

# EVALUATION BRIEFS

## FINAL INDEPENDENT PROJECT EVALUATION

# Evaluation and Strengthening of the Comprehensive Security Strategy of the State of Mexico (MEXW78)

**Region:** State of Mexico, Mexico.

**Duration:** June 1, 2019, to May 31, 2022.

**Donors:** Government of State of Mexico, through the Secretary of Security of the State of Mexico (SSEM).

**Evaluation team:** Radamanto Portilla Tinajero, PhD; and Clemente Romero Olmedo, MSc.

**Full report:**  
[https://www.unodc.org/unodc/en/evaluation/reports\\_year\\_2022.html](https://www.unodc.org/unodc/en/evaluation/reports_year_2022.html)

## BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT

The project MEXW78 (the Project) was developed and implemented from 2019 to 2022 by the Liaison and Partnership Office in Mexico of the UNODC, with a budget of US\$476,111. The main expected result of the Project was creating recommendations that, if accepted by the SSEM, would help increase the results of the Comprehensive Security Strategy of the State of Mexico (EISEM). The Project generated four Reports, a Guide for the Implementation of Recommendations, an online Diploma in Crime Prevention, and the implementation of the “Line Up Live Up” and “Strong families” prevention programs in three priority municipalities of the State of Mexico. The purpose of the Final Independent Project Evaluation was to assess if the project met its objective and generated the expected results.

## MAIN FINDINGS

They are divided into seven evaluation criteria: **1. Relevance:** The Project was adapted to the requirements of the SSEM, who learned international standards and best practices and knew their areas for improvement in all the axes of the EISEM. **2. Efficiency:** The Project optimally used the economic resources when generating the products and expected results and even implemented more actions than those originally agreed upon. **3. Coherence:** The Project generated collaboration and coordination networks for the implemented actions. **4. Effectiveness:** The Project carried out all the planned activities and generated 135 recommendations for improvement, of which 67% were clear, relevant, timely, and feasible. However, the evaluation team did not obtain evidence on the number of recommendations incorporated by the SSEM. Therefore, it was not possible to assess to what extent the EISEM was strengthened. **5. Impact:** The Project improved the EISEM design, implementation, and evaluation processes in crime prevention and data management programs, contributed to SDG 16.a and SDG 5 by preparing the final products and an online course in crime prevention, and was rated very positively by 90% of the attendees, and applied the “Line Up Live Up” and “Strong families” programs. **6 Sustainability:** The SSEM incorporated the Project's recommendations in crime prevention and data management, but the lack of formalization and follow-up mechanisms for recommendations, or staff turnover in the SSEM, limited adoption in other areas. It was identified in a participatory workshop with stakeholders that the project counterpart could adopt almost seven out of ten recommendations issued by the Project. **7. Human rights, gender equality, leaving no one behind:** The Project proposed actions to the SSEM to improve investigation capacities in matters of criminal incidence, femicides, attention to victims, crime prevention, with a gender-focused approach to the victims and respect for human rights.



## LESSONS LEARNED

1. *Avoiding delays in hiring personnel facilitates the timely fulfillment of the agreed activities.* Delays in hiring coordinating staff responsible for the Office's projects caused discrepancies and adjustments in the Project's work schedules.

2. *The focus of projects on activities with more excellent UNODC institutional experience facilitates the adoption of its recommendations.* Of the eight axes of the EISEM to be analyzed, those related to data management and crime prevention generated most of the recommendations adopted and developed under the Project, which coincide with some of the areas with the most significant institutional experience UNODC in Mexico.

Criteria for assessing the quality of the recommendations

<b>Clear</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is accurately expressed.</li> <li>It is understood what is proposed or expected.</li> </ul>
<b>Relevant</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is a significant contribution to the improvement of intervention.</li> <li>Will lead to increase or improve the results of intervention.</li> </ul>
<b>Timely</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Show up the right time.</li> <li>It is not necessary to generate conditions that do not exist to carry it out.</li> </ul>
<b>Feasible</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It can be done; it is feasible to carry out in a given time, with the resources of the responsible area.</li> <li>It is in control of the responsible area.</li> </ul>

## GOOD PRACTICES

- The development and preservation of optimal interpersonal relationships facilitated problem-solving and the adoption of recommendations.
- The flexibility in the Project's development improved its impact, carrying out additional activities as agreed.
- Acting resilient to any internal or external circumstance to the Project contributed to fulfilling its objectives.
- The participatory construction of the recommendations increases their understanding and appropriation.

## METHODOLOGY

A mixed methodological approach of qualitative and quantitative techniques was used to increase the validity of the findings through triangulated data analysis. The results of the evaluation were obtained from i) an exhaustive review of documents or secondary sources, ii) 14 semi-structured interviews with the main actors involved in the project, carried out remotely, iii) 82 answers to the questionnaire in line, and iv) a

## RECOMMENDATIONS

**1. Plan or agenda for improvement:** It is recommended that the project team create a mechanism for formalizing and monitoring the recommendations issued by the office, preferably before the end of the first half of 2022, to increase its usefulness.

**2. Design of the Project:** It is recommended that in the next two years (2022-2023), the UNODC program area includes the participation of all the actors involved, from the establishment of objectives and results, especially in projects that involve the emission improvement recommendations.

**3. Starting the Project:** It is recommended that the areas of selection, formation, or hiring of the teams that will implement the projects improve or streamline their processes to avoid delays in the start of these, which could be done in the course of 2022.

**4. Design of Logical Framework:** It is recommended that the area responsible for the generation of UNODC projects prepare the logical framework of the projects, to be generated in 2022 and 2023, in accordance with the UNODC management manual for results.

**5. Integration of workteams:** It is recommended that, in projects that involve police institutions, the area in charge of UNODC in the creation and/or hiring of the project teams incorporates personnel specialized in investigation or with professional experience in the matter.

participatory workshop to evaluate recommendations with 15 SSEM officials, conducted remotely. A purposive sampling strategy (non-probabilistic) was used to select the participants in the interviews, the online questionnaire, and the workshop. The data collection was carried out remotely, but this did not represent a threat to the development of the evaluation or the validity of the findings.