



ARTICULACIÓN
CIUDADANA
PARA LA EQUIDAD
Y EL DESARROLLO A. C.

**Methodology of the Index
of Promotion of Activities
by the Civil
Society Organizations
at the Subnational
Level in
Mexico 2022**



I F A O S C

*Methodology of the Index of Promotion
of Activities by the Civil Society Organizations
at the Subnational Level in
Mexico 2022*

Second edition, 2023

Project coordinator:

Pablo Armando González Ulloa Aguirre

Research team:

Araceli Gómez Martínez

Valeria Carreón Reyes

Osmar Cervantes González



**Some of the acronyms correspond to Spanish
language.**

Mexico city, Mexico.

The total or partial reproduction of this material, by any means, without the prior and express written consent of the authors and the organization, is prohibited.

Acknowledgments

We thank all the organizations, networks and collectives that have given us the opportunity to present the index and who, day after day, work tirelessly for a better Mexico. We also express our gratitude to all the people who have trusted in our work and have supported us throughout this time.

We also acknowledge the commitment of the public officials who have been willing to dialogue with us and receive our opinions and suggestions.

It is important to emphasize that Civil Society Organizations (CSOs) are fundamental actors in the construction of a democratic and participatory country. Their commitment and tireless work contribute to the strengthening of democratic values, social inclusion and transparency in Mexico.

Research such as this plays a fundamental role in building a more just, participatory and open Mexico. These initiatives promote a relationship between government, society and diverse actors based on inclusion, mutual collaboration and transparency.

INDEX

Introduction	1
Laws and actions to promote activities carried out by Civil Society Organizations	2
Methodological framework	4
What is an index?	4
Scope of the Index of Promotion of Activities of Civil Society Organizations at the Subnational Level (IFAOSC)	5
Methodology for the construction of IFAOSC	7
Structure of the Index: dimensions, sub-dimensions and variables	12
Data Collection	12
Dimension 1: Legal framework	13
1.1 Promotion Law	14
1.2 Regulations	16
1.3 State Consultation and Participation Bodies	17
1.4 Budget	21
Dimension 2: Institutional framework	23
2.1 Policy Guiding Documents Focused on CSOs	23
2.2 Entity Responsible for CSOs	24
2.3 State Participation and Consultation Bodies	26
2.4 State-level Registration for CSOs (Institutional)	32
Dimension 3: Programmatic framework	34
3.1 Economic Promotion	34
3.2 Promotion Program	36
3.3 Other	39
Sources of reference	40
Annex	42

Introduction

Promotion, according to the Busan Declaration, refers to establishing a regulatory framework and public policies for the development of Civil Society Organizations (CSOs). Thus, for the purposes of this study, it refers to the relationship between the government and CSOs for their promotion. Actions driven by governments at various levels directed at CSOs range from economic support to training, consulting, and networking, among others.

Civil Society Organizations are public interest entities that facilitate citizen participation in decision-making and in solving public issues. These organizations are composed of individuals who decide to come together to act as a link between society and the government, aiming to assist (but not replace) institutions in addressing citizen demands and advocating for their resolution.

They also serve as a counterbalance to governments to ensure the protection of rights, in addition to contributing to the creation of knowledge, the development of citizenship and democracy, and the strengthening of organized civil society, among other relevant aspects.

These groups are non-profit (which does not mean they do not need resources to carry out their work and achieve professionalization), and they do not engage in partisan, political, or religious proselytism (which also does not mean they cannot influence the modification of laws or the construction of public policies). The organizations represent the plurality of society, meaning they are very diverse and represent all kinds of interests in the country's public life aimed at the common good.

Mexico is a Federal Republic; however, it experiences centralism in terms of policies, studies, education, and more. This is the case with the promotion of CSOs. At the federal level, there were promotion programs (which were canceled following Circular One issued by the President of the Republic on February 14, 2019) that had their ups and downs but accumulated significant experience. In the entities, there has been some progress regarding promotion policies, but they are very unequal, like the country's development, and poorly documented.

Studies from the local level in this area have been very few or lagging behind (Segob, 2008; García, Hevia, Layton, *et al.*, 2010; Vargas, 2012; González Ulloa, Góngora, Sánchez, *et al.*, 2015), even more so after the disappearance of the call for research of the extinct National Institute for Social Development (INDESOL) in this six-year term (2018-2024), based on the same policy against CSOs. This highlights that it is not common to look at what is happening in the different entities. Additionally, most studies focus on a specific entity or a group of organizations, and while the results can be very valuable, they do not allow for a comparative understanding of what is happening with CSOs across the entire country.

In the country, there are numerous CSOs focused specifically on their entities or on one or several municipalities. Similarly, local governments make some progress in terms of promotion policies, either in congresses or in responsible institutions.

Thus, the objective of this research is to construct an index of promotion of CSO activities at the subnational level, using 2021 as the base year, in order to provide a comparative framework for the various entities and influence the empowerment and development of CSOs at the subnational level, as well as to understand the local realities.

Laws and actions to promote activities carried out by Civil Society Organizations

The organized sector in Mexico has been fundamental for the democratic development of the country. Since the transition to democracy in Mexico in 2000, the government's relationship with its organizations began to change to a climate of certain trust, so much so that in 2004 the Federal Law for the Promotion of Activities Carried out by Civil Society Organizations was published, after several decades of struggle by the organizations to be recognized.

This law is the touchstone for the publication of their own laws in the various states (although in some, such as Baja California, the Federal District, Tlaxcala, Veracruz, it had been published years before), although, as will be seen in the IFAOSC, publication alone does not guarantee promotion.

The spirit of these laws was not to regulate the organizations per se but rather to promote their various activities and support their professionalization. The federal law (similarly to several local laws) includes a registration process, which is optional but helps to better understand the ecosystem of organizations at the national level. This registration allows them to access various promotion actions from entities within the Federal Public Administration (APF) and is also used by some entities in the country and private actors to access resources.

This law also includes a promotion commission and a technical advisory council to guide the promotion actions carried out by the APF. These spaces become a crucial mechanism for citizen participation and a point of convergence between CSOs and the government.

In this administration, the federal promotion policy essentially ceased, cutting programs directed at CSOs because they were deemed intermediaries and unnecessary from the presidential discourse, which viewed them as having only a social assistance role, despite their broader role. This also led to various practices and policies that neglected CSOs within the entities of the APF. In this context, several states are taking steps to promote their organized sector, and it is important to study this to understand its evolution and/or potential setbacks.

Methodological framework

What is an index?

An index is a set of variables and indicators designed to measure the state of an empirical reference, meaning data or aspects of reality that, while not measurable in themselves, can be assessed through coherently justified parameters grounded in a solid theoretical-conceptual framework. Collectively, these parameters can characterize diverse phenomena such as local development (Knack and Kugler, 2002), the level of democratization in countries (V-Dem Institute, 2002), bureaucratic complexity (TMF Group, 2015), institutional conditions for representing and protecting ethnic minorities (Queens University, 2014), or organizational sustainability (CIESC, 2020).

In other words, an index is an aggregate of complex indicators whose calculation requires that different measures be made on a common measurement scale, with the percentage scale being the most commonly used. An index, therefore, is a measurement tool composed of a series of variables that allows for assessing the state of something or an attribute of interest.

An index can be either a simple summative or weighted type. In a simple summative index, all indicators have equal weight. In a weighted index, different weights are assigned to the various indicators that make up the index, based on the influence each has relative to the others. This involves assigning numerical values to the indicators, ensuring that the assignment reflects the relationship between them by giving higher values to the more important ones (Batthianny, 2011: 58), according to the measurement objective.

It is important to note that, for constructing an index, the concepts being measured must be empirical, meaning they must have observable referents. If, on the other hand, these concepts are abstract and lack a real and effective existence —such as the concept of "State" in the field of Political Science —the process of operationalization becomes impossible. This process involves transitioning from theoretical concepts and variables to empirical, verifiable, and measurable indicators (Hernández et al., 2014: 211).

In this process, when constructing a measurement tool such as an index, the most logical procedure is to transition from the variable to its dimensions or components, then to the indicators, and finally to the items or responses (Hernández *et al.*, 2014: 211).

An empirical concept is an observable, evaluable concept (validated, invalidated, or modified) through observations, and according to Sartori (2002), the maximum observability of a concept is given by its operational definition (Sartori, 2002: x), which implies that the empirical referent denoted by a concept can be measured through indicators.

It is important to note that an index is a useful and complementary tool for analysis. Although it does not inherently contain quantitative analysis, it provides elements for researchers to conduct a more comprehensive quantitative analysis, which—as will be discussed in the next section— involves establishing generalized relationships between variables.

Actions to promote the activities of Civil Society Organizations (CSOs) are empirical referents, not abstract, and can be defined operationally. Thus, the proposed tool presented here is a useful methodological instrument capable of quantifying the promotion of CSO activities based on three main dimensions. These dimensions are composed— in descending order, based on Sartori's (2002) scale of abstraction— of dimensions, subdimensions, and variables.

Scope of the Index of Promotion of Activities of Civil Society Organizations at the Subnational Level (IFAOSC)

The IFAOSC is an indicator that allows for the evaluation and guidance of decision-making at the subnational level concerning the promotion of CSOs. The design of the index enables a detailed understanding of the state of promotion for these organizations in the legal, institutional, and programmatic spheres.

These measurements are carried out at the subnational level, making the implementation of this index a tool that allows for the collection, systematization, and analysis of information regarding the promotion of Civil Society Organizations (CSOs) in the 32 federal entities of the country. This provides a comparative framework and aims to influence the promotion of CSOs.

The data generated by the IFAOSC will enable the creation of impactful data for analyzing and engaging with authorities on CSO matters. This seeks to affect strategic actors involved in the development, promotion, and growth of these organizations by providing empirical evidence that can inform public policy recommendations and government actions aimed at strengthening CSOs through improved promotion and support.

This measurement tool represents a resource that provides information about the state of CSOs in terms of their promotion activities, allowing for an understanding of not only their strengths but also their weaknesses in the legal, institutional, and programmatic aspects. Thus, the findings from this tool facilitate a detailed evaluation and ongoing improvement of the promotion of CSOs by subnational governments.

Thus, the IFAOSC provides an approach to support other research focused on CSOs and their promotion, as well as to generate new questions about the state of these organizations in each of Mexico's federal entities. Additionally, one of the advantages of this measurement tool, similar to other quantitative techniques in social research, is its ability to open up new possibilities for studies based on variables. This aims to establish generalized (and generalizable) relationships between variables, allowing for mathematical management and analysis in the search for causal and correlational relationships between defined dependent and independent variables.

Finally, it should be noted that the IFAOSC complements but does not replace any type of qualitative study on the promotion of CSOs.

Methodology for the construction of IFAOSC

The Index of Promotion of CSO Activities at the Subnational Level represents the realization of the previously discussed transition from theoretical-abstract to empirical. The promotion that CSOs receive to operate and carry out their activities is empirically referencable and, therefore, subject to measurement. For each of the dimensions and subdimensions considered here, variables and items were designed to represent the most concrete level of the process of breaking down more abstract elements, known as operationalization.

The work constitutes a comprehensive measurement proposal because it includes dimensions beyond the normative framework: the programmatic and institutional dimensions, meaning the index is not limited to analyzing the promotion of CSOs from a legalistic perspective. The proposal is ambitious in its scope and practical utility, and accessible because, despite the number of variables it includes, its measurement can be achieved without specialized knowledge in statistics or in CSO promotion.

The first step in constructing the IFAOSC involved establishing and defining the general objective of the study, which served as a guide throughout the index construction process. Subsequently, the existing literature on the topic was reviewed, and "key" elements, both normative and non-normative, were identified within the framework of government actions for the development and consolidation of CSOs.

Once these elements, which are operationalizable and termed variables, were identified, they were classified into broader categories to assess their relevance according to the objectives set, namely, into subdimensions. It is important to clarify that the creation and relevance of the variables that make up the Index are theoretically and conceptually grounded and are the result of discussions and consensus among specialists in the field, thus avoiding arbitrary and analytically deficient considerations.

To define the strengths and weaknesses of the institutional architecture responsible for decision-making that impacts the promotion of CSOs and to operationalize the calculation, dimensions, subdimensions, variables, and indicators were proposed in a descending scale of abstraction.

Thus, the Index of Promotion of CSO Activities constitutes a proposal that adopts a multidimensional perspective and is composed of 57 variables grouped into three main dimensions: legal framework, institutional framework, and programmatic framework.

Once the variables were defined and grouped into dimensions and subdimensions, weighting was carried out, with differentiated approaches at the dimensional and subdimensional levels to correct any internal imbalance due to the de facto, real, and effective importance of certain elements (or variables) relative to others. This is because they impact different scales and cannot be equated in the same magnitude regarding their influence and role in promoting activities across the 32 entities of the country.

The following table presents the detailed structure of the index, as well as the weighting assigned to each component:

Table 1. IFAOSC structure, variables and weightings

Dimension	Subdimension	Variables	Weightings	Final Weighting	
Legal Framework	Promotion Law	Existence of promotion law	100.00	25.00	20.00
		Reform in the last year	100.00		
		Existence of the regulation of law	100.00		
		Promotion activities	100.00		
		CSO rights and obligations	100.00		
		Registration for CSOs at the state level	100.00		
		Recognition of unincorporated groups (collectives, networks and/or groupings)	100.00		
		Autonomy	100.00		
	Regulations	Violations	100.00	25.00	
		Sanctions	100.00		
		Means of appeal	100.00		
	State participation and/or consultation bodies	State participation and/or consultation bodies	100.00	25.00	
		Technical/Executive Secretary	100.00		
		Functions of the Secretary	100.00		
		Representation in participation and/or consultation bodies	100.00		
Appointment of members		100.00			
Functions in participation and/or consultation bodies		100.00			

		Work plan/annual report	100.00		
		Promotion plan/program	100.00		
		Evaluation/Joint evaluation of promotion policies and actions	100.00		
		Own budget	100.00		
	Budget	Budget for promotion actions or programs	100.00	25.00	
		Budget for other unincorporated groups (collectives, networks and groupings)	100.00		
State or municipal incentives		100.00			
Institutional Framework	Guiding documents focused on CSOs	State Development Plan	100.00	10.00	35.00
		Sector program of the responsible entity	100.00		
	Entity responsible for CSOs	Institutional hierarchy	100.00	30.00	
		Website	100.00		
		Social networks	100.00		
	State participation and consultation bodies	Integrated promotion and/or consultation body	100.00	40.00	
		Regulation	100.00		
		Call for applications	100.00		
		Information on meetings (minutes and/or records)	100.00		
		Evaluation/Joint evaluation of promotion policies and actions	100.00		
		Work plan/report/follow-up on agreements	100.00		
		Promotion plan/program	100.00		
		Technical/Executive Secretary	100.00		
		Allocated budget	100.00		
		Website	100.00		
		Social networks	100.00		
		State-level registry for CSOs	Existence		
	Breakdown of information		100.00		
	Instructions for the registration and renewal process		100.00		
	Programmatic Framework	Economic promotion	Promotion actions	100.00	
Continuity			100.00		
Historical resources			100.00		
National comparative resources			100.00		
Promotion program		Rules of operation (ROP)	100.00	40.00	
		Partial report and follow-up (ROP)	100.00		
		Final report (ROP)	100.00		

		Financial report (ROP)	100.00		
		Partial report and follow-up (physical)	100.00		
		Final report (physical)	100.00		
		Financial report (physical)	100.00		
		Call for applications	100.00		
		Eligibility Criteria	100.00		
		Publication of results	100.00		
	Other	Other promotion actions	100.00	20.00	
					100.00

Given that in many cases biases seek to be corrected with differentiated weighting at the dimensional level, in the first dimension it was considered unnecessary to increase or decrease the importance of each sub-dimension and variable, so that in this dimension —related to the legal framework— the weight assigned to each sub-dimension results from dividing 100 by the number of sub-dimensions that comprise it, so that since this dimension is composed of four sub-dimensions, the percentage value of each of them is 25 percent.

Unlike the first, the institutional framework and programmatic framework dimensions have a different scale, so that the assignment of differentiated weightings to the subdimensions that comprise them was evaluated, since the influence and role they play in achieving the objective in this case cannot be comparable. Giving them the same value would inevitably underestimate the real weight of other subdimensions. And although it is possible to see in a disaggregated way how developed each subdimension is, collectively there would be a bias in the entity because it could stand out at the dimensional level, despite not developing subdimensions that could be relevant.

In the institutional framework, the subdimensions “guiding documents focused on CSOs,” “responsible entity,” “state participation and consultation bodies,” and “state-level registry for CSOs” are assigned weighted percentage values of 10, 30, 40, and 20, respectively. In the programmatic framework, the subdimensions “economic promotion” and “promotion program” are each assigned a weighting of 40, while “Other” is assigned a value of 20.

By using a percentage scale at each level, the subdimensions are transformed into a simple and weighted summatory index, which is constructed from other elements known as variables. For example, in the case of the subdimension “regulations” within the legal framework, each of the three variables that make it up (“violations,” “sanctions,” and “means of appeal”) is assigned a value of 33.33%. When summed, these values total 100%, which represents the overall value of the subdimension, set at 25%.

Finally, the same logic is applied to the first level of aggregation, that of the indicators, which is the closest empirical referent denoting the variable. At this level each indicator takes a value from 0 to 1, where 1 is equal to the maximum value obtained for each indicator; the rest of the values are a function of the number of indicators available for each variable. Following the example above, for the variable "violations", being composed of three indicators (“yes,” “partially” and “no”), the assignment is made as follows:

“Yes” = 1.00 = 100 %

“Partially” = 0.50 = 50 %

“No” = 0.00 = 0 %

Thus, the mathematical procedure followed to obtain the resulting value of each subdimension (which is a function of the assigned weighting) is as follows:

$$VrSub = (i_1 + i_2 + \dots i_n)(PSub)/n$$

Where VrSub is the resulting value of the subdimension, x is the value of the indicators, PSub is the initial weighting assigned to the subdimension and n is the number of indicators over which the percentage weighting assigned to the subdimension should be divided.

The dimensions, for their part, adhere to the following procedure for the calculation of their resulting value:

$$VrDim = (VrSub_1 + VrSub_2 + \dots VrSub_n)(PDim)/100$$

Where VrDim is the resultant value of the dimension, VrSub is the resultant value of each dimension and PDim is the weighting assigned to the dimension in question.

The overall result of the development index is the sum of each subdimension that comprise it. Where MJ is the dimension related to the legal framework, MI the institutional framework and MP the programmatic framework.

$$\textit{IFAOSC} = \Sigma(\textit{MJ}, \textit{MI}, \textit{MP})$$

Structure of the Index: dimensions, sub-dimensions and variables

The Index for Promoting the Activities of Civil Society Organizations at the subnational level, with a base year of 2021, allows for the measurement and comparison of specific information regarding the development of promotion policies across the 32 entities in the country. The generated information will be used to organize, create networks, and empower organizations by providing them with knowledge of the legal frameworks that regulate them at both local and federal levels, enabling them to demand their rights and encourage the defense and creation of civic spaces. The goal is to empower CSOs through an understanding of the legal framework governing them within their entity and the related federal laws.

The index comprises three dimensions (legal, institutional, and programmatic), as well as 11 subdimensions, 57 variables (see annex for definitions), and 177 indicators, providing a comprehensive understanding of the realities within each of the 32 entities and enabling comparisons between them.

Data Collection

One of the fundamental premises for constructing the IFAOSC is the collection of information, which has enabled the evaluation of the legal, institutional, and programmatic dimensions of the 32 federal entities. It is important to note that the availability of information related to state promotion (legislation, regulations, programs, websites of responsible entities, etc.) varies significantly across the states, meaning that information was gathered from various sources.

One of the primary sources of information was the promotion laws and regulations specific to each entity. However, in the case of collecting information for the institutional framework, the websites of the agencies responsible for promotion often lacked all the necessary data for the proposed measurement within the index.

In this regard, data that was not publicly available was obtained through a series of information requests via the National Transparency Platform (PNT). If the required information was not provided, it was considered nonexistent and scored as 0 in the index.

Thus, through a series of information requests directed at the agencies and institutions responsible for promotion within the entities, the necessary information for constructing the measurement instrument was collected. This approach verified whether the elements outlined in the legislation and regulations of the country's entities also existed within the institutional framework responsible for promotion, or whether they existed even if not explicitly mentioned. Finally, it was verified whether the provisions in the legislation were reflected in more specific actions, such as promotion programs.

These information requests also enabled an investigation into the level of support and importance given to promotion in entities that do not have a legal framework in this regard, meaning they lack specific laws or regulations. Investigating entities where promotion is not a priority is one of the primary objectives of this index, which aims to influence strategic actors involved in the promotion and support of CSOs.

Dimension 1: Legal framework

The legal framework dimension includes variables related to the legislation that promotes the activities and establishes the guidelines for Civil Society Organizations (CSOs). This dimension involves an individual evaluation of the content of state laws that support CSOs and their respective regulations. It accounts for **20% of the index**, based on the understanding that while these laws set the standards governing CSO activities, they have not necessarily been fully implemented or met the deadlines specified in the laws' transitional provisions. Nonetheless, having legal norms in place is a significant step toward strengthening these actors.

This dimension comprises 4 subdimensions, 24 variables, and 70 indicators.

1.1.1.1 Promotion Law

The section on the promotion law evaluates eight variables.

The first aspect assessed **(1)** is the **existence or absence of state legislation regarding the promotion of Civil Society Organizations (CSOs)** as of 2022. If such legislation exists, it receives a score of 1; if it does not, it receives a score of 0.

Secondly, the evaluation **(2)** considers whether the legal framework has been updated in the past year, specifically if it underwent any **reform** in the year preceding the index (2022). However, the assessment does not only consider the existence of these reforms but also their nature. A score of 1 is given if the reform was progressive (enhancing rights and improving conditions for CSOs); a score of 0.66 is assigned if the reform was neutral (changes that neither harm nor benefit CSOs, such as updating the names of secretariats); a score of 0.33 is awarded if the reform was regressive (indicating a rollback of rights and freedoms, thus not aimed at improving the existing system). Finally, a score of 0 is given if no reforms were made to the state legislation in the year in question.

On the other hand, the evaluation **(3)** considers whether the state laws promoting Civil Society Organizations include their **own regulation**, with the publication of such regulation serving as evidence. If a regulation is mentioned within the law and is published, it receives a score of 1. If the regulation is mentioned but not published, it receives a score of 0. Similarly, if the law does not mention the regulation and there is no evidence of its existence, it also receives a score of 0.

The next variable **(4)** **assesses the number of activities** that CSOs are allowed to carry out as established in the legislation. This evaluation was based on the information collected from the legislations enacted up until 2022 and was divided into quartiles, with the following indicators:

- **Q4 and higher outliers:** Those legislations that had a list of activities greater than 21.75, giving a score equal to 1, as this reflects a diversification of their participation in the civic space.
- **Q3:** Those legislations that had a list of activities between 19 and 21.75, which receive a score of 0.75.
- **Q2:** Those legislations that had a list of activities between 18 and 19, giving them a score of 0.50.
- **Q1 and lower outliers:** Those legislations with a list of activities less than 18, giving them a score of 0.25, since they indicate little diversification of the same activities.

Meanwhile, those that receive a score of 0 either lack a state law for the promotion of Civil Society Organizations that specifies the activities they can undertake, or even if such a law exists, it does not describe those activities.

The criterion for establishing quartiles as indicators in the index is intended to standardize the interannual data of the variables and facilitate comparison, as the figures can vary significantly from year to year. The goal is to avoid pre-setting indicators based on data that fluctuate annually, so the decision was made to work with parameters that divide the data sample into four equal parts. Using quartiles also allows for an assessment of the data's dispersion and provides insight into its position within the four created subgroups. Data below Q1 represent 25% of the total, those below Q2 represent 50%, and those below Q3 represent 75%.

Lastly, it's important to note that the existence of a list of promotional activities is not always as beneficial as it might seem and can be exclusionary. An innovative approach would be to avoid a predefined list and open the legislation to all activities that contribute to the development of CSOs and society in general. However, until legislation progresses in this direction, this variable remains the most suitable option.

In variable (5) concerning the **rights and obligations** of Civil Society Organizations (CSOs), the evaluation determines whether there is potential overregulation of CSO activities. The assessment is carried out as follows: if there are more rights than obligations, a score of 1 is awarded, as this reflects a certain degree of freedom in their operations. If there is a balance between the number of rights and obligations, the score is 0.67.

Ideally, this balance should exist in the legislation, as it would contribute to empowering civil society organizations and preventing their overregulation.

On the other hand, if there are more obligations than rights, the score is 0.33, indicating overregulation of CSOs. Finally, if there is no law promoting CSOs that establishes their rights and obligations, or if the law exists but does not describe them, a score of 0 is assigned.

Similarly, the next aspect evaluated (6) is whether state legislation on promoting the activities of Civil Society Organizations includes the establishment of a **state registry, roster, or catalog of CSOs**. If the creation of such a registry is specified, a score of 1 is given; otherwise, the score is 0. In cases where the creation of a registry is not included, this could be replaced by the federal registry to avoid duplicating processes for organizations and local governments. However, so far, no law has considered this option. Nevertheless, these registries could also serve as an opportunity to better understand the specific characteristics of CSOs in the entities.

In addition to the above, it is examined (7) whether state legislations consider the **recognition of other unincorporated groups** (collectives, networks and/or groups). If they are mentioned in the legislations, a score of 1 is given, while if they are not, the score given is 0.

The final variable (8) in this subdimension assesses the **autonomy** of CSOs within the legislation, specifically whether they are recognized as having management and independence from the government structure. If this is affirmed, a score of 1 is given; if not, the score is 0.

1.2 Regulations

This section is composed of **three variables**: infractions, sanctions, and means of appeal.

Most laws promoting Civil Society Organizations establish a set of regulations that these organizations must consider in carrying out their activities. Therefore, this subdimension assesses whether the legislation includes measures such as infractions, sanctions, and means of appeal.

Firstly, **infractions (1)** consist of a list of actions and/or omissions that represent violations and non-compliance with the regulations; in other words, they are warnings that consequently lead to sanctions. In this case, if the legislation specifies which actions are considered infractions, a score of 1 is awarded. On the other hand, if the infractions are not clearly and specifically defined, a score of 0.5 is given. If the legislation makes no mention of infractions, the score is 0.

Secondly, **sanctions (2)** refer to the coercive measures and means provided by state laws to promote compliance by CSOs if they fail to meet their obligations. However, sanctions should not endanger the sustainability or existence of the CSO (e.g., forced dissolution).

The Index evaluates whether the legislation specifies the types of sanctions that apply to CSOs but do not jeopardize their sustainability or existence. If the legislation meets this criterion, it is scored 1. If the legislation does not specify the types of sanctions, it receives a score of 0.5. If the sanctions are not contemplated or if they jeopardize the CSO's sustainability or existence, the score is 0.

Finally, **(3) means of appeal** refers to the existence of defense resources available to Civil Society Organizations to oppose the decision of a judicial authority, requesting that it be revoked or that another hierarchical superior make the decision. This variable receives a score of 1 when the legislation contemplates and mentions the means of appeal, and 0 if no mention is made of such means of appeal.

1.3 State participation and/or consultation bodies

This subdimension addresses **ten variables** related to state fostering and consulting bodies, specifically the fostering committee/commission and the technical advisory council¹ outlined in the state legislations concerning CSOs.

¹ It should be noted that the nomenclatures depend on the entities and their dependencies.

The first variable (1) refers to the **existence of state promotion and advisory bodies**. At this point it should be emphasized that not all legislations are homogeneous in terms of the figures of promotion and consultation, some consider two figures (the committee and the technical advisory council), while in others only one (generally, the promotion one).

In this sense, within this first variable there are three indicators: 1) if there are both bodies (promotion and advisory) or only one with advisory functions, a value of 1 is given; 2) if there is only one body, but it does not have advisory functions, a score of 0.5 is given; and finally, 3) if state legislation does not contemplate the creation of promotion and advisory bodies, a score of 0 is given.

The second variable qualifies (2) the existence of the **figure of the technical/executive secretary** within the promotion and consultation agencies and whether this is honorary or structural/supporting, for which some type of remuneration is received. It should be noted that the nomenclature "technical" and "executive" refers to the same figure, although most of the entities that have this figure consider it as technical secretary, there are states that consider it as executive secretary.

This variable has three indicators: 1) if the figure of the technical/executive secretary is a structural/support figure, it is given a value of 1; 2) if it is considered an honorary figure, it is given a value of 0.5. Finally, if the existence of this figure is not contemplated in the legislation or its nature is not clear, it is given a value of 0.

Continuing with the figure of the secretary, the third variable evaluates the **functions of the technical/executive secretary (3)** contemplated in state legislation and/or regulations. For this purpose, the various functions of this position were grouped into three classifications:

N°	Classification of functions
1	Operational/administrative function
2	Evaluation/monitoring
3	Sanction

For this variable, the indicators are established as follows: 1) If state legislations outline functions for this role grouped into two or more classifications, it is rated 1; 2) If the functions are outlined within only one classification, it is rated 0.5; and finally, 3) If the functions of the technical/executive secretary are not mentioned in the legislations, it is rated 0.

The fourth variable (4) in this subdimension assesses the **representation in participation and consultation bodies**, specifically how the participation of OSC members and other sectors compares to that of government representatives in percentage terms. This variable has four indicators for evaluation.

- Higher number of representatives from OSCs and other sectors compared to government representatives, with a maximum score of 1, applies when:
 - There are two bodies, and in both, the representation of OSCs and other sectors is more than 50% compared to government representatives.
 - There is only one body, and in its composition, the number of representatives from OSCs and other sectors is more than 50% compared to government representatives.
- Balance with a score of 0.67:
 - There are two bodies, but in one of them, the representation of CSOs and other sectors exceeds 50%, while in the other body, the majority representation is government officials.
 - There is only one body, and its composition is 50% CSOs and other sectors, and 50% government representatives.
- Lower number of representatives from CSOs and other sectors than government representatives with a score of 0.33:
 - There are two bodies, and in both, the representation of CSOs and other sectors is less than 50% compared to government representatives.
 - There is only one body, and in its composition, the number of representatives from CSOs and other sectors is less than 50% compared to government representatives.

Finally, if the representation of CSOs and other sectors is not specified or contemplated within the state legislations, it is rated 0.

The next variable (5) evaluates how the **appointment of members to participation and/or advisory bodies** is established within the legislations and regulations. If the appointment process is through a public call, it is rated 1. If it is through direct appointment, it is rated 0.5. Finally, if the appointment process for members is not specified or established, it is rated 0.

The sixth variable (6) analyzes the **functions of participation and/or advisory bodies** contemplated within state legislations. For this purpose, various functions were grouped into five classifications, resulting in six indicators:

N°	Classification of functions
1	Design of public policies
2	Evaluación
3	Evaluation
4	Consultation
5	Comptroller

Regarding the indicators of this variable, it is noteworthy that

- If the entities include functions grouped within all five classifications, it is evaluated with 1.
- If they include four out of five classifications, it is rated 0.8.
- If they include three out of five, it is evaluated with 0.6..
- If they include two out of five, it is assigned a value of 0.4.
- If only one classification is included, it is rated 0.2.
- If functions are not contemplated in the participation and/or consultation bodies, it is assigned a value of 0.

The following variable assesses the **existence of a work plan or annual report (7)** by state promotion and consultation bodies. For evaluating this variable, three indicators are considered: if both elements (work plan and annual report) are present, it is assigned a score of 1; if only one element is present, it is assigned a value of 0.5; and if neither is contemplated in the state legislation, it is assigned a score of 0.

The eighth variable within this subdimension evaluates **(8) the existence of a promotion plan/program**. That is, if the promotion and/or consultation bodies include the establishment of a promotion plan/program, it is assigned a score of 1. Conversely, if the legislation makes no mention of such a program, it is assigned a score of 0.

The next variable examines **(9) the existence of evaluation or joint evaluation of promotion policies and actions** by the promotion and consultation bodies. A maximum score of 1 is given when: a) joint evaluation of promotion policies and actions is contemplated between the promotion body and the consultation body, or b) evaluation of promotion policies and actions is contemplated by the single existing body. A score of 0 is assigned when there is no mention of such evaluations by the bodies.

The final variable analyzes **(10)** whether the promotion and consultation bodies are provided with **their own budget**. Therefore, if there is a clear mention that these bodies must have a budget for their activities, they receive a score of 1; otherwise, the score is 0.

1.4. Budget

This subdimension is made up of **three variables**.

The first variable **(1)** pertains to the **budget allocated for promotion actions or programs** and assesses whether the legislation specifies the existence and details of the proportion of resources from the government and its agencies.

If the legislation clearly defines the budget allocated for promotion actions or programs, it is scored with 1. If the legislation only addresses the existence of a budget for promotion actions or programs in general terms, it is scored with 0.5. Finally, if the legislation does not address this matter at all, it is scored with 0.

Another variable (2) within this subdimension concerns the budget allocated for other **unincorporated groups (collectives, networks and groupings)**. Therefore, if the legislation explicitly provides for the allocation of resources to these groups, it is scored with 1. If the legislation mentions the existence of such a budget but only addresses it in general and unclear terms, it is scored with 0.5 (partially). Finally, if the legislation does not provide information about the budget for other groups (collectives, networks and groupings), it is scored with 0.

The last variable within this subdimension evaluates (3) whether the entities have **state or municipal fiscal incentives**, that is, whether they have exemptions, subsidies, incentives and other economic and/or administrative benefits at the state or municipal level. If the existence of such incentives is explicitly and specifically stated, a score of 1 is given. If the existence of such incentives is contemplated, but only addressed in a general and unclear manner, a score of 0.5 is given. Finally, if the existence of such incentives is not contemplated in the legislation, the score is 0.

Dimension 2: Institutional framework

The institutional framework dimension contemplates variables regarding CSO participation in policy documents, the entity responsible for addressing them, participation and/or consultation bodies and the state CSO registry. **This dimension accounts for 35% of the index**, since it analyzes the materialization of legislation at the institutional level. As mentioned above, mere legislation is an important step forward; however, this does not guarantee its materialization in an institutional framework conducive to the promotion of CSOs in the various entities.

The dimension has 4 sub-dimensions, 19 variables and 62 indicators.

2.1 Guiding documents focused on CSOs

The subdimension of guiding documents focused on Civil Society Organizations considers **two variables**: state development plan and sectoral program, both from the most recent years to 2022.

Regarding the first variable, **(1) the state development plan** is a document that sets out the problems, strategies and proposed solutions of a given state government. In other words, it sets the direction of the state's public programs and policies in order to solve the problems identified.

Like the plans, **(2) the sectoral programs** of the entities responsible for the attention of CSOs (specifically social development) are documents made up of a series of objectives, priorities and public policies that govern the performance of the administrative sector. These programs have the objective of raising the quality of life of the population and achieving greater integration of social groups into the process of development and economic growth of the entity.

In the Index, both variables receive a score of 1, as long as the documents contemplate Civil Society Organizations as key actors or fundamental parts in the development to achieve the established objectives, as well as if strategies and/or actions that promote their development and empowerment are established. In the case that it makes general mention of CSO participation, it receives a score of 0.5.

Finally, if no reference is made to any of the CSOs or the responsible entity does not have some of both documents, the score is 0.

2.2 Entity responsible for CSOs

This section is composed of **three variables** regarding the entity responsible for addressing CSOs: institutional hierarchy, website, and social media.

In each state, there is an entity responsible for addressing Civil Society Organizations (usually, the responsibility falls to various social development secretariats or their equivalents). Each of these entities has specific operational areas to interact with or assist CSOs in their sector or area of expertise. Consequently, the variable **(1) of institutional hierarchy** evaluates the relevance of the rank of each of the operational areas as follows:

- **Undersecretariat:** If the name of the operational area is an Undersecretariat, it is assigned a score of 1. This score is higher because it indicates that, being a higher hierarchy, it has a greater operational and organizational capacity to serve Civil Society Organizations.
- **Directorate:** If the name of the operational area is a Directorate, a score of 0.75 is assigned.
- **Sub-Directorate:** If the name of the operational area is a Sub-Directorate, a score of 0.50 is assigned.
- **Headship:** If the name of the operational area is a Headship, it is assigned a score of 0.25.

A score of no (value 0) is given when this information is not known about the operational areas or if the entities themselves did not provide this information.

The second variable **(2)** of this subdimension evaluates not only the **existence of the web pages of the responsible entities**, but also their content with respect to the dissemination of actions, programs and news regarding the promotion of Civil Society Organizations. The indicators of this variable are the following:

Indicator	Description	Score
Complete	The website contains information about various programs aimed at the CSOs for all the years since its establishment. This means there is an updated historical archive of both economic programs (e.g., calls for proposals, operational rules, results) and non-economic programs (e.g., training, in-kind support, etc.), as well as information about the CSOs within the state entity.	1
Basic	The website contains information about programs aimed at CSOs. However, it lacks a historical archive or overview of economic and non-economic programs. It includes outdated or incomplete information about the programs, such as information from only one year or only some formats (e.g., only calls for proposals/only operational rules/only results, etc.).	0.67
Under construction	The website is under construction.	0.33
Null	The website exists but does not contain any information about programs directed at CSOs. The responsible entity's website does not yet exist.	0

Ideal and best practice in this area is for all responsible entities to have a website that contains a historical archive of the actions that have been implemented in support of CSOs.

Thirdly, (3) the **social media presence of the responsible entities** is evaluated, primarily Twitter and Facebook. The importance of this lies in the fact that social media are new communication channels that offer significant benefits, as they provide low-cost dissemination channels with immediate access to various informational services for broad sectors of society.

This last variable assesses the update status of the social media accounts, meaning if there are posts referring to programs or actions aimed at supporting CSOs in the year 2022. A score of 1 is given if both social media platforms (Twitter and Facebook) are updated for 2022; a score of 0.67 is given if only one of the platforms is updated for 2022; a score of 0.33 is given if neither platform is updated for 2022; and finally, a score of 0 is given if the entity does not have any social media accounts or if they are not available.

2.3 State participation and consultation bodies

This subdimension considers **eleven variables** related to state bodies of participation and consultation. However, it differs from the legal framework subdimension because it evaluates, on one hand, the physical implementation of what is stipulated in the laws regarding these bodies, as well as institutional actions independent of the normative frameworks.

The first variable **(1)** assesses the **physical integration of the promotion and/or consultation bodies**. It is important to note that some state legislations establish the existence of two bodies or only one. Therefore, the following indicators have been established for the different scenarios

Indicator	Description	Score
Yes	It is established in the OSC law that there are two bodies: one for promotion and another for consultation and advisory. The responses to requests indicate that both bodies are in operation.	1
	It is established in the OSC law that there is only one body, generally the promotion body. The responses to requests indicate that this body is operational.	
Partially	It is established in the OSC law that there are two bodies: one for promotion and one for consultation and advisory. The responses to requests indicated that only one of the bodies is operational.	0.5
No	It is established in the OSC law that there are two bodies: one for promotion and one for consultation and advisory. The responses to requests indicated that neither has been established.	0
	It is established in the OSC law that there is a single body, usually for promotion. The responses to requests indicated that it is not integrated.	

Another variable (2) to consider is the **publication of the regulations for the promotion and/or consultation bodies**. A score of 1 is awarded when: a) Two bodies are contemplated in the law, and both have published regulations, or b) There is a single body contemplated in the law, and it has its regulations published. A score of 0.5 is given only if there are two bodies contemplated in the law, and only one of them has published regulations. Finally, a score of 0 is awarded in the following cases: a) Two bodies are contemplated in the law, and neither has published regulations, or b) There is a single body contemplated in the law, and it does not have its regulations published.

The third variable (3) evaluates, on the one hand, the publication of the call for the integration of the promotion and/or consultation bodies, and, on the other hand, whether this call includes a clear methodology for integration.

- The maximum grade of 1 is awarded:
 - A) Two bodies exist: If both have their own published call for applications and the methodology for their integration is clearly established within them.
 - B) A single body exists: If it has its own published call for applications and the methodology for its integration is clearly established within it.

- A grade of 0.5 is awarded:
 - A) There are two bodies:
 - If both bodies have their own published call for applications, but the methodology for their integration is not clearly established in either.
 - If both bodies have their own published call for applications, but only one of them establishes a clear methodology for their integration.
 - If only one body has a published call for applications, and that call establishes a clear methodology for its integration.

 - B) If there is only one body: If it has its own published call for applications, but the call does not establish a clear methodology for its integration.

- A grade of 0 is awarded:

- A) If there are two bodies: If neither of them has its own published call for applications.
- B) If there is only one body: If this body does not have its own published call for applications.

The fourth variable to analyze (4) pertains to the **information about the meetings of the promotion and/or consultation bodies**, that is, physical evidence of such meetings through minutes and/or records.² Accordingly, the following parameters were established depending on the description:

Indicator	Description	Score
Yes	There are two bodies: Complete information and documentary evidence (minutes and/or records) of the meetings held by both bodies were provided.	1
	There is one body: Complete information and documentary evidence (minutes and/or records) of the meetings held by the body were provided.	
Partially	There are two bodies: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Complete information and documentary evidence (minutes and/or records) of the meetings held by only one of the bodies were provided. • Very general information and documentary evidence (only a list of meeting dates) of the meetings held by both bodies were provided. 	0.5
	There is one body: General information and documentary evidence (only a list of meeting dates) of the body's meetings were provided.	
No	There are two bodies: No information or documentary evidence of meetings held by either body was provided.	0
	There is one body: No information or documentary evidence of meetings held by the body was provided.	

² These can include a record of past sessions, attendees of the meetings, evidence of regular and extraordinary sessions, etc.

The fifth variable (5) within this subdimension examines **the joint evaluation/assessment of policies and promotion actions**. It should be recalled that in the legal framework, the evaluation carried out by the corresponding bodies within the state legislations was rated. Now, this subdimension assesses the physical-documentary evidence supporting the evaluation of policies and promotion actions carried out in 2022. But beyond the fact that it is not contemplated in the law, this would be a desirable practice by the participation and/or consultation bodies and in the same way it is evaluated positively if they have it and negatively otherwise.

A maximum score of 1 is given when: a) There is physical-documentary evidence of the joint evaluation of promotion policies and actions carried out between the promotion body and the consultation body. OR b) There is physical-documentary evidence of the evaluation of policies and promotion actions carried out by the only existing body. While it is evaluated with 0 when in none of the previous cases there is evidence of such evaluations.

The next variable (6) considers the **existence of physical-documentary evidence of work plans/reports/follow-ups of agreements** (elements) held by the promotion and/or consultation body of each entity. A score of 1 is awarded when evidence of two or more elements is provided. A score of 0.5 is given when only one of the elements is provided. Finally, a score of 0 is assigned when none of the elements are provided.

The seventh variable (7) assesses the **existence of a promotion plan/program** within the state promotion and consultation bodies. It is important to note that having a promotion plan/program implies a more comprehensive approach to promotion within the entities, going beyond economic promotion programs and/or specific actions. A score of 1 is given if information about the existence of such a plan/program is available, while a score of 0 is given if there is no information or evidence of its existence.

Another variable to examine (8) pertains to the position of the **technical or executive secretary**. The distinction of this variable in this subdimension, compared to the legal subdimension, lies in the physical verification of responses. For example, while the legal framework specifies the type of position, this subdimension seeks to assess whether the provisions of the law have been implemented in practice, or if the law does not address it, what the actual situation is.

Having clarified the above, this variable qualifies whether the figure of the technical or executive secretary exists and has support/structural functions; if so, it is given a value of 1; if, on the contrary, it exists, but only serves as an honorary institution, it is given a score of 0.5. Finally, if there is no record of the existence of such a figure, it is given a score of 0.

The ninth variable (9) examines whether the responsible entities provided specific information about whether the **promotion and/or consultation bodies have an assigned budget**. A score of 1 is awarded when: a) Two bodies exist: information was provided about the budget allocated to each in 2022; b) One body exists: its budget for 2022 was provided. A score of 0.5 is given when there are two bodies but only information on the budget of one of them was provided. Finally, a score of 0 is assigned when, whether with one or two bodies, no information about the budget was provided, or the response was negative because no budget is allocated for these bodies.

The next variable (10) considers the existence of a **website for the state promotion and consultation bodies**, as well as the information contained on it. The evaluation of this variable followed these assumptions:

Indicator	Description	Score
Complete	When there are two bodies (promotion and consultation) and both have a web page and these contain information on programs of various kinds aimed at CSOs for all the years since it has been in existence.	1
	When there is only one body and it has its own web page, which contains information on programs of various kinds aimed at CSOs for all the years since it has been in existence.	
Basic	When there are two bodies and each has its own web page, but the information contained is very general. That is, it has some or none of the calls for proposals, operating rules, results and other information on CSOs.	0.67
	When there is only one body and it has its own web page, but the information is very general. That is, it has some or none of the calls for proposals, operating rules, results and other information on CSOs.	

Under construction	The website of the body(ies) is under construction, so no information is available.	0.33
Null	When there are two bodies, but neither has a website.	0
	When there is only one body, but it does not have its own website.	

The last variable in this subdimension evaluates **(II) the existence and information contained in the social networks** of the state promotion and consultation bodies, mainly facebook and twitter. Likewise, it is rated whether the information is updated³ or not, so the analysis follows the following assumptions:

Indicator	Description	Score
Updated two networks	There are two bodies (promotion and consultation) and each has a facebook and twitter account. Likewise, both networks share CSO promotion issues, as well as other related activities for 2022.	1
	There is one body (promotion) and both networks share CSO promotion issues, as well as other related activities for 2022.	
Updated a network	Two bodies: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The promotion and consultation bodies have their two respective social networks, but of these only one network of both bodies is updated to 2022, meaning they share CSO promotion issues as well as other activities. The promotion and consultation bodies have their two respective networks, but only one of the bodies has both social networks (twitter and facebook) updated to 2022, while the other body does not. 	0.67
	One body: The body has its two social networks, but only one of them is up to date as of 2022, while the other is not.	

³ Updated information refers to the most recent documentation related to evidence of meetings, minutes, programs, calls, information of interest to CSOs, etc.

Not updated	There are two bodies (promotion and consultation) and each has its respective networks (either facebook and twitter, or just one of them). However, none of the social media accounts are updated to 2022, meaning they only have information shared up to 2021 or previous years.	0.33
	There is one body (promotion) and it has one or two networks (facebook and twitter). However, none of these accounts are updated to 2022, meaning they only have information shared up to 2021 or previous years.	
Null	Regardless of whether there are two bodies or only one, neither has any network, meaning neither Facebook nor Twitter.	0

2.4 State-level Registration for CSOs (Institutional)

This dimension is made up of **3 variables**.

The first variable **(1)** examines **the existence or absence of a state registry, list, or catalog of CSOs**, that is, whether the registry or the implementation of what is established in some state legislation on supporting CSOs has been realized. A score of 1 is given if physical evidence of the registries is provided, and a score of 0 is assigned to those who did not provide such evidence or do not have it.

Another variable **(2)** is the **breakdown of information**, which refers to the details available in state registries. This can be an area of opportunity to understand CSOs at the local level and not just duplicate administrative procedures, as there is a federal registry. The following indicators are considered:

Indicator	Description	Score
Complete	<p>The state registry of CSOs contains more than the following three initial elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Name of the CSO • Date of registration/affiliation • Status • RFC • Social purpose 	1

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Address and phone numbers • Name of the legal representative • Website and email • Submission of annual report • If it has a founding deed • Name of the president of the CSO • If it is registered as a donor • If it has CLUNI (Unique Registry of Non-Profit Organizations) • Main activities 	
Partial	<p>The state registry of CSOs contains:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Name of the CSO • Date of registration/affiliation • Status • RFC • Social purpose • Address and phone numbers 	0.67
Basic	<p>The state registry of CSOs contains only some of the following elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Name of the CSO • Date of registration/affiliation 	0.33
Null	There is no state registry of CSOs.	0

The final variable (3) in this subdimension assesses whether the websites dedicated to state registries of CSOs include **information on the registration and renewal processes**. If the website contains all the aforementioned elements, it is scored with 1. If it contains one or two of the elements, it is scored with 0.5. Finally, if none of the elements are present, it is scored with 0.

Dimension 3: Programmatic framework

The Promotion Actions dimension includes variables related to the implementation of economic promotion programs directed at Civil Society Organizations (CSOs) in 2022, as well as other actions in support of these actors. **This dimension accounts for 45% of the index.** The reason for giving this dimension a higher weight is that the existence of programs demonstrates and reflects that the state entity is committed to and collaborating in the strengthening and empowerment of Civil Society Organizations. Thus, through concrete actions, it contributes to ensuring that these actors remain active and continue to participate in the public space to address various social issues.

The dimension comprises 3 subdimensions, 14 variables, and 45 indicators.

3.1 Economic promotion

This subdimension covers **four variables**: economic promotion actions, historical background, historical resources, and national comparative resources.

The first variable **(1)** pertains to **economic promotion actions** and evaluates whether there are state programs of an economic nature directed at CSOs within the entity. It is scored as 1 if a program of this type was implemented in 2022 and as 0 if not.

Regarding **(2) continuity**, as the name suggests, it examines whether the same state program existed in the previous year (2021), even if it changed its name. A score of 1 (not interrupted) is given when the economic program of 2022 was preceded by a program in 2021, indicating that it has not been interrupted. This also applies if it is a new program whose creation began in 2022. A score of 0.5 (interrupted) is given when the economic program existed in 2021 but was interrupted or stopped being implemented in 2022. "Interrupted" also applies if the program was executed in 2022 but was not carried out in 2021, considering that it was implemented in 2020 and previous years. Finally, a score of 0 is given when there is no program in 2022 and no previous history of it in previous years.

Thirdly, variable **(3)** regarding **historical resources** refers to the percentage increase in the amounts or budget allocated to programs directed at CSOs in 2022 compared to 2021. Therefore, only entities that maintained economic programs in both 2021 and 2022 were considered. Thus, the indicators were constructed based on the percentage increase or decrease in the budget of the programs for 2022 compared to that of 2021. As a result, the following quartiles were obtained as indicators:

- **Q4 and higher outliers:** A value of 1 is assigned when the percentage increase in the 2022 budget compared to 2021 is greater than 35.10%.
- **Q3:** A score of 0.75 is assigned when the percentage increase in the 2022 budget compared to 2021 is between 0.00% and 35.10%.
- **Q2:** A score of 0.50 is assigned when the percentage increase in the 2022 budget compared to 2021 is between -8.36% and 0.00%.
- **Q1 and lower outliers:** A score of 0.25 is assigned when the percentage increase in the 2022 budget compared to 2021 is less than -8.36%.

A good practice in this area is for the budgets of programs from the previous year to increase, as well as for a greater number of selected actors to receive adequate amounts to carry out their activities.

The variable **national comparative resource (4)** refers to the total amount allocated to programs for CSOs in 2022 in relation to the number of inhabitants in each federal entity in 2022 (population projections from the National Population Council, CONAPO), for which the quartiles identified were included as indicators.

- **Q4 and higher outliers:** A score of 1 is given when the ratio of budget to population is greater than 12.58.
- **Q3:** A score of 0.75 is given when the ratio of budget to population falls between 2.31 and 12.58.
- **Q2:** A score of 0.50 is given when the ratio of budget to population ranges between 0.73 and 2.31.
- **Q1 and lower outliers:** A score of 0.25 is given when the ratio of budget to population is less than 0.73.

In this variable, the criterion followed is the establishment of quartiles. As explained earlier, the relevance of choosing this criterion is justified by the need to limit the number of class intervals established as indicators due to the high dispersion among the data, which can be corroborated by the range of variation in the sample and its standard deviation, which are high. If the division of the sample into four equal parts, as done by these positional measures called quartiles, had not been considered, it would have been more complex not only to establish the class intervals but also their length, which would likely have been too short, leading to the fragmentation and atomization of the indicator values.

Additionally, working with quartiles offers the possibility to understand their position within the four created subgroups. Data below Q1 represent the lowest 25% of the data, those below Q2 represent 50%, and data below Q3 represent 75%.

3.2 Promotion Program

This subdimension encompasses 10 variables related to the components that make up an economic promotion program.⁴

The first variable analyzed **(1) is the operational rules (ROP)** of the economic programs for 2022 directed at OSCs. A score of 1 is given if these ROPs are publicly available, meaning they are published in official state newspapers, on the website of the responsible entity, or on the social media of the entity implementing the program.

A score of 0.5 is assigned if, on the other hand, they are not published through any of the aforementioned channels, either because they were removed from websites and obtained through transparency requests to the responsible entities.

⁴ It is worth noting that if the state has two or more economic promotion programs directed at OSCs, this subdimension is broken down into other sections (depending on the number of programs) to ultimately obtain an average result among all of them.

Finally, a score of 0 is given if they are not available through either of the two previous options or if no program was implemented in 2022.

Reports are written documents that describe the rationale, objectives, scope, and goals of a specific program from the perspective of the beneficiary OSCs. In this case, the index evaluates the following: 1) Partial report and follow-up, 2) final report, and 3) financial report.

Six variables related to reports were established, which are further divided into two parts. In the first part, the presence of reports within the operational rules is examined, and the following scores are assigned based on each case:

- **(2) Partial report and follow-up (ROP):** A score of 1 is given if both are included in the ROP. A score of 0.5 (partially) is given if only one is mentioned. A score of 0 is given if neither is mentioned.
- For variables **(3) final report (ROP)** and **(4) financial report (ROP):** A score of 1 is given if they are included in the ROP, and a score of 0 is given if they are not.

In the second part of the variables, the focus is on whether the reports exist, meaning that the beneficiary CSOs of the programs have provided proof of these reports, regardless of whether they are included in the rules of operation.⁵ Thus, the indicators for these three variables are similar to the previous ones:

- **(5) Partial and follow-Up Report (Physical):** It is scored with a 1 if both the partial report and the follow-up report for the program are provided. A score of 0.5 (partially) is given if only one of these reports is provided. A score of 0 is given if neither report is provided or if the report does not exist for the program.
- For the variables **(6) Final report (Physical)** and **(7) Financial report (Physical):** A score of 1 is given if the reports are provided, and a score of 0 is given if they are not.

The next variable **(8)** is **the call for the economic programs of 2022** directed at CSOs. It is scored with a 1 if the call is available to the public through all three of the following means: state official newspaper, social media, and official websites.

⁵ Physical or digital delivery of state economic development program reports in 2022.

A score of 0.75 is assigned if the call is available only on official websites or social media. A score of 0.50 is given if it is only publicly available in the official state newspaper. It is rated 0.25 if the call was obtained through a transparency request, and finally, a score of 0 is given if the call is not available through any of the aforementioned means.

Eligibility criteria (9) is the next variable. The index assigns a score of 1 if these criteria are included in the rules of operation. On the other hand, it is rated 0.5 if the criteria, instead of being established in the ROP, are described in the program calls. A score of 0 is assigned if eligibility criteria are not established in either of the two sources or if it is not possible to determine this because the program calls or rules of operation were not provided.

The final variable **(10)** concerns the **publication of program results**. Here, the availability of the results is assessed, as well as whether they provide complete and adequate information about the beneficiaries. The indicators are presented below:

Indicator	Description	Score
Available to the public with complete information	<p>The publication of the results is found in one of the following media: official State newspaper, social networks (RRSS) and official pages. Likewise, the information contained in the publication includes more than the first three elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participation Folio • Name or company name • Amount granted • RFC of the organization • Name of the project • Objective of the project • Place of execution • Number of beneficiaries 	1
Available to the public with basic information	<p>The publication of the results can be found in one of the following media: official state newspaper, social networks (RRSS) and official pages, but the information contained in the publication only responds to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participation Folio • Name or company name • Amount granted 	0.75

Available for transparency with complete information	<p>The publication of the results is not available in any of the aforementioned media and was obtained through a request for transparency. Likewise, the information contained in the publication includes more than the first three elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participation Folio • Name or company name • Amount granted • RFC of the organization • Name of the project • Objective of the project • Place of execution • Number of beneficiaries 	0.50
Available for transparency with basic information	<p>The publication of the results is not found in any of the mentioned media and was obtained through a transparency request, but the information contained in the publication only responds to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participation Folio • Name or company name • Amount granted 	0.25
No	<p>The publication of the results is not available in any publicly available media, nor was it provided through a transparency request.</p>	0

3.3 Other

This subdimension consists of a single variable.

The only variable **(1)** in this subdimension evaluates the **existence of other types and/or promotion actions** in the entities, that is, whether they offer in-kind support, equipment, project development, courses, workshops, advisory services, or the hiring of professional services, such as training —both remote and in-person— for CSOs, among other actions aimed at promotion.

It is important to note that this subdimension does not contain variables because the entities do not have uniform information regarding other promotion actions. In other words, it was difficult to establish parameters as in the promotion programs subdimension because these types of actions function differently in many states.

For example, in some entities, these other promotion actions are carried out through calls for applications, while in others, they are not. Additionally, in some entities, there is a wide variety of other actions (food packages, in-kind support, water bill waivers, training, etc.), and there is no record of the beneficiaries or other related information. For this reason, it was only considered as a binary indicator: if any of the aforementioned promotion actions are present, a value of 1 is assigned, and if not, it is rated 0.

Sources of reference

Batthyány, K. and Cabrera M (Coordinators) (2011). Research methodology in the social sciences. Notes for an initial course. Communication Unit of the University of the Republic.

García, S., Hevia, F., Layton, M., et al. (2010), State laws to promote the activities of civil society organizations. Analysis and recommendations. INCIDE Social, ITAM.

González Ulloa, P. (2022). Civil Society organizations in Mexico: proposals for their promotion. *Revista Estado, Gobierno y Gestión Pública*, (36), (36), 187-226. <https://revistaeggp.uchile.cl/index.php/REGP/article/view/66055/69707>

González Ulloa, P., Góngora, M.A., Sánchez, N., et al. (2015). The inclusion of civil society in the Federal District of Mexico: a review in perspective. ACED-INDESOL.

Heath, J. (2012). What the indicators tell. How to use statistical information to understand Mexico's economic reality. National Institute of Statistics and Geography.

Hernández, R. et al. (2014). Research methodology. McGraw Hill.

QuestionPro. (2022). what is weighting and how to apply it. <https://www.questionpro.com/blog/es/ponderacion/>.

Reguant, M., and Martínez-Olmo, F. (2014). Operationalization of concepts/variables. Barcelona: Dipòsit Digital de la UB. <http://diposit.ub.edu/dspace/bitstream/2445/57883/1/Indicadores-Repository.pdf>.

Segob (2008). Marco legal estatal en materia de Fomento a las Actividades de las Organizaciones de la Sociedad Civil. Secretaría de Gobernación, 2008.

No author (n.d.). Methodology for the construction of indexes. Mexico City: Instituto de Investigaciones Jurídicas.
<https://archivos.juridicas.unam.mx/www/bjv/libros/6/2805/10.pdf>

United States Agency for International Development (2022). 2020 Civil Society Organization Sustainability Index for Mexico.
<https://ciesc.org.mx/documentos/csosi/CSOSI20.pdf>

Vargas, P. (2012). Reinsertion of civil organizations in Mexico, comparative study of the Promotion Law in ten states. Espiral: vol.19 no.53, Jan./Apr.

Annex

Dimension 1: Legal framework

1.1 Promotion Law

1.1.1 Existence of promotion law

Having legislation that promotes the activities and establishes the guidelines for civil society organizations (CSOs) is one of the important steps toward the institutionalization of these organizations and ensuring legal security in the relationship between CSOs and the State, that is, between the government and society.

1.1.2 Law reforms

The reforms that have been made and those anticipated in each of the existing state legislations regarding the promotion of Civil Society Organizations (CSOs) should be aimed at improving the existing system and are generally gradual and phased. However, these reforms can also be retroactive and detrimental to CSOs.

1.1.3 Existence the regulation of law

The existence of regulations is crucial as they establish and concretely define the guidelines and mechanisms by which the legal mandate contained in the law is materialized—in this case, in the state laws promoting the activities of Civil Society Organizations.

1.1.4 Promotion activities

These are a series of diverse actions stipulated in state legislation for the promotion of CSOs, which involve providing various types of incentives, not limited to financial support, but also other strengthening actions for CSOs, such as facilitating access to information, protecting vulnerable activities, among others.

1.1.5 Rights and obligations of CSOs

These are a set of norms aimed at fostering relationships between civil society, the government, and institutions.

Rights are discretionary matters that ensure freedoms and benefits from the State toward civil society organizations, while obligations entail responsibilities of CSOs toward the State, and can even be requirements for accessing economic support and incentives. Ideally, there should be a balance between the number of rights and obligations in the legislation, as this would contribute to empowering civil society organizations and avoiding potential overregulation.

1.1.6 Registration for CSOs at the state level (legal)

One of the important aspects within state legislation is whether it includes the creation of a state registry, roll, or catalog, that is, an authorized body whose primary function is to consolidate information and handle all matters related to the procedures of the organizations

1.1.7 Recognition of unincorporated groups (collectives, networks and/or groupings)

While most state legislation regarding CSOs promotes the third sector, some also recognize activities for other groups, such as grouping —collectives of organized citizens not legally constituted— and networks —groups not legally constituted, made up of civil society organizations and/or associations—.

1.1.8 Autonomy

CSOs are understood as legally constituted groups with self-governing capacity, internal and managerial autonomy, and independence from government structures. In other words, autonomy refers to the separation from the government and is assumed as a constitutive element of the third sector.

1.2 Regulations

1.2.1 Violations

These are a list of actions and/or omissions that represent violations and non-compliance with the norms that establish obligations that Civil Society Organizations must adhere to. Consequently, violations constitute warnings that may result in sanctions.

1.2.2 Sanctions

Sanctions are the coercive measures and means provided by state laws promoting CSOs to encourage compliance in cases where organizations fail to meet their obligations, as long as they do not jeopardize the sustainability or existence of the organizations or groups. The most common sanctions in these cases are warnings, fines, suspensions, and definitive cancellations of their registration in state records.

1.2.3 Means of appeal

Means of appeal refer to the legal resources available to Civil Society Organizations to challenge a decision made by an authority, requesting that it be revoked or that a higher authority review the decision.

1.3 State participation and/or consultation bodies

1.3.1 State promotion and advisory bodies.

State promotion and advisory bodies are responsible for encouraging, promoting, regulating, supervising, evaluating, and setting the criteria upon which CSOs should develop their activities. Together, they can develop plans, projects, and programs to provide comprehensive support for the proper application of public resources allocated to them.

Within the legislation or regulations regarding the promotion and support of CSOs, there are provisions for state promotion bodies or bodies with consultative functions. It is worth noting that not all legislations are homogeneous concerning promotion and advisory figures; some consider two figures (such as committees and technical advisory councils), while others include only one (generally the promotion body).

Similarly, the terminology established within the legislations can vary from commission to committee, council, group, and so forth. Additionally, there may be promotion/consultation figures without a supporting legislation or regulation.

1.3.2 Technical/executive secretary

In the state promotion and consultation bodies present in the entities, the role of a technical/executive secretary is contemplated. This role can be honorary or structured/supportive, with remuneration. The main functions of this role involve coordinating the programs of various CSOs, executing the agreements made by the promotion body, and assisting with administrative tasks resulting from the sessions or meetings held by the promotion and/or consultation body.

It is important to specify that the terms “technical” and “executive” refer to the same position. While most entities that have this role refer to it as a technical secretary, some states consider it an executive secretary.

1.3.3 Functions of the technical/executive secretary

In the legislation and regulations of the entities, various functions of the technical/executive secretary were identified, which were grouped into three classifications based on their scope. The first is the operational/administrative function, which includes tasks such as: providing necessary support to all members for their participation in committee meetings, receiving, organizing, and dispatching correspondence, drafting minutes of sessions, among others.

The second function is evaluation/monitoring, which includes tasks such as: overseeing compliance with relevant provisions established in the laws, conducting analyses and research studies as requested by the body, following up on the actions of the council, and if applicable, municipalities, for monitoring the council's actions, among other duties.

Finally, the third classification of functions is related to sanctions, which includes tasks such as: informing the competent authority of acts or facts that may constitute a crime, proposing sanctions to the committee for organizations' non-compliance with legal obligations, among other responsibilities.

1.3.4 Representation within the participation and consultation body

Within the participation and consultation bodies, the percentage of representation of CSO members and other sectors relative to government representatives is important, particularly regarding decision-making. Regardless of whether there is one body (promotion or consultation) or both, if there is greater representation of government officials compared to CSO members and other sectors, it can negatively impact decision-making and actions of the promotion and consultation bodies regarding support.

1.3.5 Appointment of members

This refers to how the appointment of members to the participation and/or consultation bodies is carried out within the legislation and regulations, whether there is one (promotion or consultation) or both. Legislation may specify the appointment process through calls for applications, direct appointment, random selection, or may not specify or have provisions for the appointment of members.

1.3.6 Functions of the participation and consultation body

This pertains to the functions of the promotion and consultation bodies within the entities. Similar to the functions of the technical/executive secretary, these functions were grouped into classifications based on their scope. The promotion and/or consultation body may perform functions related to public policy definition, evaluation, sanctioning, consultation, or oversight. Some entities have functions in all five classifications, while others have functions in only one or two groupings, highlighting the importance of their evaluation.

1.3.7 Work plan/annual report

This refers to whether the legislation and/or regulations include a work plan/annual report requirement for the promotion and/or consultation body in each entity. Some states' legislations include the existence of both elements, one, or neither.

1.3.8 Promotion plan/program

This refers to whether the legislation and/or regulations include a promotion plan/program from the promotion and/or consultation body. It is important to note that the existence of a promotion plan/program implies a more comprehensive approach to promotion within the entities, going beyond economic promotion programs and/or specific actions. Additionally, the nomenclature of this plan or program varies among entities; for example, some refer to it as a general promotion plan, state promotion program, or state promotion plan, among other names.

1.3.9 Evaluation/joint evaluation of promotion policies and actions

What is not evaluated cannot be improved. This includes the joint evaluation of policies if there is both a promotion and a consultation body, as well as the evaluation of promotion policies and actions if only one body exists or if there is no mention of such evaluations in the state legislation.

1.3.10 Own budget

This refers to whether the legislation includes the allocation of a budget or resources for the functioning of the promotion and consultation bodies, regardless of whether one or both bodies are present. Therefore, it is assessed whether there is a clear mention of a budget, if it is not specific, or if there is no provision for an own budget for these bodies.

1.4 Budget

1.4.1 Budget for promotion actions or programs

There are legislations that provide for the allocation of a budget for promotion actions or programs by governments and their agencies. This evaluation assesses whether such provisions are included in the legislation, as well as the clarity of what is established, whether it is addressed in general terms, or if there is no mention of the budget allocated for promotion actions or programs.

1.4.2 Budget for other unincorporated groups (collectives, networks and groupings)

This refers to the way in which the budget is established for groups other than CSOs. Therefore, an evaluation should be made of whether the legislation explicitly establishes the budget, whether it is only partial, or whether no reference is made to the establishment of a budget.

1.4.3 State or municipal fiscal incentives

These are exemptions, subsidies, incentives, and other economic and/or administrative benefits for CSOs and other groups, which are covered within the legislation or regulations. These benefits can be granted at the state or municipal level.

Dimension 2: Institutional framework

2.1 Guiding policy documents focused on CSOs

2.1.1 State development plan

This is a document outlining the problems, strategies, and proposed solutions of a particular state government. In other words, it sets the direction for state public policies aimed at addressing identified issues. In the index, this variable aims to assess whether these documents consider Civil Society Organizations (CSOs) as key actors in development or if there are strategies that promote their development and empowerment.

The importance of including CSOs in these plans lies in their role as allies in building a country with less injustice, contributing to the development and well-being of the population, as civil society is a driving force for social change.

2.1.2 Sectorial program of the responsible entity

These are documents, especially those related to social development, consisting of a series of objectives, priorities, and public policies that govern the performance of the administrative sector. These programs aim to improve the quality of life for the population and achieve greater integration of all social groups into the development and economic growth process of the entity.

Similarly, this variable indicates whether these programs again consider CSOs as a fundamental part in achieving the established objectives, as they contribute to improving the quality of life for citizens and their development.

2.2 Entity responsible for CSOs

2.2.1 Institutional hierarchy

The entities in charge of attending to Civil Society Organizations, generally the secretariats of social development, have specific operational areas for interacting with or assisting CSOs in a sectoral manner or area of competence (for example: secretariat of social and human development - directorate of articulation with Civil Society Organizations). Therefore, this variable indicates the hierarchical relevance of the names of the existing operational areas, which range from undersecretariat, directorates, headquarters, among others. Thus, the higher the organizational hierarchy, the greater the capacity to operate in terms of promotion.

2.2.2 Website and/or social networks

The website and/or social networks variable refers to whether or not the entities responsible for Civil Society Organizations have digital media. The importance of this lies in the fact that these new means of communication have great benefits, as they constitute low-cost dissemination channels and immediate access to different information services for broad sectors of society. Likewise, this variable evaluates whether these media provide complete, basic or no information on CSOs.

2.3 State participation and consultation bodies

2.3.1 Integrated promotion and/or consultation body (according to the entity)

Described in 1.3.1, the state promotion and consultation bodies are those responsible for promoting, encouraging, regulating, supervising, evaluating and establishing the criteria on which CSOs must develop their activities. They jointly develop plans, projects and programs to provide them with comprehensive support for the correct application of the public resources allocated to them.

The difference here is that this subdimension evaluates the implementation of what is established in the legislation, while this variable specifically assesses evidence of whether the promotion and/or consultation body is properly integrated.

2.3.2 Regulation

This variable refers to the publication of the regulations for the participation and/or consultation bodies. This regulation is fundamental, as it establishes and defines the guidelines and mechanisms by which the mentioned bodies should be governed and function to carry out their duties and other activities.

2.3.3 Call for applications (published)

The call for applications for the participation and/or consultation bodies is an announcement disseminated through various media, inviting potential interested parties to participate in a process to become members of these bodies. It is crucial that these calls be published to ensure accessibility to a broad audience and any interested parties in joining the state promotion and consultation bodies.

2.3.4 Information on meetings (minutes and/or records)

Information about the meetings or sessions of the promotion and consultation bodies—whether there is one or both types—is essential for understanding the development and decision-making of these bodies concerning promotion. Therefore, this variable assesses the documentary evidence of information about meetings, such as minutes, records, or other types of documents.

2.3.5 Evaluation/joint evaluation of policies and promotion actions

Described in 1.3.9, the difference in this subdimension from the previous one is that here it is assessed according to the physical-documentary evidence of such evaluations conducted by the promotion and/or consultation bodies. However, regardless of whether it is covered in legislation or regulations, it is also evaluated whether such evaluations are presented within these institutional bodies.

2.3.6 Work plan/report/follow-up of agreements

Described in 1.3.7, the difference in this subdimension from the previous one lies in evaluating according to the physical-documentary evidence of the existence of a work plan, report, or follow-up of agreements by the promotion and/or consultation body in each entity. Some states have all three elements, two, or at least one, while others do not have any of these plans or reports. However, regardless of whether it is covered in legislation or regulations, it is also assessed whether any of these documents are present within these institutional bodies.

2.3.7 Promotion plan/program

Described in 1.3.8, the difference in this subdimension from the previous one is that it evaluates according to the physical-documentary evidence of the existence of a promotion plan/program by the promotion and/or consultation body in each entity. It is important to note that the existence of a promotion plan/program implies a more comprehensive approach to promotion in the entities, extending beyond economic promotion programs and/or specific actions. Additionally, regardless of whether it is covered in legislation or regulations, it is assessed whether any of these documents are present within these institutional bodies.

2.3.8 technical/executive secretary

Described in 1.3.2, the difference in this subdimension from the previous one is that it evaluates according to the physical-documentary evidence of the existence of a technical/executive secretary, and whether this position is honorary or a structural/support role with some form of remuneration. It is important to note that regardless of whether the existence of this role is covered in legislation or regulations, it is assessed whether such a position is present within these institutional bodies.

2.3.9 Assigned budget

Described in 1.3.10, the difference in this subdimension from the previous one lies in evaluating according to the physical-documentary evidence of the allocation of budget for the promotion and/or consultation bodies.

In this regard, an assessment is made of whether such allocation of resources exists, whether it is only partial, or whether the promotion and/or consultation bodies do not have a budget. Regardless of whether or not the granting of a budget is contemplated in legislation or regulations, what is evaluated is whether such allocation of resources is present at the institutional level in these promotion and/or consultation bodies.

2.3.10 Website

As described in 2.2.2, this variable evaluates whether the website has complete, basic or no information on CSOs, or whether the digital media is under construction.

2.3.11 Social networks

The social networks variable refers to whether or not the promotion and consultation bodies have these digital media (mainly Facebook and Twitter). As mentioned in 2.2.2, these new means of communication have great benefits, as they are low-cost dissemination channels with immediate access to different information services. Therefore, regardless of whether there is one or both bodies (promotion and consultation), the existence of these social networks is evaluated and whether they have updated information in both, in one, if one is not updated, or if both networks are not updated.

2.4 State-level registry for CSOs (institucional)

2.4.1 Existence

As mentioned within the legal framework, one of the key aspects of promoting CSOs is whether they include the creation of a state registry, register, or catalog, that is, an authorized entity whose main function is to concentrate information and everything related to the procedures for organizations to obtain registration. At the institutional level, regardless of whether it is covered in state legislation, this variable aims to evaluate the physical realization or documentary evidence proving the existence of this state registry, register, or catalog.

2.4.2 Breakdown of information

Similar to the previous variable, the breakdown of information refers to the documentary evidence of the type of information available in the state registry of CSOs. It is evaluated with various indicators based on the quantity and type of elements included. Examples of such elements include the name of the CSO, the date of registration, status, tax identification number (RFC), social purpose, address and phone numbers, name of the legal representative, website and email, annual report submission, among others.

2.4.3 Registration and renewal process instructions (instructions, required documentation, registration forms, updates, reports, contact)

Continuing with the registry for CSOs, this variable refers to the physical or evidentiary proof of the instructions for the registration and renewal process for CSOs. It evaluates how complete and accessible the instructions, required documentation, registration forms, updates, reports, and contact information are.

Dimension 3: Programmatic framework

3.1 Economic promotion

3.1.1 Promotion actions

Economic promotion actions are initiatives created by one or more government entities. In this index, these are understood as programs with a specific financial amount allocated to Civil Society Organizations to continue playing their role as intermediary actors in addressing and improving societal living conditions and achieving social well-being.

3.1.2 Continuity

Continuity refers to the existence of precedents, i.e., economic programs directed at CSOs implemented in the year prior to the index. This allows for understanding whether there is continuity, interruption, or the creation of a new program, as well as evaluating its performance in terms of allocated budget and number of beneficiaries.

3.1.3 Historical resources

Historical resources refer to the percentage increase in the amounts or budget allocated to programs directed at CSOs in 2022 compared to 2021. In this regard, only those entities that maintained economic programs in both 2021 and 2022 were considered.

3.1.4 National comparative resource

The national comparative resource refers to the division of the total amount allocated to programs for CSOs in 2022 by the population projections for each federal entity in 2022 provided by the National Population Council (CONAPO).

3.2 Promotion program

3.2.1 Rules of operation (ROP)

Operational rules are normative documents used for the proper execution of programs, as they establish participation guidelines to achieve equity, efficiency, effectiveness, and transparency throughout the process.

*3.2.2 Partial report and follow-up*⁶

The partial report aims to assess the progress of a specific program by examining the activities completed up to a certain point. This helps refine and evaluate the initial timelines. Follow-up, on the other hand, involves continuous supervision (using various tools) of the program's implementation to ensure it aligns with the original plan. Both the partial report and follow-up are responsibilities of the CSO benefiting from the programs.

3.2.3 Final report

The final report is a comprehensive analysis of the program and presents the final evaluation and feedback on the actions implemented. The final report is related to the one provided by the CSO benefiting from the programs.

⁶ It should be noted that each of the reports described below has two variables in the index. The first variable evaluates whether the reports are included in the operational rules, while the second assesses whether physical or documentary evidence of these reports is provided, regardless of whether they are established in the operational rules. Therefore, here we will only describe what each report refers to.

3.2.4 Financial report

The financial report reflects information regarding the management and balance of the program's budget, including any modifications that occur during its implementation. This report is prepared by the beneficiary CSO.

3.2.5 Call for applications

The call for applications is an announcement inviting potential interested parties to participate in a process to become beneficiaries of certain supports. This index applies to the economic programs for 2022 aimed at CSOs.

3.2.6 Eligibility criteria

Eligibility criteria are a set of guidelines that CSOs must meet to have a higher chance of being selected as beneficiaries of economic development programs.

3.2.7 Publication of results

The publication of results refers to the process of publicly disclosing, through appropriate channels, the participants selected to receive the economic benefits announced in the calls for applications.

3.3 Other

3.3.1 Other Promotion Actions

Other types of promotion refer to support in kind, equipment, project development, courses, workshops, advisory services, and the hiring of professional services, such as remote and in-person training for CSOs, among other actions.