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The rule of law is fundamental in guaranteeing security, justice, human rights, effective democracy, and sustainable development. However, in Mexico, the strengthening of the rule of law continues to be a pending issue. Violence, corruption, and impunity affect millions of Mexicans and are testaments to the lack of mechanisms to guarantee the adherence to norms for an effectively organized society and government.

Recent changes in government at the local, state, and federal levels present a unique opportunity to begin a collective process of institutional consolidation aimed at strengthening the rule of law in Mexico. With this in mind, the WJP presents the Mexico States Rule of Law Index 2019–2020, the second edition of the most comprehensive citizen-based measurement of the rule of law in Mexico's 32 states. The Index presents new data organized into eight factors of the rule of law: Constraints on Government Powers, Absence of Corruption, Open Government, Fundamental Rights, Order and Security, Regulatory Enforcement, Civil Justice, and Criminal Justice. The scores for these factors reflect the perceptions and experiences of over 25,000 citizens across the entire country and of over 2,600 specialists, in addition to a variety of third-party survey databases related to rule of law topics. Behind every indicator is a detailed academic analysis supported by experts in each subject and a significant effort to collect, verify, and validate the data.

The results of the Index show persistent challenges in all states regarding corruption and justice, and, in most of them, a worrying deterioration of security. Despite these results, there are important differences in the performance and progress of the 32 states. The scores increased in fifteen states, decreased in eleven, and remained unchanged in six. Of the eight factors of the Index, the most states saw improvements in their Constraints on Government Powers scores.

Mexico faces major institutional challenges, especially at the state and municipal levels. Therefore, it is necessary to advance alliances and policies that strengthen its institutions and ensure compliance with the law. Such transformation, however, is complex and requires the participation and commitment of all areas of government, the private sector, political forces, civil society organizations, and the media. The WJP seeks to contribute to this effort by generating specialized, accurate, and timely data. Our goal is that the scores published here are used as a reference to evaluate the performance of state authorities over time and motivate actions aimed at strengthening the rule of law in Mexico.

Dr. Alejandro Ponce
Chief Research Officer, World Justice Project
The Mexico States Rule of Law Index 2019-2020 captures the experiences and perceptions of over 25,000 citizens and 2,600 experts in the 32 states of the country.
The Index presents new data organized into 42 subfactors and eight factors: Constraints on Government Powers, Absence of Corruption, Open Government, Fundamental Rights, Order and Security, Regulatory Enforcement, Civil Justice, and Criminal Justice. These factors summarize different components of the rule of law, provide information regarding the institutional strengths and weaknesses of each state, and serve as reference points to evaluate the performance of state authorities over time or in comparison to other states. This is the second edition of the Index, which allows for the identification of developments and persistent challenges on topics related to the rule of law.

This Index is unique. It uses information obtained firsthand from citizens to capture the voices of thousands of people in urban and rural areas in the 32 states of the country. Specifically, the Index uses over 600 variables generated from answers to a General Population Poll (GPP) of 25,600 people, answers to Qualified Respondents’ Questionnaires (QRQs) administered to over 2,600 attorneys and experts in criminal law, civil law, labor law, and public health, and information produced by other institutions (third-party sources). For more details on the methodology used by the WJP, please refer to “Sources of Information” (page 20) and “Methodology” (page 56).

The Index is aimed at a wide audience that includes legislators, civil society organizations, academia, and the media, among others. Our intention is that this tool is used to identify strengths and weaknesses in each state, and promote public policies that strengthen the rule of law in Mexico.

Box 1: Main features of the Mexico States Rule of Law Index
There are several features that differentiate the Mexico States Rule of Law Index 2019–2020 from other measurements and indices:

1. Rule of Law in Practice: The Index measures adherence to the rule of law by looking at policy outcomes, such as whether people have access to courts or whether crime is effectively controlled. This stands in contrast to efforts that focus on the written legal code or the institutional means by which a society may seek to achieve these policy outcomes.

2. Comprehensive and Multi-Dimensional Theoretical Framework: While other indices cover particular aspects of the rule of law, such as absence of corruption or human rights, they do not yield a full picture of the state of the rule of law. The WJP Mexico States Rule of Law Index is the only instrument that looks at the rule of law comprehensively in Mexico.

3. Perspective of Ordinary People: The WJP Mexico States Rule of Law Index puts people at its core. It looks at a country’s adherence to the rule of law from the perspective of ordinary individuals and their experiences with the rule of law. The Index examines practical, everyday situations, such as whether people can access public services and whether a dispute among neighbors can be resolved peacefully and cost-effectively by an independent adjudicator.

4. New Data Anchored in Actual Experiences: The Index is based on primary data obtained from the assessments of the general population and experts. This ensures that the findings reflect the conditions experienced by actual people from different segments of the population, including those from marginalized sectors of society.

5. Adapted to the Reality in Mexico: Lastly, even though the Mexico States Rule of Law Index 2019–2020 uses the same conceptual framework and methodology that the WJP Rule of Law Index uses on a global level, the surveys and third-party sources have been adapted to reflect the institutional architecture in Mexico, the competencies of the different government levels, and the availability of data.
Summary Table: Scores and rankings

The following map and table present the scores and rankings of the *Mexico States Rule of Law Index 2019-2020*. Scores range from 0 to 1, with 1 indicating the strongest adherence to the rule of law. No state has a perfect score. In fact, the highest score is 0.46 (Yucatán), which implies that all states face important challenges. Even though the *Mexico States Rule of Law Index 2019-2020* is based on the methodology that the WJP *Rule of Law Index* has used on a global level for many years, its scores cannot be compared to those found in the global Index due to adaptations of the conceptual framework and methodology applied to the Mexico Index in order to strengthen local measurement and reflect the national context. A section that summarizes the differences between the Global Index and the Mexico States Index is found on page 61.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Score*</th>
<th>Change 2018–2019–2020*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yucatán</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Aguascalientes</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Zacatecas</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Campeche</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Querétaro</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Coahuila</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Nuevo León</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Durango</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Guanajuato</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Hidalgo</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Sinaloa</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Colima</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Baja California</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Oaxaca</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Chihuahua</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Nayarit</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Baja California Sur</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Michoacán</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Tamaulipas</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>San Luis Potosí</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Sonora</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Veracruz</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Chiapas</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Tabasco</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Tlaxcala</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Jalisco</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>State of Mexico</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Mexico City</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Morelos</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Quintana Roo</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Puebla</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Guerrero</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Scores are rounded to two decimal places
The Mexico States Rule of Law Index 2019-2020 is the second edition of the most comprehensive measurement of the rule of law in Mexico’s 32 states.


The scores of the eight factors are disaggregated into 42 sub-factors, which reflect the perspectives and experiences of more than 25,000 citizens from all over the country and more than 2,600 specialists in civil justice, criminal justice, labor justice, and public health, as well as the results of a variety of surveys and databases on topics related to the rule of law (third-party sources).

The Index uses a scale from 0 to 1, where 1 indicates the highest adherence to the rule of law. Like in the last edition, no state has a perfect score, which implies that all states face important challenges.¹

The states with the highest scores in the Mexico States Rule of Law Index 2019–2020 are Yucatán (0.46), Aguascalientes (0.45), and Zacatecas (0.43). These same states were at the top of the ranking in the 2018 edition of the Index. The states with the lowest places are Guerrero (0.33), Puebla (0.35), and Quintana Roo (0.35). In the last edition, Guerrero was also at the bottom of the ranking.

Since the last edition, the scores of the Mexico States Rule of Law Index increased in 15 states (Aguascalientes, Baja California Sur, Chihuahua, Colima, Durango, Guanajuato, Guerrero, Nayarit, Nuevo León, Oaxaca, Sinaloa, Sonora, Tamaulipas, Veracruz and Yucatán), decreased in 11 (Baja California, Chiapas, Mexico City, Michoacán, Morelos, Puebla, Quintana Roo, San Luis Potosí, Tabasco, Tlaxcala and Zacatecas) and remained unchanged in 6 (Campeche, Coahuila, State of Mexico, Hidalgo, Jalisco and Querétaro).

Changes in scores by factor

Statistically significant changes in the scores of each factor of the Mexico States Rule of Law Index 2019–2020, compared to 2018.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mexico States Rule of Law Index</th>
<th>States with a decrease in its score</th>
<th>States with an increase in its score</th>
<th>States without a statistically significant change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Factor 1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 3*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹Factor 3 did not have any changes since the 2018 version of the Index. For more details on the measurement of Factor 3, refer to the Methodology section.

1 Scores are rounded to two decimal places
Improvements and Setbacks of the Rule of Law in Mexico

Changes in the scores of the Mexico States Rule of Law Index from 2018 to 2019–2020, by state

Note: The scores are on a scale of 0 to 1, where 1 means greater adherence to the Rule of Law.
Main findings

The most worrisome result of the *Mexico States Rule of Law Index 2019–2020* is the decline in Factor 5, Order and Security, which decreased its score in 19 states (all statistically significant), due to the increase in the homicide rate (sub-factor 5.1, which decreased in 13 states), the increase in the prevalence and incidence of crime (sub-factor 5.2, which decreased in 15 states), and the deterioration in citizens’ perception of security (sub-factor 5.3, which decreased in 18 states).

The data also show persistent challenges in Factor 2, which measures absence of corruption, defined as the use of public power to obtain private benefits. In this topic, the lowest scores are in sub-factor 2.4, which measures the perceptions of corruption in local legislatures.

Another aspect that requires special attention is Factor 7, Civil Justice, which measures whether people can resolve their grievances peacefully and effectively through the civil justice system. In most states, the sub-factors with the lowest scores in this topic are related to access to justice and procedural efficiency of the civil justice system.

Most states also face major challenges in Factor 8, which evaluates the effectiveness and quality of the criminal justice system. Specially, many states face challenges in sub-factor 8.1, which measures whether the police and the Prosecutor’s Office (Ministerio Público) investigate crimes efficiently. Of the eight sub-factors under Factor 8, this is the sub-factor with the lowest scores in every state of the country. This is largely due to the ‘dark figure,’ or the number of crimes that are not reported or recorded by the police. INEGI estimates this figure at 93.2% nationally, according to the National Survey on Victimization and Perception of Public Security (ENVIPE) 2019.

Strengths and improvements of the rule of law in Mexico

Despite these results, the Index also shows some progress. The scores of Factor 1, Constraints on Government Powers, which measures the extent to which those who govern are bound by law, increased in 26 states (nine of them statistically significant). These increases were caused by changes in citizen perceptions of the effectiveness of state systems to sanction public officials who abuse their power (sub-factor 1.4, which increased in 30 states) and by changes in the perceptions about freedom and transparency in elections (sub-factor 1.6, which increased in 24 states). As in the 2018 edition, the results of the *Mexico States Rule of Law Index 2019–2020* show that the most effective checks on the power of governors in Mexico are civil society and the press (sub-factor 1.5).

---

2 Yucatán, Coahuila, Chiapas, Hidalgo, Querétaro, Tlaxcala, San Luis Potosí, Sinaloa, Tamaulipas, Zacatecas, Puebla, Quintana Roo, Jalisco, Tabasco, Sonora, Guanajuato, Mexico City, Baja California and Morelos.

### Rule of Law by Factor

Scores and rankings of the *Mexico States Rule of Law Index 2019–2020*

#### Factor 1: Constraints on Government Powers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Score*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Nuevo León</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Baja California</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Colima</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Yucatán</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Zacatecas</td>
<td>0.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Aguascalientes</td>
<td>0.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Campeche</td>
<td>0.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Hidalgo</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Querétaro</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Tlaxcala</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Tabasco</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Guanajuato</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Sinaloa</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Chihuahua</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Oaxaca</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Baja California</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*</td>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>San Luis Potosí</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Sonora</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Jalisco</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Durango</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Morelos</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Nayarit</td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Michoacán</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Mexico City</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>State of Mexico</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Tamaulipas</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Coahuila</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Chiapas</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Guerrero</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Puebla</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Quintana Roo</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Veracruz</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Scores are rounded to two decimal places

#### Factor 2: Absence of Corruption

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Score*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Querétaro</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Zacatecas</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Guanajuato</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Aguascalientes</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Colima</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Nuevo León</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Yucatán</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Hidalgo</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Campeche</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Sinaloa</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Baja California</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Nayarit</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Tamaulipas</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*</td>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Oaxaca</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Chihuahua</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Tabasco</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Baja California</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Coahuila</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Veracruz</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Sonora</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>San Luis Potosí</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Michoacán</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Morelos</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Tlaxcala</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Puebla</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Durango</td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Quintana Roo</td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Jalisco</td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>State of Mexico</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Guerrero</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Chiapas</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Mexico City</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Scores are rounded to two decimal places
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Weaker adherence to the rule of law
Stronger adherence to the rule of law

---
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Score*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Mexico City</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Guanajuato</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Jalisco</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>State of Mexico</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Zacatecas</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Aguascalientes</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Sinaloa</td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Sonora</td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Coahuila</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Michoacán</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Baja California</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Veracruz</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Tabasco</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Quintana Roo</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Durango</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Nuevo León</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Morelos</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Chihuahua</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Yucatán</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Guerrero</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Campeche</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Hidalgo</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>San Luis Potosí</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Colima</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Chiapas</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Baja California Sur</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Puebla</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Tamaulipas</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Oaxaca</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Nayarit</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Tlaxcala</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Querétaro</td>
<td>0.27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Weaker adherence to the rule of law

Stronger adherence to the rule of law

*Scores are rounded to two decimal places
## Factor 5
### Order and Security

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yucatán</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Durango</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Coahuila</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Chiapas</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Campeche</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Hidalgo</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Aguascalientes</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Veracruz</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Oaxaca</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Nayarit</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Tamaulipas</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Querétaro</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Michoacán</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Nuevo León</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Baja California Sur</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Sinaloa</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Tlaxcala</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Zacatecas</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>San Luis Potosí</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Chihuahua</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Colima</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Jalisco</td>
<td>0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Sonora</td>
<td>0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Quintana Roo</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Puebla</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Tabasco</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Guerrero</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Mexico City</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Guanajuato</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>State of Mexico</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Baja California</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Morelos</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Scores are rounded to two decimal places

### Factor 6
### Regulatory Enforcement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Querétaro</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Guanajuato</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Baja California</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Campeche</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Aguascalientes</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Zacatecas</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Colima</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Nuevo León</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Puebla</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Yucatán</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Chihuahua</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Coahuila</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Sinaloa</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Oaxaca</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Veracruz</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Baja California Sur</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Tamaulipas</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Durango</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>State of Mexico</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Tlaxcala</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Hidalgo</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>San Luis Potosí</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Guerrero</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Quintana Roo</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Jalisco</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Michoacán</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Nayarit</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Morelos</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Sonora</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Mexico City</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Chiapas</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Tabasco</td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Scores are rounded to two decimal places
### Civil Justice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Score*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Guanajuato</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Nuevo León</td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Durango</td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Aguascalientes</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Campeche</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Baja California</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Sinaloa</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Chihuahua</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Zacatecas</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Colima</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Yucatán</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Querétaro</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Coahuila</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Sonora</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>State of Mexico</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*</td>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.36</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Hidalgo</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>San Luis Potosí</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Morelos</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Mexico City</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Oaxaca</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Tabasco</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Quintana Roo</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Nayarit</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Puebla</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Tamaulipas</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Michoacán</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Baja California Sur</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Tlaxcala</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Veracruz</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Jalisco</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Chiapas</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Guerrero</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Scores are rounded to two decimal places

### Criminal Justice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Score*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Querétaro</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Zacatecas</td>
<td>0.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Sinaloa</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Guanajuato</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Aguascalientes</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Oaxaca</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Coahuila</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Hidalgo</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Nayarit</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Colima</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Tabasco</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Durango</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Yucatán</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Chihuahua</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Nuevo León</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*</td>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.38</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Michoacán</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Sonora</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>San Luis Potosí</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Tamaulipas</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Baja California Sur</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Baja California</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Campeche</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Tlaxcala</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Morelos</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Quintana Roo</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Chiapas</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Jalisco</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>State of Mexico</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Veracruz</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Puebla</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Mexico City</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Guerrero</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Scores are rounded to two decimal places
What is the Rule of Law?
The rule of law is a principle of governance in which the government and private actors alike are accountable under the law, and that those laws are clear, publicized, stable, just, applied evenly, and protect fundamental rights. It also requires that the process by which the laws are enacted, administered, and enforced is accessible, fair, and efficient, and that justice is delivered in a timely manner by competent, ethical, and independent representatives and neutrals who are accessible, have adequate resources, and reflect the makeup of the communities they serve. The rule of law is one of the necessary pillars upon which societies can promote equality of opportunities, sustainable development, effective democracy, and peace.

The rule of law is recognized by the international community as an essential element of sustainable development and made part of Goal 16 of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, approved by the United Nations (UN) General Assembly in 2015. Goal 16 aims to promote fair, peaceful, and inclusive societies, and target 16.3 specifically invites countries to “promote the rule of law at the national and international levels and ensure equal access to justice for all.”

How is the Rule of Law Measured? Conceptual Framework of the Mexico States Rule of Law Index
The rule of law as a concept is notoriously difficult to define and measure. The Mexico States Rule of Law Index 2019-2020 approaches this challenge by building a series of indicators that capture multiple outcomes of the rule of law in everyday life, defined using the four universal principles highlighted in Box 2.

The Mexico States Rule of Law Index 2019-2020 uses a conceptual framework and methodology very similar to those used by WJP around the world, but with concepts, surveys, and third-party sources adapted to the Mexican context in order to provide a comprehensive summary of the rule of law situation in each of the states and respond to the national reality, the availability of data, the institutional architecture, and the competencies of the different levels of government. The Mexico States Rule of Law Index 2019-2020 is comprised of eight factors: Constraints on Government Powers, Absence of Corruption, Open Government, Fundamental Rights, Order and Security, Regulatory Enforcement, Civil Justice, And Criminal Justice.

The conceptual framework connecting these indicators is based on two main principles regarding the relationship between the government and the citizens. First, that the law imposes limits on the exercise of power by the state and its agents, as well as individuals and private entities. This is measured in factors 1, 2, 3, and 4. Second, the state limits the actions of members of society and fulfills its basic duties towards its population so that the public interest is served, people are protected from violence, and all members of society have access to dispute resolution and grievance mechanisms. This is measured in factors 5, 6, 7, and 8.

Box 2: Four Universal Principles of the Rule of Law
The WJP uses a working definition of the rule of law based on four universal principles derived from internationally accepted standards. The rule of law is a system where the following four universal principles are upheld:

1. Accountability: The government as well as private actors are accountable under the law.
2. Just Laws: The laws are clear, publicized, stable, and just; are applied evenly; and protect fundamental rights, including the security of persons and property and certain core human rights.
3. Open government: The processes by which the laws are enacted, administered, and enforced are accessible, fair, and efficient.
4. Accessible & Impartial Dispute Resolution: Justice is delivered in a timely manner by competent, ethical, and independent representatives and neutrals who are accessible, have adequate resources, and reflect the makeup of the communities they serve.

*Refer to page 21 to consult the footnotes.
Factors and Sub-Factors of the Mexico States Rule of Law Index

Factor 1

Constraints on Government Powers: Factor 1 measures the extent to which those who govern are bound by law. It comprises the means, both constitutional and institutional, by which the powers of the governors, mayors, and other authorities in the state’s executive branch are limited and held accountable under the law for their actions. This factor also considers the role played by the non-governmental checks on the government’s power, such as the press, civil society organizations, and political parties. Specifically, the factor is comprised of the following six sub-factors:

1.1 Government powers are effectively limited by the local legislature
Measures whether local legislative bodies have the ability in practice to exercise effective checks on and oversight of the government. It also measures whether legislators in the opposition can express their opinions against government policies without fear of retaliation.

1.2 Government powers are effectively limited by the local judiciary
Measures whether the judiciary has the independence and the ability in practice to exercise effective checks on the state government and whether authorities comply with the decisions of courts.

1.3 State government powers are effectively limited by independent auditing and review
Measures whether comptrollers or auditors, as well as human rights ombudsman agencies, have sufficient independence and the ability to exercise effective checks on and oversight of the state government and apply penalties in practice.

1.4 State government officials are penalized when they abuse their powers or fail to comply with regulations
Measures whether government officials who abuse their powers or fail to comply with regulations are punished in practice. The sub-factor considers officials in the executive, legislative, and judicial branches, as well as police officers.

1.5 State government powers are subject to non-governmental checks from civil society, political parties and the press
Measures whether journalists, civil society organizations, political parties, activists, and individuals are free to report and comment on government policies without fear of retaliation. The sub-factor also measures whether people can speak freely and protest peacefully against the government or whether they can present petitions to the government.

1.6 Elections are free, clean and transparent
Measures the integrity of the electoral process, including access to the ballot, the absence of intimidation, and public scrutiny of election results.

Factor 2

Absence of Corruption: This factor measures the absence of corruption, defined as the use of public power to obtain private benefits in the local executive branch, the judiciary, the legislature, and safety and law enforcement systems. This factor considers three types of corruption: bribery, improper influence, and misappropriation of public funds, and is divided into four sub-factors.

2.1 Government officials in the state executive branch do not commit acts of corruption
Measures the integrity of officials in the state executive branch through the absence of bribery, informal payments, and other inducements in the delivery of public services and the enforcement of regulations. It also measures the transparency of bidding processes and whether the government officials refrain from embezzling public funds.

2.2 Government officials in the judicial branch do not use public office for private gain
Measures whether judges and judicial officials refrain from soliciting and accepting bribes to perform duties or expedite processes, and whether the judiciary and judicial rulings are free of improper influence by the government, private interests, and criminal organizations.

*Refer to page 21 to consult the footnotes.*
2.3 Government officials in the safety and law enforcement systems do not use public office for private gain

Measures whether police officers and criminal investigators refrain from soliciting and accepting bribes, and whether they are free from improper influence by private interests or criminal organizations. It also measures the absence of corruption in the army and navy.

2.4 Government officials in the legislative branch do not use public office for private gain

Measures whether members of the legislature refrain from soliciting or accepting bribes or other inducements in exchange for political favors or favorable votes on legislation.

Factor 3

Open Government: Factor 3 measures the openness of government, defined by the extent to which government shares information, empowers people with tools to hold the government accountable, and fosters citizen participation in public policy deliberations. In other words, it measures whether citizens can know the actions of the government and whether they can influence their deliberations. The factor presents information from the Open Government Metric 2017, performed by the National Institute of Access to Information (INAI) and the Center for Economic Research and Teaching (CIDE), which uses an extremely robust conceptual framework and methodology and is transparent and public. The Open Government Metric incorporates two fundamental aspects of open government: citizen participation (3.1) and transparency (3.2).

3.1 Civic participation in decision-making

Measures whether citizens can effectively participate in the formulation of public policies.

3.2 The right to public information is effectively guaranteed

Measures whether citizens have access to public information and open data, including the availability of information (active transparency) and the response to requests for information (passive transparency). It also measures how feasible it is for citizens to obtain public information in a prompt and complete manner.

Factor 4

Fundamental Rights: Factor 4 measures the effective protection of human rights, recognizing that a governance system that does not guarantee the fundamental rights established by international law is not a rule of law system. This factor is focused on the civil and individual rights established under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, which are most closely related to the rule of law (first-generation rights), leaving aside the second- and third-generation rights (economic and social rights and solidarity rights), which are measured, directly or indirectly, by other metrics. Currently, in Mexico there is no adequate data to measure sub-factor 4.2 on a state level, and it cannot be properly quantified through surveys. Therefore, it has been left as an empty value that has no effect on scores.

4.1 Equal treatment and absence of discrimination

Measures whether individuals are free from discrimination in practice, which is understood as a distinction, exclusion, restriction, or preference based on socio-economic status, gender, race, ethnicity, religion, national origin, sexual orientation, gender identity, disability, or educational level, with respect to public services or everyday experiences.

4.2 The right to life and security of the person is effectively guaranteed

Measures the absence of extrajudicial executions, forced disappearances, and whether political dissidents or activists are subjected to unjustified detentions, threats, abusive treatment, or violence.9

4.3 Due process of the law and rights of the accused are effectively guaranteed

Measures respect for investigation rules and due process. It measures whether the basic rights of criminal suspects are respected, including the presumption of innocence, the freedom from arbitrary arrest and unreasonable pre-trial detention, the right to not be tortured, to have a fair and public trial before an independent, competent, and impartial court, and the right to adequate legal assistance. In addition, it measures whether the principle of equality is respected in the criminal process.

4.4 Freedom of opinion and expression is effectively guaranteed

Measures whether journalists, civil society organizations, political parties, and individuals are free to report and comment on government policies without fear of retaliation. The sub-factor also measures whether people may speak freely and protest peacefully against the government and whether they may present petitions to the government.

*Refer to page 21 to consult the footnotes.
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4.5 Freedom of belief and religion is effectively guaranteed
Measures whether people can worship and conduct religious practices freely and publicly, without fear of retaliation.

4.7 Freedom of assembly and association is effectively guaranteed
Measures whether people can freely attend peaceful protests, community meetings, sign petitions, and join political organizations without fear of retaliation.

4.6 The right to privacy is effectively guaranteed
Measures whether the police or other government officials spy on or intercept electronic communications of activists and the opposition and whether they conduct physical searches without warrants.

4.8 Fundamental labor rights are effectively guaranteed
Measures the effective enforcement of fundamental labor rights, including the right to social security, safety and health conditions at work, freedom of association and the right to collective bargaining, the absence of discrimination with respect to employment, and the freedom from forced labor and child labor.

Factor 5
Order & Security: Factor 5 measures whether the state effectively guarantees the safety of people and property. Security is one of the defining aspects of any society with rule of law and is a fundamental function of the state. It is also a precondition for the realization of rights and freedoms that the rule of law seeks to advance. This factor does not include crimes such as drug trafficking, organized crime, money laundering, theft of fuel, and human trafficking, among others, because these crimes are not suitable for measurement through surveys, and there is currently no consistent, uniform, high-quality data for them in the country. The violence caused by organized crime is indirectly captured by the number of murders and perceptions of insecurity.

5.1 Absence of homicides
Measures the homicide rate for every 100,000 people as an approximation of peace by recognizing that the state is responsible for protecting people’s lives.

5.2 Ausencia de crimen
Measures the absence of crimes that directly affect people and homes. It incorporates measurements of the incidence and prevalence of crimes.

5.3 Perception of safety
Measures whether people feel safe in their state and in spaces such as their homes, work, streets, schools, markets, parks, malls, banks, ATMs, public transport, cars, and roads. It also measures the perception of safety of businesses in the state.

Factor 6
Regulatory Enforcement: Factor 6 measures the extent to which regulations are fairly and effectively implemented. Factor 6 does not assess which activities a government chooses to regulate, nor does it consider how much regulation of a particular activity is appropriate. Rather, it examines how regulations are implemented and enforced in aspects such as public health, workplace safety, environmental protection, and commercial activities.

6.1 Government regulations are effectively enforced
Measures whether government regulations, such as labor, environmental, commercial, and public health are effectively enforced and whether authorities investigate and penalize those that do not comply with regulations.

6.2 Government regulations are applied and enforced without corruption
Measures whether the enforcement of regulations and processes such as payments are subject to corruption and improper influences.

6.3 Administrative proceedings are conducted effectively and efficiently
Measures whether administrative procedures are conducted effectively, efficiently, and without unreasonable delay.

6.4 Due process is respected in administrative proceedings
Measures whether due process of the law is respected in administrative proceedings.

6.5 The state government does not expropriate without lawful process and adequate compensation
Measures whether the government respects the property rights of people and corporations, refrains from the illegal seizure of private property, and provides adequate compensation when property is legally expropriated without delays. This sub-factor considers direct and indirect expropriation and measures respect of intellectual property.
Factor 7

**Civil Justice**: Factor 7 measures whether people can resolve their grievances peacefully and effectively through the civil justice system. To guarantee access to civil justice, it is necessary for people to know and trust the formal mechanisms to solve legal problems (7.1), for adequate and affordable counsel to be available (7.2), and for civil justice to not impose barriers through cost or bureaucratic processes (7.3). The effective application of civil justice also requires that the system be impartial, independent, and free of corruption and improper influences (7.4); that judicial procedures respect due process (7.5); that procedures be performed promptly and without unreasonable delay (7.6); and that judicial resolutions be applied effectively (7.7). Lastly, this factor measures the accessibility, impartiality, and effectiveness of mediation and arbitration systems that allow parties to resolve disputes (7.8).

7.1 People know their rights and trust civil justice institutions
Measures whether people are aware of their rights, know what to do and where to go when faced with a civil legal problem, and whether they trust the formal mechanisms to solve disputes. It also includes a measurement of the difficulties faced by people due to lack of information.

7.2 People have access to information and affordable quality legal counsel when facing legal problems or disputes
Measures whether people have access to adequate, affordable, and quality legal counsel when facing civil and labor legal problems, including free legal assistance if they lack the means to pay for it.

7.3 People can resolve their legal problems easily and without high costs or bureaucratic procedures
Measures whether people can access the civil justice system without facing high costs or problems caused by the complexity of requirements and procedures.

7.4 The civil justice system is impartial, independent and free of corruption
Measures whether the civil justice system is free of discrimination, corruption, and improper influences. The sub-factor includes measurements on the use of bribery to rush processes or favor a particular party, as well as the use of improper influence in the designation and promotion of court personnel. It also quantifies whether judges solve cases independently and objectively.

7.5 The civil justice system guarantees a quality process
Measures whether the civil justice system respects due process and guarantees quality processes and resolutions. It also includes variables regarding the adequate education and professionalization of mediators and judges.

7.6 The civil justice system is not subject to unreasonable delay
Measures whether civil justice proceedings are conducted in a timely manner and without unreasonable delay during the resolution of disputes.

7.7 Resolutions of civil and administrative courts are effectively enforced
Measures whether the civil justice system effectively solves disputes and if civil justice decisions are effectively and efficiently enforced.

7.8 Alternative dispute resolution mechanisms are accessible, impartial and effective
Measures whether alternative dispute resolution mechanisms are accessible, efficient, enforceable, timely, and free of corruption.

7.9 The civil justice system guarantees a quality process
Measures whether the civil justice system respects due process and guarantees quality processes and resolutions. It also includes variables regarding the adequate education and professionalization of mediators and judges.

Factor 8

**Criminal Justice**

Factor 8 evaluates the effectiveness and quality of the criminal justice system. An effective criminal justice system is a key aspect of the rule of law, as it constitutes the conventional mechanism to redress grievances. A quality criminal justice system must respect the rights of victims and the accused. This is why a comprehensive assessment of the criminal justice system must take into consideration the actions of all participants in the system, including the police, lawyers, legal counsels for victims, prosecutors, judges and prison officers.

8.1 The police and the public ministry investigate crimes effectively
Measures whether the justice system is effective at solving crimes and respecting due process. It includes structural variables such as resources, equipment and technology, sufficiency of personnel, training and education of agents in charge of the investigation of crimes, the sufficiency of crime information systems, and indicators of outcomes regarding the effectiveness of investigations.

8.2 The criminal adjudication system is timely and effective
Measures whether the criminal adjudication system is timely and effective, including whether it is capable of solving cases effectively and without unreasonable delays.
8.3 Victim's rights are effectively guaranteed
Measures whether the criminal justice system as a whole respects victims' rights. It includes medical and psychological assistance, legal counsel, restitution, protection, and the effectiveness of alternative mechanisms to solve disputes in criminal matters.

8.5 Criminal justice system is impartial, independent and free of corruption
Measures whether the police and criminal judges are impartial, independent, and free of corruption and improper influence. The sub-factor includes measurements of the use of bribery and the improper influence of political powers, economic powers, and organized crime to favor a party in the criminal process. It also includes measurements for the use of bribery and improper influence in the recruiting and promotion processes.

8.4 Due process of the law for the accused is effectively guaranteed
Measures whether due process of the law is respected, including the presumption of innocence, the principle of equality in the criminal process, absence of discrimination, the treatment received by detained people, the right to an adequate defense, and the right to a public trial before a competent and impartial judge.

8.6 The prison system guarantees the safety and rights of detained people
Measures whether the prison system guarantees conditions of safety and order and respects the rights of the detained. It also measures the absence of corruption and the effectiveness of the prison system in reducing recidivism.

Sources of Information

The indicators presented in the Mexico States Rule of Law Index 2019-2020 measure adherence to the rule of law through 42 indicators that reflect the experiences and perceptions of people who live in Mexico. The Index shows the citizens' view of the rule of law in the 32 Mexican states, and is focused on outcomes rather than on the written legal code.

The Index uses three different sources of information: i) a General Population Poll (GPP), ii) Qualified Respondents' Questionnaires (QRQs) for experts and attorneys who practice in each of the 32 states, and iii) official statistics and databases compiled by other institutions (or third-party sources). The use of three sources allows WJP to measure the rule of law from different complementary perspectives, use a large number of questions, and use the best sources for measurement of the different concepts, which reduces the bias that could come from a single method of data collection.

The Mexico States Rule of Law Index is the result of a long process of development, validation, and consultation. The surveys, designed by the WJP, are the result of a comprehensive consultation with academia and experts and feedback from various forums and meetings. Third-party sources were selected by the WJP team after reviewing over 30 databases and surveys. The indicators were built following strict methodological criteria, reviewed for their conceptual consistency, validated using other metrics and indices, and subjected to a sensitivity analysis to guarantee their reliability. The purpose of this Index is to provide reliable information that can be compared over time and used to design public policies in Mexico.

1. General Population Poll: The general population poll for the Mexico States Rule of Law Index 2019-2020 was administered to a representative sample of 800 adults in each state, yielding a total of 25,600 surveyed individuals. The GPP was designed by WJP and includes questions regarding the perception and experience of issues such as fundamental rights, civic participation, knowledge of the law, discrimination, contact with police and armed forces, corruption, safety, institutional performance, ordinary justice, and elections. The GPP was administered in a coordinated manner by four leading public opinion companies in Mexico from May to July 2019. The interviews were conducted face-to-face using tablets and smartphones. In order to guarantee the quality of the information, traditional in-situ supervision techniques were applied by the field personnel, and remote supervision techniques were applied in real time by a fifth survey monitoring company.

2. Qualified Respondents' Questionnaires: The WJP designed four Qualified Respondents' Questionnaires (QRQs), aimed at attorneys specialized in: i) civil, administrative, and commercial law; ii) criminal law; iii) labor law; and to health personnel specialized in iv) public health. The QRQs include questions regarding the perception of the performance of state authorities, focused specifically on the performance of justice authorities in the specialized fields of each surveyed individual. The WJP collected more than 16,000 attorney contacts across the entire country and
invited them to respond the questionnaires. The WJP administered the survey online from April to August 2019 and obtained 2,673 complete surveys.

3. Third-party sources: The WJP compiled administrative information and state representative surveys addressing rule of law issues to complement the WJP’s other sources of information. The WJP used five criteria to select and include the data. The data had to be: i) conceptually valid, ii) timely, iii) disaggregated by state, iv) representative at the state level, and v) compiled using a transparent and robust methodology.

In total, 12 third-party sources were included in the Mexico States Rule of Law Index 2019-2020: administrative records of murder rates by the National Institute of Statistics and Geography (INEGI), the National Survey on Victimization and Perception of Public Safety (ENVIPE) by INEGI, the National Survey of Population Deprived of Liberty (ENPOL) by INEGI, the National Survey on the Dynamics of Relationships in Homes (ENDIREH) by INEGI, the National Survey of Occupation and Employment (ENOE) by INEGI, the National Survey on Government Impact and Quality (ENCIG) by INEGI, the National Survey on Victimization of Companies (ENVE) by INEGI, the record of murdered journalists (Article 19), INAI/CIDE’s Open Government Metric, the data base of the National Diagnosis of Prison Supervision (DNSP) by the National Commission on Human Rights (CNDH), and prison statistics journals taken by the Department of Interior (Segob).

Box 3: Citizens listening to citizens: experiences during field work
The WJP hired leading survey companies in Mexico to conduct interviews of 25,600 people across the entire country. Translators and interpreters were used at times. This was an exercise in which citizens heard other citizens. The survey field teams worked to produce empathy and win the trust of respondents in order to ask questions regarding potentially sensitive subjects. Survey teams were exposed to unsafe and violent situations, such as threats and theft, but managed to capture the perception and experience of the general population in Mexico on the rule of law.

The survey companies that worked with WJP for the Mexico States Rule of Law Index 2019-2020 were:

1. **Data Opinión Pública y Mercados**: Coordination and monitoring of fieldwork.
2. **Buendía & Laredo**: Fieldwork in Mexico City, Durango, Guerrero, State of Mexico, Michoacán, Nayarit, Querétaro, San Luis Potosí, and Tlaxcala.
3. **Parametría**: Fieldwork in Baja California, Baja California Sur, Chihuahua, Quintana Roo, Sonora, Tamaulipas, Yucatán, and Zacatecas.
4. **Pulso Mercadológico**: Fieldwork in Campeche, Chiapas, Coahuila, Morelos, Oaxaca, Puebla, Sinaloa, and Tabasco.
5. **Sistemas de Inteligencia en Mercados y Opinión (SIMO)**: Fieldwork in Aguascalientes, Colima, Guanajuato, Hidalgo, Jalisco, Nuevo León, and Veracruz.

---


5 Refer to the Methodology section for detailed information on the differences between the Mexico States Rule of Law Index 2019-2020 and the global WJP Rule of Law Index.

6 Each of the 42 sub-factors are written as a statement that reflects concrete aspects of the rule of law and that fulfill certain characteristics, such as providing a clear interpretation of the concept for measurement, measuring progress towards a specific goal of the rule of law, providing a balanced measurement of each concept, and being sensitive to changes over time [Vera Institute of Justice (2003), Measuring Progress toward Safety and Justice: A Global Guide to the Design of Performance Indicators across the Justice Sector].

7 For more information regarding each factor and sub-factor in the global WJP Rule of Law Index, visit the website worldjusticeproject.org.

8 For the Mexico States Rule of Law Index 2019-2020, it was decided to use the Open Government Metric 2017, due to the adjustments made to its methodology in the 2019 version. Consult the Methodology section for more details.

9 Refer to the Methodology section to find more details regarding the measurement of sub-factor 4.2.

10 Refer to the Methodology section to find more details about third-party sources.
How to read the State Profiles

The state profiles show scores for each of the factors and sub-factors in the *Mexico States Rule of Law Index 2019-2020*. Scores range from 0 to 1, where 1 indicates the highest adherence to the rule of law. Each profile consists of four sections, outlined below.

**Section 1:** Displays the state’s overall score for the *Mexico States Rule of Law Index 2019-2020*, the state’s ranking, and a map that shows where the state is located. It also includes the change of score and position of the state with respect to the 2018 Index, as well as arrows indicating the direction of the change. Scores and changes in score are rounded to two decimal places. The rank is based on the exact score.

**Section 2:** Displays the state’s individual factor scores for the *Mexico States Rule of Law Index 2019-2020* and compares the state’s ranking to other states. It also includes arrows indicating changes in the scores of the factors with respect to the 2018 Index.

**Section 3:** Displays the state’s scores for each of the eight factors of the *Mexico States Rule of Law Index 2019-2020*. The center of the circle represents the lowest score (0) and the outside of the circle represents the highest score (1). The color area shows the state’s scores, and the black dotted line shows the average score.

**Section 4:** Presents the state’s disaggregated scores for each of the 42 sub-factors of the *Mexico States Rule of Law Index 2019-2020*. The black line shows the average score for the 32 states. Sub-factor 4.2 is not included in the measurement because there are no current systematized records to measure the concept in the country. Refer to the Methodology section for more details.
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*Refer to the methodology section to know more details about sub-factor 4.2
**Refer to the methodology section to know more details about Factor 3

Overall Rank 02/32
Change in Score 0.01
Change in Rank -
Baja California

Scores range from 0 to 1, with 1 indicating the strongest adherence to the rule of law

**Overall Score 2019-2020**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Rank</th>
<th>Change in Score</th>
<th>Change in Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13/32</td>
<td>-0.03 ▼</td>
<td>-6 ▼</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Factor Score**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor Score</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Trend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constraints on Government Powers</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>02/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absence of Corruption</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>11/32</td>
<td>▼</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Government</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>11/32</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fundamental Rights</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>3/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Order &amp; Security</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>31/32</td>
<td>▼</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulatory Enforcement</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>03/32</td>
<td>▼</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Justice</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>06/32</td>
<td>▼</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Justice</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>21/32</td>
<td>▼</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Constraints on Government Powers**

1.1 Limits by the legislature                        | 0.49  |
1.2 Limits by the judiciary                          | 0.55  |
1.3 Independent auditing                             | 0.31  |
1.4 Sanctions for official misconduct                | 0.43  |
1.5 Non-governmental checks                         | 0.58  |
1.6 Elections comply with the law                   | 0.52  |

**Absence of Corruption**

2.1 In the executive branch                          | 0.38  |
2.2 In the judiciary                                 | 0.49  |
2.3 In police/military                               | 0.36  |
2.4 In the legislature                               | 0.30  |

**Open Government**

3.1 Civic participation                              | 0.30  |
3.2 Right to information                             | 0.51  |

**Fundamental Rights**

4.1 Absence of discrimination                        | 0.51  |
4.2 Right to life and security*                      |       |
4.3 Due process of law                               | 0.44  |
4.4 Freedom of opinion                               | 0.58  |
4.5 Freedom of religion                              | 0.78  |
4.6 Right to privacy                                 | 0.38  |
4.7 Freedom of association                           | 0.63  |
4.8 Labor rights                                     | 0.46  |

**Order & Security**

5.1 Absence of homicides                             | 0.00  |
5.2 Absence of crime                                 | 0.17  |
5.3 Perception of safety                             | 0.41  |

**Regulatory Enforcement**

6.1 Efficient regulatory enforcement                 | 0.40  |
6.2 Regulatory enforcement free of corruption        | 0.57  |
6.3 Effiecient administrative procedures             | 0.33  |
6.4 Due process in administrative procedures         | 0.50  |
6.5 Property rights                                  | 0.35  |

**Civil Justice**

7.1 People know their rights                         | 0.35  |
7.2 Access to information and affordable legal counsel in civil justice | 0.46  |
7.3 Affordable civil justice without bureaucratic processes | 0.32  |
7.4 Impartial and independent civil justice free of corruption | 0.54  |
7.5 Quality civil justice                            | 0.44  |
7.6 No unreasonable delay in civil justice           | 0.29  |
7.7 Effective enforcement of civil decisions         | 0.38  |
7.8 Accessible, impartial and prompt ADRs            | 0.49  |

**Criminal Justice**

8.1 Effective criminal investigations                 | 0.24  |
8.2 Effective and efficient criminal adjudication     | 0.35  |
8.3 Rights of victims                                | 0.47  |
8.4 Due process of law                               | 0.44  |
8.5 Impartial and independent criminal justice free of corruption | 0.40  |
8.6 Safe prison systems that respect human rights    | 0.34  |

*Refer to the methodology section to know more details about sub-factor 4.2
**Refer to the methodology section to know more details about Factor 3
Baja California Sur
Scores range from 0 to 1, with 1 indicating the strongest adherence to the rule of law

Overall Score 2019-2020
0.39

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Rank</th>
<th>Change in Score</th>
<th>Change in Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17/32</td>
<td>0.04 ▲</td>
<td>14 ▲</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Factor Score**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor Score</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Trend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constraints on Government Powers</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>16/32</td>
<td>▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absence of Corruption</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>17/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Government **</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>26/32</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fundamental Rights</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>15/32</td>
<td>▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Order &amp; Security</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>15/32</td>
<td>▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulatory Enforcement</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>16/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Justice</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>27/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Justice</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>20/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Constraints on Government Powers**

- 1.1 Limits by the legislature 0.48
- 1.2 Limits by the judiciary 0.49
- 1.3 Independent auditing 0.29
- 1.4 Sanctions for official misconduct 0.35
- 1.5 Non-governmental checks 0.54
- 1.6 Elections comply with the law 0.48

**Absence of Corruption**

- 2.1 In the executive branch 0.33
- 2.2 In the judiciary 0.45
- 2.3 In police/military 0.36
- 2.4 In the legislature 0.29

**Open Government **

- 3.1 Civic participation 0.25
- 3.2 Right to information 0.44

**Fundamental Rights**

- 4.1 Absence of discrimination 0.51
- 4.2 Right to life and security* -
- 4.3 Due process of law 0.49
- 4.4 Freedom of opinion 0.54
- 4.5 Freedom of religion 0.81
- 4.6 Right to privacy 0.25
- 4.7 Freedom of association 0.58
- 4.8 Labor rights 0.36

**Order & Security**

- 5.1 Absence of homicides 0.17
- 5.2 Absence of crime 0.46
- 5.3 Perception of safety 0.55

**Regulatory Enforcement**

- 6.1 Efficient regulatory enforcement 0.38
- 6.2 Regulatory enforcement free of corruption 0.47
- 6.3 Efficient administrative procedures 0.33
- 6.4 Due process in administrative procedures 0.33
- 6.5 Property rights 0.36

**Civil Justice**

- 7.1 People know their rights 0.21
- 7.2 Access to information and affordable legal counsel in civil justice 0.39
- 7.3 Affordable civil justice without bureaucratic processes 0.26
- 7.4 Impartial and independent civil justice free of corruption 0.47
- 7.5 Quality civil justice 0.38
- 7.6 No unreasonable delay in civil justice 0.24
- 7.7 Effective enforcement of civil decisions 0.30
- 7.8 Accessible, impartial and prompt ADRs 0.38

**Criminal Justice**

- 8.1 Effective criminal investigations 0.22
- 8.2 Effective and efficient criminal adjudication 0.34
- 8.3 Rights of victims 0.47
- 8.4 Due process of law 0.49
- 8.5 Impartial and independent criminal justice free of corruption 0.41
- 8.6 Safe prison systems that respect human rights 0.30

*Refer to the methodology section to know more details about sub-factor 4.2
**Refer to the methodology section to know more details about Factor 3
Campeche

Scores range from 0 to 1, with 1 indicating the strongest adherence to the rule of law

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Score 2019-2020</th>
<th>0.43</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Rank</th>
<th>Change in Score</th>
<th>Change in Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>04/32</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor Score</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Trend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constraints on Government Powers</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>07/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absence of Corruption</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>09/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Government **</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>21/32</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fundamental Rights</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>20/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Order &amp; Security</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>05/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulatory Enforcement</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>04/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Justice</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>05/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Justice</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>22/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Factor Score Details**

**Constraints on Government Powers**
1.1 [ ] Limits by the legislature | 0.45
1.2 [ ] Limits by the judiciary | 0.49
1.3 [ ] Independent auditing | 0.34
1.4 [ ] Sanctions for official misconduct | 0.40
1.5 [ ] Non-governmental checks | 0.56
1.6 [ ] Elections comply with the law | 0.50

**Absence of Corruption**
2.1 [ ] In the executive branch | 0.43
2.2 [ ] In the judiciary | 0.46
2.3 [ ] In police/military | 0.35
2.4 [ ] In the legislature | 0.31

**Open Government **
3.1 [ ] Civic participation | 0.22
3.2 [ ] Right to information | 0.52

**Fundamental Rights**
4.1 [ ] Absence of discrimination | 0.45
4.2 [ ] Right to life and security* | -
4.3 [ ] Due process of law | 0.38
4.4 [ ] Freedom of opinion | 0.56
4.5 [ ] Freedom of religion | 0.80
4.6 [ ] Right to privacy | 0.31
4.7 [ ] Freedom of association | 0.58
4.8 [ ] Labor rights | 0.37

**Order & Security**
5.1 [ ] Absence of homicides | 0.58
5.2 [ ] Absence of crime | 0.54
5.3 [ ] Perception of safety | 0.47

**Regulatory Enforcement**
6.1 [ ] Efficient regulatory enforcement | 0.32
6.2 [ ] Regulatory enforcement free of corruption | 0.63
6.3 [ ] Efficient administrative procedures | 0.43
6.4 [ ] Due process in administrative procedures | 0.37
6.5 [ ] Property rights | 0.38

**Civil Justice**
7.1 [ ] People know their rights | 0.31
7.2 [ ] Access to information and affordable legal counsel in civil justice | 0.47
7.3 [ ] Affordable civil justice without bureaucratic processes | 0.34
7.4 [ ] Impartial and independent civil justice free of corruption | 0.49
7.5 [ ] Quality civil justice | 0.43
7.6 [ ] No unreasonable delay in civil justice | 0.38
7.7 [ ] Effective enforcement of civil decisions | 0.40
7.8 [ ] Accessible, impartial and prompt ADRs | 0.49

**Criminal Justice**
8.1 [ ] Effective criminal investigations | 0.20
8.2 [ ] Effective and efficient criminal adjudication | 0.34
8.3 [ ] Rights of victims | 0.44
8.4 [ ] Due process of law | 0.38
8.5 [ ] Impartial and independent criminal justice free of corruption | 0.39
8.6 [ ] Safe prison systems that respect human rights | 0.33

*Refer to the methodology section to know more details about sub-factor 4.2
**Refer to the methodology section to know more details about Factor 3

Mexico States Rule of Law Index 2019–2020 | 27
Chiapas

Scores range from 0 to 1, with 1 indicating the strongest adherence to the rule of law

**Overall Score 2019-2020**

0.38

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor Score</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Trend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constraints on Government Powers</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>28/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absence of Corruption</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>31/32</td>
<td>▼</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Government</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>25/32</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fundamental Rights</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>29/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Order &amp; Security</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>04/32</td>
<td>▼</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulatory Enforcement</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>31/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Justice</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>31/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Justice</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>26/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Overall Rank**

23/32

**Change in Score**

-0.01 ▼

**Change in Rank**

-9 ▼

**Constraints on Government Powers**

1.1 Limits by the legislature (0.42)
1.2 Limits by the judiciary (0.38)
1.3 Independent auditing (0.26)
1.4 Sanctions for official misconduct (0.45)
1.5 Non-governmental checks (0.51)
1.6 Elections comply with the law (0.33)

**Absence of Corruption**

2.1 In the executive branch (0.26)
2.2 In the judiciary (0.36)
2.3 In police/military (0.30)
2.4 In the legislature (0.26)

**Open Government** **

3.1 Civic participation (0.23)
3.2 Right to information (0.47)

**Fundamental Rights**

4.1 Absence of discrimination (0.35)
4.2 Right to life and security* (0.36)
4.3 Due process of law (0.51)
4.4 Freedom of opinion (0.75)
4.5 Freedom of religion (0.30)
4.6 Right to privacy (0.55)
4.7 Freedom of association (0.37)
4.8 Labor rights (0.37)

**Order & Security**

5.1 Absence of homicides (0.42)
5.2 Absence of crime (0.88)
5.3 Perception of safety (0.38)

**Regulatory Enforcement**

6.1 Efficient regulatory enforcement (0.30)
6.2 Regulatory enforcement free of corruption (0.32)
6.3 Efficient administrative procedures (0.35)
6.4 Due process in administrative procedures (0.27)
6.5 Property rights (0.35)

**Civil Justice**

7.1 People know their rights (0.28)
7.2 Access to information and affordable legal counsel in civil justice (0.29)
7.3 Affordable civil justice without bureaucratic processes (0.27)
7.4 Impartial and independent civil justice free of corruption (0.37)
7.5 Quality civil justice (0.33)
7.6 No unreasonable delay in civil justice (0.28)
7.7 Effective enforcement of civil decisions (0.33)
7.8 Accessible, impartial and prompt ADRs (0.42)

**Criminal Justice**

8.1 Effective criminal investigations (0.19)
8.2 Effective and efficient criminal adjudication (0.30)
8.3 Rights of victims (0.43)
8.4 Due process of law (0.36)
8.5 Impartial and independent criminal justice free of corruption (0.34)
8.6 Safe prison systems that respect human rights (0.38)

*Refer to the methodology section to know more details about sub-factor 4.2

**Refer to the methodology section to know more details about Factor 3

28
Chihuahua

Scores range from 0 to 1, with 1 indicating the strongest adherence to the rule of law

Overall Score 2019-2020
0.40

Overall Rank
15/32
Change in Score
0.01▲
Change in Rank
3▲

Factor Score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor Score</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Trend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constraints on Government Powers</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>14/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absence of Corruption</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>15/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Government</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>18/32</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fundamental Rights</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>12/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Order &amp; Security</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>20/32</td>
<td>▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulatory Enforcement</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>11/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Justice</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>08/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Justice</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>14/32</td>
<td>▼</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Constraints on Government Powers**

1.1 Limits by the legislature 0.42
1.2 Limits by the judiciary 0.51
1.3 Independent auditing 0.32
1.4 Sanctions for official misconduct 0.39
1.5 Non-governmental checks 0.49
1.6 Elections comply with the law 0.52

**Absence of Corruption**

2.1 In the executive branch 0.32
2.2 In the judiciary 0.47
2.3 In police/military 0.37
2.4 In the legislature 0.29

**Open Government** **

3.1 Civic participation 0.25
3.2 Right to information 0.50

**Fundamental Rights**

4.1 Absence of discrimination 0.46
4.2 Right to life and security 0.47
4.3 Due process of law 0.49
4.4 Freedom of opinion 0.75
4.5 Freedom of religion 0.43
4.6 Right to privacy 0.56
4.7 Freedom of association 0.41
4.8 Labor rights 0.41

**Order & Security**

5.1 Absence of homicides 0.00
5.2 Absence of crime 0.50
5.3 Perception of safety 0.40

**Regulatory Enforcement**

6.1 Efficient regulatory enforcement 0.40
6.2 Regulatory enforcement free of corruption 0.32
6.3 Efficient administrative procedures 0.39
6.4 Due process in administrative procedures 0.38
6.5 Property rights 0.44

**Civil Justice**

7.1 People know their rights 0.33
7.2 Access to information and affordable legal counsel in civil justice 0.45
7.3 Affordable civil justice without bureaucratic processes 0.34
7.4 Impartial and independent civil justice free of corruption 0.49
7.5 Quality civil justice 0.39
7.6 No unreasonable delay in civil justice 0.32
7.7 Effective enforcement of civil decisions 0.39
7.8 Accessible, impartial and prompt ADRs 0.49

**Criminal Justice**

8.1 Effective criminal investigations 0.23
8.2 Effective and efficient criminal adjudication 0.43
8.3 Rights of victims 0.48
8.4 Due process of law 0.47
8.5 Impartial and independent criminal justice free of corruption 0.40
8.6 Safe prison systems that respect human rights 0.32

*Refer to the methodology section to know more details about sub-factor 4.2
**Refer to the methodology section to know more details about Factor 3
Mexico City

Scores range from 0 to 1, with 1 indicating the strongest adherence to the rule of law

| Overall Score 2019-2020 | 0.36 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Rank</th>
<th>Change in Score</th>
<th>Change in Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28/32</td>
<td>-0.01 ▼</td>
<td>-3 ▼</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Factor Score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor Score</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Trend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constraints on Government Powers</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>24/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absence of Corruption</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>32/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Government **</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>01/32</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fundamental Rights</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>22/32</td>
<td>▼</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Order &amp; Security</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>28/32</td>
<td>▼</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulatory Enforcement</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>30/32</td>
<td>▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Justice</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>19/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Justice</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>31/32</td>
<td>▼</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Constraints on Government Powers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-factor</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Limits by the legislature</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limits by the judiciary</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent auditing</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanctions for official misconduct</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-governmental checks</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elections comply with the law</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Absence of Corruption

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-factor</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In the executive branch</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the judiciary</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In police/military</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the legislature</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Open Government **

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-factor</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Civic participation</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right to information</td>
<td>0.62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Fundamental Rights

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-factor</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Absence of discrimination</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right to life and security*</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Due process of law</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freedom of opinion</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freedom of religion</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right to privacy</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freedom of association</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor rights</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Order & Security

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-factor</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Absence of homicides</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absence of crime</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception of safety</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Regulatory Enforcement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-factor</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Efficient regulatory enforcement</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulatory enforcement free of corruption</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficient administrative procedures</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Due process in administrative procedures</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property rights</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Civil Justice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-factor</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>People know their rights</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to information and affordable legal counsel in civil justice</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordable civil justice without bureaucratic processes</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impartial and independent civil justice free of corruption</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality civil justice</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No unreasonable delay in civil justice</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective enforcement of civil decisions</td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessible, impartial and prompt ADRs</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Criminal Justice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-factor</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Effective criminal investigations</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective and efficient criminal adjudication</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rights of victims</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Due process of law</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impartial and independent criminal justice free of corruption</td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe prison systems that respect human rights</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

*Refer to the methodology section to know more details about sub-factor 4.2
**Refer to the methodology section to know more details about Factor 3
Coahuila

Scores range from 0 to 1, with 1 indicating the strongest adherence to the rule of law

### Overall Score 2019-2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor Score</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Trend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constraints on Government Powers</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>27/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absence of Corruption</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>18/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Government</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>09/32</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fundamental Rights</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>19/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Order &amp; Security</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>03/32</td>
<td>▼</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulatory Enforcement</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>12/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Justice</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>13/32</td>
<td>▼</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Justice</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>07/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Constraints on Government Powers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-factor</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Limits by the legislature</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Limits by the judiciary</td>
<td>0.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Independent auditing</td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4 Sanctions for official misconduct</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5 Non-governmental checks</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6 Elections comply with the law</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Absence of Corruption

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-factor</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1 In the executive branch</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 In the judiciary</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 In police/military</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4 In the legislature</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Open Government **

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-factor</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Civic participation</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2 Right to information</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Fundamental Rights

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-factor</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.1 Absent discrimination</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2 Right to life and security*</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3 Due process of law</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4 Freedom of opinion</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5 Freedom of religion</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.6 Right to privacy</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.7 Freedom of association</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.8 Labor rights</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Order & Security

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-factor</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.1 Absence of homicides</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2 Absence of crime</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3 Perception of safety</td>
<td>0.54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Regulatory Enforcement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-factor</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.1 Efficient regulatory enforcement</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2 Regulatory enforcement of corruption</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3 Efficient administrative procedures</td>
<td>0.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.4 Due process in administrative procedures</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.5 Property rights</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Civil Justice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-factor</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.1 People know their rights</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.2 Access to information and affordable legal counsel in civil justice</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.3 Affordable civil justice without bureaucratic processes</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.4 Impartial and independent civil justice free of corruption</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.5 Quality civil justice</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.6 No unreasonable delay in civil justice</td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.7 Effective enforcement of civil decisions</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.8 Accessible, impartial and prompt ADRs</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Criminal Justice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-factor</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.1 Effective criminal investigations</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.2 Effective and efficient criminal adjudication</td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.3 Rights of victims</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.4 Due process of law</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.5 Impartial and independent criminal justice free of corruption</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.6 Safe prison systems that respect human rights</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Refer to the methodology section to know more details about sub-factor 4.2
**Refer to the methodology section to know more details about Factor 3
**Colima**

Scores range from 0 to 1, with 1 indicating the strongest adherence to the rule of law

**Overall Score 2019-2020**

- **Score**: 0.41
- **Overall Rank**: 12/32
- **Change in Score**: 0.02
- **Change in Rank**: 3

### Factor Score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor Score</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Trend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constraints on Government Powers</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>03/32</td>
<td>▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absence of Corruption</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>05/32</td>
<td>▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Government</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>24/32</td>
<td>▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fundamental Rights</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>07/32</td>
<td>▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Order &amp; Security</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>21/32</td>
<td>▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulatory Enforcement</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>07/32</td>
<td>▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Justice</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>10/32</td>
<td>▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Justice</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>10/32</td>
<td>▲</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Constraints on Government Powers

1.1 Limits by the legislature | 0.51
1.2 Limits by the judiciary | 0.55
1.3 Independent auditing | 0.29
1.4 Sanctions for official misconduct | 0.37
1.5 Non-governmental checks | 0.61
1.6 Elections comply with the law | 0.51

### Absence of Corruption

2.1 In the executive branch | 0.41
2.2 In the judiciary | 0.49
2.3 In police/military | 0.43
2.4 In the legislature | 0.31

### Open Government**

3.1 Civic participation | 0.21
3.2 Right to information | 0.49

*Refer to the methodology section to know more details about sub-factor 4.2

**Refer to the methodology section to know more details about Factor 3

### Fundamental Rights

4.1 Absence of discrimination | 0.44
4.2 Right to life and security* | –
4.3 Due process of law | 0.47
4.4 Freedom of opinion | 0.61
4.5 Freedom of religion | 0.81
4.6 Right to privacy | 0.49
4.7 Freedom of association | 0.62
4.8 Labor rights | 0.22

### Order & Security

5.1 Absence of homicides | 0.00
5.2 Absence of crime | 0.50
5.3 Perceptions of safety | 0.38

### Regulatory Enforcement

6.1 Efficient regulatory enforcement | 0.35
6.2 Regulatory enforcement free of corruption | 0.55
6.3 Efficient administrative procedures | 0.41
6.4 Due process in administrative procedures | 0.30
6.5 Property rights | 0.42

### Civil Justice

7.1 People know their rights | 0.27
7.2 Access to information and affordable legal counsel in civil justice | 0.35
7.3 Affordable civil justice without bureaucratic processes | 0.28
7.4 Impartial and independent civil justice free of corruption | 0.46
7.5 Quality civil justice | 0.40
7.6 No unreasonable delay in civil justice | 0.37
7.7 Effective enforcement of civil decisions | 0.44
7.8 Accessible, impartial and prompt ADRs | 0.57

### Criminal Justice

8.1 Effective criminal investigations | 0.20
8.2 Effective and efficient criminal adjudication | 0.35
8.3 Rights of victims | 0.45
8.4 Due process of law | 0.47
8.5 Impartial and independent criminal justice free of corruption | 0.47
8.6 Safe prison systems that respect human rights | 0.47

---

*Score by sub-factor

**Score by factor

**Average Score by factor
Durango
Scores range from 0 to 1, with 1 indicating the strongest adherence to the rule of law

Overall Score 2019-2020
0.43

Factor Score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor Score</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Trend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constraints on Government Powers **</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>20/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absence of Corruption</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>26/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Government **</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>15/32</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fundamental Rights</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>16/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Order &amp; Security</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>02/32</td>
<td>▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulatory Enforcement</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>18/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Justice</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>03/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Justice</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>12/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Refer to the methodology section to know more details about Factor 3

*Fundamental Rights

4.1 Absence of discrimination 0.53
4.2 Right to life and security* -
4.3 Due process of law 0.49
4.4 Freedom of opinion 0.54
4.5 Freedom of religion 0.79
4.6 Right to privacy 0.22
4.7 Freedom of association 0.59
4.8 Labor rights 0.38

*Refer to the methodology section to know more details about sub-factor 4.2

**Constraints on Government Powers

1.1 Limits by the legislature 0.44
1.2 Limits by the judiciary 0.46
1.3 Independent auditing 0.32
1.4 Sanctions for official misconduct 0.35
1.5 Non-governmental checks 0.54
1.6 Elections comply with the law 0.47

Absence of Corruption

2.1 In the executive branch 0.28
2.2 In the judiciary 0.45
2.3 In police/military 0.25
2.4 In the legislature 0.27

Order & Security

5.1 Absence of homicides 0.58
5.2 Absence of crime 0.71
5.3 Perception of safety 0.52

Regulatory Enforcement

6.1 Efficient regulatory enforcement 0.35
6.2 Regulatory enforcement free of corruption 0.29
6.3 Efficient administrative procedures 0.33
6.4 Due process in administrative procedures 0.46
6.5 Property rights 0.41

Civil Justice

7.1 People know their rights 0.26
7.2 Access to information and affordable legal counsel in civil justice 0.45
7.3 Affordable civil justice without bureaucratic processes 0.28
7.4 Impartial and independent civil justice free of corruption 0.51
7.5 Quality civil justice 0.43
7.6 No unreasonable delay in civil justice 0.38
7.7 Effective enforcement of civil decisions 0.43
7.8 Accessible, impartial and prompt ADRs 0.59

Criminal Justice

8.1 Effective criminal investigations 0.25
8.2 Effective and efficient criminal adjudication 0.35
8.3 Rights of victims 0.44
8.4 Due process of law 0.49
8.5 Impartial and independent criminal justice free of corruption 0.34
8.6 Safe prison systems that respect human rights 0.48
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State of Mexico
Scores range from 0 to 1, with 1 indicating the strongest adherence to the rule of law

**Overall Score 2019-2020**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor Score</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Trend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constraints on Government Powers</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>25/32</td>
<td>▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absence of Corruption</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>29/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Government</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>04/32</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fundamental Rights</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>24/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Order &amp; Security</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>30/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulatory Enforcement</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>19/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Justice</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>15/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Justice</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>28/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Overall Rank**

Overall Rank: 27/32
Change in Score: -
Change in Rank: 3 ▲

---

**Constraints on Government Powers**

1.1 Limits by the legislature
1.2 Limits by the judiciary
1.3 Independent auditing
1.4 Sanctions for official misconduct
1.5 Non-governmental checks
1.6 Elections comply with the law

**Absence of Corruption**

2.1 In the executive branch
2.2 In the judiciary
2.3 In police/military
2.4 In the legislature

**Open Government** **

3.1 Civic participation
3.2 Right to information

**Fundamental Rights**

4.1 Absence of discrimination
4.2 Right to life and security*
4.3 Due process of law
4.4 Freedom of opinion
4.5 Freedom of religion
4.6 Right to privacy
4.7 Freedom of association
4.8 Labor rights

**Order & Security**

5.1 Absence of homicides
5.2 Absence of crime
5.3 Perception of safety

**Regulatory Enforcement**

6.1 Efficient regulatory enforcement
6.2 Regulatory enforcement free of corruption
6.3 Efficient administrative procedures
6.4 Due process in administrative procedures
6.5 Property rights

---

*Refer to the methodology section to know more details about sub-factor 4.2
**Refer to the methodology section to know more details about Factor 3
Guanajuato

Scores range from 0 to 1, with 1 indicating the strongest adherence to the rule of law

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Score 2019-2020</th>
<th>0.42</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Overall Rank
- Overall Rank: **09/32**
- Change in Score: **0.01**
- Change in Rank: **3**

### Factor Score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor Score</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Trend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constraints on Government Powers</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>12/32</td>
<td>▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absence of Corruption</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>03/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Government **</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>02/32</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fundamental Rights</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>08/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Order &amp; Security</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>29/32</td>
<td>▼</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulatory Enforcement</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>02/32</td>
<td>▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Justice</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>01/32</td>
<td>▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Justice</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>04/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Constraints on Government Powers
- 1.1 Limits by the legislature: 0.40
- 1.2 Limits by the judiciary: 0.56
- 1.3 Independent auditing: 0.30
- 1.4 Sanctions for official misconduct: 0.39
- 1.5 Non-governmental checks: 0.55
- 1.6 Elections comply with the law: 0.46

#### Absence of Corruption
- 2.1 In the executive branch: 0.45
- 2.2 In the judiciary: 0.51
- 2.3 In police/military: 0.47
- 2.4 In the legislature: 0.30

#### Open Government **
- 3.1 Civic participation: 0.37
- 3.2 Right to information: 0.58

#### Fundamental Rights
- 4.1 Absence of discrimination: 0.44
- 4.2 Right to life and security*: -
- 4.3 Due process of law: 0.48
- 4.4 Freedom of opinion: 0.55
- 4.5 Freedom of religion: 0.72
- 4.6 Right to privacy: 0.54
- 4.7 Freedom of association: 0.61
- 4.8 Labor rights: 0.31

#### Order & Security
- 5.1 Absence of homicides: 0.08
- 5.2 Absence of crime: 0.29
- 5.3 Perception of safety: 0.27

#### Regulatory Enforcement
- 6.1 Efficient regulatory enforcement: 0.31
- 6.2 Regulatory enforcement free of corruption: 0.70
- 6.3 Efficient administrative procedures: 0.43
- 6.4 Due process in administrative procedures: 0.35
- 6.5 Property rights: 0.38

#### Civil Justice
- 7.1 People know their rights: 0.31
- 7.2 Access to information and affordable legal counsel in civil justice: 0.42
- 7.3 Affordable civil justice without bureaucratic processes: 0.49
- 7.4 Impartial and independent civil justice free of corruption: 0.48
- 7.5 Quality civil justice: 0.43
- 7.6 No unreasonable delay in civil justice: 0.35
- 7.7 Effective enforcement of civil decisions: 0.43
- 7.8 Accessible, impartial and prompt ADRs: 0.58

#### Criminal Justice
- 8.1 Effective criminal investigations: 0.31
- 8.2 Effective and efficient criminal adjudication: 0.37
- 8.3 Rights of victims: 0.48
- 8.4 Due process of law: 0.48
- 8.5 Impartial and independent criminal justice free of corruption: 0.49
- 8.6 Safe prison systems that respect human rights: 0.49

*Refer to the methodology section to know more details about sub-factor 4.2
**Refer to the methodology section to know more details about Factor 3
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Guerrero

Scores range from 0 to 1, with 1 indicating the strongest adherence to the rule of law

**Overall Score 2019-2020**

**Overall Rank** 32/32  
**Change in Score** 0.04 ▲  
**Change in Rank** -

**Factor Score**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor Score</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Trend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constraints on Government Powers</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>29/32</td>
<td>▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absence of Corruption</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>30/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Government</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>20/32</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fundamental Rights</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>32/32</td>
<td>▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Order &amp; Security</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>27/32</td>
<td>▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulatory Enforcement</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>23/32</td>
<td>▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Justice</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>32/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Justice</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>32/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Constraints on Government Powers**

1.1 Limits by the legislature  
   1.2 Limits by the judiciary  
   1.3 Independent auditing  
   1.4 Sanctions for official misconduct  
   1.5 Non-governmental checks  
   1.6 Elections comply with the law  

**Absence of Corruption**

2.1 In the executive branch  
   2.2 In the judiciary  
   2.3 In police/military  
   2.4 In the legislature

**Open Government **

3.1 Civic participation  
   3.2 Right to information

**Fundamental Rights**

4.1 Absence of discrimination  
   4.2 Right to life and security*  
   4.3 Due process of law  
   4.4 Freedom of opinion  
   4.5 Freedom of religion  
   4.6 Right to privacy  
   4.7 Freedom of association  
   4.8 Labor rights

**Order & Security**

5.1 Absence of homicides  
   5.2 Absence of crime  
   5.3 Perception of safety

**Regulatory Enforcement**

6.1 Efficient regulatory enforcement  
   6.2 Regulatory enforcement free of corruption  
   6.3 Efficient administrative procedures  
   6.4 Due process in administrative procedures  
   6.5 Property rights

**Civil Justice**

7.1 People know their rights  
   7.2 Access to information and affordable legal counsel in civil justice  
   7.3 Affordable civil justice without bureaucratic processes  
   7.4 Impartial and independent civil justice free of corruption  
   7.5 Quality civil justice  
   7.6 No unreasonable delay in civil justice  
   7.7 Effective enforcement of civil decisions  
   7.8 Accessible, impartial and prompt ADRs

**Criminal Justice**

8.1 Effective criminal investigations  
   8.2 Effective and efficient criminal adjudication  
   8.3 Rights of victims  
   8.4 Due process of law  
   8.5 Impartial and independent criminal justice free of corruption  
   8.6 Safe prison systems that respect human rights

*Refer to the methodology section to know more details about sub-factor 4.2  
**Refer to the methodology section to know more details about Factor 3
Hidalgo
Scores range from 0 to 1, with 1 indicating the strongest adherence to the rule of law

Overall Score 2019-2020
0.42

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor Score</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Trend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constraints on Government Powers</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>08/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absence of Corruption</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>08/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Government</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>22/32</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fundamental Rights</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>10/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Order &amp; Security</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>06/32</td>
<td>▼</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulatory Enforcement</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>21/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Justice</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>16/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Justice</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>08/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Constraints on Government Powers
1.1 Limits by the legislature 0.48
1.2 Limits by the judiciary 0.51
1.3 Independent auditing 0.30
1.4 Sanctions for official misconduct 0.42
1.5 Non-governmental checks 0.55
1.6 Elections comply with the law 0.46

Absence of Corruption
2.1 In the executive branch 0.36
2.2 In the judiciary 0.49
2.3 In police/military 0.41
2.4 In the legislature 0.33

Open Government **
3.1 Civic participation 0.27
3.2 Right to information 0.46

Fundamental Rights
4.1 Absence of discrimination 0.44
4.2 Right to life and security* -
4.3 Due process of law 0.53
4.4 Freedom of opinion 0.55
4.5 Freedom of religion 0.76
4.6 Right to privacy 0.40
4.7 Freedom of association 0.62
4.8 Labor rights 0.29

Order & Security
5.1 Absence of homicides 0.50
5.2 Absence of crime 0.63
5.3 Perceptions of safety 0.43

Regulatory Enforcement
6.1 Efficient regulatory enforcement 0.36
6.2 Regulatory enforcement free of corruption 0.43
6.3 Efficient administrative procedures 0.28
6.4 Due process in administrative procedures 0.28
6.5 Property rights 0.40

Civil Justice
7.1 People know their rights 0.29
7.2 Access to information and affordable legal counsel in civil justice 0.39
7.3 Affordable civil justice without bureaucratic processes 0.26
7.4 Impartial and independent civil justice free of corruption 0.47
7.5 Quality civil justice 0.43
7.6 No unreasonable delay in civil justice 0.33
7.7 Effective enforcement of civil decisions 0.30
7.8 Accessible, impartial and prompt ADRs 0.45

Criminal Justice
8.1 Effective criminal investigations 0.27
8.2 Effective and efficient criminal adjudication 0.39
8.3 Rights of victims 0.45
8.4 Due process of law 0.53
8.5 Impartial and independent criminal justice free of corruption 0.44
8.6 Safe prison systems that respect human rights 0.37

*Refer to the methodology section to know more details about sub-factor 4.2
**Refer to the methodology section to know more details about Factor 3
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**Jalisco**

Scores range from 0 to 1, with 1 indicating the strongest adherence to the rule of law

### Overall Score 2019-2020

**0.37**

**Overall Rank** 26/32  
**Change in Score** -  
**Change in Rank** -3

### Factor Score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor Score</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Trend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constraints on Government Powers</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>19/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absence of Corruption</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>28/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Government</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>03/32</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fundamental Rights</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>25/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Order &amp; Security</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>22/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulatory Enforcement</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>25/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Justice</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>30/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Justice</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>27/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Constraints on Government Powers

- **1.1** Limits by the legislature 0.47
- **1.2** Limits by the judiciary 0.42
- **1.3** Independent auditing 0.29
- **1.4** Sanctions for official misconduct 0.36
- **1.5** Non-governmental checks 0.55
- **1.6** Elections comply with the law 0.50

### Absence of Corruption

- **2.1** In the executive branch 0.31
- **2.2** In the judiciary 0.35
- **2.3** In police/military 0.29
- **2.4** In the legislature 0.27

### Open Government **

- **3.1** Civic participation 0.38
- **3.2** Right to information 0.52

### Fundamental Rights

- **4.1** Absence of discrimination 0.42
- **4.2** Right to life and security* -
- **4.3** Due process of law 0.41
- **4.4** Freedom of opinion 0.55
- **4.5** Freedom of religion 0.77
- **4.6** Right to privacy 0.35
- **4.7** Freedom of association 0.61
- **4.8** Labor rights 0.27

### Order & Security

- **5.1** Absence of homicides 0.17
- **5.2** Absence of crime 0.25
- **5.3** Perception of safety 0.38

### Regulatory Enforcement

- **6.1** Efficient regulatory enforcement 0.36
- **6.2** Regulatory enforcement free of corruption 0.33
- **6.3** Efficient administrative procedures 0.33
- **6.4** Due process in administrative procedures 0.32
- **6.5** Property rights 0.36

### Civil Justice

- **7.1** People know their rights 0.31
- **7.2** Access to information and affordable legal counsel in civil justice 0.35
- **7.3** Affordable civil justice without bureaucratic processes 0.27
- **7.4** Impartial and independent civil justice free of corruption 0.39
- **7.5** Quality civil justice 0.30
- **7.6** No unreasonable delay in civil justice 0.24
- **7.7** Effective enforcement of civil decisions 0.29
- **7.8** Accessible, impartial and prompt ADRs 0.42

### Criminal Justice

- **8.1** Effective criminal investigations 0.16
- **8.2** Effective and efficient criminal adjudication 0.27
- **8.3** Rights of victims 0.43
- **8.4** Due process of law 0.41
- **8.5** Impartial and independent criminal justice free of corruption 0.32
- **8.6** Safe prison systems that respect human rights 0.42

*Refer to the methodology section to know more details about sub-factor 4.2  
**Refer to the methodology section to know more details about Factor 3*
Michoacán
Scores range from 0 to 1, with 1 indicating the strongest adherence to the rule of law

Overall Score 2019-2020
0.39

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Rank</th>
<th>Change in Score</th>
<th>Change in Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18/32</td>
<td>-0.01 ▼</td>
<td>-5 ▼</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Factor Score**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor Score</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Trend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constraints on Government Powers</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>23/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absence of Corruption</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>22/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Government</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>10/32</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fundamental Rights</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>27/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Order &amp; Security</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>13/32</td>
<td>▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulatory Enforcement</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>26/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Justice</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>26/32</td>
<td>▼</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Justice</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>16/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Constraints on Government Powers**

1.1 | Limits by the legislature 0.38
1.2 | Limits by the judiciary 0.50
1.3 | Independent auditing 0.24
1.4 | Sanctions for official misconduct 0.42
1.5 | Non-governmental checks 0.50
1.6 | Elections comply with the law 0.45

**Absence of Corruption**

2.1 | In the executive branch 0.33
2.2 | In the judiciary 0.43
2.3 | In police/military 0.33
2.4 | In the legislature 0.27

**Open Government **

3.1 | Civic participation 0.29
3.2 | Right to information 0.53

**Fundamental Rights**

4.1 | Absence of discrimination 0.42
4.2 | Right to life and security* -
4.3 | Due process of law 0.48
4.4 | Freedom of opinion 0.50
4.5 | Freedom of religion 0.73
4.6 | Right to privacy 0.38
4.7 | Freedom of association 0.57
4.8 | Labor rights 0.24

**Order & Security**

5.1 | Absence of homicides 0.08
5.2 | Absence of crime 0.79
5.3 | Perception of safety 0.35

**Regulatory Enforcement**

6.1 | Efficient regulatory enforcement 0.28
6.2 | Regulatory enforcement free of corruption 0.45
6.3 | Efficient administrative procedures 0.33
6.4 | Due process in administrative procedures 0.29
6.5 | Property rights 0.32

**Civil Justice**

7.1 | People know their rights 0.24
7.2 | Access to information and affordable legal counsel in civil justice 0.32
7.3 | Affordable civil justice without bureaucratic processes 0.28
7.4 | Impartial and independent civil justice free of corruption 0.40
7.5 | Quality civil justice 0.32
7.6 | No unreasonable delay in civil justice 0.30
7.7 | Effective enforcement of civil decisions 0.32
7.8 | Accessible, impartial and prompt ADRs 0.44

**Criminal Justice**

8.1 | Effective criminal investigations 0.21
8.2 | Effective and efficient criminal adjudication 0.38
8.3 | Rights of victims 0.41
8.4 | Due process of law 0.48
8.5 | Impartial and independent criminal justice free of corruption 0.40
8.6 | Safe prison systems that respect human rights 0.43

*Refer to the methodology section to know more details about sub-factor 4.2
**Refer to the methodology section to know more details about Factor 3
Morelos

Scores range from 0 to 1, with 1 indicating the strongest adherence to the rule of law

**Overall Score 2019-2020**

Overall Score: 0.36

**Overall Rank**

Overall Rank: 29/32

**Change in Score**

Change in Score: -0.01

**Change in Rank**

Change in Rank: -3

---

**Factor Score**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor Score</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Trend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constraints on Government Powers</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>21/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absence of Corruption</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>23/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Government</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>17/32</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fundamental Rights</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>06/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Order &amp; Security</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>32/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulatory Enforcement</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>28/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Justice</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>18/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Justice</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>24/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Constraints on Government Powers**

1.1 Limits by the legislature | 0.42 |
1.2 Limits by the judiciary | 0.52 |
1.3 Independent auditing | 0.28 |
1.4 Sanctions for official misconduct | 0.37 |
1.5 Non-governmental checks | 0.54 |
1.6 Elections comply with the law | 0.43 |

**Absence of Corruption**

2.1 In the executive branch | 0.30 |
2.2 In the judiciary | 0.45 |
2.3 In police/military | 0.31 |
2.4 In the legislature | 0.25 |

**Open Government **

3.1 Civic participation | 0.20 |
3.2 Right to information | 0.55 |

---

**Fundamental Rights**

4.1 Absence of discrimination | 0.45 |
4.2 Right to life and security* | 0.45 |
4.3 Due process of law | 0.54 |
4.4 Freedom of opinion | 0.76 |
4.5 Freedom of religion | 0.52 |
4.6 Right to privacy | 0.61 |
4.7 Freedom of association | 0.39 |
4.8 Labor rights | 0.39 |

**Order & Security**

5.1 Absence of homicides | 0.08 |
5.2 Absence of crime | 0.17 |
5.3 Perception of safety | 0.31 |

**Regulatory Enforcement**

6.1 Efficient regulatory enforcement | 0.30 |
6.2 Regulatory enforcement free of corruption | 0.37 |
6.3 Efficient administrative procedures | 0.41 |
6.4 Due process in administrative procedures | 0.25 |
6.5 Property rights | 0.32 |

**Civil Justice**

7.1 People know their rights | 0.32 |
7.2 Access to information and affordable legal counsel in civil justice | 0.34 |
7.3 Affordable civil justice without bureaucratic processes | 0.24 |
7.4 Impartial and independent civil justice free of corruption | 0.47 |
7.5 Quality civil justice | 0.36 |
7.6 No unreasonable delay in civil justice | 0.28 |
7.7 Effective enforcement of civil decisions | 0.34 |
7.8 Accessible, impartial and prompt ADRs | 0.44 |

**Criminal Justice**

8.1 Effective criminal investigations | 0.20 |
8.2 Effective and efficient criminal adjudication | 0.27 |
8.3 Rights of victims | 0.39 |
8.4 Due process of law | 0.45 |
8.5 Impartial and independent criminal justice free of corruption | 0.35 |
8.6 Safe prison systems that respect human rights | 0.35 |

---

*Refer to the methodology section to know more details about sub-factor 4.2
**Refer to the methodology section to know more details about Factor 3

40
Nuevo León

Scores range from 0 to 1, with 1 indicating the strongest adherence to the rule of law

### Overall Score 2019-2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score by factor</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Trend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall Score</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>07/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Change in Score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score by factor</th>
<th>Overall Score</th>
<th>Fundamentals Rights</th>
<th>Order &amp; Security</th>
<th>Regulatory Enforcement</th>
<th>Civil Justice</th>
<th>Criminal Justice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Score</td>
<td>Overall Rank</td>
<td>Change in Score</td>
<td>Change in Rank</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>07/32</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Factor Score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor Score</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Trend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constraints on Government Powers</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>01/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absence of Corruption</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>06/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Government</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>16/32</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fundamental Rights</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>02/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Order &amp; Security</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>14/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulatory Enforcement</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>08/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Justice</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>02/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Justice</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>15/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Constraints on Government Powers

- 1.1 Limit by the legislature 0.56
- 1.2 Limit by the judiciary 0.54
- 1.3 Independent auditing 0.31
- 1.4 Sanctions for official misconduct 0.42
- 1.5 Non-governmental checks 0.62
- 1.6 Elections comply with the law 0.52

### Absence of Corruption

- 2.1 In the executive branch 0.37
- 2.2 In the judiciary 0.50
- 2.3 In police/military 0.40
- 2.4 In the legislature 0.32

### Open Government **

- 3.1 Civic participation 0.27
- 3.2 Right to information 0.49

### Fundamental Rights

- 4.1 Absence of discrimination 0.43
- 4.2 Right to life and security* -
- 4.3 Due process of law 0.45
- 4.4 Freedom of opinion 0.62
- 4.5 Freedom of religion 0.77
- 4.6 Right to privacy 0.42
- 4.7 Freedom of association 0.66
- 4.8 Labor rights 0.42

### Order & Security

- 5.1 Absence of homicides 0.33
- 5.2 Absence of crime 0.46
- 5.3 Perception of safety 0.39

### Regulatory Enforcement

- 6.1 Efficient regulatory enforcement 0.37
- 6.2 Regulatory enforcement free of corruption 0.45
- 6.3 Efficient administrative procedures 0.42
- 6.4 Due process in administrative procedures 0.39
- 6.5 Property rights 0.38

### Civil Justice

- 7.1 People know their rights 0.36
- 7.2 Access to information and affordable legal counsel in civil justice 0.44
- 7.3 Affordable civil justice without bureaucratic processes 0.32
- 7.4 Impartial and independent civil justice free of corruption 0.49
- 7.5 Quality civil justice 0.42
- 7.6 No unreasonable delay in civil justice 0.39
- 7.7 Effective enforcement of civil decisions 0.42
- 7.8 Accessible, impartial and prompt ADRs 0.52

### Criminal Justice

- 8.1 Effective criminal investigations 0.26
- 8.2 Effective and efficient criminal adjudication 0.37
- 8.3 Rights of victims 0.48
- 8.4 Due process of law 0.45
- 8.5 Impartial and independent criminal justice free of corruption 0.44
- 8.6 Safe prison systems that respect human rights 0.31

*Refer to the methodology section to know more details about sub-factor 4.2
**Refer to the methodology section to know more details about Factor 3
Oaxaca

Scores range from 0 to 1, with 1 indicating the strongest adherence to the rule of law

Overall Score 2019-2020

0.40

Overall Rank
14/32
Change in Score
0.01 ▲
Change in Rank
2 ▲

Factor Score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor Score</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Trend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constraints on Government Powers</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>15/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absence of Corruption</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>14/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Government</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>29/32</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fundamental Rights</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>23/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Order &amp; Security</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>09/32</td>
<td>▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulatory Enforcement</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>14/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Justice</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>20/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Justice</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>06/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Constraints on Government Powers

1.1 Limits by the legislature                       0.44
1.2 Limits by the judiciary                         0.48
1.3 Independent auditing                             0.33
1.4 Sanctions for official misconduct                0.47
1.5 Non-governmental checks                         0.50
1.6 Elections comply with the law                   0.42

Absence of Corruption

2.1 In the executive branch                          0.34
2.2 In the judiciary                                 0.43
2.3 In police/military                               0.40
2.4 In the legislature                               0.28

Open Government **

3.1 Civic participation                             0.24
3.2 Right to information                            0.42

Fundamental Rights

4.1 Absence of discrimination                        0.45
4.2 Right to life and security*                      -
4.3 Due process of law                               0.51
4.4 Freedom of opinion                               0.50
4.5 Freedom of religion                              0.71
4.6 Right to privacy                                 0.40
4.7 Freedom of association                           0.59
4.8 Labor rights                                     0.27

Order & Security

5.1 Absence of homicides                             0.25
5.2 Absence of crime                                 0.71
5.3 Perception of safety                             0.39

Regulatory Enforcement

6.1 Efficient regulatory enforcement                 0.32
6.2 Regulatory enforcement free of corruption       0.50
6.3 Efficient administrative procedures              0.40
6.4 Due process in administrative procedures        0.28
6.5 Property rights                                  0.37

Civil Justice

7.1 People know their rights                         0.27
7.2 Access to information and affordable legal counsel in civil justice 0.37
7.3 Affordable civil justice without bureaucratic processes 0.30
7.4 Impartial and independent civil justice free of corruption 0.41
7.5 Quality civil justice                            0.39
7.6 No unreasonable delay in civil justice           0.25
7.7 Effective enforcement of civil decisions         0.28
7.8 Accessible, impartial and prompt ADRs            0.44

Criminal Justice

8.1 Effective criminal investigations                 0.21
8.2 Effective and efficient criminal adjudication    0.44
8.3 Rights of victims                                 0.46
8.4 Due process of law                               0.51
8.5 Impartial and independent criminal justice free of corruption 0.44
8.6 Safe prison systems that respect human rights    0.44

*Refer to the methodology section to know more details about sub-factor 4.2
**Refer to the methodology section to know more details about Factor 3
Puebla
Scores range from 0 to 1, with 1 indicating the strongest adherence to the rule of law

Overall Score 2019-2020
0.35

Overall Rank Change in Score Change in Rank
31/32 -0.01 ▼ -3 ▼

Factor Score
Score Rank Trend
Constraints on Government Powers 0.39 30/32
Absence of Corruption 0.32 25/32
Open Government 0.34 27/32 **
Fundamental Rights 0.44 30/32
Order & Security 0.25 25/32 ▼
Regulatory Enforcement 0.40 09/32
Civil Justice 0.33 24/32
Criminal Justice 0.29 30/32

Constraints on Government Powers
1.1 Limits by the legislature 0.36
1.2 Limits by the judiciary 0.44
1.3 Independent auditing 0.26
1.4 Sanctions for official misconduct 0.38
1.5 Non-governmental checks 0.49
1.6 Elections comply with the law 0.40

Absence of Corruption
2.1 In the executive branch 0.38
2.2 In the judiciary 0.36
2.3 In police/military 0.28
2.4 In the legislature 0.24

Open Government **
3.1 Civic participation 0.27
3.2 Right to information 0.41

Fundamental Rights
4.1 Absence of discrimination 0.41
4.2 Right to life and security* 0.37
4.3 Due process of law 0.49
4.4 Freedom of opinion 0.77
4.5 Freedom of religion 0.27
4.6 Right to privacy 0.56
4.7 Freedom of association 0.25
4.8 Labor rights

Order & Security
5.1 Absence of homicides 0.25
5.2 Absence of crime 0.25
5.3 Perception of safety

Regulatory Enforcement
6.1 Efficient regulatory enforcement 0.36
6.2 Regulatory enforcement free of corruption 0.65
6.3 Efficient administrative procedures 0.39
6.4 Due process in administrative procedures 0.31
6.5 Property rights 0.29

Civil Justice
7.1 People know their rights 0.30
7.2 Access to information and affordable legal counsel in civil justice 0.36
7.3 Affordable civil justice without bureaucratic processes 0.28
7.4 Impartial and independent civil justice free of corruption 0.38
7.5 Quality civil justice 0.33
7.6 No unreasonable delay in civil justice 0.26
7.7 Effective enforcement of civil decisions 0.32
7.8 Accessible, impartial and prompt ADRs 0.43

Criminal Justice
8.1 Effective criminal investigations 0.20
8.2 Effective and efficient criminal adjudication 0.27
8.3 Rights of victims 0.37
8.4 Due process of law 0.37
8.5 Impartial and independent criminal justice free of corruption 0.33
8.6 Safe prison systems that respect human rights 0.24

*Refer to the methodology section to know more details about sub-factor 4.2
**Refer to the methodology section to know more details about Factor 3
# Querétaro

Scores range from 0 to 1, with 1 indicating the strongest adherence to the rule of law

## Overall Score 2019-2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Trend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>05/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Constraints on Government Powers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-factor</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Limits by the legislature</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Limits by the judiciary</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Independent auditing</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4 Sanctions for official misconduct</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5 Non-governmental checks</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6 Elections comply with the law</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Absence of Corruption

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-factor</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1 In the executive branch</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 In the judiciary</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 In police/military</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4 In the legislature</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Open Government **

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-factor</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Civic participation</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2 Right to information</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Fundamental Rights

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-factor</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.1 Absence of discrimination</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2 Right to life and security*</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3 Due process of law</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4 Freedom of opinion</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5 Freedom of religion</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.6 Right to privacy</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.7 Freedom of association</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.8 Labor rights</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Refer to the methodology section to know more details about sub-factor 4.2

## Order & Security

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-factor</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.1 Absence of homicides</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2 Absence of crime</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3 Perception of safety</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Regulatory Enforcement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-factor</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.1 Efficient regulatory enforcement</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2 Regulatory enforcement free of corruption</td>
<td>0.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3 Efficient administrative procedures</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.4 Due process in administrative procedures</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.5 Property rights</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Civil Justice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-factor</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.1 People know their rights</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.2 Access to information and affordable legal counsel in civil justice</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.3 Affordable civil justice without bureaucratic processes</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.4 Impartial and independent civil justice free of corruption</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.5 Quality civil justice</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.6 No unreasonable delay in civil justice</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.7 Effective enforcement of civil decisions</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.8 Accessible, impartial and prompt ADRs</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Criminal Justice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-factor</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.1 Effective criminal investigations</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.2 Effective and efficient criminal adjudication</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.3 Rights of victims</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.4 Due process of law</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.5 Impartial and independent criminal justice free of corruption</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.6 Safe prison systems that respect human rights</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Refer to the methodology section to know more details about Factor 3**
## Quintana Roo

Scores range from 0 to 1, with 1 indicating the strongest adherence to the rule of law

### Overall Score 2019-2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Rank</th>
<th>Change in Score</th>
<th>Change in Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30/32</td>
<td>-0.01↓</td>
<td>-3↓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Factor Score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor Score</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Trend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constraints on Government Powers</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>31/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absence of Corruption</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>27/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Government</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>14/32</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fundamental Rights</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>28/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Order &amp; Security</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>24/32</td>
<td>▼</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulatory Enforcement</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>24/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Justice</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>22/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Justice</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>25/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Constraints on Government Powers

1.1 Limits by the legislature 0.37
1.2 Limits by the judiciary 0.40
1.3 Independent auditing 0.30
1.4 Sanctions for official misconduct 0.39
1.5 Non-governmental checks 0.45
1.6 Elections comply with the law 0.32

### Absence of Corruption

2.1 In the executive branch 0.30
2.2 In the judiciary 0.39
2.3 In police/military 0.29
2.4 In the legislature 0.24

### Open Government **

3.1 Civic participation 0.26
3.2 Right to information 0.54

### Fundamental Rights

4.1 Absence of discrimination 0.42
4.2 Right to life and security* -
4.3 Due process of law 0.45
4.4 Freedom of opinion 0.45
4.5 Freedom of religion 0.74
4.6 Right to privacy 0.30
4.7 Freedom of association 0.57
4.8 Labor rights 0.30

### Order & Security

5.1 Absence of homicides 0.08
5.2 Absence of crime 0.38
5.3 Perception of safety 0.32

### Regulatory Enforcement

6.1 Efficient regulatory enforcement 0.36
6.2 Regulatory enforcement free of corruption 0.42
6.3 Efficient administrative procedures 0.35
6.4 Due process in administrative procedures 0.26
6.5 Property rights 0.31

### Civil Justice

7.1 People know their rights 0.30
7.2 Access to information and affordable legal counsel in civil justice 0.34
7.3 Affordable civil justice without bureaucratic processes 0.28
7.4 Impartial and independent civil justice free of corruption 0.41
7.5 Quality civil justice 0.35
7.6 No unreasonable delay in civil justice 0.30
7.7 Effective enforcement of civil decisions 0.30
7.8 Accessible, impartial and prompt ADRs 0.41

### Criminal Justice

8.1 Effective criminal investigations 0.18
8.2 Effective and efficient criminal adjudication 0.34
8.3 Rights of victims 0.41
8.4 Due process of law 0.45
8.5 Impartial and independent criminal justice free of corruption 0.34
8.6 Safe prison systems that respect human rights 0.29

*Refer to the methodology section to know more details about sub-factor 4.2
**Refer to the methodology section to know more details about Factor 3
### San Luis Potosí

Scores range from 0 to 1, with 1 indicating the strongest adherence to the rule of law

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Score 2019-2020</th>
<th>0.38</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### Overall Rank Change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Rank</th>
<th>Change in Score</th>
<th>Change in Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20/32</td>
<td>-0.01▼</td>
<td>-3▼</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Factor Score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor Score</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Trend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constraints on Government Powers</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>17/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absence of Corruption</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>21/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Government</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>23/32</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fundamental Rights</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>11/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Order &amp; Security</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>19/32</td>
<td>▼</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulatory Enforcement</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>22/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Justice</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>17/32</td>
<td>▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Justice</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>18/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Constraints on Government Powers

1.1 Limits by the legislature | 0.47 |
1.2 Limits by the judiciary | 0.52 |
1.3 Independent auditing | 0.21 |
1.4 Sanctions for official misconduct | 0.36 |
1.5 Non-governmental checks | 0.57 |
1.6 Elections comply with the law | 0.47 |

### Absence of Corruption

2.1 In the executive branch | 0.27 |
2.2 In the judiciary | 0.47 |
2.3 In police/military | 0.35 |
2.4 In the legislature | 0.26 |

### Open Government **

3.1 Civil participation | 0.24 |
3.2 Right to information | 0.47 |

### Fundamental Rights

4.1 Absence of discrimination | 0.40 |
4.2 Right to life and security* | - |
4.3 Due process of law | 0.46 |
4.4 Freedom of opinion | 0.57 |
4.5 Freedom of religion | 0.77 |
4.6 Right to privacy | 0.46 |
4.7 Freedom of association | 0.61 |
4.8 Labor rights | 0.34 |

### Order & Security

5.1 Absence of homicides | 0.25 |
5.2 Absence of crime | 0.38 |
5.3 Perception of safety | 0.40 |

### Regulatory Enforcement

6.1 Efficient regulatory enforcement | 0.35 |
6.2 Regulatory enforcement free of corruption | 0.29 |
6.3 Efficient administrative procedures | 0.39 |
6.4 Due process in administrative procedures | 0.33 |
6.5 Property rights | 0.37 |

#### Civil Justice

7.1 People know their rights | 0.31 |
7.2 Access to information and affordable legal counsel in civil justice | 0.37 |
7.3 Affordable civil justice without bureaucratic processes | 0.35 |
7.4 Impartial and independent civil justice free of corruption | 0.46 |
7.5 Quality civil justice | 0.36 |
7.6 No unreasonable delay in civil justice | 0.29 |
7.7 Effective enforcement of civil decisions | 0.28 |
7.8 Accessible, impartial and prompt ADRs | 0.45 |

#### Criminal Justice

8.1 Effective criminal investigations | 0.20 |
8.2 Effective and efficient criminal adjudication | 0.30 |
8.3 Rights of victims | 0.46 |
8.4 Due process of law | 0.46 |
8.5 Impartial and independent criminal justice free of corruption | 0.41 |
8.6 Safe prison systems that respect human rights | 0.42 |

*Refer to the methodology section to know more details about sub-factor 4.2

**Refer to the methodology section to know more details about Factor 3

---

Mexico States Rule of Law Index 2019–2020 | 47
### Sinaloa

Scores range from 0 to 1, with 1 indicating the strongest adherence to the rule of law

#### Overall Score 2019-2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Trend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>11/32</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Factor Score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor Score</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Trend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constraints on Government Powers</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>13/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absence of Corruption</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>10/32</td>
<td>▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Government</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>07/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fundamental Rights</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>21/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Order &amp; Security</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>16/32</td>
<td>▼</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulatory Enforcement</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>13/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Justice</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>07/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Justice</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>03/32</td>
<td>▲</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Constraints on Government Powers

1.1 Limits by the legislature | 0.43
1.2 Limits by the judiciary | 0.56
1.3 Independent auditing | 0.27
1.4 Sanctions for official misconduct | 0.41
1.5 Non-governmental checks | 0.48
1.6 Elections comply with the law | 0.51

#### Absence of Corruption

2.1 In the executive branch | 0.34
2.2 In the judiciary | 0.49
2.3 In police/military | 0.39
2.4 In the legislature | 0.33

#### Open Government **

3.1 Civic participation | 0.28
3.2 Right to information | 0.56

#### Fundamental Rights

4.1 Absence of discrimination | 0.46
4.2 Right to life and security* | -
4.3 Due process of law | 0.51
4.4 Freedom of opinion | 0.48
4.5 Freedom of religion | 0.72
4.6 Right to privacy | 0.33
4.7 Freedom of association | 0.56
4.8 Labor rights | 0.39

#### Order & Security

5.1 Absence of homicides | 0.17
5.2 Absence of crime | 0.50
5.3 Perception of safety | 0.49

#### Regulatory Enforcement

6.1 Efficient regulatory enforcement | 0.33
6.2 Regulatory enforcement free of corruption | 0.37
6.3 Efficient administrative procedures | 0.43
6.4 Due process in administrative procedures | 0.37
6.5 Property rights | 0.38

#### Civil Justice

7.1 People know their rights | 0.33
7.2 Access to information and affordable legal counsel in civil justice | 0.46
7.3 Affordable civil justice without bureaucratic processes | 0.35
7.4 Impartial and independent civil justice free of corruption | 0.49
7.5 Quality civil justice | 0.41
7.6 No unreasonable delay in civil justice | 0.32
7.7 Effective enforcement of civil decisions | 0.35
7.8 Accessible, impartial and prompt ADRs | 0.47

#### Criminal Justice

8.1 Effective criminal investigations | 0.30
8.2 Effective and efficient criminal adjudication | 0.45
8.3 Rights of victims | 0.53
8.4 Due process of law | 0.51
8.5 Impartial and independent criminal justice free of corruption | 0.47
8.6 Safe prison systems that respect human rights | 0.45

*Refer to the methodology section to know more details about sub-factor 4.2
**Refer to the methodology section to know more details about Factor 3
Sonora
Scores range from 0 to 1, with 1 indicating the strongest adherence to the rule of law

Overall Score 2019-2020
0.38

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor Score</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Trend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constraints on Government Powers</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>18/32</td>
<td>▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absence of Corruption</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>20/32</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Government</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>08/32</td>
<td>▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fundamental Rights</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>17/32</td>
<td>▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Order &amp; Security</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>23/32</td>
<td>▼</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulatory Enforcement</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>29/32</td>
<td>▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Justice</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>14/32</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Justice</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>17/32</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall Rank | Change in Score | Change in Rank |
21/32 | 0.02 ▲ | 8 ▲ |

Constraints on Government Powers
1.1 | Limits by the legislature | 0.42 |
1.2 | Limits by the judiciary | 0.47 |
1.3 | Independent auditing | 0.29 |
1.4 | Sanctions for official misconduct | 0.42 |
1.5 | Non-governmental checks | 0.53 |
1.6 | Elections comply with the law | 0.46 |

Absence of Corruption
2.1 | In the executive branch | 0.29 |
2.2 | In the judiciary | 0.44 |
2.3 | In police/military | 0.35 |
2.4 | In the legislature | 0.29 |

Open Government **
3.1 | Civic participation | 0.34 |
3.2 | Right to information | 0.50 |

Fundamental Rights
4.1 | Absence of discrimination | 0.43 |
4.2 | Right to life and security* | — |
4.3 | Due process of law | 0.45 |
4.4 | Freedom of opinion | 0.53 |
4.5 | Freedom of religion | 0.76 |
4.6 | Right to privacy | 0.37 |
4.7 | Freedom of association | 0.60 |
4.8 | Labor rights | 0.35 |

Order & Security
5.1 | Absence of homicides | 0.17 |
5.2 | Absence of crime | 0.17 |
5.3 | Perception of safety | 0.46 |

Regulatory Enforcement
6.1 | Efficient regulatory enforcement | 0.33 |
6.2 | Regulatory enforcement free of corruption | 0.29 |
6.3 | Efficient administrative procedures | 0.34 |
6.4 | Due process in administrative procedures | 0.32 |
6.5 | Property rights | 0.35 |

Civil Justice
7.1 | People know their rights | 0.31 |
7.2 | Access to information and affordable legal counsel in civil justice | 0.37 |
7.3 | Affordable civil justice without bureaucratic processes | 0.30 |
7.4 | Impartial and independent civil justice free of corruption | 0.44 |
7.5 | Quality civil justice | 0.39 |
7.6 | No unreasonable delay in civil justice | 0.30 |
7.7 | Effective enforcement of civil decisions | 0.37 |
7.8 | Accessible, impartial and prompt ADRs | 0.52 |

Criminal Justice
8.1 | Effective criminal investigations | 0.21 |
8.2 | Effective and efficient criminal adjudication | 0.42 |
8.3 | Rights of victims | 0.47 |
8.4 | Due process of law | 0.45 |
8.5 | Impartial and independent criminal justice free of corruption | 0.40 |
8.6 | Safe prison systems that respect human rights | 0.33 |

*Refer to the methodology section to know more details about sub-factor 4.2
**Refer to the methodology section to know more details about Factor 3
Scores range from 0 to 1, with 1 indicating the strongest adherence to the rule of law

**Overall Score 2019-2020**

- **Score**: 0.37
- **Overall Rank**: 24/32
- **Change in Score**: -0.01
- **Change in Rank**: -3

**Factor Score**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor Score</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Trend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constraints on Government Powers</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>11/32</td>
<td>▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absence of Corruption</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>16/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Government</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>13/32</td>
<td>▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fundamental Rights</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>14/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Order &amp; Security</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>26/32</td>
<td>▼</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulatory Enforcement</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>32/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Justice</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>21/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Justice</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>11/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Constraints on Government Powers

1.1 | Limits by the legislature | 0.46
1.2 | Limits by the judiciary | 0.53
1.3 | Independent auditing | 0.31
1.4 | Sanctions for official misconduct | 0.42
1.5 | Non-governmental checks | 0.55
1.6 | Elections comply with the law | 0.40

### Absence of Corruption

2.1 | In the executive branch | 0.30
2.2 | In the judiciary | 0.45
2.3 | In police/military | 0.40
2.4 | In the legislature | 0.28

### Open Government **

3.1 | Civic participation | 0.31
3.2 | Right to information | 0.50

### Fundamental Rights

4.1 | Absence of discrimination | 0.45
4.2 | Right to life and security* | -
4.3 | Due process of law | 0.48
4.4 | Freedom of opinion | 0.55
4.5 | Freedom of religion | 0.77
4.6 | Right to privacy | 0.38
4.7 | Freedom of association | 0.60
4.8 | Labor rights | 0.33

### Order & Security

5.1 | Absence of homicides | 0.25
5.2 | Absence of crime | 0.25
5.3 | Perception of safety | 0.22

### Regulatory Enforcement

6.1 | Efficient regulatory enforcement | 0.26
6.2 | Regulatory enforcement free of corruption | 0.33
6.3 | Efficient administrative procedures | 0.36
6.4 | Due process in administrative procedures | 0.25
6.5 | Property rights | 0.35

*Refer to the methodology section to know more details about sub-factor 4.2

**Refer to the methodology section to know more details about Factor 3
Tamaulipas
Scores range from 0 to 1, with 1 indicating the strongest adherence to the rule of law

Overall Score 2019-2020

0.39

Factor Score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor Score</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Trend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constraints on Government Powers</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>26/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absence of Corruption</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>13/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Government</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>28/32</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fundamental Rights</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>26/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Order &amp; Security</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>11/32</td>
<td>▼</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulatory Enforcement</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>17/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Justice</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>25/32</td>
<td>▼</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Justice</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>19/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall Rank Change in Score Change in Rank
19/32 0.01 ▲  -

Constraints on Government Powers
1.1 Limits by the legislature 0.33
1.2 Limits by the judiciary 0.46
1.3 Independent auditing 0.33
1.4 Sanctions for official misconduct 0.39
1.5 Non-governmental checks 0.43
1.6 Elections comply with the law 0.44

Absence of Corruption
2.1 In the executive branch 0.40
2.2 In the judiciary 0.44
2.3 In police/military 0.34
2.4 In the legislature 0.33

Open Government **
3.1 Civic participation 0.22
3.2 Right to information 0.45

Fundamental Rights
4.1 Absence of discrimination 0.42
4.2 Right to life and security* -
4.3 Due process of law 0.46
4.4 Freedom of opinion 0.43
4.5 Freedom of religion 0.76
4.6 Right to privacy 0.35
4.7 Freedom of association 0.53
4.8 Labor rights 0.43

Order & Security
5.1 Absence of homicides 0.17
5.2 Absence of crime 0.71
5.3 Perception of safety 0.36

Regulatory Enforcement
6.1 Efficient regulatory enforcement 0.33
6.2 Regulatory enforcement free of corruption 0.59
6.3 Efficient administrative procedures 0.28
6.4 Due process in administrative procedures 0.31
6.5 Property rights 0.33

Civil Justice
7.1 People know their rights 0.29
7.2 Access to information and affordable legal counsel in civil justice 0.33
7.3 Affordable civil justice without bureaucratic processes 0.24
7.4 Impartial and independent civil justice free of corruption 0.42
7.5 Quality civil justice 0.35
7.6 No unreasonable delay in civil justice 0.26
7.7 Effective enforcement of civil decisions 0.30
7.8 Accessible, impartial and prompt ADRs 0.47

Criminal Justice
8.1 Effective criminal investigations 0.24
8.2 Effective and efficient criminal adjudication 0.33
8.3 Rights of victims 0.47
8.4 Due process of law 0.46
8.5 Impartial and independent criminal justice free of corruption 0.40
8.6 Safe prison systems that respect human rights 0.33

*Refer to the methodology section to know more details about sub-factor 4.2
**Refer to the methodology section to know more details about Factor 3
# Tlaxcala

Scores range from 0 to 1, with 1 indicating the strongest adherence to the rule of law.

## Overall Score 2019-2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Score</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall Rank</td>
<td>25/32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in Score</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in Rank</td>
<td>-5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Factor Score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor Score</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Trend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constraints on Government Powers</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>10/32</td>
<td>▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absence of Corruption</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>24/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Government **</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>31/32</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fundamental Rights</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>18/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Order &amp; Security</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>17/32</td>
<td>▼</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulatory Enforcement</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>20/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Justice</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>28/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Justice</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>23/32</td>
<td>▼</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Constraints on Government Powers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-factor</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Limits by the legislature</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Limits by the judiciary</td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Independent auditing</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4 Sanctions for official misconduct</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5 Non-governmental checks</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6 Elections comply with the law</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Absence of Corruption

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-factor</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1 In the executive branch</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 In the judiciary</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 In police/military</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4 In the legislature</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Open Government **

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-factor</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Civic participation</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2 Right to information</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Fundamental Rights

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-factor</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.1 Absence of discrimination</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2 Right to life and security*</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3 Due process of law</td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4 Freedom of opinion</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5 Freedom of religion</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.6 Right to privacy</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.7 Freedom of association</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.8 Labor rights</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Order & Security

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-factor</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.1 Absence of homicides</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2 Absence of crime</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3 Perception of safety</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Regulatory Enforcement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-factor</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.1 Efficient regulatory enforcement</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2 Regulatory enforcement free of corruption</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3 Efficient administrative procedures</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.4 Due process in administrative procedures</td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.5 Property rights</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Civil Justice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-factor</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.1 People know their rights</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.2 Access to information and affordable legal counsel in civil justice</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.3 Affordable civil justice without bureaucratic processes</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.4 Impartial and independent civil justice free of corruption</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.5 Quality civil justice</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.6 No unreasonable delay in civil justice</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.7 Effective enforcement of civil decisions</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.8 Accessible, impartial and prompt ADRs</td>
<td>0.46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Criminal Justice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-factor</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.1 Effective criminal investigations</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.2 Effective and efficient criminal adjudication</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.3 Rights of victims</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.4 Due process of law</td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.5 Impartial and independent criminal justice free of corruption</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.6 Safe prison systems that respect human rights</td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Refer to the methodology section to know more details about sub-factor 4.2
**Refer to the methodology section to know more details about Factor 3

---
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**Veracruz**

Scores range from 0 to 1, with 1 indicating the strongest adherence to the rule of law.

### Overall Score 2019-2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Rank</th>
<th>Change in Score</th>
<th>Change in Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22/32</td>
<td>0.01▲</td>
<td>2▲</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Factor Score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Trend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constraints on Government Powers</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>32/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absence of Corruption</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>19/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Government</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>12/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fundamental Rights</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>31/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Order &amp; Security</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>08/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulatory Enforcement</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>15/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Justice</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>29/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Justice</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>29/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Constraints on Government Powers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-Factor</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Limits by the legislature</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Limits by the judiciary</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Independent auditing</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4 Sanctions for official misconduct</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5 Non-governmental checks</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6 Elections comply with the law</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Absence of Corruption

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-Factor</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1 In the executive branch</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 In the judiciary</td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 In police/military</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4 In the legislature</td>
<td>0.27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Open Government **

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-Factor</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Civic participation</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2 Right to information</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Fundamental Rights

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-Factor</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.1 Absence of discrimination</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2 Right to life and security*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3 Due process of law</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4 Freedom of opinion</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5 Freedom of religion</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.6 Right to privacy</td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.7 Freedom of association</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.8 Labor rights</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Order & Security

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-Factor</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.1 Absence of homicides</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2 Absence of crime</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3 Perception of safety</td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Regulatory Enforcement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-Factor</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.1 Efficient regulatory enforcement</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2 Regulatory enforcement free of corruption</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3 Efficient administrative procedures</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.4 Due process in administrative procedures</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.5 Property rights</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Civil Justice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-Factor</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.1 People know their rights</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.2 Access to information and affordable legal counsel in civil justice</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.3 Affordable civil justice without bureaucratic processes</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.4 Impartial and independent civil justice free of corruption</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.5 Quality civil justice</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.6 No unreasonable delay in civil justice</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.7 Effective enforcement of civil decisions</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.8 Accessible, impartial and prompt ADRs</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Criminal Justice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-Factor</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.1 Effective criminal investigations</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.2 Effective and efficient criminal adjudication</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.3 Rights of victims</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.4 Due process of law</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.5 Impartial and independent criminal justice free of corruption</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.6 Safe prison systems that respect human rights</td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Refer to the methodology section to know more details about sub-factor 4.2
**Refer to the methodology section to know more details about Factor 3.
Yucatán

Scores range from 0 to 1, with 1 indicating the strongest adherence to the rule of law

Overall Score 2019-2020
0.46

Factor Score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor Score</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Trend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constraints on Government Powers</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>04/32</td>
<td>▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absence of Corruption</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>07/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Government</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>19/32</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fundamental Rights</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>01/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Order &amp; Security</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>01/32</td>
<td>▼</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulatory Enforcement</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>10/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Justice</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>11/32</td>
<td>▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Justice</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>13/32</td>
<td>▼</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall Rank | Change in Score | Change in Rank |
01/32        | 0.01 ▲         | -              |

Constraints on Government Powers
1.1 | Limits by the legislature | 0.53 |
1.2 | Limits by the judiciary   | 0.49 |
1.3 | Independent auditing      | 0.26 |
1.4 | Sanctions for official misconduct | 0.39 |
1.5 | Non-governmental checks   | 0.63 |
1.6 | Elections comply with the law | 0.50 |

Absence of Corruption
2.1 | In the executive branch | 0.41 |
2.2 | In the judiciary         | 0.46 |
2.3 | In police/military       | 0.41 |
2.4 | In the legislature       | 0.31 |

Open Government **
3.1 | Civic participation      | 0.22 |
3.2 | Right to information     | 0.54 |

Fundamental Rights
4.1 | Absence of discrimination | 0.37 |
4.2 | Right to life and security* | - |
4.3 | Due process of law       | 0.46 |
4.4 | Freedom of opinion       | 0.63 |
4.5 | Freedom of religion      | 0.75 |
4.6 | Right to privacy         | 0.66 |
4.7 | Freedom of association   | 0.64 |
4.8 | Labor rights             | 0.26 |

Order & Security
5.1 | Absence of homicides      | 0.83 |
5.2 | Absence of crime         | 0.71 |
5.3 | Perception of safety     | 0.65 |

Regulatory Enforcement
6.1 | Efficient regulatory enforcement | 0.33 |
6.2 | Regulatory enforcement free of corruption | 0.47 |
6.3 | Efficient administrative procedures | 0.37 |
6.4 | Due process in administrative procedures | 0.38 |
6.5 | Property rights          | 0.41 |

Civil Justice
7.1 | People know their rights | 0.34 |
7.2 | Access to information and affordable legal counsel in civil justice | 0.42 |
7.3 | Affordable civil justice without bureaucratic processes | 0.29 |
7.4 | Impartial and independent civil justice free of corruption | 0.44 |
7.5 | Quality civil justice | 0.41 |
7.6 | No unreasonable delay in civil justice | 0.33 |
7.7 | Effective enforcement of civil decisions | 0.31 |
7.8 | Accessible, impartial and prompt ADRs | 0.53 |

Criminal Justice
8.1 | Effective criminal investigations | 0.22 |
8.2 | Effective and efficient criminal adjudication | 0.38 |
8.3 | Rights of victims | 0.46 |
8.4 | Due process of law | 0.46 |
8.5 | Impartial and independent criminal justice free of corruption | 0.43 |
8.6 | Safe prison systems that respect human rights | 0.39 |

*Refer to the methodology section to know more details about sub-factor 4.2
**Refer to the methodology section to know more details about Factor 3
### Zacatecas

Scores range from 0 to 1, with 1 indicating the strongest adherence to the rule of law

#### Overall Score 2019-2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Trend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>03/32</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Overall Rank** | **Change in Score** | **Change in Rank** |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>03/32</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Factor Score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor Score</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Trend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constraints on Government Powers</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>05/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absence of Corruption</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>02/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Government</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>05/32</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fundamental Rights</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>13/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Order &amp; Security</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>18/32</td>
<td>▼</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulatory Enforcement</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>06/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Justice</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>09/32</td>
<td>▼</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Justice</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>02/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Constraints on Government Powers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-Factor</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **1.1** Limits by the legislature
- **1.2** Limits by the judiciary
- **1.3** Independent auditing
- **1.4** Sanctions for official misconduct
- **1.5** Non-governmental checks
- **1.6** Elections comply with the law

#### Absence of Corruption

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-Factor</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **2.1** In the executive branch
- **2.2** In the judiciary
- **2.3** In police/military
- **2.4** In the legislature

#### Open Government **

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-Factor</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **3.1** Civic participation
- **3.2** Right to information

#### Fundamental Rights

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-Factor</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>0.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>0.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>0.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **4.1** Absence of discrimination
- **4.2** Right to life and security*
- **4.3** Due process of law
- **4.4** Freedom of opinion
- **4.5** Freedom of religion
- **4.6** Right to privacy
- **4.7** Freedom of association
- **4.8** Labor rights

*Refer to the methodology section to know more details about sub-factor 4.2

#### Order & Security

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-Factor</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **5.1** Absence of homicides
- **5.2** Absence of crime
- **5.3** Perception of safety

#### Regulatory Enforcement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-Factor</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>0.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **6.1** Efficient regulatory enforcement
- **6.2** Regulatory enforcement free of corruption
- **6.3** Efficient administrative procedures
- **6.4** Due process in administrative procedures
- **6.5** Property rights

#### Civil Justice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-Factor</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>0.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **7.1** People know their rights
- **7.2** Access to information and affordable legal counsel in civil justice
- **7.3** Affordable civil justice without bureaucratic processes
- **7.4** Impartial and independent civil justice free of corruption
- **7.5** Quality civil justice
- **7.6** No unreasonable delay in civil justice
- **7.7** Effective enforcement of civil decisions
- **7.8** Accessible, impartial and prompt ADRs

#### Criminal Justice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-Factor</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **8.1** Effective criminal investigations
- **8.2** Effective and efficient criminal adjudication
- **8.3** Rights of victims
- **8.4** Due process of law
- **8.5** Impartial and independent criminal justice free of corruption
- **8.6** Safe prison systems that respect human rights

*Refer to the methodology section to know more details about Factor 3

**Score by sub-factor**

- **Fundamental Rights**
  - Absence of discrimination: 0.46
  - Right to life and security*: 0.46
  - Due process of law: 0.53
  - Freedom of opinion: 0.54
  - Freedom of religion: 0.75
  - Right to privacy: 0.35
  - Freedom of association: 0.61
  - Labor rights: 0.32

- **Order & Security**
  - Absence of homicides: 0.08
  - Absence of crime: 0.58
  - Perception of safety: 0.36

- **Regulatory Enforcement**
  - Efficient regulatory enforcement: 0.32
  - Regulatory enforcement free of corruption: 0.64
  - Efficient administrative procedures: 0.38
  - Due process in administrative procedures: 0.32
  - Property rights: 0.37

**Score by factor**

- **Fundamental Rights**: 0.51
- **Order & Security**: 0.34
- **Regulatory Enforcement**: 0.41
- **Civil Justice**: 0.40
- **Criminal Justice**: 0.46
Methodology

The indicators presented in the Mexico States Rule of Law Index 2019-2020 are organized into eight factors and 42 sub-factors.

These indicators are built using three sources of information: i) the General Population Poll (GPP), ii) Qualified Respondents Questionnaires (QRQs) for attorneys who practice law in each of the 32 states, and iii) official statistics and databases compiled by other institutions (or third-party sources). The scores presented in each of the state profiles are calculated using the following procedure:

1. Conceptual Framework and Surveys
   - The WJP developed the conceptual framework and surveys to quantify the rule of law based on the framework developed for the global Index and adapted it to the subnational Mexican context.
   - The WJP team designed five surveys based on the surveys developed for the global Rule of Law Index: the GPP and the four QRQs for professionals specialized in civil, administrative or commercial law, criminal law, labor law, and public health. The WJP adapted the surveys to reflect the institutional architecture in Mexico, the competencies of the different government levels, and the availability of data. The five surveys benefited from exhaustive consultation with academia and experts.

2. Data Collection
   - **General Population Poll (GPP):** The WJP hired four leading companies in public opinion surveys to administer the survey to the general population and a fifth company to supervise fieldwork. The WJP developed the methodological framework with the survey companies and selected the target population, sample frame, sample selection process, geographic coverage, and size of the sample.

     The survey was administered to a representative sample of 800 people in every state, for a total of 25,600 surveyed individuals, using multi-stage sampling, with data from the Population and Housing Census 2010 (INEGI) used as the sampling frame. In the first stage, 80 Primary Sampling Units (PSU) were selected, comprised of basic geostatistical areas (AGEB) in urban and rural areas, using quotas of sex and age. In the second stage, blocks or clusters of homes were selected using simple random sampling. In the third stage, homes were selected using systematic methods based on the number of homes visible on each block. Finally, in the last stage, the person to be interviewed was selected based on gender and age quotas from adults who live in the country and who permanently live in the home where the survey took place. The GPP has a 95% confidence level, a margin of error of +/- 0.61% at the national level and +/- 3.46% at the state level.

     The surveys were administered from May 11 to July 27, 2019. The interviews were conducted face-to-face using tablets or smartphones. The survey was programmed in the SurveyToGo (STG) application. Before conducting fieldwork, the pollsters completed a training program and the survey companies performed a pilot exercise. In order to guarantee the quality of the information, traditional in-situ supervision techniques were applied by field personnel, and remote supervision was applied in real time to validate the interviews through the STG console.

   - **Qualified Respondent Questionnaires:** The WJP collected 16,000 records from attorneys specialized in civil, commercial, administrative, criminal, and labor matters across the entire country, using phone books in over 100 cities, websites, databases from Centro de Estudios para la Enseñanza y el Aprendizaje del Derecho, A.C. (CEEAD), and references from other attorneys.

     The WJP programmed the surveys using an online platform and invited the experts to participate. Data was collected using SurveyGizmo. The WJP administered the online survey between April 9 and August 18, 2019 and kept in constant communication with the surveyed individuals to increase response rates. The WJP obtained 2,673 effective complete interviews: 41% were lawyers specialized in civil, administrative, or commercial law, 25% were lawyers specialized in criminal law, 17% were public health experts.
Box 3: An Overview of the General Population Poll

The expression used to obtain the sample size of the GPP was:

\[ n = \frac{(z^2 \cdot pqN)}{(r^2 (N-1)+z^2 \cdot pq)} \]

- \( z^2 \) — Value in statistical Z-table of a normal function, a necessary condition to achieve a confidence level of 95%.
- \( p \) — Proportion estimated from the sample
- \( q \) — \((1-p)\)
- \( N \) — Finite population to estimate
- \( r \) — Maximum expected error

The parameters of \( p = q = 0.5 \) (maximum variability) were used for the target population, \( N \) as the size of the universe to be represented, and a maximum expected relative error of: +/- 3.465% at 95% confidence. Obtaining a sample size of 800 cases per state.

The results are considered proportion estimates when accounting for the sample design (by clusters, stratified and weighted). Therefore, expansion factors were developed. These represent the “weight” of each individual in the sample, according to their probability of selection, considering the sociodemographic distributions and the sample itself. This is a way of calibrating the sample to represent the total population. The weight was adjusted by sex, age and region (urban or rural).

The expansion factors were calculated as the inverse of the selection probability. Namely:

\[ F_{ijh} = \frac{1}{P_{ijh}} \]

- \( F_{ijh} \) — Expansion factor for the individual \( i \) of the \( j^{th} \) PSU of the \( h^{th} \) stratum.
- \( P_{ijh} \) — Probability of selection for the individual \( i \) of the \( j^{th} \) PSU of the \( h^{th} \) stratum.

The probability of selection is calculated:

\[ P_{ijh} = \frac{(n_h \cdot m_{jh})}{P_h} \]

- \( n_h \) — Number of PSU selected in the \( h^{th} \) stratum.
- \( m_{jh} \) — Number of interviews conducted in \( j^{th} \) PSU of the \( h^{th} \) stratum.
- \( P_h \) — Population over 18 years that lives in the \( h^{th} \) stratum.
Third-party sources: The WJP compiled administrative information and survey databases representative at the state level on rule of law topics to complement the WJP’s other sources of information. The WJP used five criteria to select and include third-party data. The data had to be: i) conceptually valid, ii) timely, iii) disaggregated by state, iv) representative at the state level, and v) compiled using a transparent and robust methodology. In the Mexico States Rule of Law Index 2019-2020, the WJP included 12 third-party sources, which were published before September 30, 2019:

- National Survey on Discrimination (ENADIS) 2017 - INEGI
- National Survey of Population Deprived of Liberty (ENPOL) 2016 - INEGI
- National Survey on Government Impact and Quality (ENCIG) 2017 - INEGI
- National Survey on the Dynamics of Relationships in Homes (ENDIREH) 2016 - INEGI
- National Survey on Victimization and Perception of Public (ENVIPE) 2019 - INEGI
- National Survey on Victimization of Companies (ENVE) 2018 - INEGI
- National Survey of Occupation and Employment (ENOIE) 2019 - INEGI
- Records of murder rates 2018 - INEGI
- Records of murdered journalists - Artículo 19
- National Diagnosis of Prison Supervision (DNSP) 2018 - National Commission on Human Rights (CNDH)
- Open Government Metric 2017 - INAI y CIDE

Data Cleaning and Score Computation

Once collected, the WJP carefully cleaned and processed the data. Any incomplete answers and answers with atypical values detected through the Z-score method (X+/−2SD) were excluded. Then, the WJP calculated the scores for every state (disaggregated into eight factors and 42 sub-factors), according to the following steps: i) First, the responses to each of the interviews completed in the general population survey, qualified respondent questionnaires, and third-party sources were codified to produce numerical values ranging from 0 to 1, where 0 represents lower adherence to the rule of law and 1 represents higher adherence to the rule of law. ii) Then, average scores were calculated for every state to produce statistical data for each question. iii) Intervals were created for categorical variables, so that the transformed variables were located between 0 and 1. The categorical variables are the records of murdered journalists (Article 19), incidence and perception of corruption by the ENCIG (INEGI), prevalence of violence against women by the ENDIREH (INEGI), discrimination experiences by the ENADIS (INEGI), mistreatment in arrest and detention in the Public Ministry by the ENPOL (INEGI), child labor by the ENOE (INEGI), deaths by murders (INEGI), crime prevalence and incidence in the ENVIPE (INEGI), and the National Diagnosis of Prison Supervision (CNDH). For the rest of the variables, WJP decided to not normalize the variables, and instead use the original measurement scale where, for each question, 0 represents the total absence of rule of law and 1 represents the ideal rule of law. This was to facilitate comparisons over time and to prevent the transmission of erroneous messages suggesting that leading states in the country had reached perfection in the rule of law. iv) Next, scores of the categories inside the sub-factors were calculated and used to calculate sub-factor scores. Sub-factor scores were then aggregated using simple averages to produce the factor scores. Lastly, the scores of the factors were combined to produce a state score, and the final rankings were calculated.

Validation and Visualization of Data

The data was validated through comparisons with over 20 quantitative and qualitative indicators produced by other organizations to identify possible mistakes and inconsistencies, as well as through trends presented in the news media and qualitative reports. The WJP also validated the final results with a diverse group of experts from a variety of fields.

11 The variable map and the exact formulas used to calculate each score are available at worldjusticeproject.com and worldjusticeproject.mx
1. CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK AND SURVEYS

The Mexico States Rule of Law Index 2019-2020 uses a conceptual framework and methodology that are very similar to those used by WJP around the world, but has adapted the concepts and surveys to the Mexican context in order to provide a comprehensive summary of the rule of law situation in each of the states.

The WJP team made an exhaustive consultation with academia and experts to design five surveys: one General Population Poll (GPP) and four Qualified Respondent Questionnaires (QRQs).

2. DATA COLLECTION

Three sources of information were used:

I. GENERAL POPULATION POLL

25,600 face-to-face interviews
800 interviews in each state
Representative sample of the population of 18 years and above.

II. QUALIFIED RESPONDENT QUESTIONNAIRES

2,673 interviews with experts in:
- Civil Justice
- Criminal Justice
- Labor Justice
- Public Health

WJP invited more than 16,000 experts to take an online poll.
In some states, a telephone follow-up was performed.
Their responses were received.

III. THIRD-PARTY SOURCES

12 indicators of administrative information and survey databases representative at the state level

3. DATA CLEANING AND SCORE COMPUTATION

WJP cleaned and processed the data:

- 607 variables were codified
- Average scores were calculated for every state
- Scores for the eight factors and 42 sub-factors were calculated
- Scores for the factors were aggregated to calculate the scores for the Mexico States Rule of Law Index 2019-2020

4. VALIDATION

Data were validated with:
- Over 20 quantitative and qualitative indicators from other organizations
- News media and qualitative reports
- Review with a diverse group of experts from a variety of fields
Lastly, the data was organized into tables and graphs in the state profiles in order to facilitate the data's presentation and interpretation.

5. Tracking Changes Over Time

This year’s report includes a measure to illustrate whether the rule of law in a state, as measured through the factors of the WJP Rule of Law Index, changed since the previous year. This measure is presented in the form of arrows and represents a summary of rigorous statistical testing based on the use of bootstrapping procedures, to generate 150 samples of all the variables of the Index in order to estimate the standard deviations of each of the factors by state. The upward (downward) arrow means that the score of that factor increased (decreased) more than 1.96 standard deviations. If there was no statistically significant change, the arrow is not included.

Notes on the Mexico States Rule of Law Index

The Mexico States Rule of Law Index 2019-2020 employs a conceptual framework and methodology similar to those used by the WJP to measure adherence to the rule of law around the world from the citizens’ perspective.

For the Mexico States Rule of Law Index, however, the conceptual framework and methodology were adapted to reflect the national context and the institutional architecture in Mexico. Additionally, more third-party sources were included to measure some concepts. As a result, the scores in the global Index and in the Index in Mexico are not comparable. The Mexico States Rule of Law Index 2019-2020 seeks to identify the strengths and weaknesses of each state in order to provide useful and timely information to decision-makers, companies, civil society organizations, academia, and anyone interested in strengthening the rule of law in Mexico.

The Index, like any analysis tool, has strengths and weaknesses. On one hand, it summarizes complex information into very few indicators, is robust and relatively easy to communicate, and allows comparisons across states and over time. On the other hand, the Index presents a simplified image of reality. It may hide details that would be obvious when analyzing certain individual indicators and may lead to simplified interpretations of data. Likewise, the Index does not establish causality or contextualize the results. Therefore, it is necessary to use it with other quantitative and qualitative instruments to obtain a comprehensive picture of the situation in a state and the problems faced by the state in public policy matters. Additionally, the scores in the Index may be sensitive to specific events that took place while the data was collected or may be subject to measurement mistakes due to the limited number of experts interviewed in some states, which produces less precise estimations. To mitigate this, WJP works to continuously expand the network of experts that contribute their knowledge and time to this project.

Lastly, it is worth mentioning that indices and indicators are subject to possible abuse and misinterpretation. Once released to the public, they can take on a life of their own and be used for purposes unanticipated by their creators. If data are taken out of context, it can lead to unintended or erroneous policy decisions.

Other Considerations

Regarding Factor 3 (Open Government), WJP decided to incorporate the Open Government Metric of the INAI/CIDE into the Mexico States Rule of Law Index because of its robust methodology and publicly accessible data. The Open Government Metric incorporates two fundamental aspects of open government: citizen participation (3.1) and transparency (3.2) and is the most complete and comprehensive measuring tool on the subject in Mexico.

In line with its objective of providing the best possible information, the Metric made changes to its methodology for its 2019 edition. These included changes in the sources of information and in the construction of the indicators. These changes were substantial, affecting the comparability of its scores over time. After a thorough analysis, conversations with the developers, and a series of comparative exercises, the WJP decided to prioritize comparability over time to the detriment of a more accurate measurement of open government in 2019 and decided to use the results of the 2017 edition of the Metric, which were used in the Mexico States Rule of Law Index 2018. If the Open Government Metric 2019 had been incorporated into the Index, it would have
been impossible to determine whether the changes observed in the scores were due to changes in the openness of the state governments or changes in the methodology, which would have been especially problematic in a year in which many states have new governments.

Regarding Factor 4.2 (Right to Life and Security of the Person). Currently, in Mexico there is no adequate data to measure sub-factor 4.2 on a state level, and it cannot be properly quantified through surveys. Therefore, it has been left as an empty value that has no effect on scores. Nonetheless, WJP recognizes the importance of guaranteeing this right for the rule of law, and it is therefore included in the conceptual framework of the Mexico States Rule of Law Index 2019-2020.

**Differences Between WJP’s Global Index and the Mexico Index**

As noted before, the Mexico States Rule of Law Index 2019-2020 uses the same conceptual framework and methodology as WJP’s global Index to quantify respect for the rule of law, with some adaptations made to reflect the institutional architecture in Mexico, the competencies of the different government levels, and the availability of data. Specifically, i) some sub-factors were modified; ii) surveys were reviewed, adapted, and expanded to reflect the multiple situations, manifestations, and problems associated with the rule of law in Mexico; and iii) 12 third-party sources were added to capture some concepts included in the Index in a reliable, systematic, and precise manner. In total, the Mexico States Rule of Law Index 2019-2020 was prepared using 607 variables, while the global Index has 550.

Below is a summary of the main changes, organized by the factors of the Index. A full map of all the sub-factors and variables is available at WJP’s website.

- **Factor 1. Constraints on Government Powers:** In the global Rule of Law Index, sub-factor 1.6 refers to the transition of power according to the law. In Mexico, the transition of power requires elections that are free and transparent. Therefore, sub-factor 1.6 has been retitled “Elections are free, clean, and transparent.”

- **Factor 2. Absence of Corruption:** Sub-factor 2.3, previously titled “Government officials in the police and the military do not use public office for private gain,” was renamed “Government officials in the safety and law enforcement systems do not use public office for private gain” to include the absence of corruption in the Prosecutor’s Office.

- **Factor 3. Open Government:** The global Index uses four sub-factors: publicized laws and government data (3.1), right to information (3.2), civic participation (3.3), and complaint mechanisms (3.4). The Mexico Index uses only two sub-factors: civic participation (3.1) and transparency (3.2) and employs the Open Government Metric 2017 published by the INAI and CIDE, because it is considered robust and reliable. This measurement includes an analysis of the regulations that apply to each required subject, a review of websites, and a simulated user exercise.

- **Factor 5. Order & Security:** The global Index uses three sub-factors: crime is effectively controlled (5.1), civil conflict is effectively limited (5.2), and people do not resort to violence to redress personal grievances (5.3). In contrast, the Mexico States Rule of Law Index 2019-2020 uses three different sub-factors to measure Factor 5: absence of homicides (5.1), absence of crime (5.2), and the perception of safety by people and companies in the state (5.3). These changes better reflect the security situation in Mexico by giving more weight to murders, incorporating data of crime prevalence and incidence from INEGI, and including security perceptions.

- **Factor 7. Civil Justice:** Factor 7 of the Mexico States Rule of Law Index includes the same measurements used in the global Index, but redistributes them to give more weight and specificity to the concept of accessibility, which is now split into sub-factors 7.1, 7.2, and 7.3. The global Index comprises seven sub-factors to measure civil justice: people can access and afford civil justice (7.1); civil justice is free of corruption (7.3); civil justice is free of discrimination (7.2); civil justice is free of corruption (7.3); civil justice is free of improper government influence (7.4); civil justice is not subject to unreasonable delay (7.5); civil justice is effectively enforced (7.6); and alternative dispute resolution mechanisms are accessible, impartial, and effective (7.7). By contrast, the Mexico States Rule of Law Index 2018 measures civil justice by taking into consideration whether people know of and trust the formal mechanisms to solve their legal problems (7.1); whether there is adequate and affordable legal counsel (7.2); whether people can easily solve their legal problems without high costs and bureaucratic processes (7.3); whether the civil justice system is impartial, independent, and free of corruption (7.4); whether the civil justice system guarantees a quality process (7.5); whether the civil justice system conducts procedures promptly and without unreasonable delays (7.6); whether judicial decisions in civil courts are effectively enforced (7.7); and whether alternative mechanisms to solve disputes are accessible, impartial, and timely.
Factor 8. Criminal Justice: Factor 8 of the global Index comprises seven sub-factors: criminal investigation system is effective (8.1), criminal adjudication system is timely and effective (8.2), correctional system is effective in reducing criminal behavior (8.3), criminal justice system is impartial (8.4), criminal justice system is free of corruption (8.5), criminal justice system is free of improper government influence (8.6), and due process of the law and rights of the accused (8.7). Factor 8 of the Mexico States Rule of Law Index 2018 incorporates the protection of victims’ rights and reorganizes the other sub-factors into six sub-factors: effective criminal investigation (8.1), effective and efficient criminal adjudication system (8.2), guarantee of the rights of victims (8.3), guarantee of the right to due process of law for the accused (8.4), impartial and independent criminal justice free of corruption (8.5), and the prison system guarantees the safety and human rights of people deprived of their liberty (8.6).
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Results of the Mexico States Rule of Law Index, 2018 and 2019-2020

The following tables show the data of *Mexico States Rule of Law Index* 2018 and 2019–2020 for the 32 states disaggregated by factor.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aguascalientes</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baja California</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baja California Sur</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campeche</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chiapas</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chihuahua</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico City</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coahuila</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colima</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durango</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State of Mexico</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guanajuato</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guerrero</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hidalgo</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jalisco</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michoacán</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morelos</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nayarit</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuevo León</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oaxaca</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puebla</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Querétaro</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quintana Roo</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Luis Potosí</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sinaloa</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonora</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tabasco</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tamaulipas</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tlaxcala</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veracruz</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yucatán</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zacatecas</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aguascalientes</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baja California</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baja California Sur</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campeche</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chiapas</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chihuahua</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico City</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coahuila</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colima</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durango</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State of Mexico</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guanajuato</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guerrero</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hidalgo</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jalisco</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michoacán</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morelos</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nayarit</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuevo León</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oaxaca</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puebla</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Querétaro</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quintana Roo</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Luis Potosí</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sinaloa</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonora</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tabasco</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tamaulipas</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tlaxcala</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veracruz</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yucatán</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zacatecas</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The rule of law is the foundation for communities of equity, opportunity, and peace - underpinning development, accountable government, and respect for fundamental rights. The rule of law helps fight poverty and protects people from injustices.
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