a coordinator and four staff members whereby for each area of cooperation with the UN, one or more persons are assigned

- The UN Desk further has established the C-CPAP Working Group which has a coordination role in order to give further depth to development cooperation within the Government of Suriname and the United Nations

- The engagement of the line ministries in all stages of the process is similarly essential if the DaO process is to be truly successful and country-owned

---

\(^{17}\) See UNDAF
• In order for the DaO to work it has to be country driven i.e. no “one size fits all”, and therefore the Government and UN country team need to have the flexibility to adjust the process according to the country situation and changing needs.

• The DaO process has resulted in stronger interaction, communication and information exchange between the UN agencies as a group and its Government partners.

• The planning and implementation of a large multi-sectoral and multi-thematic programme with many stakeholders has resulted in increased capacity development needs for government staff members; e.g. planning and facilitation of large consultative meetings with many different stakeholders; providing information and advice on the DaO; formulation of M and E guidelines for a large multi-sectoral and thematic programme.

Areas for improvement:

• There is still a lack of total clarity given the complex and recent nature of the CCPAP about responsibilities regarding information sharing on UN procedures, monitoring and reporting, project fund mobilisation etc.

• A common project proposal format for the Executive Committee (Ex Com) agencies is being developed and needs to be finalised

• The engagement of the line ministries needs to be more forceful

• Financial commitments made by the Government in the UNDAF and CCPAP are essential for the achievement of the Programme’s outcomes.

2. UN Agency Involvement, Teamwork and Leadership

As seen in Diagram 1, there are only four resident UN agencies in Suriname out of the total twelve. The Ex Com agencies resident in Suriname are UNICEF, UNDP, UNFPA, ExComm while PAHO/WHO is a specialised UN agency. The small number of agencies at country level has made it relatively easy to initiate and carry out all the common tasks i.e. the CCA, UNDAF, CCPAP and AWPs. It is important to stress at this point that the UN agencies’ overarching motivation comes from their desire to produce better programme development results and thereby have a greater impact on the country’s development, especially on the lives of the most vulnerable. It was solely with this objective in mind that they embarked on the DaO process.

As a starting point, the four resident UN agencies have aligned the start date of their programme cycles with the CCPAP. UNICEF and UNDP have a four-year programming cycle (2008/2011), UNFPA has an annual programming cycle and PAHO/WHO with a two-year programming cycle (2008/2009).
The start of this work in 2005 was facilitated by the fact that the mix of the country team in terms of personality and background experience was such that everyone in the team was willing to experiment with a new approach. Additionally, three of the four resident agencies, UNICEF, UNFPA and PAHO/WHO, have common programme interests () which also made it easier to work together. Representatives from UNICEF, UNDP and UNFPA in particular took a strong lead to initiate and maintain the momentum of the CCPAP process and the teamwork was generally very smooth and participatory. It also consumed a great deal of time from these staff members, anywhere between 25-50% of their working hours in the period from 2005 to 2007. Additionally, there were substantial contributions from other staff members in these agencies, reflecting their different areas of expertise and experience. Finally, all the country representatives were given the freedom by their respective headquarters to pursue this objective, only ensuring that they kept the headquarters informed and consulted them about problem areas.

The non-resident UN agencies are broadly committed to increased UN coherence through the DaO process because they understand the impact it can and will have. All eight non-resident UN agencies have participated in and contributed substantively to the formulation of the UNDAF and the CCPAP. Because they are not located in Suriname they were not always able to be present at country-level events such as consultations with the Government. However but they commented on many draft documents and participated in some key events including the signing of the CCPAP on 3 April 2008. Only UNAIDS, FAO and UNIFEM have committed funds for the CCPAP.

However, the participation of most of the non-resident UN agencies in the implementation of the CCPAP and the DaO process as a whole is generally mixed and not very strong. This is a reflection of many factors such as physical location, other priorities including regional ones, staffing and funding constraints.
In this context, it is noted that many of the non-resident UN agencies are part of a regional network of offices and have regional coverage. For example, UNECLAC is involved in five UNDAF processes at the same time and it becomes impossible to participate and contribute in a systematic way because of staffing and time constraints.

Regarding leadership by the RC, two slightly contradictory points were made. The fact that the RC is not based in Suriname had given the UNCT more freedom to work on the UNDAF and the CCPAP in its own way. However, the point was also made that it would be ideal if the RC was permanently resident in Suriname and could participate more substantively in processes and events that are happening locally.

It is also important to mention the contribution of the UN Development Operations Coordination Office (UNDOCO), formerly UN Development Group, in supporting the process of increased UN coherence at the country level. In the case of the UNCT in Suriname, DOCO provides information on the latest developments regarding UN coherence, advice through regular email contact on any aspect of the DaO, a recent staff mission, facilitation of workshops between 2005-2007 and further has indicated its willingness to fund RC activities in 2009.
Lessons Learned:

Positive:
- The combination of personalities of the RC and UNCT, chemistry and common programme interests, positively influenced the extent of teamwork and cooperation in the DaO process
- The process was smooth because the RC played an active consultative, coordinating and information sharing role. If the RC was located in the country this would improve his/her level of information and involvement in the policy related strategic issues of the CCPAP

Areas for improvement:
- There is a great deal of potential for UN agencies with a regional identity to support country level activities within their areas of interest but there needs to be a mechanism in the UNDAF or CCPAP to enable this interaction
- It is unclear at the moment, how involved the non-resident UN agencies wish to be in the CCPAP implementation and the DaO process as a whole. This may create different expectations among the Government, the resident country team and the non-resident UN agencies
- Sufficient forward planning of major country events will improve the participation of all stakeholders, particularly that of the non-resident UN agencies.
- The DaO process has resulted in stronger interaction, communication and information exchange between the UN agencies as a group and its Government partners
- The planning and implementation of a large multi-sectoral and multi-thematic programme with many stakeholders has resulted in increased capacity development needs for government staff members; e.g. planning and facilitation of large consultative meetings with many different stakeholders; providing information and advice on the DaO; formulation of M and E guidelines for a large multi-sectoral and thematic programme

3. The Programme

It cannot be overly stressed that the motivation for both Government and UN agencies in piloting the DaO process in Suriname was that it would eventually result in improved programme delivery and thereby produce tangible development results and impact. It is generally accepted that the CCPAP is a well-defined, high-quality “programme
Implementation framework” that is closely aligned to the MOP priorities. Secondly, the CCPAP constitutes the political commitment of the Government and the UN agencies in Suriname to work towards a more coherent UN-supported programme.

On the positive side, Government partners across the board commented that their participation in the CCPAP has given them a better understanding of the UN system as a whole in Suriname i.e. the agencies’ mandates, their funding levels, structures and procedures. This is particularly true for the line ministries who until recently worked with only one or two UN agencies. The CCPAP has brought together different stakeholders including the Government, UN agencies and non-government parties, to jointly discuss development priorities and jointly decide on development solutions. This has increased the opportunities for joint cooperation and collaboration between the Government and the UN agencies.

However, many government partners expressed that they do not feel the one UN yet when they participate in meetings with the UN agencies nor do they see this vision reflected in the implementation of the CCPAP. It was generally agreed that the selected project activities in the AWPs fit within the sectoral and thematic priorities of a particular ministry. However, the AWPs are largely a collection of individual projects or discrete activities, supported by individual UN agencies and there is little linkage among them nor clustering of activities towards a common development outcome. This is partly evidenced by the fact that the majority of activities are funded in the range of $ 25-35,000 with some exceptions such as some PAHO and UNDP funded activities. In well-defined sectors such as education and health, there was considerable joint analysis and planning prior to identifying the individual projects in the AWPs and therefore there is more of a convergence and complementarity among projects; however they also contain projects that do not appear to be a strong priority of the relevant sectors or priority areas. In some AWPs of 2008 it seems that projects have been “misplaced” in that they do not fit with the outcome of the Plan e.g. AWP 1.

This was an opinion conveyed by many interviewees from government, non-government and UN and was validated by the consultant’s observations at implementers review meetings. In these meetings, the procedure was to review each project in the AWP, some being very small, in terms of the activities. ; There was no discussion on critical issues such as capacity constraints; how a pilot could be expanded under a ministry programme; how these activities linked up with other activities funded by other donor.. At best, one may conclude that the projects under the AWPs were identified in such a way as to not overlap nor duplicate the projects of other UN agencies.

In reality therefore the AWPs do not constitute joint programmes between the ministries and the UN agencies. (See box 1 on the Implementers Review Meeting for Projects 8 and 11 on Health and HIV/AIDS and the follow-up meeting with the Director of Health).

---

**Box.1 Observations on the implementers review meeting for Health and HIV/AIDS, 14 November 2008.**

The participants represented various departments of the Ministry of Health, the National HIV/AIDS Programme and NGO Foundations e.g. Stichting Lobi, PAHO/WHO, UNICEF, UNFPA and UNAIDS.

The review opened in an original way with Dr. Virginia Asin-Oostberg, the presenter and facilitator, asking the participants to indicate with a show...
of hands if they knew what the UNDAF was, what the CCPAP was, what the AWP was. Most people knew what the AWP was but the numbers decreased with the CCPAP and the UNDAF! She then proceeded to explain very clearly the entire DaO process that has led up to the present meeting.

During the second half of the morning the group broke up into smaller teams to carry out a SWOT analysis of the plans and the results were presented in a follow-up meeting on 21/11. These two meetings were very well structured and were clearly instruments for raising understanding of the DaO process and the role of different UN agencies.

A follow-up meeting with Dr. M. Eersel, Director of Health and Dr. Asin-Oostberg, Policy Adviser elicited the following information. They noted that despite the move to increase UN coherence through the DaO, it was still “business as usual” in that some of the individual UN agencies were often “following their own mandates”. They mentioned examples in the areas of malaria prevention, disaster prevention, HIV/AIDS and development of the interior.

They felt strongly that there needs to be a radical change in the way the CCPAP is designed with a stronger focus on government/MOP priorities and these being translated into real joint programmes. The role of the UN is to provide high-quality technical expertise, best practices, and capacity development. The Ministry of Health was ready to pilot-test such an approach and a joint programme for the provision of basic social services in the interior.

The UNCT members are similarly very concerned that the DaO process is diverting their attention and energy from the programme and the delivery of the programme to achieve real development results. They believe they should be dealing with more critical issues such as programme implementation constraints and how to address the development challenges in the interior.

This concern is partly validated by the consultant’s own findings regarding the development and implementation of the CCPAP. There appears to be a “parallel universe” of documentation, monitoring and reporting, emerging on top of the normal day-to-day activities of the government and UN agencies. With the introduction of the Harmonised Approach to Cash Transfers (HACT), Government implementers will receive funds though one financial modality and report on financial and substantive matters using one common reporting format in regards to UNDP, UNICEF and UNFPA funded activities. However, UN agency staff will have to report to their agency headquarters through their own systems. Since the burden of work is now being shifted to the UN agencies, one may view this as the best short-term solution in the current reality.

Text approved by V. Asin-Oostburg in email dated 7 December 2008
In the case of programming documents, UNDP, UNFPA, and UNICEF all prepare a four-year programme document, whereas PAHO/WHO prepares a two-year Country Cooperation Strategy. The UN non resident agencies also have their own programming and planning documents which they formulate with their national partners. On the plus side, both UNICEF and UNFPA use the AWP to budget and deliver their respective activities and only need to prepare simple agreements or exchange of letters to channel funds. In addition, most of the UN agencies are part of a regional network of offices and therefore contribute to a regional programme strategy for the Caribbean sub-region.

Regarding the coordination of the CCPAP at various levels, it is generally understood that PLOS has an overall coordinating, facilitating and information sharing role. It is also responsible for general monitoring of the AWPs to ensure that they fit with MOP development priorities. But it is not clear to all stakeholders that they are also an implementing partner for some AWPs. Although some initial concerns had been expressed about PLOS’s coordination role becoming one of control, this was not evident at the sectoral level. There seems to be a very positive relationship between PLOS staff and ministry staff, with the PLOS staff basically acting as a source of facilitation, information and clarification.

Regarding programme operations, mention needs to be made of the status of the HACT and the Fund Authorisation and Certificate of Expenditure (FACE) for the transfer of funds for project activities under the AWPs. This is a significant move by the UN system to harmonise and standardise financial transfers and reporting requirements. In 2008, micro-assessments have been done of all the implementing ministries to determine their financial management and accountability capacities. It was also agreed within the UNCT that those UN agencies already working with NGOs would conduct micro-assessments of those NGOs, using an instrument developed by UNICEF. UN agencies would later use these same micro-assessments to work with the same NGOs.

The HACT system is currently being introduced in the Ministries of PLOS with UNDP support; MINOV with UNICEF support and VG with UNFPA support, with the intention to expand the system in all the implementing ministries in the CCPAP by 1 December 2008.

Most government partners agreed that it would be very beneficial to have one common procedure for financial transfers and reporting for all the UN agencies. However, there is widespread confusion among many government implementing agencies and UN agency staff about the system and how it will be introduced. The remaining Ministries have the understanding that the HACT system is to be tested with a few partners, from which an assessment would be made of whether it is feasible to expand to the rest of the AWP implementers. The HACT system will be introduced across the board from 1 December 2008 and the Ministries have expressed concern about whether they will have adequate knowledge and skills to implement at that time.
The process has significantly raised awareness among government, non-government and UN agencies themselves about the UN supported projects and activities in Suriname. Efforts are now underway to eliminate overlaps and duplication among these projects. Stakeholders have become more aware of the potential for collaboration and funding and the process has brought together sectoral ministries who have a common interest to work on common programmes.

In the CCPAP document the M and E and the different roles are clearly defined but as implementation starts it will be visible were adjustments are necessary.

Areas for improvement:

As they are currently formulated, the AWPs, as the modality to operationalise the CCPAP, do not constitute real joint Government UN programmes and therefore can be revised as such. The AWPs are largely as a result of ongoing and planned activities which were grouped together, sometimes artificially, under an UNDAF outcome and leaves room for further convergence and inter-relationship.

There is very good potential to link country activities with regional activities since many of the non-resident agencies are working in the same areas such as poverty reduction, data, and gender at country level and a mechanism needs to be developed to enable this linkage.

Most of the UN agencies, especially the specialised ones, have a very important normative role to play and although this is mentioned in the CCPAP, there does not seem to be a strong link with the AWP activities.

There are still mis-perceptions regarding the implementation of the CCPAP for example, some ministries think that all UN supported activities need to be included in it.

The crosscutting issues of gender, human rights and the environment are not mainstreamed as a general strategy but are dealt with by individual agencies through the project mode. Most of the projects supported by UNICEF, UNFPA and PAHO/WHO consider women’s needs as well as men’s, UNDP supports a project on human rights, etc.

Despite the time extension given by UN headquarters and two orientation training sessions on HACT over the past year, the timing for the introduction of the system has not taken into account the country level realities and therefore more advanced notice should be given to raise awareness among the large number of stakeholders.
4. One UN Fund

Suriname is not a major recipient of international development assistance and UN financial programme resources are equally modest. The CCPAP calls for the mobilisation of USD17.3 million financial resources from non UN sources to complement the UN’s own seed investments and deliver on the expected results.

Although the mechanism of a “One UN Fund” has been discussed in a general way, the DaO process has not reached a point where this is feasible. There is no mechanism at the country level for co-mingling of funds from different UN agencies, and, this presents an area of work for each agency at the Headquarter level. The only mechanism that may be possible is to channel UN agency funds into a government programme account but this is too premature. Therefore there is no “lesson learned” yet regarding this aspect. However, if the Government and UN were to test some different models of joint programmes (based on the activities carried out so far in the AWPs) there may be new and interesting opportunities for joint pooling of development funds including with other donors.

5. Common Premises and Shared Services

As a follow-up to GA Resolution 44/211 of December 1989 and GA Resolution A/RES/47/199 of 22 December 199219, the UNCT has been working very hard over the past two years towards creating a more cost effective and efficient UN programme in Suriname. Currently, UNDP, UNFPA and UNICEF are housed in “Common Premises” and PAHO/WHO has a separate office. In a city as small as Paramaribo this is not a problem per se, as distances between the two offices are very small and do not hamper communication and contact. However, the RC is playing a proactive role to obtain one building (a “UN House) where all the resident UN agencies can be housed as this will improve synergies among the agencies. This element is part of the commitment made by the Government under the CCPAP. The three UN agencies that are housed in the common premises have made much progress on several fronts and this is reflected in a recently signed Memorandum of Understanding (MOU). This MOU aims to reflect a “consultative and coordinated effort of all the UN entities participating in the common premises for the adequate and sound management of common services, under the leadership of the UNRC”.

Progress on this aspect has been partly affected by the inordinate amount of staff time and energy that has been spent on the implementation of the CCPAP. The harmonising of common services at the country level is affected by the internal procedures and regulations of individual UN agencies. Also, although UNICEF, UNDP and PAHO/WHO each have a dedicated operations officer, implementation of decisions take time given that such staff have to address both UN system and their respective agency priorities. Regarding the sharing of services, there have been numerous UNCT and staff meetings to discuss possibilities and to reach agreements. As a result, the following joint agreements and mechanisms are in place:

- A jointly signed lease agreement for the common premises and their administration

---

19 Triennial Policy Review of the Operational Activities of the UN Development System
• A common yearly budget, with a breakdown by UN agency, covering security, utilities, cleaning and other maintenance services, local communications and common equipment
• A Common Premises Management Committee
• A Contracts and Procurement Committee
• Participation in each other’s interview panels for recruitment of agency specific staff
• Inter-agency short listing and interview panels for recruitment of common premises staff such as Receptionist and Librarian
• A Security Management Team
• Informal transport pool
• Common cleaning services
• Common UN promotional activities

It has also been agreed that the new Receptionist and Librarian position would be jointly funded under the common premises budget and that the incumbent would serve all three agencies in the UN House.

In November 2008, an Operations Consultant reviewed business processes in UNDP and recommended that additional business processes such as a joint UN Career Review Group, could be aligned with the DaO process.

A large part of day to day operations of the UN premises still lies with UNDP and efforts need to be made to share these responsibilities more equally or to ensure that UNDP has sufficient staff to carry out this responsibility on behalf of the other agencies. Further efforts to share common services among the four resident UN agencies need to be continued and may be implemented in areas such as international travel, internet, IT, LAN maintenance and a formalised transport pool.

Lessons Learned

Positive:
The DaO process has considerably raised awareness of UNCT members to reduce transaction costs and become more efficient. The UNCT and their staff are willing to continue efforts to examine the potential for pooling and sharing more operations and services. UNICEF, UNDP and PAHO/WHO each have a dedicated Operations Officer and therefore, there is now more potential to share the burden of office operations more equally.

Areas for improvement:
• There is broad agreement that the location of all UNCT members and their staff in one building would be a positive move which will allow for improved teamwork, contact, communication and information sharing. Such a common space could also provide improved communication with the non-resident UN agencies. In this way the UN in Suriname can present a stronger image as “One UN”.
• Country office efforts to harmonise internal business operations and reporting procedures are still limited and will depend on how rapidly individual agency headquarters move on this front.
6. Communication and Information Sharing

Findings regarding the communication aspect cover several levels:

- Government agencies
- UN agencies, resident and non-resident UN agencies and
- among UNCT, government agencies and non government stakeholders
- Development assistance community, civil society and private sector

Even though sensitisation sessions led by UNICEF and supported by PLOS and UNDP have been held, Communication still emerged as a critical common issue throughout the consultations with the different stakeholders. Several examples were given by senior government officials, PLOS staff, the implementing partners, the UN agency country representatives and their staff that they were unaware of some events, missions, procedures, documents, funding possibilities, the status of of the CCPAP and the DaO process. Additionally, some UN staff members and government representatives felt that they had not been sufficiently involved in the substantive consultations on the CCPAP

Given the wide range of stakeholders involved in this process, it is impossible to have a perfect system of communication and information sharing but it is clear that much more can be done from both the Government and UN agency sides to improve the flow of information and communication on the DaO and CCPAP processes.

One of the RC’s main functions is to raise awareness and understanding of the DaO and CCPAP processes not only with PLOS and BuZa, as central government bodies but also with the line ministries and this strategy is been actively pursued. During the consultant’s mission, the RC, accompanied by the relevant UN agency representative, met with the Ministers of VG, J&P and the Director of MINOV and briefed them on the process. However, it is the responsibility of all stakeholders to inform, brief and clarify this process and the work being done with their supervisors and their colleagues.

Communication and information sharing within the UNCT is generally very good as they are a small team and the RC visits Suriname about once a month. UNCT meetings are planned at that time and a record of the discussions is circulated to the team. In addition there are many efforts being made to have joint UN events, brochures and communiqués on various common issues.

Programme staff members within the agencies are in principle very committed to increased UN coherence but find it difficult to balance this with the need to maintain the identity of the UN agency they work for. It was observed that the role of the UN agency staff that participate in the AWPs was a major influencing factor on the dynamics and success of the process. During a UN retreat in September 2008, the general support staff indicated that although they had heard of the DaO and the CCPAP, they had little idea about how it impacted on their daily work situation and how they fit into it. Many staff members also defer to the UNCT as having the major responsibility for implementing the DaO. This is also supported by the lack of response to the web questionnaire.
Lessons Learned

Positive:

Communication and information sharing are key elements of the DaO process. While the CCPAP has, improved the communication and information sharing at all levels, it is also evident that the CCPAP is creating new demands and challenges regarding this aspect. The participation of so many stakeholders has made the process even more complex and created an increased need for better and more regular communication as the more informed stakeholders are, the more effective their participation will be.

The flow of information and communication processes has been strongly supported by PLOS and the RC and UNCT. This process can be strengthened if the sectoral ministry representatives and individual UN staff members take on more responsibility to keep their supervisors and partners in other departments informed of the CCPAP and the DaO.

Areas for improvement:

Communication, information and a clear delineation of responsibilities regarding the CCPAP among government, nongovernment and UN agency staff are essential to ensure the commitment and involvement of all stakeholders.

7. Monitoring and Evaluation of the DaO and CCPAP

The monitoring and evaluation (M and E) of the DaO and the CCPAP are essential in order to determine progress and eventual impact in achieving the planned development results through increased UN coherence and efficiency.

The CCPAP broadly describes the role of different parties in monitoring and evaluating for which PLOS has taken the initiative to develop guidelines based on this. The guidelines identify a Government UN Steering Committee, a Programme Monitoring Group and an AWP Monitoring Group together with focal points in each line ministry as the mechanisms for monitoring of the CCPAP. UNICEF was requested to coordinate comments from the other UN agencies on this initial outline. Based on the comments received, it has been agreed that the current draft needs to be further developed into a more detailed plan with objectives, indicators, means of verification and the responsible parties.

Since there is likely to be a need for technical expertise and capacity building of PLOS and other relevant staff in M and E, this could be sourced from the “Strengthening Aid Coordination and Management and Monitoring of the MOP / MDGs” project which has been approved for funding by the Government of the Netherlands and is expected to start in 2009. This would neatly link up the CCPAP to the MOP development outcomes. See box 2 for details.
Box .2 Project Title: Strengthening National Capacities for Aid Coordination and Monitoring of Development Plans and MDG Achievements

The development vision for Suriname has been set by the MDGs which are fully reflected in its Multi-Annual Development Plan for 2006-2011. From the perspective of development cooperation the Rome and Paris Declarations call for more national ownership, harmonisation and alignment. Therefore it is of mutual benefit for the Government of Suriname and its development partners to take immediate measures to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of the development assistance programme.

This is to be achieved through two strategies: firstly, to improve the government capacity to coordinate, manage and report on official development assistance as part of its overall planning and policy-making process. The second strategy is to improve its current monitoring and evaluation functions so that they become more inclusive and therefore have greater influence on adjusting the national development plans to progress towards achieving the MDG goals.

Expected Outputs:
1. An aid coordination and management capacity and supporting system established with a central base in the Ministry of Planning and Development Cooperation to increase the impact of external development assistance on national development.
2. A participatory monitoring and evaluation capacity with a supporting system established among government agencies to measure progress in national development plans and their contribution to achieving the MDGs.

Estimated start date: May 2009

Currently the discussion on M and E focuses only on the CCPAP and on the monitoring of activities to ensure that they are successfully completed. Given the valid concern expressed by the UNCT about programme delivery, results and impact, more thought needs to be given to outcomes and process indicators. Bearing in mind the complexity of the CCPAP and the many stakeholders, it will be a challenge to achieve a balance between keeping it simple and at the same time assessing the development outcomes and impacts and if the DaO process has contributed to this.

The UNCT still has to examine the extent to which the DaO process and increased UN coherence and efficiency impacts on programming. This is a much more complex task, yet a critical one which will determine the future of the DaO in Suriname.
4. Next Step Forward

Based on the findings and the lessons learned, this section presents a set of next steps or actions for the Government and the UNCT to consider, in order to move forward the DaO process in Suriname.

- As a general comment, the focus of the DaO model in Suriname needs to remain on programming and achieving development results. Any processes that are put into place should support this overall goal and should remain simple, clear and feasible in terms of implementation.

These suggestions and ideas have emanated from consultations with stakeholders and from the review of experiences in other pilot countries. The next steps are presented under the same categories as in the preceding chapter but there are also steps and actions that cross categories. Some indication of priority is given but it will be up to the Government and the UNCT to determine the next steps forward in 2009.

a. Government Leadership / Ownership / Commitment

- RC and UNCT to continue the awareness raising process with ministers and senior officials of the line ministries to increase their understanding of the DaO and encourage their support, including the co-funding of projects (high priority/being done)
- RC and UNCT to continue the dialogue with PLOS regarding the Government’s commitment in the CCPAP i.e. USD17.3million for programmes and programme support (high priority/being done)
- At the line ministry level much more attention to be given to the information requests, concerns and needs of the implementing partners regarding various aspects of the AWPs e.g. HACT and reporting procedures. While understanding that there is a balance to maintain, UN agencies should be more proactive and supportive in assisting their implementing partners with problem solving (high priority/being done)
- UNCT and its Programme and Operations staff to continue the informal process of capacity building of PLOS and the line ministries and to look into the possibilities of organising training in facilitation skills, participatory training skills, results based monitoring, etc. (see box 3). (medium priority/being done)

b. Agency Involvement / Teamwork / Leadership

- The newly appointed UN Coordination Analyst to play a neutral and service-minded role in supporting the UNCT (high priority)
- RC to initiate one on one discussions with the non-resident UN agencies to be very clear on how they wish to be involved in the DaO and CCPAP now that implementation is in full swing. Based on this, to prepare a “Code of Conduct” among the twelve agencies which will then clearly spell out how they wish to be
involved and will avoid unrealistic expectations such as if one of the UN agencies has hardly any activity in Suriname, they may only wish to be informed of major products and events (high priority)

- In order to strengthen the relationship between the CCPAP and the regionally organised activities of many of the non-resident UN agencies, an information sharing mechanism should be developed among the government, UNCT and non resident agencies to enable the practice of using them more for advice and to further support activities (medium priority)
- Staff situation permitting, non-resident UN agencies to appoint a focal point for DaO and CCPAP related work (medium priority)

c. The Programme

- Following on from the Annual Review, the UNCT, PLOS and the line ministries to meet and agree on a plan to re-organise the AWPs in such a way that they move in the direction of joint UN programmes. This could involve the clustering of activities, the transfer of activities to a more appropriate AWP or the removal of activities altogether. A mechanism also needs to be found to enable sharing of project information among AWPs (high priority)
- Consider testing parallel models of joint UN programmes as a means of achieving increased UN coherence. For example, joint UN programmes could be developed around a particular development issue such as inadequate comprehensive health care for most vulnerable groups; early drop-out rate among boys; lack of reliable up-to-date poverty and human development data. Another possibility would be for the Government and UNCT to select a vulnerable area of Suriname and develop a multi facetted programme with several development interventions. Many examples of these kinds of programmes are already being tried out in other countries (high priority)

- Within the implementing partners in the line ministries, task team leaders to initiate discussions on broader topics such as factors that impede implementation, how pilots can be made more sustainable and the need for financial and in-kind support from the ministry (high priority)

- Task team leaders to ensure that AWPs for 2009 include government support, both in financial and in-kind terms (high priority)

- Use the M and E guidelines (based on the CCPAP) that are being developed to clearly identify the roles and responsibilities among the UN agencies, PLOS, BuZa, the line ministries and the implementing partners (high priority)

- UNCT to finalise a common project proposal format in consultation with PLOS (high priority)

- Implementing partners to organise study visits to their projects for different stakeholders including PLOS staff and other UN agencies, in order to improve general understanding of these projects. (medium priority)

d. One UN Fund

- RC and UNCT to continue advocating with the Government for matching programme funds for the CCPAP, in line with commitments made
• Discussion on a “One UN Fund” should be initiated in conjunction with the above recommendations to consider the formulation of another model for joint UN programming. **(medium priority)**

e. Common Premises and Common Services

• UNCT and relevant agency staff to continue to intensify their work on the opportunities for sharing common services **(high priority)**
• Speedy action on the renovation and expansion of the current UN premises to create an inviting, professional image that reflects the total UN image and the respective specialisations of each UN agency **(high priority)**
• RC and UNCT to continue to advocate with the Government for one location where all the UN agencies could be housed **(medium priority)**
• UNCT, with UNDP guidance, to implement those recommendations on common services made by the Business Process Consultant that are feasible in the Suriname context **(medium priority)**
• UNCT to continue to advocate with their respective headquarters to work on harmonising and standardising internal business and reporting processes **(medium priority)**
• If possible the UNCT to allocate a modest office for nonresident UN agencies to use when on mission; this will create a more open door image. **(medium priority)**

f. Communications and Information Sharing

• UNCT members and their respective staff to continue to be very proactive in facilitating, planning, implementing and monitoring meetings and in being a channel of information for all aspects of the CCPAP and DaO processes **(high priority)**
• The UN Coordination Analyst to develop a tool for sharing information about visiting missions from all agencies and circulate this information regularly **(high priority/being done)**
• UNRC to continue organising a UN retreat annually to keep everyone informed of developments and to improve team work **(high priority)**
• The job descriptions of all UN agency staff members should contain a task related to working on DaO aspects and raising awareness of this process and the CCPAP. Appropriate competencies should be reflected in these job descriptions **(high priority)**
• UNCT to continue issuing joint statements and communiqués; organising joint events around international UN days; and joint public events in order to promote the image of “One UN” **(high priority)**
• UNCT and PLOS to consider the need to develop a separate communications strategy as some other pilots have done. However, past experience shows that often such a strategy remains on paper unless there is a full-time driving force behind it. UNCT should therefore consider recruiting an United Nations Volunteer (UNV) or Junior Professional Officer (JPO) for this purpose **(medium priority)**
• UNCT members to invite in-country staff from other UN agencies to visit their projects in order to improve the general understanding of other agency programmes and the increased potential for collaboration. **(medium priority)**
g. Monitoring and Evaluation of the CCPAP

Immediately after the annual review the UNCT and PLOS to agree on how to finalise the M and E guidelines. PLOS and the UNCT may wish to seek the services of the M and E specialist who will be provided under the Aid Coordination Project.

Although every effort should be to keep the M and E guidelines simple and Suriname-specific, it will be a complex and challenging task because an evaluation of the CCPAP and the DaO process is planned in 2010. The M and E plan therefore has to generate the necessary information for this purpose. **(high priority)**

From the viewpoint of programme effectiveness, the main challenge that now exists is how to reorganise the AWPs in the CCPAP in such a way as to move them into real joint Government UN programmes. At the Annual Review Meeting held on 3-4 December 2008, this matter was discussed in detail and the implementers of the AWPs, under the guidance of the team leaders, have started this process.

In terms of programme efficiency, the UNCT and their respective agency headquarters need to expedite actions to obtain common premises and to share common services which will in the end reduce transaction costs.

In concluding, it is clear that the development and implementation of the CCPAP has had a noticeably positive impact in that all stakeholders have gained a better understanding of the UN system of agencies working in Suriname and their respective mandates and expertise. This has created a platform for additional collaboration, cooperation and funding. By sharing information about projects and experiences in implementation, the possibility for overlaps and duplication is being reduced and thereby scarce development resources are saved. Whether this will result in a greater development impact is too early to say and it will depend on many factors including a full-scale evaluation of the CCPAP which is planned in 2010.
# ANNEX 1 - COUNTRY FACTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Official Name</th>
<th>Republic of Suriname</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Area and Topography</td>
<td>163820 km² mostly rolling hills narrow coastal plain rain forest in the south</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate</td>
<td>Tropical with two rainy seasons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main towns</td>
<td>Paramaribo (capital) Nickerie Albina Brownsberg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form of Government</td>
<td>Presidential democracy based on 1987 constitution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Population</td>
<td>492829 persons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population density</td>
<td>3 per km²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDP per capita (PPPUS$)</td>
<td>7722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real GDP growth rate 2006</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Development Index (2008)</td>
<td>0.770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Development Index ranking (2008)</td>
<td>89th out of 179 countries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Poverty Index</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender Development Index as % of the HDI</td>
<td>99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life expectancy at birth</td>
<td>69.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infant mortality rate per1000 live births</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult literacy rate</td>
<td>89.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined primary secondary tertiary gross enrolment rate</td>
<td>77.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children underweight for age (% ages 0-5)</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People without access to improved water sources</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Ethnic groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic groups</th>
<th>Hindustani 27%</th>
<th>Indigenous 3.7%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chinese 1.8%</td>
<td>Creole 17.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White 0.8%</td>
<td>Maroon 14.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other 0.5%</td>
<td>Javanese 14.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown 6.6%</td>
<td>Mixed 12.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: ABS 2006, Population Census Data 2005
UN Human Development Report, 2007/2008
Suriname MDG Baseline Report 2005
### ANNEX 2 - LIST OF PERSONS MET AND INTERVIEWED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title and Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UN</td>
<td>Dr. Marcia de Castro</td>
<td>UN Resident Coordinator for Suriname and Trinidad &amp; Tobago</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN</td>
<td>Ms. Narissa Seegulam</td>
<td>UN Coordination Analyst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAHO/WHO</td>
<td>Dr. Stephen Simon</td>
<td>Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAHO/WHO</td>
<td>Mr. Guno van der Jagt</td>
<td>Administrative Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>Mr. Johannes Wedenig</td>
<td>Representative for Guyana, Trinidad &amp; Tobago and Suriname</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>Mr. René van Dongen</td>
<td>Chief of Field Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>Ms. Liesbeth Roovink</td>
<td>Education Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>Ms. Claudine Hammen</td>
<td>Health Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNFPA</td>
<td>Ms. Jewel Quallo-Rosberg</td>
<td>Programme Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNFPA</td>
<td>Ms. Judith Brielle</td>
<td>Programme Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDP</td>
<td>Mr. Thomas Gittens</td>
<td>Country Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDP</td>
<td>Ms. Christine de Rooij</td>
<td>Programme Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDP</td>
<td>Mr. Ruben Martoredjo</td>
<td>Programme Associate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDP</td>
<td>Ms. Kitty Lioe A Tjam</td>
<td>Administrative Assistant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDP</td>
<td>Ms. Cheryl Francis</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNAIDS</td>
<td>Mr. Ruben del Prado</td>
<td>Country Coordinator</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ECLAC
Mr. Neil Pierre
Director (via telephone)

Ministry of Planning and Development Cooperation (PLOS)
Dr. Ricardo van Ravenswaay
Minister

PLOS
Drs. Iris Sandel
Acting Permanent Secretary and
Deputy Director Project Evaluation and Monitoring

PLOS
Ms. Thania Chin A Lin
Deputy Director for International Development Cooperation

PLOS
Ms. Monique Essed-Fernandes
Policy Adviser

PLOS (UN Desk)
Ms. Natasha Halfhuid
Senior Coordinator

Ms. Presella Young A Fat
Junior Coordinator

Ms. Madhawi Ramdin
Junior Coordinator

Ms. Bhartie Ramdjanamssingh
Junior Coordinator

Ms. Sagita Jaggan
Senior Sector Coordinator – Environment

Ministry of Health
Dr. Celsior Waterberg
Minister

Dr. Marthelise Eersel
Director

Dr. Verginia Asin-Oostberg
Policy Adviser

Ministry of Education
Mr. Ruben Soetosenojo
Director of Education

Ms. Rinette Telting-Djokarto
Secretary to Minister of Education and Community Development

Ms. S. Tjoe A On-Pawiro
Staff

Ministry of Agriculture
Ms. Ashmje Jairam
FAO National Correspondent
Delivering as one UN in Suriname

FAO
Ms. Florita Kentish
Representative (by email correspondence)

Ministry of Foreign Affairs
Ms. Bianca Doelahasori
Staff International Organisations Division

Suriname Conservation Foundation
Mr. L.C. Johanns
Executive Director

Medical Mission
Dr. E. van Eer
Director

Conservation International
Ms. Annette Tjon Sie Fat
Executive Director

In addition the consultant attended the following AWP implementers meetings in 2008:

13 November- Ministry of Education and Community Development Implementers review Meeting of AWP 9, chaired by Ms. Priya Hirasingh, focal point for the CCPAP. Attended by UNICEF, PLOS, several staff members from different departments in the MoE and by NGOs including Eco2Consult, StichtingSucet, StichingTana

14 November- Ministry of Health Implementers review meeting of AWPs 8 and 11, chaired by Dr. Asin-Oostberg. Attended by PAHO/WHO, UNICEF, UNAIDS, UNFPA, PLOS, Ministry departments and NGOs e.g. StichtingLobi


3 - 4 December- Annual Review Meeting of the CCPAP
ANNEX 3a - GUIDE QUESTIONS FOR INTERVIEWS ON “DELIVERING AS ONE UN” LESSONS LEARNED REPORT, NOVEMBER 2008 FOR GOVERNMENT AGENCIES and NON-GOVERNMENT AGENCIES

a. Over the past three years there has been a series of consultations and documents produced as part of the Delivering as One (DaO) process including CCA, UNDAF, CCPAP and AWPs. How much have you been involved and contributed to these processes and documents? What is your opinion of them and do you think they are leading to UN coherence?

b. How do you see the role of the UN system of agencies developing in Suriname i.e. in the context of the activities of other development agencies, the private sector, NGO and foreign direct investment?

c. A key element of the DaO process is the need for strong government ownership and leadership. Are you satisfied with the current level of coordination and exchange of information among government agencies about this process?

d. Based on the CCPAP, the Government has committed an amount of about USD17 million over four years to the DaO process. What commitments in both financial and staff terms has your ministry so far made to support the DaO process?

e. What is your ministry’s opinion about common premises and supportive common services for all the resident UN agencies and can you assist in enabling this?

f. What has been the most significant changes, both positive and negative, that you have observed as a result of the DaO process?

g. What obstacles do you foresee in implementing the DaO process in Suriname?

h. Are there any additional comments or recommendations on the DaO process?
a. Over the past three years there has been a series of consultations and documents produced as part of the DaO process for example CCA, UNDAF, CCPAP, AWPs. How much have you been involved in and contributed to these processes and documents? What is your opinion of them? Are you satisfied with your agency’s level of involvement?

b. What is your view on the ownership and leadership of this process from the government? Who should be in the “driving seat” in terms of political leadership and coordination of the UN agencies and their respective activities in Suriname? In this context, what is your opinion of the role and capabilities of PLOS, The leading Ministry in the process?

c. What commitments so far has your agency made in financial, staff and operational terms to support the DaO process? Can your agency continue to provide this level of support?

d. What is your view on the establishment of a One UN Fund and do you think it is feasible in the Suriname context? Will your agency support it? Do you see it as an additional source of funding for your agency’s activities?

e. Is your agency currently participating in the establishment of common services in Suriname e.g. procurement, communications, HR? If yes, what has been your agency’s contribution? If not, why not? What more can be done?

f. To what extent are you supportive of the current steps being taken to harmonise the operational activities of the One UN programme e.g. HACT and the project management functions? If yes, what has been your agency’s contribution? What more can be done?

g. What is your view on the RC’s leadership role for the DaO process? Does the RC have adequate tools and funds to fulfil this role?

h. In your view, what have been the most significant changes, positive and negative, as a result of the DaO process? Considering the way UN agencies work together in developmental and business processes? And in the way UN agencies relate to their government partners?

i. What are the greatest obstacles that you face in contributing to the DaO process?

j. As a non-resident UN agency what are the particular challenges you face in implementing the CCPAP and the DaO process?

k. To what extent is the rest of your office team aware of and contributing to the DaO process?

l. What level of support have you been receiving from your headquarters and regional headquarters in the DaO process and are you satisfied with the level?

m. Any additional comments and recommendations for moving the DaO process forward?
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