

Metrics of Transparency in Mexico

Research team and working

Diego Ernesto Diaz Iturbe
Author and general coordinator of the project

Lorena Navarro Archundia
Author in charge of the methodology

Benito Nacif Hernandez
Professor investigator responsible to the CIDE

Marla Medina Cortes
Victor Gonzalez Tlatempa
Alejandra Rocio Rivera Barrada
Jose Augusto Garrido Delgadillo
Analysis of planning, assessment and answers

Fernando Martinez-Mier Celis
Graphic Design and Publishing

Shantal Argon
Erik Bacilio
Braulio Gonzalez
Rebeca Romo
Javier Gomez
Oscar Gomez
Carlos Valdes
Marcelina Valdes
Team capture and analysis of pages

Index	
Research team and working.....	2
Presentation and considerations.....	6
Introduction	8
PART ONE: General Provisions	10
Chapter One: Diagnosing transparency: the standard, institutions and instruments	10
PART TWO: Methodology	13
Chapter Two: Making	13
Chapter Three: Clarity, quality and usability of the information published electronically	16
Substantiation	16
Motivation and justification	18
Description of the assessment	18
Times	22
Sample selection	22
Assessment	24
Chapter IV: Quality of service, facilities and guidance to the user	25
Motivation and justification	25
Sample selection	26
Description of the assessment	27
Chapter Five: The efficiency and compliance in response to requests.....	29
Motivation and justification	29
Description of the assessment	29
Battery of questions to the executive	29
Battery of questions at the Legislative	29
Battery of questions to the municipalities	30
Sample selection	33
PART THREE: Findings, conclusions and recommendations	32
Seventh chapter: Overall results	32
Table 3.1. Overall averages for each group of institutions	33
Table of conglomerate 3.2 assessments of the Executive	34
Table of conglomerate 3.3 assessments of the Legislative	37
Table of conglomerate 3.4 assessments of the Municipality	39
Chapter Eight: Results of the evaluation of internet portals	41
Evaluation of internet portals for the town	41
Evaluation of internet portals for the legislative branch	43
Evaluation of internet portals for the executive branch	45
Evaluation of internet portals for the Judiciary	46
Ninth chapter: Results of the assessment of customer services	48
Evaluation of customer services for the town	49
Evaluation of customer services for the legislative branch	51
Evaluation of customer services for the executive branch	53
Chapter tenth: Result of the evaluation of the quality of answers	54

Evaulación of responses at the municipal level	54
Evaulación of response in the executive branch	58
Eleventh chapter: General conclusions	59
Mexico	61
State of Aguascalientes	63
State of Baja California	65
State of Baja California Sur	67
State of Campeche	68
State of Chiapas	70
Chihuahua State	71
State of Coahuila de Zaragoza	73
State of Colima	75
Federal District	77
State of Durango	79
State of Mexico	81
State of Guanajuato	83
State of Guerrero	85
State of Hidalgo	87
State of Jalisco	88
State of Michoacan de Ocampo	90
State of Morelos	92
State of Nayarit	94
State of Nuevo Leon	96
State of Oaxaca de Juarez	98
State of Puebla de Zaragoza	99
State of Queretaro.....	101
State of Quintana Roo	103
State of San Luis Potosi	105
State of Sinaloa	107
State of Sonora	109
State of Tabasco	111
State of Tamaulipas	112
State of Tlaxcala	114
State of Veracruz Ignacio de la Llave	115
State of Yucatan	116
State of Zacatecas.....	118
ANNEXES	120
Annex 1 Evaluation of internet portals	120
Breakdown of evaluation to internet portals of municipalities	125
Breakdown of evaluation to internet portals of power Legislative	126
Breakdown of evaluation of internet portals of the portal's general stayed in the office of the Executive	127
Breakdown of the evaluation of internet portals of the secretariats of Government or equivalent	128

Breakdown of the evaluation of internet portals of the secretariats of Finance or equivalent	129
Breakdown of the evaluation of internet portals of the secretariats of social development and equivalents	130
Breakdown of the evaluation of internet portals of the secretariats public safety and equivalents	131
Breakdown of evaluation to the Judiciary	132
Annex 02. Questionnaires about services and guidance liaison unit	134
Breakdown of the assessments in response to users	139
Annex 3. Evaluation breakdown of requests answered	145
Bibliography	163

Presentation and considerations

Work is now in short supply represents a further effort to Research presented on November 15 in Colima (during the sixth meeting The COMAIP). The team has done a thorough review and comprehensive the source documents, from tables in which the information was drained from the Percentages of valuation of the chips from each of the states and Institutions and the end of the 13 tables that contain the overall results.

Consolidation of this work was some variations due to much localized errors in the calculation formulas and the work of emptying data. In no event will alter the assessment criteria and results and neither will the general conclusions from them.

The research team faced a double challenge as it had on the one hand, the urgent requirement of presenting the study without any postponement, and secondly, in the final run charged severe budgetary restrictions, which still today have not been corrected.

However, it should be noted that the methodological approaches remain constant, that each of the ratings are supported by documentary and are accessible to anyone, that results in the tables consolidated remain essentially the same and that the overall conclusions about the Diagnosis of transparency in Mexico remain the same, with sustenance statistical and methodological documentary.

I also think it appropriate to recognize the extraordinary work conducted by the research team, which has remained at the bottom of the canyon and even in the financial uncertainty has staked his job on a Mexico best. So, I witness to my deep gratitude to Dr. Benito Nacif Hernandez, who once again placed their trust in me. Also, I wish to express my thanks to the extraordinary team of analysts and data capturers that made it possible to digest the information we had giant front, so I am grateful to Braulio Gonzalez, Marcelina Valdes, Carlos Valdes, Rebecca Romo, Shantal Argon, Erik Bacilio, Oscar Gomez, Javier Gomez, and especially to Joseph Augusto Garrido Delgadillo Barrada and Rocio Rivera, who collaborated on the finding information and review of documentation. Quite special, I am grateful to my colleagues Marla Cortes and Victor Gonzalez Tlatempa, both students of CIDE, for his dedication and absolute surrender to the Completion of this project. I have no doubt at all that this huge effort without them ever would have been consummated. In all, my appreciation for your valuable participation.

Diego Ernesto Diaz Iturbe
General Coordinator of the Project
December 5, 2007

Introduction

Recent reforms to Article 6 of the Constitution represent most significant organizational changes in the modern history of public administration in Mexico. By including the principle of maximum publicity The Constitution is raised to guarantee the individual right of everyone to know the operation and government spending and, in contrast, requires all levels of government, from all states and the powers to implement policy instruments, administrative and organizational to enforce this mandate.

In its transitional section, the reform provides for two deadlines for compliance with the Constitutional provision: the first is due in July 2008 and provides that "The Federation, states and the Federal District, within their respective spheres of competence, shall issue laws access to public information and transparency, or in his case, make the necessary adjustments, no later than one year after the entry into force of this decree. "

The second term expires in July 2009 and provides that "The Federation, states and the federal district must have electronic systems, so that anyone can make use of the mechanisms for remote access to information and review procedures referred to this decree, no later than two years after the entry into force. The Local Laws established to ensure that municipalities with a population exceeding seventy thousand inhabitants, and the territorial boundaries of the Federal District have the same deadline with the respective electronic systems. "

Faced with the challenges arising from the reform of Article 6 Constitutional, the purpose of this study is to make a diagnosis of the state of transparency in the country with emphasis on mechanisms that enable the effective exercise of this right and every day. In other words, as the title this right rests with the people, the study focuses on analyzing real access to the citizen has to guarantee this new individual.

Experience has shown that not enough good legislation to give effect to the daily exercise of this right, as is required institutional and administrative mechanisms to ensure compliance with the rule. But the institutions of the Federation are not alien to the existence of gaps between his policy framework and its administrative structure, it is important to note that this situation is most evident in the analysis of some states and even more so in the municipalities.

Although since the publication in 2002 of the Federal Law of Transparency and Access to Public Government Information was detonated by a process of opening part of the states of Mexico, it is important to note that this process is still nascent, incomplete and fragmented (Merino, 2005). By May 2007, 32 states already had a law on the subject, however, until November 2007, not all legislation had come into exercise, and no regulatory procedures needed to implement them.

So far investigations have been conducted to determine various ways of measuring the transparency and diagnose the condition in which it is located. Among these studies are:

- Ayllon, Sergio (2006) "Study on transparency of other subjects required by the Federal Law of Transparency and Access to Public Government Information" (CIDE)
- Monitor Legislature (2006) "Report of transparency in the legislative branch in Mexico" (CIDE)
- Monitor Legislature (2007) "Report of transparency in the legislatures of the states in Mexico" (CIDE)
- Guerrero Gutierrez, Eduardo and Leticia Ramirez de Alba Leal, "Transparency in Mexico at the subnational level: a comparative assessment of state laws" (IFAI)
- IFAI (2005) "A comparative study of laws on access to public information"
- Villanueva, Ernesto (2005) "The right of access to public information in Mexico. Indicators legal "(LIMAC)

Although these studies were pioneers in measuring and setting standards for transparency, the results are not explaining the set of obligors at the national level, since such tests were focused on a specific area and its measurements are not comparable with each other. However, this research will use as a benchmark to learn from the valuable experiences of their research and methods.

At this point it is observable that the problem is the lack of a standardized parameter for measuring the transparency and access to public information at the national level in terms of their daily operation, making it impossible to know with certainty the progress between levels and government entities of the federation. As such, this study called "Metrics of transparency in Mexico: diagnosis of the state of access to public information," conducted by the Central Economic Research and Teaching (CIDE) under the auspices of the Mexican Conference on Access to Public Information (COMAIP), aims to build a central methodology to obtain a diagnosis on the degree and opening access to information of public bodies at all levels and branches of government, as well as identify areas that need to be addressed for the realization of this right.

The analysis finds that there are three parameters to measure the quality and performance of transparency in terms of the effectiveness of access for citizens. These are:

- A. Clarity, quality and usability of information published electronically;
- B. Quality of service, facilities and guidance to the user, and
- C. Efficiency, completeness and satisfactory compliance in response to requests.

For each of these dimensions has developed a specific indicator. It is important to note that each of these indicators measure different issues and therefore are not comparable to each other but together, they enable a more comprehensive approach on the status of

transparency in institutions of all levels of government, in line with The second paragraph of Article 6 of the Constitution of the United Mexican States.

Like any political-economic indicator of the social sciences, each measurement contained within the parameters should be considered an approximation to reality. But its ramifications are themselves a sufficient condition to analyze behaviors, trends and findings on the study.

The study is organized into three sections. The first contains an analytical discussion on transparency, access to information and its organizational implications. A second section comprises a review and methodological justification of the parameters to be measured, and the way in which it will apply its evaluation, the details and peculiarities of its construction. In this section shall be expressed the assumptions that guide the investigation.

The third section is reviewing and examining the results obtained after the measurement of all elements, looking for patterns of behavior and crosses between them, will bring general and specific recommendations for each area. The importance of this section lies in serving as a support for decision making by pointing out the strengths and weaknesses of the culture of transparency at the national level.

It is important to mention that each assessment was carried out under standard of simplicity for the sake of an investigation that could contribute to make known to all entities evaluated, answers that were so simple to answer, that would be comparable between them. Likewise, it is worth noting that the information obtained is available in electronic version for consultation and study, ie, the study of the Metrics of Transparency in Mexico is fully documented.

Thus, the study as a whole has the vision to carry out a diagnostic exercise to access information and thus encourage the media to ensure the quality and effectiveness of this right, as a way to contribute to the strengthening of a pluralistic democracy with institutions responsible for the results they generate, as well as an informed and participatory society.

PART ONE: General Provisions

Chapter One: Diagnosing transparency: the standard, institutions and instruments.

In the essay Perpetual Peace, Kant said: "They are unjust, all actions relating to the right of other human beings if it's maximum is not supported by advertising."¹

This principle of political morality transferred to a context of democracy should allow citizens to public scrutiny of any government action. From here, David Luban derives a question that should be anyone who makes a political action: "Could you also do what I do if my action and my reason to be undertaken in the public record?"²

The question in this regard stresses Luban, the principle is that advertising is not only a proposition of morality, but also a principle of institutional design. In this sense, one could argue that the principle of publicity forced to build institutions that are responsible for the impact of their decisions and the results of their actions.

If the principle of publicity is an issue of institutional design, it is the question of what should be the components for this design actually allows citizens to make an informed oversight of public affairs.

According to theories of institutional design, there are broadly three basic ways in which social institutions are transformed³:

- 1) By accident: when social change occurs without any causal mechanisms that drive the change.
- 2) Evolution: when social change responds to an adaptation to the environment.
- 3) Intention: when social change is the product of a deliberate intervention by agents with intent in search of a goal.

In the specific case of the right of access to public information in Mexico, we have a clear case of institutional reforms with intention on the part of the political actors that drove them as constitutional law.

The Federal Law of Transparency and Access to Public Government Information adopted in 2002, including subsequent amendments to Article 6. Constitutional 2007, can not be understood outside the context of political transition that our country.

¹ Cf. Luban, David. "The principle of publicity" in Goodin, Robert (2003). Theory of institutional design. Ed. Gedisa, Spain.

² Ibid.

³ Goodin, Robert. Op. Cit. p.41

There are various analysis on the efforts and negotiations that several actors from the company made to allow the adoption of the right to información⁴. Here, what matters is to emphasize the context of political transition that led to one of the most significant reforms to the Mexican government over the last seventy years.

With the political transition recorded in 2000 opened a scenario that favors the conditions to move towards transparency in public administration and thus provide a new profile to public service in keeping with a democratic system. It is important to note that the adoption of a law on transparency and access to information has political implications, particularly in the case of Mexico, its consequences will, over time, to transform the traditional relationships within the bureaucracy and his with society.

To analyze the institutional implications of the law of transparency, the scheme will be used for interpretive case studies that suggested Lowi⁵ Theodore (2003), who argues that political relations are determined by the type of policy that is at stake. In other words Lowi implicitly states that politics (politics) depends on the policies (policies). For Lowi there are three basic categories of public policy: distributive, regulatory and redistributive. In each of these categories has a particular arena of power, which in turn is characterized by developing its own political structure, its process, its elites and their relations group. Here is briefly referred to each of these policies and their corresponding power of sand and then, based on this schema, analyze the costs and benefits involved the adoption of the law on transparency to the actors involved in a context political transition.

The outline of Lowi, the distribution policies are those where the resources, and therefore the costs and benefits, are broken. They cannot be determined clearly the beneficiary and the loser, so that the parties need not face. It is a pluralistic arena because it operates a large number of interests to the degree to which each individual can rely on its own. The decisions are based on values such as equality, consistency, impartiality. Hospital policies are seeking universality, and therefore their level of conflict is low. The regulatory policies, for their part, are those whose impacts are more specific and disaggregated by sector, which means a decision on who will be directly affected and who benefited. It is characterized by the interaction between conflicting groups. Finally, redistributive policies impacting categories close to the social classes. The discussion is not focused on the effectiveness of the redeployment, but in knowing who to affect the redistribution.

This approach has been supplemented by Jose Luis Mendez ⁶(1993), who also restores the original model of sands of political Wilson⁷ (1973)⁷ and analyzed based on three basic

⁴ See Escobedo, Juan Francisco (2004), "Mobilization of public opinion: the case of Oaxaca Group and the Federal Law of Transparency and Access to Information," Mexico: polyarchies under construction, Mexico, Universidad Iberoamericana.

⁵ Lowi, Theodore (2003). "Public policies, case studies and political theory." In Aguilar Villanueva, Luis F. The shape of policies. Mexico, M.A. Porrúa.

⁶ Mendez, Jose Luis. "Public policy as a dependent variable: toward a more comprehensive analysis of public policies." Mexico, January-February 1993.

elements: 1) distribution of costs and benefits of policies, 2) The number of types of actors and 3) the nature of the political game, in addition to rescue a kind of policy that felt that no Lowi is the so-called majority.

BENEFITS

	Concentrates	Dispersed
d		
i	Arena: Distributive	Arena: Majority
s	Players in the sand:	Players in the sand:
p	State and winners	Mainly the State
e	Game type:	Game type:
r	Positive-sum (Low conflict)	Positive-sum (Low conflict)
s		
e		
d		
C		
O		
c		
S		Arena: Regulatory
o	Arena: redistributive	Players in the sand:
T	Players in the sand:	State, losers and
n	State winners and	winners
c	losers	Game type:
e	Game type:	Zero-sum relative (Conflict
n	Zero-Sum (Upper conflict)	Intermediate)
t		
e		
s		

Source: Jose Luis Mendez, op. cit., p. 138.

⁷, J.Q. Political Organizations, New York, Basic Books, 1973. In Mendez, Jose Luis. Op. Cit. 1993

According to this methodology we can say that past attempts to make effective the right of access to information could not be built because the political system of hegemonic party prevailing placed these efforts into a regulatory arena where the profits were scattered and costs concentrated.

This scenario changes when once achieved political alternation, in 2000, the main concern is focused on achieving institutional changes that would put the foundation for a consolidation of democracy. In this regard, a number of political actors of the new regime, as well as various social actors, they see the conditions for establishing a law on transparency and access to information is open.

The environment of political transition emerged from a democratic process, the formation of coalitions representative of the executive and legislative branches and the academic and social sectors, contributed to the discussion on the need for a law on transparency would be moved from the regulatory arena where it was located above a sand scattered distribution of costs and benefits concentrated. In other words, the cost of not adopting a system of this nature in an environment of transition towards democracy, it may be too high for the actors involved, primarily for the Congress.

The benefits also extend to political parties as private entities. On the other hand, the adoption of the LFTAIPG allows Mexico is put into line with several of his counterparts in international organizations like the OECD, APEC and WTO.

No doubt the adoption of the LFTAIPG paid to strengthening a democratic system in Mexico, but not enough to do so, the above analysis shows the complexity of the institutional transformation that involves open to public scrutiny a system traditionally linked to the secrecy in decision - decisions and in its operation. This complexity increases when we consider that recent amendments to Article 6 Constitutional raised to the highest rank the principle of maximum publicity.

While the federal and state rule that resulted from it, are the starting point for effecting the required transparency, accountability and the right of access to information is important to note that the legal framework must be accompanied an effort of institutional transformation and tools that enable citizens to the free exercise of this right.

As has been said repeatedly, institutional transformation that lies ahead is the greatest impact in the last seventy years since it obliges all levels of government in all states and all powers to implement policy instruments, administrative organizations to enforce this mandate.

The other aspect, that studies on transparency have neglected and that this analysis considers of utmost importance is that of the instruments with which the citizen has access to effective way to information on decisions, functioning and results of public action.

So far, we can identify four instruments that must be obligated to develop the society to give useful information, timely, accurate and truthful about their chores:

- The electronic portals
- Requests for information
- Attention to the applicant
- Files

1) Construction, or possibly improving, the electronic portals

To date, the issuance of obligations for transparency in electronic portals has been skewed in terms of quality and presentation. That is why, to be sure that mandated emanating from the reform does not result in a mere bureaucratic compliance, but the bodies guarantors of the Federation and the states monitor websites that contain useful information, relevant, timely and easily accessible for the citizen.

2) Information Requests

On this issue there is a strong discretion. There is a wide range of possibilities in terms of requests for information ranging from those that can be done electronically to those in which the public has to present site to enter your request. The decree of reform in conjunction with the requirement of having electronic systems can help to standardize applications and fully comply with the Act as allowing that "Everyone, without having to demonstrate any interest or justify its use, will have free access to public information, their personal data or to rectify them "(Fraction. III).

3) Attention to the applicant

Hand in hand with the previous one, the way it receives and deals geared to the citizens is crucial to ensure an open government and an educated society. A natural step for the applicant is to approach your government to know you better, and it is from this point of departure as the guidance and treatment they receive will encourage and motivate greater interest in public affairs. In addition, proper guidance deepens the ties between citizens and government, provides institutional trust and strengthens accountability.

4) The files

Transparency requires an appropriate file system. The reform establishes that "Obligated must preserve its documents on file administrative update and publish, through the electronic media available, the full and updated information about their management indicators and the exercise of public resources" (Fraction V). This mandate is significant because many institutions bound by the Transparency Law have left in a second term

emissions regulations that ensure the systematization of information which, consequently, would facilitate their public consultation.

The study is presented here, aims to focus on the analysis of the instruments at its disposal citizens, including a monitoring of electronic portals, the quality of care and quality of response to requests information. It is a pioneering study on the matter because it is the first diagnosis that provides information on how they are operating in reality the legal, administrative and institutional guarantors.

In other words, it's a provocative study in the sense that the results offered, beyond the conception that reflect on transparency are the institutions and entities, becomes an input to know indirectly the degree of democratic transformation of the country as a whole.

Without effective tools for transparency to allow public access to public information, the Kantian ambition is only that.

PART TWO: Methodology

Chapter Two: Approaches

Since the objective of the research was to determine the degree of openness towards transparency throughout the national territory, three parameters were chosen to be tested: 1) electronic portals of transparency, 2) quality of care to the applicant, and 3) Quality in response to the applicant.

The choice of these three categories is because they are the bridge of communication between the institution and the public. These three categories allow us to know whether the instruments at its disposal citizens to access public information from the obligors are effective or poor, also allow you to construct an approximation on the level of transparency that will live in each of the regions of the country.

By ordinance, all obligated parties must make available to the public, through its electronic portals, the public information office that stated in federal law in this area and state laws. However, as discussed in the section on results, there is a huge asymmetry in the information that is published electronically, which translates into a distinct exercise of the right of access to information.

The parameter of the quality of care is relevant to the applicant while can become an element that facilitates or inhibits access to information. Few institutions of the states that allow citizens to make requests for information by electronic means, this requires the caller to go personally to deliver his request for information, and in many cases, it also forces him to go to the department forget the answer. The process for requesting information which, incidentally, should be public, is still long and tortuous: the citizen has to seek the office of attention, and then be subjected, in many cases, a veiled questioning, the wait time Regulations drawn, and finally receive a response.

Finally, quality response to requests for information is far more important to know how far the institutions are committed to transparency. The present legal grounds for appealing to non-delivery, lack of documentation or information that should be public is still a recurring practice in several institutions.

It is important to note that the study will undertake a general revision of laws, but not the institutional mechanisms that will emerge from it. This due to the recent reforms to Article 6th. of the Constitution to require policy changes and institutional design in the obligated, making it impossible at this time make an analysis on the specificity of the intra-institutional arrangements for transparency. However, this parameter is important to consider in the future, as it is essential to a comprehensive study of the metric of transparency.

This is not to omit that the study itself could serve as a framework for generating recommendations on regulatory reform that will carry out all the states.

Chapter Three: Clarity, quality and usability of the information published electronically

The automation of public information and online access with ease and clarity is an essential step in ensuring the penetration and consolidating the culture of transparency. In addition, it is half that charged more force to move in line technology resources and their use is spreading among the population. Electronic publishing is the only mechanism to guarantee the principle of maximum publicity of information while reducing transaction costs for both the institution and for the citizen.

The online publication should be understood as an investment in the medium term will make efficient use of resources devoted to transparency, and allow the public unfettered access to its scrutiny.

Obligated must have an Internet page where it will run the key information also provided a means for the citizens make demands on the data are not available online. On the understanding that some of obligated not have the infrastructure and resources needed for that purpose, especially some small municipalities or agencies, it is advisable that they deliver the information to the body guarantor of the entity or unit to which they are attached for it to provide the information accessed through its website.

Substantiation

In this regard, the constitutional reform approved in its third establishes a transitional period of two years from its entry into force, so that the public can make use of the mechanisms of access to information through remote. So that this evaluation should be understood as a support to identify the strengths and weaknesses of the use of electronic media and to highlight best practices in the use of electronic means to access public information.

The Constitution is very clear in explaining "[t] he obligation of all state organs to make available to the public and to keep its main management indicators, as well as the obligations of such bodies and political parties to provide information on their activities, through electronic means, to seek a proper accountability; [also] the existence of administrative records up to date and reliable "It has been provided that the guiding principles for the evaluation of that order, the review of its electronic portals were:

- Operation and usability
- Information basic administrative compulsory by law and the Constitution
- Financial and material
- Roles and responsibilities of its competition

Motivation and justification

The information published in electronic media remote under the principle of maximum disclosure can generate confidence and certainty in the medium term, as although lacked legal validity and is only informative, reflecting strength and commitment to openness. Thus, far from constituting a threat to the institutions represents an ideal medium to promote its strengthening as it forges legitimacy and respect.

Ideally, the content available to the public must comply with the requirements of clarity, quality, reliability, timeliness and reliability. In practice it is more straightforward assessment of some of them to others. For example, a generic way to determine the veracity of the information is complicated, while calling their clarity and timeliness can be made with greater certainty.

As mentioned earlier, the use of electronic publication represents an investment that leads to reduced costs for both the institution and for the user, but the exploitation of this resource can also favor the misinformation if not properly conducted. The quality of information can be diminished by their disorganization or saturation, therefore impossible to query expedited documentation and may even create confusion or misinterpretation of the data. The information may be available, but if it is not easily found and consulted invalid. Under this consideration, the evaluation of Internet sites should incorporate elements to describe the order, design and organization of content, as well as the provision of resources to support the identification of files easily, clear and accessible.

Description of evaluation

Each of the pages evaluated in the sample was revised at least four times in a comprehensive way to determine the existence of the element and the criteria for evaluation. Through the comparative searches and their matches set a parameter of "accessibility and usability of information." The results were verified by monitors from the area, and confirmed particularly when comments were not sufficient to demonstrate an accurate measurement. This comprehensive evaluation was designed to minimize the possibility of error in the verification of electronic content.

- Design and Usability.- This entry is designed to measure the usability and ease of access from the website of the obligor to the user.
- - Content organic base .- The purpose of this is to measure the level of clarity that the information published electronically offers the user about the nature of the institution, its structure, its main obligations and goals.
- - Financial and material .- This entry is designed to measure the level of clarity of the information published on the management of public resources, as well as on the functioning of the internal controls for its proper implementation.
- - Nature Operations .- This entry is designed to measure the relevance that has published information electronically to the user in terms of knowledge of the results achieved by the institution analyzed according to the purposes for which it was created.

TABLE FOR THE ASSESSMENT OF CLARITY, AND QUALITY
OF INFORMATION usability e-Procurement.

VARIABLE	CRITERIA TO EVALUATE
Design and Usability	<p>Ease of access.</p> <p>A link for "transparency" visible from the Start Page⁸</p> <p>Possibility of contact responsible for giving keeping to the page</p> <p>Full Coverage</p> <p>Dates of last update</p> <p>Average on-line consultation / application or questions</p> <p>Response time server</p>
Basic organic content	<p>Regulatory framework</p> <p>Schools of all its administrative units</p> <p>Organizational Structure</p> <p>Activity Report</p> <p>Progress in meeting the goals and objectives</p> <p>Directory of Public Servants</p> <p>Services offered for each operational area</p> <p>Staff</p> <p>Operational and strategic plans</p> <p>Bids and criteria for admission, promotion and permanence of public service</p> <p>Directorate liaison unit</p>

⁸ In case you all the elements described as a visible and easily reachable, the criterion will be taken as valid yet exist without a submenu of "transparency".

Financial and material	Budget
	Progress report on implementation of the budget, current expenditure or financial report (quarterly)
	Revenue from additional concepts to the budget, specifying origin and execution.
	Public accounts
	Results of audits
	Inventories and vehicle parks
	Tab of monthly salary for civil servants
	Contracts awarded, public works or advice.
Operational nature (generic)	Reports generated by operation of law
	Research conducted
	Official travel (cost, route, schedule and results)
	Conventions and Agreements
	Mechanisms for citizen participation and contact
Operational nature (specific)	See Attachment 2

The scores will be standardized in order to have a rating of 10 for this item.

TIMES

The periods of assessment of the portal sites were carried out on a temporary space of two months (August-September 2007). In addition, each page was updated at least four times by different people. In a way that captures the essence of a general page under a standardized approach and without the minor changes carried out steadily over the Internet portals represent noise in the sample.

SELECTION OF THE SAMPLE

A key element among these bodies is that they must have a wide degree of comparison. That is, be units or corporate bodies that essentially perform the same functions. For the group's state executive were elected five. First, the site of the general office of the executive government and, in seconds, the General Secretariat of Government or equivalent in the third, the Ministry of Public Security, or it's nearest equivalent, in view of several entities that this is a unit of the General Secretariat of Government, or has other names and powers. Fourth, the Ministry of Social Development, or equivalent unit in charge of the promotion of the company and, finally, in fifth place the Ministry of Finance, in many cases also called for "Administration and Finance." In some cases, was also evaluated tangentially portal obligations of the state, in order to answer the questions of the documents were not found in the rest of the pages. As can be seen, it was sought by the criterion of maximum compatibility between subjects evaluated to ensure the reception of the methodology with the least amount of friction.

A next part of the sample was composed by a municipality, which was selected to the municipality in the state capital, which is both the most populous in 56% of cases.

Finally, given the inherent characteristics of each, in selecting the other two powers are decided by the study of the Legislative and Judicial of each entity.

States:

- 5 Secretaries / executive branches of state
- 1 Municipality (in case of the delegation D.F.)
- 1 power of the State Legislative Body
- 1 Body of the Judiciary state

Sub-total: 256 portals

Federation:

- 5 ministries / departments of the Executive

- 2 Bodies of the legislative branch

- 1 Body of the Judiciary

Sub-total: 8 portals

Total sample: 264 Portals

As shown, the sample, for the purposes of this study, which includes institutions must have the resources and infrastructure needed to provide information through electronic portals. Future studies should evaluate units and sub-units, under the assumptions above, then forced his subjects as information must also be in the public domain.

Assessment

For the evaluation of the elements within each portal revised assigned a rating of one (1) if the information and its contents are completos⁹. In the event of did not meet adequately detailed or incomplete will be assigned half point (.5), and if it is not available, is listed but does not contain information or contains a broken link was penalized with a score of zero (0).

So that each element evaluated can be divided into one of three categories:

1 = complete information

5 = incomplete information

0 = not available

The choice of a range of 0 to 1, unlike other studies, reflects a congruence of mathematics, where one is the correct term to express completeness and therefore a fraction equivalent to the state a state of fragmented and incomplete its nature.

⁹ The list of reagents and specifications are within Annex 01 of this document.

Chapter IV: Quality of service, facilities and guidance to the user

By giving the public the right of access to public information, the Constitution, together with local laws, establishes the need for efficient care to citizens in exercising their requests for public information, and for this purpose includes a clause which penalizes the conduct of public servants that violate the right to the information which will be considered as serious for purposes of administrative sanctions that would be established. The validity of this precept starts with the functioning of the administrative units responsible for guiding and respond to citizens in exercising their rights, and it is considered that the units of the first link that must be evaluated.

The elements to consider in assessing this parameter were:

1. Correct direction of the liaison unit (as published)
2. Accessibility
3. Call time visible
4. Waiting time
5. Space and resources to process the application.
6. Staff training
7. Good treatment
8. Request of personal data (evaluated negatively)
9. Application of a legitimate interest (to be evaluated negatively)
10. Information on cost
11. Information on response time
12. Information possibility of disagreement with response
13. Delivery of acknowledgment of receipt
14. Middle electronic application
15. Need to physically go for an answer
16. Choice of modality

Motivation and justification

The procedures for access to information must be clear and easily usable. The effective functioning is essential to provide citizens a gateway to the information you want to know the state. That is why the third parameter to measure the transparency will be assessing the liaison units of obligated. This will be done using a tool commonly used in economics and marketing, a user simulated, or "*mystery shopper*". The modus operandi of this instrument is as follows: a researcher goes to the module link of each institution; it seeks support for staff working on it asking for guidance to make a request to take you to find the information you want. At no time were identified as a researcher but as an ordinary citizen. It is nothing until it completes the application procedure and leaves the premises until it is a descriptive fill out a questionnaire on the care, management and quality of service provided.

Sample selection

Given the characteristics of the study, only a simulation of user sent to each person in the sample, in the case of municipalities will assess the capital city of each state.

For purposes of this study, the application procedure will be simple to ensure its standardization. Also, the evaluation questionnaire of the service must be completed soon to quickly and easily to the next subject for further evaluation.

Each of the units in the sample receives a visit from a simulated user, these are:

In each state:

- 4 Secretaries / executive branches of state
- 1 power of the State Legislative Body
- 1 Municipality (delegation in case of D. F.)

Sub-total: 162 subjects

In the case of the states were left out of the sample: Chiapas, Hidalgo, Oaxaca, Tabasco and Veracruz.

Federation:

- 4 ministries / departments of the Executive
- 2 Bodies of the legislative branch

Sub-total: 6 subjects

Total sample: 168 subjects

Visited the spot 168 units.

Description of the evaluation

In this parameter will assess the quality of care, support and guidance to citizen, as well as the provision of equipment and tools that facilitate their query.

CATEGORY	VARIABLE	POINTS	CRITERIA TO EVALUATE
Quality of service, facilities and customer services.	Location	1 Point	Was published in the location and was properly marked as such.
	Space	1 Point	The liaison had enough space to write the request and respond adequately to the people.
	Time	1 Point	The waiting time is reasonable to receive attention.
	Equipment	1 Point	There are computers for information or consultation to write the same
	Training	1 Point	The staff knows the procedures to guide the citizen at the entrance of his request for access to information.
	Complete information	1 Point	It was reported on the application process, including the possibility of submitting applications for review.
	Attention	1 Point	Citizens are given all possible support to enter his application.
	Personal Information	1 Point	NO requesting personal information to the user or personal identification, additional to those for sending response (IFE, CURP, RFC).
	Motivation	1 Point	NOT be asked to indicate rightful interest or motivation in the case.
	Cost	1 Point	In case the requested service has a cost was informed of this.
	Response time	1 Point	It was said the approximate time of response.
	Receipt	1 Point	Delivered acknowledgment of receipt.

Electronic application system	1 Point	There half of the request for electronic form, or without physically going to perform the procedure.
Answer attendance	1 Point	It is necessary to apply in person to obtain the requested information once they responded.
Format	1 Point	It offers choice of format for receiving information.
Additional	1 Point	Additional data to facilitate search.
PUNTAJE MÁXIMO	16 puntos	

Chapter Five: The efficiency and compliance in response to requests

Motivation and justification

The amendment to Article 6 seeks to give effect to the exercise of the right to information as it certifies his own argument. This will determine how through mandatory "[u] n expedited procedure that includes all possibilities of application (including electronically) to all organs of state, federal, state, municipal and political parties to allow the issuance of the corresponding response no later than twenty days, extendable for a time until only for a period as long as there are reasons therefore, for any person seeking access to information, without having to demonstrate any interest or justify their use".

Description of the evaluation

This method will evaluate the quality of the response to the request in addition to the compliance in a timely manner. Will be sent requests for written information to individual units, each of the subjects of the sample. This will provide greater statistical significance to the results of their responses.

Here is the battery of questions for group instituciones¹⁰:

Battery of questions to the executive

1. Relationship of cell phone contracts (3 secretariats)
2. Budget for advertising
3. Name and type of weapon of the custodians of the Governor (*)
4. List of beneficiaries of social support program
5. Allergies of the Secretary of Development (*)
6. Number of police officers disqualified
7. Amount of debt the state
8. Amount received by branch 33.

* Data classified or confidential

Battery of questions at the Legislative

1. Relationship of cell phone contracts
2. Congressional budget (broken down)
3. Roll call votes
4. Religious affiliation of the Deputy President (*)

* Data classified or confidential

¹⁰ To see the list in greater detail should be revised Annex 2 of this document.

Battery of questions to the municipalities

1. Relationship of cell phone contracts
2. Budget for advertising
3. Listing of building permits
4. Budget of the municipality
5. Paper medical checkup of the Mayor (*)

* Data classified or confidential

The selection of questions arose from the following logic applies to the three Obligated diagnosed.

- 1) Administrative information held by all as is the management of cellular telephony
- 2) Two inherent in their operational nature
- 3) Two confirmed that they might be doing the same question to two subjects' related matters such as budget
- 4) Two questions about data protection and personal or confidential. (Refusing to be substantiated)

In those institutions that have electronic means to make requests, they were sent by this means. In cases where there was no such system, the questions were sent using the user simulated when assessing the quality of customer service. In some cases, required that the person concerned to draft the request at the unit liaison for the unit. The final wording was exactly as the technical team previously defined to ensure the standardization of the level of requirements and minimize their chances of rejection justified.

Sample selection

The sample for this category was distributed as follows:

- ✓ 10 for the Executive
 - 2 Office of the Governor
 - 2 Ministry of Public Security (or unit in charge of security)
 - 3 Ministry of Finance (or equivalent)
 - 3 Secretariat of Social Development
- ✓ 4 for the power of the Legislative Body
- ✓ 5 for the municipality (in case of the delegation DF)

19 questions were made by state

TOTAL: 459 questions)

Were displayed outside the states of Baja California Sur, Chiapas, Hidalgo, Oaxaca, Tabasco and Veracruz.

PART THREE: Findings, conclusions and recommendations

Seventh chapter: Overall results

The results which are presented below are the result of an extensive analysis that included evaluation of 264 Web sites, a visit to 185 units, and the completion of 466 requests for information and review of 326 responses.

The study results show that, notwithstanding the constitutional reform that rises to more senior citizens' right to access information, we live in a country where this right is exercised unevenly. There is a wide variance not only to compare one state to another, but even within a single entity, there are groups of institutions with different attitudes to the issue of transparency.

Mexico is still in the middle of the road. This first approach to the subject, from a citizen, said that in general all institutions across the country and all powers not yet have the optimal electronic portals in this area. We need to train staff responsible for receiving applications to promote rather than inhibit this right, and we need to know in greater depth the law in order to provide better answers to requests that are submitted.

This means that transparency and the right of access to information are performed with difficulty and that most of the territory does not reach a satisfactory level. However, there are already cases of reference that can set itself up as models to follow (for example, the portal Supreme Court of Justice of the Nation, the response of the Congress of Coahuila or the Government of the Federal District).

The aggregated results allow making the following observations (See Table 1):

- The evaluation of the electronic portals of transparency indicates that the average obtained by the institutions are below a minimum level of 60% approval, except in the case of municipalities which received a combined average of 61%.
- In terms of customer service, the average is satisfactory which suggests that there is an administrative culture of public attention more developed compared with other parameters.
- On the parameter of quality of answers, it is important to note that only executives met with the least satisfactory, while the Legislative and municipal levels are below 60%. One concern here is the high rate of non-response to requests (29%).

Table 3.1.- Overall averages for each group of institutions

Group of Institutions	Electronic portals	Customer Service	Quality of Response	Weighted average
Executive Power	58.04%	68.13%	56.98%	59.63%
Legislative Branch	59.62%	75.86%	55.70%	61.30%
Judiciary *	47.84%	*	*	*
Municipalities	62.65%	73.43%	45.30%	57.87%

* The judiciary was evaluated solely through their Web sites due to time constraints and budgetary.
Source: our own

The results of transparency and access to information allows also assess the institutional development in this area, namely the organizational dynamic that exists inside the groups of institutions assessed. In this sense, it is interesting to note that in general terms the executive is the one that presents a relatively more balanced development in different parameters, showing that its internal mechanisms exist for institutional coordination between the areas responsible for presenting information in electronically, and those responsible for the reception and the attention to requests for information.

Contrasting cases of the legislature and municipalities. In both, the commitment of attention to citizenship is much higher than in the executive, (75.86% in the first case and 73.43% in the second case). However, this dedication in caring does not match the quality of the answers provided to citizens (55.70% quality of Response in the first case and 45.30% in the second).

While budget issues and time, he was assessed only through its electronic portals, it is disturbing that the judiciary should be placed at the last site of this parameter with respect to the other branches. The organs of justice should be, from our perspective, which should provide better and more extensive information on their institutional affairs.

3.2 Conglomerate assessments of the Executive

	Electronic portals	Customer Service	Quality of Response	Weighted average
Federal District	81.07%	65.63%	98.96%	85.14%
Yucatan	66.79%	93.75%	91.46%	82.05%
Coahuila	71.43%	89.06%	84.64%	80.24%
Guanajuato	67.50%	78.13%	93.23%	79.92%
Federation	65.71%	93.75%	82.81%	78.16%
Nuevo Leon	63.21%	87.50%	87.76%	77.89%
Sonora	76.07%	93.75%	70.83%	77.51%
Quintana Roo	62.50%	87.50%	78.65%	73.96%
Guerrero	63.57%	73.44%	72.92%	69.28%
Mexico State	55.36%	82.60%	75.00%	68.66%
Jalisco	85.36%	85.94%	43.33%	68.66%
Sinaloa	65.36%	63.54%	73.96%	68.43%
Aguascalientes	74.29%	71.88%	58.34%	67.43%
Colima	36.43%	75.00%	92.97%	66.76%
Puebla	61.20%	81.92%	64.58%	66.70%
Morelos	73.21%	65.63%	56.25%	64.91%
Baja California	37.50%	87.50%	80.00%	64.50%
San Luis Potosi	53.21%	65.00%	74.48%	64.08%
Campeche	55.71%	65.87%	55.21%	57.54%
Zacatecas	53.21%	85.42%	39.69%	54.24%
Chihuahua	49.29%	57.64%	41.67%	47.91%
Nayarit	55.36%	42.19%	42.19%	47.46%

Tamaulipas	41.79%	79.69%	36.46%	47.24%
Queretaro	37.86%	70.31%	0.00%	29.20%
Durango	53.21%	18.75%	0.00%	25.04%
Michoacan	51.07%	17.19%	0.00%	23.87%
Baja California Sur	49.29%	0.00%	0.00%	19.71%
Tlaxcala	18.57%	29.17%	0.00%	13.26%
Average	58.04%	68.13%	56.98%	59.63%

The following entities do not have a standard in-office, however its website it had been evaluated, although his scores were not used for the overall averages.

Entity	Internet Voting
Chiapas	55.71%
Veracruz	56.79%
Hidalgo	16.79%
Oaxaca	16.43%
Tabasco	57.86%

Source: our own

When making a comparison between institutions of the executive branch by state show a high degree of variance. While the Federal District shows a weighted average of 85.14%, Tlaxcala only reaches 13.26%. Highlights the cases of Queretaro, Durango, Michoacan, Baja California Sur and Tlaxcala, where there was no response to requests submitted. Of these cases, the Queretaro is relevant because of the high degree of contrast between the customer services (70.31%), the information presented on the Internet (37.86%) and the quality of the responses (0%). It is assumed that this entity exists in a wide spread of the issue of transparency and access to information, but does not have the relevant institutional mechanisms to sustain such dissemination.

Within the cluster of results of this power highlights the number six position of the Federal Executive. But the institutions of the federal executive have greater financial and human resources, failed to overcome the efforts of five entities: the Federal District, Yucatan, Coahuila, Guanajuato and Sinaloa.

In the cluster of results of the legislative branch also shows a high variance in the comparison between entities of the federation. While Guanajuato has a weighted average of 91.42%, above the average achieved by the executive branch of the Federal District and above the county better evaluated, Tlaxcala is again in last place in the table with a weighted average of 13.26%.

The Federal Chamber of Deputies is in second place in the table with a weighted average of 83.23%, while the Senate is in sixth place with a weighted average of 75.50%, passed by the congresses of Nayarit, Coahuila and District Federal. In the case of the Senate highlights the contrast between the cares that presents the user (93.75%) with the quality of the responses obtained (59.38%).

Concerned about instances of the congresses of Tamaulipas, Baja California, Queretaro, Michoacan, Durango, Colima and Tlaxcala, where there was no response to requests for information. The case of Baja California Sur is even more worrying given that it was not possible to requests for information.

Table 3.3 Conglomerate assessments of the Legislative

	Electronic portals	Customer Service	Quality of Response	Weighted average
Guanajuato	87.93%	93.75%	93.75%	91.42%
Cámara de Diputados	86.21%	81.25%	81.25%	83.23%
Coahuila	60.34%	93.75%	96.88%	81.64%
Zacatecas	60.34%	81.25%	93.74%	77.88%
Distrito Federal	58.62%	75.00%	96.87%	77.20%
Cámara de Senadores	82.76%	93.75%	59.37%	75.60%
Sinaloa	55.17%	75.00%	93.75%	74.57%
Nayarit	48.28%	93.75%	90.62%	74.31%
Quintana Roo	48.28%	93.75%	90.63%	74.31%
Jalisco	74.14%	87.50%	67.85%	74.30%
Estado de México	58.62%	75.00%	87.50%	73.45%
San Luis Potosí	48.28%	81.25%	93.75%	73.06%
Morelos	62.07%	68.75%	84.38%	72.33%
Puebla	67.24%	87.50%	68.75%	71.90%
Campeche	53.45%	75.00%	85.00%	70.38%
Chihuahua	68.97%	93.75%	59.37%	70.09%
Sonora	60.34%	87.50%	65.62%	67.88%
Nuevo León	68.97%	93.75%	43.75%	63.84%
Aguascalientes	55.17%	87.50%	59.37%	63.32%
Yucatán	63.79%	87.50%	40.62%	59.26%
Guerrero	50.00%	56.25%	62.50%	56.25%
Tamaulipas	67.24%	87.50%	0.00%	44.40%
Baja California	68.97%	75.00%	0.00%	42.59%
Querétaro	62.07%	87.50%	0.00%	42.33%

Durango	72.41%	56.25%	0.00%	40.22%
Michoacán	55.17%	68.75%	0.00%	35.82%
Colima	46.55%	56.25%	0.00%	29.87%
Tlaxcala	32.76%	6.25%	0.00%	14.35%
Baja California Sur	12.07%	0.00%	0.00%	4.83%
Average	59.62%	75.86%	55.70%	61.30%

The following entities do not have a standard in-office, however its website it had been evaluated, although his scores were not used for the overall averages.

Entity	Internet Voting
Chiapas	48.28%
Hidalgo	25.86%
Oaxaca	25.86%
Veracruz	53.45%
Tabasco	55.17%

Table 3.4 Conglomerate assessments of the Municipality

Municipality	Electronic portals	Customer Service	Quality of Response	Weighted average
Guadalajara	96.67%	81.25%	90.00%	90.92%
Merida	85.00%	87.50%	75.00%	81.50%
Guanajuato	98.33%	68.75%	67.50%	80.08%
Aguascalientes	75.00%	87.50%	76.25%	78.00%
Hermosillo	38.33%	93.75%	100.00%	74.08%
Cd. Victoria	56.67%	68.75%	92.50%	73.42%
Monterrey	66.67%	93.75%	60.00%	69.42%
Chihuahua	85.00%	62.50%	52.50%	67.50%
Cuernavaca	71.67%	87.50%	50.00%	66.17%
Toluca	60.00%	68.75%	70.00%	65.75%
Cuahutémoc	45.00%	78.57%	80.00%	65.71%
Puebla	68.33%	81.25%	55.00%	65.58%
Chilpancingo	50.00%	56.25%	85.00%	65.25%
Mexicali	56.67%	93.75%	55.00%	63.42%
Tepic	58.33%	68.75%	62.50%	62.08%
Othón P. Blanco	73.33%	81.25%	40.00%	61.58%
Culiacán	75.00%	66.67%	40.00%	59.33%
Campeche	65.00%	81.25%	32.50%	55.25%
Morelia	53.33%	75.00%	37.50%	51.33%
Durango	78.33%	87.50%	0.00%	48.83%
Querétaro	71.67%	81.25%	0.00%	44.92%
San Luis Potosí	60.00%	87.50%	0.00%	41.50%
Saltillo	55.00%	87.50%	0.00%	39.50%
Colima	71.67%	31.25%	0.00%	34.92%
Zacatecas	21.67%	87.50%	0.00%	26.17%
La Paz	65.00%	0.00%	0.00%	26.00%
Tlaxcala	15.00%	37.50%	0.00%	13.50%
Average	63.58%	73.43%	45.23%	58.21%

The following entities do not have a standard in-office, however we evaluated the websites, but its rating was not used for the overall averages.

Municipality	Entity	Evaluation
Tuxtla		
Gutierrez	Chiapas	66.67%
Pachuca	Hidalgo	70.00%
Oaxaca	Oaxaca	58.33%
Centro	Tabasco	0.00%
Xalapa	Veracruz	41.67%

Fuente: Elaboración propia

The analysis of the municipalities is one of the most interesting. The degree of variance is similar to that recorded in the executive and the legislature: 90.92% in the weighted average number of the municipality of Guadalajara against a 13.50% in the weighted average number of the Municipality of Tlaxcala.

What is interesting is the level of quality in the responses that reach some municipalities such as Hermosillo (100% in this parameter) even with the various restrictions faced this level of government, namely financial, governance and temporary.

In contrast, highlights the cases of the municipalities of Durango, Queretaro, San Luis Potosi, Saltillo, Colima, Tlaxcala and Zacatecas, who did not respond to requests for information.

Finally, in making a cross-entity concerned about instances of Durango, Queretaro and Tlaxcala, where no institution of any of the powers analyzed issued any response to requests for information. Obviously this is a critical point for the attention of the organs guarantors of these entities.

Following are the results broken down by parameter and evaluated by group institution.

Chapter Eight: Results of the evaluation of internet portals

Table 1.1 Assessment of internet portals for the municipality

Municipality	Internet sites
Guanajuato	98.33%
Guadalajara	96.67%
Chihuahua	85.00%
Mérida	85.00%
Durango	78.33%
Aguascalientes	75.00%
Culiacán	75.00%
Othón P Blanco (Chetumal)	73.33%
Colima	71.67%
Cuernavaca	71.67%
Querétaro	71.67%
Pachuca	70.00%
Puebla	68.33%
Tuxtla Gutierrez	66.67%
Monterrey	66.67%
La Paz	65.00%
Campeche	65.00%
Toluca	60.00%
San Luis Potosí	60.00%
Tepic	58.33%
Oaxaca	58.33%
Mexicali	56.67%
Cd. Victoria	56.67%
Saltillo	55.00%
Morelia	53.33%
Chilpancingo	50.00%
Cuahutémoc	45.00%
Xalapa	41.67%
Hermosillo	38.33%
Zacatecas	21.67%
Tlaxcala	13.33%
Centro (Villahermosa)	0.00%
Average	60.99%

Electronic portals of municipalities.

The results of the evaluation of the electronic portals of municipalities (See Table 1.1.) indicate that 19 municipalities met with more than 60% of the standards defined. In turn, they are the only ones who are above the average (60.99%). Only a capital (Villahermosa-Center) does not have transparency page.

The weakness of the portals of municipal transparency is that they tend to be used more for advertising information. Its strength is that the best pages of transparency are at this level of government, as evidenced by the portal city of Guanajuato evaluated with a 98.33%.

Electronic portals of the legislature.

Table 1.2 Assessment of internet portals for the legislative branch

Subject rated	Evaluation
Guanajuato	87.93%
Cámara de Diputados	86.21%
Cámara de Senadores	82.76%
Jalisco	74.14%
Distrito Federal	72.41%
Baja California	68.97%
Chihuahua	68.97%
Nuevo León	68.97%
Puebla	67.24%
Tamaulipas	67.24%
Yucatán	63.79%
Nayarit	62.07%
Querétaro	62.07%
Coahuila	60.34%
Sonora	60.34%
Zacatecas	60.34%
Durango	58.62%
Estado de México	58.62%
Aguascalientes	55.17%
Michoacán	55.17%
Sinaloa	55.17%
Veracruz	55.17%
Campeche	53.45%
Tabasco	53.45%
Guerrero	50.00%
Chiapas	48.28%
Morelos	48.28%
Quintana Roo	48.28%
San Luis Potosí	48.28%
Colima	46.55%
Tlaxcala	32.76%
Hidalgo	25.86%
Oaxaca	25.86%
Baja California Sur	12.07%
Average	57.20 %

The analysis of the electronic portals of the legislature (see Table 1.2), indicates that 16 congresses are above the standard approval (60%). The average for this group is located at 57%.

In addition to the portals of the congresses also tend to be used more for publicity outreach, have outdated information, confused and have poor usability due to the saturation of its contents.

However, there are cases that are worthy of the portal such as transparency of the Congress of Guanajuato and the Congress of the Union.

Electronic portals of the executive branch.

The analysis of the electronic portals of the executive indicates that only 13 states and the Federation met with more than 60% of the standards analyzed (see Table 1.3). The average quality of the pages is below the standard approval (55%). There are huge differences in quality of the information in a single government.

The weaknesses of the portals of the executive are the same as that recorded the legislature: downgrade, confusing information, poor usability and saturation. The strength of this group of institutions is that the best pages are in 3 entities of the federation: they can access the original documents from a distance.

Table 1.3 Assessment of internet portals for the executive branch

Subject rated	Evaluation
Jalisco	85.36%
Distrito Federal	81.07%
Sonora	76.07%
Aguascalientes	73.93%
Morelos	73.21%
Coahuila	71.43%
Yucatán	70.00%
Guanajuato	67.50%
Executive Federal	65.71%
Sinaloa	65.36%
Guerrero	63.57%
Nuevo León	63.21%
Quintana Roo	62.50%
Puebla	60.71%
Veracruz	57.86%
Hidalgo	56.79%
Campeche	55.71%
Chiapas	55.71%
Estado de México	55.36%
Nayarit	55.36%
Durango	53.21%
San Luis Potosí	53.21%
Zacatecas	53.21%
Michoacán	51.07%
Chihuahua	49.29%
Baja California Sur	49.29%
Tamaulipas	41.79%
Querétaro	37.86%
Baja California	37.50%
Colima	36.43%
Tlaxcala	18.57%
Oaxaca	16.79%
Tabasco	16.43%
Average	55.49%

Electronic portals of the judiciary.

Table 1.4 Assessment of internet portals for the Judiciary

Entity	Internet sites
Federación (SCJN)	80.30%
Morelos	78.79%
Sonora	75.76%
Campeche	69.70%
Querétaro	69.70%
Chihuahua	66.67%
Distrito Federal	65.15%
Jalisco	62.12%
Zacatecas	60.61%
Yucatán	57.58%
Coahuila	56.06%
Durango	56.06%
Michoacán	56.06%
Nuevo León	56.06%
Estado de México	54.55%
Aguascalientes	51.52%
Puebla	51.52%
Sinaloa	50.00%
Quintana Roo	48.48%
Guerrero	45.45%
San Luis Potosí	45.45%
Veracruz	45.45%
Tabasco	42.42%
Hidalgo	39.39%
Tamaulipas	39.39%
Baja California Sur	33.33%
Tlaxcala	31.82%
Chiapas	27.27%
Guanajuato	25.76%
Colima	19.70%
Oaxaca	16.67%
Baja California	0.00%
Nayarit	0.00%
Average	47.84%

The analysis of the electronic portals of the judiciary said that only 9 courts comply with more than half of the standards (see Table 1.4), highlights the SCJN and Morelos. The average quality of this group of institutions is the lowest in the evaluation of this parameter (47%).

Importantly, Nayarit and Baja California Sur had no page in the period analyzed.

The weaknesses of the portals of the judiciary are very similar to those recorded in previous cases: downgrade, confusing information, poor usability and limited information.

The strength within this group of institutions is located at the site of the SCJN, who has developed one of the best pages that can serve as reference for the entire judicial branch.

Ninth chapter: Results of the assessment of user attention

As for the attention to the applicant, the results are presented to indicate that there is a wide disparity between entities, and even among units within the same power. Here, the results are slightly more encouraging when compared with other parameters (electronic portals and quality of response) because in general there is an administrative culture of public attention more fully developed. There are few cases that do not provide care to citizens when it comes to demand information. However, cases of Baja California Sur, Durango and Tlaxcala, distinguished by its attention to emerging culture of citizenship, which generally can be described as invalid, since almost no case could initiate a procedure for the applicant, even if There is a legal provision in the exercise to ensure it.

The customer services at the municipal level

Of the 26 counties analyzed in this category, 23 municipalities and the City's Cuauhtemoc Delegation met with more than 60% of the criteria evaluated (see Table 2.1). Are 15 municipalities that reach a higher level of care to 80% and 4 capitals that met with less than 60% of the standards assessed.

The main weakness is that in most cases there is no electronic means to request information. The main strength lies in the fact that most municipalities demonstrate knowledge of the subject and willingness to respond to the user.

Table 2.1 Assessment of customer services for the municipality

Municipality	Evaluation
Mexicali	93.75%
Monterrey	93.75%
Hermosillo	93.75%
Aguascalientes	87.50%
Saltillo	87.50%
Durango	87.50%
Cuernavaca	87.50%
San Luis Potosí	87.50%
Mérida	87.50%
Zacatecas	87.50%
Campeche	81.25%
Guadalajara	81.25%
Puebla	81.25%
Querétaro	81.25%
Othón P. Blanco	81.25%
Cuauhtémoc	78.57%
Morelia	75.00%
Guanajuato	68.75%
Toluca	68.75%
Tepic	68.75%
Cd. Victoria	68.75%
Culiacán	66.67%
Chihuahua	62.50%
Chilpancingo	56.25%
Tlaxcala	37.50%
Colima	31.25%
La Paz	0.00%
Xalapa	N/E
Oaxaca	N/E
Tuxtla Gutiérrez	N/E
Pachuca	N/E
Centro	N/E
Average	73.43%

N/E = Not rated by not having an existing law

The customer service in the legislature

The results of the assessment of user attention by the Congress (see Table 2.2) indicate that there are 24 legislative (federal and state) that meet more than 60% of the criteria evaluated. Of these, 17 legislative bodies met with more than 80% of the criteria and 5 Legislative meet less than 60% of the standards assessed.

Most often the weakness that has not been widespread use of electronic systems to enter the information. The main strength is that there is a consistent commitment to public attention.

Table 2.2 Assessment of customer services for the legislative branch

Subject evaluated	Assessment
Senate	93.75%
Chihuahua	93.75%
Coahuila	93.75%
Guanajuato	93.75%
Nayarit	93.75%
Nuevo Leon	93.75%
Quintana Roo	93.75%
Aguascalientes	87.50%
Jalisco	87.50%
Puebla	87.50%
Queretaro	87.50%
Sonora	87.50%
Tamaulipas	87.50%
Yucatan	87.50%
Chamber of Deputies	81.25%
San Luis Potosi	81.25%
Zacatecas	81.25%
Baja California	75.00%
Campeche	75.00%
Federal Distric	75.00%
Mexico	75.00%
Sinaloa	75.00%
Michoacan	68.75%
Morelos	68.75%
Colima	56.25%
Durango	56.25%
Guerrero	56.25%
Tlaxcala	6.25%
Baja California Sur	0.00%
Chiapas	N/E
Hidalgo	N/E
Oaxaca	N/E
Tabasco	N/E
Veracruz	N/E
Average	74.97%

N/E = Not rated by not having an existing law

The customer service in the executive branch

The results of this parameter indicate that there are 22 governments that meet more than 60% of the criteria evaluated (see Table 2.3). Only 16 of the 22 are above the average (67%). In Baja California Sur and Tlaxcala was unable to submit a request for information.

Among the weaknesses, it is important to note that there is a widespread practice to require identification to the applicant. As strength highlights the existence of a highly developed culture of service.

Table 2.3 Evaluation of customer services for the Executive Branch

Subject evaluated	Assessment
Federal Executive	93.75%
Sonora	93.75%
Yucatan	93.75%
Coahuila	90.63%
Baja California	87.50%
Nuevo Leon	87.50%
Quintana Roo	87.50%
Jalisco	85.94%
Zacatecas	85.42%
State of Mexico	82.60%
Puebla	81.92%
Tamaulipas	79.69%
Guanajuato	78.13%
Colima	75.00%
Guerrero	73.44%
Queretaro	70.31%
Federal District	65.63%
Morelos	65.63%
San Luis Potosi	65.00%
Campeche	64.06%
Sinaloa	63.54%
Chihuahua	62.33%
Aguascalientes	53.13%
Nayarit	42.19%
Tlaxcala	29.17%
Durango	18.75%
Michoacan	17.19%
Baja California Sur	0.00%
Chiapas	N/E
Hidalgo	N/E
Oaxaca	N/E
Tabasco	N/E
Veracruz	N/E
Average	67.62%

N/E = Not rated by not having an existing law

Chapter tenth: Result of the Evaluation of quality of answers

In regard to the evaluation of responses, there is a first point of concern: the high rate of non-response to requests initiated. For this study were sent 466 applications, of which 29% were not answered by the authorities still have a legal obligation to do so. In this case are the towns of Durango and Queretaro, whose responses could be classified as not delivered even if they were received. They were joined Baja California Sur and Tlaxcala that as mentioned before, not even received requests.

Quality of the responses at the municipal level

10 municipalities and the delegation of D.F. were located above the 60% of the criteria evaluated (see Table 3.1). The average quality of Response in 31Municipalitys and the delegation is 45%. 12 municipalities are below 50% of the standards considered in the study, of which 8 were not responded to the request, even taking a legal obligation. It is noteworthy performance of the municipality of Hermosillo (100% of respondents conducted properly).

Among the strengths highlighted that the legal response times are respected and the answers tend to be comprehensive. The main weakness lies in the very high rate of non-response to requests (38%)

Table 3.1 Assessment of responses from the municipalities capital

Municipality	Assessment
Hermosillo	100.00%
Cd. Victoria	92.50%
Guadalajara	90.00%
Chilpancingo	85.00%
Cuauhtémoc	80.00%
Aguascalientes	76.25%
Mérida	75.00%
Toluca	70.00%
Guanajuato	67.50%
Tepic	62.50%
Monterrey	60.00%
Mexicali	55.00%
Puebla	55.00%
Chihuahua	52.50%
Cuernavaca	50.00%
Othón P. Blanco	40.00%
Culiacán	40.00%
Morelia	37.50%
Campeche	32.50%
Saltillo	0.00%
Colima	0.00%
Durango	0.00%
Querétaro	0.00%
San Luis Potosí	0.00%
Zacatecas	0.00%
La Paz	0.00%
Tlaxcala	0.00%
Tuxtla Gutiérrez	N/E
Pachuca	N/E
Oaxaca	N/E
Centro	N/E
Xalapa	N/E
Average	45.23%

N/E = Not rated by not having an existing law

Quality of the responses in the legislature

Table 3.2 Assessment of response by the legislative branch

Subject evaluated	Assessment
Distrito Federal	96.88%
Coahuila	96.88%
Guanajuato	93.75%
San Luis Potosí	93.75%
Sinaloa	93.75%
Nayarit	90.63%
Quintana Roo	90.63%
Estado de México	87.50%
Campeche	84.38%
Morelos	84.38%
Cámara de Diputados	81.25%
Zacatecas	70.00%
Jalisco	68.75%
Puebla	68.75%
Sonora	65.63%
Chihuahua	62.50%
Guerrero	62.50%
Cámara de Senadores	59.38%
Aguascalientes	59.38%
Nuevo León	43.75%
Yucatán	40.63%
Baja California	0.00%
Colima	0.00%
Michoacán	0.00%
Querétaro	0.00%
Tamaulipas	0.00%
Durango	0.00%
Baja California Sur	0.00%
Tlaxcala	0.00%
Chiapas	N/E
Hidalgo	N/E
Oaxaca	N/E
Tabasco	N/E
Veracruz	N/E
Average	54.89%

N/E = Not rated by not having an existing law

17 legislatures are above 60% of the criteria evaluated (see Table 3.2). 10 are below those criteria. So worrying 8 congresses did not respond to the request, even taking a legal obligation.

Among the strengths highlighted that in general there is a proper justification for the answers. Among the weaknesses are: high rate of non-response to requests (29%), a high response rate of incomplete or unsatisfactory in roll call votes special and detailed budget.

Quality of the response in the executive branch

8 governments comply with more than 60% of the criteria evaluated (see Table 3.3).
10 governments do not comply with either half of the standards assessed.

Among the strengths is important to note that the times of law are generally well respected and the classification of information is substantiated in most cases. Among the weaknesses is important to note that in general, the information is supplied is incomplete. There is a high rate of non-response (25%); In a high percentage of the responses were also unsatisfactory.

Table 3.3 Assessment of response by the executive branch

Subject evaluated	Assessment
Distrito Federal	98.96%
Sinaloa	98.61%
Guanajuato	93.23%
Colima	92.97%
Yucatán	90.63%
Nuevo León	87.76%
Coahuila	84.64%
Campeche	84.38%
Executive Federal	82.81%
Baja California	80.00%
Quintana Roo	78.65%
Estado de México	75.00%
San Luis Potosí	74.48%
Guerrero	72.92%
Morelos	71.25%
Aguascalientes	70.83%
Sonora	70.83%
Puebla	64.58%
Jalisco	42.71%
Nayarit	42.19%
Chihuahua	41.67%
Tamaulipas	36.46%
Zacatecas	22.92%
Michoacán	0.00%
Querétaro	0.00%
Baja California Sur	0.00%
Durango	0.00%
Tlaxcala	0.00%
Chiapas	N/E
Hidalgo	N/E
Oaxaca	N/E
Tabasco	N/E
Veracruz	N/E
Average	63.79%

N/E = Not rated by not having an existing law

Eleventh chapter: General conclusions

1. This investigation is a response to the need to build a tool to report the true state of the right of access to information in Mexico. For five years, have developed a variety of methodologies that settings and try to build various measurements and with varying degrees of success. However, until the completion of the Metrics, had not been tested a method for measuring the practical reality of openness in government of Mexico.

2. The center of this methodological investigation ordered by the COMAIP, is the applicant information. In other words, what is sought to describe the real difficulties which are an ordinary citizen faces when looking for information from their governments or public institutions. Therefore Metrics gives much importance to the ease and simplicity with which the access takes place. Beyond the laws, but in perfect sync with the constitutional article six-Metrics noted the effective aperture (not formal) from governments and institutions.

3. To do this, the Metrics revised 33 laws of transparency in the country and always checked for validity practice, but as this was comparable to develop a methodology on a national scale, had to establish some general indicators (not always present in all Laws alike). Therefore, this research did not "suits tailored to the laws of each state or the federation, but tried to make a generalization possible comparison. In other words, the Metrics of Transparency, built indicators applicable standards, but always with the utmost simplicity of logic and simplicity, so that the requirement was minimal in all cases.

4. Thus, this research is not part of an "ideal model" of an imagined previously levy, the study verified the minimum requirement that access to information and transparency, force, as fundamental rights. We insist, always in line with the Constitution. This is the radical novelty of the exercise: it is simple to measure, measure the minimum, measuring it is very easy to manage by any public authority in Mexico.

5. Thus, the principles of the vertebral Metrics are required to build comparable parameters and on the other hand, the simplicity in the search for information. Therefore, our research did not use any indicator built sophisticated or complex formulas to measure, by contrast, was designed a methodology and addressed a type that can be understood by any citizen, precisely because the applicant was placed in the center of the measurement.

6. It is worth emphasizing that the Metrics of Transparency is another feature that makes it unique in relation to other exercises in the measurement of transparency and access in Mexico, and it is their intention comprehensive, national governments and all the powers in their three levels. No other exercise conducted so far, had referred to as broad a vocation. Metrics Transparency evaluated 264 pages of transparency at least four times, visited 33 executives, 33 legislatures, judiciaries 33, 31 municipalities and a delegation from the City; went directly to 168 government departments and reviewed 326 responses

to requests for information . As you can see, this was a very comprehensive exercise was "to reality" and which was developed over the past five months.

7. In this national tour, performed in its entirety by young CIDE, was found with the heterogeneity that access to information, is practiced in Mexico. The same right, even the same rules, the same provision, offered very different results just by crossing a state border or just changing an email address. This huge disparity is perhaps the greatest challenge of access to information for the following years.

8. There and where there is no specialized body to monitor and ensure the principles of openness and publicity, inevitably, the worst form of exercising the right of access to information and transparency. If the Mexicans want to turn this practice into an effective right, these institutions are absolutely necessary.

9. It is important to repeat what the Metrics sought, was the simplest and the most affordable. There were no extensive or complex questions, precisely because it wanted to test the law in the basics. Still, the results are not encouraging. All the national averages (of the information on the Internet pages; of the attention being given to the applicant, the documents that are granted to individuals) were in the middle of the table and only a few indicators exceed Assessment pass. In other words: the right of access to information in Mexico is only beginning to develop, is at an embryonic stage and almost unsatisfactory despite the issuance of the first laws, and since almost five years.

10. As mentioned in the preceding paragraphs, the level of response is not very high. This is the main cause for which many governments or authorities blamed low ratings. This practice (and generally close to 30 per cent) does not have any justification under any circumstances. The non-response of the applications is the most disturbing finding of our study and proof of the indifference with which many authorities assume the right of access to information.

11. Meter found in many combinations reality: good laws and bad practices; Internet pages complete with very evasive systematic guide to the citizen; bad laws and political will to inform people, excellent attention to the applicant and a real negative for deliver the documents. That's why all the links to the right (Web pages, care and delivery of information) are necessary for the exercise of rights as conceived by the Constitution and the 33 laws, none of these dimensions can be neglected or minimized in order to relaunch the principle of Opening government.

12. The recent amendment to the sixth article of the Constitution, democratic aspiration is a powerful, but the gap between aspiration and reality that access is still very big. The country requires a second boost, decisive and national levels, so that this fundamental right becomes effective practice of Mexicans. The metrics of transparency proves that we are in the middle of the road.

Twelfth chapter: Fact Sheets and recommendations by State



ENTITY: United Mexican States
 LEGISLATION: Federal Law of Transparency and Access to Public Government Information
 BODY GUARANTOR: Federal Institute of Access to Information
 EFFECT OF LAW: June 12, 2002
 OBLIGATED(DIRECT): Executive

CONGLOMERATE ASSESSMENT

	Electronic portals	Customer Service	Quality of Response	Weighted average
Executive	65.71%	93.75%	82.81%	78.16%
Legislative (Chamber of Deputies)	86.21%	81.25%	81.25%	83.23%
Legislative (Senate)	82.76%	93.75%	59.38%	75.60%

1. ELECTRONIC PORTALS

RATING INTERNET PORTALS

LEVEL OF GOVERNMENT	UNIT APPRAISES	QUALIFICATION
Executive	Office of the President	80%
	Interior Ministry	75%
	Ministry of Finance and Public Credit	41%
	Ministry of Public Security	68%
	Ministry of Social Development	64%
	Average Executive	66%
Legislative	Chamber of Deputies	86%
	Senate	83%

RATING CUSTOMER SERVICE

LEVEL OF GOVERNMENT	UNIT APPRAISES	QUALIFICATION
Executive	Office of the President	100%
	Ministry of Finance and Public Credit	100%
	Ministry of Public Security	87%
	Ministry of Social Development	87%
	Average Executive	94%
Legislative	Chamber of Deputies	81%
	Senate	94%

2. ASSESSMENT OF RESPONSES

LIST OF APPLICATIONS AND ANSWERS

LEVEL OF GOVERNMENT	UNIT APPRAISES	QUALIFICATION
Executive	Office of the President	2/2
	Ministry of Social Development	3/3
	Ministry of Finance and Public Credit	3/3
	Ministry of Public Security	1/2
	Total Executive	9/10
Legislative	Chamber of Deputies	5/5
	Senate	3/4
	Total	17/19

LEVEL OF GOVERNMENT	UNIT APPRAISES	QUALIFICATION
Executive	Office of the President	100%
	Ministry of Finance and Public Credit	96%
	Ministry of Public Security	43%
	Ministry of Social Development	92%
	Average of Executive	83%
Legislative	Chamber of Deputies	81%
	Senate	59%



ENTITY State of Aguascalientes
LEGISLATION: Law of Transparency and Public Information of the State of Aguascalientes
BODY GUARANTOR: Transparency Institute of the State of Aguascalientes
PUBLICATION OF THE LAW January 15, 2003
 (Last reform on August 1, 2006)
EFFECT OF LAW: January 15, 2003
 (Last reform on August 1, 2006)
OBLIGATED(DIRECT) Three branches of government, autonomous bodies and municipalities, individuals and corporations.

CONGLOMERATE ASSESSMENT

	Electronic portals	Customer Service	Quality of Response	Weighted average
Executive	73.93%	53.13%	70.83%	68.53%
Legislative	55.17%	87.50%	59.38%	63.32%
Municipality	75.00%	87.50%	76.25%	78.00%

1. ELECTRONIC PORTALS

RATING INTERNET PORTALS

LEVEL OF GOVERNMENT	UNIT APPRAISES	QUALIFICATION
Executive	Governor's Office	77%
	General Secretariat of Government	91%
	Secretariat of Finance	70%
	Secretariat of Social Development	84%
	Secretariat of Public Security	48%
	Average of Executive	74%
Legislative	Congress of the State of Aguascalientes	55%
Judiciary	Judiciary of the State of Aguascalientes	52%
Municipality	Municipality of Aguascalientes	75%

2. CUSTOMER SERVICE

RATING CUSTOMER SERVICE

LEVEL OF GOVERNMENT	UNIT APPRAISES	TOTAL
Executive	Governor's Office	88%
	Secretariat of Finance	88%
	Secretariat of Social Development	19%
	Secretariat of Public Security	19%
	Average of Executive	53%
Legislative	Congress of the State of Aguascalientes	88%
Municipality	Municipality of Aguascalientes	88%

3. ASSESSMENT OF RESPONSES

LIST OF APPLICATIONS AND ANSWERS

LEVEL OF GOVERNMENT	UNIT APPRAISES	REQUESTS ANSWERED
Executive	Governor's Office	1/2
	Secretariat of Finance	2/3
	Secretariat of Social Development	2/3
	Secretariat of Public Security	1/1
	Average of Executive	6/9
Legislative	Congress of the State of Aguascalientes	5/5
Municipality	Municipality of Aguascalientes	3/4
Total		14/18

ASSESSMENT OF QUALITY OF ANSWERS

LEVEL OF GOVERNMENT	UNIT APPRAISES	TOTAL
Executive	Governor's Office	50%
	Secretariat of Finance	67%
	Secretariat of Social Development	67%
	Secretariat of Public Security	100%
	Average of Executive	71%
Legislative	Congress of the State of Aguascalientes	59%
Municipality	Municipality of Aguascalientes	76%



ENTITY	State of Baja California
LEGISLATION:	Law on Access to Public Information for the State of Baja California
BODY GUARANTOR:	Watch council of Transparency and Access to Public Information of Baja California
PUBLICATION OF THE LAW	August 13, 2005
EFFECT OF LAW:	February 13, 2006
OBLIGATED(DIRECT)	Three branches of government, autonomous bodies and municipalities, individuals and corporations.

CONGLOMERATE ASSESSMENT

	Electronic portals	Customer Service	Quality of Response	Weighted average
Executive	37.50%	87.50%	80.00%	64.50%
Legislative	68.97%	75.00%	0.00%	42.59%
Municipality	56.67%	93.75%	55.00%	63.42%

1. ELECTRONIC PORTALS

RATING INTERNET PORTALS

LEVEL OF GOVERNMENT	UNIT APPRAISES	TOTAL
Executive	Private Secretary to the Governor / Citizen portal of Baja California	71%
	General Secretariat of Government	0%
	Secretariat of Planning and Finance	59%
	Secretariat of Social Development	45%
	Secretariat of Public Security	29%
	Average of Executive	49%
Legislative	Congress of the State of Baja California	69%
Judiciary	Judiciary of State of Baja California	0%
Municipality	Municipality of Mexicali	57%

2. CUSTOMER SERVICE

RATING CUSTOMER SERVICE

LEVEL OF GOVERNMENT	UNIT APPRAISES	TOTAL
Executive	Unity concentrations Executive	88%
Legislative	Congress of the State of Baja California	75%
Municipality	Municipality of Mexicali	94%

3. ASSESSMENT OF RESPONSES

LIST OF APPLICATIONS AND ANSWERS

LEVEL OF GOVERNMENT	UNIT APPRAISES	REQUESTS ANSWERED
Executive	Unity concentrations Executive	8/10
Legislative	Congress of the State of Baja California	0/4
Municipality	Municipality of Mexicali	4/5
	Total	12/19

ASSESSMENT OF QUALITY OF ANSWERS

LEVEL OF GOVERNMENT	UNIT APPRAISES	TOTAL
Executive	Unity concentrations Executive	80%
Legislative	Congress of the State of Baja California	0%
Municipality	Municipality of Mexicali	55%



ENTITY State of Baja California Sur
LEGISLATION: Law of Transparency and Access to Public Information for the State of Baja California Sur
BODY GUARANTOR: Commission on Transparency, Access to Public Information and Citizens
PUBLICATION OF THE LAW: January 1, 2006
EFFECT OF LAW: January 1, 2006
OBLIGATED(DIRECT) Three branches of government, autonomous bodies and municipalities, political parties; individuals and corporations.

1. ELECTRONIC PORTALS

RATING INTERNET PORTALS

LEVEL OF GOVERNMENT	UNIT APPRAISES	TOTAL
Executive	Governor's Office	59%
	General Secretariat of Government	45%
	Secretariat of Finance	48%
	Secretariat of Economic Development and Promotion	39%
	Secretariat of Public Security	59%
	Average of Executive	49%
Legislative	Congress of State of Baja California Sur	12%
Judiciary	High Court of Justice in Baja California Sur	33%
Municipality	Municipality of La Paz	65%

2. CUSTOMER SERVICE

RATING CUSTOMER SERVICE

LEVEL OF GOVERNMENT	UNIT APPRAISES	TOTAL
Executive	Governor's Office	0%
	Secretariat of Finance	0%
	Secretariat of Economic Development and Promotion	0%
	Secretariat of Public Security	0%
	Average of Executive	0%
Legislative	Congress of State of Baja California Sur	0%
Municipality	Municipality of La Paz	0%



ENTITY State of Campeche
LEGISLATION: Law of Transparency and Access to Information of the State of Campeche
BODY GUARANTOR: Commission on Transparency and Access to Public Information of the State of Campeche
PUBLICATION OF THE LAW: July 22, 2005
EFFECT OF LAW: February 12, 2007
OBLIGATED(DIRECT) Three branches of government, autonomous bodies and municipalities, political parties; individuals and corporations

CONGLOMERATE ASSESSMENT

	Electronic portals	Customer Service	Quality of Response	Weighted average
Executive	55.71%	64.06%	84.38%	68.85%
Legislative	53.45%	75.00%	84.38%	70.13%
Municipality	65.00%	81.25%	32.50%	55.25%

1. ELECTRONIC PORTALS

RATING INTERNET PORTALS

LEVEL OF GOVERNMENT	UNIT APPRAISES	TOTAL
Executive	Governor's Office	68%
	Secretariat of Government	54%
	Secretariat of Finance and Administration	66%
	Secretariat of Social Development	54%
	Secretariat of Public Security	38%
	Average of Executive	56%
Legislative	Congress of State of Campeche	53%
Judiciary	High Court of Justice in Campeche	70%
Municipality	Municipality of Campeche	65%

2. CUSTOMER SERVICE

RATING CUSTOMER SERVICE

LEVEL OF GOVERNMENT	UNIT APPRAISES	TOTAL
Executive	Governor's Office	94%
	Secretariat of Finance and Administration	100%
	Secretariat of Social Development	31%
	Secretariat of Public Security	31%
	Average of Executive	64%
Legislative	Congress of State of Campeche	75%
Municipality	Municipality of Campeche	81%

3. ASSESSMENT OF RESPONSES

LIST OF APPLICATIONS AND ANSWERS

LEVEL OF GOVERNMENT	UNIT APPRAISES	REQUESTS ANSWERED
Executive	Governor's Office	1/1
	Secretariat of Finance and Administration	1/3
	Secretariat of Social Development	2/3
	Secretariat of Public Security	2/2
	Total of Executive	6/9
Legislative	Congress of State of Campeche	4/4
Municipality	Municipality of Campeche	2/5
	Total	12/18

ASSESSMENT OF QUALITY OF ANSWERS

LEVEL OF GOVERNMENT	UNIT APPRAISES	TOTAL
Executive	Governor's Office	100%
	Secretariat of Finance and Administration	71%
	Secretariat of Social Development	67%
	Secretariat of Public Security	100%
	Average of Executive	84%
Legislative	Congress of State of Campeche	84%
Municipality	Municipality of Campeche	33%



ENTITY: State of Chiapas
 LEGISLATION: Law that ensures transparency and the Right to Information for the State of Chiapas
 BODY GUARANTOR: Institute for Access to Public Information of the State Civil Service
 PUBLICATION OF LAW : October 13, 2006
 EFFECT OF LAW: September 1, 2007
 OBLIGATED(DIRECT): Three branches of government, autonomous bodies and municipalities

1. ELECTRONIC PORTALS

RATING INTERNET PORTALS

LEVEL OF GOVERNMENT	UNIT APPRAISES	TOTAL
Executive	Governor's Office	68%
	Secretariat of Government	36%
	Secretariat of Finance	63%
	Secretariat of Social Development	50%
	Secretariat of Public Security and Citizen Protection	63%
	Average of Executive	56%
Legislative	Congress of the State of Chiapas	48%
Judiciary	Senior State Judiciary	27%
Municipality	Municipality of Tuxtla Gutierrez	67%

2. CUSTOMER SERVICE AND ASSESSMENT OF RESPONSES

Comments: Not assessed under your Legislation is not yet in office.



ENTITY State of Chihuahua
LEGISLATION: Law of Transparency and Access to Public Information of the State of Chihuahua
BODY GUARANTOR: Chihuahua Institute for Transparency and Access to Information
PUBLICATION OF LAW: October 16, 2005
EFFECT OF THE LAW: January 1, 2007
OBLIGATED(DIRECT) Three branches of government, autonomous bodies and municipalities; political parties and individuals and corporations.

CONGLOMERATE ASSESSMENT

	Electronic portals	Customer Service	Quality of Response	Weighted average
Executive	49.29%	62.33%	41.67%	48.85%
Legislative	68.97%	93.75%	62.50%	71.34%
Municipality	85.00%	62.50%	52.50%	67.50%

1. ELECTRONIC PORTALS

Rating of Electronic Portals

LEVEL OF GOVERNMENT	UNIT APPRAISES	TOTAL
Executive	Office of C. Governor	54%
	General Secretariat of Government	32%
	Secretariat of Finance	61%
	Secretariat of Social Development	41%
	State Secretariat for Public Safety	59%
	Average of Executive	49%
Legislative	Congress of the State of Chihuahua	69%
Judiciary	Supreme Court of Chihuahua	67%
Municipality	Municipality of Chihuahua	85%

2. CUSTOMER SERVICE

RATING CUSTOMER SERVICE

LEVEL OF GOVERNMENT	UNIT APPRAISES	TOTAL
Executive	Office of C. Governor	56%
	Secretariat of Finance	68%
	Secretariat of Social Development	63%
	State Secretariat for Public Safety	63%
	Average of Executive	62%
Legislative	Congress of the State of Chihuahua	94%

Municipality	Municipality of Chihuahua	63%
--------------	---------------------------	-----

3. ASSESSMENT OF RESPONSES

LIST OF APPLICATIONS AND ANSWERS

LEVEL OF GOVERNMENT	UNIT APPRAISES	REQUESTS ANSWERED
Executive	Office of C. Governor	½
	Secretariat of Finance	1/3
	Secretariat of Social Development	2/3
	State Secretariat for Public Safety	½
	Total of Executive	5/10
Legislative	Congress of the State of Chihuahua	4/3
Municipality	Municipality of Chihuahua	4/5
	Total	12/19

ASSESSMENT OF QUALITY ANSWERS

LEVEL OF GOVERNMENT	UNITS APPRAISES	TOTAL
Executive	Office of C. Governor	50%
	Secretariat of Finance	33%
	Secretariat of Social Development	33%
	State Secretariat for Public Safety	50%
	Average of Executive	42%
Legislative	Congress of the State of Chihuahua	63%
Municipality	Municipality of Chihuahua	53%



ENTITY State of Coahuila
LEGISLATION: Law of Access to the Public Information of the State of Coahuila de Zaragoza
BODY GUARANTOR: Coahuilense Institute of Access to Public Information
PUBLICATION OF THE LAW: March 12, 2004
EFFECT OF LAW: December 1, 2004
OBLIGATED(DIRECT) Three branches of government, autonomous bodies and municipalities; political parties and individuals and corporations.

CONGLOMERATE ASSESSMENT

	Electronic portals	Customer Service	Quality of Response	Weighted average
Executive	71.43%	90.63%	84.64%	80.55%
Legislative	60.34%	93.75%	96.88%	81.64%
Municipality	55.00%	87.50%	0.00%	39.50%

1. ELECTRONIC PORTALS

Rating of Electronic portals

LEVEL OF GOVERNMENT	UNIT APPRAISES	TOTAL
Executive	Office of C. Governor	77%
	Secretariat of Government	73%
	Secretariat of Finance	66%
	Secretariat of Social Development	82%
	Secretariat of Public Security and Citizen Protection	59%
Legislative	Average Executive	71%
Judiciary	Congress of Estate Of Coahuila	60%
Municipality	High Court of Justice of the State of Coahuila	56%
	Municipality of Saltillo	55%
	Municipality of Torreon	72%

2. CUSTOMER SERVICE

RATING CUSTOMER SERVICE

LEVEL OF GOVERNMENT	UNITS APPRAISES	TOTAL
Executive	Office of C. Governor	81%
	Secretariat of Finance	94%
	Secretariat of Social Development	94%
	Secretariat of Public Security and Citizen Protection	94%

		Average Executive	91%
Legislative	Congress of State of Coahuila		94%
Municipality	Municipality of Saltillo		88%

2. ASSESSMENT OF RESPONSES

LIST OF APPLICATIONS AND ANSWERS

LEVEL OF GOVERNMENT	UNIT APPRAISES	REQUESTS ANSWERED
Executive	Office of C. Governor	1/2
	Secretariat of Finance	3/3
	Secretariat of Social Development	3/3
	Secretariat of Public Security and Citizen Protection	2/2
	Total of Executive	9/10
Legislative	Congress of State of Coahuila	4/4
Municipality	Municipality of Saltillo	0/5
	Total	13/19

ASSESSMENT OF QUALITY ANSWERS

LEVEL OF GOVERNMENT	UNIT APPRAISES	TOTAL
Executive	Office of C. Governor	50%
	Secretariat of Finance	98%
	Secretariat of Social Development	100%
	Secretariat of Public Security and Citizen Protection	90%
	Average of Executive	85%
Legislative	Congress of State of Coahuila	97%
Municipality	Municipality of Saltillo	0%



ENTITY Estate of Colima
LEGISLATION: Law of Transparency and Access of Public Information of the State of Colima
BODY GUARANTOR: State Commission for Access to Public Information of Colima
PUBLICATION OF THE LAW: March 2, 2003
EFFECT OF LAW: March 2, 2004
OBLIGATED(DIRECT) Three branches of government, autonomous bodies and municipalities; political parties and individuals and corporations.

CONGLOMERATE ASSESSMENT

	Electronic portals	Customer Service	Quality of Response	Weighted average
Executive	36.43%	75.00%	92.97%	66.76%
Legislative	46.55%	56.25%	0.00%	29.87%
Municipality	71.67%	31.25%	0.00%	34.92%

1. ELECTRONIC PORTALS

Rating of Electronic Portals

LEVEL OF GOVERNMENT	UNIT APPRAISES	TOTAL
Executive	Governor's Office	45%
	General Secretariat of Government	32%
	Secretariat of Finance	51%
	Secretariat of Social Development	53%
	General Secretariat of Government, Directorate General of Government ¹¹	0%
	Average of Executive	36%
Legislative	Congress of the State of Colima	47%
Judiciary	Supreme Court of Justice	20%
Municipality	Municipality of Colima	72%

2. CUSTOMER SERVICE

RATING OF CUSTOMER SERVICE

LEVEL OF GOVERNMENT	UNIT APPRAISES	TOTAL
Executive	Office Hub	55%
Legislative	Congress of State of Colima	56%
Municipality	Municipality of Colima	31%

¹¹ In the absence of a Secretariat in charge of specific public safety applications pertaining to that topic were presented and answered by the Directorate General of Government, under the aegis of the General Secretariat of Government.

3. ASSESSMENT OF RESPONSES

LIST OF APPLICATIONS AND ANSWERS

LEVEL OF GOVERNMENT	UNIT APPRAISES	Requests Answered
Executive	Office Hub	8/8
Legislative	Congress of State of Colima	0/4
Municipality	Municipality of Colima	0/5
	Total	8/17

ASSESSMENT OF QUALITY ANSWERS

LEVEL OF GOVERNMENT	UNIT APPRAISES	TOTAL
Executive	Office Hub	93%
Legislative	Congress of State of Colima	0%
Municipality	Municipality of Colima	0%



DISTRITO FEDERAL

ENTITY	Federal District
LEGISLATION:	Law of Transparency and Access to Public Information of the Federal District
BODY GUARANTOR:	Federal District Access of the Public Information Institute
PUBLICATION LAW :	May 9, 2003
EFFECT LAW:	June 1, 2006
OBLIGATED(DIRECT)	Three branches of government, autonomous bodies and municipalities; individuals and corporations.

CONGLOMERATE ASSESSMENT

	Electronic portals	Customer Service	Quality of Response	Weighted average
Executive	81.07%	65.63%	98.96%	85.14%
Legislative	72.41%	75.00%	96.88%	82.72%
Delegation	45.00%	78.57%	80.00%	65.71%

1. ELECTRONIC PORTALS

Rating of Electronic Portals

LEVEL OF GOVERNMENT	UNIT APPRAISES	TOTAL
Executive	Office of the Head of Government	86%
	Secretariat of Government	88%
	Secretariat of Finance	67%
	Secretariat of Social Development	82%
	Secretariat of Public Security	84%
	Average of Executive	81%
Legislative	Federal District Legislative Assembly	72%
Judiciary	High Court of Justice of the Federal District	65%
Municipality	Cuauhtemoc Delegation	45%
	Iztapalapa Delegation	72%

2. CUSTOMER SERVICE

RATING OF COSTUMER SERVICE

LEVEL OF GOVERNMENT	UNIT APPRAISES	TOTAL
Executive	Office of the Head of Government	100%
	Secretariat of Finance	81%
	Secretariat of Social Development	0%
	Secretariat of Public Security	81%
	Average of Executive	66%
Legislative	Federal District Legislative Assembly	75%
Municipality	Cuauhtemoc Delegation	79%

3. ASSESSMENT OF ANSWERS

LIST OF APPLICATIONS AND ANSWERS

LEVEL OF GOVERNMENT	UNIT APPRAISES	Requests Answered
Executive	Office of the Head of Government	1/1
	Secretariat of Finance	3/3
	Secretariat of Social Development	3/3
	Secretariat of Public Security	2/2
	Total of Executive	9/9
Legislative	Federal District Legislative Assembly	4/4
Municipality	Cuauhtemoc Delegation	4/5
	Total	17/18

ASSESSMENT OF QUALITY ANSWERS

LEVEL OF GOVERNMENT	UNIT APPRAISES	TOTAL
Executive	Office of the Head of Government	100%
	Secretariat of Finance	100%
	Secretariat of Social Development	96%
	Secretariat of Public Security	100%
	Average of Executive	99%
Legislative	Federal District Legislative Assembly	99%
Municipality	Cuauhtemoc Delegation	80%



ENTITY State of Durango
LEGISLATION: Law on Access to Public Information of the State of Durango
BODY GUARANTOR: State Commission on Access to Public Information of Durango
PUBLICATION OF THE LAW: February 28, 2003
EFFECT OF LAW: Government: August 28, 2004; Municipalities: February 28, 2005
OBLIGATED(DIRECT) Three branches of government, autonomous bodies and municipalities; individuals and corporations.

CONGLOMERATE ASSESSMENT

	Electronic portals	Customer Service	Quality of Response	Weighted average
Executive	53.21%	18.75%	0.00%	25.04%
Legislative	58.62%	56.25%	0.00%	34.70%
Municipality	78.33%	87.50%	0.00%	48.83%

1. ELECTRONIC PORTALS

Rating of Electronic Portals

LEVEL OF GOVERNMENT	UNITS APPRAISES	TOTAL
Executive	Governor's Office	70%
	General Secretariat of Government	67%
	Secretariat of Finance and Administration	45%
	Secretariat of Social Development	27%
	Secretariat of Public Security	59%
	Average of Executive	53%
Legislative	Congress of State of Durango	59%
Judiciary	High Curt of Justice of State of Durango	56%
Municipality	Municipality of Durango	78%

2. CUSTOMER SERVICE

RATING OF COSTUMER SERVICE

LEVEL OF GOVERNMENT	UNITS APPRAISES	TOTAL
Executive	Governor's Office	0%
	Secretariat of Finance and Administration	0%
	Secretariat of Social Development	75%
	Secretariat of Public Security	0%
	Average of Executive	19%
Legislative	Congress of State of Durango	56%

Municipality	Municipality of Durango	88%
--------------	-------------------------	-----

3. ASSESSMENT OF ANSWERS

LIST OF APPLICATIONS AND ANSWERS

LEVEL OF GOVERNMENT	UNITS APPRAISES	Requests Answered
Executive	Governor's Office	0/0
	Secretariat of Finance and Administration	0/0
	Secretariat of Social Development	0/3
	Secretariat of Public Security	0/0
	Total of Executive	0/3
Legislative	Congress of State of Durango	0/4
Municipality	Municipality of Durango	0/5
	Total	0/12

ASSESSMENT OF QUALITY ANSWERS

LEVEL OF GOVERNMENT	UNITS APPRAISES	TOTAL
Executive	Governor's Office	-
	Secretariat of Finance and Administration	-
	Secretariat of Social Development	0%
	Secretariat of Public Security	-
	Average of Executive	0%
Legislative	Congress of State of Durango	0%
Municipality	Municipality of Durango	0%



ENTITY	State of Mexico
LEGISLATION:	Law of Transparency and Access to Public Information of the State of Mexico
BODY GUARANTOR:	Institute of Transparency and Access to Public Information of the State of Mexico
PUBLICATION OF LAW:	May 1, 2004
EJERCICIO:	July 25, 2005
OBLIGATED(DIRECT)	Three branches of government, autonomous bodies and municipalities

CONGLOMERATE ASSESSMENT

	Electronic portals	Customer Service	Quality of Response	Weighted average
Executive	55.36%	82.60%	75.00%	68.66%
Legislative	58.62%	75.00%	87.50%	73.45%
Municipality	60.00%	68.75%	70.00%	65.75%

1. ELECTRONIC PORTALS

Rating of ELECTRONIC PORTALS

LEVEL OF GOVERNMENT	UNITS APPRAISES	TOTAL
Executive	Governor's Office	77%
	General Secretariat of Government	57%
	Secretariat of Finances	82%
	Secretariat of Social Development	61%
	Department of Public Safety 12	0%
	Average of Executive	55%
Legislative	Congress of State of Mexico	59%
Judiciary	Judiciary of State of Mexico	55%
Municipality	Municipality of Toluca	60%

2. CUSTOMER SERVICE

RATING OF CUSTOMER SERVICE

LEVEL OF GOVERNMENT	UNITS APPRAISES	TOTAL
Executive	Governor's Office	87%
	Secretariat of Finances	63%
	Secretariat of Social Development	88%
	Department of Public Safety	94%
	Average of Executive	83%
Legislative	Congress of State of Mexico	75%

¹² Department dependent on the General Secretariat of Government

Municipality	Municipality of Toluca	69%
--------------	------------------------	-----

3. ASSESSMENT OF ANSWERS

LIST OF APPLICATIONS AND ANSWERS

LEVEL OF GOVERNMENT	UNITS APPRAISES	Requests Answered
Executive	Governor's Office	2/2
	Secretariat of Finances	3/3
	Secretariat of Social Development	2/3
	Department of Public Safety	2/2
	Average of Executive	9/10
Legislative	Congress of State of Mexico	4/4
Municipality	Municipality of Toluca	4/5
	Total	7/19

ASSESSMENT OF QUALITY ANSWERS

LEVEL OF GOVERNMENT	UNITS APPRAISES	TOTAL
Executive	Governor's Office	75%
	Secretariat of Finances	75%
	Secretariat of Social Development	50%
	Department of Public Safety	100%
	Average of Executive	75%
Legislative	Congress of State of Mexico	88%
Municipality	Municipality de Toluca	70%



ENTITY State of Guanajuato
LEGISLATION: Law on Access to Public Information for the state and the municipalities of Guanajuato
BODY GUARANTOR: Institute of Access to Public Information of the State of Guanajuato
PUBLICATION OF LAW: July 30, 2003
EFFECT OF LAW: August 30, 2004
OBLIGATED(DIRECT) Three branches of government, autonomous bodies and municipalities

CONGLOMERATE ASSESSMENT

	Electronic portals	Customer Service	Quality of Response	Weighted average
Executive	67.50%	78.13%	93.23%	79.92%
Legislative	87.93%	93.75%	93.75%	91.42%
Municipality	98.33%	68.75%	67.50%	80.08%

1. ELECTRONIC PORTALS

Rating of ELECTRONIC PORTALS

LEVEL OF GOVERNMENT	UNITS APPRAISES	TOTAL
Executive	Governor's Office	86%
	Secretariat of Government	75%
	Secretariat of Finances and Administration	57%
	Secretariat of Human and Social Development	57%
	Secretariat of Public Security	63%
	Average of Executive	68%
Legislative	Congress of State of Guanajuato	88%
Judiciary	Judiciary of State of Guanajuato	26%
Municipality	Municipality of Guanajuato	98%

2. CUSTOMER SERVICE

RATING OF CUSTOMER SERVICE

LEVEL OF GOVERNMENT	UNITS APPRAISES	TOTAL
Executive	Governor's Office	81%
	Secretariat of Finances and Administration	75%
	Secretariat of Human and Social Development	81%
	Secretariat of Public Security	75%
	Average of Executive	78%
Legislative	Congress of State of Guanajuato	94%

Municipality	Municipality of Guanajuato	69%
--------------	----------------------------	-----

3. ASSESSMENT OF ANSWERS

LIST OF APPLICATIONS AND ANSWERS

LEVEL OF GOVERNMENT	Units APPRAISES	Requests Answered
Executive	Governor's Office	81%
	Secretariat of Finances y Administration	92%
	Secretariat of Social and Human Development	100%
	Secretariat of Public Security	100%
	Average of Executive	93%
Legislative	Congress of State of Guanajuato	94%
Municipality	Municipality of Guanajuato	68%

ASSESSMENT OF QUALITY ANSWERS

LEVEL OF GOVERNMENT	UNITS APPRAISES	TOTAL
Executive	Governor's Office	2/2
	Secretariat of Finances and Administration	3/3
	Secretariat of Social and Human Development	3/3
	Secretariat of Public Security	2/2
	Total of Executive	10/10
Legislative	Congress of State of Guanajuato	4/4
Municipality	Municipality of Guanajuato	4/5
	Total	18/19



ENTITY	State of Guerrero
LEGISLATION:	Law on Access to Public Information of the State of Guerrero
BODY GUARANTOR:	Committee for Access to Public Information of the State of Guerrero
PUBLICATION OF LAW:	February 14, 2006
EFFECT OF LAW:	June 14, 2006
OBLIGATED(DIRECT)	Three branches of government, autonomous bodies and municipalities.

CONGLOMERATE ASSESSMENT

	Electronic portals	Customer Service	Quality of Response	Weighted average
Executive	63.57%	73.44%	72.92%	69.28%
Legislative	50.00%	56.25%	62.50%	56.25%
Municipality	50.00%	56.25%	85.00%	65.25%

1. ELECTRONIC PORTALS

Rating of Electronic Portals

LEVEL OF GOVERNMENT	UNITS APPRAISES	TOTAL
Executive	Governor's Office	70%
	General Secretariat of Government	61%
	Secretariat of Finances and Administration	52%
	Secretariat of Social Development	61%
	Secretariat of Public Security and Civil Protection	75%
	Average of Executive	64%
Legislative	Congress of State of Guerrero	50%
Judiciary	High Court of Justice of the State of Guerrero	45%
Municipality	Municipality of Chilpancingo	50%

2. CUSTOMER SERVICE

RATING OF CUSTOMER SERVICE

LEVEL OF GOVERNMENT	UNITS APPRAISES	TOTAL
Executive	Governor's Office	81%
	Secretariat of Finances and Administration	81%
	Secretariat of Social Development	50%
	Secretariat of Public Security and Civil Protection	81%
	Average of Executive	73%
Legislative	Congress of State of Guerrero	56%
Municipality	Municipality of Chilpancingo	56%

3. ASSESSMENT OF ANSWER

LIST OF APPLICATIONS AND ANSWERS

LEVEL OF GOVERNMENT	Units APPRAISES	Requests Answered
Executive	Governor's Office	2/2
	Secretariat of Finances and Administration	3/3
	Secretariat of Social Development	0/3
	Secretariat of Public Security and Civil Protection	2/2
	Total of Executive	7/10
Legislative	Congress of State of Guerrero	4/4
Municipality	Municipality of Chilpancingo	5/5
	Total	16/19

ASSESSMENT OF QUALITY ANSWERS

LEVEL OF GOVERNMENT	UNITS APPRAISES	TOTAL
Executive	Governor's Office	100%
	Secretariat of Finances and Administration	92%
	Secretariat of Social Development	0%
	Secretariat of Public Security and Civil Protection	1%
	Average of Executive	73%
Legislative	Congress of State of Guerrero	63%
Municipality	Municipality of Chilpancingo	85%



ENTITY: State of Hidalgo
 LEGISLATION: Law of Transparency and Access to Public Government Information for the State of Hidalgo
 BODY GUARANTOR: There is no
 PUBLICATION OF LAW: December 30, 2006
 EFFECT OF LAW: June 15, 2008
 OBLIGATED(DIRECT): Three branches of government, autonomous bodies and municipalities.

1. ELECTRONIC PORTALS

Rating of ELECTRONIC PORTALS

LEVEL OF GOVERNMENT	UNITS APPRAISES	TOTAL
Executive	Governor's Office	63%
	Secretariat of Government	63%
	Secretariat of Finances	48%
	Secretariat of Social Development	64%
	Secretariat of Public Security	46%
	Average of Executive	57%
Legislative	H. Congress of Free and Sovereign State of Hidalgo	26%
Judiciary	Judiciary of State of Hidalgo	39%
Municipality	Municipality of Pachuca	70%

2. CUSTOMER SERVICE AND ASSESSMENT OF ANSWER

Comments: Not assessed under your Legislation is not yet in office.



ENTITY	State of Jalisco
LEGISLATION:	Law of Transparency and Public Information of the State of Jalisco
BODY GUARANTOR:	Institute of Transparency and Access to Public Information of Jalisco
PUBLICATION OF LAW	May 21, 2002
EFFECT OF LAW:	September 22, 2002
OBLIGATED(DIRECT)	Three branches of government, autonomous bodies and municipalities, political parties, individuals and corporations.

CONGLOMERATE ASSESSMENT

	Electronic portals	Customer Service	Quality of Response	Weighted average
Executive	85.36%	85.94%	42.71%	68.41%
Legislative	74.14%	87.50%	68.75%	74.66%
Municipality	96.67%	81.25%	90.00%	90.92%

1. ELECTRONIC PORTALS

Rating of Electronic Portals

LEVEL OF GOVERNMENT	UNITS APPRAISES	TOTAL
Executive	Governor's Office	93%
	General Secretariat of Government	96%
	Secretariat of Finances	84%
	Secretariat of Public Security	75%
	Secretariat of Human Development	79%
	Average of Executive	85%
Legislative	Congress of State of Jalisco	74%
Judiciary	Supreme Court of Jalisco	62%
Municipality	Municipality of Guadalajara	97%

2. CUSTOMER SERVICE

RATING OF CUSTOMER SERVICE

LEVEL OF GOVERNMENT	UNITS APPRAISES	TOTAL
Executive	Governor's Office	81%
	Secretariat of Finances	94%
	Secretariat of Human Development	81%
	Secretariat of Public Security	88%
	Average of Executive	86%
Legislative	Congress of State of Jalisco	88%

Municipality	Municipality de Guadalajara	81%
--------------	-----------------------------	-----

3. ASSESSMENT OF ANSWER

LIST OF APPLICATIONS AND ANSWERS

LEVEL OF GOVERNMENT	Units Appraises	Requests Answered
Executive	Governor's Office	½
	Secretariat of Finances	1/3
	Secretariat of Human Development	2/3
	Secretariat of Public Security	½
	Total of Executive	5/10
Legislative	Congress of State of Jalisco	4/4
Municipality	Municipality de Guadalajara	5/5
	Total	14/19

ASSESSMENT OF QUALITY ANSWERS

LEVEL OF GOVERNMENT	UNITS APPRAISES	TOTAL
Executive	Governor's Office	50%
	Secretariat of Finances	13%
	Secretariat of Human Development	58%
	Secretariat of Public Security	50%
	Average of Executive	43%
Legislative	Congress of State of Jalisco	69%
Municipality	Municipality de Guadalajara	90%



ENTITY	State of Michoacán
LEGISLATION:	Law on Access to Public Information of the State of Michoacán
BODY GUARANTOR:	Committee for Access to Public Information of the State of Michoacán
PUBLICATION OF LAW:	February 20, 2003
EFFECT OF LAW:	February 20, 2004
OBLIGATED(DIRECT)	Three branches of government, autonomous bodies and municipalities, political parties, individuals and corporations

CONGLOMERATE ASSESSMENT

	Electronic portals	Customer Service	Quality of Response	Weighted average
Executive	51.07%	17.19%	0.00%	23.87%
Legislative	55.17%	68.75%	0.00%	35.82%
Municipality	53.33%	75.00%	37.50%	51.33%

1. ELECTRONIC PORTALS

Rating of Electronic Portals

LEVEL OF GOVERNMENT	UNITS APPRAISES	TOTAL
Executive	Governor's Office	63%
	Secretariat of Government	36%
	Treasury	46%
	Secretariat of Social Development	44%
	Secretariat of Public Security	66%
	Average of Executive	51%
Legislative	Congress of State of Michoacán de Ocampo	55%
Judiciary	Supreme Court of Justice of the State of Michoacan	56%
Municipality	Municipality of Morelia	53%

2. CUSTOMER SERVICE

RATING OF CUSTOMER SERVICE

LEVEL OF GOVERNMENT	UNITS APPRAISES	TOTAL
Executive	Governor's Office	69%
	Treasury	0%
	Secretariat of Social Development	0%
	Secretariat of Public Security	0%
	Average of Executive	17%
Legislative	Congress of State of Michoacán de Ocampo	69%
Municipality	Municipality of Morelia	75%

3. ASSESSMENT OF ANSWER

LIST OF APPLICATIONS AND ANSWERS

LEVEL OF GOVERNMENT	Units APPRAISES	Requests Answered
Executive	Governor's Office	0/2
	Treasury	0/0
	Secretariat of Social Development	0/0
	Secretariat of Public Security	0/0
	Total del Executive	0/2
Legislative	Congress of State of Michoacán de Ocampo	0/4
Municipality	Municipality de Morelia	5/5
	Total	5/11

ASSESSMENT OF QUALITY ANSWERS

LEVEL OF GOVERNMENT	UNITS APPRAISES	TOTAL
Executive	Governor's Office	0%
	Treasury	0%
	Secretariat of Social Development	0%
	Secretariat of Public Security	0%
	Average of Executive	0%
Legislative	Congress of State of Michoacán de Ocampo	0%
Municipality	Municipality de Morelia	38%



ENTITY: State of Morelos
 LEGISLATION: Law on Public Information, Statistics and Protection of Personal Data of the State of Morelos
 BODY GUARANTOR: Morelos Institute of Public Information and Statistics
 PUBLICATION OF LAW: August 28, 2003
 EFFECT OF LAW: August 27, 2004
 OBLIGATED(DIRECT): Three branches of government, autonomous bodies and municipalities, political parties, individuals and corporations.

CONGLOMERATE ASSESSMENT

	Electronic portals	Customer Service	Quality of Response	Weighted average
Executive	73.21%	65.63%	71.25%	70.91%
Legislative	48.28%	68.75%	84.38%	66.81%
Municipality	71.67%	87.50%	50.00%	66.17%

1. ELECTRONIC PORTALS

Rating of Electronic Portals

LEVEL OF GOVERNMENT	UNITS APPRAISES	TOTAL
Executive	Governor's Office	82%
	Secretariat of Government	0%
	Secretariat of Finances and Planning	66%
	Secretariat of Social Development	48%
	Secretariat of Public Security	80%
	Average of Executive	73%
Legislative	Congress of State of Morelos	48%
Judiciary	Judiciary of State of Morelos	79%
Municipality	Municipality de Cuernavaca	72%

2. CUSTOMER SERVICE

RATING OF CUSTOMER SERVICE

LEVEL OF GOVERNMENT	UNITS APPRAISES	TOTAL
Executive	Governor's Office	38%
	Secretariat of Finances and Planning	75%
	Secretariat of Social Development	81%
	Secretariat of Public Security	69%
	Average of Executive	66%
Legislative	Congress of State of Morelos	69%
Municipality	Municipality de Cuernavaca	88%

3. ASSESSMENT OF ANSWER

LIST OF APPLICATIONS AND ANSWERS

LEVEL OF GOVERNMENT	Units APPRAISES	Requests Answered
Executive	Governor's Office	0/1
	Secretariat of Finances and Planning	3/3
	Secretariat of Social Development	3/3
	Secretariat of Public Security	1/3
	Average of Executive	7/10
Legislative	Congress of State of Morelos	4/4
Municipality	Municipality de Cuernavaca	3/5
	Total	14/19

ASSESSMENT OF QUALITY ANSWERS

LEVEL OF GOVERNMENT	UNITS APPRAISES	TOTAL
Executive	Governor's Office	60%
	Secretariat of Finances and Planning	100%
	Secretariat of Social Development	92%
	Secretariat of Public Security	33%
	Average of Executive	71%
Legislative	Congress of State of Morelos	84%
Municipality	Municipality de Cuernavaca	50%



ENTITY: State of Nayarit
 LEGISLATION: Law of Transparency and Access to Information of Nayarit
 BODY GUARANTOR: State Commission for Transparency and Access to Public Information
 PUBLICATION LAW: June 17, 2005
 EFFECT OF LAW: June 17, 2005
 OBLIGATED(DIRECT): Three branches of government, autonomous bodies and municipalities. Individuals and corporations.

CONGLOMERATE ASSESSMENT

	Electronic portals	Customer Service	Quality of Response	Weighted average
Executive	55.36%	42.19%	42.19%	47.46%
Legislative	62.07%	93.75%	90.63%	79.83%
Municipality	58.33%	68.75%	62.50%	62.08%

1. ELECTRONIC PORTALS

Rating of Electronic Portals

LEVEL OF GOVERNMENT	UNITS APPRAISES	TOTAL
Executive	Governor's Office	61%
	General Secretariat of Government	45%
	Secretariat of Finances	66%
	Secretariat of Economic Development	55%
	General Security	50%
	Average of Executive	55%
Legislative	Congress of State of Nayarit	62%
Judiciary	Judiciary of State of Nayarit	0%
Municipality	Municipality of Tepic	58%

2. CUSTOMER SERVICE

RATING OF CUSTOMER SERVICE

LEVEL OF GOVERNMENT	UNITS APPRAISES	TOTAL
Executive	Governor's Office	6%
	Secretariat of Finances	81%
	Secretariat of Economic Development	43%
	General Security	38%
	Average of Executive	42%
Legislative	Congress of State of Nayarit	94%
Municipality	Municipality of Tepic	69%

3. ASSESSMENT OF ANSWER

LIST OF APPLICATIONS AND ANSWERS

LEVEL OF GOVERNMENT	Units APPRAISES	Requests Answered
Executive	Governor's Office	0/2
	Secretariat of Finances	3/3
	Secretariat of Economic Development	0/3
	General Security	2/2
	Total of Executive	5/10
Legislative	Congress of State of Nayarit	4/4
Municipality	Municipality of Tepic	4/5
	Total	13/19

ASSESSMENT OF QUALITY ANSWERS

LEVEL OF GOVERNMENT	UNITS APPRAISES	TOTAL
Executive	Governor's Office	0%
	Secretariat of Finances	100%
	Secretariat of Economic Development	0%
	General Security	69%
	Average of Executive	42%
Legislative	Congress of State of Nayarit	91%
Municipality	Municipality of Tepic	63%



ENTITY: State of Nuevo Leon
 LEGISLATION: Law on Access to Public Information
 BODY GUARANTOR: Committee on Access to Public Information of Nuevo Leon
 PUBLICATION OF LAW: February 21, 2003
 EFFECT OF LAW: September 1, 2003
 OBLIGATED(DIRECT): Three branches of government, autonomous bodies and municipalities

CONGLOMERATE ASSESSMENT

	Electronic portals	Customer Service	Quality of Response	Weighted average
Executive	63.21%	87.50%	87.76%	77.89%
Legislative	68.97%	93.75%	43.75%	63.84%
Municipality	66.67%	93.75%	60.00%	69.42%

1. ELECTRONIC PORTALS

Rating Electronic Portals

LEVEL OF GOVERNMENT	UNITS APPRAISES	TOTAL
Executive	Governor's Office	75%
	General Secretariat of Government	71%
	Secretariat Finance and Treasury General of the State	66%
	Secretariat of Economic Development	48%
	Secretariat of Public Security	55%
	Average of Executive	63%
Legislative	Congress of State of Nuevo Leon	69%
Judiciary	Judiciary of State of Nuevo León	56%
Municipality	Municipality of Monterrey	67%

2. CUSTOMER SERVICE

RATING OF CUSTOMER SERVICE

LEVEL OF GOVERNMENT	UNITS APPRAISES	TOTAL
Executive	Governor's Office	88%
	Secretariat Finance and Treasury General of the State	81%
	Secretariat of Economic Development	94%
	Secretariat of Public Security	88%
	Average of Executive	88%
Legislative	Congress of State of Nuevo Leon	94%
Municipality	Municipality of Monterrey	94%

3. ASSESSMENT OF ANSWER

LIST OF APPLICATIONS AND ANSWERS

LEVEL OF GOVERNMENT	Units APPRAISES	Requests Answered
Executive	Governor's Office	2/2
	Secretariat Finance and Treasury	
	General of the State	3/3
	Secretariat of Economic Development	2/3
	Secretariat of Public Security	2/2
	Total of Executive	9/10
Legislative	Congress of State of Nuevo Leon	2/4
Municipality	Municipality of Monterrey	3/5
	Total	14/19

ASSESSMENT OF QUALITY ANSWERS

LEVEL OF GOVERNMENT	UNITS APPRAISES	TOTAL
Executive	Governor's Office	84%
	Secretariat Finance and Treasury	
	General of the State	100%
	Secretariat of Economic Development	67%
	Secretariat of Public Security	100%
	Average of Executive	88%
Legislative	Congress of State of Nuevo Leon	44%
Municipality	Municipality of Monterrey	60%



ENTITY: State of Oaxaca
 LEGISLATION: Law of Transparency and Access to Public Information for the State of Oaxaca
 BODY GUARANTOR: There is no
 EFFECT OF LAW: March 16, 2008
 EJERCICIO: March 16, 2008
 OBLIGATED(DIRECT) Three branches of government, autonomous bodies and municipalities. Individuals and corporations.

1. ELECTRONIC PORTALS

Rating of Electronic

LEVEL OF GOVERNMENT	UNITS APPRAISES	TOTAL
Executive	Governor's Office	38%
	General Secretariat of Government	0%
	Secretariat of Finances	46%
	Planning Committee for Development	0%
	Secretary of Citizen Protection	0%
	Average of Executive	17%
Legislative	Congress of State of Oaxaca	26%
Judiciary	Judiciary of State of Oaxaca	17%
Municipality	Municipality of Oaxaca	58%

2. CUSTOMER SERVICE Y ASSESSMENT OF ANSWER

Comments: Not assessed under your Legislation is not yet in office.



ENTITY	State of Puebla
LEGISLATION:	Law of Transparency and Access to Public Information of the State of Puebla
BODY GUARANTOR:	Committee for Access to Public Information of the State of Puebla
PUBLICATION OF LAW:	August 17
EFFECT OF LAW:	February 17
OBLIGATED(DIRECT)	Three branches of government, autonomous bodies and municipalities.

CONGLOMERATE ASSESSMENT

	Electronic portals	Customer Service	Quality of Response	Weighted average
Executive	60.71%	81.92%	64.58%	66.50%
Legislative	67.24%	87.50%	68.75%	71.90%
Municipality	68.33%	81.25%	55.00%	65.58%

1. ELECTRONIC PORTALS

Rating of ELECTRONIC PORTALS

LEVEL OF GOVERNMENT	UNITS APPRAISES	TOTAL
Executive	Governor's Office	66%
	Secretariat of de Government	64%
	Secretariat of Finances and Administration	41%
	Secretariat of Social Development	59%
	Secretariat of Public Security of the State of Puebla	73%
	Average of Executive	61%
Legislative	Congress of State of Puebla	67%
Judiciary	Honorable High Court of Justice of the State of Puebla	52%
Municipality	Municipality of Puebla	68%
	Municipality of Tehuacan	72%

2. CUSTOMER SERVICE

RATING OF CUSTOMER SERVICE

LEVEL OF GOVERNMENT	UNITS APPRAISES	TOTAL
Executive	Governor's Office	93%
	Secretariat of Finances and Administration	75%
	Secretariat of Social Development	71%
	Secretariat of Public Security of the State of Puebla	88%
	Average of Executive	82%

Legislative	Congress of State of Puebla	88%
Municipality	Municipality of Puebla	81%

3. ASSESSMENT OF ANSWER

LIST OF APPLICATIONS AND ANSWERS

LEVEL OF GOVERNMENT	Units APPRAISES	Requests Answered
Executive	Governor's Office	0/2
	Secretariat of Finances and Administration	3/3
	Secretariat of Social Development	2/2
	Secretariat of Public Security of the State of Puebla	3/3
	Average of Executive	8/10
Legislative	Congress of State of Puebla	¾
Municipality	Municipality of Puebla	3/5
	Total	14/19

ASSESSMENT OF QUALITY ANSWERS

LEVEL OF GOVERNMENT	UNITS APPRAISES	TOTAL
Executive	Secretariat of Finances and Administration	0%
	Secretariat of Social Development	58%
	Secretariat of Public Security of the State of Puebla	100%
	Average of Executive	100%
Legislative	Secretariat of Finances and Administration	65%
	Congress of the State of Puebla	69%
Municipality	Municipality of Puebla	55%



ENTITY State of Queretaro
LEGISLATION: Law on Access to Government Information in the State of Queretaro
BODY GUARANTOR: State Commission on Government Information Queretaro
EFFECT OF LAW: September 28
EJERCICIO: April 1
OBLIGATED(DIRECT) Three branches of government, autonomous bodies and municipalities. Political Parties. Individuals and corporations.

CONGLOMERATE ASSESSMENT

	Electronic portals	Customer Service	Quality of Response	Weighted average
Executive	37.86%	70.31%	0.00%	29.21%
Legislative	62.07%	87.50%	0.00%	42.33%
Municipality	71.67%	81.25%	0.00%	44.92%

1. ELECTRONIC PORTALS

Rating of ELECTRONIC PORTALS

LEVEL OF GOVERNMENT	UNITS APPRAISES	TOTAL
Executive	Office of C. Governor	66%
	Secretariat of Government	43%
	Secretariat of Planing and Finance	43%
	Secretariat of Sustainable Development	38%
	Secretariat of Public Safety	0%
	Average of Executive	38%
Legislative	Congress of State of Queretaro	62%
Judiciary	Judiciary of State of Queretaro	70%
Municipality	Municipality of Queretaro	72%

2. CUSTOMER SERVICE

RATING OF CUSTOMER SERVICE

LEVEL OF GOVERNMENT	UNITS APPRAISES	TOTAL
Executive	Office of C. Governor	75%
	Secretariat of Planning and Finance	75%
	Secretariat of Sustainable Development	75%
	Secretariat of Public Safety	56%
	Average of Executive	70%
Legislative	Congress of State of Queretaro	88%
Municipality	Municipality of Queretaro	81%

3. ASSESSMENT OF ANSWER

LIST OF APPLICATIONS AND ANSWERS

LEVEL OF GOVERNMENT	Units APPRAISES	Requests Answered
Executive	Office of C. Governor	0/2
	Secretariat of Planning and Finance	0/3
	Secretariat of Sustainable Development	0/3
	Secretariat of Public Safety	0/2
	Total of Executive	0/10
Legislative	H. Congreso de Querétaro	0/4
Municipality	Municipality de Querétaro	0/5
	Total	0/19

ASSESSMENT OF QUALITY ANSWERS

LEVEL OF GOVERNMENT	UNITS APPRAISES	TOTAL
Executive	Office of C. Governor	0%
	Secretariat of Planning and Finance	0%
	Secretariat of Sustainable Development	0%
	Secretariat of Public Safety	0%
	Average of Executive	0%
Legislative	Congress of State of Queretaro	0%
Municipality	Municipality of Queretaro	0%



ENTITY	State of Quintana Roo
LEGISLATION:	Law of Transparency and Access to Public Information of the State of Quintana Roo
BODY GUARANTOR:	Institute of Transparency and Access to Public Information of Quintana Roo
PUBLICATION OF LAW:	June 1
EFFECT OF LAW:	July 31
OBLIGATED(DIRECT)	Three branches of government, autonomous bodies and municipalities

CONGLOMERATE ASSESSMENT

	Electronic portals	Customer Service	Quality of Response	Weighted average
Executive	62.50%	87.50%	78.65%	73.96%
Legislative	48.28%	93.75%	90.63%	74.31%
Municipality	73.33%	81.25%	40.00%	61.58%

1. ELECTRONIC PORTALS

Rating of ELECTRONIC PORTALS

LEVEL OF GOVERNMENT	UNITS APPRAISES	TOTAL
Executive	Governor's Office	79%
	Secretariat of Government	77%
	Secretariat of Finance	75%
	Secretariat of Economic Development	0%
	Secretariat of Public Security	82%
	Average of Executive	63%
Legislative	Congress of State of Quintana Roo	48%
Judiciary	Judiciary of State of Quintana Roo	48%
Municipality	Municipality of Othon P. Blanco	73%

2. CUSTOMER SERVICE

CALIFICACIONES DE CUSTOMER SERVICE

LEVEL OF GOVERNMENT	UNITS APPRAISES	TOTAL
Executive	Governor's Office	88%
	Secretariat of Finance	88%
	Secretariat of Economic Development	88%
	Secretariat of Public Security	88%
	Average of Executive	88%
Legislative	Congress of State of Quintana Roo	94%

Municipality	Municipality of Othon P. Blanco	81%
--------------	---------------------------------	-----

3. ASSESSMENT OF ANSWER

LIST OF APPLICATIONS AND ANSWERS

LEVEL OF GOVERNMENT	Units APPRAISES	Requests Answered
Executive	Governor's Office	2/2
	Secretariat of Finance	3/3
	Secretariat of Economic Development	3/3
	Secretariat of Public Security	2/2
	Total of Executive	10/10
Legislative	Congress of State of Quintana Roo	4/4
Municipality	Municipality of Othon P. Blanco	3/5
	Total	17/19

ASSESSMENT OF QUALITY ANSWERS

LEVEL OF GOVERNMENT	UNITS APPRAISES	TOTAL
Executive	Governor's Office	100%
	Secretariat of Finance	80%
	Secretariat of Economic Development	79%
	Secretariat of Public Security	56%
	Average of Executive	79%
Legislative	Congress of State of Quintana Roo	91%
Municipality	Municipality of Othon P. Blanco	40%



ENTITY State of San Luis Potosi
LEGISLATION: Law of Administrative Transparency and Access to Public Information of the State of San Luis Potosi
BODY GUARANTOR: State Commission of Guarantee of Access to Information of San Luis Potosi
EFFECT OF LAW: March 21, 2003
EJERCICIO: March 21, 2004
OBLIGATED(DIRECT) Three branches of government, autonomous bodies and municipalities, political parties, individuals and corporations.

CONGLOMERATE ASSESSMENT

	Electronic portals	Customer Service	Quality of Response	Weighted average
Executive	53.21%	65.00%	74.48%	64.08%
Legislative	48.28%	81.25%	93.75%	73.06%
Municipality	60.00%	87.50%	0.00%	41.50%

1. ELECTRONIC PORTALS

Rating of ELECTRONIC PORTALS

LEVEL OF GOVERNMENT	UNITS APPRAISES	TOTAL
Executive	Governor's Office	71%
	General Secretariat of Government	25%
	Secretariat of Finance	66%
	Secretariat of Social and Regional Development	45%
	State Board of Public Safety	59%
	Average of Executive	53%
Legislative	Congress of the State of San Luis Potosi	48%
Judiciary	Judiciary of the State of San Luis Potosi	45%
Municipality	Municipality of San Luis Potosi	60%

2. CUSTOMER SERVICE

RATING DE CUSTOMER SERVICE

LEVEL OF GOVERNMENT	UNITS APPRAISES	TOTAL
Executive	Governor's Office	69%
	Secretariat of Finances	88%
	Secretariat of Social and Regional Development	56%
	State Board of Public Safety	56%
	Average of Executive	65%
Legislative	Congress of State of San Luis Potosi	81%

Municipality	Municipality of San Luis Potosi	88%
--------------	---------------------------------	-----

3. ASSESSMENT OF ANSWER

LIST OF APPLICATIONS AND ANSWERS

LEVEL OF GOVERNMENT	Units APPRAISES	Requests Answered
Executive	Governor's Office	2/2
	Secretariat of Finances	3/3
	Secretariat of Social and Regional Development	2/3
	State Board of Public Safety	2/2
	Total of Executive	9/10
Legislative	Congress of State of San Luis Potosi.	4/4
Municipality	Municipality of San Luis Potosi	0/5
	Total	13/19

ASSESSMENT OF QUALITY ANSWERS

LEVEL OF GOVERNMENT	UNITS APPRAISES	TOTAL
Executive	Governor's Office	81%
	Secretariat of Finances	100%
	Secretariat of Social and Regional Development	67%
	State Board of Public Safety	50%
	Average of del Executive	74%
Legislative	Congress of State of San Luis Potosi	94%
Municipality	Municipality of San Luis Potosí	0%



ENTITY: State of Sinaloa
 LEGISLATION: Law on Access to Public Information of the State of Sinaloa
 BODY GUARANTOR: State Commission for Access to Public Information of the State of Sinaloa
 Publication of Law: April 27
 Effect of Law: April 27
 OBLIGATED(DIRECT): Three branches of government, autonomous bodies and municipalities. Political Parties. Individuals and corporations.

CONGLOMERATE ASSESSMENT

	Electronic portals	Customer Service	Quality of Response	Weighted average
Executive	65.36%	63.54%	98.61%	78.30%
Legislative	55.17%	75.00%	93.75%	74.57%
Municipality	75.00%	66.67%	40.00%	59.33%

1. ELECTRONIC PORTALS

Rating of ELECTRONIC PORTALS

LEVEL OF GOVERNMENT	UNITS APPRAISES	TOTAL
Executive	Governor's Office	66%
	General Secretariat of Government	57%
	Secretariat of Finance and Administration	59%
	Secretariat of Social and Sustainable Development	75%
	Secretariat of Public Security	70%
	Average of Executive	56%
Legislative	Congress of State of Sinaloa	55%
Judiciary	Supreme Court of Sinaloa	50%
Municipality	Municipality of Culiacan	75%

2. CUSTOMER SERVICE

RATING OF CUSTOMER SERVICE

LEVEL OF GOVERNMENT	UNITS APPRAISES	TOTAL
Executive	Governor's Office	44%
	Secretariat of Finance and Administration	75%
	Secretariat of Social and Sustainable Development	69%
	Secretariat of Public Security	67%
	Average of Executive	64%
Legislative	Congress of State of Sinaloa	75%
Municipality	Municipality of Culiacan	67%

3. ASSESSMENT OF ANSWER

LIST OF APPLICATIONS AND ANSWERS

LEVEL OF GOVERNMENT	Units APPRAISES	Requests Answered
Executive	Governor's Office	2/2
	Secretariat of Finance and Administration	3/3
	Secretariat of Social and Sustainable Development	3/3
	Secretariat of Public Security	0/0
	Total of Executive	8/8
Legislative	Congress of State of Sinaloa	4/4
Municipality	Municipality of Culiacan	2/5
	Total	14/17

ASSESSMENT OF QUALITY ANSWERS

LEVEL OF GOVERNMENT	UNITS APPRAISES	TOTAL
Executive	Governor's Office	100%
	Secretariat of Finance and Administration	96%
	Secretariat of Social and Sustainable Development	100%
	Secretariat of Public Security	-
	Average of Executive	99%
Legislative	Congress of State of Sinaloa	94%
Municipality	Municipality of Culiacan	40%



ENTITY: State of Sonora
 LEGISLATION: Law on Access to Public Information of the State of Sonora
 BODY GUARANTOR: Transparency Institute of Information of the State of Sonora
 PUBLICATION OF LAW: February 26, 2005
 EFFECT OF LAW: August 1, 2006
 OBLIGATED(DIRECT): Three branches of government, autonomous bodies and municipalities. Political Parties. Individuals and corporations.

CONGLOMERATE ASSESSMENT

	Electronic portals	Customer Service	Quality of Response	Weighted average
Executive	76.07%	93.75%	70.83%	77.51%
Legislative	60.34%	87.50%	65.63%	67.89%
Municipality	38.33%	93.75%	100.00%	74.08%

1. ELECTRONIC PORTALS

Rating of Electronic Portals

LEVEL OF GOVERNMENT	UNITS APPRAISES	TOTAL
Executive	Governor's Office	82%
	Secretariat of Government	61%
	Secretariat of Finance	80%
	Secretariat of Social Development	77%
	Executive Secretary of the State Board of Public Safety	80%
	Average of Executive	76%
Legislative	Congress of State of Sonora	60%
Judiciary	Judiciary of State of Sonora	77%
Municipality	Municipality of Hermosillo	38%

2. CUSTOMER SERVICE

RATING OF CUSTOMER SERVICE

LEVEL OF GOVERNMENT	UNITS APPRAISES	TOTAL
Executive	Governor's Office	100%
	Secretariat of Finance	100%
	Secretariat of Social Development	75%
	Executive Secretary of the State Board of Public Safety	100%
	Average of Executive	94%
Legislative	Congress of State of Sonora	88%
Municipality	Municipality of Hermosillo	94%

3. ASSESSMENT OF ANSWER

LIST OF APPLICATIONS AND ANSWERS

LEVEL OF GOVERNMENT	Units APPRAISES	Requests Answered
Executive	Governor's Office	1/2
	Secretariat of Finance	2/3
	Secretariat of Social Development	3/3
	Executive Secretary of the State Board of Public Safety	2/2
	Total of Executive	8/10
Legislative	Congress of State of Hermosillo	3/4
Municipality	Municipality of Hermosillo	5/5
	Total	16/19

ASSESSMENT OF QUALITY ANSWERS

LEVEL OF GOVERNMENT	UNITS APPRAISES	TOTAL
Executive	Governor's Office	38%
	Secretariat of Finance	54%
	Secretariat of Social Development	92%
	Executive Secretary of the State Board of Public Safety	100%
	Average of Executive	71%
Legislative	Congress of State of Hermosillo	66%
Municipality	Municipality of Hermosillo	100%



ENTITY: State of Tabasco
 LEGISLATION: Law of Transparency and Access to Public Information of the State of Tabasco
 BODY GUARANTOR: Tabasco Institute of Transparency and Access to Public Information
 Publication of Law: February 11 2007
 Effect of Law: February 11, 2008
 OBLIGATED(DIRECT): Three branches of government, autonomous bodies and municipalities, political parties and individuals and corporations

1. ELECTRONIC PORTALS

Rating of Electronic Portals

LEVEL OF GOVERNMENT	UNITS APPRAISES	TOTAL
Executive	Governor's Office	52%
	Secretariat of Government	0%
	Secretariat of Administration and Finance	30%
	Secretariat of Economic Development	0%
	Secretariat of Public Security	0%
	Average of Executive	16%
Legislative	Congress of State of Tabasco	53%
Judiciary	Judiciary of State of Tabasco	42%
Municipality	Municipality of Centro	0%

2. CUSTOMER SERVICE Y ASSESSMENT OF ANSWER

Comments: It was not evaluated on the basis that their legislation is not yet in office.



ENTITY: State of Tamaulipas
 LEGISLATION: Law on Public Information of the State of Tamaulipas
 BODY GUARANTOR: There is no
 PUBLICATION OF LAW: November 26, 2004
 EFFECT OF LAW: June 26, 2005
 OBLIGATED(DIRECT): Three branches of government, autonomous bodies and municipalities, and individuals and corporations.

CONGLOMERATE ASSESSMENT

	Electronic portals	Customer Service	Quality of Response	Weighted average
Executive	41.79%	79.69%	36.46%	47.24%
Legislative	67.24%	87.50%	0.00%	44.40%
Municipality	56.67%	68.75%	92.50%	73.42%

1. ELECTRONIC PORTALS

Rating of ELECTRONIC PORTALS

LEVEL OF GOVERNMENT	UNITS APPRAISES	TOTAL
Executive	Governor's Office	50%
	General Secretariat of Government	52%
	Secretariat of Finances	45%
	Secretariat of Social Development; Culture and Sport	63%
	Secretariat of Public Security	0%
	Average of Executive	42%
Legislative	H. Congress of Free and Sovereign State of Tamaulipas	67%
Judiciary	Judiciary of State of Tamaulipas	39%
Municipality	Municipality of Victoria	57%

2. CUSTOMER SERVICE

RATING OF CUSTOMER SERVICE

LEVEL OF GOVERNMENT	UNITS APPRAISES	TOTAL
Executive	Governor's Office	63%
	Secretariat of Finances	81%
	Secretariat of Social Development; Culture and Sport	88%
	Secretariat of Public Security	88%
	Average of Executive	80%
Legislative	Congress of State of Tamaulipas	88%
Municipality	Municipality of Victoria	69%

3. ASSESSMENT OF ANSWER

LIST OF APPLICATIONS AND ANSWERS

LEVEL OF GOVERNMENT	Units APPRAISES	Requests Answered
Executive	Governor's Office	1/2
	Secretariat of Finances	2/3
	Secretariat of Social Development; Culture and Sport	2/3
	Secretariat of Public Security	0/2
	Total of Executive	5/10
Legislative	H. Congress of Free and Sovereign State of Tamaulipas	0/0
Municipality	Municipality of Victoria	5/5
	Total	10/15

ASSESSMENT OF QUALITY ANSWERS

LEVEL OF GOVERNMENT	UNITS APPRAISES	TOTAL
Executive	Governor's Office	38%
	Secretariat of Finances	42%
	Secretariat of Social Development; Culture and Sport	67%
	Secretariat of Public Security	0%
	Average of Executive	36%
Legislative	H. Congress of Free and Sovereign State of Tamaulipas	0%
Municipality	Municipality of Victoria	93%



ENTITY State of Tlaxcala
 LEGISLATION: Public Information Act for the State of Tlaxcala
 BODY GUARANTOR: Transparency Commission of the State of Tlaxcala
 EFFECT OF LAW: August 15, 2005
 EJERCICIO: August 15, 2005
 OBLIGATED(DIRECT) Three branches of government, autonomous bodies and municipalities, and individuals and corporations.

CONGLOMERATE ASSESSMENT

	Electronic portals	Customer Service	Quality of Response	Weighted average
Executive	18.57%	29.17%	0.00%	13.26%
Legislative	32.76%	6.25%	0.00%	13.26%
Municipality	15.00%	37.50%	0.00%	13.50%

1. ELECTRONIC PORTALS

Rating of ELECTRONIC PORTALS

LEVEL OF GOVERNMENT	UNITS APPRAISES	TOTAL
Executive	Governor's Office	48%
	Secretariat of Government	14%
	Secretariat of Finances	21%
	Secretariat of Economic Development	9%
	State Board of Public Safety	0%
	Average of Executive	19%
Legislative	Congress of State of Tlaxcala	33%
Judiciary	Supreme Court State of Tlaxcala	32%
Municipality	Municipality of Tlaxcala	15%

2. CUSTOMER SERVICE

RATING OF CUSTOMER SERVICE

LEVEL OF GOVERNMENT	UNITS APPRAISES	TOTAL
Executive	Governor's Office	25%
	Secretariat of Government	25%
	Secretariat of Finances	33%
	Secretariat of Economic Development	33%
	Average of Executive	30%
Legislative	Congress of State of Tlaxcala	6%
Municipality	Municipality of Tlaxcala	38%

3. ASSESSMENT OF ANSWER

Comments: Not assessed under which no applications were received from any branch.



ENTITY: State of Veracruz
 Legislation: Law on Access to Information of the State of Veracruz by Ignacio de la Llave
 BODY GUARANTOR: There is no
 PUBLICATION OF LAW: December 8, 2004
 EFFECT OF LAW: October 8, 2005
 OBLIGATED(DIRECT): Three branches of government, autonomous bodies and municipalities, political parties and individuals and corporations.

1. ELECTRONIC PORTALS

Rating of ELECTRONIC PORTALS

LEVEL OF GOVERNMENT	UNITS APPRAISES	TOTAL
Executive	Governor's Office	63%
	Secretariat of Government	77%
	Secretariat of Finances	75%
	Secretariat of Social Development and Environment	63%
	Secretariat of Public Security	0%
	Average of Executive	58%
Legislative	H. Congress of Free and Sovereign State of Veracruz by Ignacio de la Llave	55%
Judiciary	Judiciary of State of Veracruz	45%
Municipality	Municipality of Xalapa	42%

2. CUSTOMER SERVICE

Comments: was not assessed under its legislation is not yet in office.

3. ASSESSMENT OF ANSWER

Comments: was not assessed under its legislation is not yet in office.



ENTITY: State of Yucatan
 LEGISLATION: Law on Access to Public Information of the State and Municipalitys Yucatan
 BODY GUARANTOR: State Institute of Access to Public Information (INAIP)
 EFFECT OF LAW: June 4, 2004
 EJERCICIO: June 4, 2005
 OBLIGATED(DIRECT): Three branches of government, autonomous bodies and municipalities, and political parties

CONGLOMERATE ASSESSMENT

	Electronic portals	Customer Service	Quality of Response	Weighted average
Executive	70.00%	93.75%	90.63%	83.00%
Legislative	63.79%	87.50%	40.63%	59.27%
Municipality	85.00%	87.50%	75.00%	81.50%

1. ELECTRONIC PORTALS

Rating of Electronic Portals

LEVEL OF GOVERNMENT	UNITS APPRAISES	TOTAL
Executive	Governor's Office	75%
	General Secretariat of Government	70%
	Secretariat of Finance	66%
	Secretariat of Social Development	66%
	Secretariat of Roads and Protection	73%
	Average of Executive	70%
Legislative	Congress of State of Yucatan	64%
Judiciary	Judiciary of State of Yucatán,	58%
Municipality	Municipality of Mérida	85%

2. CUSTOMER SERVICE

RATING OF CUSTOMER SERVICE

LEVEL OF GOVERNMENT	UNITS APPRAISES	TOTAL
Executive	Governor's Office	94%
	Secretariat of Finance	94%
	Secretariat of Social Development	94%
	Secretariat of Roads and Protection	94%
	Average of Executive	94%
Legislative	Congress of State of Yucatán	88%
Municipality	Municipality of Mérida	88%

3. ASSESSMENT OF ANSWER

LIST OF APPLICATIONS AND ANSWERS

LEVEL OF GOVERNMENT	UNITS APPRAISES	TOTAL
Executive	Governor's Office	2/2
	Secretariat of Finance	3/3
	Secretariat of Social Development	3/3
	Secretariat of Roads and Protection	2/2
	Total of Executive	10/10
Legislative	Congress of State of Yucatán	2/4
Municipality	Municipality of Mérida	5/5
Total		17/19

ASSESSMENT OF QUALITY ANSWERS

LEVEL OF GOVERNMENT	Units APPRAISES	Requests Answered
Executive	Governor's Office	83%
	Secretariat of Finance	92%
	Secretariat of Social Development	88%
	Secretariat of Roads and Protection	88%
	Promedio del Executive	91%
Legislative	Congress of State of Yucatán	41%
Municipality	Municipality of Mérida	75%



ENTITY: State of Zacatecas
 LEGISLATION: Law on Access to Public Information of Zacatecas
 BODY GUARANTOR: State Commission for Access to Public Information of Zacatecas
 EFFECT OF LAW: July 15, 2005
 EJERCICIO: July 15, 2005
 OBLIGATED(DIRECT): Three branches of government, autonomous bodies and municipalities, political parties and individuals and corporations

CONGLOMERATE ASSESSMENT

	Electronic portals	Customer Service	Quality of Response	Weighted average
Executive	53.21%	85.42%	22.92%	47.54%
Legislative	60.34%	81.25%	70.00%	68.39%
Municipality	21.67%	87.50%	0.00%	26.17%

1. ELECTRONIC PORTALS

Rating of Electronic Portals

LEVEL OF GOVERNMENT	UNITS APPRAISES	TOTAL
Executive	Governor's Office	80%
	General Secretariat of Government	66%
	Secretariat of Finances	63%
	Secretaría de Economic Development	41%
	State Board of Public Safety	16%
	Average of Executive	53%
Legislative	Congres of State of Zacatecas	60%
Judiciary	High Court of Justice of the State of Zacatecas	61%
Municipality	Municipality of Zacatecas	22%

2. CUSTOMER SERVICE

CALIFICACIONES DE CUSTOMER SERVICE

LEVEL OF GOVERNMENT	UNITS APPRAISES	TOTAL
Executive	Governor's Office	92%
	Secretariat of Finances	81%
	Secretaría de Desarrollo Económico	81%
	Consejo Estatal de Seguridad Pública	88%
	Promedio del Executive	85%

Legislative	H. Congreso del Estado Libre y Soberano de Zacatecas	81%
Municipality	Municipality Zacatecas	88%

3. ASSESSMENT OF ANSWER

RELACIÓN DE SOLICITUDES Y RESPUESTAS

LEVEL OF GOVERNMENT	Units APPRAISES	Requests Answered
Executive	Governor's Office	0/0
	Secretariat of Finances	1/3
	Secretaría de Desarrollo Económico	3/3
	Consejo Estatal de Seguridad Pública	½
	Total del Ejecutivo	5/8
Legislative	H. Congreso del Estado Libre y Soberano de Zacatecas	4/4
Municipality	Municipality Zacatecas	0/5
	Total	9/17

ASSESSMENT OF QUALITY ANSWERS

LEVEL OF GOVERNMENT	UNITS APPRAISES	TOTAL
Executive	Governor's Office	0%
	Secretariat of Finances	13%
	Secretaría de Desarrollo Económico	13%
	Consejo Estatal de Seguridad Pública	43%
	Promedio del Ejecutivo	23%
Legislative	H. Congreso del Estado Libre y Soberano de Zacatecas	70%
Municipality	Municipality Zacatecas	0%

ANNEXES

Annex 1 Evaluation of internet portals

Design and Operation

- O1 Link transparent: visible link of transparency or field of specific item from home page to allow easy access to the section.
- O2 contact webmaster: There is a visible link to contact the person responsible for the portal (webmaster)
- O3 Searcher: It has a search engine for information visible on the home page
- O4 Update: Notes from the date of updating information posted on the website
- O5 server response Time: The response time of the server and links to income is less than 5 seconds per section (using a broadband connection)

Organic content (Executive and Municipalities)

- C1 Legal Framework: The laws apply to the obligated. Must be found listed and easily accessible.
- C2 Powers: We describe the powers of each administrative unit.
- C3 Structure: The organizational structure of the organizational structure from department head or equivalent.
- C4 Activity Report of obligated: Report of activities that generate legal provision obligated (may be by administrative unit).
- C5 Objectives and Goals of Administrative Units: Progress in meeting the goals and objectives
- C6 Directory of public servants: The directory of public officials, including legislators themselves (in the case of legislative) must contain: name, title, telephone, address and e-mail.
- C7 Services Offered by the Administrative Units: It displays the name of the procedures performed and gives access to formats that implement the procedures.
- C8 Compensation of servers: We must show the total number of seats vacant, the total number of staff employed by payroll fees along with the amount of benefits
- C9 Programs operational and strategic plans: General and administrative unit, including commissions for the legislation.
- C10 and criteria Calls for entry, promotion and retention of public service.
- C11 Directorate Liaison Unit: The home of the liaison, telephone, address, name of charge, e-mail or means of delivery for applications and description of services offered by noting the cost (if any)

Organic Content (Legislative Branch)

- C1 Agenda
- C2 parliamentary Gazette

- C3 Journal of debates
- C4 Initiatives and opinions
- C5 Decrees
- C6 attended meetings of the full
- C8 Travel Information Officers
- C9 mechanisms for citizen participation

Organic Content (Judiciary)

- C1 Policy Framework
- C2 Powers of all its administrative units
- C3 Structure
- C4 Activity Report
- C5 Progress in meeting the goals and objectives
- C6 Directory of Public Servants
- C7 Services offered for each operational area
- C8 Programs operational and strategic plans
- C9 Call and criteria for admission, retention and promotion of public service
- C10 Directorate liaison unit.

Financial and material (Executive and Municipalities)

- F1 Budget: Global, broken down by administrative unit to specific projects and budgets and historical past.
- F2 Progress Report on Implementation of the budget spending or financial report (quarterly): Global, breakdown and historical record of past reports
- F3 Additional income to the budget, specifying origin and execution.
- F4 Public Accounts
- F5 Results of audits: Publication of list of number and kind comments, archive and access to the document
- F6 Tab monthly pay per seat (perceptions net): In the event reflected by code rather than by job description, the directory should contain the code for
- F7 Inventories: Description of personal property (with a value exceeding 500) real estate and vehicles.
- F8 Contracts held, public works or consultancies: List of contracted services, including name of the supplier or contractor, the amount, duration and terms of the contract.

Financial and material (Legislative Branch)

- F1 Budget: Global, broken down by administrative unit to specific projects and budgets and historical past.
- F2 Compensation of servers: We must show the total number of seats vacant, the total number of staff employed by payroll fees along with the amount of benefits

- F3 Progress Report on implementation of the budget, current expenditure or financial report (quarterly): Global, breakdown and historical record of past reports
- F4 Allocation of movable and immovable property: Description of personal property (with a value exceeding 500) real estate and vehicles.
- F5 Contracts held, public works or consultancies: List of contracted services, including name of the supplier or contractor, the amount, duration and terms of the contract
- F6. Results of audits: Publication of list of number and kind comments, archive and access to the document.

Financial and material (Judiciary)

- F1 Budget
- F2 Report of progress of implementation of budget spending or financial report (quarterly)
- F3 additional income to the budget, specifying origin and execution
- F4 Results of audits
- F5 Tab monthly pay per seat (Net Perceptions)
- F6 Inventories
- F7 Contracts held, public works or advice.

Nature Operations (Executive Branch)

- N1 Reports generated by operation of law
- N2 Official travel
- N3 Conventions and Agreements
- N4 mechanisms of participation and citizen contact

Nature Operations (County)

- N1 Municipal Development Plan
- N2 Arrangements and services
- N3 Regulations
- N4 Official travel
- N5 Conventions
- N6 mechanisms of participation and citizen contact

Nature Operations (Legislative Branch)

- N1 Agenda: It must show the issues to be discussed at the next plenary session. Must stand independently of the Journal of Debates and the Parliamentary Gazette
- N2 Parliamentary Gazette: Fixes issues and documents to be discussed at the next meeting.
- N3 Journal of Debates: It's the synthesis that incorporates all the official documentation (initiatives, opinions, orders, etc.) of the matters that were dealt with in full.
- N4 Initiatives and opinions
- N5 Decrees
- N6 attended meetings of the plenary: The attendance of Members of the plenary sessions individually; Content can be in Journal of Debates, if done well should note in this regard; be updated until last session.

N7 Roll-call votes: The list of roll call votes: nombre's deputy, party and direction of the vote, as well as the name of the case that this voting, may be contained in the Journal of Debates, if done well should note in this regard; must be updated until last session.

N8 Official travel: official trips made by the officials, including event dates and spending per diem.

N9 mechanisms for citizen participation: Chat available, discussion forum, mailbox for complaints and suggestions. E-mail to staff members. E profile information from legislators

Operational nature (Judiciary)

N1 Reports generated by operation of law

N2 Official travel

N3 Conventions

N4 Listing agreements by court

N5 agreements and minutes of meetings

N6 Judgments and decisionmaking in the public interest

N7 opinions of approval or rejection (projects)

N8 Jurisprudence

N9 Index of experts

N10 Historical information delivered to individuals

N11 mechanisms of participation and citizen contact

Annex 1: Breakdown of evaluation to internet portals of municipalities

State	Municipality	Design and Operation					Organic content											Financial and material								Nature Operations						Promedio								
		O1	O2	O3	O4	O5	C1	C2	C3	C4	C5	C6	C7	C8	C9	C10	C11	F1	F2	F3	F4	F5	F6	F7	F8	N1	N2	N3	N4	N5	N6									
Aguascalientes	Aguascalientes	1	0	1	0	1	1	0	0.5	1	1	0	1	0.5	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0.5	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	75.00%	
Baja California	Mexicali	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	56.67%		
Baja California Sur	La Paz	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	0.5	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	65.00%		
Campeche	Campeche	1	0	1	0	1	1	0.5	0.5	1	0	1	0.5	1	1	0	1	0.5	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	65.00%		
Chiapas	Tuxtla Gutiérrez	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	0.5	1	0	1	1	0.5	1	0	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	0.5	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	66.67%	
Chihuahua	Chihuahua	1	0	1	1	1	1	0.5	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	85.00%	
Coahuila	Saltillo	1	0	0	0	1	1	0.5	1	1	0.5	0.5	1	0.5	1	0	0	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55.00%	
Colima	Colima	1	0	1	0	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	1	1	0.5	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	71.67%	
Distrito Federal	Cuauhtémoc	1	0	0	0	1	0.5	0.5	0.5	0		1	0.5	0	1	0.5	0	1	1	0	0.5	0.5	1	0.5	0.5	0.5	0	0.5	0.5	0	0.5	0.5	0	0	0	0	1	46.55%		
Durango	Durango	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0.5	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	78.33%	
Guanajuato	Guanajuato	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0.5	0	1	1	1	0.5	0	1	1	1	1	0.5	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	71.67%	
Guerrero	Chilpancingo	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0.5	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0.5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	50.00%		
Hidalgo	Pachuca	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	0.5	1	1	0.5	1	0	1	0.5	0.5	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	70.00%	
Jalisco	Guadalajara	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	96.67%	
Estado de México	Toluca	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	0	1	0.5	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0.5	1	1	1	1	1	60.00%	
Michoacán	Morelia	1	1	0	0	1	1	0.5	1	1	0.5	1	0.5	0	1	0	0	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0	1	0	0.5	1	0.5	1	0	0	0	0	0.5	1	1	1	1	1	53.33%	
Morelos	Cuernavaca	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	0.5	0.5	0	0.5	1	1	0.5	0	1	1	1	1	0.5	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	0.5	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	71.67%	
Nayarit	Tepic	1	1	1	0	1	0.5	1	0.5	0	0	1	1	0.5	0	0	1	1	1	0.5	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	58.33%	
Nuevo León	Monterrey	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	0.5	1	1	1	1	0	1	0.5	0	0.5	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0.5	1	1	1	1	1	66.67%	
Oaxaca	Oaxaca	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	0.5	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	58.33%	
Puebla	Puebla	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	0.5	1	0	1	0.5	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0.5	1	1	1	1	1	68.33%
Querétaro	Querétaro	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	0.5	1	0	1	1	1	0.5	1	0.5	1	1	1	0.5	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0.5	1	1	1	71.67%
Quintana Roo	Othón P. Blanco	1	0	1	1	1	1	0.5	1	1	0	1	1	0.5	1	0	0	1	1	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	1	1	1	1	0.5	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	73.33%		
San Luis Potosí	San Luis Potosí	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	0.5	1	0	0	0.5	0.5	1	1	1	1	1	0	0.5	0	1	0	0.5	1	0.5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	60.00%	
Sinaloa	Culiacán	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	0.5	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	75.00%
Sonora	Hermosillo	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0.5	0	1	1	1	0.5	0	0	0.5	1	1	0	0.5	0.5	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38.33%	
Tabasco	Centro	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.00%	
Tamaulipas	Cd. Victoria	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0.5	1	0	0	1	1	0.5	0	0	0.5	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	56.67%	
Tlaxcala	Tlaxcala	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0.5	1	0	0	0	0	0.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15.00%	
Veracruz	Xalapa	0	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	0.5	1	1	1	1	41.67%	
Yucatán	Mérida	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	0.5	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0.5	0.5	1	1	1	1	1	85.00%		
Zacatecas	Zacatecas	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0.5	1	1	21.67%	

Breakdown of Internet portals evaluation of Legislative power

	Design and Operation					Organic content									Financial and material						Labor Law									Average		
	A1	A2	A3	A4	A5	C1	C2	C3	C4	C5	C6	C7	C8	C9	I1	I2	I3	I4	I5	I6	L1	L2	L3	L4	L5	L6	L7	L8	L9			
Cámara de Senadores	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	0.5	1	1	1	1	1	1	0.5	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	0.5	1	1	0.5	0.5	0.5	1	82.76%		
Cámara de Diputados	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	0.5	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0.5	1	0.5	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0.5	1	86.21%		
Aguascalientes	1	0	0	0	0.5	0.5	1	0.5	0	0.5	1	0	0	1	0.5	1	0.5	1	0	1	1	0	0.5	1	1	0.5	0.5	0.5	1	55.17%		
Baja California	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0.5	0.5	0	0	0	1	1	1	0.5	0.5	0	1	68.97%		
Baja California Sur	0	0.5	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12.07%		
Campeche	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	0.5	1	0.5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	0.5	0	1	53.45%		
Chiapas	1	1	1	0.5	1	1	1	0.5	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	1	0.5	0	0	0	0	0	1	0.5	0.5	0.5	0	0	0	48.28%		
Chihuahua	1	0	0	0.5	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	0.5	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	1	0	1	1	68.97%		
Coahuila	1	0	0.5	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	0.5	1	60.34%		
Colima	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	0.5	0	0	0.5	0	0	0	0.5	1	0.5	0	0	0	0.5	0	1	0	1	0	1	0.5	0.5	0	46.55%	
Distrito Federal	0.5	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	0.5	1	1	0	1	0.5	1	1	0.5	0.5	1	0	0	1	0.5	1	0	0	0	1	58.62%		
Durango	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0.5	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	0.5	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	72.41%	
Guanajuato	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0.5	1	1	1	0.5	1	1	1	1	1	0.5	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	87.93%	
Guerrero	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	0.5	1	0.5	1	1	0.5	0.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0.5	1	0	0	0	1	50.00%		
Hidalgo	0.5	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	1	0	0.5	0	0	0.5	0	0.5	0	0.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	22.73%	
Jalisco	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	0.5	1	1	1	1	1	0.5	0.5	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	74.14%		
Estado de México	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	0.5	0	0	1	1	0	1	0.5	0	1	0	0	0.5	0	1	0.5	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	58.62%	
Michoacán	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	0.5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0.5	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	55.17%	
Morelos	1	1	0.5	0	1	1	1	0.5	0	1	0.5	0	0	1	0.5	1	0.5	0	0	0	1	0.5	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	62.07%	
Nayarit	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0.5	1	0	1	0	0	0	0.5	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	48.28%	
Nuevo León	1	0.5	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0.5	0	1	1	1	0.5	1	1	0	0	0.5	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	68.97%	
Oaxaca	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0.5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.5	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0.5	25.86%	
Puebla	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	1	1	0.5	1	1	1	0.5	0.5	0	0.5	0.5	0.5	1	0	1	1	0.5	0.5	0.5	0	1	1	67.24%	
Querétaro	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	0.5	1	1	0.5	1	0	1	0.5	1	0.5	0	1	0	1	0.5	0.5	0.5	1	0.5	0	0	1	1	62.07%	
Quintana Roo	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	0.5	0	0.5	0.5	1	0	0.5	0.5	0.5	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	48.28%		
San Luis Potosí	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0.5	1	0.5	0.5	0	0	1	1	1	0.5	0.5	0.5	0	0	1	1	48.28%	
Sinaloa	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	0.5	1	1	0.5	1	0	1	1	0.5	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0.5	55.17%	
Sonora	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	0.5	1	0.5	1	1	1	1	1	0.5	1	1	0	0.5	0.5	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	53.03%		
Tabasco	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0.5	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	0.5	0.5	0	1	53.45%
Tamaulipas	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	0.5	1	0.5	0	1	0	0.5	1	1	1	1	0	1	0.5	0.5	1	59.09%	
Tlaxcala	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0.5	0	0.5	0.5	0	1	0	0.5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.5	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	32.76%	
Veracruz	0	1	1	0	1	1	1	0.5	0	1	0.5	1	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	55.17%	
Yucatán	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	0.5	1	0.5	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0.5	1	0.5	0	0	0.5	1	1	63.79%	
Zacatecas	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0.5	1	0	1	0.5	0.5	0.5	1	0.5	0	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	60.34%	

Breakdown of the evaluation of internet portals portal of the state in the office of the Executive

	Design and Operation					Organic content											Financial and material								Nature Operations				Average		
	O1	O2	O3	O4	O5	C1	C2	C3	C4	C5	C6	C7	C8	C9	C10	C11	F1	F2	F3	F4	F5	F6	F7	F8	N1	N2	N3	N4			
Federación	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	1	80.36%		
Aguascalientes	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	76.79%		
Baja California	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0.5	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	71.43%		
Baja California Sur	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0.5	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	1	58.93%		
Campeche	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0.5	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0.5	0.5	1	1	67.86%		
Chiapas	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0.5	0	0	0.5	67.86%		
Chihuahua	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	0.5	0.5	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	0.5	0	1	53.57%		
Coahuila	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	0.5	1	76.79%		
Colima	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	44.64%		
Distrito Federal	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0.5	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	85.71%		
Durango	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	69.64%		
Guanajuato	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0.5	0	1	85.71%
Guerrero	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	1	0.5	69.64%	
Hidalgo	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	62.50%		
Jalisco	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0.5	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	92.86%	
Estado de México	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	1	1	0.5	1	1	76.79%	
Michoacán	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	0		1	0	1	1	64.81%		
Morelos	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0.5	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0.5	1	1	82.14%	
Nayarit	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	60.71%	
Nuevo León	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	1	75.00%		
Oaxaca	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0.5	37.50%		
Puebla	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	0		1	68.52%		
Querétaro	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	0.5	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	66.07%		
Quintana Roo	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	78.57%	
San Luis Potosí	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0.5	1	71.43%	
Sinaloa	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	0.5	66.07%	
Sonora	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	0.5	1	1	82.14%		
Tabasco	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	51.79%		
Tamaulipas	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	50.00%		
Tlaxcala	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	1	0	0.5	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	48.21%		
Veracruz	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0.5	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0.5	0	1	75.00%
Yucatán	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	0	0.5	0	1	1	62.50%		
Zacatecas	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	80.36%		

Breakdown of the evaluation of internet portals of the secretaries of finance or equivalent

	Design and Operation					Organic content											Financial and material								Nature Operations				Average	
	O1	O2	O3	O4	O5	C1	C2	C3	C4	C5	C6	C7	C8	C9	C10	C11	F1	F2	F3	F4	F5	F6	F7	F8	N1	N2	N3	N4		
Federación	1	0	0	0	1	1	0.5	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	41.07%	
Aguascalientes	1	1	0.5	0	1	1	1	0.5	0.5	1	1	1	0.5	0.5	0	1	0.5	0.5	0.5	1	1	0.5	0	1	0.5	1	1	0.5	69.64%	
Baja California	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	0.5	1	0	1	1	0	1	0	0.5	1	1	1	1	0.5	0	0	0.5	0.5	1	0.5	1	0.5	58.93%
Baja California Sur	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	0.5	1	0.5	1	1	0	1	0	0	0.5	0	1	0.5	0	0	0	0.5	1	0	0	0	44.64%	
Campeche	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	0.5	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	66.07%	
Chiapas	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	0.5	0	1	1	1	0	1	0	0.5	1	1	1	1	0	0	0.5	1	1	0	0	1	62.50%	
Chihuahua	1	0	1	0	0.5	1	0.5	1	0	1	0.5	0	0.5	1	0	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	0	1	60.71%	
Coahuila	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	0.5	1	1	0.5	1	1	0.5	0	1	1	0	0	1	0.5	0.5	0	1	0.5	0	0.5	1	66.07%	
Colima	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	0.5	0.5	1	0.5	0.5	0	0	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0	0	0.5	0.5	1	0	1	1	51.79%	
Distrito Federal	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	0.5	1	1	0	0	1	66.07%	
Durango	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0.5	44.64%	
Guanajuato	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0.5	1	0.5	1	0.5	0.5	1	0	0.5	0.5	0.5	1	0.5	1	0	0.5	1	0.5	0	1	57.14%	
Guerrero	1	1	1	0.5	1	1	1	0.5	0.5	1	1	0.5	0	1	0	0.5	0.5	0.5	0	0.5	0	0	0	0	0.5	0	0	1	51.79%	
Hidalgo	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	0.5	0	0	1	1	0.5	1	1	1	0.5	0	0.5	0	0	0.5	0	0	0	0	0	1	48.21%	
Jalisco	1	0	0.5	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0.5	1	1	0.5	1	1	1	1	83.93%	
Estado de México	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0.5	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0.5	1	0.5	1	1	0.5	1	0	82.14%	
Michoacán	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	0.5	0	0	0.5	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	46.43%	
Morelos	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	1	0	0.5	1	1	1	1	0.5	0	0	0	0	1	1	0.5	66.07%	
Nayarit	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	0.5	1	1	1	1	0.5	1	0	1	1	1	0.5	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	66.07%	
Nuevo León	1	1	0	0	0.5	1	1	1	0	1	0.5	1	1	0.5	0.5	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	0.5	1	1	0	0	1	66.07%	
Oaxaca	0	1	0	0	1	1	0.5	1	1	0.5	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0.5	0	1	0	0	0.5	0	1	0	1	1	46.43%	
Puebla	1	0	1	0	1	1	0	0.5	1	0	0.5	1	0	0.5	0	0.5	0.5	0.5	0	0	0.5	0.5	0	0	1	0	0	0.5	41.07%	
Querétaro	0	0	0	0	1	0.5	0.5	0.5	0	0	1	1	0.5	0.5	0	0.5	1	1	0.5	1	0	0	1	0.5	0.5	0	0	0.5	42.86%	
Quintana Roo	1	1	0.5	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0.5	0	1	0	0.5	1	1	0.5	1	0.5	0.5	1	75.00%	
San Luis Potosí	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	0.5	0.5	1	1	0.5	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	66.07%	
Sinaloa	1	0	0.5	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0.5	0	0.5	0	0	1	1	1	0.5	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	1	58.93%	
Sonora	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	0.5	1	0.5	1	0.5	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	0.5	0.5	1	1	1	0	1	80.36%
Tabasco	0	0.5	0	0	1	0	0.5	1	0	0.5	1	0.5	0	0	0	0	0.5	0.5	0.5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	30.36%	
Tamaulipas	0	0	0	0.5	1	0.5	0	1	0	0.5	1	1	0.5	1	0	1	0.5	0.5	1	0	0	0	0.5	0.5	0.5	0	0	1	44.64%	
Tlaxcala	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0.5	0.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	21.43%	
Veracruz	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	0.5	1	0.5	0.5	1	0	0.5	1	1	1	1	0.5	1	0	1	1	0.5	1	1	75.00%	
Yucatán	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	0.5	0	1	1	0.5	0	0	0.5	1	1	1	1	1	0.5	1	1	1	1	0.5	0	66.07%	
Zacatecas	1	0	0.5	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	0.5	1	0.5	1	0	0.5	1	1	1	1	0	0.5	1	1	1	0	0	1	62.50%	

Breakdown of the evaluation of internet portals of the secretaries of social development and equivalents

	Design and Operation					Organic content											Financial and material								Nature Operations				Average	
	O1	O2	O3	O4	O5	C1	C2	C3	C4	C5	C6	C7	C8	C9	C10	C11	F1	F2	F3	F4	F5	F6	F7	F8	N1	N2	N3	N4		
Federación	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	0	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	1	64.29%	
Aguascalientes	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	83.93%	
Baja California	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	28.57%	
Baja California Sur	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0.5	1	48.21%	
Campeche	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0.5	53.57%	
Chiapas	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	50.00%	
Chihuahua	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0.5	41.07%	
Coahuila	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	0	1	1	82.14%		
Colima	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	0.5	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0.5	53.57%	
Distrito Federal	1	1	0.5	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	82.14%		
Durango	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	26.79%
Guanajuato	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	1	1	0.5	0	0.5	57.14%	
Guerrero	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	0.5	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	60.71%	
Hidalgo	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0.5	1	0	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	64.29%	
Jalisco	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0.5	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	0.5	1	75.00%		
Estado de México	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	0.5	60.71%	
Michoacán	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	44.64%
Morelos	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0.5	1	48.21%	
Nayarit	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0.5	55.36%	
Nuevo León	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	48.21%	
Oaxaca	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.00%	
Puebla	1	0	1	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	58.93%	
Querétaro	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0.5	37.50%	
Quintana Roo	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.00%	
San Luis Potosí	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0.5	44.64%	
Sinaloa	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	75.00%	
Sonora	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0.5	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	76.79%		
Tabasco	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.00%	
Tamaulipas	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0.5	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0.5	62.50%		
Tlaxcala	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8.93%	
Veracruz	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	0.5	0	0	1	66.07%	
Yucatán	1	0.5	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0.5	1	62.50%	
Zacatecas	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	41.07%	

Breakdown of the evaluation of internet portals for the public security secretariats and equivalents

	Design and Operation					Organic content											Financial and material								Nature Operations				Average		
	O1	O2	O3	O4	O5	C1	C2	C3	C4	C5	C6	C7	C8	C9	C10	C11	F1	F2	F3	F4	F5	F6	F7	F8	N1	N2	N3	N4			
Federación	1	0	1	1	1	1	0.5	1	0.5	0	1	1	0	1	0.5	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	0.5	67.85%	
Aguascalientes	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	50.00%	
Baja California	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	0.5	0	0.5	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	28.57%	
Baja California Sur	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	39.29%		
Campeche	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.5	37.50%	
Chiapas	1	0	0.5	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0.5	1	0	1	1	0.5	0	1	1	0.5	0	1	0.5	0	0	0.5	0	1	62.50%
Chihuahua	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	0.5	1	0	0.5	0.5	0.5	1	0	0.5	1	0	1	0	0.5	1	0	0.5	1	1	0.5	0.5	58.93%		
Coahuila	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	0.5	1	1	0.5	0.5	0.5	0	1	0.5	0.5	0	0	1	0	0	0.5	58.93%		
Colima	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.00%	
Distrito Federal	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	0.5	1	1	0.5	1	1	1	1	1	1	0.5	0.5	1	1	0.5	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	83.93%	
Durango	1	1	0	1	1	1	0.5	0.5	1	1	0.5	0.5	0	1	0	1	0.5	1	0	1	0.5	0	0	0.5	1	0	0	1	58.93%		
Guanajuato	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	0.5	1	0	0.5	1	1	0.5	1	1	0.5	1	0.5	0	0.5	0.5	0	1	62.50%		
Guerrero	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0.5	0	1	0.5	1	0	1	0.5	0.5	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	1	1	75.00%		
Hidalgo	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	0.5	1	0	1	1	0.5	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0.5	0	0	1	0	1	0.5	46.43%		
Jalisco	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	1	0.5	1	0.5	0	1	1	1	1	78.57%		
Estado de México	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.00%	
Michoacán	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	0.5	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	1	66.07%		
Morelos	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	0.5	0	0.5	0.5	0.5	1	1	0.5	1	1	80.36%		
Nayarit	1	1	1	0	0.5	1	1	1	0	0.5	1	0.5	1	0	0	1	0.5	0	0	0	0.5	1	0	0.5	0	0	0	1	50.00%		
Nuevo León	1	0	1	0	0.5	1	1	0.5	0	1	1	1	0.5	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	1	55.36%		
Oaxaca	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.00%	
Puebla	1	0	1	0.5	1	1	1	0.5	1	1	1	1	0.5	1	0	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	0.5	1	0	0.5	1	73.21%		
Querétaro	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.00%	
Quintana Roo	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	82.14%	
San Luis Potosí	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0.5	0.5	0.5	1	0.5	1	0.5	1	0	0.5	0	0.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	58.93%	
Sinaloa	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	0.5	0.5	0.5	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	1	69.64%		
Sonora	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0.5	0.5	0	1	0.5	1	0.5	1	0.5	1	0.5	0.5	1	1	0	1	80.36%		
Tabasco	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.00%	
Tamaulipas	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.00%	
Tlaxcala	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.00%	
Veracruz	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.00%	
Yucatán	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	0.5	0	0	0.5	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	0.5	1	0.5	1	1	0	0.5	1	73.21%		
Zacatecas	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16.07%	

Breakdown of evaluation to the Judiciary

	Design and Operation					Organic content											Financial and material							Nature Operations											Average
	O1	O2	O3	O4	O5	C1	C2	C3	C4	C5	C6	C7	C8	C9	C10	F1	F2	F3	F4	F5	F6	F7	N1	N2	N3	N4	N5	N6	N7	N8	N9	N10	N11		
SCJN	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	0.5	1	0.5	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	0.5	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	80.30%
Aguascalientes	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	0.5	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0.5	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	51.52%	
Baja California	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.00%	
Baja California Sur	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	1	1	0.5	0.5	0	0	0.5	0	0.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0.5	0	0	0	1	0	0.5	33.33%	
Campeche	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	0.5	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	1	0.5	1	0	0	1	1	1	69.70%	
Chiapas	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0.5	0	0	0	0.5	1	0	0.5	0.5	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27.27%	
Chihuahua	1	0	0.5	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	1	0.5	1	1	1	1	0.5	1	1	0.5	0	0	0	0	1	1	66.67%	
Coahuila	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	0.5	1	0	1	1	0	0	1	0.5	0.5	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	0.5	0	0	0.5	56.06%	
Colima	0	1	0	0	0.5	1	1	0.5	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.5	19.70%	
Distrito Federal	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	0.5	0.5	0.5	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	0.5	1	1	1	1	0	0	0.5	1	1	0	0	1	0	1	65.15%	
Durango	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	0.5	1	0	0.5	1	1	1	1	0.5	0	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	56.06%	
Guanajuato	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	0.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0.5	25.75%
Guerrero	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	0.5	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0.5	45.45%	
Hidalgo	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	0.5	1	0	0.5	1	1	0	1	0.5	0	0	0.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	39.39%	
Jalisco	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0.5	0.5	0	1	1	1	1	1	0.5	1	0.5	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0.5	0	0	1	1	0	0	62.12%	
Estado de México	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	0.5	1	0	0.5	0	1	0	1	0.5	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0.5	54.55%	
Michoacán	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	0.5	1	0	1	1	0	1	1	0.5	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0.5	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	56.06%	
Morelos	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0.5	1	0.5	0.5	1	1	1	1	1	1	0.5	1	1	1	1	1	0.5	1	0.5	0	0.5	0	1	1	0	0.5	78.79%	
Nayarit	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.00%	
Nuevo León	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0.5	56.06%	
Oaxaca	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	16.67%	
Puebla	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	0.5	0.5	0	1	1	0.5	0	1	0.5	0	0	0	1	0	0.5	0.5	0	0.5	0.5	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	51.52%	
Querétaro	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	0.5	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	0.5	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	69.70%	
Quintana Roo	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	0.5	0	1	0.5	1	1	1	0.5	0	0	0	1	0	0	0.5	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	48.48%	
San Luis Potosí	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	0.5	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0.5	1	45.45%	
Sinaloa	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	0.5	1	0	0.5	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0.5	50.00%	
Sonora	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	0.5	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0.5	0	1	1	1	1	1	0.5	1	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	1	0.5	75.76%	
Tabasco	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	0.5	0	0.5	0.5	1	0	0	0	0.5	0.5	0	0	1	0	0.5	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	1	0	1	42.42%	
Tamaulipas	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	0.5	0.5	0	0	1	0.5	1	0.5	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	39.39%	
Tlaxcala	1	1	0	0.5	1	1	1	0.5	0.5	0	0.5	0	0	0	0.5	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	31.82%	
Veracruz	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	1	0	0.5	0	0	1	0	0.5	0.5	0	0	0	0.5	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	45.45%	
Yucatán	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	0.5	0	1	0	1	1	0.5	1	1	0.5	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0.5	57.58%	
Zacatecas	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	0.5	0	0.5	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	0.5	1	0	0	0	0	0.5	60.61%	

Annex 02. Questionnaires about services and guidance of liaison unit

QUESTIONS ON DIRECTION OF SERVICES AND UNIT LINK

INSTRUCTIONS:

1. Visiting a module of the liaison unit, to the address listed.
2. Seek support and guidance to staff who labor there.
3. Deliver a written application and request is sent by the response format e-mail here pointed out, or failing to request media alternative shipping without the need to attend in person.
4. Wait receipt or not. of Folio. You did not need to be together with the date and means which will be dealt with the response.
5. Only once that is completed the process should be respond immediately following the questionnaire.

Agency: _____

Entity: _____

Directorate liaison unit

Applied: _____

Date: _____ Time: _____

I. CARE UNIT IN TRAINING AND LIAISON

1. Is the liaison unit was at the correct location?

Yes ()

No ()

2. Is the liaison unit was in an accessible place?

Yes ()

No ()

There is no special unit for information ()

3. Are showed a visible place in the hours of operation?

Yes. ()

No. ()

4. How long did you wait to be served?

0-5 minutes. ()

5-15 minutes. ()

15 minutes or more ()

The wait was due to some reason in particular (non-business hours, too many applicants)

Specify:

5. Is the liaison unit had the space and resources needed to write the application?

If. ()

No ()

Specify:

6. Does the staff who worked in the unit was well trained to care for and guide the user?

Yes. ()

No. ()

Because they do not specify:

7. How would you rate the treatment they gave him?

Very good. ()

Good. ()

Minimum acceptable. ()

Bad ()

Lousy ()

Specify if necessary:

II. QUALITY AND COMPLIANCE WITH TRANSPARENCY IN THE ATTENTION

8. Is requested personal information to the user or personal identification, additional to those for sending response? (IFE, CURP, RFC)

Yes ()

No. ()

Specify:

9. Were you asked to indicate rightful interest or justify the reason for your request?

Yes ()

No. ()

10. Is reported on the cost of the service? (in case there is any)

Yes. ()

No. ()

11. Will said the response time?

Yes. ()

No. ()

12. Were informed about the application process, including the possibility of filing for judicial review?

Yes. ()

No. ()

13. Is delivered an acknowledgment of receipt?

Yes. ()

No. ()

14. Is there a means to make the request in electronic form, or go without physically to perform the procedure?

If. ()

No ()

15. Once the application is made must come to receive the information

Pending?

If ()

No. ()

16. Can you give the user the choice of format or medium requested or the modality in which you wish to receive information?

Yes. ()

No. ()

Remarks:

Place the questionnaire in envelope and seal it. Continue to the next unit on its agenda.

Annex 2.1 Breakdown of the assessments in response to users

ESTADO	Sujeto obligado	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	Total	Average
FEDERATION	Presidency of the Republic	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	100.00%	0.9375
FEDERATION	Ministry of Finance	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	100.00%	
FEDERATION	Social Development	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	87.50%	
FEDERATION	Public Security	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	87.50%	
FEDERATION	Chamber of Deputies	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	81.25%	
FEDERATION	Senate	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	93.75%	
AGUASCALIENTES	Office of Governor	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	87.50%	0.7188
AGUASCALIENTES	Finance	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	87.50%	
AGUASCALIENTES	Public Security	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18.75%	
AGUASCALIENTES	Social Development	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	93.75%	
AGUASCALIENTES	Congress	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	87.50%	
AGUASCALIENTES	Municipality of Aguascalientes	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	87.50%	
BAJA CALIFORNIA	Concentrator Office of the Executive	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	87.50%	0.875
BAJA CALIFORNIA	Congress	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	1	75.00%	
BAJA CALIFORNIA	Municipality of Mexicali	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	93.75%	
BAJA CALIFORNIA SUR	Office of Governor	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.00%	0
BAJA CALIFORNIA Sur	Finances	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.00%	
BAJA CALIFORNIA SUR	Public Security	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.00%	
BAJA CALIFORNIA SUR	Social Development	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.00%	
BAJA CALIFORNIA SUR	Congress	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.00%	
BAJA CALIFORNIA SUR	Municipality of La Paz	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.00%	
CAMPECHE	Office of Governor	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	93.75%	65.87%
CAMPECHE	Finance	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	100.00%	
CAMPECHE	Public Security	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	31.25%	
CAMPECHE	Social Development	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	N/A	0	N/A	N/A	38.46%	
CAMPECHE	Congress	0	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	75.00%	
CAMPECHE	Municipality Campeche	0	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	81.25%	
CHIAPAS	General Government Portal																	N/E	57.64%
CHIAPAS	Finance																	N/E	
CHIAPAS	Public Security																	N/E	
CHIAPAS	Social Development																	N/E	
CHIAPAS	Congress																	N/E	
CHIAPAS	Municipality de Tuxtla Gutiérrez																	N/E	
CHIHUAHUA	Office of Governor	0	0	0	1	0	N/A	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	1	1	1	55.56%	
CHIHUAHUA	Finance	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	68.75%	
CHIHUAHUA	Public Security	0	0	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	62.50%	
CHIHUAHUA	Social Development	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	43.75%	
CHIHUAHUA	Congress	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	93.75%	
CHIHUAHUA	Municipality de Chihuahua	1	0	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	62.50%	
COAHUILA	General Government Portal	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	81.25%	

ESTADO	Sujeto obligado	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	Total	Average
COAHUILA	Finance	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	93.75%	89.06%
COAHUILA	Public Security	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	93.75%	
COAHUILA	Social Development	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	87.50%	
COAHUILA	Congress	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	93.75%	
COAHUILA	Municipality Saltillo	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	87.50%	
COLIMA	Concentrator Office of the Executive	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	75.00%	75.00%
COLIMA	Congress	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	56.25%	
COLIMA	Municipality Colima	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	31.25%	
DISTRITO FEDERAL	Office of the Head of Government	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	100.00%	65.63%
DISTRITO FEDERAL	Finance	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	81.25%	
DISTRITO FEDERAL	Public Security	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	81.25%	
DISTRITO FEDERAL	Social Development	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.00%	
DISTRITO FEDERAL	Congress	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	75.00%	
DISTRITO FEDERAL	Cuauhtemoc Delegation	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	N/A	1	1	N/A	78.57%	
DURANGO	Office of Governor	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.00%	18.75%
DURANGO	Finance	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.00%	
DURANGO	Public Security	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.00%	
DURANGO	Social Development	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	75.00%	
DURANGO	Congress	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	56.25%	
DURANGO	Municipality Durango	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	87.50%	
GUANAJUATO	Office of Governor	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	81.25%	78.13%
GUANAJUATO	Finance	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	75.00%	
GUANAJUATO	Public Security	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	1	1	75.00%	
GUANAJUATO	Social Development	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	81.25%	
GUANAJUATO	Congress	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	93.75%	
GUANAJUATO	Municipality Guanajuato	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	68.75%	
GUERRERO	Office of Governor	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	81.25%	73.44%
GUERRERO	Finance	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	81.25%	
GUERRERO	Public Security	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	81.25%	
GUERRERO	Social Development	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	50.00%	
GUERRERO	Congress	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	1	56.25%	
GUERRERO	Municipality Chilpancingo	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	56.25%	
HIDALGO	Office of Governor																	N/E	85.94%
HIDALGO	Finance																	N/E	
HIDALGO	Public Security																	N/E	
HIDALGO	Social Development																	N/E	
HIDALGO	Congress																	N/E	
HIDALGO	Municipality Pachuca																	N/E	
JALISCO	Office of Governor	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	81.25%	
JALISCO	Finance	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	93.75%	
JALISCO	Public Security	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	87.50%	
JALISCO	Social Development	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	81.25%	
JALISCO	Congress	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	87.50%	
JALISCO	Municipality Guadalajara	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	81.25%	

ESTADO	Sujeto obligado	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	Total	Average
ESTADO DE MEXICO	Office of Governor	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	N/A	1	1	1	86.67%	82.60%
ESTADO DE MEXICO	Finance	0	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	62.50%	
ESTADO DE MEXICO	Public Security	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	93.75%	
ESTADO DE MEXICO	Social Development	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	87.50%	
ESTADO DE MEXICO	Congress	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	75.00%	
ESTADO DE MEXICO	Municipality Toluca	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	68.75%	
MICHOACAN	Office of Governor	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	68.75%	0.1719
MICHOACAN	Finance	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.00%	
MICHOACAN	Public Security	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.00%	
MICHOACAN	Social Development	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.00%	
MICHOACAN	Congress	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	68.75%	
MICHOACAN	Municipality Morelia	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	75.00%	
MORELOS	Office of Governor	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37.50%	0.6563
MORELOS	Finance	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	0	1	1	75.00%	
MORELOS	Public Security	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	68.75%	
MORELOS	Social Development	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	81.25%	
MORELOS	Congress	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	68.75%	
MORELOS	Municipality Cuernavaca	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	87.50%	
NAYARIT	Office of Governor	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6.25%	0.4219
NAYARIT	Finance	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	81.25%	
NAYARIT	Public Security	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	37.50%	
NAYARIT	Social Development	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	43.75%	
NAYARIT	Congress	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	93.75%	
NAYARIT	Municipality Tepic	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	68.75%	
NUEVO LEON	Office of Governor	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	87.50%	0.875
NUEVO LEON	Finance	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	81.25%	
NUEVO LEON	Public Security	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	87.50%	
NUEVO LEON	Social Development	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	93.75%	
NUEVO LEON	Congress	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	93.75%	
NUEVO LEON	Municipality de Monterrey	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	93.75%	
OAXACA	Office of Governor																	N/E	0.8192
OAXACA	Finance																	N/E	
OAXACA	Public Security																	N/E	
OAXACA	Social Development																	N/E	
OAXACA	Congress																	N/E	
OAXACA	Municipality Oaxaca																	N/E	
PUEBLA	Office of Governor	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	93.75%	0.8192
PUEBLA	Finance	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	1	75.00%	
PUEBLA	Public Security	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	87.50%	
PUEBLA	Social Development	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	N/A	1	1	N/A	71.43%	
PUEBLA	Congress	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	87.50%	
PUEBLA	Municipality Puebla	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	81.25%	

ESTADO	Sujeto obligado	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	Total	Average				
QUERÉTARO	Office of Governor	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	75.00%	0.7031				
QUERÉTARO	Finance	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	75.00%		0.7031			
QUERÉTARO	Public Security	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	56.25%			0.7031		
QUERÉTARO	Social Development	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	75.00%				0.7031	
QUERÉTARO	Congress	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	87.50%					0.7031
QUERÉTARO	Municipality Querétaro	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	81.25%					
QUINTANA ROO	Office of Governor	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	87.50%	0.875				
QUINTANA ROO	Finance	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	87.50%		0.875			
QUINTANA ROO	Public Security	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	87.50%			0.875		
QUINTANA ROO	Economic Development	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	87.50%				0.875	
QUINTANA ROO	Congress	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	93.75%					0.875
QUINTANA ROO	Municipality Othón P. Blanco (Chetumal)	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	81.25%					
SAN LUIS POTOSÍ	Office of Governor	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	N/A	60.00%	65.00%				
SAN LUIS POTOSÍ	Finance	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	87.50%		65.00%			
SAN LUIS POTOSÍ	Public Security	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	56.25%			65.00%		
SAN LUIS POTOSÍ	Social Development	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	56.25%				65.00%	
SAN LUIS POTOSÍ	Congress	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	81.25%					65.00%
SAN LUIS POTOSÍ	Municipality San Luis Potosí	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	87.50%					
SINALOA	Office of Governor	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	43.75%	63.54%				
SINALOA	Finance	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	0	1	1	75.00%		63.54%			
SINALOA	Public Security	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	N/A	1	1	1	1	66.67%			63.54%		
SINALOA	Social Development	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	0	1	1	68.75%				63.54%	
SINALOA	Congress	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	75.00%					63.54%
SINALOA	Municipality Culiacán	N/A	1	0	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	1	66.67%					
SONORA	Office of Governor	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	100.00%	93.75%				
SONORA	Finance	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	100.00%		93.75%			
SONORA	Public Security	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	100.00%			93.75%		
SONORA	Social Development	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	75.00%				93.75%	
SONORA	Congress	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	87.50%					93.75%
SONORA	Municipality Hermosillo	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	93.75%					
TABASCO	Office of Governor																	N/E	93.75%				
TABASCO	Finance																	N/E		93.75%			
TABASCO	Public Security																	N/E			93.75%		
TABASCO	Social Development																	N/E				93.75%	
TABASCO	Congress																	N/E					93.75%
TABASCO	Municipality Centro (Villahermosa)																	N/E					
TAMAULIPAS	Office of Governor	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	62.50%	79.69%				
TAMAULIPAS	Finance	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	81.25%		79.69%			
TAMAULIPAS	Public Security	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	87.50%			79.69%		
TAMAULIPAS	Social Development	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	87.50%				79.69%	
TAMAULIPAS	Congress	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	87.50%					79.69%
TAMAULIPAS	Municipality Victoria	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	68.75%					

ESTADO	Sujeto obligado	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	Total	Average					
TLAXCALA	Office of Governor	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	25.00%	29.17%					
TLAXCALA	Finance	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	25.00%		29.17%				
TLAXCALA	Public Security	0	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	33.33%			29.17%			
TLAXCALA	Social Development	0	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	33.33%				29.17%		
TLAXCALA	Congress	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	6.25%					29.17%	
TLAXCALA	Municipality Tlaxcala	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	37.50%						29.17%
VERACRUZ	General Government Portal																	N/E						
VERACRUZ	Finance																	N/E	29.17%					
VERACRUZ	Public Security																	N/E		29.17%				
VERACRUZ	Social Development																	N/E			29.17%			
VERACRUZ	Congress																	N/E				29.17%		
VERACRUZ	Municipality Xalapa																	N/E					29.17%	
YUCATAN	Office of Governor	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	93.75%						93.75%
YUCATAN	Finance	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	93.75%						
YUCATAN	Public Security	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	93.75%	93.75%					
YUCATAN	Social Development	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	93.75%		93.75%				
YUCATAN	Congress	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	87.50%			93.75%			
YUCATAN	Municipality Mérida	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	87.50%				93.75%		
ZACATECAS	Office of Governor	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	N/A	1	1	1	1	N/A	1	N/A	N/A	91.67%					85.42%	
ZACATECAS	Finance	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	81.25%						85.42%
ZACATECAS	Public Security	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	87.50%						
ZACATECAS	Economic Development	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	81.25%	85.42%					
ZACATECAS	Congress	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	81.25%		85.42%				
ZACATECAS	Municipality Zacatecas	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	87.50%			85.42%			

3: Quality of responses, criteria, and evaluation forms.

Battery of Questions

Town Hall

1. General common:

Copies of contracts and / or detailed list of all agreements entered into amending the ___ (name of the town hall) __ respect of acquisitions, leases and services for the hiring of services of cellular telephony, mobile telephony services local wireless and mobile radio services in all its forms during the fiscal year for 2006; in case of providing listing, including cost, equipment, conditions, minimum and maximum, and duration.

2. Budget:

Amount allotted to the departure of government advertising, and pattern projected for print and TV for the fiscal year corresponding to 2006.

3. Remit:

Listing of building permits granted by the council, specifying, if possible, the name and address of the owner.

4. Verifiable:

Approved budget of (name of town) _ 2007. Containing an unbundled enough by chapter, concept and object, and to ascertain the amount per unit and projects labeled.

5. D.P. and reserved:

Document showing the latest medical checkup of the Mayor.

OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR

1. Spending on advertising: (P) Amount allocated to the departure of government advertising, and pattern projected for print and TV for the fiscal year corresponding to 2006.

2. D.P. and reserved:

Name and number of items in custody of the State Governor, specifying type of weapon assigned to each.

MINISTRY OF SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT (SDS)

1. General common:

Copies of contracts where it is recorded in the relationship or detailed list of all contracts and / or agreements entered into amending the Secretariat ___ (name of the secretariat) __ respect of acquisitions, leases and services for the hiring of services of cellular telephony, local telephony and

mobile wireless mobile radio services in all its forms during the fiscal year for 2006.

2. Remit:

List of beneficiaries of the program __ (name of the program)____; for the fiscal year 2006.

3. D.P. and reserved:

Document showing the blood type and allergies from the Secretary of Secretary of the secretariat of __Name) __, _____(behalf of the Secretary)_____.

MINISTRY OF PUBLIC SECURITY

1. General common:

General common: (P) Copies of contracts and / or detailed list of all agreements entered into amending the Secretariat _ (name of the secretariat) _ respect of acquisitions, leases and services for the recruitment of telephone service cellular, local mobile phone services and wireless mobile radio services in all its forms during the fiscal year for 2006; in case of providing listing, including cost, equipment, conditions, minimum and maximum, and duration.

2. Remit:

Number of police barred by anomalies, irregularities and/or any other reason in 2006; if possible indicate the name of the elements.

MINISTRY OF FINANCE (SF)

General common:

(P) Copies of contracts and / or detailed list of all agreements entered into amending the Secretariat _ (name of the secretariat) _ respect of acquisitions, leases and services for the hiring of services of cellular telephony services Local mobile telephony and wireless mobile radio services in all its forms during the fiscal year for 2006; in case of providing listing, including cost, equipment, conditions, minimum and maximum, and duration.

1. Remit:

Amount which amounts to the State's public debt _ (Name of State)_____.

2. Verifiable:

Amount allocated by the Federation of State for Education _ (Name of State) __, for the fiscal year 2007, within the "Ramo 33". (Ramo 33. Federal Submissions for states and municipalities)

The State Congress (PL)

1. General common:

Copies of contracts and / or detailed list of all agreements entered into amending the H. Congress of the State of __ (Name of State) __ and all agreements entered into amending the Congress regarding acquisitions, leases and services for the hiring of services of cellular telephony, local telephony and mobile wireless services mobile radar in all its forms during the fiscal year for 2006; in case of providing listing, including cost, equipment, conditions, minimum and maximum, and duration.

2. Budget:

Full budget of the State Congress _ (name of state) _ allocated for 2007. Containing an unbundled enough by chapter, concept and object, and to ascertain the amount per unit and projects labeled; grants to groups including parliamentarians, legislators and advertising assignments.

3. Remit:

Roll call votes for the period September 2006 to March 2007. List by voting for every detail and legislated in electronic format.

4. DP / or reserved:

Membership and affiliation with religious organizations of the Deputy Chairman of the Board of the State Congress.

Annex 3. Evaluation breakdown of requests answered

STATE	OBLIGATED	QUESTION	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	PONDERED RATING	AVERAGE OF EXECUTIVE
FEDERACIÓN	Presidency of the Republic	Advertising	2	1	1	1	1	1	1		
FEDERACIÓN	Presidency of the Republic	Custodians	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	100.00%	
FEDERACIÓN	Finance	Contracts	1	1	1	1	1	1	1		
FEDERACIÓN	Finance	Debt	2	1	1	1	1	1	1		
FEDERACIÓN	Finance	Ramo 33	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	95.83%	
FEDERACIÓN	Social Development	Contracts	1	1	1	1	1	0	1		
FEDERACIÓN	Social Development	List of beneficiaries	2	1	1	1	1	1	1		
FEDERACIÓN	Social Development	Allergies	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	91.67%	
FEDERACIÓN	Public Security	Contracts	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
FEDERACIÓN	Public Security	Policie	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	43.75%	82.81%
FEDERACIÓN	Chamber of Deputies	Contracts	2	1	1	1	1	0	0		
FEDERACIÓN	Chamber of Deputies	Budget	2	1	1	1	1	0	0		
FEDERACIÓN	Chamber of Deputies	Roll call votes	2	1	1	1	0	0	1		
FEDERACIÓN	Chamber of Deputies	Religious organizations	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	81.25%	
FEDERACIÓN	Senate	Contracts	1	1	1	1	1	1	1		
FEDERACIÓN	Senate	Budget	1	1	1	1	1	0	1		
FEDERACIÓN	Senate	Roll call votes	2	1	1	1	1	0	0		
FEDERACIÓN	Senate	Religious organizations	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	59.37%	

STATE	OBLIGATED	QUESTION	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	PONDERED RATING	AVERAGE OF EXECUTIVE
AGUASCALIENTES	Office of Governor	Advertising	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
AGUASCALIENTES	Office of Governor	Custodians	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	50.00%	
AGUASCALIENTES	Finance	Contracts	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
AGUASCALIENTES	Finance	Debt	2	1	1	1	1	1	1		
AGUASCALIENTES	Finance	Ramo 33	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	66.67%	
AGUASCALIENTES	Public Security	Contracts	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
AGUASCALIENTES	Public Security	Police	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	50.00%	
AGUASCALIENTES	Social Development	Contracts	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
AGUASCALIENTES	Social Development	List of beneficiaries	2	1	1	1	1	1	1		
AGUASCALIENTES	Social Development	Allergies	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	66.67%	58.34%
AGUASCALIENTES	Municipality of Aguascalientes	Contracts	2	1	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		
AGUASCALIENTES	Municipality of Aguascalientes	Advertising	2	1	1	0.5	0	0	0		
AGUASCALIENTES	Municipality of Aguascalientes	Licenses	2	1	1	0	0	0	0		
AGUASCALIENTES	Municipality of Aguascalientes	Budget	2	1	1	1	1	1	1		
AGUASCALIENTES	Municipality of Aguascalientes	Medical checkup	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	76.25%	
AGUASCALIENTES	Congress	Contracts	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
AGUASCALIENTES	Congress	Budget Congress	2	1	1	1	1	1	1		
AGUASCALIENTES	Congress	Roll call votes	2	1	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		
AGUASCALIENTES	Congress	Religious organizations	2	1	1	0	0	0	1	59.37%	

STATE	OBLIGATED	QUESTION	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	PONDERED RATING	AVERAGE OF EXECUTIVE
BAJA CALIFORNIA	Oficina Concentradora del Poder Ejecutivo	Advertising	2	1	1	1	1	1	1		
BAJA CALIFORNIA	Oficina Concentradora del Poder Ejecutivo	Custodians	2	1	1	1	1	1	1		
BAJA CALIFORNIA	Oficina Concentradora del Poder Ejecutivo	Contracts	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
BAJA CALIFORNIA	Oficina Concentradora del Poder Ejecutivo	Debt	2	1	1	1	1	1	1		
BAJA CALIFORNIA	Oficina Concentradora del Poder Ejecutivo	Ramo 33	2	1	1	1	1	1	1		80.00%
BAJA CALIFORNIA	Oficina Concentradora del Poder Ejecutivo	Contracts	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
BAJA CALIFORNIA	Oficina Concentradora del Poder Ejecutivo	Police	2	1	1	1	1	1	1		
BAJA CALIFORNIA	Oficina Concentradora del Poder Ejecutivo	Contracts	2	1	1	1	1	1	1		
BAJA CALIFORNIA	Oficina Concentradora del Poder Ejecutivo	List of beneficiaries	2	1	1	1	1	1	1		
BAJA CALIFORNIA	Oficina Concentradora del Poder Ejecutivo	Allergies	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	80.00%	
BAJA CALIFORNIA	Municipality of Mexicali	Contracts	2	1	1	1	1	0	0		
BAJA CALIFORNIA	Municipality of Mexicali	Advertising	2	1	1	1	1	1	1		
BAJA CALIFORNIA	Municipality of Mexicali	Licenses	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
BAJA CALIFORNIA	Municipality of Mexicali	Budget	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
BAJA CALIFORNIA	Municipality of Mexicali	Medical checkup	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	55.00%	
BAJA CALIFORNIA	Congress	Contracts	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
BAJA CALIFORNIA	Congress	Budget	Congress	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
BAJA CALIFORNIA	Congress	Votaciones	nominales	0	0	0	0	0	0		
BAJA CALIFORNIA	Congress	Org.	Religiosas	0	0	0	0	0	0		0.00%

STATE	OBLIGATED	QUESTION	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	PONDERED RATING	AVERAGE OF EXECUTIVE
CAMPECHE	Office of Governor	Advertising	2	1	1	1	1	1	1		
CAMPECHE	Office of Governor	Custodians	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	50.00%	
CAMPECHE	Finance	Contracts	2	1	1	1	1	1	1		
CAMPECHE	Finance	Debt	2	1	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		
CAMPECHE	Finance	Ramo 33	2	1	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	87.5%	76.04%
CAMPECHE	Public Security	Contracts	2	1	1	1	1	1	1		
CAMPECHE	Public Security	Police	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	100.00%	
CAMPECHE	Social Development	Contracts	2	1	1	1	1	1	1		
CAMPECHE	Social Development	List of beneficiaries	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
CAMPECHE	Social Development	Allergies	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	66.67%	
CAMPECHE	Municipality of Campeche	Contracts	2	1	1	1	1	1	1		
CAMPECHE	Municipality of Campeche	Advertising	2	1	1	1	0	0	0		
CAMPECHE	Municipality of Campeche	Licenses	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
CAMPECHE	Municipality of Campeche	Budget	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
CAMPECHE	Municipality of Campeche	Medical checkup	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32.50%	
CAMPECHE	Congress	Contracts	2	1	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		
CAMPECHE	Congress	Budget Congress	1	1	1	1	1	1	1		
CAMPECHE	Congress	Roll call votes	1	1	1	1	1	1	1		
CAMPECHE	Congress	Religious organizations	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	85%	

STATE	OBLIGATED	QUESTION	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	PONDERED RATING	AVERAGE OF EXECUTIVE
CHIHUAHUA	Office of Governor	Advertising	2	1	1	1	1	1	1		
CHIHUAHUA	Office of Governor	Custodians	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	50.00%	
CHIHUAHUA	Finance	Contracts	2	1	1	1	1	1	1		
CHIHUAHUA	Finance	Debt	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
CHIHUAHUA	Finance	Ramo 33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33.33%	41.67%
CHIHUAHUA	Public Security	Contracts	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
CHIHUAHUA	Public Security	Police	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	50.00%	
CHIHUAHUA	Social Development	Contracts	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
CHIHUAHUA	Social Development	List of beneficiaries	2	1	1	1	1	1	1		
CHIHUAHUA	Social Development	Allergies	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33.33%	
CHIHUAHUA	Municipality of de Chihuahua	Contracts	1	1	1	1	1	1	1		
CHIHUAHUA	Municipality of de Chihuahua	Advertising	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
CHIHUAHUA	Municipality of de Chihuahua	Licenses	2	1	1	1	1	1	1		
CHIHUAHUA	Municipality of de Chihuahua	Budget	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
CHIHUAHUA	Municipality of de Chihuahua	Medical checkup	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	52.50%	
CHIHUAHUA	Congress	Contracts	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
CHIHUAHUA	Congress	Budget Congress	2	0	1	1	1	1	1		
CHIHUAHUA	Congress	Roll call votes	2	1	1	0	0	0	0		
CHIHUAHUA	Congress	Religious organizations	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	59.37%	

STATE	OBLIGATED	QUESTION	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	PONDERED RATING	AVERAGE OF EXECUTIVE
COAHUILA	Office of Governor	Advertising	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
COAHUILA	Office of Governor	Custodians	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	50.00%	
COAHUILA	Finance	Contracts	2	1	1	1	1	0.5	1		
COAHUILA	Finance	Debt	2	1	1	1	1	1	1		
COAHUILA	Finance	Ramo 33	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	97.92%	84.64%
COAHUILA	Public Security	Contracts	2	1	1	1	1	0.5	1		
COAHUILA	Public Security	Police	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	90.63%	
COAHUILA	Social Development	Contracts	2	1	1	1	1	1	1		
COAHUILA	Social Development	List of beneficiaries	2	1	1	1	1	1	1		
COAHUILA	Social Development	Allergies	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	100.00%	
COAHUILA	Municipality of Saltillo	Contracts	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
COAHUILA	Municipality of Saltillo	Advertising	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
COAHUILA	Municipality of Saltillo	Licenses	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
COAHUILA	Municipality of Saltillo	Budget	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
COAHUILA	Municipality of Saltillo	Medical checkup	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.00%	
COAHUILA	Congress	Contracts	2	1	1	1	1	1	1		
COAHUILA	Congress	Budget Congress	2	1	1	1	1	1	1		
COAHUILA	Congress	Roll call votes	2	1	1	1	1	1	1		
COAHUILA	Congress	Religious organizations	2	1	1	1	0	1	1	96.88%	

STATE	OBLIGATED	QUESTION	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	PONDERED RATING
COLIMA	Oficina Concentradora del Poder Ejecutivo	Advertising	2	1	1	1	1	0	1	
COLIMA	Oficina Concentradora del Poder Ejecutivo	Custodians	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	
COLIMA	Oficina Concentradora del Poder Ejecutivo	Contracts	2	1	1	0.5	1	1	1	
COLIMA	Oficina Concentradora del Poder Ejecutivo	Debt	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	
COLIMA	Oficina Concentradora del Poder Ejecutivo	Ramo 33	2	1	1	1	0	0	0	
COLIMA	Oficina Concentradora del Poder Ejecutivo	Police	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	
COLIMA	Oficina Concentradora del Poder Ejecutivo	List of beneficiaries	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	
COLIMA	Oficina Concentradora del Poder Ejecutivo	Allergies	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	92.97%
COLIMA	Municipality of Colima	Contracts	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
COLIMA	Municipality of Colima	Advertising	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
COLIMA	Municipality of Colima	Licenses	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
COLIMA	Municipality of Colima	Budget	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
COLIMA	Municipality of Colima	Medical checkup	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.00%
COLIMA	Congress	Contracts	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
COLIMA	Congress	Budget Congress	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
COLIMA	Congress	Roll call votes	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
COLIMA	Congress	Religious organizations	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.00%

STATE	OBLIGATED	QUESTION	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	PONDERED RATING	AVERAGE OF EXECUTIVE
DISTRITO FEDERAL	Oficina del Jefe de Gobierno	Advertising	N/S	N/S	N/S	N/S	N/S	N/S	N/S		
DISTRITO FEDERAL	Oficina del Jefe de Gobierno	Custodians	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	100.00%	
DISTRITO FEDERAL	Finance	Contracts	2	1	1	1	1	1	1		
DISTRITO FEDERAL	Finance	Debt	2	1	1	1	1	1	1		
DISTRITO FEDERAL	Finance	Ramo 33	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	100.00%	98.96%
DISTRITO FEDERAL	Public Security	Contracts	2	1	1	1	1	1	1		
DISTRITO FEDERAL	Pública	Police	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	100.00%	
DISTRITO FEDERAL	Social Development	Contracts	2	1	1	1	1	1	1		
DISTRITO FEDERAL	Social Development	List of beneficiaries	2	1	1	1	1	0	1		
DISTRITO FEDERAL	Social Development	Allergies	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	95.83%	
DISTRITO FEDERAL	Delegación Cuauhtémoc	Contracts	2	1	1	1	1	1	1		
DISTRITO FEDERAL	Delegación Cuauhtémoc	Advertising	2	1	1	1	1	1	1		
DISTRITO FEDERAL	Delegación Cuauhtémoc	Licenses	2	1	1	1	1	1	1		
DISTRITO FEDERAL	Delegación Cuauhtémoc	Budget	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
DISTRITO FEDERAL	Delegación Cuauhtémoc	Medical checkup	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	80.00%	
DISTRITO FEDERAL	Congress	Contracts	2	1	1	1	0	1	1		
DISTRITO FEDERAL	Congress	Budget Congress	2	1	1	1	1	1	1		
DISTRITO FEDERAL	Congress	Roll call votes	2	1	1	1	1	1	1		
DISTRITO FEDERAL	Congress	Religious organizations	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	96.87%	

STATE	OBLIGATED	QUESTION	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	PONDERED RATING	AVERAGE OF EXECUTIVE
DURANGO	Office of Governor	Advertising	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
DURANGO	Office of Governor	Custodians	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.00%	
DURANGO	Finance	Contracts	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
DURANGO	Finance	Debt	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
DURANGO	Finance	Ramo 33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.00%	0.00%
DURANGO	Public Security	Contracts	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
DURANGO	Public Security	Police	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.00%	
DURANGO	Social Development	Contracts	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
DURANGO	Social Development	List of beneficiaries	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
DURANGO	Social Development	Allergies	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.00%	
DURANGO	Municipality of Durango	Contracts	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
DURANGO	Municipality of Durango	Advertising	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
DURANGO	Municipality of Durango	Licenses	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
DURANGO	Municipality of Durango	Budget	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
DURANGO	Municipality of Durango	Medical checkup	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.00%	
DURANGO	Congress	Contracts	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
DURANGO	Congress	Budget Congress	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
DURANGO	Congress	Roll call votes	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
DURANGO	Congress	Religious organizations	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.00%	

STATE	OBLIGATED	QUESTION	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	PONDERED RATING	AVERAGE OF EXECUTIVE
STATE OF MEXICO	Office of Governor	Advertising	2	1	1	1	1	1	1		
STATE OF MEXICO	Office of Governor	Custodians	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	75.00%	
STATE OF MEXICO	Finance	Contracts	2	1	1	1	1	1	1		
STATE OF MEXICO	Finance	Debt	2	1	1	0	0	0	0		
STATE OF MEXICO	Finance	Ramo 33	2	1	1	1	0	0	1	75.00%	75.00%
STATE OF MEXICO	Public Security	Contracts	2	1	1	1	1	1	1		
STATE OF MEXICO	Public Security	Police	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	100.00%	
STATE OF MEXICO	Social Development	Contracts	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
STATE OF MEXICO	Social Development	List of beneficiaries	2	1	1	1	0	1	1		
STATE OF MEXICO	Social Development	Allergies	2	1	1	0	0	0	1	50.00%	
STATE OF MEXICO	Municipality of Toluca	Contracts	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
STATE OF MEXICO	Municipality of Toluca	Advertising	2	1	1	1	1	1	1		
STATE OF MEXICO	Municipality of Toluca	Licenses	2	1	1	1	1	1	1		
STATE OF MEXICO	Municipality of Toluca	Budget	2	1	1	0	0	0	1		
STATE OF MEXICO	Municipality of Toluca	Medical checkup	2	1	1	1	1	0	1	70.00%	
STATE OF MEXICO	Congress	Contracts	2	1	1	0	0	0	0		
STATE OF MEXICO	Congress	Budget Congress	2	1	1	1	1	1	1		
STATE OF MEXICO	Congress	Roll call votes	2	1	1	1	1	1	1		
STATE OF MEXICO	Congress	Religious organizations	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1 87.50%	

STATE	OBLIGATED	QUESTION	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	PONDERED RATING	AVERAGE OF EXECUTIVE
GUANAJUATO	Office of Governor	Advertising	2	1	1	1	0	0	0		
GUANAJUATO	Office of Governor	Custodians	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	81.25%	
GUANAJUATO	Finance	Contracts	2	1	1	1	1	1	1		
GUANAJUATO	Finance	Debt	2	1	1	1	1	1	1		
GUANAJUATO	Finance	Ramo 33	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	91.67%	93.23%
GUANAJUATO	Public Security	Contracts	2	1	1	1	1	1	1		
GUANAJUATO	Public Security	Police	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	100.00%	
GUANAJUATO	Social Development	Contracts	2	1	1	1	1	1	1		
GUANAJUATO	Social Development	List of beneficiaries	2	1	1	1	1	1	1		
GUANAJUATO	Social Development	Allergies	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	100.00%	
GUANAJUATO	Municipality of Guanajuato	Contracts	2	1	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		
GUANAJUATO	Municipality of Guanajuato	Advertising	2	1	1	1	1	1	1		
GUANAJUATO	Municipality of Guanajuato	Licenses	2	1	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		
GUANAJUATO	Municipality of Guanajuato	Budget	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
GUANAJUATO	Municipality of Guanajuato	Medical checkup	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	65.62%	
GUANAJUATO	Congress	Contracts	2	1	1	1	1	1	1		
GUANAJUATO	Congress	Budget Congress	2	1	1	1	1	1	1		
GUANAJUATO	Congress	Roll call votes	2	1	1	1	0	0	1		
GUANAJUATO	Congress	Religious organizations	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	93.75%	

STATE	OBLIGATED	QUESTION	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	PONDERED RATING	AVERAGE OF EXECUTIVE
GUERRERO	Office of Governor	Advertising	2	1	1	1	1	1	1		
GUERRERO	Office of Governor	Custodians	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	100.00%	
GUERRERO	Finance	Contracts	2	1	1	1	1	0	1		
GUERRERO	Finance	Debt	2	1	1	1	1	1	1		
GUERRERO	Finance	Ramo 33	2	1	1	1	1	0	1	91.67%	72.92%
GUERRERO	Public Security	Contracts	2	1	1	1	1	1	1		
GUERRERO	Public Security	Police	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	100.00%	
GUERRERO	Social Development	Contracts	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
GUERRERO	Social Development	List of beneficiaries	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
GUERRERO	Social Development	Allergies	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.00%	
GUERRERO	Municipality of Chilpancingo	Contracts	2	1	1	1	1	1	1		
GUERRERO	Municipality of Chilpancingo	Advertising	2	1	1	1	1	1	1		
GUERRERO	Municipality of Chilpancingo	Licenses	2	1	0	0	0	0	0		
GUERRERO	Municipality of Chilpancingo	Budget	2	1	1	1	1	0	1		
GUERRERO	Municipality of Chilpancingo	Medical checkup	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	85.00%	
GUERRERO	Congress	Contracts	1	1	1	1	0	0	0		
GUERRERO	Congress	Budget Congress	1	1	1	1	1	1	1		
GUERRERO	Congress	Roll call votes	1	1	0	0	0	0	0		
GUERRERO	Congress	Religious organizations	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	62.50%	

STATE	OBLIGATED	QUESTION	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	PONDERED RATING	AVERAGE OF EXECUTIVE
JALISCO	Office of Governor	Advertising	2	1	1	1	1	1	1		
JALISCO	Office of Governor	Custodians	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	50.00%	
JALISCO	Finance	Contracts	2	1	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		
JALISCO	Finance	Debt	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
JALISCO	Finance	Ramo 33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15.00%	43.33%
JALISCO	Public Security	Contracts	2	1	1	1	1	1	1		
JALISCO	Public Security	Police	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	50.00%	
JALISCO	Social Development	Contracts	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
JALISCO	Social Development	List of beneficiaries	2	1	1	1	0	0	1		
JALISCO	Social Development	Allergies	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	58.33%	
JALISCO	Municipality of Guadalajara	Contracts	2	1	1	1	1	1	1		
JALISCO	Municipality of Guadalajara	Advertising	2	1	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		
JALISCO	Municipality of Guadalajara	Licenses	2	1	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		
JALISCO	Municipality of Guadalajara	Budget	2	1	1	1	1	1	1		
JALISCO	Municipality of Guadalajara	Medical checkup	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	93.75%	
JALISCO	Congress	Contracts	2	1	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		
JALISCO	Congress	Budget Congress	2	1	1	1	1	1	1		
JALISCO	Congress	Roll call votes	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
JALISCO	Congress	Religious organizations	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	67.85%	

STATE	OBLIGATED	QUESTION	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	PONDERED RATING	AVERAGE OF EXECUTIVE
MICHOACÁN	Office of Governor	Advertising	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
MICHOACÁN	Office of Governor	Custodians	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.00%	
MICHOACÁN	Finance	Contracts	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
MICHOACÁN	Finance	Debt	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
MICHOACÁN	Finance	Ramo 33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.00%	0.00%
MICHOACÁN	Public Security	Contracts	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
MICHOACÁN	Public Security	Police	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.00%	
MICHOACÁN	Social Development	Contracts	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
MICHOACÁN	Social Development	List of beneficiaries	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
MICHOACÁN	Social Development	Allergies	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.00%	
MICHOACÁN	Municipality of Morelia	Contracts	2	1	0	0	0	0	0		
MICHOACÁN	Municipality of Morelia	Advertising	2	1	0	0	0	0	0		
MICHOACÁN	Municipality of Morelia	Licenses	2	1	0	0	0	0	0		
MICHOACÁN	Municipality of Morelia	Budget	2	1	0	0	0	0	0		
MICHOACÁN	Municipality of Morelia	Medical checkup	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	37.50%	
MICHOACÁN	Congress	Contracts	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
MICHOACÁN	Congress	Budget Congress	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
MICHOACÁN	Congress	Roll call votes	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
MICHOACÁN	Congress	Religious organizations	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.00%	

STATE	OBLIGATED	QUESTION	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	PONDERED RATING	AVERAGE OF EXECUTIVE
MORELOS	Office of Governor	Advertising	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.00%	
MORELOS	Finance	Contracts	2	1	1	1	1	1	1		
MORELOS	Finance	Debt	2	1	1	1	1	1	1		
MORELOS	Finance	Ramo 33	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	100%	56.25%
MORELOS	Public Security	Custodians	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
MORELOS	Public Security	Contracts	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
MORELOS	Public Security	Police	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	33.33%	
MORELOS	Social Development	Contracts	2	1	1	1	1	1	1		
MORELOS	Social Development	List of beneficiaries	2	1	1	1	1	1	1		
MORELOS	Social Development	Allergies	2	1	1	0	0	1	1	91.67%	
MORELOS	Municipality of Cuernavaca	Contracts	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
MORELOS	Municipality of Cuernavaca	Advertising	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
MORELOS	Municipality of Cuernavaca	Licenses	2	1	1	1	1	1	1		
MORELOS	Municipality of Cuernavaca	Budget	2	1	1	1	1	0	1		
MORELOS	Municipality of Cuernavaca	Medical checkup	2	1	1	0	0	0	1	50.00%	
MORELOS	Congress	Contracts	2	1	1	1	1	1	1		
MORELOS	Congress	Budget Congress	2	1	1	1	0	0	1		
MORELOS	Congress	Roll call votes	2	1	1	1	1	0	1		
MORELOS	Congress	Religious organizations	2	1	1	0	0	1	1	84.38%	

STATE	OBLIGATED	QUESTION	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	PONDERED RATING	AVERAGE OF EXECUTIVE
NAYARIT	Office of Governor	Advertising	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
NAYARIT	Office of Governor	Custodians	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.00%	
NAYARIT	Finance	Contracts	2	1	1	1	1	1	1		
NAYARIT	Finance	Debt	2	1	1	1	1	1	1		
NAYARIT	Finance	Ramo 33	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	100.00%	42.19%
NAYARIT	Public Security	Contracts	2	1	0	0	0	0	0		
NAYARIT	Public Security	Police	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	68.75%	
NAYARIT	Social Development	Contracts	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
NAYARIT	Social Development	List of beneficiaries	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
NAYARIT	Social Development	Allergies	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.00%	
NAYARIT	Municipality of Tepic	Contracts	1	1	1	0	1	1	1		
NAYARIT	Municipality of Tepic	Advertising	1	1	1	1	0	0	1		
NAYARIT	Municipality of Tepic	Licenses	1	1	1	1	1	1	1		
NAYARIT	Municipality of Tepic	Budget	1	1	1	1	1	1	1		
NAYARIT	Municipality of Tepic	Medical checkup	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	62.50%	
NAYARIT	Congress	Contracts	2	1	1	0	0	1	0		
NAYARIT	Congress	Budget Congress	2	1	1	1	1	1	1		
NAYARIT	Congress	Roll call votes	2	1	1	1	1	1	1		
NAYARIT	Congress	Religious organizations	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	90.62%	

STATE	OBLIGATED	QUESTION	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	PONDERED RATING	AVERAGE OF EXECUTIVE
NUEVO LEÓN	Office of Governor	Advertising	0	1	1	1	1	1	1		
NUEVO LEÓN	Office of Governor	Custodians	2	1	1	0.5	1	1	1	84.38%	
NUEVO LEÓN	Finance	Contracts	2	1	1	1	1	1	1		
NUEVO LEÓN	Finance	Debt	2	1	1	1	1	1	1		
NUEVO LEÓN	Finance	Ramo 33	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	100.00%	87.76%
NUEVO LEÓN	Public Security	Contracts	2	1	1	1	1	1	1		
NUEVO LEÓN	Public Security	Police	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	100.00%	
NUEVO LEÓN	Social Development	Contracts	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
NUEVO LEÓN	Social Development	List of beneficiaries	2	1	1	1	1	1	1		
NUEVO LEÓN	Social Development	Allergies	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	66.67%	
NUEVO LEÓN	Municipality of de Monterrey	Contracts	2	1	1	1	1	1	1		
NUEVO LEÓN	Municipality of de Monterrey	Advertising	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
NUEVO LEÓN	Municipality of de Monterrey	Licenses	2	1	1	1	1	1	1		
NUEVO LEÓN	Municipality of de Monterrey	Budget	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
NUEVO LEÓN	Municipality of de Monterrey	Medical checkup	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	60.00%	
NUEVO LEÓN	Congress	Contracts	2	1	1	1	0	0	1		
NUEVO LEÓN	Congress	Budget Congress	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
NUEVO LEÓN	Congress	Roll call votes	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
NUEVO LEÓN	Congress	Religious organizations	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	43.75%	

STATE	OBLIGATED	QUESTION	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	PONDERED RATING	AVERAGE OF EXECUTIVE
PUEBLA	Office of Governor	Advertising	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
PUEBLA	Office of Governor	Custodians	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.00%	
PUEBLA	Finance	Contracts	2	1	0	0	0	0	0		
PUEBLA	Finance	Debt	2	1	0	1	0	0	0		
PUEBLA	Finance	Ramo 33	2	1	0	1	1	1	1	58.33%	64.58%
PUEBLA	Public Security	Contracts	2	1	1	1	1	1	1		
PUEBLA	Public Security	Police	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	100.00%	
PUEBLA	Social Development	Contracts	2	1	1	1	1	1	1		
PUEBLA	Social Development	List of beneficiaries	2	1	1	1	1	1	1		
PUEBLA	Social Development	Allergies	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	100.00%	
PUEBLA	Municipality of Puebla	Contracts	2	1	1	1	1	1	0		
PUEBLA	Municipality of Puebla	Advertising	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
PUEBLA	Municipality of Puebla	Licenses	2	1	1	1	0	1	1		
PUEBLA	Municipality of Puebla	Budget	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
PUEBLA	Municipality of Puebla	Medical checkup	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	55.00%	
PUEBLA	Congress	Contracts	1	1	1	1	1	1	1		
PUEBLA	Congress	Budget Congress	1	1	1	1	1	1	1		
PUEBLA	Congress	Roll call votes	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
PUEBLA	Congress	Religious organizations	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	68.75%	

STATE	OBLIGATED	QUESTION	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	PONDERED RATING	AVERAGE OF EXECUTIVE
QUERÉTARO	Office of Governor	Advertising	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
QUERÉTARO	Office of Governor	Custodians	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.00%	
QUERÉTARO	Finance	Contracts	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
QUERÉTARO	Finance	Debt	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
QUERÉTARO	Finance	Ramo 33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.00%	
QUERÉTARO	Public Security	Contracts	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
QUERÉTARO	Public Security	Police	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.00%	
QUERÉTARO	Social Development	Contracts	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
QUERÉTARO	Social Development	List of beneficiaries	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
QUERÉTARO	Social Development	Allergies	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.00%	0.00%
QUERÉTARO	Municipality of Querétaro	Contracts	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
QUERÉTARO	Municipality of Querétaro	Advertising	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
QUERÉTARO	Municipality of Querétaro	Licenses	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
QUERÉTARO	Municipality of Querétaro	Budget	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
QUERÉTARO	Municipality of Querétaro	Medical checkup	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.00%	
QUERÉTARO	Congress	Contracts	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
QUERÉTARO	Congress	Budget Congress	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
QUERÉTARO	Congress	Roll call votes	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
QUERÉTARO	Congress	Religious organizations	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.00%	

STATE	OBLIGATED	QUESTION	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	PONDERED RATING	AVERAGE OF EXECUTIVE
QUINTANA ROO	Office of Governor	Advertising	2	1	1	1	1	1	1		
QUINTANA ROO	Office of Governor	Custodians	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	100.00%	
QUINTANA ROO	Finance	Contracts	2	1	0	0	0	0	0		
QUINTANA ROO	Finance	Debt	2	1	1	1	1	1	1		
QUINTANA ROO	Finance	Ramo 33	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	79.17%	78.65%
QUINTANA ROO	Public Security	Contracts	2	1	0	0	0	0	0		
QUINTANA ROO	Public Security	Police	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	56.25%	
QUINTANA ROO	Social Development	Contracts	2	1	0	0	0	0	0		
QUINTANA ROO	Social Development	List of beneficiaries	2	1	1	1	1	1	1		
QUINTANA ROO	Social Development	Allergies	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	79.17%	
QUINTANA ROO	Municipality of Othón P. Blanco	Contracts	1	1	1	1	0	0	0		
QUINTANA ROO	Municipality of Othón P. Blanco	Advertising	1	1	1	1	1	0	1		
QUINTANA ROO	Municipality of Othón P. Blanco	Licenses	1	1	1	1	1	0	1		
QUINTANA ROO	Municipality of Othón P. Blanco	Budget	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
QUINTANA ROO	Municipality of Othón P. Blanco	Medical checkup	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40.00%	
QUINTANA ROO	Congress	Contracts	2	1	1	1	1	1	0		
QUINTANA ROO	Congress	Budget	Congress	2	1	1	1	1	0	1	
QUINTANA ROO	Congress	Votaciones	nominales	2	1	1	1	1	0	1	
QUINTANA ROO	Congress	Org.	Religiosas	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	90.63%

STATE	OBLIGATED	QUESTION	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	PONDERED RATING	AVERAGE OF EXECUTIVE
SAN LUIS POTOSI	Office of Governor	Advertising	2	1	1	1	1	1	1		
SAN LUIS POTOSI	Office of Governor	Custodians	2	1	1	1	0	0	0	81.25%	
SAN LUIS POTOSI	Finance	Contracts	2	1	1	1	1	1	1		
SAN LUIS POTOSI	Finance	Debt	2	1	1	1	1	1	1		
SAN LUIS POTOSI	Finance	Ramo 33	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	100.00%	74.48%
SAN LUIS POTOSI	Public Security	Contracts	2	1	1	0	0	0	0		
SAN LUIS POTOSI	Public Security	Police	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	50.00%	
SAN LUIS POTOSI	Social Development	Contracts	2	1	1	1	1	1	1		
SAN LUIS POTOSI	Social Development	List of beneficiaries	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
SAN LUIS POTOSI	Social Development	Allergies	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	66.67%	
SAN LUIS POTOSI	Municipality of SAN LUIS POTOSI	Contracts	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
SAN LUIS POTOSI	Municipality of SAN LUIS POTOSI	Advertising	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
SAN LUIS POTOSI	Municipality of SAN LUIS POTOSI	Licenses	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
SAN LUIS POTOSI	Municipality of SAN LUIS POTOSI	Budget	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
SAN LUIS POTOSI	Municipality of SAN LUIS POTOSI	Medical checkup	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.00%	
SAN LUIS POTOSI	Congress	Contracts	2	1	1	1	1	1	1		
SAN LUIS POTOSI	Congress	Budget	Congress	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	
SAN LUIS POTOSI	Congress	Votaciones	nominales	2	1	1	1	1	0	0	
SAN LUIS POTOSI	Congress	Org.	Religiosas	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	93.75%

STATE	OBLIGATED	QUESTION	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	PONDERED RATING	AVERAGE OF EXECUTIVE
SINALOA	Office of Governor	Advertising	2	1	1	1	1	1	1		
SINALOA	Office of Governor	Custodians	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	100.00%	
SINALOA	Finance	Contracts	2	1	1	1	1	0	1		
SINALOA	Finance	Debt	2	1	1	1	1	1	1		
SINALOA	Finance	Ramo 33	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	95.83%	73.96%
SINALOA	Public Security	Contracts	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
SINALOA	Public Security	Police	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%	
SINALOA	Social Development	Contracts	2	1	1	1	1	1	1		
SINALOA	Social Development	List of beneficiaries	2	1	1	1	1	1	1		
SINALOA	Social Development	Allergies	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	100.00%	
SINALOA	Municipality of Culiacán	Contracts	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
SINALOA	Municipality of Culiacán	Advertising	2	1	1	1	1	1	1		
SINALOA	Municipality of Culiacán	Licenses	2	1	1	1	1	1	1		
SINALOA	Municipality of Culiacán	Budget	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
SINALOA	Municipality of Culiacán	Medical checkup	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40.00%	
SINALOA	Congress	Contracts	2	1	1	1	1	1	1		
SINALOA	Congress	Budget Congress	2	1	1	1	1	1	1		
SINALOA	Congress	Roll call votes	2	1	1	1	1	0	1		
SINALOA	Congress	Religious organizations	2	1	1	1	1	0	1	93.75%	

STATE	OBLIGATED	QUESTION	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	PONDERED RATING	AVERAGE OF EXECUTIVE
SONORA	Office of Governor	Advertising	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
SONORA	Office of Governor	Custodians	2	1	1	0	0	1	1	37.50%	
SONORA	Finance	Contracts	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
SONORA	Finance	Debt	2	1	1	1	1	1	1		
SONORA	Finance	Ramo 33	2	1	1	0	0	0	1	54.17%	70.84
SONORA	Public Security	Contracts	2	1	1	1	1	1	1		
SONORA	Public Security	Police	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	100.00%	
SONORA	Social Development	Contracts	2	1	1	1	1	0	1		
SONORA	Social Development	List of beneficiaries	2	1	1	1	1	0	1		
SONORA	Social Development	Allergies	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	91.67%	
SONORA	Municipality of Hermosillo	Contracts	2	1	1	1	1	1	1		
SONORA	Municipality of Hermosillo	Advertising	2	1	1	1	1	1	1		
SONORA	Municipality of Hermosillo	Licenses	2	1	1	1	1	1	1		
SONORA	Municipality of Hermosillo	Budget	2	1	1	1	1	1	1		
SONORA	Municipality of Hermosillo	Chequeo	Médico	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	100.00%
SONORA	Congress	Contracts	2	1	1	0	1	0	1		
SONORA	Congress	Budget Congress	2	1	1	1	1	0	1		
SONORA	Congress	Roll call votes	2	1	1	1	1	1	1		
SONORA	Congress	Religious organizations	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65.62%	

STATE	OBLIGATED	QUESTION	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	PONDERED RATING	AVERAGE OF EXECUTIVE
TAMAULIPAS	Office of Governor	Advertising	0	1	1	1	1	1	1		
TAMAULIPAS	Office of Governor	Custodians	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37.50%	
TAMAULIPAS	Finance	Contracts	2	1	1	1	0	0	0		
TAMAULIPAS	Finance	Debt	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
TAMAULIPAS	Finance	Ramo 33	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	41.67%	36.46%
TAMAULIPAS	Public Security	Contracts	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
TAMAULIPAS	Public Security	Police	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.00%	
TAMAULIPAS	Social Development	Contracts	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
TAMAULIPAS	Social Development	List of beneficiaries	2	1	1	1	1	1	1		
TAMAULIPAS	Social Development	Allergies	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	66.67%	
TAMAULIPAS	Municipality of Victoria	Contracts	2	1	1	1	1	0	1		
TAMAULIPAS	Municipality of Victoria	Advertising	2	1	1	1	1	0	1		
TAMAULIPAS	Municipality of Victoria	Licenses	2	1	1	1	1	0	1		
TAMAULIPAS	Municipality of Victoria	Budget	2	1	1	1	1	1	1		
TAMAULIPAS	Municipality of Victoria	Medical checkup	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	92.50%	
TAMAULIPAS	Congress	Contracts	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
TAMAULIPAS	Congress	Budget Congress	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
TAMAULIPAS	Congress	Roll call votes	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
TAMAULIPAS	Congress	Religious organizations	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.00%	

STATE	OBLIGATED	QUESTION	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	PONDERED RATING	AVERAGE OF EXECUTIVE
YUCATÁN	Office of Governor	Advertising	2	1	1	1	1	1	1		
YUCATÁN	Office of Governor	Custodians	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	100.00%	
YUCATÁN	Finance	Contracts	2	1	1	1	0	0	1		
YUCATÁN	Finance	Debt	2	1	1	1	1	1	1		
YUCATÁN	Finance	Ramo 33	2	1	1	1	0	0	1	83.33%	91.46%
YUCATÁN	Public Security	Contracts	2	1	1	1	1	1	1		
YUCATÁN	Public Security	Police	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	87.50%	
YUCATÁN	Social Development	Contracts	2	1	1	1	1	1	1		
YUCATÁN	Social Development	List of beneficiaries	2	1	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		
YUCATÁN	Social Development	Allergies	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	95.00%	
YUCATÁN	Municipality of Mérida	Contracts	2	1	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		
YUCATÁN	Municipality of Mérida	Advertising	2	1	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		
YUCATÁN	Municipality of Mérida	Licenses	2	1	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		
YUCATÁN	Municipality of Mérida	Budget	2	1	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		
YUCATÁN	Municipality of Mérida	Medical checkup	2	1	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	75.00%	
YUCATÁN	Congress	Contracts	2	1	1	1	1	1	1		
YUCATÁN	Congress	Budget Congress	2	1	1	1	0	0	0		
YUCATÁN	Congress	Roll call votes	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
YUCATÁN	Congress	Religious organizations	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40.62%	

STATE	OBLIGATED	QUESTION	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	PONDERED RATING	AVERAGE OF EXECUTIVE
ZACATECAS	Office of Governor	Advertising	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
ZACATECAS	Office of Governor	Custodians	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%	
ZACATECAS	Finance	Contracts	2	1	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		
ZACATECAS	Finance	Debt	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
ZACATECAS	Finance	Ramo 33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15.00%	39.69%
ZACATECAS	Public Security	Contracts	1	1	1	1	1	1	1		
ZACATECAS	Public Security	Police	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43.75%	
ZACATECAS	Social Development	Contracts	2	1	1	1	1	1	1		
ZACATECAS	Social Development	List of beneficiaries	2	1	1	1	1	1	1		
ZACATECAS	Social Development	Allergies	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	100.00%	
ZACATECAS	Municipality of Zacatecas	Contracts	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
ZACATECAS	Municipality of Zacatecas	Advertising	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
ZACATECAS	Municipality of Zacatecas	Licenses	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
ZACATECAS	Municipality of Zacatecas	Budget	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
ZACATECAS	Municipality of Zacatecas	Chequeo	Médico	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.00%
ZACATECAS	Congress	Contracts	2	1	1	1	1	1	1		
ZACATECAS	Congress	Budget Congress	2	1	1	1	1	1	1		
ZACATECAS	Congress	Roll call votes	2	1	1	1	1	0	1		
ZACATECAS	Congress	Religious organizations	2	1	1	1	0	1	1	93.74%	

Bibliography

Ayllón, Sergio (2006) "Study on transparency of other subjects required by the Federal Law of Transparency and Access to Public Government Information" (CIDE)

Legislative Monitor (2006) "Report of transparency in the legislative branch in Mexico" (CIDE)

Legislative Monitor (2007) "Report of transparency in the legislatures of the states in Mexico" (CIDE)

Guerrero Gutierrez, Eduardo and Leticia Ramirez de Alba Leal (200?) "Transparency in Mexico at the subnational level: a comparative assessment of state laws" (IFAI)

IFAI (2005) "A comparative study of laws on access to public information"

Villanueva, Ernesto (2005) "The right of access to public information in Mexico. Indicators legal "(LIMAC)

Luban, David. "The principle of publicity." In Goodin, Robert (2003). Theory of institutional design. Ed. Gedisa, Spain.

Escobedo, Juan Francisco (2004), "Mobilization of public opinion: the case of Oaxaca Group and the Federal Law of Transparency and Access to Information," Mexico: polyarchies under construction, Mexico, Universidad Iberoamericana.

Lowi, Theodore (2003). "Public policies, case studies and political theory." In Aguilar Villanueva, Luis F. The shape of policies. Mexico, M.A. Porrúa.

Mendez, Jose Luis. "Public policy as a dependent variable: toward a more comprehensive analysis of public policies." Mexico, January-February 1993.

Wilson, J.Q. Political Organizations, New York, Basic Books, 1973. In Mendez, José Luis. Op. Cit. 1993