World Justice Project

Mexico States
Rule of Law
Index 2020-2021
The Mexico States Rule of Law Index 2020-2021 was prepared by a team led by Alejandro Ponce, Alejandro González Arreola, and Leslie Solís, under the executive direction of Elizabeth Andersen and the regional direction of Tim Kessler.

The conceptual framework and methodology of the Mexico States Rule of Law Index were developed by Camilo Gutiérrez, Alejandro Ponce, and Leslie Solís, with the help of Alicia Evangelides, Daniel Gamboa, Roberto Hernández, Rachel Martin, Layda Negrete, and Pablo Parás, based on the conceptual framework and methodology of the WJP Rule of Law Index, developed by Mark David Agrast, Juan Carlos Botero, and Alejandro Ponce.

The data collection for the Mexico States Rule of Law Index 2020-2021 was coordinated by Eréndira González Portillo.

The data analysis for the Mexico States Rule of Law Index 2020-2021 was performed by Eréndira González Portillo and Alejandro Ponce.

The research, data collection, analysis, and final report production was done by Estefany Caudillo, Michelle Esquivel, Amir Galván, Alejandro González Arreola, Lucía Estefanía González Medel, Eréndira González Portillo, Matthew Harman, Irene Heras, Natalia Jardón, Osvaldo Jiménez, Tim Kessler, Rafael Lozano, Fernando Omedé, Alejandro Ponce, Mario Rodríguez Vigueras, and Leslie Solís, with the help of Juan Manuel Alcántara, María Chavarría, Michael Cormier, Issa Guerra, Eduardo Monroy, Luis Montalvo, Paulina del Paso, Christina Ramiro, Mayte Ramos and Paulina Vega.

The website was produced by New Emage.

The WJP Mexico States Rule of Law Index 2020-2021 was made possible thanks to the generosity of the World Justice Project’s sponsors. The WJP Rule of Law Index® and the World Justice Project Rule of Law Index® are trademarks of the World Justice Project.

All rights reserved. Any requests to reproduce this document must be sent to:

Alejandro Ponce
World Justice Project
1025 Vermont Avenue NW, Suite 1200
Washington DC, 20005, USA

Email: aponce@worldjusticeproject.org

Table of Contents

Preface

07 Preface

1 Introduction

09 Introduction

10 Summary Table: Scores and Rankings

12 Executive Summary

14 Rule of Law by Factor

18 What is the Rule of Law and How is it Measured?

19 Factors and Sub-Factors of the Mexico States Rule of Law Index

23 Sources of information

2 State Profiles

26 How to Read the State Profiles

25 State Profiles

3 Methodology

60 Methodology

63 Notes on the Mexico States Rule of Law Index

66 Word Clouds

68 Summary Table

69 Contributing Experts

95 Acknowledgments

96 About the World Justice Project

97 Results of the Mexico States Rule of Law Index

100 Other World Justice Project Publications
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 & Security
- Regulatory Enforcement
- Civil Justice
- Criminal Justice

“The scores for these factors are comparable over time for each state. They reflect the perspectives and experiences of more than 25,000 citizens and of more than 2,300 specialists from all over Mexico, combined and validated with quantitative data from highly reliable third-party sources […]”

Alejandro González Arreola
DIRECTOR OF RULE OF LAW PROJECTS
On September 24, 2012, the High-level Meeting of the 67th Session of the General Assembly on the Rule of Law at the National and International Levels was held at the United Nations (UN). Its Member States and a large, high-level representation of civil society organizations reached a historic joint declaration by consensus in which the rule of law and development were recognized as closely interrelated variables with mutual feedback. This declaration establishes that "the advancement of the rule of law at the national and international levels is essential for sustained and inclusive economic growth, sustainable development, the eradication of poverty and hunger, and the full realization of all human rights and fundamental freedoms."1

This way of understanding the rule of law and its importance in people's lives, as well as for the prosperity of countries, has been our leitmotif at the World Justice Project (WJP) in developing the Mexico States Rule of Law Index, which we present in its third edition. We believe that the advancement of the rule of law must be based on a shared understanding, as well as a systematic, comprehensive, and actionable assessment, in order to identify its main strengths, areas of opportunity, improvements, and setbacks.

In its 2020-2021 edition, the Index reaffirms its place as the most complete tool for measuring the rule of law in Mexico's 32 states, offering updated and structured data on eight factors: 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 are comparable over time for each state. They reflect the perspectives and experiences of more than 25,000 citizens and of more than 2,300 specialists from all over Mexico, combined and validated with quantitative data from highly reliable third-party sources such as the National Institute of Statistics and Geography (INEGI). Behind each score, there is a rigorous technical analysis, supported by a robust capacity for data collection, verification, and validation.

The results of the Mexico States Rule of Law Index 2020-2021 show persistent challenges in all the aspects of the rule of law, although the main gaps continue to be in the areas of justice, security, corruption, and regulatory enforcement. However, there are important differences in performance and progress between the states. The general scores increased in 17 states, decreased in 5, and stayed the same in 10.

This edition of the Index also shows the first local effects on the rule of law caused by the global COVID-19 pandemic. The ongoing health emergency that began in 2020 has disrupted every possible dimension of our lives in both the private and public spheres, and the rule of law has not been the exception, for example, in the paralysis of justice services. In the absence of provisions from Open and Digital Justice, some states were forced to suspend their operation for a long period of time, despite the fact that all federal and local jurisdictional activity was defined as essential by the country's health authorities.2 Sixteen states decreased their scores in criminal justice as a result of this unfortunate situation.

However, 2021 offers a significant opportunity to generate political and programmatic commitments towards strengthening of the rule of law at the highest level, since there will be elections for governors and local congresses in at least 15 states. The results of the Index provide an outlook on the rule of law in these places. It is not only possible but highly desirable that new development plans and programs identify public policy priorities based on evidence. We hope that the data, scores, and findings that we present here serve as a reference to inform the diagnostics and strategies for strengthening the rule of law in programmatic instruments, as well as to evaluate the progress of state authorities over time.

---


1 Introduction
Introduction

The Mexico States Rule of Law Index 2020-2021 captures the experiences and perceptions of over 25,000 citizens and 2,300 experts in the 32 states of the country.

Over more than a decade, the World Justice Project® (WJP) has conducted interviews in over 120 countries to measure adherence to the rule of law from the citizen’s point of view, producing information regarding the experiences and perceptions of people on issues such as corruption, contact with authorities, perception of safety, victimization, fundamental rights, and access to justice. The WJP Rule of Law Index® has become a leading tool to identify institutional strengths and weaknesses in countries and to promote evidence-based decision making.

The Mexico States Rule of Law Index 2020-2021 is the third edition of the only subnational index produced by the WJP and is one of the most complete measurements of institutional performance in the country. The Mexico States Rule of Law Index uses the same conceptual framework and methodology to measure adherence to the rule of law in each of Mexico’s 32 states that the WJP has used around the globe.

The Index presents new data organized into 42 sub-factors and eight factors: i) Constraints on Government Powers, ii) Absence of Corruption, iii) Open Government, iv) Fundamental Rights, v) Order and Security, vi) Regulatory Enforcement, vii) Civil Justice, and viii) 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 third edition of the Index, which allows to identify developments and persistent challenges on topics related to the rule of law.

This Index is unique in its kind. It uses information obtained first-hand 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 2,300 attorneys and specialists 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 23) and “Methodology” (page 60).

The Index is aimed at a wide audience that includes decision-makers at the state and federal level, legislators, civil society organizations, academia, and the media, among others. Its potential as a decision-making tool is highlighted by the citations of the Mexico States Rule of Law Index in multiple planning documents of state governments and the national government. 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 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 other efforts that focus on 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 status of the rule of law. The WJP Mexico States Rule of Law Index is the only instrument that takes a comprehensive look at the rule of law in Mexico.

3. Perspective of Ordinary People: The WJP Mexico States Rule of Law Index puts people at its core. 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 Experience: 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 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 competences of the different government levels, and the availability of data.
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 0.47 by Yucatán, which implies that all states face important challenges in different aspects of the rule of law. Even though the Mexico States Rule of Law Index 2020-2021 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 global Index due to adaptations of the conceptual framework and methodology applied to the Mexico Index, to strengthen local measurement and reflect the national context. A section that summarizes the differences between the Global Index and that of Mexico is found on page 64.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Score*</th>
<th>Change 2019–2020—2020–2021*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yucatán</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Coahuila</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Campeche</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Querétaro</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Zacatecas</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Aguascalientes</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Nuevo León</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Guanajuato</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Baja California Sur</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Sinaloa</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Durango</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Hidalgo</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Nayarí</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Colima</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Chihuahua</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Tamaulipas</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Sonora</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Michoacán</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Oaxaca</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Baja California</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>San Luis Potosí</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Chiapas</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Tabasco</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Tlaxcala</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Jalisco</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Veracruz</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>-0.01</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>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Guerrero</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Morelos</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Puebla</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Quintana Roo</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Scores are rounded to two decimal places

Weaker adherence to the rule of law
Stronger adherence to the rule of law
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Executive Summary

The Mexico States Rule of Law Index 2020-2021 is the third edition of the most comprehensive measurement of the rule of law in Mexico’s 32 states.

The results of the Mexico States Rule of Law Index 2020-2021 show a stagnation in the country’s progress towards strengthening the rule of law, with marginal changes in the general scores of most states since the 2019-2020 edition of the Index. Notwithstanding the above, the data show some changes in some aspects of the rule of law. The COVID-19 pandemic and the subsequent response measures disrupted the functioning of government institutions. In most states, judicial institutions were particularly affected by this situation, as shown by decreases in the scores of Factor 8. The data also show a weakening of freedom of the press and a shrinking civic space in most states (with decreases in sub-factor 1.5 scores), continuing a trend that began before the pandemic and deepened during the public health crisis. As in previous editions, public safety continues to be one of the greatest challenges in Mexico, although many states recorded a decrease in crime incidence and prevalence rates (with increases in sub-factor 5.2 scores).

The Index presents data organized into eight factors of the rule of law: i) Constraints on Government Powers, ii) Absence of Corruption, iii) Open Government, iv) Fundamental Rights, v) Order and Security, vi) Regulatory Enforcement, vii) Civil Justice, and viii) Criminal Justice. 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 2,300 specialists in civil justice, criminal justice, labor justice, and public health (which were polled between July and October of 2020), as well as the results of a variety of surveys and databases on topics related to the rule of law (third-party sources).

The gap between the states’ scores and the ideal score (the Index uses a scale from 0 to 1, where 1 indicates the highest adherence to the rule of law) is still substantial, which implies that all states face challenges to strengthen the rule of law. The states with the highest scores in the Mexico States Rule of Law Index 2020–2021 are Yucatán (0.47), Coahuila (0.45), and Campeche (0.44). Yucatán has been at the top of the ranking in the three editions of the Index, while Coahuila and Campeche improved from the 6th and 4th place from the previous edition, respectively. The states with the lowest scores are Quintana Roo (0.34), Puebla (0.35), and Morelos (0.36).

Since the last edition of the Mexico States Rule of Law Index (2019-2020), the scores of the Mexico States Rule of Law Index modestly increased in 17 states (Baja California Sur, Campeche, Chihuahua, Coahuila, Guanajuato, Guerrero, Michoacán, Nayarit, Querétaro, San Luis Potosí, Sinaloa, Sonora, Tabasco, Tamaulipas, Tlaxcala, Yucatán and Zacatecas), decreased in 5 (Aguascalientes, Baja California, Oaxaca, Quintana Roo and Veracruz) and remained unchanged in 10 (Chiapas, Colima, Durango, Hidalgo, Jalisco, Mexico City, Morelos, Nuevo León, Puebla and State of Mexico).

On the other hand, four states stand out for showing significant progress in general scores of the Mexico States Rule of Law Index, in the three editions since 2018: Baja California Sur (from 0.35 in 2018 to 0.43 in 2020-2021), Guerrero (from 0.29 to 0.36), Sonora (from 0.36 to 0.40), and Nayarit (from 0.37 to 0.42).

---

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

The main challenge of the rule of law during the public health crisis was undoubtedly the criminal justice system. The score for Factor 8: Criminal Justice, decreased in 16 states since the previous edition of the Index (Aguascalientes, Baja California Sur, Chiapas, Colima, Durango, Guanajuato, Michoacán, Morelos, Nayarit, Oaxaca, Quintana Roo, San Luis Potosí, Sinaloa, State of Mexico, Veracruz and Zacatecas). The sub-factors with the highest decreases in scores were sub-factor 8.2, which measures the efficiency and effectiveness of the systems of prosecution and administration of justice, sub-factor 8.3, which measures the rights of victims, and sub-factor 8.4, which measures whether due process of law for the accused is effectively guaranteed (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). With unique data collected during the pandemic, this finding reflects the experiences and perspectives of criminal justice specialists across the country.

The data suggest that criminal justice systems were affected by the lack of timely and appropriate Open and Digital Justice measures, to enable access to citizens by remote and collaborative means. In fact, most of the country’s jurisdictional bodies were forced to suspend their operation over a long period of time, despite that all federal and local judicial activity was categorized as essential by health authorities.\(^4\)

Security continues to be one of the greatest challenges in Mexico, highlighted by the homicide rates (sub-factor 5.1), the perceptions of insecurity (sub-factor 5.3), and the decrease in scores in absence of corruption in the safety and law enforcement systems (sub-factor 2.3) in 20 states, according to the experiences of specialists polled during 2020. However, there were improvements in crime incidence and prevalence indicators in most states. Scores of sub-factor 5.2, which measures absence of crime, improved in 26 states, due to decreases in crime incidence and prevalence rates of ENVIPE 2020, which measures crimes that occurred in 2019.

Finally, the Index data show a continuous weakening of the freedom of the press and a shrinking civic space, reflected in the decreases of sub-factor 1.5 scores in 16 states. Despite this decline, civil society and the press are the most effective checks and balances of state governments for the third time, well above the legislative branch, the judiciary, oversight and control agencies, and human rights commissions.

The country still faces challenges in criminal investigation. In the three editions of the Index, most states have their lowest scores in sub-factor 8.1, which measures whether the police and the Prosecutor’s Office (Ministerio Público) investigate crimes efficiently. 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 92.4% nationally, according to the National Survey on Victimization and Perception of Public Security (ENVIPE) 2020.

---

4 A study from Transparencia Mexicana and Tojil, to monitor plans, programs and budgets in the framework of COVID-19, monitored the delivery of eight justice services in the 32 states during the pandemic: reception and processing of demands; receipt of non-initial promotions; consultation of agreements; notification; holding hearings; electronic court; digital signature for online services; and publicity of criminal hearings in real time. Of the 16 states that decreased their Factor 8 scores, 12 provided three or fewer justice services through digital means during the pandemic, and they were those that suffered the most substantial decreases. Study available at: [https://www.tm.org.mx/justiciadigitalpostcovid-episodio2/](https://www.tm.org.mx/justiciadigitalpostcovid-episodio2/). For more details on the justice services provided by each state and their Factor 8 score, refer to the WJP Mexico States Rule of Law Index 2020-2021 Insights report.

## Rule of Law by Factor

Scores and rankings of the *Mexico States Rule of Law Index* 2020–2021

### 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>0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Sinaloa</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Aguascalientes</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Guanajuato</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Querétaro</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Tlaxcala</td>
<td>0.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Yucatán</td>
<td>0.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Zacatecas</td>
<td>0.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Chihuahua</td>
<td>0.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Hidalgo</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Nayarit</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Sonora</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Baja California Sur</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Colima</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Durango</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Coahuila</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 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>0.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Guanajuato</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Zacatecas</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Campeche</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Yucatán</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Aguascalientes</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Nuevo León</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Nayarit</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Sinaloa</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Hidalgo</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Colima</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Tamaulipas</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Baja California Sur</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Chihuahua</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Coahuila</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Oaxaca</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Ranks are rounded to two decimal places.*
### Factor 3
**Open Government**

<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>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>*</td>
<td><strong>Average</strong></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>

*Scores are rounded to two decimal places*  

### Factor 4
**Fundamental Rights**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Score*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Querétaro</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Nuevo León</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Sinaloa</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Baja California</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Chihuahua</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Coahuila</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Baja California Sur</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Tlaxcala</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Aguascalientes</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Colima</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Tabasco</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Hidalgo</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Guanajuato</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Yucatán</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Zacatecas</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Nayarit</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Tamaulipas</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*</td>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Jalisco</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Sonora</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Morelos</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>San Luis Potosí</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Mexico City</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Campeche</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Durango</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Oaxaca</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>State of Mexico</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Michoacán</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Quintana Roo</td>
<td>0.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Chiapas</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Guerrero</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Puebla</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Veracruz</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Score*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yucatán</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Campeche</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Coahuila</td>
<td>0.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Durango</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Baja California Sur</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Chiapas</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Nayarit</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Hidalgo</td>
<td>0.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Veracruz</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Tamaulipas</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Oaxaca</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Michoacán</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Sinaloa</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Aguascalientes</td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Querétaro</td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>San Luis Potosí</td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Zacatecas</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Tlaxcala</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Sonora</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Nuevo León</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Chihuahua</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Colima</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Guerrero</td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Puebla</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Jalisco</td>
<td>0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Tabasco</td>
<td>0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Mexico City</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Quintana Roo</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Morelos</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Baja California</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>State of Mexico</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Guanajuato</td>
<td>0.22</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>Guanajuato</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Zacatecas</td>
<td>0.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Querétaro</td>
<td>0.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Aguascalientes</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Coahuila</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Puebla</td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Nuevo León</td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Campeche</td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Colima</td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Baja California</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Baja California Sur</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Veracruz</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Yucatán</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Durango</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Tamaulipas</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>State of Mexico</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Michoacán</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Oaxaca</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Jalisco</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Sonora</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Sinaloa</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Guerrero</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Chihuahua</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Tlaxcala</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>San Luis Potosí</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Morelos</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Nayarit</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Quintana Roo</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Hidalgo</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Tabasco</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Mexico City</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Chiapas</td>
<td>0.27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Scores are rounded to two decimal places

Weaker adherence to the rule of law
Stronger adherence to the rule of law
## Mexico States Rule of Law Index 2020 - 2021

### Factor 7
**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>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Durango</td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Nuevo León</td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Colima</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Campeche</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Zacatecas</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Chihuahua</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Aguascalientes</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Querétaro</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Michoacán</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Sinaloa</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>San Luis Potosí</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Sonora</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Yucatán</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Baja California</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>State of Mexico</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*</td>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Hidalgo</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Coahuila</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Tamaulipas</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Morelos</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Tabasco</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Jalisco</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Chiapas</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Baja California Sur</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Guerrero</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Puebla</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Nayarit</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Mexico City</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Tlaxcala</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Veracruz</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Oaxaca</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Quintana Roo</td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Scores are rounded to two decimal places

**Weaker adherence to the rule of law**

**Stronger adherence to the rule of law**

### Factor 8
**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>0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Coahuila</td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Zacatecas</td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Yucatán</td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Aguascalientes</td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Sinaloa</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Hidalgo</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Guanajuato</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Oaxaca</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Nuevo León</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Tabasco</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Chihuahua</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Colima</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Nayarit</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Baja California</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Sonora</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*</td>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Tamaulipas</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>San Luis Potosí</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Campeche</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Baja California Sur</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Tlaxcala</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Michoacán</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Guerrero</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Durango</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Morelos</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Jalisco</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Chiapas</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>State of Mexico</td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Quintana Roo</td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Mexico City</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Puebla</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Veracruz</td>
<td>0.27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What is the Rule of Law and How is it Measured?

What is the Rule of Law?
The rule of law is a principle of governance in which the government as well as private actors are accountable under the law and the laws are clear, publicized, stable, and just, applied evenly, and protect fundamental rights. The rule of law is a guiding principle that connects authorities and citizens through the establishment of rights, obligations, and constraints in order for people to live in harmony, access better opportunities, participate in the decisions made by their communities, and enjoy a safe life and estate. The rule of law is one of the pillars for societies to promote equality of opportunities, sustainable development, effective democracy, and peace.

The rule of law as a concept is notoriously difficult to define and measure. The Mexico States Rule of Law Index 2020-2021 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.

How is the Rule of Law Measured? Conceptual Framework of the Mexico States Rule of Law Index

The Mexico States Rule of Law Index 2020-2021 is comprised of 42 sub-factors, which are organized in 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, the law imposes limits on the exercise of power by the state and its agents, as well as by 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 timely by competent, ethical, and independent representatives and neutrals who are accessible, have adequate resources, and reflect the makeup of the communities they serve.


7 Refer to the Methodology section for detailed information on the differences between the Mexico States Rule of Law Index 2020-2021 and the global WJP Rule of Law Index.

8 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].
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 government, 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. It 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. It 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 absence of corruption, defined as the use of public power to obtain private benefits in the local executive branch, the judiciary, the legislature, and the safety and law enforcement systems. This factor considers three types of corruption: bribery, improper influence, and misappropriation of public funds and is divided in 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 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.

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.

---

9 For more information regarding each factor and sub-factor in the global WJP Rule of Law Index, visit the website www.worldjusticeproject.org.
Factor 3. 
Open Government: Factor 3 measures the openness of government, defined by the extent to which the government shares information, empowers people with tools to hold it accountable, and fosters citizen participation in policy decision-making. In other words, it measures whether citizens can know about the actions of the government and whether they can influence the decision-making process. The factor presents information from the Open Government Metric 2017, developed 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).10

3.1 Civic participation in decision-making
Measures whether citizens can effectively participate in public policy design.

3.2 The right to public information is effectively guaranteed.
Measures whether citizens have access to public information and open data, including 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 focuses on 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, social, 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, in practice, individuals are free from discrimination, 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.11

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 not to 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.

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.

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

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.

4.8 Fundamental labor rights are effectively guaranteed
Measures the effective enforcement of fundamental labor rights, including the right to social security, safety

10 For this edition of the Mexico States Rule of Law Index, 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.
11 Refer to the Methodology section to find more details regarding the measurement of sub-factor 4.2.
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 and 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 homicides and perceptions of security.

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 Absence of crime
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 security
Measures whether people feel safe and secure 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 security of businesses in the state.

**Factor 6.**

**Regulatory Enforcement:** Factor 6 measures the extent to which regulations are enforced fairly and effectively. 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 don't 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 expropriation of private property, and provides adequate compensation when property is legally expropriated without delays. This sub-factor considers direct and indirect expropriation and also measures the 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 resolve 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.

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 personnel.

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 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.

8.4 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.

8.5 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.

8.6 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 2020-2021 measure the adherence to the rule of law through 42 sub-factors that reflect the experiences and perceptions of people in Mexico's 32 states.

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 of feedback from different 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 objective of this Index is to provide reliable information that can be compared over time and used for public policy design in Mexico.

1. General Population Poll
The general population poll for the Mexico States Rule of Law Index 2020-2021 was administered to a representative sample of 800 adults in each state, yielding a total of 25,600 surveyed individuals. The GPP was applied in a coordinated manner by five leading public opinion companies in Mexico from May to July 2019. 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 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 the survey monitoring company.

2. Qualified Respondents’ Questionnaires
WJP designed four Qualified Respondents’ Questionnaires (QRQs), aimed at attorneys specialized in: i) civil, administrative, and commercial law; ii) criminal law; and 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. WJP collected 16,361 attorney contacts across the entire country and invited them to respond the questionnaires. Finally, WJP administered the online surveys from July to October 2020 and obtained 2,351 complete surveys.

3. Third-party sources
The WJP compiled administrative information and state representative surveys addressing rule of law issues to

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 2020-2021 were:

1. Data Opinión Pública y Mercados: coordination and monitoring of fieldwork.
3. Parametría: Fieldwork in Baja California, Baja California Sur, Chihuahua, Quintana Roo, Sonora, Tamaulipas, Yucatán, and Zacatecas.
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 2020-2021*: 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 Discrimination (ENADIS) by the National Council to Prevent Discrimination (CONAPRED) and INEGI, the National Survey on Victimization of Companies (ENVE) by INEGI, the record of murdered journalists (Article 19), INAI and CIDE Open Government Metric, the database 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).\(^\text{12}\)

---

\(^{12}\) Refer to the Methodology section to find more details about third-party sources.
2 State Profiles
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 2020-2021. 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 2020-2021, 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 previous edition of the Index, as well as arrows indicating the direction of the change.

Section 2 Displays the state’s individual factor scores for the Mexico States Rule of Law Index 2020-2021 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 previous edition of the Index.

Section 3 Displays the state’s scores for each of the eight factors of the Mexico States Rule of Law Index 2020-2021. 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, while the black dotted line shows the average score for the 32 states.

Section 4 Presents the state’s disaggregated scores for each of the 42 sub-factors of the Mexico States Rule of Law Index 2020-2021. 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.
Aguascalientes

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

Overall Score 2020-2021

0.44

Change in score
-0.01

Change in rank
-4

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>03/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absence of Corruption</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>06/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Government</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>06/32</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fundamental Rights</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>09/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Order &amp; Security</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>14/32</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>0.40</td>
<td>08/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Justice</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>05/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key

Score by factor

Average

*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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Baja California

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

Overall Score 2020-2021

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>0.43</td>
<td>18/32</td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absence of Corruption</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>17/32</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>0.53</td>
<td>04/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Order &amp; Security</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>30/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulatory Enforcement</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>10/32</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>0.38</td>
<td>15/32</td>
<td></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>20/32</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>-7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Constraints on Government Powers

1.1 | Limits by the legislature | 0.37 |
1.2 | Limits by the judiciary | 0.51 |
1.3 | Independent auditing | 0.29 |
1.4 | Sanctions for official misconduct | 0.44 |
1.5 | Non-governmental checks | 0.50 |
1.6 | Elections comply with the law | 0.48 |

Absence of Corruption

2.1 | In the executive branch | 0.36 |
2.2 | In the judiciary | 0.47 |
2.3 | In police/military | 0.35 |
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 | 0.50 |
4.2 | Right to life and security* | - |
4.3 | Due process of law | 0.47 |
4.4 | Freedom of opinion | 0.50 |
4.5 | Freedom of religion | 0.75 |
4.6 | Right to privacy | 0.46 |
4.7 | Freedom of association | 0.60 |
4.8 | Labor rights | 0.44 |

Order & Security

5.1 | Absence of homicides | 0.00 |
5.2 | Absence of crime | 0.25 |
5.3 | Perception of safety | 0.43 |

Regulatory Enforcement

6.1 | Efficient regulatory enforcement | 0.42 |
6.2 | Regulatory enforcement free of corruption | 0.58 |
6.3 | Efficient administrative procedures | 0.32 |
6.4 | Due process in administrative procedures | 0.39 |
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 | 0.42 |
7.3 | Affordable civil justice without bureaucratic processes | 0.29 |
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 | 0.27 |
7.7 | Effective enforcement of civil decisions | 0.35 |
7.8 | Accessible, impartial and prompt ADRs | 0.42 |

Criminal Justice

8.1 | Effective criminal investigations | 0.24 |
8.2 | Effective and efficient criminal adjudication | 0.35 |
8.3 | Rights of victims | 0.46 |
8.4 | Due process of law | 0.47 |
8.5 | Impartial and independent criminal justice free of corruption | 0.39 |
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
Índice de Estado de Derecho en México 2020 - 2021

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

Overall Score 2020-2021

0.43

Overall Rank Change in score Change in rank
09/32 0.04 ▲ 8 ▲

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>0.38</td>
<td>13/32</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>0.53</td>
<td>07/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Order &amp; Security</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>05/32</td>
<td>▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulatory Enforcement</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>11/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Justice</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>24/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Justice</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>20/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key

Constraint on Government Powers
- Limits by the legislature: 0.51
- Limits by the judiciary: 0.50
- Independent auditing: 0.23
- Sanctions for official misconduct: 0.33
- Non-governmental checks: 0.58
- Elections comply with the law: 0.50

Absence of Corruption
- In the executive branch: 0.36
- In the judiciary: 0.45
- In police/military: 0.39
- In the legislature: 0.32

Open Government**
- Civic participation: 0.25
- Right to information: 0.44

Fundamental Rights
- Absence of discrimination: 0.50
- Right to life and security*: -
- Due process of law: 0.48
- Freedom of opinion: 0.58
- Freedom of religion: 0.81
- Right to privacy: 0.33
- Freedom of association: 0.61
- Labor rights: 0.39

Order & Security
- Absence of homicides: 0.92
- Absence of crime: 0.61
- Perception of safety: 0.61

Regulatory Enforcement
- Efficient regulatory enforcement: 0.43
- Regulatory enforcement free of corruption: 0.47
- Efficient administrative procedures: 0.31
- Due process in administrative procedures: 0.41
- Property rights: 0.37

Civil Justice
- People know their rights: 0.27
- Access to information and affordable legal counsel in civil justice: 0.38
- Affordable civil justice without bureaucratic processes: 0.28
- Impartial and independent civil justice free of corruption: 0.46
- Quality civil justice: 0.39
- No unreasonable delay in civil justice: 0.25
- Effective enforcement of civil decisions: 0.35
- Accessible, impartial and prompt ADRs: 0.35

Criminal Justice
- Effective criminal investigations: 0.16
- Effective and efficient criminal adjudication: 0.30
- Rights of victims: 0.46
- Due process of law: 0.48
- Impartial and independent criminal justice free of corruption: 0.42
- Safe prison systems that respect human rights: 0.32

*R 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

Overall Score 2020-2021

0.44

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>0.42</td>
<td>22/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absence of Corruption</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>04/32</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>0.48</td>
<td>23/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Order &amp; Security</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>02/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulatory Enforcement</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>08/32</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>0.36</td>
<td>19/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall Rank | Change in score | Change in rank
03/32 | 0.01 ▲ | 1 ▲

Key

- Score by factor
- Average

Constraints on Government Powers

1.1 Limits by the legislature | 0.34
1.2 Limits by the judiciary | 0.51
1.3 Independent auditing | 0.35
1.4 Sanctions for official misconduct | 0.40
1.5 Non-governmental checks | 0.50
1.6 Elections comply with the law | 0.40

Absence of Corruption

2.1 In the executive branch | 0.40
2.2 In the judiciary | 0.48
2.3 In police/military | 0.46
2.4 In the legislature | 0.33

Open Government**

3.1 Civic participation | 0.22
3.2 Right to information | 0.52

Fundamental Rights

4.1 Absence of discrimination | 0.48
4.2 Right to life and security* | -
4.3 Due process of law | 0.36
4.4 Freedom of opinion | 0.50
4.5 Freedom of religion | 0.75
4.6 Right to privacy | 0.39
4.7 Freedom of association | 0.53
4.8 Labor rights | 0.31

Order & Security

5.1 Absence of homicides | 0.58
5.2 Absence of crime | 0.92
5.3 Perception of safety | 0.50

Regulatory Enforcement

6.1 Efficient regulatory enforcement | 0.34
6.2 Regulatory enforcement free of corruption | 0.62
6.3 Efficient administrative procedures | 0.47
6.4 Due process in administrative procedures | 0.36
6.5 Property rights | 0.33

Civil Justice

7.1 People know their rights | 0.36
7.2 Access to information and affordable legal counsel in civil justice | 0.42
7.3 Affordable civil justice without bureaucratic processes | 0.31
7.4 Impartial and independent civil justice free of corruption | 0.49
7.5 Quality civil justice | 0.38
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 | 0.50

Criminal Justice

8.1 Effective criminal investigations | 0.18
8.2 Effective and efficient criminal adjudication | 0.37
8.3 Rights of victims | 0.40
8.4 Due process of law | 0.36
8.5 Impartial and independent criminal justice free of corruption | 0.48
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
Chiapas

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Score 2020-2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>0.38</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<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>0.00</td>
<td>1 ▲</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>30/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absence of Corruption</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>29/32</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>0.44</td>
<td>29/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Order &amp; Security</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>06/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulatory Enforcement</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>32/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Justice</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>23/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Justice</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>27/32</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>0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Limits by the judiciary</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Independent auditing</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4 Sanctions for official misconduct</td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5 Non-governmental checks</td>
<td>0.48</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>0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 In the judiciary</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 In police/military</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4 In the legislature</td>
<td>0.30</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>0.23</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 Absence of discrimination</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2 Right to life and security*</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3 Due process of law</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4 Freedom of opinion</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5 Freedom of religion</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.6 Right to privacy</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.7 Freedom of association</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.8 Labor rights</td>
<td>0.24</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>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3 Perception of safety</td>
<td>0.38</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>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3 Efficient administrative procedures</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.4 Due process in administrative procedures</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.5 Property rights</td>
<td>0.28</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>0.27</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>0.24</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>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.6 No unreasonable delay in civil justice</td>
<td>0.27</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>0.45</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>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.2 Effective and efficient criminal adjudication</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.3 Rights of victims</td>
<td>0.42</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>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.6 Safe prison systems that respect human rights</td>
<td>0.30</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
Chihuahua

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

Overall Score 2020-2021

0.41

Factors

<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>09/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absence of Corruption</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>14/32</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>0.53</td>
<td>05/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Order &amp; Security</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>21/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulatory Enforcement</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>23/32</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>0.39</td>
<td>12/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key

Score by factor

Overall Rank | Change in score | Change in rank |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15/32</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Criminal Justice

Factor Score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-factor</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Trend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>Effective criminal investigations</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>Effective and efficient criminal adjudication</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>Rights of victims</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>Due process of law</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>Impartial and independent criminal justice free of corruption</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>Safe prison systems that respect human rights</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Civil Justice

Factor Score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-factor</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Trend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>People know their rights</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>Access to information and affordable legal counsel in civil justice</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>Affordable civil justice without bureaucratic processes</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>Impartial and independent civil justice free of corruption</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>Quality civil justice</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>No unreasonable delay in civil justice</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>Effective enforcement of civil decisions</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>Accessible, impartial and prompt ADRs</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Order & Security

Factor Score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-factor</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Trend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>Absence of homicides</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>Absence of crime</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>Perception of safety</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fundamental Rights

Factor Score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-factor</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Trend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>Absence of discrimination</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>Right to life and security*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>Due process of law</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>Freedom of opinion</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>Freedom of religion</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>Right to privacy</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>Freedom of association</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>Labor rights</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Open Government

Factor Score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-factor</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Trend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>Civic participation</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>Right to information</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Constraints on Government Powers

Factor Score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-factor</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Trend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>Limits by the legislature</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>Limits by the judiciary</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>Independent auditing</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>Sanctions for official misconduct</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>Non-governmental checks</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>Elections comply with the law</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Absence of Corruption

Factor Score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-factor</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Trend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>In the executive branch</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>In the judiciary</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>In police/military</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>In the legislature</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Open Government**

Factor Score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-factor</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Trend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>Civic participation</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>Right to information</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key

Score by sub-factor

Average

**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 2020-2021

Factor Score

Constraints on Government Powers

Absence of Corruption

Open Government

Fundamental Rights

Order & Security

Regulatory Enforcement

Civil Justice

Criminal Justice

Fundamental Rights

Absence of discrimination

Right to life and security*

Due process of law

Freedom of opinion

Freedom of religion

Right to privacy

Freedom of association

Labor rights

Order & Security

Absence of homicides

Absence of crime

Perception of safety

Regulatory Enforcement

 Efficient regulatory enforcement

Regulatory enforcement free of corruption

Efficient administrative procedures

Due process in administrative procedures

Property rights

Civil Justice

People know their rights

Access to information and affordable legal counsel in civil justice

Affordable civil justice without bureaucratic processes

Impartial and independent civil justice free of corruption

Quality civil justice

No unreasonable delay in civil justice

Effective enforcement of civil decisions

Criminal Justice

Effective criminal investigations

Effective and efficient criminal adjudication

Rights of victims

Due process of law

Impartial and independent criminal justice free of corruption

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
Coahuila

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

**Overall Score 2020-2021**

<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>0.38</td>
<td>15/32</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>0.53</td>
<td>06/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Order &amp; Security</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>03/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulatory Enforcement</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>05/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Justice</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>18/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Justice</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>02/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Factor Score Breakdown**

### 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>0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Limits by the judiciary</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Independent auditing</td>
<td>0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4 Sanctions for official misconduct</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5 Non-governmental checks</td>
<td>0.58</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>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 In the judiciary</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 In police/military</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4 In the legislature</td>
<td>0.33</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 Absence of discrimination</td>
<td>0.50</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>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4 Freedom of opinion</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5 Freedom of religion</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.6 Right to privacy</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.7 Freedom of association</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.8 Labor rights</td>
<td>0.45</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>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3 Perception of safety</td>
<td>0.56</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>0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2 Regulatory enforcement free of corruption</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3 Efficient administrative procedures</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.4 Due process in administrative procedures</td>
<td>0.38</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>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.1 People know their rights</td>
<td>0.35</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>0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.4 Impartial and independent civil justice free of corruption</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.5 Quality civil justice</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.6 No unreasonable delay in civil justice</td>
<td>0.33</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>0.41</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>0.24</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>0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.4 Due process of law</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.5 Impartial and independent criminal justice free of corruption</td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.6 Safe prison systems that respect human rights</td>
<td>0.54</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 2020-2021

0.41

Overall Rank: 14/32

Change in score: 0.00

Change in rank: -2

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

Overall Score 2020-2021

<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>0.31</td>
<td>31/32</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>0.48</td>
<td>24/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Order &amp; Security</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>04/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulatory Enforcement</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>14/32</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>0.33</td>
<td>24/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score by sub-factor</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</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
## Índice de Estado de Derecho en México 2020 - 2021

### Overall Score 2020-2021

<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>0.42</td>
<td>21/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absence of Corruption</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>30/32</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>0.47</td>
<td>26/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Order &amp; Security</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>31/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulatory Enforcement</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>16/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Justice</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>16/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Justice</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>28/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Factor Score Details

#### 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>0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Limits by the judiciary</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Independent auditing</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4 Sanctions for official misconduct</td>
<td>0.36</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>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 In the judiciary</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 In police/military</td>
<td>0.24</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>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2 Right to information</td>
<td>0.58</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>0.35</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>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4 Freedom of opinion</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5 Freedom of religion</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.6 Right to privacy</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.7 Freedom of association</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.8 Labor rights</td>
<td>0.32</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>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2 Absence of crime</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3 Perception of safety</td>
<td>0.28</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 free of corruption</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3 Efficient administrative procedures</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.4 Due process in administrative procedures</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.5 Property rights</td>
<td>0.38</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
Guanajuato

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

Overall Score 2020-2021

0.43

0.0 1.0

Overall Rank

08/32 0.01 ▲ 1 ▲

Change in score

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>04/32</td>
<td>▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absence of Corruption</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>02/32</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>0.51</td>
<td>13/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Order &amp; Security</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>32/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulatory Enforcement</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>01/32</td>
<td>▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Justice</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>01/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Justice</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>08/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key

Score by factor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key</th>
<th>Score by factor</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</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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Guerrero

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

Overall Score 2020-2021

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score by factor</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall Rank: 29/32

Factor Score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score by factor</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constraints on Government Powers 0.39</td>
<td>28/32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absence of Corruption 0.33</td>
<td>22/32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Government 0.37</td>
<td>20/32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fundamental Rights 0.43</td>
<td>30/32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Order &amp; Security 0.31</td>
<td>23/32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulatory Enforcement 0.36</td>
<td>22/32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Justice 0.34</td>
<td>25/32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Justice 0.34</td>
<td>23/32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key

- Score by factor
- Average

Constraints on Government Powers

1.1 Limits by the legislature 0.43
1.2 Limits by the judiciary 0.39
1.3 Independent auditing 0.26
1.4 Sanctions for official misconduct 0.41
1.5 Non-governmental checks 0.46
1.6 Elections comply with the law 0.39

Absence of Corruption

2.1 In the executive branch 0.35
2.2 In the judiciary 0.35
2.3 In police/military 0.32
2.4 In the legislature 0.32

Open Government**

3.1 Civic participation 0.21
3.2 Right to information 0.53

Fundamental Rights

4.1 Absence of discrimination 0.36
4.2 Right to life and security* -
4.3 Due process of law 0.38
4.4 Freedom of opinion 0.46
4.5 Freedom of religion 0.73
4.6 Right to privacy 0.25
4.7 Freedom of association 0.58
4.8 Labor rights 0.24

Order & Security

5.1 Absence of homicides 0.08
5.2 Absence of crime 0.54
5.3 Perception of safety 0.32

Regulatory Enforcement

6.1 Efficient regulatory enforcement 0.32
6.2 Regulatory enforcement free of corruption 0.42
6.3 Efficient administrative procedures 0.37
6.4 Due process in administrative procedures 0.28
6.5 Property rights 0.39

Civil Justice

7.1 People know their rights 0.25
7.2 Access to information and affordable legal counsel in civil justice 0.33
7.3 Affordable civil justice without bureaucratic processes 0.35
7.4 Impartial and independent civil justice free of corruption 0.35
7.5 Quality civil justice 0.33
7.6 No unreasonable delay in civil justice 0.30
7.7 Effective enforcement of civil decisions 0.33
7.8 Accessible, impartial and prompt ADRs 0.47

Criminal Justice

8.1 Effective criminal investigations 0.26
8.2 Effective and efficient criminal adjudication 0.32
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 0.35
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
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### Hidalgo

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

#### Overall Score 2020-2021

<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>0.39</td>
<td>10/32</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>12/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Order &amp; Security</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>08/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulatory Enforcement</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>29/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Justice</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>17/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Justice</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>07/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Key

- **Score by sub-factor**: Score for each sub-factor contributing to the overall score.
- **Average**: Average score across all sub-factors.

### Factor Score Details

#### Constraints on Government Powers

1.1 Limits by the legislature | 0.46
1.2 Limits by the judiciary | 0.52
1.3 Independent auditing | 0.32
1.4 Sanctions for official misconduct | 0.41
1.5 Non-governmental checks | 0.56
1.6 Elections comply with the law | 0.44

#### Absence of Corruption

2.1 In the executive branch | 0.34
2.2 In the judiciary | 0.48
2.3 In police/military | 0.43
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 | 0.49
4.4 Freedom of opinion | 0.56
4.5 Freedom of religion | 0.76
4.6 Right to privacy | 0.42
4.7 Freedom of association | 0.56
4.8 Labor rights | 0.35

#### Order & Security

5.1 Absence of homicides | 0.33
5.2 Absence of crime | 0.88
5.3 Perception of safety | 0.41

#### Regulatory Enforcement

6.1 Efficient regulatory enforcement | 0.32
6.2 Regulatory enforcement free of corruption | 0.38
6.3 Efficient administrative procedures | 0.36
6.4 Due process in administrative procedures | 0.24
6.5 Property rights | 0.37

#### Civil Justice

7.1 People know their rights | 0.30
7.2 Access to information and affordable legal counsel in civil justice | 0.41
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 | 0.39
7.6 No unreasonable delay in civil justice | 0.32
7.7 Effective enforcement of civil decisions | 0.33
7.8 Accessible, impartial and prompt ADRs | 0.47

#### Criminal Justice

8.1 Effective criminal investigations | 0.22
8.2 Effective and efficient criminal adjudication | 0.40
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 | 0.46
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
Índice de Estado de Derecho en México 2020 - 2021

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

###Overall Score 2020-2021

**0.37**

**Overall Rank**

25/32

**Change in score**

0.00

**Change in rank**

1 ▲

###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>0.32</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>0.49</td>
<td>18/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Order &amp; Security</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>25/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulatory Enforcement</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>19/32</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>0.33</td>
<td>26/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

###Constraints on Government Powers

1.1 Limits by the legislature 0.46
1.2 Limits by the judiciary 0.43
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 0.51

###Absence of Corruption

2.1 In the executive branch 0.33
2.2 In the judiciary 0.37
2.3 In police/military 0.28
2.4 In the legislature 0.30

###Open Government**

3.1 Civic participation 0.38
3.2 Right to information 0.52

###Fundamental Rights

4.1 Absence of discrimination 0.40
4.2 Right to life and security* 0.35
4.3 Due process of law 0.42
4.4 Freedom of opinion 0.55
4.5 Freedom of religion 0.77
4.6 Right to privacy 0.40
4.7 Freedom of association 0.57
4.8 Labor rights 0.32

###Order & Security

5.1 Absence of homicides 0.17
5.2 Absence of crime 0.29
5.3 Perception of safety 0.36

###Regulatory Enforcement

6.1 Efficient regulatory enforcement 0.38
6.2 Regulatory enforcement free of corruption 0.37
6.3 Efficient administrative procedures 0.35
6.4 Due process in administrative procedures 0.33
6.5 Property rights 0.37

###Civil Justice

7.1 People know their rights 0.30
7.2 Access to information and affordable legal counsel in civil justice 0.40
7.3 Affordable civil justice without bureaucratic processes 0.27
7.4 Impartial and independent civil justice free of corruption 0.40
7.5 Quality civil justice 0.35
7.6 No unreasonable delay in civil justice 0.24
7.7 Effective enforcement of civil decisions 0.32
7.8 Accessible, impartial and prompt ADRs 0.46

###Criminal Justice

8.1 Effective criminal investigations 0.19
8.2 Effective and efficient criminal adjudication 0.25
8.3 Rights of victims 0.42
8.4 Due process of law 0.42
8.5 Impartial and independent criminal justice free of corruption 0.30
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
**Michoacán**

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

### Overall Score 2020-2021

<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>-</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>0.40</td>
<td>26/32</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>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>0.44</td>
<td>12/32</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>0.39</td>
<td>10/32</td>
<td>▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Justice</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>22/32</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>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Limits by the judiciary</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Independent auditing</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4 Sanctions for official misconduct</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5 Non-governmental checks</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6 Elections comply with the law</td>
<td>0.44</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>0.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 In police/military</td>
<td>0.31</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>0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2 Right to information</td>
<td>0.53</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>0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2 Right to life and security*</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3 Due process of law</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4 Freedom of opinion</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5 Freedom of religion</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.6 Right to privacy</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.7 Freedom of association</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.8 Labor rights</td>
<td>0.30</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>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2 Absence of crime</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3 Perception of safety</td>
<td>0.36</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>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2 Regulatory enforcement free of corruption</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3 Efficient administrative procedures</td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.4 Due process in administrative procedures</td>
<td>0.30</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>0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.2 Access to information and affordable legal counsel in civil justice</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.3 Affordable civil justice without bureaucratic processes</td>
<td>0.34</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>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.6 No unreasonable delay in civil justice</td>
<td>0.35</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>0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.3 Rights of victims</td>
<td>0.42</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>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.6 Safe prison systems that respect human rights</td>
<td>0.35</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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**Absence of Corruption Score by sub-factor**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Trend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>20/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>26/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>17/32</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>20/32</td>
<td>▼</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>29/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>26/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>20/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>25/32</td>
<td></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
Nayarit

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

**Overall Score 2020-2021**

<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>0.40</td>
<td>08/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Government</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>30/32</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><strong>0.60</strong></td>
<td>07/32</td>
<td>▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulatory Enforcement</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>27/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Justice</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>27/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Justice</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>14/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Overall Score**

- Overall Rank: 13/32
- Change in score: 0.02 ▲
- Change in rank: 3 ▲

**Key**

- Score by factor
- Average

---

**Constraints on Government Powers**

1.1 Limits by the legislature | 0.46
1.2 Limits by the judiciary | 0.48
1.3 Independent auditing | 0.33
1.4 Sanctions for official misconduct | 0.41
1.5 Non-governmental checks | 0.56
1.6 Elections comply with the law | 0.45

**Absence of Corruption**

2.1 In the executive branch | 0.35
2.2 In the judiciary | 0.47
2.3 In police/military | 0.47
2.4 In the legislature | 0.33

**Open Government**

3.1 Civic participation | 0.19
3.2 Right to information | 0.47

**Fundamental Rights**

4.1 Absence of discrimination | 0.45
4.2 Right to life and security* | 0.43
4.3 Due process of law | 0.56
4.4 Freedom of opinion | 0.76
4.5 Freedom of religion | 0.43
4.6 Right to privacy | 0.60
4.7 Freedom of association | 0.30
4.8 Labor rights | 0.35

**Order & Security**

5.1 Absence of homicides | 0.33
5.2 Absence of crime | 0.92
5.3 Perceptions of safety | 0.55

**Regulatory Enforcement**

6.1 Efficient regulatory enforcement | 0.36
6.2 Regulatory enforcement free of corruption | 0.47
6.3 Efficient administrative procedures | 0.32
6.4 Due process in administrative procedures | 0.28
6.5 Property rights | 0.29

**Civil Justice**

7.1 People know their rights | 0.32
7.2 Access to information and affordable legal counsel in civil justice | 0.35
7.3 Affordable civil justice without bureaucratic processes | 0.26
7.4 Impartial and independent civil justice free of corruption | 0.43
7.5 Quality civil justice | 0.32
7.6 No unreasonable delay in civil justice | 0.28
7.7 Effective enforcement of civil decisions | 0.32
7.8 Accessible, impartial and prompt ADRs | 0.41

**Criminal Justice**

8.1 Effective criminal investigations | 0.24
8.2 Effective and efficient criminal adjudication | 0.36
8.3 Rights of victims | 0.43
8.4 Due process of law | 0.43
8.5 Impartial and independent criminal justice free of corruption | 0.48
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
Nuevo León
Scores range from 0 to 1, with 1 indicating the strongest adherence to the rule of law

**Overall Score 2020-2021**

<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>0.51</td>
<td>01/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absence of Corruption</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>07/32</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>0.56</td>
<td>02/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Order &amp; Security</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>20/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulatory Enforcement</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>07/32</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>10/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Overall Rank**

07/32  Change in score  0.00  Change in rank  -

**Factor Score**

**Constraints on Government Powers**

1.1 Limits by the legislature 0.58
1.2 Limits by the judiciary 0.58
1.3 Independent auditing 0.31
1.4 Sanctions for official misconduct 0.43
1.5 Non-governmental checks 0.64
1.6 Elections comply with the law 0.53

**Absence of Corruption**

2.1 In the executive branch 0.38
2.2 In the judiciary 0.52
2.3 In police/military 0.38
2.4 In the legislature 0.35

**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 0.64
4.5 Freedom of religion 0.80
4.6 Right to privacy 0.46
4.7 Freedom of association 0.68
4.8 Labor rights 0.46

**Order & Security**

5.1 Absence of homicides 0.25
5.2 Absence of crime 0.46
5.3 Perception of safety 0.42

**Regulatory Enforcement**

6.1 Efficient regulatory enforcement 0.43
6.2 Regulatory enforcement free of corruption 0.46
6.3 Efficient administrative procedures 0.41
6.4 Due process in administrative procedures 0.41
6.5 Property rights 0.41

**Civil Justice**

7.1 People know their rights 0.39
7.2 Access to information and affordable legal counsel in civil justice 0.46
7.3 Affordable civil justice without bureaucratic processes 0.31
7.4 Impartial and independent civil justice free of corruption 0.51
7.5 Quality civil justice 0.44
7.6 No unreasonable delay in civil justice 0.35
7.7 Effective enforcement of civil decisions 0.40
7.8 Accessible, impartial and prompt ADRs 0.54

**Criminal Justice**

8.1 Effective criminal investigations 0.26
8.2 Effective and efficient criminal adjudication 0.40
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 0.44
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
Oaxaca

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

Overall Score 2020-2021

Factor Score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absence of Corruption</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>16/32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Government</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>29/32 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fundamental Rights</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>25/32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Order &amp; Security</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>11/32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulatory Enforcement</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>18/32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Justice</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>31/32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Justice</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>09/32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key

- Score by sub-factor
- Average

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constraints on Government Powers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Limits by the legislature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Limits by the judiciary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Independent auditing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4 Sanctions for official misconduct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5 Non-governmental checks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6 Elections comply with the law</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Absence of Corruption</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1 In the executive branch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 In the judiciary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 In police/military</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4 In the legislature</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Open Government**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Civic participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2 Right to information</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fundamental Rights</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.1 Absence of discrimination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2 Right to life and security*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3 Due process of law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4 Freedom of opinion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5 Freedom of religion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.6 Right to privacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.7 Freedom of association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.8 Labor rights</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Order &amp; Security</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.1 Absence of homicides</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2 Absence of crime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3 Perception of safety</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regulatory Enforcement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.1 Efficient regulatory enforcement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2 Regulatory enforcement free of corruption</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3 Efficient administrative procedures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.4 Due process in administrative procedures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.5 Property rights</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Civil Justice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.1 People know their rights</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.2 Access to information and affordable legal counsel in civil justice</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.3 Affordable civil justice without bureaucratic processes</td>
<td>0.30</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>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.6 No unreasonable delay in civil justice</td>
<td>0.23</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>0.39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Criminal Justice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.1 Effective criminal investigations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.2 Effective and efficient criminal adjudication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.3 Rights of victims</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.4 Due process of law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.5 Impartial and independent criminal justice free of corruption</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.6 Safe prison systems that respect human rights</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
# Índice de Estado de Derecho en México 2020 - 2021

**Puebla**

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

## Overall Score 2020-2021

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score by factor</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall Score 2020-2021</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Change in score: 0.00

### Change in rank: -

**Overall Rank**: 31/32

**Score Trend**: Overall Rank

<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>0.38</td>
<td>29/32</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>0.34</td>
<td>27/32</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fundamental Rights</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>31/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Order &amp; Security</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>24/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulatory Enforcement</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>06/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Justice</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>26/32</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

- **1.1** Limits by the legislature: 0.32
- **1.2** Limits by the judiciary: 0.43
- **1.3** Independent auditing: 0.24
- **1.4** Sanctions for official misconduct: 0.37
- **1.5** Non-governmental checks: 0.47
- **1.6** Elections comply with the law: 0.42

## Absence of Corruption

- **2.1** In the executive branch: 0.41
- **2.2** In the judiciary: 0.37
- **2.3** In police/military: 0.26
- **2.4** In the legislature: 0.28

## Open Government**

- **3.1** Civic participation: 0.27
- **3.2** Right to information: 0.41

## Fundamental Rights

- **4.1** Absence of discrimination: 0.38
- **4.2** Right to life and security*:
- **4.3** Due process of law: 0.37
- **4.4** Freedom of opinion: 0.47
- **4.5** Freedom of religion: 0.73
- **4.6** Right to privacy: 0.30
- **4.7** Freedom of association: 0.54
- **4.8** Labor rights: 0.20

## Order & Security

- **5.1** Absence of homicides: 0.25
- **5.2** Absence of crime: 0.37
- **5.3** Perception of safety: 0.27

## Regulatory Enforcement

- **6.1** Efficient regulatory enforcement: 0.36
- **6.2** Regulatory enforcement free of corruption: 0.65
- **6.3** Efficient administrative procedures: 0.42
- **6.4** Due process in administrative procedures: 0.35
- **6.5** Property rights: 0.34

## Civil Justice

- **7.1** People know their rights: 0.27
- **7.2** Access to information and affordable legal counsel in civil justice: 0.36
- **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: 0.35
- **7.6** No unreasonable delay in civil justice: 0.27
- **7.7** Effective enforcement of civil decisions: 0.32
- **7.8** Accessible, impartial and prompt ADRs: 0.47

## Criminal Justice

- **8.1** Effective criminal investigations: 0.16
- **8.2** Effective and efficient criminal adjudication: 0.25
- **8.3** Rights of victims: 0.39
- **8.4** Due process of law: 0.37
- **8.5** Impartial and independent criminal justice free of corruption: 0.32
- **8.6** Safe prison systems that respect human rights: 0.28

---

*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 2020-2021

0.44

Overall Rank

04/32

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>05/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absence of Corruption</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>01/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Government</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>32/32</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fundamental Rights</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>01/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Order &amp; Security</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>15/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulatory Enforcement</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>03/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Justice</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>09/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Justice</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>01/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key

- Score by sub-factor
- Average

*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
## Quintana Roo

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

### Overall Score 2020-2021

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Trend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>32/32</td>
<td>-0.01</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>0.33</td>
<td>25/32</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>0.24</td>
<td>28/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulatory Enforcement</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>28/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Justice</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>32/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Justice</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>29/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Scores by sub-factor

**Constraints on Government Powers**
- 1.1 Limits by the legislature: 0.35
- 1.2 Limits by the judiciary: 0.47
- 1.3 Independent auditing: 0.29
- 1.4 Sanctions for official misconduct: 0.35
- 1.5 Non-governmental checks: 0.43
- 1.6 Elections comply with the law: 0.34

**Absence of Corruption**
- 2.1 In the executive branch: 0.32
- 2.2 In the judiciary: 0.42
- 2.3 In police/military: 0.27
- 2.4 In the legislature: 0.29

**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: 0.43
- 4.4 Freedom of opinion: 0.75
- 4.5 Freedom of religion: 0.42
- 4.6 Right to privacy: 0.58
- 4.7 Freedom of association: 0.24
- 4.8 Labor rights: -

**Order & Security**
- 5.1 Absence of homicides: 0.08
- 5.2 Absence of crime: 0.33
- 5.3 Perception of safety: 0.29

**Regulatory Enforcement**
- 6.1 Efficient regulatory enforcement: 0.33
- 6.2 Regulatory enforcement free of corruption: 0.44
- 6.3 Efficient administrative procedures: 0.35
- 6.4 Due process in administrative procedures: 0.30
- 6.5 Property rights: -

### Key

*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

### Overall Score 2020-2021

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Rank</th>
<th>Change in score</th>
<th>Change in rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21/32</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-1</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>0.42</td>
<td>23/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absence of Corruption</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>20/32</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>0.48</td>
<td>21/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Order &amp; Security</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>16/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulatory Enforcement</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>25/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Justice</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>12/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Justice</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>18/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Constraints on Government Powers

1.1 Limits by the legislature | 0.42 |
1.2 Limits by the judiciary | 0.49 |
1.3 Independent auditing | 0.23 |
1.4 Sanctions for official misconduct | 0.36 |
1.5 Non-governmental checks | 0.52 |
1.6 Elections comply with the law | 0.49 |

### Absence of Corruption

2.1 In the executive branch | 0.31 |
2.2 In the judiciary | 0.47 |
2.3 In police/military | 0.32 |
2.4 In the legislature | 0.30 |

### Open Government**

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

### Fundamental Rights

4.1 Absence of discrimination | 0.39 |
4.2 Right to life and security* | - |
4.3 Due process of law | 0.43 |
4.4 Freedom of opinion | 0.52 |
4.5 Freedom of religion | 0.76 |
4.6 Right to privacy | 0.35 |
4.7 Freedom of association | 0.56 |
4.8 Labor rights | 0.36 |

### Order & Security

5.1 Absence of homicides | 0.25 |
5.2 Absence of crime | 0.63 |
5.3 Perception of safety | 0.38 |

### Regulatory Enforcement

6.1 Efficient regulatory enforcement | 0.34 |
6.2 Regulatory enforcement free of corruption | 0.31 |
6.3 Efficient administrative procedures | 0.44 |
6.4 Due process in administrative procedures | 0.32 |
6.5 Property rights | 0.33 |

### Civil Justice

7.1 People know their rights | 0.34 |
7.2 Access to information and affordable legal counsel in civil justice | 0.37 |
7.3 Affordable civil justice without bureaucratic processes | 0.37 |
7.4 Impartial and independent civil justice free of corruption | 0.46 |
7.5 Quality civil justice | 0.35 |
7.6 No unreasonable delay in civil justice | 0.33 |
7.7 Effective enforcement of civil decisions | 0.37 |
7.8 Accessible, impartial and prompt ADRs | 0.43 |

### Criminal Justice

8.1 Effective criminal investigations | 0.23 |
8.2 Effective and efficient criminal adjudication | 0.30 |
8.3 Rights of victims | 0.44 |
8.4 Due process of law | 0.43 |
8.5 Impartial and independent criminal justice free of corruption | 0.36 |
8.6 Safe prison systems that respect human rights | 0.41 |

*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
## Sinaloa

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Score 2020-2021</th>
<th>Score Trend</th>
<th>Change in score</th>
<th>Change in rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>Overall Rank</td>
<td>10/32</td>
<td>0.01 ▲</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Overall Score 2020-2021**

### 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>0.49</td>
<td>02/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absence of Corruption</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>09/32</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>0.53</td>
<td>03/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Order &amp; Security</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>13/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulatory Enforcement</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>21/32</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>0.41</td>
<td>06/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Factor Score**

### Constraints on Government Powers

- 1.1 Limits by the legislature: 0.47
- 1.2 Limits by the judiciary: 0.57
- 1.3 Independent auditing: 0.32
- 1.4 Sanctions for official misconduct: 0.46
- 1.5 Non-governmental checks: 0.53
- 1.6 Elections comply with the law: 0.58

### Absence of Corruption

- 2.1 Absence of corruption in the executive branch: 0.34
- 2.2 Absence of corruption in the judiciary: 0.50
- 2.3 Absence of corruption in police/military: 0.41
- 2.4 Absence of corruption in the legislature: 0.35

### Open Government

- 3.1 Civic participation: 0.28
- 3.2 Right to information: 0.56

### Fundamental Rights

- 4.1 Absence of discrimination: 0.43
- 4.2 Right to life and security*: -
- 4.3 Due process of law: 0.48
- 4.4 Freedom of opinion: 0.53
- 4.5 Freedom of religion: 0.80
- 4.6 Right to privacy: 0.52
- 4.7 Freedom of association: 0.64
- 4.8 Labor rights: 0.34

### Order & Security

- 5.1 Absence of homicides: 0.17
- 5.2 Absence of crime: 0.67
- 5.3 Perception of safety: 0.48

### Regulatory Enforcement

- 6.1 Efficient regulatory enforcement: 0.36
- 6.2 Regulatory enforcement free of corruption: 0.36
- 6.3 Efficient administrative procedures: 0.35
- 6.4 Due process in administrative procedures: 0.33
- 6.5 Property rights: 0.39

### Civil Justice

- 7.1 People know their rights: 0.31
- 7.2 Access to information and affordable legal counsel in civil justice: 0.36
- 7.3 Affordable civil justice without bureaucratic processes: 0.32
- 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: 0.38
- 7.7 Effective enforcement of civil decisions: 0.38
- 7.8 Accessible, impartial and prompt ADRs: 0.46

### Criminal Justice

- 8.1 Effective criminal investigations: 0.18
- 8.2 Effective and efficient criminal adjudication: 0.42
- 8.3 Rights of victims: 0.49
- 8.4 Due process of law: 0.48
- 8.5 Impartial and independent criminal justice free of corruption: 0.47
- 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
### Sonora

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

#### Overall Score 2020-2021

**0.40**

<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>0.02 ▲</td>
<td>4 ▲</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>12/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absence of Corruption</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>21/32</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>0.49</td>
<td>19/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Order &amp; Security</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>19/32 ▲</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>0.38</td>
<td>13/32</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 | 0.45
- **1.2** Limits by the judiciary | 0.49
- **1.3** Independent auditing | 0.33
- **1.4** Sanctions for official misconduct | 0.41
- **1.5** Non-governmental checks | 0.50
- **1.6** Elections comply with the law | 0.48

### Absence of Corruption

- **2.1** In the executive branch | 0.30
- **2.2** In the judiciary | 0.45
- **2.3** In police/military | 0.32
- **2.4** In the legislature | 0.32

### Open Government**

- **3.1** Civic participation | 0.34
- **3.2** Right to information | 0.50

### Fundamental Rights

- **4.1** Absence of discrimination | 0.46
- **4.2** Right to life and security* | -
- **4.3** Due process of law | 0.44
- **4.4** Freedom of opinion | 0.50
- **4.5** Freedom of religion | 0.75
- **4.6** Right to privacy | 0.29
- **4.7** Freedom of association | 0.59
- **4.8** Labor rights | 0.38

### Order & Security

- **5.1** Absence of homicides | 0.08
- **5.2** Absence of crime | 0.67
- **5.3** Perception of safety | 0.43

### Regulatory Enforcement

- **6.1** Efficient regulatory enforcement | 0.41
- **6.2** Regulatory enforcement free of corruption | 0.29
- **6.3** Efficient administrative procedures | 0.38
- **6.4** Due process in administrative procedures | 0.37
- **6.5** Property rights | 0.34

### Civil Justice

- **7.1** People know their rights | 0.35
- **7.2** Access to information and affordable legal counsel in civil justice | 0.44
- **7.3** Affordable civil justice without bureaucratic processes | 0.31
- **7.4** Impartial and independent civil justice free of corruption | 0.42
- **7.5** Quality civil justice | 0.37
- **7.6** No unreasonable delay in civil justice | 0.29
- **7.7** Effective enforcement of civil decisions | 0.37
- **7.8** Accessible, impartial and prompt ADRs | 0.45

### Criminal Justice

- **8.1** Effective criminal investigations | 0.24
- **8.2** Effective and efficient criminal adjudication | 0.40
- **8.3** Rights of victims | 0.48
- **8.4** Due process of law | 0.44
- **8.5** Impartial and independent criminal justice free of corruption | 0.38
- **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

---
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**Tabasco**

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

### Overall Score 2020-2021

**0.38**

**Overall Rank** 23/32  
**Change in score** 0.01  
**Change in rank** 1

### 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>0.36</td>
<td>18/32</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>0.52</td>
<td>11/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Order &amp; Security</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>26/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulatory Enforcement</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>30/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Justice</td>
<td>0.35</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>

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

**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 0.39
1.5 Non-governmental checks 0.50
1.6 Elections comply with the law 0.38

**Absence of Corruption**

2.1 In the executive branch 0.29
2.2 In the judiciary 0.44
2.3 In police/military 0.39
2.4 In the legislature 0.31

**Open Government**

3.1 Civic participation 0.31
3.2 Right to information 0.50

**Fundamental Rights**

4.1 Absence of discrimination 0.44
4.2 Right to life and security* -
4.3 Due process of law 0.50
4.4 Freedom of opinion 0.50
4.5 Freedom of religion 0.79
4.6 Right to privacy 0.43
4.7 Freedom of association 0.59
4.8 Labor rights 0.36

**Order & Security**

5.1 Absence of homicides 0.17
5.2 Absence of crime 0.37
5.3 Perception of safety 0.26

**Regulatory Enforcement**

6.1 Efficient regulatory enforcement 0.36
6.2 Regulatory enforcement free of corruption 0.31
6.3 Efficient administrative procedures 0.34
6.4 Due process in administrative procedures 0.33
6.5 Property rights 0.32

**Civil Justice**

7.1 People know their rights 0.34
7.2 Access to information and affordable legal counsel in civil justice 0.40
7.3 Affordable civil justice without bureaucratic processes 0.28
7.4 Impartial and independent civil justice free of corruption 0.42
7.5 Quality civil justice 0.39
7.6 No unreasonable delay in civil justice 0.25
7.7 Effective enforcement of civil decisions 0.27
7.8 Accessible, impartial and prompt ADRs 0.45

**Criminal Justice**

8.1 Effective criminal investigations 0.21
8.2 Effective and efficient criminal adjudication 0.34
8.3 Rights of victims 0.47
8.4 Due process of law 0.50
8.5 Impartial and independent criminal justice free of corruption 0.45
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
Tamaulipas
Scores range from 0 to 1, with 1 indicating the strongest adherence to the rule of law

Overall Score 2020-2021

Factor Score

Constraints on Government Powers
- Limits by the legislature: 0.35
- Limits by the judiciary: 0.47
- Independent auditing: 0.28
- Sanctions for official misconduct: 0.40
- Non-governmental checks: 0.47
- Elections comply with the law: 0.46

Absence of Corruption
- In the executive branch: 0.40
- In the judiciary: 0.45
- In police/military: 0.35
- In the legislature: 0.35

Open Government**
- Civic participation: 0.22
- Right to information: 0.45

Fundamental Rights
- Absence of discrimination: 0.41
- Right to life and security*: -
- Due process of law: 0.47
- Freedom of opinion: 0.47
- Freedom of religion: 0.77
- Right to privacy: 0.40
- Freedom of association: 0.56
- Labor rights: 0.39

Order & Security
- Absence of homicides: 0.17
- Absence of crime: 0.88
- Perception of safety: 0.40

Regulatory Enforcement
- Efficient regulatory enforcement: 0.32
- Regulatory enforcement free of corruption: 0.58
- Efficient administrative procedures: 0.27
- Due process in administrative procedures: 0.34
- Property rights: 0.40

Civil Justice
- People know their rights: 0.33
- Access to information and affordable legal counsel in civil justice: 0.37
- Affordable civil justice without bureaucratic processes: 0.25
- Impartial and independent civil justice free of corruption: 0.45
- Quality civil justice: 0.36
- No unreasonable delay in civil justice: 0.29
- Effective enforcement of civil decisions: 0.34
- Accessible, impartial and prompt ADRs: 0.51

Criminal Justice
- Effective criminal investigations: 0.22
- Effective and efficient criminal adjudication: 0.36
- Rights of victims: 0.45
- Due process of law: 0.47
- Impartial and independent criminal justice free of corruption: 0.41
- 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

Overall Rank: 16/32
Change in score: 0.01
Change in rank: 3

Key
- Score by sub-factor
- Average

Overall Score 2020-2021: 0.40

Overall Rank: 16/32
Change in score: 0.01
Change in rank: 3

Score Trend

Constraints on Government Powers
- Open Government
- Fundamental Rights
- Order & Security
- Regulatory Enforcement
- Civil Justice
- Criminal Justice

Fundamental Rights
- Absence of discrimination
- Right to life and security*
- Due process of law
- Freedom of opinion
- Freedom of religion
- Right to privacy
- Freedom of association
- Labor rights

Order & Security
- Absence of homicides
- Absence of crime
- Perception of safety

Regulatory Enforcement
- Efficient regulatory enforcement
- Regulatory enforcement free of corruption
- Efficient administrative procedures
- Due process in administrative procedures
- Property rights

Civil Justice
- People know their rights
- Access to information and affordable legal counsel in civil justice
- Affordable civil justice without bureaucratic processes
- Impartial and independent civil justice free of corruption
- Quality civil justice
- No unreasonable delay in civil justice
- Effective enforcement of civil decisions
- Accessible, impartial and prompt ADRs

Criminal Justice
- Effective criminal investigations
- Effective and efficient criminal adjudication
- Rights of victims
- Due process of law
- Impartial and independent criminal justice free of corruption
- 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
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**Tlaxcala**

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

### Overall Score 2020-2021

- **Overall Score**: 0.38
- **Overall Rank**: 24/32
- **Change in score**: 0.01
- **Change in rank**: 1

### 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>06/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absence of Corruption</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>27/32</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>0.53</td>
<td>08/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Order &amp; Security</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>18/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulatory Enforcement</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>24/32</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>0.35</td>
<td>21/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Constraints on Government Powers

- **Limits by the legislature**: 0.50
- **Limits by the judiciary**: 0.48
- **Independent auditing**: 0.32
- **Sanctions for official misconduct**: 0.40
- **Non-governmental checks**: 0.61
- **Elections comply with the law**: 0.47

### Absence of Corruption

- **In the executive branch**: 0.32
- **In the judiciary**: 0.39
- **In police/military**: 0.28
- **In the legislature**: 0.31

### Open Government**

- **Civic participation**: 0.19
- **Right to information**: 0.39

### Fundamental Rights

- **Absence of discrimination**: 0.36
- **Right to life and security**
- **Due process of law**: 0.43
- **Freedom of opinion**: 0.61
- **Freedom of religion**: 0.74
- **Right to privacy**: 0.56
- **Freedom of association**: 0.62
- **Labor rights**: 0.37

### Order & Security

- **Absence of homicides**: 0.42
- **Absence of crime**: 0.42
- **Perception of safety**: 0.36

### Regulatory Enforcement

- **Efficient regulatory enforcement**: 0.29
- **Regulatory enforcement free of corruption**: 0.35
- **Efficient administrative procedures**: 0.27
- **Due process in administrative procedures**: 0.45
- **Property rights**: 0.40

### Civil Justice

- **People know their rights**: 0.25
- **Access to information and affordable legal counsel in civil justice**: 0.32
- **Affordable civil justice without bureaucratic processes**: 0.20
- **Impartial and independent civil justice free of corruption**: 0.38
- **Quality civil justice**: 0.36
- **No unreasonable delay in civil justice**: 0.28
- **Effective enforcement of civil decisions**: 0.33
- **Accessible, impartial and prompt ADRs**: 0.49

### Criminal Justice

- **Effective criminal investigations**: 0.16
- **Effective and efficient criminal adjudication**: 0.34
- **Rights of victims**: 0.40
- **Due process of law**: 0.43
- **Impartial and independent criminal justice free of corruption**: 0.32
- **Safe prison systems that respect human rights**: 0.47

*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.
Veracruz

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

Overall Score 2020-2021

0.37

Overall Rank

26/32

Key

Score by factor

Average

Factors

Constraints on Government Powers

1.1 Limits by the legislature

0.31

1.2 Limits by the judiciary

0.39

1.3 Independent auditing

0.24

1.4 Sanctions for official misconduct

0.34

1.5 Non-governmental checks

0.36

1.6 Elections comply with the law

0.36

Absence of Corruption

2.1 In the executive branch

0.38

2.2 In the judiciary

0.38

2.3 In police/military

0.27

2.4 In the legislature

0.29

Open Government**

3.1 Civic participation

0.34

3.2 Right to information

0.48

Fundamental Rights

4.1 Absence of discrimination

0.36

4.2 Right to life and security*

- -

4.3 Due process of law

0.34

4.4 Freedom of opinion

0.36

4.5 Freedom of religion

0.75

4.6 Right to privacy

0.22

4.7 Freedom of association

0.52

4.8 Labor rights

0.30

Order & Security

5.1 Absence of homicides

0.33

5.2 Absence of crime

0.88

5.3 Perception of safety

0.32

Regulatory Enforcement

6.1 Efficient regulatory enforcement

0.31

6.2 Regulatory enforcement free of corruption

0.60

6.3 Efficient administrative procedures

0.45

6.4 Due process in administrative procedures

0.35

6.5 Property rights

0.27

Criminal Justice

6.2 People know their rights

0.29

6.3 Access to information and affordable legal counsel in civil justice

0.35

6.4 Affordable civil justice without bureaucratic processes

0.21

6.5 Impartial and independent civil justice free of corruption

0.40

6.6 Quality civil justice

0.36

6.7 No unreasonable delay in civil justice

0.24

6.8 Effective enforcement of civil decisions

0.29

6.9 Accessible, impartial and prompt ADRs

0.43

6.10 Effective criminal investigations

0.15

6.11 Effective and efficient criminal adjudication

0.19

6.12 Rights of victims

0.38

6.13 Due process of law

0.34

6.14 Impartial and independent criminal justice free of corruption

0.29

6.15 Safe prison systems that respect human rights

0.28

*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
Índice de Estado de Derecho en México 2020 - 2021

Yucatán

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

Overall Score 2020-2021

0.47

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>07/32</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>0.38</td>
<td>19/32 **</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>0.84</td>
<td>01/32 ▲</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulatory Enforcement</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>13/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Justice</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>14/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Justice</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>04/32</td>
<td></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>01/32</td>
<td>0.01 ▲</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key

Score by sub-factor

Average

*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 2020-2021**

<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>08/32</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>0.43</td>
<td>05/32</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>0.40</td>
<td>17/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulatory Enforcement</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>02/32</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>0.42</td>
<td>03/32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Overall Rank** 05/32

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change in score</th>
<th>Change in rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.01 ▲</td>
<td>-2 ▼</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Constraints on Government Powers**

1.1 Limits by the legislature 0.46
1.2 Limits by the judiciary 0.58
1.3 Independent auditing 0.35
1.4 Sanctions for official misconduct 0.36
1.5 Non-governmental checks 0.54
1.6 Elections comply with the law 0.45

**Absence of Corruption**

2.1 In the executive branch 0.42
2.2 In the judiciary 0.54
2.3 In police/military 0.42
2.4 In the legislature 0.33

**Open Government**

3.1 Civic participation 0.31
3.2 Right to information 0.56

**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 0.54
4.5 Freedom of religion 0.76
4.6 Right to privacy 0.50
4.7 Freedom of association 0.59
4.8 Labor rights 0.26

**Order & Security**

5.1 Absence of homicides 0.08
5.2 Absence of crime 0.79
5.3 Perception of safety 0.33

**Regulatory Enforcement**

6.1 Efficient regulatory enforcement 0.38
6.2 Regulatory enforcement free of corruption 0.63
6.3 Efficient administrative procedures 0.47
6.4 Due process in administrative procedures 0.39
6.5 Property rights 0.43

**Criminal Justice**

7.1 People know their rights 0.30
7.2 Access to information and affordable legal counsel in civil justice 0.40
7.3 Affordable civil justice without bureaucratic processes 0.31
7.4 Impartial and independent civil justice free of corruption 0.51
7.5 Quality civil justice 0.46
7.6 No unreasonable delay in civil justice 0.32
7.7 Effective enforcement of civil decisions 0.44
7.8 Accessible, impartial and prompt ADRs 0.53

**Civil Justice**

7.9 Effective criminal investigations 0.29
7.10 Effective and efficient criminal adjudication 0.39
7.11 Rights of victims 0.49
7.12 Due process of law 0.48
7.13 Impartial and independent criminal justice free of corruption 0.47
7.14 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
3 Methodology
Methodology

The indicators presented in the *Mexico States Rule of Law Index 2020-2021* are organized into eight factors and 42 sub-factors.

These indicators are formed with 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, competencies of the different government levels, and availability of data. The five surveys benefited from exhaustive consultation with academia and experts.

2. **Data Collection**
   - **General Population Poll (GPP):** The *Mexico States Rule of Law Index 2020-2021* uses data from the GPP that was administered from May 11 to July 27, 2019 by five leading companies in public opinion surveys. 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 and a margin of error of +/- 0.61% at the national level and +/- 3.46% at the state level.

   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 more than 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. In addition, the WJP mapped more than 50 associations, bars, foundations, and networks of lawyers and experts of the health sector, as well as civil society organizations throughout the country, in order to invite more specialists to collaborate in the *Mexico States Rule of Law Index 2020-2021*. After establishing contacts and extending invitations, the support of 15 of these was obtained, with presence in different states and with different areas of expertise. These allies provided contact information of their members or dissemination of the project, which helped to increase the scope and diversification of the specialists’ profiles.

   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 July 22 and October 19, 2020 and kept constant communication with the respondents to increase response rates. The WJP obtained 2,351 effective complete interviews: 36% were lawyers specialized in civil, administrative, or commercial law, 29% were lawyers specialized in criminal law, 19% were lawyers specialized in labor law, and 16% were public health experts.

   - **Third-party sources:** The third-party sources strengthen the *Mexico States Rule of Law Index 2020-2021* by providing specialized information on the situation of the country on issues related to the rule of law. The WJP used five criteria to select and include third-party sources. 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.
The Mexico States Rule of Law Index 2020-2021 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 conducted an exhaustive consultation with academia and experts to design five surveys: one General Population Poll (GPP) and four Qualified Respondent Questionnaires (QRQs).

### 1. Conceptual Framework and Surveys

1. **Conceptual Framework and Methodology**

2. A comprehensive index designed to assess the rule of law in each Mexican state.

### 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

- **2,351 interviews** with experts in:
  - Civil Justice
  - Criminal Justice
  - Labor Justice
  - Public Health

#### 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 2020-2021

### 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
In the *Mexico States Rule of Law Index* 2020-2021, the WJP included 12 third-party sources, which were published before November 30, 2020:

- 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) 2019 → INEGI
- National Survey on the Dynamics of Relationships in Homes (ENDIREH) → INEGI
- National Survey on Victimization and Perception of Public (ENVPE) 2020 → INEGI
- National Survey on Victimization of Companies (ENVE) 2018 → INEGI
- National Survey of Occupation and Employment (ENOE) 2019 → INEGI
- Records of murder rates 2019 → INEGI
- Records of murdered journalists → Article 19
- National Diagnosis of Prison Supervision (DNSP) 2019 → National Commission on Human Rights (CNDH)
- Open Government Metric 2017 → INAI and CIDE
- Prison Statistics Journals 2019-2020 → Department of Interior (Segob)

### 3. 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 ENVPE (INEGI), and the National Diagnosis of Prison Supervision (CNDH). For the rest of the variables, WJP decided not to 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 in 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.

  v. Lastly, the scores of the factors were combined to produce a state score, and the final rankings were calculated.

### 4. 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 and 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.

Lastly, the data was organized into tables and graphs in the state profiles in order to facilitate the data’s presentation and interpretation.

---

13 The variable map and the exact formulas used to calculate each score are available at worldjusticeproject.com and worldjusticeproject.mx
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 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 (or downward) arrow means that the score of that factor increased (or 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 2020-2021 uses a conceptual framework and methodology similar to those used by the WJP to measure the adherence to the rule of law around the world from the citizens’ perspective.

However, the conceptual framework and methodology were adapted to reflect the national context and institutional architecture of 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 2020-2021 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 any person interested in strengthening the rule of law in Mexico.

The Index, like any other 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. 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 errors 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 to this project with their knowledge and time.

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 incorrect 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 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. To ensure the comparability of Factor 3 in future Index editions, WJP is in a process of collaboration with INAI to produce the next editions of the Open Government Metric.
Regarding Factor 4.2 (Right to Life and Security), Mexico currently lacks 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.

The WJP compiles the latest version of the third-party sources, which are administrative records and state representative surveys related to rule of law topics. However, some of these sources were not updated due to the COVID-19 pandemic. The third-party sources that were updated since the previous edition of the Mexico States Rule of Law Index are: 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 on Government Impact and Quality (ENCIG) by INEGI, the record of murdered journalists (Article 19), the database 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).15

During the 2019 update of the ENCIG, it was identified that the encoding in two variables of small-scale corruption (which are used in sub-factors 2.1 and 6.2) is very sensitive to small changes. Therefore, it produces changes in the scores that are not consistent with the magnitude of change of the rest of the variables. For this reason, these two variables (ENCIG_Q1 and ENCIG_Q2) maintain the indicators of the last edition of the Index. The rest of the variables that use the ENCIG were updated with the results of the new version.

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

As noted, the Mexico States Rule of Law Index 2020-2021 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, competences of the different government levels, and 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 2020-2021 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 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);

---

14 The score of Querétaro in the Open Government Metric of 2017 is not strictly comparable with the rest of the country’s states, because, during its preparation, the National Transparency Platform (essential for making public information requests) presented technical problems. Consequently, some of the results of the state are the product of an imputation.

15 Refer to the Methodology section to find more details about third-party sources.
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* 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).
What do you associate with the phrase “Rule of Law”?

In the general population survey, administered to 25,600 people throughout the country, respondents were asked about the three words they associate with the phrase “Rule of Law.” The most common answers are presented below, by age range.

18 TO 35 YEARS OLD

48% DON’T KNOW

***Simulated text to show proportion of mentions through text size.
36 TO 59 YEARS OLD

PEACE
POLITICS
LIE
VOTE
MEXICO
THERE ISN'T
TO HAVE
GOOD
HUMAN RIGHTS

EQUALITY
PEOPLE
TRICK
RESPECT
FREEDOM
SECURITY
INEXISTENT
LEGALITY
INJUSTICE
HONESTY
TRUTH
LIES
ACCESS
VALUES

CORRUPTION
OBLIGATION
EDUCATION
RESPONSIBILITY
INSECURITY
DEFENSE
JUSTICE
DISTRUST
GOVERNMENT

52% DON'T KNOW

60 OR MORE YEARS OLD

PEACE
INJUSTICE
GOOD
HELP
TO HAVE
HUMAN RIGHTS

HONESTY
THERE ISN'T
EQUALITY
RIGHTS
JUSTICE
PEOPLE
THAT
TO FULFILL
VALUES
GOVERNMENT

FREEDOM
OF EXPRESSION
LIE
TRICK
OBLIGATION
DELIQUEANCE
NONCOMPLIANCE
FREEDOM
CONSTITUTION
POLITICS
WORK
TRUST

DISTRUST
ALL
ASSISTANCE
INSECURITY
DEFENSE
JUSTICE
LAW

CITIZEN
SECURITY
AUTHORITY
CORRUPTION

59% DON'T KNOW
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Changes in the color scale of the summary table and the results map

The Mexico States Rule of Law Index 2020-2021 changed the color scale of the results map and the summary tables of the overall score and the eight factors.

In the 2018 and 2019-2020 editions of the Index, a scale of six or seven colors was used and ranges were assigned from the average of the 32 states, so each edition required a different assignment of colors. In this edition, a scale of ten colors is used, which are assigned to the scores for each range based on the full scale from 0 to 1, with the objective of simplifying the visual comparability of the data over the years and between the factors, regardless of the different results. The results are new visual references to better communicate the situation of the rule of law and its factors, the changes over time, as well as the differences and similarities between states.

The following maps show the results of the 2018 and 2019-2020 editions with the new color scale.

2018:

2019-2020:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Score Change</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>0.41</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Zacatecas</td>
<td>0.44</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>0.42</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Durango</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>San Luis Potosí</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Hidalgo</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Sinaloa</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Tamaulipas</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Michoacán</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Chihuahua</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Colima</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Oaxaca</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Chiapas</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Guanajuato</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Mexico City</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Puebla</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Morelos</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Quintana Roo</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>State of Mexico</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Nayarit</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Veracruz</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Sonora</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Tlaxcala</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Baja California Sur</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Guadalajara</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Jalisco</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Chiapas</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Morelos</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Average: 0.37

The Mexico States Rule of Law Index 2020-2021 changed the color scale of the results map and the summary tables of the overall score and the eight factors.
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Ana Dulce Aguilar, Laura Aquino, Eduardo Bohórquez (Transparencia Mexicana), Patricia Bonequi Alvarado, Javier Carrasco Solís (UJP), Guillermo Cejudo, Jaime Chávez Alor, Alfredo Elizondo (Gesoc), José Enríquez (FICOSEC), Marco Iván Escotto (CETIFARMA), Marco Fernández (ITESM-México Evalúa), René Flores (University of Washington), Luis Manuel Flores Lazo (COPARMEX), Gustavo Fondevilla (CIDE), Luis Foncerrada (Centro de Estudios Económicos del Sector Privado), Jonathan Furszyfer (Stanford University), José Gerardo García Aguirre (Asociación Mexicana de Retina, A.C.), José Luis García Chagoyán (COPARMEX), Alejandro Garnica (AMAI), Alejandra Gómez (UNODC-Chihuahua), Kenneth Greene (The University of Texas at Austin), Ángela Guerrero, Carlos G. Guerrero Orozco (Derechos Humanos y Litisgo Estratégico Mexicano, A.C.), Gustavo Hernández (Transparencia Mexicana), Edna Jaime (México Evalúa), Alma Lilia Juárez Armenta (Berkeley School of Public Health), Max Kaiser (IMCO), Sandra Ley (CIDE), José Manuel Linares Espil (Colegio De Abogados Del Estado De Guerrero, A.C.), José Lobo (Chemonics International, Inc.), Eduardo López Ortiz (UNAM), Ricardo Luévano (Artículo 19), Ana Laura Magaloni (CIDE), Beatriz Magaloni (Stanford University), Violeta Maltos (IIJDEJURE), Javier Martín (CIDE), Jesús Lorenzo Martínez (AMAJUR), Cynthia Michel (CIDE), Marco Mira d’Ercole (OECD), Enrique Morán Faz (COPARMEX), José Luis Nassar (FBMA), Juan Manuel Nava Castillo (Red de Abogados Laborales), María Nova, Almudena Ocejo, Pablo Parás (DATA OPM), Juan Pardinas (IMCO), Pascoe Pleasence (University College London), Jérémy Renaux (II(ED)EAS), Julio Ríos (CIDE), Octavio Rodríguez (University of San Diego), Carla Román (FBMA), Vidal Romero (ITAM), Rogelio Salgado, Joel Salas Suárez, Rebecca Sandefur (University of Illinois), Miguel Sarre (ITAM), David Shirk (University of San Diego), Bilal Murtaza Siddiqi (World Bank), Jorge Luis Silva (World Bank), Vanessa Silveyra (Transparencia Mexicana), Alberto Simpser (ITAM), Guillermo Vázquez del Mercado (CIDE), Amparo Vela (Asamblea Nacional de Médicos Residentes), Carlos Vilalta (CentroGeo).

We also had the support of Héctor Sebastián Arcos Robles, Ana Corzo Cosme, Artizy Sánchez Merino, Carlos Guadalupe Sánchez Avilés, Juan Ramón Moreno Flores, and Luis Fernando Ramírez Ruiz, for the elaboration of the database of experts, as well as the collaboration from Alianza Mexicana de Asistencia Jurídica, the Asamblea Nacional de Médicos Residentes, the Asociación Mexicana de Retina, A.C, the Centro de Estudios para la Enseñanza y el Aprendizaje del Derecho, A.C. (CEEAAD), the Circulo Feminista de Análisis Jurídico, the Colegio de Abogados del Estado de Guerrero, A.C., Derechos Humanos y Litisgo Estratégico Mexicano, A.C., the Federación Mexicana de Abogados, the Fundación Barra Mexicana de Abogados, the Ilustre y Nacional Colegio de Abogados de México (INCAM), the Instituto Republicano Internacional (IRI), the Instituto de Justicia Procesal Penal, and the Red de Abogados Laborales to contact them.
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Results of the Mexico States Rule of Law Index

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>State</th>
<th>Score 2018</th>
<th>Score 2019</th>
<th>Score 2020</th>
<th>Score 2018</th>
<th>Score 2019</th>
<th>Score 2020</th>
<th>Score 2018</th>
<th>Score 2019</th>
<th>Score 2020</th>
<th>Score 2018</th>
<th>Score 2019</th>
<th>Score 2020</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>
<td></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>
<td></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>
<td></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>
<td></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>
<td></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>0.27</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td></td>
<td></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>
<td></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>
<td></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>
<td></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>
<td></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>
<td></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>
<td></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>
<td></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>
<td></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>
<td></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>
<td></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>
<td></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>
<td></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>
<td></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>
<td></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>
<td></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>
<td></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>
<td></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>
<td></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>
<td></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>
<td></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>
<td></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>
<td></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>
<td></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>
<td></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>
<td></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>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 2019–2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Score Factor 1</th>
<th>Score Factor 2</th>
<th>Score Factor 3</th>
<th>Score Factor 4</th>
<th>Score Factor 5</th>
<th>Score Factor 6</th>
<th>Score Factor 7</th>
<th>Score Factor 8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<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>
</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>
</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>
</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>
</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>
</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>
</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>
</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>
</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>
</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>
</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>
</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>
</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>
</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>
</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>
</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>
</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>
</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>
</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>
</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>
</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Querétaro</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.43</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>
</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>
</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>
</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>0.40</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>
</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>
</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>
</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>
</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>
</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>
</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>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Mexico States Rule of Law Index 2020 - 2021

#### 2020–2021

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Constraints on Government Power</th>
<th>Absence of Corruption</th>
<th>Open Government</th>
<th>Fundamental Rights</th>
<th>Order and Security</th>
<th>Regulatory Enforcement</th>
<th>Civil Justice</th>
<th>Criminal Justice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aguascalientes</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baja California</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baja California Sur</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campeche</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chiapas</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chihuahua</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico City</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coahuila</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colima</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durango</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State of Mexico</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guanajuato</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guerrero</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hidalgo</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jalisco</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michoacán</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morelos</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nayarit</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuevo León</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oaxaca</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puebla</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Querétaro</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quintana Roo</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Luis Potosí</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sinaloa</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonora</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tabasco</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tamaulipas</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tlaxcala</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veracruz</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yucatán</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zacatecas</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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