

Programa 3X1 para Migrantes



By **Alina Rocha Menocal**



**Social Cohesion Practical Experiences
and Initiatives**

<http://epic.programaeurosocial.eu>

This report has been prepared by Alina Rocha Menocal, within the framework of an agreement signed between the Coordination Office of EUROsociAL - FIIAPP and Overseas Development Institute (ODI). Its contents reflect the research and opinions of its authors and under no circumstances are they to be interpreted as the official position of the European Union, the FIIAPP or the Coordination Office of EUROsociAL.

INDEX

1	SYNTHETIC INFORMATION REGARDING THE EXPERIENCE.....	1
2	ANALYSIS OF THE EXPERIENCE.....	3
2.1	RESULTS OBTAINED: ANALYSIS OF THE EFFICACY, EFFICIENCY, AND THE IMPACT IN TERMS OF SOCIAL COHESION	3
2.1.1	<i>Initial situation:</i>	3
2.1.2	<i>Expected results:</i>	3
2.1.3	<i>Results attained:</i>	4
2.1.4	<i>Unexpected effects:</i>	5
2.1.5	<i>Resources invested and efficiency:</i>	6
2.1.6	<i>Repercussions of the experience in terms of social cohesion:</i>	6
2.2	ACTIVITIES PERFORMED, PROCESSES AND PARTIES INVOLVED IN THE DESIGN, APPROVAL, AND EXECUTION OF THE EXPERIENCE.....	7
2.2.1	<i>Discussion, approval, and execution processes of the experience:</i>	7
2.2.2	<i>Technical activities and processes that give shape to the experience:</i>	8
2.2.3	<i>Activities for the evaluation of the experience:</i>	8
2.2.4	<i>Transfer of the experience:</i>	8
2.2.5	<i>Main actors and parties involved in the execution of the experience:</i>	9
2.2.6	<i>Alliances established between the actors:</i>	9
2.3	CONTEXT OF APPLICATION OF THE EXPERIENCE	9
2.3.1	<i>Back-up policies:</i>	9
2.3.2	<i>Institutional capacity:</i>	10
2.3.3	<i>Economic-financial factors:</i>	11
2.4	FOR MORE INFORMATION... ..	11
2.4.1	<i>Documentary and bibliographical references:</i>	11
2.4.2	<i>Institutional and personal references</i>	12
3	LESSONS LEARNED FROM THE EXPERIENCE.....	13
3.1	ESSENTIAL SUCCESSFUL FACTORS OF THE EXPERIENCE (ELEMENTS TO BE REPEATED):	13
3.2	ERRORS COMMITTED AND UNRESOLVED DIFFICULTIES (ELEMENTS TO BE AVOIDED):	13
3.3	MAIN CONTEXTUAL ELEMENTS NECESSARY IN ORDER FOR THE EXPERIENCE TO BE TRANSFERABLE:	14

1 SYNTHETIC INFORMATION REGARDING THE EXPERIENCE

1.1. Name: Programa 3X1 para Migrantes (henceforth Programa 3X1)

1.2. Geographical location (country, region, town): Multiple municipalities and states throughout Mexico, with participation of migrant communities in the USA. By September 2006 the programme was operating in 26 out of 31 states, and in 373 municipalities within those states. The number of migrant clubs involved was 2,300 as of September 2006, based in 35 different states in the US.

1.3. Sector:

- Education
- Health
- Employment
- Taxation
- Justice
- Others (please specify):

Local-level development projects that include infrastructure, basic facilities (e.g. health clinics), roads, caring facilities, cultural facilities, sewer systems, beautification, with a more recent focus on income-generating activities, though expansion into these more 'productive' activities is still very new and untried. The InterAmerican Development Bank (IADB) recently entered into a 5-year partnership with the Mexican government at the federal level (through SEDESOL, the Ministry of Social Development in charge of overseeing the programme at the federal level) to foster the generation of more 'productive' activities using the 3X1 framework.

1.4. Date of commencement of experience (mmmm of yy):

The origins of the experience that eventually evolved into the existing 'Programa 3X1 para Migrantes' can be traced to two different initiatives. In 1986, a group of migrants from the state of Zacatecas in Mexico began to work with municipal governments in that state on jointly financed development projects. This was the birth of a mechanism identified as '1X1' – for each dollar put in by the migrants from Zacatecas, the municipal government of their respective communities of origin put in one dollar as well. The '2X1' mechanism was born in the state of Guerrero in the late 1980s, bringing in not only municipal governments but also the state government itself to carry out local development programmes in partnership with emigrated Guerrerense communities. Zacatecas followed suit in 1992, and since then both Zacatecas and Guerrero have been considered pioneers of the programme. The programme became a federal initiative in 2002, and this is when it officially became the 'Programa 3X1 para migrantes'.

1.5. Current situation (mark box as appropriate):

Underway



Finished



1.6. If the experience is underway, indicate the expected finishing date (mmmm of yy):
ongoing for the foreseeable future

1.6. If the experience has finished, indicate the effective finishing date (mmmm of yy):

1.7. Level of the experience: Confirmed

1.8. Main components of the experience:

- | | |
|---|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Development of legislative instruments <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Development of plans or programmes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Statutes or framework agreements between actors <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Finance funds or mechanisms | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Development of managerial devices <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Procedure for provision of services <input type="checkbox"/> Others (please specify): |
|---|--|

1.9. Estimate of the total cost of the experience (in €): According to an external evaluation finalised in December 2006, between 2002 and 2006, \$767 million pesos were destined to the Programa 3X1. In 2006 itself, the total financial investment came to \$175.73 million.

1.10. Most Notable effects of the experience in terms of social cohesion:

Access to well-being, through ...

- Improved access to public services
- Improvements to quality of public services
- Greater equality in access to public services
- Increased territorial solidarity in access to public services

More efficient action by the State and public policies, through...

- Development of legislative or regulatory protection
- Improvement in the functioning of democracy and the rule of law
- A higher level of equal opportunities for excluded groups
- Higher quality public institutions
- Increased solidarity in the taxation system
- Improvement in human security conditions

More active and caring citizen body, through...

- Encouragement of citizen participation
- Increased confidence in the institutions
- Encouragement of feelings of identity and belonging
- Promotion of greater participation by women
- Others (please specify):

1.11. Brief summary of the experience:

The Programa 3X1 para Migrantes is a social welfare programme that seeks to foster development and productive investments in some of Mexico's poorest /most marginalised communities through an innovative approach that involves migrant communities resident in the United States in partnership with local beneficiaries and government entities at the national and sub-national levels (federal, state, and municipal levels). The programme supports the development initiatives of Mexicans residing outside the country and provides them with an institutional mechanism through which they can channel resources to support public works of their choice intended to benefit their communities of origin. Projects are financed through the following mixture of resources:

Federal Government	State Government	Municipal Government	Migrant group
25%	25%	25%	25%

Thus, for every \$1 that the migrant community puts in, the Mexican government (including the federal, state, and municipal level) puts \$3 – which is why the programme is called Programa 3X1. All four of these actors are meant to be equal partners not only in terms of the financing of 3X1 projects but also in terms of their voice and representation (i.e., each counterpart is intended to support local development projects in equal parts financially and all four participate in the decision-making process as equals).

The Programa 3X1 is innovative in that it is one of the very first of its kind to incorporate actively and directly (Mexican) migrant communities in government-supported development projects in their communities of origin. In fact, as the programme's title suggests, migrants residing in the outside (i.e. the US) are intended to be the main beneficiaries/targets of this programme (in the sense that the programme exists to support development projects initiating within migrant communities). As such, one of the programme's principal aims is to promote greater social cohesion between groups of migrants who have left to the United States (for a variety of reasons) but want to be able to make a difference from the outside, and impoverished communities/municipalities within Mexico.

2 ANALYSIS OF THE EXPERIENCE

2.1 Results obtained: analysis of the efficacy, efficiency, and the impact in terms of social cohesion

2.1.1 Initial situation:

Numerous conditions seemed to come together to enable the Programa 3X1 para Migrantes to take shape. Some relate to opportunities, and others to identified needs and challenges.

In terms of opportunities, the following deserve highlighting:

- The Programa 3X1 came to fruition during an important time of political transition in Mexico. President Vicente Fox from the right of centre Partido Acción Nacional (PAN) came to power in 2000, effectively ending more than 70 years of hegemonic party rule under the Partido de la Revolución Institucional (PRI). The Fox Administration made building better and stronger ties with Mexican migrants residing in the United States one of its early priorities. This included protecting their rights and interests abroad, helping them organise, and providing institutional channels for their participation on issues of interest within Mexico. These migrant communities (many of them critical of the former ruling party, which at some level they held responsible for their decision or need to leave Mexico in search of better opportunities outside), for their part, may have become more open to the possibility of engaging with the Mexican government as a result of the alternation of power.
- The number of Mexican migrants residing in the USA is quite significant (according to the *U.S. Bureau of Census*, there were 25 million people of Mexican origin living in the USA), and they have played a considerable economic role in Mexico through the remittances they channel every year, which far surpass volumes of aid and foreign direct investment combined. According to IADB data, in 2005 the volume of remittances reached USD \$20 billion.
- One of the objectives of the Federal Government under Fox thus became to take advantage of the invaluable resource that the migrant community residing in the US represented in terms of finding ways to strategically use the income generated by remittances to promote development in Mexico.
- Many migrant communities, especially from the states of Zacatecas and Guerrero, already had a history of working together with sub-national levels of government to promote development in their communities of origin, and they represented a ready-made and well organised resource that the Federal Government could tap into (see point 1.4 above).

In terms of needs, many of the communities that the migrants left are among the poorest and most marginalised in Mexico. Conditions of deprivation and lack of opportunities were important factors driving many people out of their communities to begin with in search of a better life in the US (as well as elsewhere). Many of the migrants who left Mexico remained concerned about the family members and friends they left behind, and they had a real interest in working towards improving the conditions and the quality of life in their communities of origin.

2.1.2 Expected results:

- As suggested by the programme's title, the primary beneficiaries/targets of the programme are intended to be migrant communities residing outside of Mexico. The aim is to turn organised migrant communities into binational social actors that can exert economic and political influence in their communities of origin.

- The general objective of this experience is therefore to help develop the organisational capacity of these migrant groups and to strengthen the social tissue linking migrant communities to their communities of origin within Mexico so as to help solidify identity and solidarity links between those two groups.
- This is meant to be accomplished by supporting initiatives from migrant groups residing outside of Mexico to promote participation and development in their communities of origin, so as to carry out local development projects with a combination of resources from the federal, state, and municipal governments, as well as from the migrant community in question.
- The focus of the projects should be on improving the well-being of the selected communities within Mexico, and the aim is to reach out to those communities with high levels of poverty, marginalisation, and high degrees of migration.
- Projects are intended to be carried out and overseen jointly (i.e. by government authorities at different levels and the migrant community itself).
- This is also meant to increase the transparency and accountability of government institutions, and to improve the level of trust between migrant communities and the different levels of government (municipal, state, and national) within Mexico.
- However, they are not intended to (and most likely should not be expected to) stem the flow of migration out of poor communities to the US or beyond.

2.1.3 Results attained:

To date, the Programa 3X1 has supported more than 6,000 social investment projects such as street paving, public squares improvement, school repairs and the construction of drinking water systems. Table I below presents the kinds of projects (in order of importance) that were carried out by the Programa 3X1 from 2002 to September 2006. In total, these add up to 6,121 projects in the 2002-2006 period, with urbanisation projects leading the list.

Table 1: Number of projects by type
(Source: SEDESOL, Libro Blanco 2006)

Type of Project	Number of projects per year				
	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006*
Urbanisation (Plazas, gardens, etc)	132	165	310	403	285
Electrification	99	138	126	201	115
Community Development Centres	127	143	160	308	256
Street pavement and road surfacing	144	117	167	168	156
Potable water	77	74	308	121	71
Sewer systems	50	62	113	118	69
Education infrastructure	112	61	46	73	46
Roads and highways	67	57	83	80	45
Sports facilities	50	35	42	47	41
Income generating products	40	22	53	77	31
Health centres	28	17	26	31	19
Other	16	8	2	9	74
Total:	942	899	1,436	1,636	1,208

*As of 30 September 2006

As illustrated in Table 2 below, the geographic coverage of the Programa 3X1 also grew from 2002 to 2006. By 2006, it had a presence in 26 states in Mexico, compared to 20 in 2000.

Table 2: Number of states and municipalities involved in the Programa 3X1

(Source: SEDESOL, Libro Blanco 2006)

Subnational entities involved	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006*
Status	20	18	23	26	26
Municipalities	247	257	383	425	373

*As of 30 September 2006

As these figures illustrate, while the Programme has steadily grown over time (both in terms of number of projects carried out and geographic coverage), it continues to be a relatively small one in scale, especially when compared to other SEDESOL programmes like Oportunidades. Thus, there may be a lot of potential that remains untapped.

In fact, as noted by Rodolfo García Zamora, so far the federal budget dedicated to this budget has remained extremely limited, while migrant communities keep demanding that it be substantially raised. On average, the federal government put in no more than USD\$15 million a year between 2003 and 2006, compared to the USD\$63 million that migrants sent back to Mexico in 2006 on a *daily* basis.

One of the main problems identified in the external evaluation of the Programa 3X1 carried out in December 2006 is that, while the programme is intended in principle to reach those sectors of the population/communities that are poorest/most marginalised, given the way the programme operates, this cannot be guaranteed in practice. Migrants select the communities that they want to work with, but this does not guarantee that it will always be the poorest communities that are selected. This means that there is a crucial need to define what the targeted population is much more explicitly.

Another criticism that has been levied towards the Programa 3X1 is that it has not been able to stem the flow of migration outside of Mexico. However, this is not a stated objective of the programme, and it would be unfair to hold it to such a standard. Outward migration is clearly a very severe problem that Mexico confronts, but a small programme targeted at local-level development projects cannot by its nature expect to be able to address it. Other, much larger and ambitious interventions, are necessary for that.

2.1.4 Unexpected effects:

One of the unintended consequences of this experience has been its considerable politicisation. Many migrant communities in the US have not wanted to work with municipal or state entities because of conflicts related to political party affiliation. For example, many migrants from the state of Puebla who now reside in the US are very much opposed to the Partido Revolucionario Institucional (PRI) and in fact resent the party as partly responsible for their leaving Mexico in the first place. As such, these migrants have preferred not to deal with government entities tied to the PRI and have therefore chosen not to participate in the 3X1 programme (while channelling their resources in other ways).

In addition, the possibilities offered by the Programa 3X1 have triggered considerable competition among political hopefuls, especially at the municipal level, who have increasingly launched into efforts to lobby migrant clubs to support different development projects so that they (the local politicians) can claim credit for bringing them into the benefited community and in this way advance their political aspirations. This can be seen as a positive development in the

sense that local politicians have a vested interest in being more responsive to the needs of the local population and in trying to address those needs, but the politicisation of the programme can also trigger unhealthy political competition and degenerate into clientelism and particularism.

Some turf wars have also developed between some of the better organised migrant communities in the US, and they have engaged in struggles over the ownership of the programme. Some of the most vocal and better organised groups have tried to exercise disproportionate influence on the way the programme works and how it should evolve, in ways that may not always respond to expressed local needs and priorities.

2.1.5 Resources invested and efficiency:

As stated in Point 1.9, between 2002 and 2006, \$767 million pesos were destined to the Programa 3X1 (the funds coming in equal parts from the federal, state, and municipal governments in Mexico and the migrant communities. In 2006 itself, the total financial investment came to \$175.73 million. It is estimated that, over the period 2002-2006, on average less than 1% of the total resources invested per year went to operational costs of the programme, except in 2003, when they reached 3%. This means that almost all of the resources are being used to reach the intended beneficiaries at the community level, which makes the programme highly efficient in that respect. On the other hand, such a restricted allotment to operational costs may imply that the programme is deprived of resources to support administrative needs, or to undertake important evaluation and oversight activities. As of 2006, for instance, only a handful of states received resources to cover operational costs (Colima, Hidalgo, Michoacán, Oaxaca and Zacatecas).

2.1.6 Repercussions of the experience in terms of social cohesion:

Perhaps the most significant impact that the Programa 3X1 has had in terms of social cohesion has been on the migrant communities themselves. These groups of migrants residing in the US have benefited tremendously from the possibility of forming formal transnational organisations that have enabled them to build strong identity links with the communities they have left behind in Mexico, promote their culture both in Mexico and the US, and also be able to protect their rights more effectively in the US.

In addition, by engaging with the state at different levels in Mexico and undertaking development projects in their communities of origin, these organised migrant communities have helped to strengthen citizen groups in Mexico (though as is argued further below there remains a lot to be done in this particular area) and to demand improved accountability and transparency from government institutions. The Programa 3X1 has also played an important role in encouraging the concept of co-responsibility among different (state and non-state) actors, as well as that of collective decision-making among equals (here again, with the noted lack of formal inclusion of citizen groups within benefited communities into the decision-making processes). This has led to a significant process of transnational social learning and strengthening of a democratic culture among migrants, their communities of origin, and the three different levels of government within Mexico. As a result, this kind of participation of migrants in development processes back in their communities of origin has helped to increase the levels of trust in (Mexican) government institutions at all levels.

Thus, following EUROsociAL's definition of social cohesion, the Programa 3X1 has been instrumental in fostering a sense of belonging to a wider community, enabling the participation of migrant groups in development projects and decision-making processes, and strengthening an active citizenship among migrants residing in the US who get involved with this programme. The programme has also played an important role in 'developing public policies and solidarity mechanisms between individuals, collectives, territories and generations', and all this at different levels of government authority as well.

2.2 Activities performed, processes and parties involved in the design, approval, and execution of the experience

2.2.1 Discussion, approval, and execution processes of the experience:

One of the main obstacles that the Programa 3X1 has encountered is that, especially early on, migrant communities did not trust local (municipal) authorities, whom they perceived as corrupt and/or not interested in what migrants have to say/offer. They therefore demanded playing a bigger and more direct role in supervising and overseeing the execution of the development projects they supported. By the late 1990s (when the Programme still operated under the '2X1' principle), the Mexican government, especially at the state level, put in place a new framework to oversee the evolution of projects and their quality that was intended to promote greater accountability and transparency. Since the Programa 3X1 became a federal programme, the Secretaría de Desarrollo Social (SEDESOL), the social Ministry in charge of overseeing the programme at the federal level, has invested considerable resources and effort in strengthening further the programme's operational procedures as well as transparency and accountability mechanisms.

Today, the programme is managed through an elaborate set of procedures intended to ensure that its operations are fully accountable and transparent. The Programa 3X1 is formally governed by a set of operational rules ('reglas de operación') that are visibly available on the programme's webpage (www.microrregiones.gob.mx) as well as elsewhere. These rules spell out the mechanisms for discussing, approving and executing projects. The website also provides other relevant programme information, including evaluation reports, calls for project proposals, etc.

Migrant communities organised through clubs or federations are the ones responsible for making project proposals to begin with. All proposed projects must involve all three levels of the Mexican government, and must also be aimed at improving the social welfare of the communities where they are intended to be carried out. While migrant clubs are encouraged to consult family and friends in their communities of origins to have a better sense of what the most important needs and priorities that should be addressed are, at present there is no formal mechanism through which this kind of feedback from the local community is channelled.

Project proposals are then looked at by a Comité de Validación y Atención (COVAM), which is composed of an equal number of representatives from all those groups providing development funds (the three levels of government in Mexico plus the migrant club/organisation in the US). The COVAM is presided by SEDESOL's federal representative at the state level. The COVAM has been an important institutional mechanism in ensuring that the process of project selection is more transparent and in strengthening accountability measures.

In addition to managing the process of project selection in a manner that is supposed to be open and transparent, the COVAM has many other specific functions. These include making sure that the established rules of the Programa 3X1 are being followed; specifying the timelines for project disbursements from the different actors involved, following through the execution of projects; and disseminating information on projects and results.

Once a project has been selected, the municipal government, with the assistance of the local community, must fill out a *technical file*. Once the file is properly completed and the COVAM deems that the project meets the programme's operational rules and criteria and decides to proceed with the project in principle, the project's file is sent to the state-level Development Planning Committee (Comité de Planeación de Desarrollo del Estado - Coplade). The Coplade then liaises with the municipality and the community, reviews the technical file, and sends it to the SEDESOL state-level delegation. The delegation must determine whether the proposed project is viable within 30 working days. The project file is then sent to the National SEDESOL office for a last review.

Once the project begins to be carried out, 'comités de obras' integrated by beneficiaries within the community as well as representatives of the migrant group are responsible for supervising the undertaking of the public work according to the established rules. In order to strengthen transparency and accountability, then, those citizens who benefit from the project first hand, in conjunction with the migrant communities, are intended to oversee its evolution and act as social comptrollers.

Once the public work has been finished, the executioner is responsible for handing it over to the community. An official certificate is drawn up, and this certificate must outline the different commitments made by the community, beneficiaries, and/or government entities to ensure that the completed work is properly maintained, conserved, monitored, and operated over time. A plaque is also raised indicating the name of the migrant club that supported the project, the different levels of government involved, and the financial resources that were invested in the project.

The Programa 3X1 is overseen on a monthly basis by the Annual Operation Programme (Programa Operativo Anual - POA). All of the general data on the public works that are carried out, organised by state, are stored in the POA. Other entities involved in overseeing the 3X1 Programme include the Unidad de Microrregiones within SEDESOL, in close coordination with the Dirección General de Seguimiento and the state-level SEDESOL delegation. Migrant clubs in the US and so-called 'mirror clubs' created by project beneficiaries in the community of origin also take part in supervising the programme.

2.2.2 Technical activities and processes that give shape to the experience:

See above.

2.2.3 Activities for the evaluation of the experience:

An independent evaluation of the Programa 3X1 was finalised in December 2006. The evaluation was carried out by a team at the Universidad Autónoma Chapingo led by Dr. Leticia Myriam Sagarnaga Villegas.

Two previous independent evaluations were carried out by the Red de Consultores Nacionales in 2005 and 2004 respectively.

2.2.4 Transfer of the experience:

There is a current effort in place to move some of the focus of projects supported by the Programa 3X1 from being mainly aimed at community development towards supporting income generating activities that can also help generate employment. The goal behind this is to be able to carry out projects that have greater economic impact. As was mentioned in Section 1.3, the IADB recently entered into a 5-year partnership with the Mexican government (through SEDESOL) to provide financing for a pilot project to foster the generation of more 'productive' activities using the 3X1 framework (see www.microrregiones.gob.mx/3x1/nota2.html).

However, the transferability of the experience to this new area is proving quite challenging.

Several challenges have been identified include the following:

- Lack of organisational and technical capacity among migrant clubs and federations to be able to grapple seriously with the new and distinct challenges of promoting income generating (micro) projects.
- A similar lack of capacity within the intended beneficiary communities to be able to take advantage of such opportunities.
- Poor strategies to stimulate and promote the marketing of local products.
- Weak entrepreneurial culture

- Differences in the logic operating in community development projects that are essentially based on philanthropy and solidarity (which is at the heart of the Programa 3X1 as originally conceived) and that operating in more 'productive' projects, where benefits tend to be appropriated in a more individualised basis.
- Lack of an integrated framework of public policies promoting regional development that could better support the income-generating activities proposed by the 3X1 Programme.

On the other hand, it is fair to say that the initiative of the Programa 3X1 (with support from the IADB) to focus on income generating projects is still very new (the first call for proposals closed in the fall of 2007), so that it will not be possible to assess how successful the transferring of the solidarity model towards a more 'productive' one is likely to be for at least a few years.

2.2.5 Main actors and parties involved in the execution of the experience:

The main actors/parties involved include:

- 1) migrants residing in the USA who are for the most part organised in Clubs or Federations
- 2) the Executive Government in Mexico, through the 'Microrregiones' division of the Secretaría de Desarrollo Social (SEDESOL)
- 3) state governments; and
- 4) municipal governments

All these actors are intended to be equal partners both financially and in terms of their voice (i.e., each counterpart is intended to support local development projects in equal parts financially and they all have equal voting rights).

Representatives from all four groups integrate the Comité de Validación y Atención a Migrantes (COVAM).

Citizens at the local level in the selected communities are also meant to be included in the decision-making process, especially in terms of the selection of development projects and the process of seeing their execution through, but this role is not formalised in the rules of the 3X1 Programme. However, with the decentralisation of large portions of development funds to the municipal level through the creation of Ramo 33 in 1997 and the ensuing Ley de Desarrollo Local, state and municipal authorities are mandated to disclose how local resources are being used and to involve the local population in participatory development processes from the planning phase through to evaluation.

2.2.6 Alliances established between the actors:

This issue has already been discussed in different parts of Section 2.

2.3 Context of application of the experience

2.3.1 Back-up policies:

The Programa 3X1 has been able to draw on the existence of other established policies/programmes/institutions which have been important in terms of providing a supportive institutional framework that has contributed to the overall success of this experience.

Two sets of policies are worth mentioning:

- 1) Those intended to provide better services and support networks to Mexicans residing in the US.

- 2) Those intended to combat poverty and promote development at the local level within Mexico.

In terms of the first set of policies, these have been carried out mainly through the Office of the President and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. Since the time Fox took office in 2000, Mexico made a concerted effort to expand its network of consular offices in the US to be able to build stronger ties with Mexican citizens residing abroad and provide better services (*atención a migrantes*). This more visible presence of the Mexican government in the US geared to provide better assistance to Mexican nationals residing abroad was instrumental in facilitating improved relations between the government and migrant communities, and it helped lay the foundations on which the Programa 3X1 was able to build.

In terms of policies geared towards poverty alleviation and the promotion of development, since the 1990s there have been a lot of reforms intended to decentralise social welfare spending and promote greater citizen participation in development processes at the local level.

One of the most significant ones was the creation of Budget Item 33 in late 1997. While in the past the federal government had allocated resources to the provinces through so-called 'convenios' or 'social development agreements' that were highly discretionary, Ramo 33 introduced formal mechanisms that, in principle, made the distribution of resources between different levels of government more transparent, reliable, and systematic. States and municipalities would no longer receive funds based on the discretion of the federal government but rather on the basis of both population and socio-economic indicators of marginalisation and need. In addition, through Ramo 33, for the first time resources were channelled directly to municipal level governments, providing the basis for the fiscal independence that municipalities can draw on to take part in the 3X1 programme and contribute 25 percent of total resources for local development projects.

Another important reform was the passage of the *Ley de Desarrollo Social* (<http://www.diputados.gob.mx/LeyesBiblio/pdf/264.pdf>) in January 2004, which enshrines the principle of citizen participation in development processes, especially at the local level, and also stipulates that governments at all levels must behave in a transparent and accountable manner. Access to information on development programmes is also guaranteed. This *Ley* thus provides some of the very important legal framework within which the Programa 3X1 is intended to operate – the emphasis (at least in principle) on transparency and participation has played a significant role in promoting greater trust in the different levels of government among the migrant community, though problems in both of these areas remain.

2.3.2 Institutional capacity:

Perhaps the single most important factor in ensuring the success of the Programa 3X1 is the institutional and organisational capacities of migrant organisations in the US. In this sense, the institutional history of the clubs is very relevant: clubs that have been around for a longer period of time have been able to develop considerable skills and institutional capacity; newer ones still have a lot to learn.

It is interesting to observe how the projects supported by migrant clubs evolve over time depending in part on how long a particular club has been involved with a community. Clubs usually begin by prioritising projects that are closest to their heart and/or are highly visible, like reparations of the local Church, and the building or fixing of cemeteries, public parks, and sports fields. Then they move on to focus on more basic community needs like water, electricity, road paving, and the building of basic infrastructure for schools, health centres, etc. Finally, the migrant clubs with the longest history of involvement in their communities of origin are the ones that have begun to think about most seriously how to carry out more 'productive' or income-generating projects with the potential of having greater economic impact (especially in terms of generating employment). The Club Federations of migrants from Zacatecas, Jalisco, and Michoacán have historically been strongest in these respects, and they are the ones pioneering attempts to focus not only on social projects but also projects in the productive sector in their communities of origin.

There is also the issue of institutional capacity within the different levels of the Mexican government. Problems related to weak capacity persist especially at the municipal level, and

this can pose challenges to the proper execution of development projects and can also lead to tensions among the different actors involved, especially migrant communities who may grow to resent what they perceive as government incompetence and lack of progress at the local level.

The Programa 3X1 also assumes that, through the Comités de Obras, citizens in the benefited communities will participate (alongside representatives from migrant groups) in overseeing the project and ensuring that the process through which the project is carried out is transparent and accountable (this process is referred to as 'contraloría social'). However, it is not always clear that those citizens have either the capacity or the resources (especially in terms of time) to take on such a role. In an attempt to address that institutional weakness, Comités de Obras are meant to be trained and capacitated by the Contraloría Interna at the state level. Through its Microrregiones unit, SEDESOL itself launched a pilot programme in 2005 intended to strengthen citizen capacity in overseeing 3X1 projects. Still, there is a general perception among analysts that the federal government could be doing a lot more to work on strengthening the institutional capacity of local groups of project beneficiaries and could be following the process much more closely.

2.3.3 Economic-financial factors:

As discussed in Section 1, 3X1 projects are financed through the following mixture of resources:

Federal Government	State Government	Municipal Government	Migrant group
25%	25%	25%	25%

Thus, for every \$1 that the migrant community puts in, the Mexican government (including the federal, state, and municipal level) puts \$3 – which is why the programme is called Programa 3X1.

Two potential challenges are worth identifying:

The migrant clubs are ran and staffed by volunteers who do not get paid for their work, so in this respect, time and resources can become issues impacting their organisational capacity and performance.

In addition, as noted earlier, one crucial financial constraint is that there is a ceiling beyond which the Mexican government at the federal level will not invest (though in some instances the federal government will help the state and especially the municipal government meet their match commitments in the measure that it becomes necessary), and thus far that ceiling has remained considerably low.

2.4 For more information...

2.4.1 Documentary and bibliographical references:

- Fernández de Castro, Rafael, Ana Vila, y Rodolfo García Zamora, eds. (2007) *El Programa 3x1 en México: ¿Primer política pública transnacional hacia los migrantes?* Mexico City: Miguel Ángel Porrúa, UAZ, ITAM.
This edited book compiled by prominent academics analyses the functioning and impact of the Programa 3X1 para Migrantes in the eight states where it is most active (Zacatecas, Jalisco, Michoacán, Guanajuato, Hidalgo, Oaxaca, Guerrero, Morelos, San Luis Potosí and Puebla) between 2005 and 2006. Available online at: <http://www.migracionydesarrollo.org/>

- García Zamora, Rodolfo (2007) 'El Programa 3x1 en México: Lecciones y desafíos'. Available at www.migracionydesarrollo.org. Academic article that highlights some of the main achievements of the programme, and outlines some lessons and challenges.
- SEDESOL (2006) *Libro Blanco 2006: Programa 3X1 Para Migrantes*, Mexico City: SEDESOL
Document prepared by SEDESOL which provides a brief history of the Programa 3X1 as well as a description of the design and implementation of the programme and some basic information as to the number of projects carried out and the number of migrant clubs and entities within Mexico that have been involved from 2002 to 2006.
- SEDESOL (2007) *Reglas de Operación del Programa 3x1 para Migrantes*, available at <http://www.microrregiones.gob.mx/pdl.html?func=txt0&im=pdl>
Programme's operational rules
- Vila Freyer, Ana (2007) 'Las Políticas de Atención a Migrantes en los Estados de México: Acción, Reacción, Gestión', in Cecilia Imaz, Coord., *¿Invisibles? Migrantes Internacionales en la Escena Política*, Mexico City: UNAM and SITESA.
Academic article that describes how efforts of the Mexican government have evolved since the 1990s to build better ties with migrant communities, especially those in the United States.
- Universidad Autónoma Chapingo (December 2006) *Evaluación Externa del Programa 3X1 para Migrantes 2006*. Available at <http://www.sedesol.gob.mx/index/index.php?sec=30140108&len=1>
Independent evaluation of the Programa 3X1

2.4.2 Institutional and personal references

- Programa 3X1 website: <http://www.microrregiones.gob.mx/pdl.html?func=txt0&im=pdl>
- Red Internacional de Migración y Desarrollo:
<http://www.migracionydesarrollo.org/>
- Irma Hidalgo, Director of Programme Promotion, 3X1, SEDESOL (ihidalgo@sedesol.gob.mx)
- Barbara Bravo, Coordinator of the IADB pilot project, SEDESOL (bbravo@sedesol.gob.mx)
- Maria Eugenia Guerra, Director of Social Programmes, SEDESOL (mguerra@sedesol.gob.mx)
- Dr. Germán Palafox, Head of Microrregiones, SEDESOL (gpalafox@sedesol.gob.mx)
- Ana Vila, Department of Development Studies, Universidad Autónoma de Zacatecas (ana.vila@estudiosdeldesarrollo.net). Prof. Vila is also the coordinator of the Red Internacional de Migración y Desarrollo mentioned above.
- Rodolfo García Zamora, Department of Development Studies, Universidad Autónoma de Zacatecas (rgarciaz@estudiosdeldesarrollo.net)
- Rafael Fernández de Castro, Department of International Studies, Instituto Tecnológico Autónomo de México (ITAM) (rfgcastro@itam.mx)

3 LESSONS LEARNED FROM THE EXPERIENCE

3.1 Essential successful factors of the experience (elements to be repeated):

Perhaps the single most important factor to ensure the success of the experience are the organisational history and capacity of migrant groups. Migrant groups that have been in existence for a long time have developed considerable skills and established strong linkages with their communities of origin, making their involvement with the 3X1 initiative much easier because there is already a history of such engagement.

Another important factor is the size of particular migrant communities outside of Mexico by municipality and state and the resources they can afford to bring into the 3x1 programme. Since the three levels of government within Mexico are meant to match the resources invested by the migrant communities, the more these migrant communities can contribute, the greater the total investment within a given municipality and state will be (up to the ceiling imposed by the federal government). Thus, not surprisingly, the municipalities and states within Mexico that have benefited the most from the programme (in terms of number of projects carried out) are those that have a relatively large (and, as suggested above, well-organised) migrant community based in the US. This is the case of Zacatecas, for example, as well Guanajuato, Jalisco, and Oaxaca, among others.

The downside of this is, of course, that the impact of the 3X1 programme is uneven across municipalities and states, and that many local communities within Mexico that are in need of the kind of investment made possible by the programme cannot take advantage of it because their migrant communities in the US are either too small, not organised well enough, or don't have enough resources to invest, or both. Examples here would include Yucatán, which is one of the poorest and most marginalised states in Mexico, as well as Tlaxcala and Hidalgo.

There may therefore be a need to consider whether it is possible to extend the sense of solidarity of migrant groups beyond the very narrow confines of their communities of origin and to encourage them to support other communities in municipalities and states that may be in greater need.

High levels of trust between the migrant organisations and the three levels of government are also an important factor in ensuring success, since the projects are meant to be carried out in a joint manner, with each of the actors involved as equal partners.

The above makes the need for well-established and functioning transparency and accountability mechanisms essential, because they act as crucial building blocks in fostering trust in government institutions.

3.2 Errors committed and unresolved difficulties (elements to be avoided):

The biggest challenge of the 3X1 programme remains to involve citizens/ organisations within the local communities where the development projects are being carried out much more fully and explicitly. Clearly, by design, the target audience of the programme are meant to be the migrant organisations outside of Mexico, who could be considered the 'supply' side. However, the focus of the programme exclusively on strengthening migrant communities runs the risk of missing a very important element from the 'demand' side. Beyond the 'comités de obra', more formal mechanisms to encourage citizen participation at the local level in establishing priorities and choosing projects in the first place are essential in order to guarantee that the projects do in fact respond to an expressed local need, and are not simply based on the perceptions of what the migrant community thinks the community actually needs. In this sense, there is a need for greater ownership of the programme by the intended beneficiaries of development projects in

the local communities. So far, this has been difficult to achieve because of a strong sense from the migrant communities that, if they are the ones putting the money in for improvements in their communities of origin, they should have the right to choose what those projects should be. There is also the claim that migrant communities do rely on highly effective feedback mechanisms to decide what is needed, because the family and friends left behind tell them what they need.

3.3 Main contextual elements necessary in order for the experience to be transferable:

A large and economically relevant migrant community that is concentrated geographically and either has a long history of organisation or has the potential to become organised.

Strong solidarity links between migrant communities and those they left behind.

A government (at all three levels – national, state and municipal) committed to strengthening ties with those migrant communities and to involving them in political, social, economic, and developmental issues of their communities of origin and the country at large.