Open Government Index Metric

AN ANALYSIS OF OPEN GOVERNMENT, TRANSPARENCY, AND PROACTIVE TRANSPARENCY INDICATORS, INDEXES AND MEASUREMENTS

Guillermo M. Cejudo (coord.)
Víctor Aguilar
Cynthia Michel
Roberto Zedillo

Translation by:
Roberto Zedillo

CIDE
inai
Instituto Nacional de Transparencia, Acceso a la Información y Protección de Datos Personales

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This document presents an overview of the main indexes and metrics intended to measure open government and transparency around the world. We consider a total of 22 indexes, which are analyzed per 14 criteria: 1) producer, 2) purpose, 3) financing (whether it's public, private, or both), 4) location, 5) type of data used for measurement, 6) spatial coverage, 7) temporal coverage, 8) contact information for the person/institution in charge of the index, 9) methodology, 10) result format, 11) result examples (where relevant), 12) appropriate use (what the indicator *is* for), 13) inappropriate use (what the indicator *is not* for), and 14) underlying assumptions.

To have a more precise appraisal of the various ways open government and transparency have been understood and measured, this document also presents a general analysis of the indexes' strengths and weaknesses. Our results show that a) there is no consensus on how open government should be understood and, therefore, measured; b) the main measurements for open government focus on the government exclusively, and consider transparency, citizen participation, key data disclosure, and the strength of institutions meant to guarantee access to information; c) measurements do not assess the impact any progress on these matters has on reality except for, in some cases, perception surveys; d) regarding transparency, most indexes tend to focus on the *supply* side of information (especially in terms of budget), but none of them considers proactive transparency, and therefore are limited to an evaluation of whether governments abide by the law.

INDEX

INTRODUCTION

In the last years, the concepts of "open government" and "proactive transparency" have become increasingly linked with democratic, participatory, inclusive, collaborative, innovative and accountable governments. However, despite the increasing use of these terms in academia and in the public sector, there is still no consensus as to how they should be operationalized, which impacts not only the ways in which they are put to practice, but also the way they are measured and evaluated.

Still, a wide array of governments and organizations (both public and private, both domestic and global) has sought to measure various aspects of open government and transparency overall. This document considers the main theoretical and practical proposals that have been advanced around the world to measure transparency and open government. To make comparisons easier, we organize the information based on a set of criteria put forth in Cejudo, Gerhard and Zabaleta's 2009 *Guía de indicadores de buen gobierno en las entidades federativas*. We therefore analyze each index on the basis of 14 criteria: 1) producer, 2) purpose, 3) financing (whether it's public, private, or both), 4) location, 5) type of data used for measurement, 6) spatial coverage, 7) temporal coverage, 8) contact information for the person/institution in charge of the index, 9) methodology, 10) result format, 11) result examples (where relevant), 12) appropriate use (what the indicator *is* for), 13) inappropriate use (what the indicator *is not* for), and 14) underlying assumptions.

The remainder of this document is organized as follows. Section 1 presents a table which summarizes the main features of all indexes (name, producer, what they measure, the year for the first edition, the number of times each index has been measured, financing, sector, and spatial coverage). Section 2 is the actual body of this paper and presents a detailed description of every index per the criteria specified above. Section 3 is comprised of a brief analysis of all indexes, which highlights their similarities and differences, as well as their overall strengths and weaknesses. Section 4 presents our conclusions.

I. SUMMARY TABLE

Pg.	Index name	Creator	What it measures	First year	Times it has been measured	Financing	Sector	Spatial coverage	Free access	Based on official data
9	Global Open Data Index	Open Knowledge	Open government	2013	2	Private	Private	International (97 countries)	Yes	Yes
14	Open Data Barometer	World Wide Web Foundation	Open government	2013	2	Private and public	Private	International (86 countries)	Yes	Yes
20	Open Government Index	World Justice Project	Open government	2015	1	Private	Private	International (102 countries)	Yes	No
27	Open Budget Survey/Open Budget Index	International Budget Partnership	Budget transparency	2006	5	Private	Private	Intarnational (102 countries)	Yes	No
32	Municipal Transparency Index	Nuno Ferreira da Cruz et al./LSE	Local online transparency	2015	1	None	Academia	Portuguese municiaplities (308)	Yes	Yes

Pg.	Index name	Creator	What it measures	First year	Times it has been measured	Financing	Sector	Spatial coverage	Free access	Based on official data
38	Assessing Government Transparency: an Interpretive Framework (theoretical proposal)	Albert Meijer/Utrecht University; Ben Worthy/Birkbeck College	Transparency	2015	1	None	Academia	United Kingdom	No	Partially
45	Online Transparency Index	Rui Pedro Lourenço et al.	Local online transparency	2013	1	Public	Academia	Portuguese and Italian municipalities (45 and 49, respectively)	Yes	Yes
49	Índice de Transparencia de los Ayuntamientos (Town Hall Transparency Index)	Transparency International Spain	Local transparency	2008	5	Private and public	NGO	Spanish municipalities (110)	Yes	Yes
54	Global Right to Information Rating	Access Info Europe/Centre for Law and Democracy	Legal framework for the right to access to information	2011	5	Private and public	Private	International (102 countries)	Yes	Yes

Pg.	Index name	Creator	What it measures	First year	Times it has been measured	Financing	Sector	Spatial coverage	Free access	Based on official data
58	Índice del Derecho de Acceso a la Información en México (Right to Access to Information in Mexico Index)	Fundar	Quality of transparency and accountability laws	2010	3	Private	NGO	32 state laws and the federal transparency law	Yes	Yes
62	Índice Latinoamericano de Transparencia Presupuestaria (Latin-American Index of Budgetary Transparency)	Fundar	Budget Transparency	2001	6	Private and public	Private and Public	Latin America (5 countries)	Yes	Partially
65	CIMTRA-Municipal	CIMTRA	Local proactive transparency	2008	≤11	Private and public	NGO	Mexican municipalities (165)	Yes	Partially
69	CIMTRA-Legislativo	CIMTRA	Legislative transparency	2011	≤5	Private and public	NGO	Local Mexican congresses (7)	Yes	Yes

Pg.	Index name	Creator	What it measures	First year	Times it has been measured	Financing	Sector	Spatial coverage	Free access	Based on official data
73	CIMTRA-Delegacional	CIMTRA	Territorial demarcation transparency	2004	3	Private and public	NGO	Mexico City territorial demarcations (16)	Yes	Partially
76	Índice de Información Presupuestal Estatal (State Budget Information Index)	IMCO	State budget transparency	2008	7	Private and public	Private	32 Mexican states	Yes	Yes
80	Índice de Información Presupuestal Municipal (Local Budget Information Index)	IMCO	Local budget transparency	2009	6	Private and public	Private	Mexican municipalites (410)	Yes	Yes
85	Métrica de la transparencia (Transparency Metric)	Center for Research and Teaching in Economics (CIDE)	Transparency	2007	3	Public	Academia	Mexican federal government, states and municipalities	Yes	Partially

Pg.	Index name	Creator	What it measures	First year	Times it has been measured	Financing	Sector	Spatial coverage	Free access	Based on official data
89	Metric for Releasing Open Data (MELODA)	Alberto Abella	Data reusability	2011	n/a	Private and public	Academia	Data sets	Yes	n/a
94	Medición de la Transparencia en Línea (Online Transparency Measurement)	Rodrigo Sandoval Almazán	Online transparency and open government	2007	8	Public	Academia	Mexican federation (32 states)	Yes	Yes
99	Measurement of Open Government: Metrics and Process	Bertot, McDermott y Smith	Open government	2012	1	None	Academia	30 US government agencies	Yes	Partially
102	Indicadores de iniciativas de datos abiertos en América Latina (Latin American Open Data Initiatives Indicators)	Concha y Naser – ECLAC	Open government/ Open data	2012	n/a	Public	Public (international organization)	n/a	Yes	Yes

Pg.	Index name	Creator	What it measures	First year	Times it has been measured	Financing	Sector	Spatial coverage	Free access	Based on official data
106	OECD Open Government Measurement	Gavelin, Burall y Wilson – Involve/OECD	Open government	2009	n/a	Public	Private	n/a	Yes	Yes

II. INDEX DESCRIPTION

Open government and transparency indexes and measurements below—including theoretical propositions—were selected on the basis of three criteria: a) they had to explicitly measure open government or transparency, or one of their components (e.g. *open data* or *budget transparency*); b) their methodology had to be laid out explicitly enough so that the usefulness of any dimensions, components, and weights can be analyzed; c) their unit of analysis had to be related to the purposes of our research, i.e. transparency and/or open government were measured on an international (including Mexico), national, regional or local level.

Applying these criteria led to the exclusion of some measurements. Examples include Kathleen M. Dowley's *Additive index of local government decision-making transparency in East Central Europe*, whose methodology is based on a very narrow, basic understanding of transparency; ARegional's *Índice de Transparencia y Disponibilidad de la Información Fiscal de los Municipios* [Local transparency and fiscal information availability index, or ITDDIF-M], which only measures—without specifying any selection criteria or weightings—the availability of fiscal documents in Mexican municipalities; Transparency International's *Corruption Perceptions Index*, which reflects perceived levels of corruption in the public sector; and Gartner's *Open Government Maturity Model*, which proposes a series of very general stages through which public institutions must go to reach the maximum level of engagement, without providing details on how each of them is evaluated.

The following pages present a detailed description of the most relevant open government and transparency indexes and metrics.

1) GLOBAL OPEN DATA INDEX

Producer: British network *Open Knowledge*.

Purpose: to locate countries that are (or are not) publishing open data, and to also know which countries are publishing relevant data in an appropriate manner and an adequate timing. The index measures and defines some points of reference regarding open data across the world. Instead of assessing each government's official stand on open data, this is an independent evaluation from a citizen's perspective.

Financing: private. Open Knowledge gets its resources from various sources, including *Knight Foundation*, *The William and Flora Hewlett Foundation*, *National Endowment for Democracy*, *Omidyar Network*, *Shuttleworth Funded*, and *Alfred P. Sloan Foundation*.

Location: http://index.okfn.org/.

The first edition was published on October 28, 2013, with data for 70 countries.

The second edition was published in 2014 and has data for 97 countries.

Type of data used for measurement: the index analyzes 10 datasets selected based on the *G8 key datasets definition* and a discussion with the open government community.[1] Datasets must have been published by country governments and are provided to *Open Knowledge* by volunteers from each nation. Each dataset has a different name depending on the country, yet they are all grouped under the following categories:

1) Election results: results by constituency / district for all major national electoral contests
2) Company register: List of registered (limited liability) companies, including their names, unique identifiers, addresses, and registered activities.
3) National map: with a scale of 1:250,000 (1 cm = 2.5km)

[1] For a more comprehensive review, see the *G8 Open Data Charter and Technical Annex*: https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/open-data-charter/g8-open-data-charter-and-technical-annex#technical-annex.

4) Government spending (by sector): Records of actual and past national government spending at a detailed transactional level: month to month, with specific elements (including expenses lower than $100,000). A database of contracts awarded (or any similar data) is not considered sufficient.

5) Government budget (detailed): by sector or government department, for example. Contrary to Government spending, Government budget looks at planned expenditure.

6) Legislation (laws and statutes): All national laws and statutes must be available online.

7) National statistics (geographic and demographic data): demographic and economic indicators (GDP, unemployment, population, among others), and aggregated data (population per year, GDP per quartiles)

8) Postcodes/zipcodes database: including the corresponding spatial locations in terms of a latitude and a longitude or in a national coordinate system.

9) Transport timetables: operated or commissioned national-level public transport services (mainly buses and trains)

10) Pollutant emmisions: aggregate (yearly) data about the emission of air pollutants, especially those potentially harmful to human health (nitrogen oxides, particulate matter, etc.) [2]

Spatial coverage: in 2014, it covered 97 countries from every continent.

Temporal coverage: the first edition covered the year 2012 and was published in October 2013. The 2014 edition (with data for the year 2013) is available online.[3]

Contact data

Address: St John's Innovation Centre, Cowley Road, Cambridge CB4 0WS, United Kingdom.

[2] The index does not require information on greenhouse gas emissions.

[3] For more information and updates on the *Global Open Data Index 2015*, see the *Open Knowledge Blog*: http://blog.okfn.org/2015/08/25/global-open-data-index-2015-is-open-for-submissions/.

E-mail: index@okfn.org

Open Knowledge Blog: http://blog.okfn.org/

IRC: #okfn

Twitter: @okfn

Facebook: OKFNetwork

Google+: OKF

LinkedIn: Open Knowledge Foundation Network

Methodology

Each dataset is evaluated using nine questions that examine the openness of the datasets based on technical (six questions) and legal (three questions) criteria. Each question is weighted to give technical and legal aspects the same level of importance. Both technical and legal questions weigh 50 points in total. Each database contributes 10 percent to the global open data score for each country, which ranges from 0 to 100 (100 being the highest value, suggesting the country is close to the ideal degree of openness).

Technical questions

1. Does the database exist? Either in paper or digital, online or offline. (5 points)
2. Is the data in digital form? (5 points)
3. Is it available online from an official source? (5 points)
4. Is the data machine-readable? This refers to formats that can be easily structured by a computer (PDF documents or HTML formats are not considered machine-readable). (15 points)

5. Is it available in bulk? Data is available in bulk if the whole dataset can be downloaded or accessed easily (10 points) [4]

6. Is the data provided on a timely and up to date basis? (10 points)

Legal questions

1. Is the data publicly available? Publicly available implies that someone outside of the government can access the data. Data is considered publicly available even if it exists as a PDF, in paper form or on sale. However, if a freedom of information request or similar is needed to access the data, it is not considered public. (5 points)

2. Is the data available for free? (15 points)

3. Is the data openly licensed? As per the Open Definition (http://opendefinition.org),[5] the data needs to state the terms of use or license that allow anyone to freely use, reuse or redistribute the data (subject at most to citing the original source). The requirements to qualify as open license can be found at: http://opendefinition.org/licenses/. (30 points)

In order to create the sample, this index resorts to "snowball sampling", which allows for collaboration with people interested in open data and open government who can evaluate the availability and quality of open databases in their respective countries. This means any person in any place can participate and contribute to the *Global Open Data Index*. Contributions are later examined by expert reviewers commissioned by *Open Knowledge*. The next step is a review by a panel of experts.

Result format

Reports are rich in graphs and tables. Information is disaggregated in various ways, which allows for a clear picture of the status of open data by category and country. In other words,

[4] In-bulk means that the full database is easy to download. Citizens must not be limited to just getting parts of the dataset (if information is published weekly, for example, all current and previous data must be available for download). (https://discuss.okfn.org/t/exploring-the-meaning-of-available-in-bulk/817).

[5] The Open definition defines "open" in terms of "open data" and "open content", and specifies "open" means anyone can freely access, use, modify, and share the data or content for any purpose (subject, at most, to requirements that preserve provenance and openness).

the Index provides diagnoses for each category (such as legislation, budget, pollutant emissions, water quality, public expenditure, election results, etcetera) and each country, making comparisons easy. In addition, every evaluation provides links to websites where information can be corroborated. The *Global Open Data Index*'s evaluation of data openness in each country ranges from 0 to 100 percent.[6]

Examples: Since data are presented interactively, the best way to review them is at the website. The global ranking for 2014 can be seen at http://index.okfn.org/place/, with the possibility of looking at every country in detail.

Appropriate use: The *Global Open Data Index* allows for an evaluation of the degree of openness of central governments around the world per the Open Definition. It also allows for quick, easy comparisons between countries regarding the degree of openness (and especially *accessibility)* of the data that is key to the work of the G8 (see footnote 6).[7]

Inappropriate use: The *Global Open Data Index* does not allow for any analysis or comparisons regarding the level of openness of state or local governments from around the world, since it focuses on data produced at a central level. It also does not allow for any evaluations regarding the impact of open data (how it is used, by whom, or if it fosters innovation, for example).

Assumptions: the first assumption is that the datasets considered by the index are the most important and relevant to measure the degree of openness in *every* country that participates, and that said degree of openness is indeed comparable. The index also assumes that the more accessible the data, the greater the degree of transparency, or the social and commercial value generated, or the level of citizen participation and commitment.

[6] In 2014, the country with the highest score was the United Kingdom, with a 97% degree of openness. The lowest score (10%) belonged to Guinea. Mexico ranked at #28 with 53%.

[7] In its content, the Index refers to *places* and not *countries*, since it also includes evaluations for places which are not necessarily recognized as independent countries, but whose submissions were complete and accurate (http://index.okfn.org/methodology/ §Places).

2) OPEN DATA BAROMETER

Producer: The *World Wide Web Foundation*, as part of the work of the *Open Data Research Network* under the *Exploring the Emerging Impacts of Open Data in Developing Countries* (ODDC) program.

Purpose: to measure the prevalence and impact of open data initiatives across the world. The Barometer allows for an analysis of global trends and provides comparable data for countries and regions through a combination of contextual data, technical evaluations and secondary indicators to explore various dimensions of open data availability, implementation and impact.

Financing: both private and public, from the *World Wide Web Foundation*, the *International Development Research Centre* (IDRC), and *UK Aid*.

Location: *Open Data Barometer Global Report 2nd ed*. World Wide Web Foundation. January 2015. http://barometer.opendataresearch.org/.

Type of data used for measurement: The Open Data Barometer is based upon three kinds of data.

1. A peer reviewed expert survey. Every year, between May and September, researchers are asked to provide scores ranging from 0 to 10 on questions regarding open data contexts, policy, implementation and impacts in each country considered.

2. A detailed survey on datasets. This is answered by a team of technical experts. It is based on a 10-point checklist for 15 kinds of data with respect to qualities such as data availability, format, license, timeliness and discoverability. The initial information to locate datasets and those agencies in charge of generating them is provided by the expert survey, and then validated or expanded by the technical experts. Scores for each dataset can range from 0 to 100, which are then averaged to generate a sub-index that is later standardized prior to inclusion in overall Index calculations.

3. Secondary data. Secondary indicators are selected to complement the expert survey data. They are used in the readiness section of the Barometer,[8] and are taken from the World Economic Forum (WEF), the e-Government Survey, the World Bank and Freedom House.These rankings are also normalized prior to inclusion in overall Barometer calculations.

Spatial coverage: The second edition (2015) covered 86 countries from all across the world.

Temporal coverage: The first edition was published in June 2013 and analyzed data from June 2012 to June 2013. The second edition, published in 2015, looked into data between 2013 and 2014.

Contact information:

Website:

a) For the First edition: http://barometer.opendataresearch.org/report/about/2013.html
b) For the Second edition: http://barometer.opendataresearch.org/

E-mail: project-odb@webfoundation.org

Methodology

Each country is evaluated according to three sub-indexes, each weighted as shown in brackets below for final Barometer calculations:

1. Readiness sub-index (25%). This measures readiness to secure positive outcomes from open data initiatives, which includes legal, political, economic, social, organizational and technical foundations that might back the supply and use of open data. This sub-index is evaluated through questions included in the expert survey, each of which is graded on a scale from 0 to 10. Questions are divided into three areas, each of which focuses on a sector

[8] Readiness refers to the existence of and support for open data initiatives, engagement with open data outside of government, legal frameworks that support open data (the right to information or data protection laws), and the existence of and support for the use of data and innovation.

of the population essential for an open government initiative to function and is worth a third of the total score any country can get in this component: government, citizen and civil society, and entrepreneurs and businesses.

2. Implementation sub-index (50%). This measures implementation of open data, measured via data availability and the adoption of practices specified in the Open Definition and the Open Government Data Principles.[9] Based on the possible uses that can be made of datasets, they are divided into three different clusters (each of which accounts for one third of the total score any country can get in this component).

    a. Innovation

        i. Map Data

        ii. Public Transport Timetables

        iii. Crime Statistics

        iv. International Trade Data

        v. Public Contracts

    b. Social policy

        i. Health Sector Performance

        ii. Primary or Secondary Education Performance

        iii. National Environment Statistics

        iv. Detailed Census Data

    c. Accountability

        i. Land Ownership Data

        ii. Legislation

        iii. National Election Results

[9] Every category is explicitly characterized by the technical annex in the *G8 Open Data Charter* as of high value for democracy improvement and for the promotion of data innovative reutilization.

iv. Detailed Government Budget

v. Detailed Government Spending

vi. Company Register

Each category of data is evaluated by experts in terms of availability and openness based on a 10-question checklist, each with different weightings for sub-index calculations. Experts may answer each question with a *"Yes"* (in which case they must provide qualitative information to support their answer, so that the full points shown in brackets below may be awarded) or a "*No*" (i.e. zero points are awarded). An aggregation of scores may lead to scores ranging from 0 to 100 for each category. These are the questions for the sub-index:

a. Does the data exist? (5 points)

b. Is it available online from government in any form? (10 points)

c. Is it provided in machine-readable formats? (15 points)

d. Is the machine-readable data in bulk (see footnote 4)? (15 points)

e. Is the data available free of charge? (15 points)

f. Is the data openly licensed? (15 points)

g. Is it up to date? (10 points; 5 points are deducted if the data is outdated; 10 points can only be awarded to updated, machine-readable data).

h. Is the publication of the dataset sustainable? (5 points)

i. Was it easy to find information on this dataset? (5 points)

j. Are data URLs provided for key elements of the data? (5 points)

3. Impacts subindex (25%). Impacts are measured through mentions in the media and academic publications regarding the use and impacts of open data. As a proxy, the survey asked experts to locate case studies in the media or in academic literature in which, in the past 12 months, open data had been used to create impacts. Countries were evaluated based

on six questions whose answers reflect the perceived extent of impact on a scale from 0 to 10.[10] Questions were organized into three sub-components:

a. Political

    i. To what extent has open data had a noticeable impact on increasing government efficiency and effectiveness?

    ii. To what extent has open data had a noticeable impact on increasing transparency and accountability in the country?

b. Social

    i. To what extent has open data had a noticeable impact on environmental sustainability in the country?

    ii. To what extent has open data had a noticeable impact on increasing the inclusion of marginalized groups in policy making and accessing government services?

c. Economic

    i. To what extent has open data had a noticeable positive impact on the economy?

    ii. To what extent are entrepreneurs successfully using open data to build new businesses in the country?

Results format

Reports are rich in graphs and tables. Information is disaggregated and can be grouped in various ways. Besides presenting the global score for each country, the ranking allows for an overview of each sub-index and for comparisons across time (2015 versus 2013). The score each country may get —both globally and for every sub-index— is on a range from 0 to 100

[10] If the score awarded in any question was greater than 5, the researcher had to cite at least two examples to support their decision.

and, based on the score and a hierarchical cluster analysis, countries are classified in one of four groups, which allows for comparisons between countries that share a series of features: High Capacity, Emerging and Advancing, Capacity constrained, and One sided initiatives.[11]

Examples: Since data are presented interactively, the best way to review them is at the website. The global ranking for 2015 can be seen at http://barometer.opendataresearch.org/report/analysis/rankings.html.

Appropriate use: The Barometer allows for an evaluation of the degree of openness of central governments around the world. It also allows for clear reference points to make quick, easy comparisons between countries regarding their degree of openness. Finally, due to its sub-indexes, it allows for an analysis not only of open data implementation (through categories of data considered key), but also of government, citizen and business willingness to use open data, as well as the impact of open data in each of the countries considered.

Inappropriate use: The Barometer does not allow any analysis or comparisons regarding the level of openness of state or local governments across the world, since its focus is on data produced at a central level.

Assumptions: the first assumption is that the datasets considered by the index are the most important and relevant to measure the degree of openness in every country that participates, and that said degree of openness is indeed comparable and reflected by expert perceptions. The index also assumes that the more accessible the data, the more equal the access to knowledge, which in turn allows for the creation of economic value, while access to information per se leads to greater degrees of transparency and a stronger democracy.

[11] In 2015, the highest score was that of the UK, with 100%. The country with the lowest score was Myanmar, ranked #86 with a 10% of openness. Mexico ranked #24 with 50.09%, which placed it in the Emerging and Advancing countries, in the sixth position.

3) OPEN GOVERNMENT INDEX

Producer: The *World Justice Project*, an independent multidisciplinary American organization which seeks to strengthen the rule of law across the world.

Purpose: to measure government openness in practice, based on the general public's experiences and perceptions, as well as on the knowledge of local experts.

Financing: private. The project received funds by *The William and Flora Hewlett Foundation*.

Location: http://worldjusticeproject.org/open-government-index

Type of data used for measurement: The data came from one hundred thousand household surveys in all countries considered, as well as a subset of questionnaires answered by local experts, which together informed the 78 questions on which the ranking was based.

Spatial coverage: 102 countries from across the world.

Temporal coverage: the first and only edition thus far was published in 2015. The data was captured by surveys in each country between 2012 and 2014; it was then analyzed between October 2014 and January 2015.

Contact information:

Alejandro Ponce
Address: World Justice Project, 1025 Vermont Avenue, N.W., suite 1200
Washington, D.C., 20005, U.S.A.
E-mail: aponce@worldjusticeproject.org

Methodology

The index measures four dimensions of the openness of government, which intend to reflect the way in which people experiment different levels of openness in their daily interactions with government officials. The final score for each country is derived from a representative sample of 1,000 surveys from the three biggest cities in every country, as well as responses from local academic and practitioner experts in areas such as labor law, criminal law, civil

law, commercial law, and public health (specific questions were devised to assess the openness of government in each of these areas, depending on the type of expert interviewed). Expert surveys were administered to an average of 23 experts per country.[12] All questionnaires contained closed-ended perception questions with various response options. Every response in each question had a different weight. All four dimensions are detailed below. We include information on the number of questions for both the general public (GP) and qualified experts (QE), and also one concrete example, showing response weightings in parentheses.[13]

1. Publicized laws and government data.

This dimension measures whether basic laws and information on legal rights are publicly available, presented in plain language, and are made accessible in all languages used by significant segments of the population. It also measures the quality and accessibility of information published by the government in print or online (*active transparency*), and whether administrative regulations, drafts of legislation, administrative decisions, and high court decisions are made accessible to the public in a timely manner.

GP: 9 questions.

Example: "In practice, the basic laws of [COUNTRY] are explained in plain language, so that people can understand them".

a. Strongly Agree (1)

b. Agree (.667)

c. Disagree (.333)

d. Strongly Disagree (0)

QE: 8 questions.

[12] This included experts from law firms, universities, research centers and NGOs.

[13] The rest of the questions can be found on pages 45-50 of the *World Justice Project Open Government Index 2015 Report:* http://worldjusticeproject.org/sites/default/files/ogi_2015.pdf

Example: “In practice, national regulations are published on a timely basis (i.e. within the timelines mandated by the applicable law or regulation)”.

a. Almost Always (1)

b. In Most Cases (.667)

c. In Some Cases (.333)

d. Almost Never (0)

2. Right to information.

This dimension measures whether requests for information held by a government agency are granted, whether this happens within a reasonable time period, if the information provided is pertinent and complete, and if requests for information are granted at a reasonable cost and without having to pay a bribe. It also measures whether people are aware of their right to information, and whether relevant records (such as budget figures of government officials, ombudsman reports, and information relative to community projects) are accessible to the public upon request. Along with the first dimension, this one is related to transparency and access to information.

GP: 12 questions.

Example: “Have you not requested information from a government agency because you did not know you can ask the government for information?”

a. Yes (1)

b. No (0)

QE: 14 questions.

Example: “Assume that you request to have access to information held by the Ministry of Education about how the budget of that agency is spent. How likely is it that the government agency in charge will grant such information, assuming it is properly requested?”

a. Very Likely (1)

b. Likely (.667)

c. Unlikely (.333)

d. Very Unlikely (0)

3. Civic participation.

This dimension measures the effectiveness of civic participation mechanisms, including the protection of the freedoms of opinion and expression, and assembly and association, and the right to petition the government. It also measures whether people can voice concerns to various government officers and members of the legislature, and whether government officials provide sufficient information and notice about decisions affecting the community, including opportunities for citizen feedback. It suscribes the view that citizens are not only public service beneficiaries, but also relevant subjects for the design, implementation, and evaluation of public policy.

GP: 14 questions.

Example: “In [COUNTRY], people can freely join together with others to draw attention to an issue or sign a petition”.

a. Strongly Agree (1)

b. Agree (.667)

c. Disagree (.333)

d. Strongly Disagree (0)

QE: 17 questions.

Example: “In practice, civil society organizations in [COUNTRY] can freely express opinions against government policies and actions without fear of retaliation”.

a. Strongly Agree (1)

b. Agree (.667)

c. Disagree (.333)

d. Strongly Disagree (0)

4. Complaint mechanisms.

This dimension measures whether people are able to bring specific complaints to the government about the provision of public services or the performance of government officers in carrying out their legal duties in practice, and how government officials respond to such complaints. It also measures whether people can challenge government decisions before another government agency or a judge. It is closely linked with accountability.

GP: 2 questions.

Example: “Could you please tell us how well or badly you think your local government is performing in providing effective ways to make complaints about public services?”

a. Very Well (1)

b. Fairly Well (.667)

c. Fairly Badly (.333)

d. Very Badly (0)

QE: 3 questions.

Example: “In practice, if a government agency denies a citizens’ re- quest for information, citizens can effectively challenge this decision before another government agency or a judge”.

a. Strongly Agree (1)

b. Agree (.667)

c. Disagree (.333)

d. Strongly Disagree (0)

Once questionnaires are collected, partially-completed surveys and outliers are excluded. Answers are then aggregated to the country level using a simple average of all respondents. The scores are then normalized and later aggregated from the variable level to the factor level to produce the final country scores. Both general public and expert responses are equally weighted in the calculation of the scores. As a final step, data are validated and crosschecked against qualitative and quantitative third-party sources to identify possible mistakes or inconsistencies.

Result format

Reports are rich in graphs and tables. Information is disaggregated and country data can be examined in an interactive online platform (http://data.worldjusticeproject.org/opengov). This tool presents the degree of openness for each government in a global colored map. It also includes scores for each of the dimensions, a global ranking, a regional ranking, as well as a brief explanation for the scores on each sub-index. There is also access to a full country profile.

Each country can score between 0 and 1. Scores closer to 1 reflect greater openness.[14]

Examples: Since data are presented interactively, the best way to review them is at the website: http://data.worldjusticeproject.org/opengov/.

Appropriate use: The index allows to measure citizen perceptions (including both the general public and country experts) regarding the level of openness for each government, and so provides with an indirect measurement for the level of openness of government across the world.

[14] In 2015, the highest ranking country was Sweden, with a score of 0.81. The lowest ranking country was Zimbabwe, with 0.32. Mexico ranked 42nd, with a score of 0.56

Inappropriate use: Since it is based on perceptions, the index does not measure transparency or openness directly. This cannot be said to be an adequate measurement of central government openness, as it is based on data from surveys applied only in the three biggest cities of each country. Perceptions come only from the most developed urban areas, and so might be qualitatively and significantly distinct from those in other less developed regions.

Assumptions: The main assumption is that the four dimensions of the index are deeply related to the principles of transparency, civic participation and accountability reflected in the OGP's open government declaration. The Index also assumes citizen and expert opinions on the openness of government are trustable and bald measurements to evaluate governments objectively, lacking an analysis of hard data (e. g. dataset status).

4) OPEN BUDGET SURVEY/OPEN BUDGET INDEX

Producer: *International Budget Partnership* (IBP), an international association.

Purpose: The *Open Budget Survey* seeks to provide an independent and comparable measure of budget transparency based on three pillars of accountability: transparency, participation, and budget oversight. The *Open Budget Index* (built on a subset of questions from the *Open Budget Survey*) seeks to provide a comparable measure of budget transparency for central governments

Financing: private. The *Open Budget Survey 2015* received backing from *UK Aid*, *Open Society Foundation, Ford Foundation* and *The William and Flora Hewlett Foundation.*

Location: The 2006, 2008, 2010, 2012, and 2015 editions can be found and downloaded from: http://internationalbudget.org/opening-budgets/open-budget-initiative/open-budget-survey/publications-2/full-report/.

Type of data used for measurement: Most of the 140 questions examine, through eight key documents, the amount of budget information that is published. The *Open Budget Index* is based on 109 of those questions.

Spatial coverage: The 2015 edition includes 102 countries from all across the globe.

Temporal coverage: The first edition was created on 2006. Four additional editions have been published for 2008, 2010, 2012, and 2015. For the 2015 edition, researchers began to collect information on May 2014 and finished filling their questionnaires in June 2014. Therefore, this last version only includes events, activities and progress up to June 30, 2014.

Contact information

Address: 820 First Street NE, Suite 510, Washington, DC, 20002.
Website: www.internationalbudget.org
E-Mail: info@internationalbudget.org
Phone: +1 202 4085 1080
Fax: +1 202 408 8173

Methodology

The Survey evaluates three pillars of budget accountability through a 140-question questionnaire divided into three components:

1. Public availability of budget documents (Transparency)

This component is evaluated through 109 questions that analyze the timely publication and content of eight key budget documents that all countries should make public at different stages of the budget process, according to standards released by the International Monetary Fund (IMF), the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) and the International Organization of Supreme Audit Institutions (INTOSAI):

a. Pre-Budget Statement (6 questions)

b. Executive's Budget Proposal and supporting documents (54 questions)

c. Enacted Budget (6 questions)

d. Citizens Budget (4 questions)

e. In-year Reports (9 questions)

f. Mid-Year Review (9 questions)

g. Year-End Report (14 questions)

h. Audit Report (7 questions)

2. Opportunities for public participation in the budget process (Participation)

This component is evaluated through 16 questions.

3. Strength of the formal oversight institutions (Oversight)

This component considers both congressional oversight (11 questions) and oversight by the supreme audit institution (4 questions).

The questionnaire is answered by researchers who live in the corresponding country. Most of these questions require them to choose from five responses listed below (the scores associated with each response are specified in parentheses).[15]

a. The full standard is met or exceeded (100)

b. The basic elements of the standard have been met (67)

c. Minimal efforts to attain the relevant standard (33)

d. The standard is not met at all (0)

e. The standard is not applicable (not included in the country's aggregated score).

Other questions have only three response options:

a. The standard is met (100)

b. The standard is not met (0)

c. The standard is not applicable (not included in the country's aggregated score).

All responses must be supported by evidence (citations from budget documents, the country's laws, or interviews with government officials, legislators, or experts on the country's budget process). Upon completion, IBP staff members analyze and discuss each questionnaire with the individual researchers over a three- to six-month period to ensure that all questions were answered in a manner that was internally consistent within each country, and consistent across all survey countries. Each questionnaire is then reviewed by an anonymous peer reviewer who has substantial working knowledge of the budget systems in the relevant country. IBP also invites the governments of nearly all survey countries to comment on the draft Survey results.[16] IBP reviewed peer reviewer comments, removed any inconsistent comments and shared the rest with researchers.

[15] Concrete questions can be found at the following link, which leads to the full questionnaire: http://www.internationalbudget.org/wp-content/uploads/OBS2015-Questionnaire-and-Guidelines-English.pdf

[16] 53 out of 98 governments contacted by the IBP commented on the Survey results for their country.

The *Open Budget Index* is calculated based on the simple average of the numerical value of each of the responses to the 109 questions in the questionnaire that assess the public availability of budget information. It does not explicitly assign any particular weight to any questions, although it implicitly gives more weight to those documents that are the object of more questions (such as the Executive's Budget Proposal, which is associated with 54 questions) and are thus key determinants of any given country's score.[17]

The 31 remaining questions of the Survey assess the opportunities for public engagement during the budget process and the oversight capacity of legislatures and supreme audit institutions. Therefore, each one of these components receives a separate score, also based on a simple average of there responses to their respective questions.

Result format

Reports are rich in graphs and tables. Information is disaggregated in various ways and country data may be reviewed on an interactive online platform: http://survey.internationalbudget.org/. Said platform allows for simple comparisons between various countries at a single point in time or across years, as well as a review of country scores for each question and component of the Survey.

The *Open Budget Index* awards each country a score from 0 to 100, with the higher scores reflecting greater timeliness and comprehensiveness in the publicly available budget information for the eight key budget documents. Based on their scores, countries are classified into one of the following groups:[18]

1. Sufficient
    a. Extensive (81-100)
    b. Substantial (61-80)

[17] Index creators argue that this document is the most important, since it establishes budget policy goals and plans for the coming fiscalyear.

[18] In the 2015 edition, the country with the highest level of transparency was New Zealand, with a score of 88. The lowest scores were those of Qatar and Saudi Arabia, both with a total score of 0. Mexico ranked #17 with a score of 66, which means its level of transparency is "substantial". However, in terms of the four individual indicators of the three pillars of budget accountability, Mexico only obtained a score greater than 60 (sufficient) in only two.

2. Insufficient

    c. Limited (41-60)

    d. Minimal (21-40)

    e. Scarce to none (0-20)

Examples: Since data are presented interactively, the best way to review them is at the website: http://survey.internationalbudget.org/.

Appropriate use: The Survey and Index reflect expert perceptions regarding the availability of certain key documents for budget accountability, as well as regarding citizen participation opportunities during the budget process and the strength of oversight institutions. It allows for easy, quick comparisons between countries in regards to their level of budget transparency.

Inappropriate use: The Survey and Index are not fit to evaluate datasets related to budget transparency, or to evaluate transparency on a more general, abstract level. As it is focused on proactive transparency, the analysis is also limited to reactive transparency. The Survey and Index do not allow for an analysis of local or municipal transparency, as their focus is on the central government.

Assumptions: Expert analysis is assumed to be objective and to reflect the status of budget transparency adequately. The eight key documents selected are also assumed to be the most important. This logic implies that if central governments meet the standards set by the IBP and provide budget information in a timely, comprehensive manner, then civil society and the general public will have enough elements to understand and monitor the budget.[19] Another assumption is that the number of questions in each component is an adequate indicator of their relative importance for final Index calculations, and that this is true for every country (i.e. that the Executive's Budget Proposal is indeed the most important document in every country considered, no matter its level of development or democracy).

[19] If this were true, it would imply that citizens from New Zealand (which obtained the highest score in 2015) understand the budget process and are more likely to monitor the budget than citizens from Mexico, Qatar or Saudi Arabia (the latter amongst those with the lowest scores).

5) MUNICIPAL TRANSPARENCY INDEX (MTI)

Producer: Nuno Ferreira da Cruz – London School of Economics and Political Science (UK); António F. Tavares – University of Minho (Portugal); Rui Cunha Marques – University of Lisbon (Portugal); Susana Jorge – University of Coimbra (Portugal); Luís de Sousa – University of Aveiro (Portugal).

Purpose: To create a Municipal Transparency Index (MTI) based on a participatory method that will create standards for municipal transparency. The creation of a ranking is intended to create pressure and incentives for local authorities to improve any tools that allow for communication and interaction with citizens, so that they will achieve a more open, participatory, accountable government.

Financing: None. The authors only declare support from *Transparência e Integridade, Associação Cívica* (TIAC), the official representative of Transparency International in Portugal.

Location: Ferreira da Cruz, Nuno, António F. Tavares, Rui Cunha Marques, Susana Jorge, and Luís Sousa. 2015. "Measuring Local Government Transparency". *Public Management Review* (published online on June 11, 2015): 1-28. DOI:10.1080/14719037.2015.1051572.

Type of data used for measurement: the authors based their analysis on the available information in Portugal's local governments' websites.

Spatial coverage: the index analyzed data from the 308 municipalities in Portugal.

Temporal coverage: data were collected in 2013. The ranking was created in the same year.

Contact information

Nuno Ferreira da Cruz

Address: London School of Economics and Political Science, LSE Cities, London, UK.

E-mail: n.m.ferreira-da-cruz@lse.ac.uk

António F. Tavares

Address: School of Economics and Management, University of Minho, Braga, Portugal

E-mail: atavares@eeg.uminho.pt

Rui Cunha Marques

Address: Center for Urban and Regional Systems (CESUR), Instituto Superior Técnico, University of Lisbon, Lisboa, Portugal

E-mail: rui.marques@tecnico.ulisboa.pt

Susana Jorge

Address: Faculty of Economics, University of Coimbra, Coimbra, Portugal

E-mail: susjor@fe.uc.pt

Luís da Sousa

Address: Transparência e Integridade, Associação Cívica (TI Portugal), Lisboa, Portugal / Department of Social, Political and Territorial Sciences, University of Aveiro, Aveiro, Portugal

E-mail: lmsousa@ua.pt

Methodology

The authors resorted to a participatory method to determine the dimensions and indicators of transparency, to select the metrics and to compute their weights. They therefore sought to avoid a merely additive index that would give every indicator the same weight.

They created two groups: a research team (which included members from TIAC and from four different academic institutions), and an advisory group (which included experts from various governmental and monitoring institutions) to scrutinize and approve any methodological step. First, the research team created a list of 176 indicators related to information that should be available online. Said list was later reviewed by the advisory group, who evaluated each indicator using a scale from 0 (not relevant to transparency) to 10 (extremely relevant for transparency). The results of this evaluation were presented and

discussed in a meeting where the 76 most relevant indicators were selected[20] and grouped into seven dimensions:[21]

1. Organizational information, social composition, and operation of the municipality (18 indicators)
2. Plans and planning (13 indicators)
3. Local taxes, rates, service charges, and regulations (5 indicators)
4. Relationship with citizens as customers (8 indicators)
5. Public procurement (10 indicators)
6. Economic and financial transparency (12 indicators)
7. Urban planning and land use management (10 indicators)

The authors later proceeded to determine the relative weights of each dimension for the ranking through a participatory method. First, members of the research team and the advisory group gathered at a workshop to determine which indicators could be considered *determinant* and which could only be deemed *important*. Later, a 15 level scale against which to measure transparency levels was devised. Each level requires the municipality to disclose a certain amount of *determinant information* and of *important information*. A municipality can be said to have an *acceptable performance* if it reaches at least Level X, while its performance is *good* once they reach Level VI or higher.[22] Since performance levels in one dimension are not tied to performance levels in the rest, each dimension had its own weight for the index. In order to determine said weights, advisory group members were asked to consider eight fictitious municipalities with different performance profiles: each had a *good* performance in one dimension and an *acceptable* performance in the rest (the final municipality had only an *acceptable* performance in all dimensions). Group members had to rank these municipalities

[20] Indicators had to be applicable to every municipality (universality criterion) and the publication of the relevant information had to be the exclusive responsibility of municipal governments (ownership criterion)

[21] A complete list of the indicators appears in the technical annex of Ferreira da Cruz *et al.* (pages 25-8).

[22] Level X refers to those municipalities that have disclosed 25-50% of determinant information and less than 25% of important information. Level VI refers to those municipalities that have disclosed more than 50% of determinant information and 25-50% of important information.

from the more transparent to the least transparent, and later discuss how much more transparent each one was against the rest (which incorporated a notion of 'trade-off'). This process allowed to determine the relative importance of each dimension, each of which was assigned a particular weight.[23]

The authors then proceeded to collect information for each of the 308 Portuguese municipalities (from June to July 2013). Preliminary results were sent to all municipalities on August 20, 2013. Local governments were given two weeks to send back any suggestions or corrections (supported by the proper hyperlinks) before the final rankings were made public.[24]

Result format

The ranking is simple and results are presented in an easily understandable manner, with a reduced amount of tables. The authors include a radar chart to display maximum, minimum and average scores for all Portuguese municipalities. Their article also includes a map showing the uneven geographical distribution of the scores, but it is difficult to interpret given the absence of color. Scores can range between 0 and 100, with higher scores reflecting a greater degree of transparency.

Examples:

Table 1. MTI Ranking.

Municipality	MTI	Ranking
5 best		
Figueira da Foz	61	1
Alfândenga da Fé	59	2
Batalha	58	3
Abrantes	54	4
Ferreira do Zêzere	54	4

[23] 'Urban planning and land use management' was considered the most important dimension, while 'Local taxes, rates, service charges and regulations' was considered the least (See p. 16).

[24] Only 29 municipalities sent feedback.

5 worst		
Fornos de Algodres	5	303
Belmonte	2	303
Santa Cruz das Flores	0	306
Montalegre	0	306
Calheta (Azores)	0	306

Own elaboration, based on Table 1 in Ferreira da Cruz *et al.* (2015).

Appropriate use: The Index is useful to evaluate reactive municipal transparency focusing on the supply side, in terms of how complete, timely and accesible information disclosed by municipalities is for Portuguese citizens. Overall, the Index does not depend on purely legal or formal indicators and goes beyond budget transparency, which has usually been the focus of transparency metrics at the municipal level. Lastly, the participatory methodology developed for this Index can be replicated in different parts of the world and adapted for particular contexts.

Inappropriate use: This Index is not fit to evaluate transparency on the demand side, since it solely focuses on the supply of information by Portuguese municipalities, which requires a deft selection of communication channels and mechanisms. It is also not useful to evaluate accountability or the impact of public information on social, political or economic municipal institutions. The authors themselves underscore that their operational definition for transparency excludes any considerations regarding accessibility, visibility, intelligibility, reliability, and quality (see page 7).[25] Finally, since all the dimensions and weights were derived from the Portuguese context based on local expertise, MTI indicators are only useful insofar as their application is limited to municipalities in Portugal.

[25] The authors' operational definition for transparency is: "the publicity of all the acts of government and its representatives to provide civil society with relevant information in a complete, timely, and easily accessible manner" (p. 7).

Assumptions: The Index is based upon the idea that greater transparency in municipalities' online platforms empowers citizens to monitor their governments, while the elaboration of a ranking creates incentives for the latter to become more open, accountable and inclusive in their decision making processes. As their work is based on an analysis of municipalities' websites, the authors focus exclusively on reactive transparency and ignore other possible tools that, despite their presence outside of digital platforms, might still be useful (e. g. transparency via telephone or printed responses).

6) ASSESSING GOVERNMENT TRANSPARENCY: AN INTERPRETATIVE FRAMEWORK

Producer: Albert Meijer – Utrecht School of Governance (The Netherlands); Paul t' Hart – Utrecht School of Governance (The Netherlands); Ben Worthy – Birkbeck College (London, UK).

Purpose: to create an interpretative framework that includes the relevant dimensions for a contextual assessment of government transparency.

Financing: none; the authors declared not having received any sort of financial support for the research, authorship or publication of their article.

Location: Meijer, Albert, Paul t' Hart, and Ben Worthy. 2015. "Assessing Government Transparency: An Interpretive Framework". *Administration & Society* (Published online on August 19, 2015): 1-26. doi:10.1177/0095399715598341.

Type of data used for measurement: The authors test their framework by looking at the *Freedom of Information Act* (FOI) in the United Kingdom.[26] To evaluate each category identified for the *political* and *administrative* realms of transparency (detailed below), the authors resorted to various sources (in most cases, the data had been used in previous research):

1. *Democratic empowerment*: Number of information requests for each level of government (central/local) by type of requester; voting patterns in Parliament.
2. *The constitutional perspective*: legislative studies.
3. *Social learning*: reports from the Justice Committee; journal articles; voting pattern analysis.
4. *Economy and efficiency*: analysis of the estimated costs of FOI.

[26] The FOI was approved in 2000 and seeks to provide the British public with access to information in hands of the authorities in England, Northern Ireland and Wales (except for personal information). This Act compels authorities to publish certain information about their activities and also provides citizens with the right to demand information from their governments.

5. *Integrity*: studies from the Justice Committee; journal articles; public servant opinions.

6. *Resilience*: journal articles; analysis of the number of information requests for each level of government (central/local/departmental) by type of requester; studies from the Justice Committee.

Spatial coverage: This framework was only applied to the FOI in the United Kingdom, comparing the legislation against any objectives stated while it was being designed.

Temporal coverage: The study analyzes the impact of the FOI in terms of the authors' framework. While the authors do not explicitly specify a timeframe for the study, it is easy to assume their research looks at the period between the years 2000 (when the FOI was approved) and 2015 (when this analysis was published).

Contact information

Albert Meijer

Address: Utrecht School of Governance, Bijlhouwerstraat 6, 3511 ZC Utrecht, The Netherlands.

E-mail: a.j.meijer@uu.nl

Methodology

Based on Bovens, Schillemans, and 't Hart's (2008) framework for accountability evaluation as well as Hood's (1991) typology of administrative values, the authors built a framework to evaluate transparency in two realms that are closely linked, each of them sub-divided into various sets of values:

1. The political realm: which focuses on participatory democracy and the constitutional state (rule of law). Arguments in favor include the right to know, the contribution to a strong democracy, and checks and balances. However, critics argue that transparency breeds mistrust and undermines the legitimacy of public institutions. Based on Bovens *et al*, the authors identify three basic perspectives that are relevant to evaluate transparency in this realm:

a. *The democratic perspective*: The key issue is whether transparency arrangements strengthen the information position of citizens; that is, their electoral role and their direct involvement in political agenda-setting, policy deliberation, and decision-making. Transparency is needed for public engagement, which is in turn a precondition for a strong democracy. The counterargument is that citizens do not have the capacity to properly process all the information about their governments that becomes available to them, since it (as in the case of *Wikileaks*) is not necessarily coherent and easily processed; it is also unclear that citizens are willing to make proper use of disclosed information. Also, chances of having access to information (financial/digital barriers) and citizens' abilities to make use of information (political competences) might be different.

b. *The constitutional perspective*: The key issue is whether transparency strengthens or undermines institutional checks and balances and curtails the abuse of executive power. However, even if the relationship between transparency and accountability is complementary, it must not be taken for granted, since the former might undermine the latter by reducing complex processes of accountability to defensive simple communications. In addition, an undue expansion of transparency (in the form of monitoring) may result in excessive politicization of dysfunctional surveillance, in which moral entrepreneurs exaggerate and dramatize irrelevant flaws of government.

c. *The social learning perspective*: The key issue is whether transparency— by reducing information asymmetries— strengthens the quality of public debate and collective problem-solving capacity. It can be argued that transparency is a strategic resource and that information is never neutral, since there are some actors who want access to the resource, while others want to retain the resource for themselves

2. The administrative realm: which focuses on managerial concerns related to the idea of "good governance". While transparency can help curb corruption and stimulate more efficient decision making and public service delivery, it can also stimulate risk avoidance, dis-incentivize administrative entrepreneurship, and increase compliance and control costs. The question is how and when transparency contributes to the executive competence of government. Criteria under this realm are based on Hood's characterization of administrative values:

    a. The economy/efficiency perspective: The key issue is whether transparency contributes to the achievement of policy objectives and whether it promotes the search for the most efficient ways of realizing these. Frugality is important. Institutional economists believe that better information will result in more rational behavior and, therefore, in better choices. This might be achieved if institutional memory is fostered. The risks are that benefits from an ever-expanding wave of information requests are not very clear; most citizens rely on the opinion of their neighbors or local newspapers instead of actual information to make decisions; and transparency might enhance risk avoidance among bureaucrats (incrementalism).

    b. The integrity perspective: The key issue is whether transparency induces officials to use their mandates and the resources at their disposal to implement the public will and not for the advancement their own interests. Transparency, indeed, curbs corruption, but its effects are limited since public actors are entitled to a certain degree of privacy, which blurs the boundaries. It could also curb entrepreneurship within the public sector.

    c. The resilience perspective: The key issue is whether transparency enhances the robustness and adaptive capacity of administrative systems in the face of ongoing and episodic changes, threats, and risks (see p .13). In theory, public avail- ability of information enables outsiders to scrutinize government and to detect risks. The counterargument is that too much transparency may result in a self-fulfilling prophecy: financial risks

> may indeed result in catastrophes simply because they were exposed; publicly reporting school performance may result in exit behavior from weak schools, setting in motion a vicious cycle of decline (see p. 13).

Through specific questions, the authors evaluated the FOI in both the political (from the democratic, constitutional and social learning perspectives) and the administrative realm (from the economy/efficiency, integrity and resilience perspectives).

Result format:

Results are presented in the form of a discussion, with no graphs and very few tables.

Examples: In general, in the political realm, regarding the democratic perspective, researchers found that the FOI gave way to an *iceberg effect* (whereby a small percentage of cases attracted a disproportionate amount of attention) and that there was no mass involvement, as only around 1 in 1,000 citizens made an FOI request and voting patterns did not change. On the other hand, it was journalists, NGOs, and businesses who made the most use of information (politicized requests). This means evidence for citizen empowerment due to the FOI is scarce. Still, the media highlight important issues, which added to a greater culture of involvement, especially at the local level. In terms of the constitutional perspective, the FOI seems to be an indirect tool for transparency that works best alongside other other checks and balances mechanisms; that is, it has become a new weapon in the armory of formal and informal "watchdogs" of government. As to the social learning perspective, results are less clear, since information may be limited by framing and bias. The authors mention, for example, that elections point to a negative bias (often amplified by the media), since voters punish poor performing authorities but do not reward well performing ones.

In the administrative realm, the authors observed that information requests vary: local governments attract around 70-80% of total requests, while poorly performing local authorities may attract more requests in sensitive areas instead of the better performing ones. In terms of efficiency, the authors assert that the effect of the FOI is unpredictable, which is underscored by the difficulty of measuring the costs generated by said legislation. In terms of integrity, they conclude that the FOI has helped curb corruption and unwarranted spending, yet admit that results are not conclusive and that research of these impacts is complex.

Finally, in terms of resilience, it seems resilience has improved and reduced risk. However, it remains unclear whether increased monitoring of agencies and officials can strengthen operational resilience without undermining relations of trust.

Appropriate use: The presumed similarity between the values identified by the authors—which must underly any transparency arrangement's design and evaluation—allows for an interpretative evaluation and provides an overview of various dimensions that are relevant for their evaluation in specific contexts. Therefore, in theory, MEijer, t'Hart and Worhty's framework can be useful to evaluate transparency at any level of government (central, local, municipal).[27] By focusing on a comparison between different political and administrative values, this approximation allows for a type of evaluation that differs from simple and frequently dichotomous metrics (which are based on checklists that measure the presence or absence of certain documents).

Inappropriate use: This framework does not allow for an evaluation of proactive transparency (as is the case with many other transparency laws, the FOI is a reactive legal instrument, which even the authors acknowledge). Since, unlike other metrics, this is an interpretative framework, it favors a lower degree of objectivity and is less concrete, which would make comparisons across countries, states or municipalities somewhat complicated. In this sense, the authors recognize that measuring several of their proposed dimensions might be difficult.[28] Finally, even if the authors test their framework by analyzing the case of the FOI in the UK, they rarely base their observations on hard evidence, relying instead on previous interpretations of primary data by themselves or by other authors.

Assumptions: Firstly, the authors assume that the set of values they selected to establish the metacriteria against which they evaluate transparency are similar across different contexts. They also assume that their categories can be measured. In addition, they assume that finding a balance between the opportunity costs associated with all values is possible. Finally (even

[27] In this sense, the authors observe the wide variety of contexts in which transparency is built, since it is developed in both democracies and autocracies, adversarial and consensual political cultures, countries with a highly developed civil sectors and countries with limited divil sectors, and or highly educated or low-educated populations (see p. 2).

[28] For example, for integrity, the authors argue that a greater level of transparency might lead to a chilling effect whereby evidence of decision-making processes is either reduced or exists "off paper," therefore making measurement increasingly complicated (see p. 16).

if this claim is contested by the authors), the analysis assumes that greater levels of transparency lead to less corruption, more efficiency, greater levels of democracy and more legitimacy.

7) ONLINE TRANSPARENCY INDEX

Producer: Rui Pedro Lourenço – INESC (Portugal); Patrícia Moura e Sá – INESC, NEAPP (Portugal); Susana Jorge – FEUC, NEAPP (Portugal); Anna Francesca Pattaro – UNIMORE (Italy).

Purpose: To create a model that can evaluate whether public sector entities are taking advantage of the Internet in order to facilitate citizens' access to information about *where* and *how* public officials are using public resources (*input transparency for accountability*)

Financing: public. The project was funded by the *Fundação para a Ciência e a Tecnologia* (FCT) in Portugal.

Location: Lourenço, Rui Pedro, Patrícia Mura e Sá, Susana Jorge and Anna Francesca Pattaro. 2013. "Online Transparency for Accountability: One Assessing Model and two Applications". *Electronic Journal of e-Government* 11 (2): 280-292.

Type of data used for measurement: In order to assess municipal transparency, the authors resorted to data available on the websites of 45 Portuguese and 49 Italian municipalities. They evaluated 13 datasets classified into four categories:

a. Financial (balance sheet and income statement)

b. Budgetary (budget, budgetary control statements, investments and activities plan).

c. Management (management report)

d. Complementary information (assets, financial participations, budget modifications, contracts, transfers, debt, and personnel employed)

Spatial coverage: The index measures the degree of online transparency for 45 Portuguese and 49 Italian municipalities.

Temporal coverage: Even though the authors do not specify any years for the data they use, their measurement for online transparency was only performed once, which is why we take the year of publication (2013) as reference.

Contact information

Rui Pedro Lourenço

Address: Instituto de Engenharia de Sistemas e Computadores (INESC), Coimbra, Portugal / Faculty of Economics, University of Coimbra, Portugal.

E-mail: ruiloure@fe.uc.pt

Patricia Moura e Sá

Address: Faculty of Economics, University of Coimbra, Portugal / Centre for Research in Public Policy and Administration (NEAPP), University of Minho, Braga, Portugal.

E-mail: pmourasa@fe.uc.pt

Susana Jorge

Address: Faculty of Economics, University of Coimbra, Portugal / Centre for Research in Public Policy and Administration (NEAPP), University of Minho, Braga, Portugal.

E-mail: susjor@fe.uc.pt

Anna Francesca Pattaro

Address: Department of Economics "Marco Biagi", University of Modena and Reggio Emilia (UNIMORE), Modena, Italy.

E-mail: annafrancesca.pattaro@unimore.it

Methodology

First, the authors defined which information items were more relevant (See "type of data used for measurement") for the specific type of entities considered, taking into account the

legal-administrative capabilities of Portuguese and Italian municipalities. They later systematically analyzed these items through the OTI in each municipality's website.

The OTI focuses on the assessment of three characteristics for each information item's presence on each website:

1. Visibility, meaning how each item is made visible on the website; in other words, if there are autonomous links to the items, if they are referenced in the site map, and whether a search using the item's designation in the website uncovers the item.
2. Format of presentation, which —in accordance with the principles of open government data— is evaluated by determining whether the item is on one of these formats: directly processable, extractable, or image ("protected").
3. Delivery mode, which considers whether the item is available "on its own" (i.e. autonomous delivery) or if its made available as part of a broader document and is therefore more difficult to find and locate (i.e. integrated delivery).

All three characteristics have the same weight (1/3) for the final OTI scores. Within each characteristic, every item gets a score ranging from 0 to 1. However, each of them is evaluated through specific dichotomous questions with particular coefficients as shown in the table below:

Table 2. OTI evaluation criteria for information items.

Visibility 1/3 (cumulative)		**Format 1/3** (mutually exclusive)		**Delivery mode 1/3** (mutually exclusive)	
Item or specific area referenced in main page	**0.2**	Imagen	**0.25**	Integrated	**0.5**
Item referenced in site map	**0.4**	Extractable	**0.5**	Autonomous	**1.0**
Item appears when searched by relevant words	**0.4**	Processable	**1**		

Own ellaboration based on Lourenço, Moura e Sà, Jorge y Pattaro (2013).

Once every item in one municipality have been evaluated according to the criteria laid out in Table 2, the scores for each item under every category are added and then multiplied by the

weight of each category (1/3). The scores for each category are added, then divided by 3XN (where N equals the number of items analyzed per municipality), and multiplied by 100 to get the final OTI score for the municipality.

Result format

Each municipality can score anything between 0 and 100, where the higher scores signal greater online transparency. Authors present results with no accompanying explanation, aggregated into graphs that compare the percentages of Portuguese and Italian municipalities that disclosed a given number of items, the proportion of municipalities that disclose specific items, and the proportion of municipalities whose scores fell into specified ranges.

Examples: Graphs are available at the original source.

Appropriate use: The model only allows to analyze information that is clearly linked to accountability in matters of resource management. It also pays attention to micro-level data (non-aggregated data such as contracts, expenses, debt) which supports macro-label data (aggregated information such as the annual budget).

Inappropriate use: The Index does not allow for an evaluation of purely institutional aspects (such as transport schedules or public institutions' opening hours) or administrative information (regulations, public services), since these are deliberately excluded. IT does not verify compliance with legal or international standards, or assess qualitative characteristics (clarity, timeliness, relevance, reliability), since the authors argue these are not related with the potential of the Internet as a disclosure platform. Finally, even though authors state the model to be generic enough to be replicated in other countries and under different contexts, items and weights were determined with Portugal and Italy in mind; therefore, these should be reviewed every time an attempt is made to replicate the Index.

Assumptions: The model assumes greater disclosure (i.e. greater transparency) promotes public scrutiny and curbs corruption as well as any waste of public resources. The authors also assume the coefficients they assign to their evaluation criteria are adequate and accurately reflect their relative importance, while offering no clear justification and therefore assuming that their weight can change from one country to another depending on the judgement of any scholars seeking to replicate their Index.

8) INDICE DE TRANSPARENCIA DE LOS AYUNTAMIENTOS [TOWN HALL TRANSPARENCY INDEX] (ITA)

Producer: Transparency International Spain (TI-Spain)

Purpose: to measure the levels of transparency and data openness of Spanish town halls. TI-Spain expects this will promote a greater information culture across the country's town halls and foster a closer relationship with their citizens, giving the latter more access to information.

Financing: private.

Location: All editions can be found in the following link: http://transparencia.org.es/indice-de-los-ayuntamientos-ita/

Type of data used for measurement: any available information in selected Spanish town hall websites.

Spatial coverage: The biggest 110 Spanish town halls (i.e. those with a population greater than 65,000).[29]

Temporal coverage: Five editions of the ITA have been published: 2008, 2009, 2010, 2012, 2014.

Contact information[30]

Fundación Ortega y Gasset-Marañón

Address: C/Fortuny, 53 – 28010, Madrid

Brenda Shannon

Phone number: +34 91 700 4105/06

Fax: +34 91 365 51 69

[29] All 110 town halls meet this requirement; together, they account for more than half of the Spanish population.

[30] In the 2014 report there is no contact information for the people responsible for the index, so we provide contact information for TI-Spain in general.

E-mail: *transparency.spain@transparencia.org.es*

Facebook: *https://www.facebook.com/Transparencia-Internacional-Espa%C3%B1a-206689602737373/timeline*

Methodology

Through 80 indicators, ITA evaluates the six areas of transparency detailed below. The number of indicators for each area is included in parentheses.[31]

1. Information on the municipal corporation (18)
    a. Information on publicly-elected posts and personnel (6)
    b. Information on organization and local assets (6)
    c. Information on municipal regulations and institutions (6)
2. Relations with citizens and society (16)
    a. Webpage characteristics (2)
    b. Information and assistance to citizens (9)
    c. Commitment to the citizenry (5)
3. Economic and financial transparency (11)
    a. Budget information (5)
    b. Transparency regarding income, expenditure and debt (6)
4. Transparency regarding contracts and costs (4)
    a. Contracting procedures (2)
    b. Suppliers and service costs (2)
5. Transparency regarding urban planning, public infrastructure and the environment (15)

[31] All 80 indicators can be reviewed in detail at: http://webantigua.transparencia.org.es/ita_2014/cuadro_indicadores_ita_2014.pdf.

a. Plans and agreements (6)

b. Licitations (3)

c. Information on audiences, offers and resolutions (2)

d. Public infrastructure, town planning and infrastructure (4)

6. Transparency Law indicators

a. Planning and organization (3)

b. Contracts, agreements and subventions (6)

c. High command (3)

d. Economic and budget information (4)

Indicators are updated from one edition to the next so as to evaluate how close Spanish town halls are to fully abide by the requirements established in the Spanish Transparency Law.

Once the indicators for the corresponding edition have been defined, all selected town halls are presented with a list (this happens in September). In October, TI-Spain fills in the scores for each town hall for the 80 indicators (the *minimum score*). A file with the score for each indicator is sent (in electronic format) to each local government; they may modify their scores to reflect any updates, but must attach any new information and also upload it to their website, specifying its location in the file. Once every town hall sends back their file or expresses conformity with TI-Spain's original version (either explicitly or implicitly by not responding), scores are adjusted as necessary.

Every indicator is dichotomous: if the information established by the indicator is available on the town hall's website, the score is 1; it is zero otherwise. Based on the total scores for every town hall (which are obtained by a simple addition), TI-Spain also generates a final classification.

Result format

Reports are rich in tables; classifications are presented for the global scores and also for each independent area of transparency. While the information is not presented in any interactive

formats, aggregated and non-aggregated data are available. Information is also grouped in terms of Spain's autonomous communities, the size or capitals of each town hall, and the gender of mayors. TI-Spain also presents global comparisons (by averages and groupings) through time (2008-2014). Town halls may receive scores ranging from 1 to 100; the higher scores suggest greater levels of transparency and openness.

Examples:

Table 3.[32] Town hall rankings (ITA).

Ranking	Town hall	Score (1-100)
1	Alcalá de Henares	100,0
1	Alcobendas	100,0
1	Alcorcón	100,0
1	Badalona	100,0
1	Barcelona	100,0
.	.	.
106	Teruel	38,8
107	Jaén	37,5
108	Badajoz	32,5
109	Almería	30,0
110	Granada	28,8

Own elaboration based on ITA 2014.

Appropriate use: The ranking measures the level of compliance of Spanish town halls with the Spanish Transparency Law, based on what they report on their websites.

[32] Table 3 only presents the best and worst five town halls for matters of simplicity. The full list, as well as tables for every area of transparency and for municipalities grouped under different criteria, can be found at: http://transparencia.org.es/ita-2014/.

Inappropriate use: This index does not measure proactive transparency nor the concrete or perceived impact of town hall openness on society. It also does not allow to measure other countries' municipalities level of compliance with the applicable transparency regulations, since the design of the Index is —as TI-Spain clearly mentions— based on Spanish law.

Assumptions: The ranking assumes all indicators measure transparency and openness regarding information. However, since town halls are notified in advance of the indicators each edition will consider, and given that all that matters is whether certain pieces of information are disclosed online (with no regard for their impact, quality or usefulness), the ITA does not measure the overall degree of transparency of Spanish town halls. At best, it reflects the level of compliance with the Spanish Transparency Law; at worst, it only reflects the level of compliance with the standards set by TI-Spain's indicators. Not only has TI-Spain reported (in its 2014 edition) that 19 town halls have already scored a 100 (which would seem to suggest they have nothing to improve in regards to their level of openness, since their score is perfect); it also asserts that almost all local governments have a specific section in their websites devoted to transparency overall, as well a specific section for ITA indicators. As positive as this may seem, it could mean that town halls are only focusing on meeting the requirements set by the Index instead of attempting to become more transparent.

9) GLOBAL RIGHT TO INFORMATION RATING (RTI RATING)

Producer: Access to Info Europe (AIE) (Spain) and the Centre for Law and Democracy (CLD)

Purpose: To comparatively assess the strength of right to information legal frameworks, as well as pointing to their strengths and weaknesses and identifying areas that need improvement.

Financing: private and public. AIE and CLD's resources come from donations by UNESCO, OXFAM Canada, Open Society Foundations, Citizens for Europe, International Budget Partnership, Transparency International, and the European Union.

Location: The RTI Rating is available online at: http://www.rti-rating.org/

Type of data used for measurement: The legal frameworks that serve as a basis for the right to information in 102 countries.

Spatial coverage: 102 countries from every continent.

Temporal coverage: Five yearly editions have been published (2011-2015).

Contact information[33]

Access Info Europe

Address: Cava de San Miguel 8, 4º centro, 28005, Madrid, España.

E-mail: info@access-info.org

Phone number: +34 913 656 558 y +34 667 685 319

Centre for Law and Democracy

E-mail: info@law-democracy.org

[33] No contact data are available for the RTI Rating, so the following information corresponds to the two organizations in charge of developing this tool.

Phone number: +1 902 431 3688

Methodology

The evaluation of legal frameworks is based on 61 indicators, which were originally developed in 2010 based on the analysis of a wide range of international standards on the right to information, as well as the comparative study of numerous right to information laws from around the world. Once the analysis was completed, a standardized scoring tool was developed—which was then used in a series of pilot applications on a number of countries and reviewed by an advisory council of renowned international experts on the right to information. After the 2011 edition, local legal experts from various countries under study were asked to review and comment on the original assessments, so that these would be integrated into the evaluation process (the full list of local experts is available at http://www.rti-rating.org/methodology). For every edition, the scoring tool is applied to every country with right to information laws. The list of countries has expanded from 87 in 2011 to 102 in 2015.

For each of the 61 Indicators, countries earn points(in most cases ranging between 0 and 2), depending on how well the legal framework delivers the Indicator, for a possible total of 150 points.[34] Indicators are divided into seven different categories. These categories are listed below, with the maximum score any country can get for each one in parentheses.

1. Right of access (6)
2. Scope (30)
3. Requesting procedures (30)
4. Exceptions and refusals (30)
5. Appeals (30)
6. Sanctions and protections (8)

[34] The full list of indicators and their corresponding range of scores is available at http://new.rti-rating.org/wp-content/uploads/Indicators.pdf

7. Promotional measures (16)

The methodology gives a much greater weight to four areas assumed to be more relevant, which —according to the authors— are key elements in any right to information system: Scope, Requesting procedures, Exceptions and refusals, and Appeals.

Result format

Results are rich in graphs and tables, are displayed in an interactive platform, link to each analyzed country's laws, and are disaggregated for each category. The website for the last edition shows a world map, in which stronger/weaker legal frameworks are highlighted with different colors.

Countries may score anything between 0 and 150; a higher score suggests that the country's legal framework gives the right to public information greater legal effect.[35]

Examples: Since data are for the most part presented interactively, the best way to review them is at the website: http://www.rti-rating.org/country-data (ranking); http://www.rti-rating.org/ (interactive map).

Appropriate use: This measurement allows to assess the strength of various legal frameworks for the right to information in various countries.

Inappropriate use: This measurement does not evaluate the quality of right to information law implementation, and therefore does not measure transparency or openness for any country either. It does not evaluate proactive transparency, since it focuses on the strength of legal frameworks, which determine the minimum transparency obligations in each country under study.

Assumptions: The model assumes a strong legal framework for the right to information is not only a prerequisite to properly guarantee the right to information, but that in time it also helps foster government openness. While the authors recognize legal frameworks may be weak even in countries that are remarkably open (due to remarkable efforts at implementation), the authors take these to be outliers. They also assume governments with a

[35] In 2015, the highest score belonged to Serbia (135). Dominican Republic, Belgium and Uzbekistan were the countries with the lowest scores, earning 59 points each. Mexico ranked #9, with a score of 117.

strong legal framework who have failed to implement it adequately will in time turn open and protect the right to information. Therefore, the most comprehensive assumptions rest on the legal framework and its role in fostering openness, transparency, and the fulfillment of the right to information.

10) ÍNDICE DEL DERECHO DE ACCESO A LA INFORMACIÓN EN MÉXICO (MEXICAN RIGHT TO INFORMATION INDEX) (IDAIM)

Producer: Fundar, Center of Analysis and Research (Mexico)

Purpose: to compare the quality of transparency laws in Mexico to national and international best practices.

Financing: private.

Location: The 2014 and 2015 editions can be found at: http://idaim.org.mx/

Type of data used for measurement: the federal and state transparency laws.

Spatial coverage: IDAIM covers the local transparency laws in the 32 Mexican states, as well as the Mexican Federal Law on Transparency and Access to Governmental Public Information.

Temporal coverage: Three editions have been published thus far: 2010, 2014 and 2015.

Contact information

Renata Terrazas Tapia

Address: Cerrada de Alberto Zamora 21, Villa Coyoacán, Coyoacán, México, D.F., C.P. 04000.

E-mail: renata@fundar.org.mx

Phone number: 55 54 30 01 ext. 147

Methodology

IDAIM evaluates the quality of transparency laws through three main variables, each of which is composed by various indicators which, at the same time, are made up by a total 196 criteria —which the authors argue any transparency law must meet in order to foster transparency and adequately protect and guarantee the exercise of the right to information. Variables and indicators are detailed below. The number of criteria on which each indicator is built on is included in parentheses.

1. Normative design: through seven indicators, this variable analyzes the principles and bases that will determine how each law will be interpreted and applied
    a. Definition and interpretation of right to information (5)
    b. Purpose of access to information laws (6)
    c. Regulated entities in transparency laws (14)
    d. Regulated entity obligations (10)
    e. Legal criteria that regulate how information is classified (15)
    f. Exceptions in the classification of information (6)
    g. Sanctions (7)
2. Institutional design: this variable assesses any articles that serve as a legal basis for the institutions tasked with protecting, respecting, promoting and guaranteeing the exercise of the right to information.
    h. Composition and attributions of public information offices (7)
    i. Composition and attributions of information committees/internal monitoring organs (6)
    j. Juridical nature of organs tasked with guaranteeing transparency (6)
    k. Conducting organs for organs tasked with guaranteeing transparency (16)
    l. Attributions and obligations of organs tasked with guaranteeing transparency (18)
3. Access to information procedures and transparency obligations: this variable measures the extent to which the right to information is universal, accessible, expedite and free, as well as proactive measures to divulge relevant information.
    m. Ways in which information requests can be presented (7)
    n. Requirements for requesting information (7)
    o. Regulations concerning official responses to information requests (4)
    p. Fees for duplicates of requested information (3)
    q. Requirements for motions of review (5)
    r. Deadlines for motions of review (4)
    s. Juridical guarantees for motions of review (5)

t. Information whose availability does not require a formal request (34)
u. Rules for the publication and dissemination of transparency obligations (11)

Since the text of all laws considered is different, evaluations for every criterion were based on a guide elaborated by Fundar. Each criterion assesses whether each law includes a certain element or not; they are dichotomous: the score is 1 if it does, and 0 otherwise. The values for each indicator range from 0 to 10. The score is determined by adding the values for each criterion and dividing the result over the total number of criteria for the indicator. Similarly, each variable ranges from 0 to 10; their value equals the average score for the corresponding indicators. The global IDAIM score equals the average value of the three main variables. Therefore, all criteria have the same weight for indicator calculations; all indicators have the same weight for variable calculations, and all variables have the same weight for index calculations. Therefore, criteria and indicators have different relative weights, depending on the number of criteria per indicator.

Result format

Reports are rich in graphs and data; information is presented in aggregated and non-aggregated formats. Results are presented interactively, which allows for quick comparisons between different laws. Laws can score anything between a 0 and a 10 for every indicator and variable, as well as for the index. Higher scores indicate greater quality. Scores are also associated with colors: good scores (8-10) are represented in green; low scores (0-5.9) are represented in red; the remaining scores (6-7.9) are represented in yellow. These colors allow for a more visual display and interpretation of the data in the IDAIM website.

Examples: Since data are presented interactively, the best way to review them is at the IDAIM webpage: http://idaim.org.mx/

Appropriate use: IDAIM assesses (based on a guide published by Fundar) the quality of the Mexican legal framework for transparency and seeks to facilitate comparisons regarding the quality of federal and state transparency laws so as to identify their respective strengths and weaknesses.

Inappropriate use: IDAIM does not evaluate the impacts of transparency laws, and is therefore not useful to measure transparency (especially proactive) or state and local government openness.

Assumptions: The Index assumes that the implicit (and unjustified) weights attached to each criterion and indicator adequately reflect each feature's relevance in measuring the strength of state and federal transparency laws. It also assumes that including a vast number of criteria for index calculations does not diminish the importance of the most relevant ones.

11) ÍNDICE LATINOAMERICANO DE TRANSPARENCIA PRESUPUESTARIA (ILTP) [LATINAMERICAN BUDGET TRANSPARENCY INDEX]

Producer: The Index is coordinated by Fundar, Center of Analysis and Research (Mexico)

Purpose: to identify best practices related to the budget and assist in transparency and accountability. The specific purposes for the index are: to measure the degree of budget transparency and make cross-country comparisons through time; to provide an updated overview of the budget process in Latin America and underscore the importance of transparency; to identify opaque areas of the budget process, and to formulate specific recommendations for legislators and governments to foster openness and accountability.

Financing: private. The last edition for the ILTP (2011) got support from *Open Society Foundations* and *The William and Flora Hewlett Foundation.*

Location: The 2011 edition's results for Mexico are available at: http://fundar.org.mx/indice-latinoamericano-de-transparencia-presupuestaria-2011-estudio-mexico/

Type of data used for measurement: Data come from expert surveys, which are intended to measure expert opinions on the levels of transparency of the budget process of every country considered.

Spatial coverage: The 2011 edition covered five countries: Costa Rica, Ecuador, Guatemala, Mexico, and Venezuela. Each edition covers different Latin American countries.

Temporal coverage: Six editions of the ILTP exist: 2001, 2003, 2005, 2007, 2009, and 2011.

Contact information

Liliana Ruiz Ortega

Address: Cerrada de Alberto Zamora 21; Col. Villa Coyoacán, Del. Coyoacán, México, D.F., C.P. 04000

E-mail: liliana@fundar.org.mx

Phone: 55 54 30 01 ext. 158

Methodology

There are three components to the Index, which are detailed below.

1. Expert perceptions survey

The survey measures expert opinions regarding the levels of transparency transparency of the budget process in every country considered. Four types of experts are considered: deputies involved in the Budget and Public Accounts Commission; scholars with published research on budget, public expenditure and other similar topics; journalists who write about the budget; and civil society representatives whose work is related to the budget.

2. Formal/practical analysis

This involves research meant to contextualize results from the expert survey. The purpose is to identify the main actors involved in the approval of the budget, as well as their responsibilities in every stage of the process. This also includes an analysis of the relevant legal framework, as well as informal practices that influence the four stages of the budget process: formulation, discussion-approval, implementation, auditing-evaluation.

The analysis takes the form of a questionnaire which poses each country the same 38 questions, which are grouped under the following 16 categories:

a. Access to Information laws
b. Trust in the information
c. External monitoring body capabilities
d. Attributions of Congress
e. Information quality
f. Budget auditing
g. Control over federal public officials

h. Subnational governments
i. Accountability
j. Information on national debt
k. Timeliness of information
l. Impact of expenditures and performance evaluations
m. Resource allocation
n. Internal auditing
o. Modifications to the budget
p. Citizen participation

The IGTP is build based on this questionnaire. Scores are allocated according to a Likert scale that ranges from 1 to 5, where 1 = not transparent at all, 3 = indifferent, and 5 = very transparent. Country scores reflect the proportion of positive responses (values 4 and 5) versus the total of valid responses. Scores range from 1 (not transparent at all) to 100 (fully transparent).

3. Guide

A guide is available to link both the expert survey and the questionnaire so as to put observable results in context.

Result format: Reports are rich in tables and graphs; results are presented in a non-aggregated manner per variable. Country scores range from 1 (not transparent at all) to 100 (fully transparent).[36]

Examples: While data are not available in an interactive platform, graphs and tables are considerably elaborate. These may be better reviewed at: http://fundar.org.mx/indice-latinoamericano-de-transparencia-presupuestaria-2011-estudio-mexico/

Appropriate use: ILTP is best used as a measurement of perceptions on the quality of budget transparency in each country.

[36] Mexico scored a 45 in the 2011 edition of the ILTP.

Inappropriate use: ILTP does not evaluate other types of transparency, budget transparency at the local level, proactive transparency or open government.

Assumptions: The main assumption is that individual perceptions are adequate indicators of the level of budget transparency in each country under analysis. Questions for the formal analysis are assumed to be equally relevant and valid for every country and the Likert scale is assumed to reflect different levels of transparency adequately enough to make evidence that backs any judgements based on these responses unnecessary.

12) CIMTRA-MUNICIPAL

Producer: Ciudadanos por Municipios Transparentes (CIMTRA) (Mexico).

Purpose: First, to measure municipal transparency in Mexico based on citizens' standards on the type of information that should be publicly available. Second, to influence any modifications of the legal framework surrounding the right to access to information.
Financing: private; this organization finds sources of funding.

Location: the updated ranking is available at http://www.cimtra.org.mx/portal/ranking-municipal/. The guide, tools and scoring cards can be found at http://www.cimtra.org.mx/portal/herramientas/

Type of data used for measurement: Government data sources; for example, municipal webpages, municipal service agencies, municipal treasuries, the office of regidores, town hall meeting records, municipal regulations, and gazettes/ newspapers published by the office of the Mayor. Analysts are also encouraged to review citizen council records, libraries and local newspapers. The only requirements are that all information must be updated to the month during which municipalities are evaluated and that it must be available for review without the need to fill in any information requests or resort to any other similar mechanisms.

Spatial coverage: CIMTRA-Municipal has thus far evaluated 165 Mexican municipalities.

Temporal coverage: CIMTRA-Municipal was first published in 2008. Some municipalities have been evaluated up to 11 times.

Contact information

Ricardo Jiménez González:
E-mail: ricardoj67@hotmail.com / coordinaciondf@heribertojara.org.mx
Phone number: 5639 5472
Webpage: www.cimtra.org.mx

Methodology

CIMTRA-Municipal may be measured and results may be published at any point in time. Any civil society organization or group of citizens may assist in information collection (provided they are not affiliated to any political party). Once the required information has been collected, analysts analyze the information together with CIMTRA staff and decide whether it complies with every criterion required in order to be fit for the measuring tool, so as to avoid subjectivity or discretionary decisions.

Once all the relevant information has been gathered, the CIMTRA-Municipal Scoring Table is used to calculate a municipality's level of transparency. The Table details how each of the 37 'aspects' considered are scored. These 'aspects' are organized into three fields, which are divided into nine blocks as specified below:[37]

1. Information provided to citizens (24 aspects)
    a. Expenditures
    b. Infrastructure
    c. Assets
    d. Management
    e. Urban planning
2. Society-government relations (10 aspects)
    a. Councils
    b. Citizen participation
    c. Councils ("Cabildo")
3. Citizen services (3 aspects)
    a. Citizen services

Each aspect is marked depending on various criteria which assign scores to different levels of compliance, which is judged based on the information under analysis. Final scores equal the average percentage of compliance for the nine blocks. The value for each block is a result from averaging the scores for the corresponding aspects. Therefore, each municipality is assigned an overall grade plus a particular grade for each block.

[37] All 'aspects' are detailed in CIMTRA-Municipal Manual, available at: http://www.cimtra.org.mx/portal/wp-content/uploads/2015/02/Manual-CIMTRA-Municipal-vfinal3.pdf

Once transparency scores have been computed, they are incorporated into a report with all the results. Said report is distributed among the authorities and the media. The team then identifies potential improvements for municipalities' legal framework, so that any obstacles in the road to transparency may be overcome.

Result format: Results are made available in Excel format. They are presented in aggregated and non-aggregated format. Municipalities can score anything between 0 and 100%; higher scores signal better compliance with transparency obligations, and thus greater levels of transparency. CIMTRA emphasizes, however, that favorable scores are not synonymous with excellent levels of transparency, since the index merely compares municipal performance against the minimum transparency obligations.

Examples:

Table 4. CIMTRA-Municipal Ranking, October 19, 2015.

Municipality	State	Score (%)	Date	Round	Ranking
Tlajomulco	Jal.	100.0	Aug-2015	11th	1
Zapopan	Jal.	95.8	Aug-2015	11th	2
Tamazula de G.	Jal.	93.6	Aug-2015	10th	3
Guadalajara	Jal.	92.3	Aug-2015	11th	4
Navojoa	Son.	87.0	Dec-2014	2nd	5

Own elaboration, based on the CIMTRA Municipal Ranking, last updated Oct. 19, 2015

Appropriate use: The index allows for an evaluation of the levels of municipal transparency against a bare minimum of what citizens consider relevant information.

Inappropriate use: CIMTRA-Municipal does not allow for cross-section comparisons. Even though evaluation criteria have remained the same through time, creators of the index constantly encourage citizens to gather information to evaluate any municipality at any time, no matter how often. Therefore, some municipalities have been evaluated more times than

others, which makes valid comparisons very difficult. The index does not consider legal standards of transparency and access to information; since it adopts a citizen perspective, it focuses rather on the information citizens themselves think should be made public.

Assumptions: Firstly, the measuring tool is assumed to help citizens demand transparency and have a better knowledge of which government activities are not fundamentally associated with transparency and why. CIMTRA-Municipal is assumed to encourage openness and good governance, to foster citizen oversight, to recognize those municipalities with favorable scores, and to aid municipalities by showing them their own weaknesses. Another assumption is that all the various measurements (which can be performed by basically anyone at any moment in time) are comparable and equally valid across time. A final assumption is that letting authorities know about this index which ranks municipalities and formulates recommendations based on basic transparency obligations will motivate them to improve their legal frameworks and become more open.

13) CIMTRA-LEGISLATIVO.

Producer: Ciudadanos por Municipios Transparentes (CIMTRA) (Mexico).

Purpose: To measure the level of proactive transparency and access to information displayed by local congresses based on citizens' standards. The measurement seeks to increase the levels of transparency and accountability of local congresses, as well as promote any changes needed in said institutions.

Financing: private; this organization finds sources of funding.

Location: the updated ranking is available at http://www.cimtra.org.mx/portal/ranking-cimtra-legislativo/. The guide, tools and scoring cards can be found at http://www.cimtra.org.mx/portal/herramientas/

Type of data used for measurement: The index is based on any public information that can be found at the Congress' website and allows for an evaluation of the Congress' structure, its performance, records, expenditures, management, internal control, interactions with citizens and anything related to access to information. Information must be updated to the month during which each Congress is being evaluated, include the entire period under evaluation, and be available for review without the need to fill in any information requests or resort to any other similar mechanisms.

Spatial coverage: Since its first 2011 edition, CIMTRA-Legislativo has evaluated the levels of transparency in 7 local Congresses: Jalisco, Chihuahua, Puebla, Tlaxcala, Aguascalientes, Guerrero, and Querétaro..

Temporal coverage: CIMTRA-Legislativo was first published in 2011. Some Congresses have been evaluated up to 5 times.

Contact information

Ricardo Jiménez González:

E-mail: ricardoj67@hotmail.com / coordinaciondf@heribertojara.org.mx
Phone number: 5639 5472
Webpage: www.cimtra.org.mx

Methodology:

CIMTRA-Legislativo may be measured and results may be published at any point in time. Any civil society organization or group of citizens may assist in information collection (provided they are not affiliated to any political party).

Once all the relevant information has been gathered, the CIMTRA-Legislativo Scoring Table must be used to calculate a given Congress' level of transparency. The Table details how each of the 45 'aspects' considered are scored. These 'aspects' are organized into eight blocks and measured via a total of 212 indicators, as specified below:[38]

1. Integration and structure (4 aspects; 18 indicators)
2. Legislative performance (9 aspects; 56 indicators)
3. Records (6 aspects; 37 indicators)
4. Expenditures (9 aspects; 35 indicators)
5. Management (5 aspects; 23 indicators)
6. Internal control (5 aspects; 15 indicators)
7. Interactions with the citizenry (4 aspects; 17 indicators)
8. Access to information (3 aspects; 11 indicators)

Each indicator is dichotomous: Congresses score a 1 if they meet the corresponding criterion and zero otherwise. The maximum value for each aspect thus reflects the number of indicators that make it up. For every block, the level of compliance is expressed as a percentage. The final score equals the average of every block's percentage; therefore, each municipality is assigned an overall grade plus a particular grade for each block.

Once transparency scores have been computed, they are incorporated into a report with all the results. Said report is distributed among the authorities and the media. The team then identifies potential improvements that could be made to each Congress' legal framework and

[38] All 'aspects' are detailed in CIMTRA-Municipal Manual, available at: http://www.cimtra.org.mx/portal/wp-content/uploads/2015/02/Manual-CIMTRA-Municipal-vfinal3.pdf

procedures, so that any obstacles in the road to transparency may be overcome. Ideally, the team would prepare law initiatives that could be presented to Congress for analysis.

Result format:

Results are made available in Excel format. They are presented in their aggregated and non-aggregated forms. Congresses can score anything between 0 and 100%; higher scores signal better compliance with transparency obligations, and thus greater levels of transparency. CIMTRA emphasizes, however, that favorable scores are not synonymous with excellent levels of transparency, since the index merely compares the performance of each Congress against the minimum transparency obligations.

Examples:

Table 5. CIMTRA-Legislativo Ranking, October 19, 2015.

State	Score (%)	Date	Round	Ranking
Jalisco	51.4	Mar-2014	2ª	1
Chihuahua	49.3	Dec-2012	2ª	2
Puebla	29.9	Jan-2014	5ª	3
Tlaxcala	27.2	Dec-2013	1ª	4
Aguascalientes	20.7	Sept-2014	1ª	5
Guerrero	18.1	Oct-2013	1ª	6
Querétaro	15.8	Aug-2012	2ª	7

Own elaboration, based on the CIMTRA Legislativo Ranking, last updated Oct. 19, 2015

Appropriate use: The index allows for an evaluation of each Congress' levels of transparency against a bare minimum of what citizens consider relevant information.

Inappropriate use: CIMTRA-Legislativo does not provide allow for cross-section comparisons. Even though evaluation criteria have remained the same through time, creators of the index constantly encourage citizens to gather information and evaluate any Congress

at any time, no matter how often. Therefore, some Congresses have been evaluated more times than others, which makes valid comparisons very difficult. The index does not consider legal standards of transparency and access to information; since it adopts a citizen perspective, it focuses rather on the information citizens themselves think should be made public.

Assumptions: Firstly, CIMTRA-Legislativo is assumed to encourage Congresses to improve their levels of transparency and access to information. Another assumption is that all the various measurements (which can be performed by basically anyone at any moment in time) are comparable and equally valid across time. A final assumption is that letting authorities know about this index which ranks Congresses and formulates recommendations based on basic transparency obligations will motivate them to improve their legal frameworks and become more open.

14) CIMTRA-DELEGACIONAL

Producer: Ciudadanos por Municipios Transparentes (CIMTRA) (Mexico).

Purpose: To measure the levels of transparency in Mexico City's territorial demarcations, based on citizens' standards on the type of information that should be publicly available.

Financing: private; this organization finds sources of funding.

Location: the updated ranking is available at http://www.cimtra.org.mx/portal/ranking-cimtra-delegacional/. The guide, tools and scoring cards can be found at http://www.cimtra.org.mx/portal/herramientas/

Type of data used for measurement: Any information publicized by the authorities in each territorial demarcation, either in published written records or electronic files.

Spatial coverage: The 16 territorial demarcations in Mexico City.

Temporal coverage: CIMTRA-Delegacional was first published in 2004. All 16 demarcations have been evaluated three times.

Contact information

Ricardo Jiménez González:
E-mail: ricardoj67@hotmail.com / coordinaciondf@heribertojara.org.mx
Phone number: 5639 5472
Webpage: www.cimtra.org.mx

Methodology

Once all the relevant information has been gathered, the CIMTRA-Delegacional Scoring Table is used to calculate each territorial demarcation's level of transparency. The Table details how each of the 25 'aspects' considered are scored. These 'aspects' are organized into

three general blocks, which are measured through a total 88 indicators or criteria as specified below:[39]

1. Expenditures (4 aspects; 17 indicators)
2. Infrastructure and services (3 aspects; 19 indicators)
3. Assets (2 aspects; 10 indicators)
4. Management (7 aspects; 18 indicators)
5. Urban planning (2 aspects; 4 indicators)
6. Citizen fora (4 aspects; 8 indicators)
7. Citizen services (3 aspects; 12 indicators)

Each indicator is dichotomous: territorial demarcations score a 1 if they meet the corresponding criterion and zero otherwise. The maximum value for each aspect thus reflects the number of indicators that make it up. For every block, the level of compliance is expressed as a percentage. The final score equals the average of every block's percentage; therefore, each municipality is assigned an overall grade plus a particular grade for each block.

Once transparency scores have been computed, they are incorporated into a report with all the results. Said report is distributed among the authorities and the media. The local team then identifies potential improvements that could be made to each demarcation's legal framework and procedures, so that any obstacles in the road to transparency may be overcome. Ideally, the team would prepare proposals that could be presented to each demarcation for analysis.

Result format.

Results are made available in Excel format. They are presented in aggregated and non-aggregated format. Demarcations can score anything between 0 and 100%; higher scores signal better compliance with transparency obligations, and thus greater levels of transparency. CIMTRA emphasizes, however, that favorable scores are not synonymous with excellent levels of transparency, since the index merely compares each demarcation's performance against the minimum transparency obligations.

[39] All 'aspects' are detailed in CIMTRA-Municipal Manual, available at: http://www.cimtra.org.mx/portal/wp-content/uploads/2015/02/Manual-CIMTRA-Municipal-vfinal3.pdf

Examples:

Table 4. CIMTRA-Municipal Ranking, October 19, 2015.

Territorial demarcation	Score (%)	Date	Round	Ranking
Azcapotzalco	67.0	Sept-2013	3rd	1
Álvaro Obregón	55.7	Sept-2013	3rd	2
Benito Juárez	52.1	Sept-2013	3rd	3
Iztapalapa	48.2	Sept-2013	3rd	4
Coyoacán	46.1	Sept-2013	3rd	5

Own elaboration, based on the CIMTRA-Delegacional Ranking, last updated Oct. 19, 2015

Appropriate use: The index allows for an evaluation of each demarcation's levels of transparency against a bare minimum of what citizens consider relevant information.

Inappropriate use: CIMTRA-Delegacional does not consider legal standards of transparency and access to information; since it adopts a citizen perspective, it focuses rather on the information citizens themselves think should be made public.

Assumptions: CIMTRA-Delegacional is assumed to encourage each demarcation to improve their levels of transparency and access to information. Another assumption is that letting authorities know about this index which ranks demarcations and formulates recommendations based on basic transparency obligations will motivate them to improve their legal frameworks and become more open.

15) ÍNDICE DE INFORMACIÓN PRESUPUESTAL ESTATAL (IIPE) [STATE BUDGET INFORMATION INDEX]

Producer: The Mexican Institute for Competitiveness (IMCO) (Mexico)

Purpose: To improve the quality of official information regarding state budgets so a to curb opacity in the use of public resources. IIPE creators expect that, if states comply with certain requirements regarding the way in which expenditure information is presented and organized, budgets will be more understandable to citizens, opacity will decrease, expenditures will be more easily monitored and best practices in matters such as public debt, salaries, pensions and acquisitions will be encouraged.

Financing: Public and private. IMCO gets their funding from institutions such as *US Agency for International Development (USAID),* the *Inter American Development Bank (IADB)*, the British Embassy in Mexico, Microsoft, and the *Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD)*.

Location: The 2014 edition for the Index is available at: http://imco.org.mx/indices/indice-de-informacion-presupuestal-estatal-2014/

Type of data used for measurement: The index has two basic sources of information for every state: the Revenue Act and the Budget, each of them published yearly.

Spatial coverage: IIPE evaluates each of the 31 states and Mexico City since 2008. Some criteria do not apply to Mexico City (number of posts for union members, the disaggregation of union members according to their type of functions in employment, the salaries for teachers), and some others do not apply to Tlaxcala (a number of criteria related to public debt) because of local regulations.

Temporal coverage: The Index has been measured since 2008 on a yearly basis. Therefore, there are now eight editions (2008, 2009, 2010, 2011, 2012, 2013, 2014, 2015).

Contact information

IMCO does not specify any specific contact information for issues related to the index. Their general contact information is:

Address: Musset 32, Col. Polanco, Del. Miguel Hidalgo, C.P. 11560, México, D.F.
E-mail: contacto@imco.org.mx
Phone number: 5985 1017 /18 /19
Twitter: @IMCOmx
Facebook: /IMCOmx

Methodology

Every year, IMCO follows a set of five steps to measure the index:

1. Update criteria for best practices.
2. Collect the Budget and Revenue Act for each state.
3. Evaluate each Budget and Revenue Act.
4. Generate the results.
5. Formulate recommendations.

In case any particular state has asked for technical assistance, specific recommendations are formulated, its website is reviewed, its public servants are trained, and a "citizen's budget" is developed.

For the 2014 edition, Budgets and Revenue Acts were assessed using 100 criteria, which are grouped into 10 general sections as follows:[40]

1. Initial access (7 criteria)
2. General aspects (15 criteria)
3. Classifications (6 criteria)
4. Branches/Institutions/Organizations (13 criteria)

[40] The Methodological Annex for the IIPE provides a detailed description of the criteria. See: http://imco.org.mx/wp-content/uploads/2014/10/Metodolog%C3%ADa_IIPE_2014.pdf or http://imco.org.mx/finanzaspublicas/metodologia

5. Municipalities (2 criteria)
6. Salaries/Posts (10 criteria)
7. Public debt (12 criteria)
8. Federal resources (5 criteria)
9. Specific components (22 criteria)
10. Criteria (8 criteria)

Each criterion is dichotomous: states either meet a specific requirement or not. Each criterion has the same weight, and therefore represents 1/100 of the final score.

Result format:
Reports are rich in graphs and tables. Data are presented in aggregated and non-aggregated formats. Results are displayed in an interactive platform, which allows state performance in any specific section or criterion to be analyzed through time, and also allows for cross-section comparisons between two or more states. Scores range from 0 to 100%; higher scores signal greater levels of budget transparency.

Examples: Since data are presented interactively, the best way to review them is at the IIPM 2014 webpage: http://imco.org.mx/finanzaspublicas/

Appropriate use: IIPE 2014 only allows for an evaluation of the levels of budget transparency in every Mexican state.

Inappropriate use: The Index does not reflect overall levels of transparency or open government, and does not measure proactive transparency or public perceptions about the level of openness in their states.

Assumptions: Firstly, IIPE is assumed to influence changes in the way states present information about expenditures to their citizens, making it more clear and structured. Secondly, compliance with the Index's criteria and the use of homologous classifications are assumed to make state budgets more accessible and easily understandable for citizens.

Thirdly, IMCO assumes that budget transparency (knowledge about how much is spent, and how) will increase the levels of trust between civil society, businesses and the government.

16) ÍNDICE DE INFORMACIÓN PRESUPUESTAL MUNICIPAL (IIPM) [MUNICIPAL BUDGET INFORMATION INDEX]

Producer: The Mexican Institute for Competitiveness (IMCO) (Mexico)

Purpose: To improve the quality of official information regarding municipal budgets so a to curb opacity in the use of public resources. IIPE creators expect that, if municipal governments comply with certain requirements regarding the way in which expenditure information is presented and organized, budgets will be more understandable to citizens.

Financing: Public and private. IMCO gets their funding from institutions such as *US Agency for International Development (USAID),* the *Inter American Development Bank (IADB)*, the British Embassy in Mexico, Microsoft, and the *Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD)*.

Location: The 2014 edition for the Index is available at: http://imco.org.mx/finanzaspublicas/

Type of data used for measurement: The index has two basic sources of information for every municipaltiy: the Revenue Act and the Budget, each of them published yearly.

Spatial coverage: The 2014 edition of the Index covered a sample of 410 Mexican municipalities.[41] Every Mexican state is represented in the sample.

Contact information

IMCO does not specify any particular contact data for issues related to the index. Their general contact information is:

[41] 379 of these municipalities were selected because they met at least one of the following requirements: belong to one of the 59 metropolitan areas defined by the National Institute of Geography and Statistics and the National Population Council; being the capital city of a Mexican state; being part of the 90th percentile of the GDP. Urban areas for which sources did not provide any representative or statistically valid information were excluded. The 31 remaining municipalities asked IMCO to be considered.

Address: Musset 32, Col. Polanco, Del. Miguel Hidalgo, C.P. 11560, México, D.F.
E-mail: contacto@imco.org.mx
Phone number: 5985 1017 /18 /19
Twitter: @IMCOmx
Facebook: /IMCOmx

Methodology

Every year, IMCO follows a set of six steps to measure the index:

1. Select the sample of municipalities.
2. Update criteria for best practices.
3. Collect the Budget and Revenue Act for each state.
4. Evaluate each Budget and Revenue Act.
5. Generate the results.
6. Formulate recommendations.

In case any particular state or municipality has asked for technical assistance, specific recommendations are formulated, its website is reviewed, its public servants are trained, and a "citizen's budget" is developed.

For the 2014 edition, Budgets and Revenue Acts were assessed using 80 criteria, which are grouped into 9 general sections as follows:[42]

1. Initial access (7 criteria)

   Criteria are related to the publication of the Revenue Act and the Budget in state congresses and municipalities' websites, as well as access to the relevant documentation via the official publishing channel for every municipality.

2. General aspects (15 criteria)

[42] The Methodological Annex for the IIPE provides a detailed description of the criteria. See: http://imco.org.mx/wp-content/uploads/2014/10/Metodolog%C3%ADa_IIPE_2014.pdf or http://imco.org.mx/finanzaspublicas/metodologia

Criteria are related to the quality of the relevant information, such as official characteristics, the structure of the Revenue Act (the basic concepts that every municipality should include) according to the standards set by the National Council of Account Harmonization (CONAC), open data, and legibility.

3. Classifications (6 criteria)

Criteria evaluate the presence of the different classifications established by CONAC (by object, by type of expenditure, administrative, economic, functional, programmatic). The degree to which information is organized and reliable is what matters.

4. Branches/Institutions/Organizations (4 criteria)

Criteria are related to specifications regarding the structure of each municipality's public institutions, organizations and entities.

5. Salaries/Posts (11 criteria)

Criteria assess the level of disaggregation of information related to the number and type of employment posts, with their corresponding benefits and salaries (among other characteristics), awarded to public officials, including the local police force.

6. Public debt (12 criteria)

Criteria evaluate the status of public debt: conditions on which it was contracted, interest rates, payment schedules, guarantees, the magnitude of previous fiscal years, among others.

7. Federal resources (5 criteria)

Criteria are related to federal transfers, including *participaciones* and *aportaciones*. Emphasis is placed on Ramo 33 resources (earmarked federal transfers for municipalities).

8. Specific components (12 criteria)

Criteria look at information for specific expenditure components, such as social communications, public trust-funds, subsidies, civil society organizations, among others, whose magnitude in terms of size or impact merits attention.

9. Criteria (8 criteria)
Criteria are related to those guidelines for adjustments, reallocations and contracting terms. The intention is to evaluate whether resource allocation and management is guided by clear regulations.

Each criterion is dichotomous: municipalities either meet a specific requirement or not. Each criterion has the same weight, and therefore represents 1/80 of the final score.

Result format:
Reports are rich in graphs and tables. Data are presented in aggregated and non-aggregated formats. Results are displayed in an interactive platform, which allows municipal performance in any specific section or criterion to be analyzed through time, and also allows for cross-section comparisons between two or more municipalities. Scores range from 0 to 100%; higher scores signal greater levels of budget transparency.

Examples: Since data are presented interactively, the best way to review them is at the IIPM 2014 webpage: http://imco.org.mx/finanzaspublicas/

Appropriate use: IIPM 2014 only allows for an evaluation of the levels of budget transparency in Mexican municipalities.

Inappropriate use: The Index does not reflect overall levels of transparency or open government, and does not measure proactive transparency or public perceptions about the level of openness in their municipal governments.

Assumptions: Firstly, IIPM is assumed to influence changes in the way municipalities present information about expenditures to their citizens, making it more clear and structured.

Secondly, compliance with the Index's criteria and the use of homologous classifications are assumed to make municipal budgets more accessible and easily understandable for citizens. Thirdly, IMCO assumes that budget transparency (knowledge about how much is spent, and how) will increase the levels of trust between civil society, businesses and the government.

17) MÉTRICA DE LA TRANSPARENCIA [TRANSPARENCY METRIC]

Producer: Center for Research and Teaching in Economics (CIDE) (Mexico)

Purpose: To reflect the transparency and access to information supply for the three branches of government across the three levels of government in Mexico, as well as some autonomous institutions. The Metric seeks to create information that will fuel empirical research on the status of transparency in the country, and therefore contribute towards efforts for improvement.

Financing: Public.

Location: The 2014 edition is available at: http://www.metricadetransparencia.cide.edu/. The 2010 and 2007 editions are available at: http://metricadetransparencia2010.cide.edu/.

Type of data used for measurement: Analyzing the five dimensions (explained below) requires information from a variety of sources: 175 legal documents (local constitutions, laws, guidelines and regulations on transparency, access to information and archives); 624 transparency websites for 18 institutions that have transparency obligations (all from the executive, legislative and judiciary branches, as well as decentralized and autonomous institutions); formal information requests; as well as an analysis of institutional capabilities for each body tasked with access to information, and a study about the processes and operations of transparency units for four institutions with transparency obligations.

Spatial coverage: the 31 Mexican states as well as Mexico City, and every municipality and territorial demarcation.

Temporal coverage: The first edition was published in 2007; a second one was released in 2010 and a third one in 2014.

Contact information

Center for Research and Teaching in Economics (CIDE)
Address: Carretera México- Toluca 3655, Col. Lomas de Santa Fe, 01210 México, D.F.
Phone number: 5727-98-00; Long distance: 01 800 021 2433.

Methodology

The Metric seeks to measure transparency and access to information through an analysis of the following five dimensions:

1. Laws and regulations

This dimension examines the quality of the legal framework that supports the right to access to information. Assessments are based upon a matrix of 159 variables organized into twelve categories: principles, institutions with transparency obligations, information that must be made public with no need for requests, reserved information, confidential information, personal data, archives, bodies tasked with access to information, information units institutional design, access procedures, administrative recourses, and responsibilities and sanctions.

2. Websites

This dimension evaluates the level of compliance with the standards for information that public institutions must make public (with no need for information requests), as well as the quality of said information, which must be available online. When the information is complete and updated, a score of 1 is assigned; if it exists but is incomplete, the score is 0.5; if it does not exist, the score is 0. Quality of information was assessed according to three elements: the level of accessibility, an open data format, and whether there are technical or legal restrictions. The same criteria apply for scores.

3. User simulation

This dimension evaluates the quality of the existing processes to respond to population requests (mechanisms for information requests, request management, timeliness of response), as well as the quality of the responses themselves (whether

the information required is what public officials actually provide; the adequacy of the format). The idea is to gauge the experiences of citizens trying to access public information.

4. Strength of bodies tasked with access to information

This dimension looks at the institutional capabilities of those bodies tasked with guaranteeing access to information across the country. It looks into managerial , organizational and operative capabilities, as well as the influence of every particular body, under the premise that institutional capacities derive from autonomy, sufficiency (of resources) and influence over institutions with transparency obligations.

5. Institutions with transparency obligations

This dimension examines the set of processes, routines and characteristics of those who make up all the public institutions that have transparency obligations. The analysis is based on the characteristics of access to information units, of the personnel and of any information management processes, as well as the level of internalization of transparency.

Information was categorized into quantitative variables, which were later normalized to generate five sub-indexes and a global index whose scores range from 0 to 1, where 1 always represents the better scenario.

Result format

Reports are rich in graphs and tables, and include both general scores and the scores for every dimension. All scores range from 0 to 1, where 1 is always the ideal scenario.

Examples: Given the complexity of the graphs, it is better to read the results directly on the National Report for 2014, available at: http://www.metricadetransparencia.cide.edu/?section=Documentos

Appropriate use: The 2014 Metric evaluates transparency and access to information systems for all levels of government in Mexico. The methodological design allows for a comprehensive analysis of the various components of a transparency system, as well as for cross-sectional comparisons between states, municipalities, institutions with transparency obligations, and bodies tasked with guaranteeing access to information.

Inappropriate use: The Metric does not evaluate open government or look at the impacts of transparency or access to information.

Assumptions: In the third dimension (user simulation), one of the main assumptions is that the questions used for the evaluation represent common citizens' experiences when requesting information. An additional assumption is that institutional autonomy, strength and capacities are accurately reflected by the indicators considered in the Metric. Finally, the interplay between regulations and actors captured by these indicators is assumed to reflect the status of transparency in Mexico adequately enough to allow for the identification of problems, resistance or opportunities.

18) METRIC FOR RELEASING OPEN DATA (MELODA)

Producer: Alberto Abella.

Purpose: To assist data publishers (both public and private) to take advantage of the information they release so that it can be reused. In other words, MELODA measures the potential for professional reutilization of released datasets.

Financing: Public and private.

Location: MELODA is available at: http://meloda.org.

Type of data used for measurement: Any dataset that is about to be released or that has been released. Some of the datasets that have been assessed are *DublinCore*, *FOAF*, *SKOS Vocabulary*, among others.[43]

Spatial coverage: MELODA is applicable to any dataset released by the private and the public sectors.

Temporal coverage: MELODA was used for the first time in 2011; it has been continually updated since.

Contact information

Alberto Abella
E-mail: info@meloda.org / alberto.abella@meloda.org

Methodology

MELODA evaluates each dataset across four dimensions, each with established levels of maturity that datasets may reach if the fulfill certain characteristics. The dimensions and

[43] The full list of datasets that have been assessed using MELODA is available at: http://www.meloda.org/full-description-of-meloda/

levels of maturity are displayed below. Scores for each level of maturity are specified in parentheses.

1. Legal framework
    a. Copyright (0%)
        Data are copyrighted, and therefore restrict unauthorized use.
    b. Private use (10%)
        Data reuse is allowed without approval processes, but only for private uses.
    c. Non-commercial reuse (25%)
        Reuse of data is allowed, but commercial uses are not.
    d. Commercial reuse (90%)
        Commercial reuse is allowed
    e. No restrictions or only attribution (100%)
        Reuse only requires users to attribute the data to the original source.

2. Technical standards
    a. Closed standard (20%)
        The data are released on proprietary standards, and so their format does not favor reuse (e.g. .xls, .pdf, .doc).
    b. Open standard (60%)
        Data are published on open standards but as individual files (e.g. .csv, .odb, .ods).
    c. Open standard, individual metadata (100%)
        Metadata are attached to any data (e.g. .rdf, .rss, .json)

3. Access to information
    a. No online access/ manual requests (0%)
        Access to information requires a non-automatic approval process or the manual registration of data.
    b. Online access with a URL, with registration (10%)

Access to information requires user interaction to select the data source.

c. Online access with unique URL parameters for the dataset (50%)

Access to information online requires datasets to be accessed individually, or through a unique URL, or through the use of specific parameters per query.

d. Online access with unique URL parameters for individual data (90%)

Access to information online allows for each data in the dataset to be accessed individually, or via specific parameters; it specifies the date, version, or last update for the data.

e. API or specific language (100%)

Access to information provides access to specific data, either through API or through the language used for requests in the data sources.

4. Data model sharing.

a. No known data model (15%)

Released information has no clear format (raw data).

b. Ad-hoc data model (30%)

Fields are designed by the publisher, but they are used only by the publisher.

c. Published ad-hoc data model (45%)

Fields are designed by the publisher, but specifications of said fields is available in a separate component, and allowed to be freely used by others.

d. Open data local model. (75%)

A standardized model (standardized by a local body or institution) is available but seldom adopted by others.

e. Open data global model (100%)

The standardized model has been released by a global entity, and/or has been widely adopted.

Once the scores for each dimension are available, all percentages are multiplied, then the fourth root is calculated, and this is multiplied by a hundred to get the final MELODA score.

Result format

Results are seldom accompanied by graphs or tables, which is consistent with the fact that MELODA does not provide any global or regional rankings of the datasets; it is rather a tool to evaluate any dataset when any user sees fit.

Datasets can score anything between 0 and 100%, where higher scores signal a greater potential for reuse. Depending on the score, datasets may be placed in one of the following four categories:

0 - 25%: Inadequate for reuse
25 - 50%: Basic reuse possible
50 - 75%: Reuse possible, but with areas for improvement
75 - 100%: Excellent for reuse

Examples: The description for MELODA does not provide any examples as to how datasets are categorized.

Appropriate use: MELODA allows data publishers to be aware of any legal, access, and model challenges, as well as technical standards for data publishing. It therefore facilitates the use of released information, and fosters the creation of new products and services based on the data.

Inappropriate use: MELODA does not evaluate the quality of published information. It also does not measure transparency or open government at any level.

Assumptions: The main assumption is that an analysis of the format of released datasets is enough to provide any analyst with an evaluation of its potential for reuse.

19) MEDICIÓN DE LA TRANSPARENCIA EN LÍNEA [ONLINE TRANSPARENCY MEASUREMENT]

Producer: Rodrigo Sandoval Almazán

Purpose: to measure the levels of online transparency by the Mexican states (which the author equates to open government and open data). This is intended to encourage improvements in terms of content and format in every state's websites.

Financing: Public.

Location: Sandoval, Rodrigo. 2013. *La larga marcha del gobierno abierto: teoría, medición y futuro*. México: INAP. Available at: http://www.inap.mx/portal/images/pdf/book/larga_marcha.pdf.

Type of data used for measurement: The measurement uses information found in the transparency websites of the 31 Mexican states, as well as Mexico City.

Spatial coverage: The websites for the 31 Mexican states and Mexico City.

Temporal coverage: There are eight editions for this measurement: 2007, 2009, 2010, 2011, 2012, 2013, 2014, 2015. Databases and questionnaires for each edition are available at the author's personal webpage: http://rodrigosandoval.mx/gobierno-abierto/ (reports, rankings and the methodology are not available at his website).

Contact information

Rodrigo Sandoval Almazán
Address: Universidad Autónoma del Estado de México, Facultad de Contaduría y Administración.
E-mail: rsandovuaem@gmail.com
Twitter: @horus72

Methodology

The measurement is based on seven components:

1. *Reliability*

A measure of how reliable the information available online is.

2. *Value of the information*

A measure of how useful the available information is, which considers whether it is updated and whether it rises to previous expectations.

3. *Continuous improvements*

A measure of how innovative transparency websites, which must adapt to newer technology and changing information needs, are.

4. *Accountability*

A measure of citizen perceptions regarding accountability. Citizens are asked "Does the website have a system that fosters accountability from public officials and organizations?"

5. *Transparency grades*

A measure of whether any internal transparency rankings or metrics that evaluate the level of transparency of other institutions exist.

6. *Search and classification systems*

A measure of whether any web apps (either designed or purchased by the government) facilitate the search for and classification of information. The categorization of data, as well as the level of access to and the handling of information are all evaluated against federal or state regulations.

7. *Regulations*

A measure of the level of compliance with established legislation (whether salaries, organization charts, contact information, limitations and public programs are available, for example).

For the 2012 ranking (the most recent ranking with a detailed explanation of its full methodology), all components were assessed through a total of 50 questions that asked researchers to answer according to a Likert scale that ranges from 1 to 5, where 1 = Totally disagree and 5 = Totally agree. Every component has the same weight for the final score, which is calculated by averaging the scores from each component.

Result format:

Reports include very few graphs and tables, and data are presented in an aggregated format. Transparency websites may score anything between 0 and 100.

Example:

Table 7. Online transparency ranking, 2012.

State	Score
Aguascalientes	12
Baja California	6
Baja California Sur	22
Campeche	14
Chiapas	5

Own elaboration, based on Table 5.1 in Sandoval (2013).

Appropriate use: The ranking partially evaluates the levels of online transparency in every Mexican state based on the information that is made available in their transparency websites.

Inappropriate use: This measurement does not measure open government or proactive transparency.

Assumptions: One of the main assumptions is that the author considers transparency to be synonymous with open government and government openness, which leads to conceptual imprecisions. Since transparency is measured via the information on state transparency websites, the author assumes transparency can be measured by an analysis of the data made available online.

Additional note.

The author also proposes a model that would measure open government (via transparency), which includes five components:[44]

1. *Legal obligations*

   An assessment of open government policies across every level of government (regulations, agent relations, public policies, among others).

2. *Open data*

   An assessment of progress in data openness and technology to organize and disseminate information (mobile technologies, clouds, eight open data principles, etc.).

3. *Collaboration*

   An assessment of any tools that foster citizen-government collaboration (collaboration tools using web 2.0).

4. *Coproduction*

   An assessment of joint production and any tools, processes and policies that foster feedback and accountability.

[44] Even though details are not provided, Sandoval published the *2015 Ranking of Transparency Websites* in 2015, when he measured transparency via 65 variables across five components: 1) Legal framework, 2) Open data, 3) Vertical collaboration, 4) Horizontal collaboration, 5) Interface. Said ranking is different from the measurement described above and seems similar to the open government measurement described below. The 2015 ranking is available at: http://www.u-gob.com/ranking-de-portales-estatales-de-transparencia-2015/#content-anchor

5. Institutional arrangements

An assessment of changes in internal processes, as well as institutional and power relations that facilitate or impede open government (information costs, transaction costs, normative agreements, open government processes and manuals).

20) MEASUREMENT OF OPEN GOVERNMENT: METRICS AND PROCESS

Producer: OpenTheGovernment

Purpose: To assess the attainment of open and transparent government through an evaluation of the open government plans developed as a response to the Open Government Directive (OGD), issued by the White House under President Barack Obama.

Financing: None

Location: Bertot, John C., Patrice McDermott and Ted Smith. 2012. "Measurement of Open Government: Metrics and Process". *45th Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences*. Available at: https://www.computer.org/csdl/proceedings/hicss/2012/4525/00/4525c491.pdf. DOI 10.1109/HICSS.2012.658.

Type of data used for measurement: Informative policies of 30 US Government agencies under OGD mandate.

Spatial coverage: 30 federal agencies from the US Government.

Temporal coverage: the evaluation was carried out in 2010.

Contact information

John Carlo Bertot
Address: College of Information Studies, University of Maryland College Park, 4105 Hornbake Building, College Park, MD 20742
E-mail: jbertot@umd.edu

Patrice McDermott
Address: OpenTheGovernment.org, 1742 Connecticut Ave, NW, Washington, DC, 20009

E-mail: pmcdermott@openthegovernment.org

Ted Smith
Address: Metro Louisville Government, 527 West Jefferson St., Lousville, KY 40202
E-mail: Ted.smith@louisvilleky.gov

Methodology

A scale from 0 to 3 was adopted to asses the level of inclusion of OGD components in agencies' plans, as follows:

> 0 = The open government plan component was not addressed.
> 1 = The open government plan component is mentioned but lacks critical elements of planning (such as dates or deliverables).
> 2 = The open government plan component is complete.
> 3 = The open government plan component exceeds the requirements stated in the directive (extra credit).

A self-evaluation component for every agency was included as part of this measurement, which addressed four points:

1. Data initiatives.
2. Availability of participation initiatives.
3. Use of data initiatives.
4. Impact of data initiatives.

For the first two points, the grading scheme was as follows:

> 1 = Initiative progress is insufficient and not likely to be implemented satisfactorily.
> 2 = Initiative progress is partial and the results available are insufficient.
> 3 = Initiative is working as described in the plan and results are satisfactory and no more than three months late.

4 = Initiative is working as described or better than described in the plan and results are comprehensive and on schedule.

For the last two points, agencies had to describe and justify their levels of progress freely. Scores had to be justified by the evaluator (for both the external evaluation and the self-evaluation).

Result format

Reports include very few graphs and tables; results are presented in an aggregated format. Agency scores range from 0 to 58 or 60 (depending on whether an agency has original classification authority). Greater scores signal greater compliance with the OGD, and therefore greater levels of transparency and openness.

Examples: The authors provide no examples of the ranking.

Appropriate use: This measurement determines the level of compliance with OGD directives, as well as perceptions on data initiatives from public officials inside every agency in terms of availability, use, and impact.

Inappropriate use: This measurement does not measure openness in general and does not work for any other level of government in the US, or any level of government in any other country.

Assumptions: The measurement assumes that every question in the surveys will effectively measure open government efforts' efficiency, efficacy and impact.

21) INDICADORES DE INICIATIVAS DE DATOS ABIERTOS EN AMÉRICA LATINA [LATIN AMERICAN OPEN DATA INITIATIVES INDICATORS]

Producer: Gastón Concha y Alejandra Naser – Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean (ECLAC).

Purpose: To build indicators for open government initiatives in Latin America that account for the realization and execution of activities under the Action Plan, as well as for the impact of progress in the various relevant sectors. Indicators are also expected to facilitate any future decision-making about which actions to implement in terms of open data policies.

Financing: public. The project received funding from the European Union.

Location: Concha, Gastón and Alejandra Naser. 2012. *El desafío del gobierno abierto en la hora de la igualdad*. Santiago de Chile: ECLAC. Available at: http://www.cepal.org/ilpes/noticias/paginas/3/54303/El_desafio_hacia_el_gobierno_abierto_en_la_hora_de_la_igualdad.pdf.

Type of data used for measurement: The indicators are meant to measure and keep track of any open data action plan.

Spatial coverage: Seeing as the indicators are a theoretical proposition about the features open data initiatives should display, to our knowledge, they have not been used to measure open government or open data in Latin America.

Temporal coverage: According to the authors, time frames for measurement vary depending on the indicator. Impact indicators must have a reference point, which should be the moment in which open data initiatives are set in motion. Execution indicators, on the other hand, should be updated during the development of the corresponding action plans.

Contact information

Alejandra Naser
Address: Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean (ECLAC), Instituto Latinoamericano y del Caribe de Planificación Económica y Social (ILPES), Av. Dag Hammarskjöld 3477, Vitacura, Casilla 179-D, Santiago, Chile.
E-mail: alejandra.naser@cepal.org
Phone number: (56-2) 2102 507
Fax: (56-2) 2066 104

Methodology

The authors propose six categories, each composed by a variety of indicators, which are included below:

1. Available datasets
    a. Number of datasets
    b. Quality of the data
    c. Level of use (downloads or requests)
    d. Number of apps that use every dataset
2. Available apps
    a. Number of available apps
    b. Number of information requests
    c. Dataset/app ratio.
3. Organization and personnel
    a. Functional units that open data
    b. Functional units that consume data
    c. Personnel involved in data opening and consumption
    d. Number of internal sites where datasets are present
4. App developers
    a. Number of ITC businesses (related to existing apps)
    b. Business model types
    c. Collaborations and joint work
5. Intermediary companies and other organizations

a. Number of businesses (related to existing apps)
b. Business model types
c. Collaborations and joint work

6. Perceived social demand
    a. Data opening requests and feedback
    b. Presence in the media
    c. Presence in the web

Result format

Seeing as —to our knowledge— no measurements have been developed using these indicators, the format in which results would be presented is not available.

Examples: Seeing as —to our knowledge— no measurements have been developed using these indicators, there are no available examples.

Appropriate use: These indicators suggest the type of areas in which a Latin American open data initiative should (ideally) have an impact.

Inappropriate use: While the authors argue that their measurements can evaluate the performance of open data initiatives, they comprise a list of ideal achievements for any said initiative. There are two reasons for this: on one hand, the document does not provide any methodology to measure some of the indicators (e.g. quality of the data, personnel involved in data opening and consumption, collaborations and joint work, presence in the web), and therefore calculations remain at the discretion of every researcher; on the other hand, the document does not specify any weights or categories for any execution index.

Assumptions: Indicators assume that an objective measure of "quality of the data" is possible, that open data policy implementers will have an adequate measure for concepts expressed in various reference indicators, and that all categories and indicators are equally relevant in an evaluation of any open data initiative in the region. Finally, the authors assume

that there is a causal relationship between an open data initiative and some of the indicators included, such as the number of app developers (related to existing apps).

22) OECD OPEN GOVERNMENT MEASUREMENT

Producer: Karin Gavelin, Simon Burall y Richard Wilson – Involve (an English think tank which specializes in public participation), working for the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD).

Purpose: To produce new indicators for open government that do not only consider the presence of laws and institutions or citizen perceptions, but rather focus on implementation, use, and enforcement.

Financing: public.

Location: Gavelin, Karin, Simon Burall and Richard Wilson. 2009. *Open Government: Beyond static measures*. Available at: http://www.oecd.org/gov/46560184.pdf.

Type of data used for measurement: Since this is a theoretical proposition, no specific data have been used for measurement. The document suggests that future measurements might include indicators from the OECD's *Government at a Glance*, a biennial report providing a snapshot picture of the performance of OECD member governments on a number of institutional elements and policy areas, including open government.

Spatial coverage: indicators are meant to be used for comparative, longitudinal studies of the evolution of open government practices across the world.

Temporal coverage: indicators were developed between March and June 2009.

Contact information

Karin Gavelin
Address: Involve, 33 Corsham Street, London, N1 6DR
E-mail: evaluation@involve.org.uk
Phone number: (+44) 0207 632 01 23/0207 336 9444

Methodology

Proposed indicators, which are the product of various discussions between Involve and the OECD, are organized into four categories as follows:[45]

1. *Indicators relating to law on access to information and documents*
    a. The law presumes proactive publication of information.
    b. The implementation of the law meets citizens' demand for information.
    c. The law ensures equal access to information and documents for all citizens.
    d. Complaints/appeals mechanisms available meet the needs of citizens.
2. *Indicators relating to Ombudsman/Information Commissioner Institutions*
    a. The Ombudsman/Information Commissioner is independent of the Executive.
    b. The Ombudsman/Information Commissioner's' findings are acted upon.
    c. The Ombudsman/Information Commissioner provides equal access to its reports and services for all citizens.
3. *Indicators relating to Supreme Audit Institutions*
    a. The Supreme Audit Institution is independent of the Executive.
    b. The Supreme Audit Institution's findings are acted upon.
4. *Indicators relating to consultation policies*
    a. Public bodies are required to consult with citizens or other stakeholders in decision making.

Indicators were selected on the basis of four criteria: relevance, comparability, reliability, and feasibility (i.e. documents on which measurement relies must be readily accessible).

Result format:

Seeing as no measurements have been developed using this methodology, there are no results to report.

[45] Every indicator is made up by several sub-indicators and follow-up questions, which are detailed in Table 6 of the original document, available at: http://www.oecd.org/gov/46560184.pdf

Examples: Seeing as —to our knowledge— no measurements have been developed using these indicators, there are no available examples

Appropriate use: This methodology measures the implementation, use and enforceability of open government practices.

Inappropriate use: This methodology does not evaluate the level of openness of state or municipal governments.

Assumptions: As there are no explicit weights, all indicators, sub-indicators and follow-up questions are assumed to be equally important for the final index calculations. In addition, more openness in government is assumed to have a positive impact on development.

III. ANALYSIS

Every index above is intended to measure some specific component of transparency or open government. In order to develop a clearer picture of the state of the art in measuring open government or any components frequently associated with it, this section analyzes the elements these indexes have in common, as well as their main strengths and limitations.

ELEMENTS IN COMMON

One of the most notorious features of international indexes that have sought to measure open government is that, since they are based on the Open Definition and the G8 Open Data Charter, they mostly look at whether central governments have released any datasets. The *Global Open Data Index* focuses on evaluating datasets based on their technical and legal components. The *Open Data Barometer* also includes expert perceptions and seeks to evaluate the perceived impact of released data in the countries analyzed. The *Open Government Index*, unlike the previous two, seeks to measure government openness based on public and expert perceptions and experiences exclusively. As for Mexico, only one attempt at measuring open government could be found: Rodrigo Sandoval's measurement, which has been developed from 2007 and (at least until 2011) focused on state government online transparency, using a simple methodology that awarded the same weight to every component of the model and whose limitations are specified in the corresponding section. Lastly, international organizations like ECLAC and the OECD have proposed various dimensions based on which the levels of open government across their memberships could be measured. However, a number of concepts in their measurements are open to interpretation, and the relative importance of each component, along with the calculation methods for an objective measurement, is not specified. Therefore, these measurements are better characterized as general criteria that, rather than measure open government, seek to guide central governments in their efforts by identifying best practices.

Transparency measurements are considerably more diverse and have looked at different levels of government, although for the most part they are limited to budget transparency. The *International Budget Partnership*'s methodology (first used in 2006) is outstandingly

elaborate. Based on an analysis of eight key documents, the *Open Budget Index* measures the levels of budget transparency in different countries, considering also the amount of space there is for citizens to get involved in the budget process, as well as the strength of any monitoring formal institutions. At the same time, various European nations (especially Portugal and Spain) have focused on measuring online municipal transparency. TI-Spain and Rui Pedro Lorenco *et al*'s indexes are especially notorious. Even though the latter focuses on Portuguese municipalities only, it proposes a participative method (which could be extrapolated to other contexts and countries) to define indicators and their relative weights for ranking calculations. Lastly, in Latin America, Fundar coordinated the *Índice Latinoamericano de Transparencia Presupuestaria*, whose last edition was published in 2011.

In Mexico, various measurements seek to assess different aspects of transparency. CIDE's *Métrica de la Transparencia*—which looks at the central government, as well as all the Mexican states and a sample of municipalities—is one of the most renowned. Built on five dimensions (including an analysis of legal frameworks, citizens' experiences, and bodies tasked with access to information), its elaborate methodology reflects the supply of transparency and access to information across all branches and levels of government. In terms of budget transparency, IMCO's *Índice de Información Presupuestal Municipal* and *Índice de Información Presupuestal Estatal* seek to reflect the quality of official information on budgets through a variety of dichotomous indicators. On a similar vein, CIMTRA provides transparency and access to information rankings for states, territorial demarcations and local congresses based on a methodology that stresses citizen involvement in measurement.

Lastly, some indexes seek to measure the quality or strength of transparency and access to information legal frameworks. Globally speaking, the *Global Right to Information Rating* is the most elaborate, and it looks at national access to information laws in 102 countries. In Mexico, Fundar has published the *Índice del Derecho de Acceso a la Información Pública en México* (IDAIM), which focuses on measuring the quality of federal and state transparency laws.

STRENGTHS AND LIMITATIONS

Most institutions that provide international rankings have devised strong methodologies which give each component or dimension considered different (and, to the extent possible, unbiased) relative weights. These indexes tend to be presented in the form of tables and graphs, and data are usually provided in both their aggregated and non-aggregated format, mainly through interactive platforms that allow various types of analyses. The indexes and the databases they are based on are available free of charge, which makes results easy to verify and confront. One measure of the reliability of open government indexes is that, when pitted against each other, they all tend to rank countries similarly (see Table 8).

Table 8. Top and bottom 10 countries, plus the ranking for Mexico, by Index

Primeros diez	**Global Open Data Index**	**Open Data Barometer**	**Open Government Index**
1	United Kingdom	United Kingdom	Sweden
2	Denmark	United States of America	New Zealand
3	France	Sweden	Norway
4	Finland	France	Denmark
5	Australia	New Zealand	The Netherlands
6	New Zealand	The Netherlands	Finland
7	Norway	Norway	Canada
8	United States of America	Canada	United Kingdom
9	Germany	Denmark	Australia
10	India	Australia	Republic of Korea
México	**28** (53%)	**24** (50.09%)	**42** (56%)

Bottom 10	Global Open Data Index	Open Data Barometer	Open Government Index
1	Botswana	Namibia	Ivory Coast
2	Cyprus	Botswana	Ethiopia
3	Lesotho	Ethiopia	Cameroon
4	Tanzania	Zambia	Sierra Leone
5	Benin	Sierra Leone	Venezuela
6	Oman	Yemen	Cambodia
7	Sierra Leone	Cameroon	Iran
8	Haiti	Mali	Myanmar
9	Mali	Haití	Uzbekistan
10	Guinea	Myanmar	Zimbabue

Own elaboration, based on *Global Open Data Index*, *Open Data Barometer* and *Open Government Index* rankings.

Note: Countries in blue appear in the Top 10 in at least two of the rankings; countries in red appear in the Bottom 10 in at least two of the rankings. Countries in black only appear in the top or bottom 10 in one ranking. In the case of Mexico, ranking and score (in parentheses) are included.

As Table 8 makes clear, top scores in the three indexes tend to go to the same countries. In fact, five of them (United Kingdom, Denmark, Australia, New Zealand, and Norway) appear on the top 10 for all three rankings, while only three countries appear in one ranking only (Germany, India, Republic of Korea), all of them placed last or almost last. On the other hand, even if there is a greater degree of variation for the bottom 10 spots (only Sierra Leone appears in the bottom 10 for all three indexes), these belong mostly to countries in Africa or Southeast Asia. Also, it is interesting to note that, even though Mexico's ranking varies somewhat from index to index (especially in the case of the *Open Government Index*), its level of openness is typically at around 50%.

As to Mexican indexes of transparency, most of them have a solid, elaborate methodology to provide an outline on the status of transparency in Mexico. It is important to note that, even if the methodology for CIMTRA's indexes for municipalities, territorial demarcations and states is not as solid as IMCO's or CIDE's, they do try to get citizens involved in

measurements and evaluations, which adds a citizen's perspective on transparency that other measurements lack—mainly because of their academic profile.

Despite these strengths, some of the methodologies do not allow for solid, reliable assessments of the status of transparency or open government (such as Sandoval's measure for online transparency or Bertot, McDermott and Smith's *Measurement of Open Governmetn: Metrics and Processes*). In addition, since there is no consensus on the meaning of "open government", every methodology identifies different components and they all use a wide variety of indicators. Also, measurements have for the most part been developed with an emphasis on national or central governments. As noted above, only a few indexes look at local governments. In any case, none of these measurements focuses on proactive transparency, as they rather look at the level of compliance with legal requirements.[46]

[46] The only index that looks into a proactive component is Bertot, McDermott and Smith's *Measurement of Open Government: Metrics and Processes*. The authors measure the level to which 30 federal US agencies have incorporated elements from the *Open Government Directive* (OGD), and award extra credit to agencies whose plans exceed the minimum requirements (See Index number 20 above).

IV. CONCLUSIONS

The analysis of various different national and international measurements for transparency and open government suggests that, for the most part, they examine: a) the degree of government transparency, b) datasets per the *Open Definition* and the *G8 Charter*; c) some component of citizen participation; d) the strength of access to information legal frameworks, or e) expert and citizen perceptions on the level of government transparency or openness. In any case, they tend to focus on the presence or absence of central components for these concepts and, to a lesser extent, on the impact of open government or on data releases. That is the case of the *Open Data Barometer*, whose third subindex measures the political, social, and economic impact of open data based on expert opinions.

Measurements of open data and open government have been centered around central governments (as opposed to state or municipal governments). Both the *Global Open Data Index* and the *Open Data Barometer* analyze datasets whose publication depends, for the most part, on the national government of each country considered. Even the *Open Government Index*—where some questions are devoted to local governments—only produce country-level scores.[47] This index's assessment of open government and data publication is based on the most important cities in every country considered.[48]

As to transparency, measurements tend to focus on the supply side and not on the demand for information (CIDE´s *Metric de la Transparencia* could be an exception to this trend, since one of its dimensions simulates the experience of users in order to assess the quality of state-citizen interactions as well as the quality of information request responses). In addition, none of the indexes considered above looks into proactive transparency; instead, they focus on the basic standards of transparency set by legislation or the levels of reactive transparency by institutions with transparency obligations.

This analysis therefore clearly demonstrates that, on one hand, there are various attempts at measuring and evaluating progress in open government across a wide variety of countries

[47] Country data for the *Open Data Barometer* come from surveys in the three main cities.

[48] During the *Open Government Partnership Global Summit 2015* in Mexico City, Alejandro Ponce from the World Justice Project (which measures the *Open Government Index*) announced their intention to measure local levels of open government starting next year in Mexico. This would be the first attempt at measuring open government at lower levels of government (although still based on perceptions).

and through a great diversity of methodologies and sources. On the other hand, it shows the lack of elaborate measurements that incorporate all the dimensions of open government and can be applied to a wider array of units of analysis (as opposed to national governments only).