



Evaluation Summaries

Support for the prevention and elimination of CSEC and the protection of victims in Mexico

Quick Facts

Countries: *Mexico*

Mid-Term: July 2004

Mode of Evaluation: *independent*

Technical Area: *Child Labour*

Evaluation Management: *IPEC DED*

Evaluation Team: *Laura Sarvide, Elena Luengas and Angélica Lòpez*

Project Code: *MEX/02/50/USA*

Donor: *United States*

Keywords: *Child Labour, Commercial Sexual Exploitation of Children*

Extracted from the introduction to the full report

The evaluation was carried out at the request of the International Labor Organization (ILO), in line with the agreement made with the donor to conduct an external, intermediate evaluation covering the period from October 2002 to March 2004. The Terms of Reference (TOR) were developed for this purpose, and served to guide the work of the evaluating team.

1. Activities carried out

- a) Identification, study and analysis of documents, provided by the ILO.
- b) Design and development of the methodological document, approved by the Design, Monitoring and Evaluation Official at the Sub-Regional Office and by the Design, Evaluation and

- Documentation Section of IPEC in Geneva
- c) Development of the interview script and instructions
- d) Design, application and systematization of the survey on results, obstacles, lessons and recommendations
- e) Conducting and systematizing the interviews of the individuals directly and indirectly involved, conducted on a individual or group basis; in the case of Guadalajara, the interview was conducted by telephone
- f) Two-day field visit to Tijuana and Acapulco
- g) Consultation of web-internet pages
- h) Session for presenting the “First approximation of evaluation results” rough draft, for the purpose of providing feedback and completing the information and analysis. This session was held in Mexico City with the participation of all the entities involved in the project.

2. Limitations and Successes

The methodology applied was based on the Methodological Document developed in April 2004 by the evaluating team and approved as specified in the previous paragraph. The sources of information selected were: documentary material, interviews, survey, field visits, consultations of web pages, and the complementary session held on May 25.

One of the factors that facilitated the evaluation and application of the methodology was the willingness and commitment on the part of the

ILO office in Mexico, especially by the project director and administrative assistant. The evaluating team received documentary information in a timely manner and did not experience any difficulty in obtaining a response from the director when this was required. The task of facilitating and confirming the interviews, as assumed by the administrative assistant, was carried out with great efficiency, and without this assistance, it would not have been possible to conduct the number of interviews realized.

The difficulties experienced were the following: the lack of an updated directory; the number of phone calls necessary to carry out each one of the appointments (calculated at approximately an average of six phone calls per interview); the limited availability of time on the agendas of those interviewed; some interviewees were unable to provide the information requested since they were not familiar with the details of the project or were only generally familiar; there were many cancellations of appointments or last-minute changes; and in a number of the interviews, the time dedicated was short in relation to the time necessary for arriving at more complete information.

It is important to mention that all the interviews took place in an atmosphere of openness, trust, willingness and interest in offering the information requested.

Having conducted the survey is a success, even though only 50% of those approached responded favorably. It was a success because it gave an opportunity to those interviewed to contribute their opinions and therefore enrich the evaluation. In Chapter three on “Results, obstacles and lessons,” a significant portion of the opinions expressed are included. The recommendations made are also taken into account in Chapter five.

The visit to Acapulco was made at the same time as a workshop organized by STPS and ILO was held with the city’s private tourism sector. On the one hand, it was a successful experience since we were able to participate and assess a concrete project activity; however on the other hand, some interviews programmed were not facilitated since priority was given instead to the workshop and activities stemming from the workshop.

The visit to Tijuana and Mexicali was excellent. The agenda was designed very skilfully by DIF, which also delegated a person to assist and accompany one of the evaluators, and this facilitated the conducting of interviews and the best use of the time designated for the visit.

A visit was not made to Guadalajara since when the work plan for the evaluation was developed, visiting this location was not considered to be pertinent. We were informed that the project in that city had not been concretized. At the May 25 session, the participants from Guadalajara repeatedly requested that the evaluators make a visit to their location, however this did not occur since the request was made outside the time designated for evaluators to make field visits.

The process of consulting the web pages for the governmental organizations involved did not turn out to provide reliable information, since in most of the cases, the information was not up-to-date.

Lastly, it is important to mention the pertinence of the May 25 session that served to expand the information. In addition there was an additional result that consisted of sitting all the involved parties at the table and having the opportunity to listen to each other in a single space facilitated by persons from the outside. It was essential that the ILO made the effort to see that persons from the three states participated, something not initially considered.