

What is a Good Practice? A framework to analyse the Quality of Stakeholder Engagement in implementation and follow-up of the 2030 Agenda

Application Examples

COUNTRY / CONTEXT:

MÉXICO

Contact(s) for more information:

Carlos Cortés Zea (carlos.cortes-zea@undp.org), Monica Eden (monica.eden@undp.org).

1. The Background: What was the context, what were the objectives, at which level was the tool applied?

A study was developed in the context of the ‘Project to promote the political participation of women’, between the UNDP in Mexico and the National Electoral Institute (INE, by its acronym in Spanish). This collaboration began in 2019 and consists in accompanying the INE in the National Program to Promote the Political Participation of Women Through Civil Society Organizations (PNIPPM, by its acronym in Spanish). In this program, a call for proposals is open each year to **give technical and financial support to civil society organizations** (CSO) projects throughout the country. The UNDP supports the PNIPPM in 3 activities: (1) training of CSOs, (2) documentation and systematization of results (3) support in methodologies and processes of the PNIPPM. As part of these activities, in 2019 a [study of successful experiences](#) was elaborated, in which 5 cases were documented among the 32 projects. For the [second study](#) of successful experiences, the **methodology was inspired by the UNDP UNDESA analytical framework**, especially by the proposed methods. As a result, 5 cases were documented among the 51 benefited projects. Our objective is **to identify from the projects that we support elements that allow or limit the results to promote gender equality** in the public and political spheres, which is linked to SDG 5, 10 and 16. This allows the generation and dissemination of lessons learned so that the CSOs that participate each year have more tools. Our goal is also to document the impact of our project.

2. The Process: How was the tool used (e.g. as a conversation starter, fully to guide an analytical exercise), Who initiated it, who was involved? Was it a collective analysis or unilateral analysis?

We **used the tool as inspiration to strengthen our methodology** in the second study of successful experiences that we presented this year. We worked with a consultant who **was guided by the tools and methods** of the analytical framework. However, **we adapted them to our needs and context** (INE, UNDP, and the consultancy). The study lasted more than three months because we did a documental review of 54 projects in 17 entities, then we made virtual visits with all of them to identify their achievements and challenges. We **used five criteria adapted from the analytical framework** and the documentation of previous successful experiences: compliance, adaptation, innovation, collaboration, and impact. We evaluated each project in a matrix with the five criteria using signaling and scoring according to characteristics that the projects met (or not). Once we identified projects that could be considered successful experiences, we selected 5 with different characteristics among them such as: target population, geographic location, work modality, and experience. Then we did interviews with the people responsible for the projects and with their beneficiaries. Finally, we **identified lessons learned and recommendations**, which were also informed by the analytical framework, and with it, a checklist was generated. The publication was [presented in October 2021](#) at an event aimed at CSOs and the general public.

3. The experience: What were challenges, what were success factors? What lessons, tips or recommendations would you like to share with others?

Challenges:

- (1) Integration and analysis of a large amount of information. For instance, we did a documental review of 51 projects. In addition to virtual visits in some cases, we made up to 2 and 3 virtual visits to certain projects.
- (2) Adaptation of the evaluation criteria, using the experience of the previous study and the analytical framework.
- (3) Definition of the five criteria with the INE.
- (4) Selection of cases that were going to be documented in the publication.
- (5) Identification of the impact of projects.

Success factors:

- (1) The consultant was very committed and organised to integrate and systematize the information.
- (2) Digital tools were valuable resources for the construction of the study.
- (3) We had an extraordinary commitment from the INE and UNDP teams to carry out and get involved in this study throughout the time it lasted.
- (4) CSOs were informed at every stage of the activities we were doing.
- (5) We already had a first study that gave us experience and lessons learned.
- (6) The analytical framework was our reference, among other international methodologies.
- (7) We have many sources of information about the projects, such as a virtual platform that is updated in real-time, periodic reports, a WhatsApp chat, meetings, we review all your materials, etc. In addition, we had contact with both those responsible for the projects and the beneficiaries in separate interviews, which gave us a deeper overview of the impact.
- (8) Building a checklist informed by previous experience and with the analytical framework.

Lessons learned / recommendations:

- (1) The pandemic forced us to do activities in a **virtual model** that we would never have achieved in person in a country as large as Mexico, such as visits to all projects, virtual interviews, etc. Before the pandemic, it was not possible for us to have as much contact with all CSOs.
- (2) A project like this takes **time and dedication**. Therefore, it is important to have the commitment of the parties and someone to help facilitate the process, mediate, as well as integrate, systematize and analyze the information. We were lucky to have that on this occasion.

4. The results: What changed in terms of process and / or outcome? What role did the tool play in this?

From the first study to the second study in which we used the analytical framework as a guide, **the methodology was more technical, objective, and the decisions and analyzes were more collective than unilateral. As a result, it helped us build consensus and be more confident about our selection.** And this enabled us to identify the projects that had better performance, those that we had to accompany more to achieve their goals, and those with diverse areas of opportunity.

- a. A **more solid and objective basis for evaluation** was built. Three-level signaling was carried out based on the performance of each project.
- b. The **checklist for a successful project** took up elements of the analytical framework, which contributed to its strengthening.

5. The tool: Was the tool adapted? Which parts were particularly useful, which ones less? What was unclear / could be improved?

We **adapted** almost all the methodology to our needs. The **analytical framework inspired the construction of the five evaluation criteria**, which are assimilated to the dimensions integrated in the methodology. For example, principles such as inclusion and participation were considered in our criteria (impact, innovation and collaboration); Furthermore, accountability is considered, for example, in the characteristics of compliance.

For the evaluation of the projects, a **matrix** similar to that of the analytical framework was developed, but we only rated by 3 "levels" that we evaluate as a traffic light (red, yellow, and green). We **used the recommendations about implement the study during the pandemic**, with virtual actions such as virtual visits, document review and online interviews. We tried to privilege the **collective analysis** over the unilateral. One of the most relevant adaptations is that we developed "successful experiences" and not "good practices," because the context in our country and, primarily since our focus is on projects carried out by CSOs for six months that involve various actions at the same time, such as forming networks, holding workshops, forums, awareness activities, work in schools, alliances with actors and authorities, etc. It is worth stressing that the **checklist for a successful project was inspired by the "level 3" of the analytical framework**, in addition, it was complemented with the lessons learned from the previous study and thus also, with the outstanding results of each project.

6. Next Steps: What will happen next? Is there a need for follow-up support?

In 2022 we will carry out a third study of successful experiences. We're looking forward to strengthening our methodology, and also, we're trying to make the next study more attractive and widely disseminated. But primarily, we seek to achieve our main objective, which is to support other CSOs that are developing similar projects or CSO participants in next editions of the PNIPPM. It would be very useful to get feedback on the publication and methodology.

7. Anything else you would like to share that could help improve or apply the tool?

It could be interesting to have support or feedback during the construction process of the studies of successful experiences, or to have a workshop about how to apply the methodology.