

# BINI Burgerinitiatief

voor Participatie & Goed Bestuur

[binisuriname@gmail.com](mailto:binisuriname@gmail.com) [info@projekta.sr](mailto:info@projekta.sr) [www.binisuriname.sr](http://www.binisuriname.sr)

## Who passed, who failed?

### Summary Comparison of electoral party programs 2025 in Suriname

#### Content

1. Introduction.....	1
2. Key Findings .....	2
3. Thematic Comparisons per party (summary) .....	2
4. Summary of comparison per overall party program .....	5

## 1. Introduction

BINI (Citizens' Initiative for Participation and Good Governance- Burgerinitiatief voor Participatie en Goed Bestuur) conducted its third comparative review of Surinamese political party election programs, this time for the 2025 general elections.

The review included the election programs of nine parties (A20, ABOP, BEP, DA91, NDP, NPS, OPTSU, PL, and VHP) and excluded five smaller due to either plagiarism or limited electoral relevance.

Despite the formal purpose of election programs—to present a party's vision, plans, and values to voters and to guide potential coalition negotiations—BINI found a persistent and growing gap between what parties write and what they actually do. Many programs seem to exist merely to comply with electoral law. Promises made are often not revisited after elections, and coalition talks rarely reference foundational program content.

Each party's program was evaluated through:

- A **general party profile and critique**, focusing on vision, coherence, realism, and presentation.
- A **comparative thematic analysis**, covering seven critical governance and development areas:
  1. Good Governance
  2. Rule of Law, Human Rights, and Democracy
  3. Human Development (education, health, social protection)
  4. Environment and Nature
  5. Public Sector Reform
  6. Financial-Economic Policy
  7. Offshore Oil and Gas Development

The methodology included thematic scoring (green = adequate, orange = vague/incomplete, red = absent or flawed), and detailed summaries per theme and party. The full questionnaires on which the comparisons are based are also provided for ease of reference.

## 2. Key Findings

- **General Quality:** Most programs suffer from poor planning logic, lack of integrated policy approaches, weak implementation strategies, and absence of budgetary or legislative feasibility analysis.
- **Vision & Strategy:** Very few parties articulate a clear long-term development vision. Those that do, often fail to align their plans with that vision or to define measurable indicators.
- **Execution & Realism:** Almost all programs are overly ambitious given Suriname's current institutional, financial, and human capacity. Many rely on optimistic oil and gas revenue projections, without contingency planning or institutional readiness.
- **Governance & Accountability:** While many parties mention transparency and anti-corruption, few propose concrete legislation, institutional reforms, or participatory mechanisms. The Rule of Law and checks-and-balances are frequently neglected.
- **Human Rights & Inclusion:** Attention to marginalized groups (e.g. women, people with disabilities, Indigenous and Tribal Peoples, LGBTQ+ communities) is limited, superficial, or entirely absent in most programs.
- **Environmental & Global Context:** Climate change is acknowledged but rarely embedded in a structured policy framework. The impact of regional and global developments on Suriname is often ignored or treated superficially.

### General Conclusion

BINI concludes that while some parties show potential through specific ideas or awareness of systemic issues, all parties fall short in delivering well-structured, credible, and realistic policy programs.

The review calls for political parties to treat election programs more seriously—not only as campaign tools, but as instruments of accountability and responsible governance. Voters and civil society are encouraged to use these analyses to demand better planning, honesty, and follow-through from political actors.

## 3. Thematic Comparisons per party (summary)

### 1. Good Governance

Most parties express support for transparency and anti-corruption, but few translate these into enforceable mechanisms:

- **A20** stands out with proposals like a national transparency portal, digital disclosure of public spending, and anti-corruption legislation. However, it lacks institutional guarantees or legal detail.
- **DA91** proposes a phased reform approach and cost estimates for its governance plans.
- **NDP** suggests a digital government strategy, but overestimates institutional capacity.
- **PL** and **VHP** lack credible governance frameworks and fail to address transparency systematically.
- Across the board, mechanisms for citizen participation, oversight bodies (e.g., Rekenkamer, CLAD), and policy accountability are underdeveloped or missing. Only a few parties recognize the need for strengthening oversight institutions or introduce tools like a Whistleblower Protection Act.

## 2. Rule of Law, Human Rights, and Democracy

A disappointing number of programs treat democracy and human rights as secondary:

- **DA91** and **BEP** make human rights central, mentioning access to justice, equal treatment, and youth empowerment.
- **A20** calls for democratic renewal, yet lacks attention to the judiciary and separation of powers.
- **NDP** and **NPS** support rule-of-law principles but offer no concrete legal safeguards or actions to strengthen the judiciary.
- **PL**, **OPTSU**, and **VHP** give little to no structured attention to human rights frameworks or constitutional reforms.
- Legal protections for marginalized groups (Indigenous peoples, LGBTQ+, persons with disabilities) are largely absent or symbolic.

## 3. Environment and Nature

Climate change and biodiversity receive uneven treatment:

- **ABOP** and **BEP** refer to REDD+ mechanisms and sustainable forestry, with some attention to community involvement.
- **DA91** supports climate diplomacy and green growth, though specifics are limited.
- **A20** and **NDP** mention environmental protection in passing but lack policy depth or regulatory plans.
- **VHP** refers to “greening the economy” and sustainable energy, but without a strategic framework.
- **OPTSU** and **PL** fall short, offering generic or outdated environmental rhetoric.
- No party presents a binding climate agenda aligned with international commitments or a credible strategy for coastal resilience, despite Suriname’s vulnerability.

## 4. Human Development (Health, Education, Social Protection)

This theme features prominently, though often with vague or overly ambitious goals:

- **NPS** scores high in education and health planning, integrating innovation, preventive care, and school reform.
- **DA91** offers a phased investment model in health and education, with some budgeting detail.
- **A20** proposes large-scale reforms in vocational training, digital learning, and healthcare, but lacks cost realism.
- **ABOP**, **BEP**, and **VHP** include expansive lists of social priorities, but omit how these will be staffed or financed, given Suriname’s brain drain and fiscal constraints.
- **PL** and **OPTSU** rely heavily on idealistic goals like universal healthcare or family development, without structural or legal frameworks to implement them.

## 5. Public Sector Reform

This remains one of the most critical and weakest areas across the board:

- **A20** identifies the inefficiencies of the civil service but overestimates reform capacity.
- **DA91** proposes structural changes including performance-based budgeting and professionalization, though institutional anchoring is unclear.
- **NDP** mentions digitalization, local governance, and merit-based appointments, but lacks a reform roadmap.

- Most other parties, including **ABOP**, **BEP**, **VHP**, and **PL**, fail to address the bloated and politicized bureaucracy or fail to propose realistic measures to improve effectiveness, coordination, or service delivery.
- No party presents a coherent, costed strategy for modernizing state institutions, decentralizing decision-making, or improving/depoliticizing recruitment and oversight mechanisms.

## 6. Financial-Economic Policy

Most parties promote growth and investment but lack fiscal credibility:

- **DA91** is the only party to present (some very broad stroked )cost estimates, as well as deficit projections, and revenue strategies (including taxation reform).
- **NDP** and **A20** advocate economic diversification and job creation, but fail to present realistic revenue models or debt management plans.
- **VHP** assumes tens of billions in oil revenue over 25 years but provides no contingency scenarios or macroeconomic planning.
- **NPS** and **ABOP** suggest investments in social services and infrastructure, while underestimating the need for budget discipline, tax compliance, and IMF constraints.
- Private sector development, innovation, and SME support are mentioned widely, but regulatory and financial sector reform are weakly elaborated.

## 7. Offshore Oil and Gas Development

This theme is a key national priority but poorly addressed in most programs:

- **No party** offers a clear plan for managing anticipated revenues from Block 58 (GranMorgu), or proposes legal frameworks for revenue stabilization (e.g., sovereign wealth fund).
- **BEP** and **DA91** refer to benefit-sharing and transparency in extractive industries, but lack institutional and legal detail.
- **A20** wants civil society to monitor oil and gas revenue use—an unrealistic delegation of state responsibility.
- **NDP** and **VHP** mention leveraging energy revenues for development, but without clear investment plans, legislation, or oversight proposals.
- **Environmental and social safeguards** are missing across all programs, raising concerns about the sustainability and equity of future exploitation.

## Conclusion

The BINI report reveals a deep disconnect between political promises and policy planning. While parties identify many of Suriname’s core development challenges, their programs largely fall short in terms of:

- Realistic implementation plans
- Legal and institutional anchoring
- Fiscal responsibility
- Human rights protections
- Evidence-based policy making

Few programs show understanding of the geopolitical, climate, and economic shifts affecting Suriname’s future. BINI urges parties to take their own election promises seriously and encourages voters to use this comparative analysis as a tool for informed and accountable political choice.

## 4. Summary of comparison per overall party program

### A-20 (combinatie)

- **Overall impression:** Ambitious and broad program with strong rhetorical commitment to transparency, integrity, and moral leadership. Lacks practical underpinnings like legal frameworks, planning instruments, and financial feasibility.
- **Strengths:** Clear emphasis on anti-corruption, transparency mechanisms, and institutional reform (e.g. transparency portal, asset declarations, digital procurement). Recognition of governance failures.
- **Weaknesses:** Overreliance on vague proposals (e.g. "technical cabinet"), limited attention to the rule of law and vulnerable groups, and unrealistic expectations about institutional capacity and digital readiness. Gender equality and children's rights are not addressed.
- **Feasibility:** Overestimates what can be achieved given Suriname's institutional and political limitations in 2025.
- **Vision:** Focused largely on eliminating corruption but lacks an articulated broader development vision.
- **Integration:** Some attempt at a comprehensive approach, but key institutional linkages are missing.
- **Global Awareness:** Mentions regional cooperation and international issues like climate change and financial transparency but without integration into domestic planning.

### ABOP

- **Overall impression:** A relatively broad and future-oriented program, though filled with vague and sometimes inflated language. Uses SDGs as a reference point but lacks coherence and concreteness.
- **Strengths:** References to SDGs and social development; various issue areas are at least acknowledged.
- **Weaknesses:** Many proposals are not actionable or costed. Weak institutional and legal foundations, and no realistic plan for governance or public sector reform.
- **Feasibility:** Plans are not feasible given Suriname's capacity constraints. They rely heavily on oil and gas revenue while ignoring debt and IMF limits.
- **Vision:** Aspires to place Suriname among the world's top 60 nations by various wellbeing metrics, but provides no metrics besides GDP.
- **Integration:** Thematic divisions reflect some SDG linkages, but cross-sector coherence is lacking.
- **Global Awareness:** Includes language on climate action and regional integration but neglects global economic or geopolitical shifts.

### BEP

- **Overall impression:** Socially-oriented program with references to decentralization and human rights, but often vague and sometimes unrealistic or outdated in policy concepts.
- **Strengths:** Commitment to social equity, decentralization, youth empowerment, and some entrepreneurial strategies.
- **Weaknesses:** Some proposals (e.g., a "development army") are outdated or poorly thought through. Environmental and institutional dimensions are weak.
- **Feasibility:** Many proposals lack financial and institutional grounding; overly optimistic about capacity to implement sweeping reforms.
- **Vision:** A just society where national wealth is fairly distributed.
- **Integration:** Scattered references to rights-based and integrated approaches, but implementation is not well-connected.

- **Global Awareness:** Some references to REDD+ and carbon markets, but weak on international cooperation and transnational issues.

#### DA91

- **Overall impression:** One of the better-thought-out programs, with attention to phases of implementation and some cost analysis, though still too descriptive in parts.
- **Strengths:** Strategic structure with two phases, investment cost estimates, focus on green economy and middle class. Strong on transparency and rights.
- **Weaknesses:** Still largely a wish list without detailed implementation mechanisms.
- **Feasibility:** More realistic than others due to phased planning and some budgeting, but challenges remain.
- **Vision:** An inclusive, green economy driven by SMEs and strategic alliances.
- **Integration:** Partial integration across sectors, use of SDGs as a guiding framework.
- **Global Awareness:** Strong emphasis on international law, regional alliances, and global challenges.

#### NDP

- **Overall impression:** Well-organized and coherent structure with chapters that include goals, analysis, and proposed measures. Promising presentation, but underlying gaps remain.
- **Strengths:** Structured format; cross-referencing across chapters; attention to various priority sectors; attention to planning and institutional needs.
- **Weaknesses:** Lacks true prioritization, realistic sequencing, and financial grounding. Institutional weaknesses are under-assessed.
- **Feasibility:** Proposes too much without identifying trade-offs. Investment plans are not backed by costs or funding sources.
- **Vision:** Suriname as a model of sustainable and inclusive development.
- **Integration:** Six national priorities are highlighted but not tied into an overarching policy strategy.
- **Global Awareness:** Acknowledges climate and biodiversity challenges and international positioning, but little depth in geopolitical understanding.

#### NPS

- **Overall impression:** Structured and relatively readable program, but new ambitions are not always backed by new ideas or plans.
- **Strengths:** Clear focus areas (education, health, environment); commitment to sustainable growth; mentions of innovation and institutional strengthening.
- **Weaknesses:** Lacks clear vision for post-2028 (oil revenue peak); insufficient analysis of debt, institutions, or inter-sectoral links.
- **Feasibility:** Proposals are often unrealistic given staffing, legal, and financial gaps. Too many ambitions without sequencing or costing.
- **Vision:** Sustainable and inclusive development, with key roles for oil revenue and institutional capacity.
- **Integration:** Some thematic breakdown but weak interconnections.
- **Global Awareness:** Vague references to international collaboration; fails to link to global climate or trade frameworks meaningfully.

#### OPTSU

- **Overall impression:** Disconnected program with scattered ideas and inconsistent logic. Includes some creative but impractical proposals.

- **Strengths:** Social and family-oriented framing; references to decentralization and long-term planning.
- **Weaknesses:** Lack of structure, logic, and evidence. Some implausible suggestions (e.g., capital relocation, conditional subsidies).
- **Feasibility:** Lacks budgeting, legal framework, or administrative realism.
- **Vision:** Implicit vision of socially just state, but not well-articulated or operationalized.
- **Integration:** Poorly integrated; sectors stand alone.
- **Global Awareness:** Virtually absent.

### Pertjajah Luhur (PL)

- **Overall impression:** Almost entirely recycled from 2020, indicating low seriousness and poor reflection of new realities.
- **Strengths:** Mentions of decentralization, governance, and anti-corruption, albeit mostly symbolic.
- **Weaknesses:** Outdated; lacks concrete plans, new data, or recognition of recent developments. Often unclear or contradictory.
- **Feasibility:** Unrealistic given weak institutional culture and fiscal challenges.
- **Vision:** Vaguely references economic transformation, but without detail.
- **Integration:** No integration.
- **Global Awareness:** General references to strengthening international ties, but superficial and not tied to strategy.

### VHP

- **Overall impression:** Disconnected, often rhetorical, with vague statements and major gaps in strategy, planning, and prioritization.
- **Strengths:** Emphasis on international finance, compliance, and education reform. Positive stance on trade, banking, and recognition of international context.
- **Weaknesses:** Core governance and rights issues are ignored or misrepresented. Disconnected slogans replace structured policy thinking.
- **Feasibility:** Overly reliant on oil income projections, with no financial planning. Ignores systemic reform needs.
- **Vision:** Emphasis on individual empowerment and a fair society, but lacking in institutional or structural elaboration.
- **Integration:** Thematic silos without connections.
- **Global Awareness:** Recognizes global tax and trade issues, but not geopolitical or climate-related shifts.

*BINI is a collective of Civil Society Organisations and individual citizens (experts in their field) who advocate for a human rights based approach to development, and believe that good governance, democracy are the cornerstones for the fulfillment of the human rights of all. We believe that citizens and civil society should be able to participate in policy setting, and that it is our duty to hold duty bearers to account if the systems to do are not in place. BINI was set up as a policy monitoring initiative in 2015 by Projekta with a grant from the EU. Since then, BINI has been self funded by Projekta who also operates as it's coordinator, and by the volunteer work of all BINI partners and involved citizens.*

*This comparison was self funded and free from any political affiliation. The governance paragraph was conducted with assistance from the VSB and the VES provided some input for the paragraph on Financial/Economics.*

Contact person: Sharda Ganga ([info@projekta.sr](mailto:info@projekta.sr) / [binisuriname@gmail.com](mailto:binisuriname@gmail.com))

Visit the website: [www.binisuriname.sr](http://www.binisuriname.sr) for the full report as well as partial reports.