

# Methodology



The WJP Open Government Index™ is a measure of the openness of government in 102 countries. The Open Government Index is composed of four dimensions: publicized laws and government data, right to information, civic participation, and complaint mechanisms. In order to establish the extent to which a government is transparent, accessible, participatory, collaborative, and responsive, the WJP Open Government Index draws from general population and expert surveys collected for the WJP Rule of Law Index that capture the experiences and perceptions of ordinary citizens.

## The World Justice Project Open Government Dimensions

The following section presents a summary of the concepts underlying the four dimensions highlighted in the WJP Open Government Index.

- **Publicized laws and government data**

The first dimension of the WJP Open Government Index 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. This dimension also measures the quality and accessibility of information published by the government in print or online (i.e. 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.

- **Right to information**

The second dimension measures whether requests for information held by a government agency are granted (assuming the information is a public record). It also measures whether these requests are granted 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. This dimension 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.

- **Civic participation**

The third 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.

- **Complaint mechanisms**

The fourth 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.

## Data Sources

The WJP Open Government Index scores and rankings are based on answers drawn from a General Population Poll (GPP) and a series of Qualified Respondent's Questionnaires (QRQs) collected for the WJP Rule of Law Index.

The GPP surveys provide firsthand information on the experiences and perceptions of randomly selected ordinary people in each of the 102 countries regarding a range of pertinent rule of law information, such as their dealings with the government, the ease of interacting with state bureaucracy, the extent of bribery and corruption, the availability of dispute resolution systems, and the prevalence of common crimes to which they are exposed. A subset of these GPP survey questions - which contain information on the perceptions and experiences of ordinary people regarding their access to government information, the extent of their participation in local government, and the quality of mechanisms provided to make complaints - are used to compute scores of the WJP Open Government Index. For example, whether citizens can access agency budgets without paying an official fee, or whether community members are allowed to gather to present their needs to congressional officers. The subset includes 47 perception-based questions and 10 experience-based questions. The GPP also includes socio-demographic information of all respondents. Table 1 on page 33 lists the city coverage and polling methodology for each country included in the Index.

The Qualified Respondents' Questionnaires (QRQs) complement the polling data with assessments from in-country professionals with expertise in civil and commercial law, criminal law, labor law, and public health, all of which are reflected in specific Index questions. These questionnaires gather timely input from local experts and practitioners who frequently interact with state institutions and their accountability mechanisms. The questionnaires contain closed-ended perception questions and several hypothetical scenarios with highly detailed factual assumptions aimed at ensuring comparability across countries. Questionnaire respondents are selected from directories of law firms, universities and colleges, research organizations, and non-governmental organizations (NGOs). They are also contacted through referrals from the WJP global network of practitioners and vetted by WJP staff based on their expertise. The expert surveys are administered in three languages. The QRQ data for this report includes a total of 2,500 surveys, which

represents an average of 23 respondents per country. These data were collected from October 2014 through January 2015.

## Data Cleaning and Score Computation

Once collected, the data are carefully processed to arrive at country-level scores. As a first step, the respondent-level data are edited to exclude partially-completed surveys, suspicious data, and outliers (which are detected using a Z-score method). Individual answers are then mapped to the four components of the Index (or to the intermediate categories that make up them), codified so that all values fall between 0 (least open government) and 1 (most open government), and aggregated at the country level using the simple (or un-weighted) average of all respondents. To allow for aggregation, the resulting scores are normalized using the Min-Max method. These normalized scores are then successfully aggregated from the variable level all the way up to the factor level to produce the final country scores and rankings. In most cases, the GPP and QRQ data are equally weighted in the calculation of the scores of the intermediate categories or sub-dimensions. This formulation is sometimes adjusted in cases where one data source is better suited to the measurement of a particular concept. The exact survey questions, weights, and formulas used to calculate the sub-dimensions, dimensions and the Open Government Index are presented in the "Variables Used to Construct the Open Government Index" table that follows.

## Data Validation

As a final step, data are validated and crosschecked against qualitative and quantitative third-party sources to provide an additional layer of analysis and to identify possible mistakes or inconsistencies within the data.

## Strengths and Limitations

The Open Government Index methodology displays both strengths and limitations. Among its strengths is the inclusion of both expert and household surveys to ensure that the findings reflect the conditions actually experienced by the population. Another strength is that it approaches the measurement of open government from various angles by triangulating information across data sources and types of questions. This approach enables accounting for different perspectives on open government, and helps to reduce possible bias that might be introduced by any one particular data collection

method. The Index methodology also has some limitations. First, the data shed light on open government dimensions that appear comparatively strong or weak, but are not specific enough to establish causation. Second, the GPP is administered only in three major urban areas in each of the indexed countries. Third, given the rapid changes occurring in certain countries, scores for some countries may be sensitive to the specific points in time when the data were collected. Fourth, the QRQ data may be subject to problems of measurement error due to the limited number of experts in some countries, resulting in less precise estimates. To address this, the WJP works is piloting improvements to the methodology and continues to expand its network of in-country academic and practitioner experts in all countries.

### **Constructing the Open Government Index**

A more detailed description of the variables used to calculate the WJP Open Government Index is featured in Table 2: Constructing the Open Government Index.

# City Coverage and Polling Methodology

Country/Territory	Cities Covered	Polling Company	Methodology	Sample	Year
Afghanistan	Kabul, Kandahar, Herat	ACSOR Surveys, a subsidiary of D# Systems, Inc.	Face-to-face	1000	2014
Albania	Tirana, Durres, Shkodra	Market Research & Polls - EURASIA (MRP-EUR-ASIA)	Face-to-face	1000	2013
Argentina	Buenos Aires, Cordoba, Rosario	Statmark Group	Face-to-face	1000	2013
Australia	Sydney, Melbourne, Brisbane	Survey Sampling International	Online	1000	2013
Austria	Vienna, Graz, Linz	Survey Sampling International	Online	1008	2014
Bangladesh	Dhaka, Chittagong, Khulna	Org-Quest Research	Face-to-face	1000	2013
Belarus	Minsk, Gomel, Mogilev	Market Research & Polls - EURASIA (MRP-EUR-ASIA)	Face-to-face	1000	2014
Belgium	Antwerp, Ghent, Charleroi	Survey Sampling International	Online	1000	2013
Belize	Belize City, San Ignacio, Belmopan	CID-Gallup Latin America	Face-to-face	1020	2014
Bolivia	La Paz, Santa Cruz, Cochabamba	Prime Consulting	Face-to-face	1201	2013
Bosnia and Herzegovina	Sarajevo, Tuzla, Banja Luka	Market Research & Polls - EURASIA (MRP-EUR-ASIA)	Face-to-face	1000	2014
Botswana	Gaborone, Francistown, Molepolole	SIS International Research	Face-to-face	1045	2012
Brazil	Porto Alegre, Recife, Sao Paulo	IBOPE Market Research	Face-to-face	1000	2014
Bulgaria	Sofia, Plovdiv, Varna	Alpha Research	Face-to-face	1027	2013
Burkina Faso	Ouagadougou, Bobo Dioulasso, Dédougou	TNS-RMS	Face-to-face	1000	2014
Cambodia	Phnom Penh, Battambang, Kampong Cham	Indochina Research	Face-to-face	1000	2014
Cameroon	Douala, Yaounde, Bamenda	Liaison Marketing	Face-to-face	997	2013
Canada	Toronto, Montreal, Vancouver	Survey Sampling International	Online	920	2014
Chile	Santiago, Valparaiso, Concepcion	D3 Systems	Face-to-face	1000	2014
China	Shanghai, Beijing, Guangzhou	IBI Partners	Face-to-face	1002	2013
Colombia	Bogota, Medellin, Baranquilla	Statmark Group	Face-to-face	1017	2013
Costa Rica	San Jose, Alajuela, Cartago	CID-Gallup Latin America	Face-to-face	1020	2014
Cote d'Ivoire	Abidjan, San Pedro, Bouake	TNS-RMS	Face-to-face	1000	2014
Croatia	Zagreb, Split, Rijeka	Market Research & Polls - EURASIA (MRP-EURASIA)	Face-to-face	1000	2013
Czech Republic	Prague, Brno, Ostrava	Survey Sampling International	Online	997	2014
Denmark	Copenhagen, Aarhus, Odense	SIS International Research	Online	1050	2014
Dominican Republic	Santo Domingo, Distrito Nacional, Santiago	CID-Gallup Latin America	Face-to-face	1000	2013
Ecuador	Quito, Guayaquil, Cuenca	Statmark Group	Face-to-face	1000	2014
Egypt	Cairo, Alexandria, Giza	D3 Systems, Inc./WJP in collaboration with local partner	Face-to-face	300/ 1000	2014/ 2012
El Salvador	San Salvador, San Miguel, Santa Ana	CID-Gallup Latin America	Face-to-face	1009	2013
Estonia	Tallinn, Tartu, Narva	Norstat	Online	800	2014
Ethiopia	Addis Ababa	Infinite Insight	Face-to-face	570	2014
Finland	Helsinki, Espoo, Tampere	SIS International Research	Online	1050	2014
France	Paris, Lyon, Marseille	Survey Sampling International	Online	1001	2013
Georgia	Tbilisi, Kutaisi, Batumi	ACT	Face-to-face	1000	2014
Germany	Berlin, Hamburg, Munich	Survey Sampling International	Online	1000	2013
Ghana	Accra, Kumasi, Sekondi-Takoradi	FACTS International Ghana Limited	Face-to-face	1005	2013
Greece	Athens, Tesseloniki, Patras	Survey Sampling International	Online	1000	2014
Guatemala	Guatemala City, Quetzaltenango, Escuintla	CID-Gallup Latin America	Face-to-face	1026	2013
Honduras	Tegucigalpa, San Pedro Sula, La Ceiba	CID-Gallup Latin America	Face-to-face	1020	2014

Country/Territory	Cities Covered	Polling Company	Methodology	Sample	Year
Hong Kong SAR, China	Hong Kong	IBI Partners	Face-to-face	1010	2014
Hungary	Budapest, Debrecen, Szeged	Market Research & Polls - EURASIA (MRP-EUR-ASIA)	Face-to-face	1000	2014
India	Mumbai, Delhi, Bangalore	Ipsos Public Affairs	Face-to-face	1047	2013
Indonesia	Jakarta, Surabaya, Bandung	MRI-Marketing Research Indonesia	Face-to-face	1011	2014
Iran	Teheran, Mashad, Isfahan	WJP in collaboration with local partner	Face-to-face	1045	2013
Italy	Rome, Milan, Naples	Survey Sampling International	Online	1000	2014
Jamaica	Kingston, Portmore, Spanish Town	Statmark Group	Face-to-face	1000	2011
Japan	Tokyo, Yokohama, Osaka	IBI Partners	Face-to-face	1002	2013
Jordan	Amman, Irbid, Zarqa	WJP in collaboration with local partner	Face-to-face	1004	2013
Kazakhstan	Almaty, Astana, Shymkent	VCIOM	Face-to-face	1002	2013
Kenya	Nairobi, Mombasa, Nakuru	TNS-RMS	Face-to-face	1003	2013
Kyrgyzstan	Bishkek, Osh, Jalalabad	VCIOM	Face-to-face	1000	2013
Lebanon	Beirut, Tripoli, Sidon	IIACSS	Face-to-face	1003	2014
Liberia	Monrovia, Kakata, Gbarnga	FACTS International Ghana Limited	Face-to-face	1000	2013
Macedonia, FYR	Skopje, Kumanovo, Bitola	Market Research & Polls - EURASIA (MRP-EUR-ASIA)	Face-to-face	1000	2014
Madagascar	Antananarivo, Antsirabe, Toamasina	DCDM Research	Face-to-face	1000	2014
Malawi	Blantyre, Lilongwe, Mzuzu	Consumer Options Ltd.	Face-to-face	997	2014
Malaysia	Kuala Lumpur, Johor Bahru, Ipoh	IBI Partners	Face-to-face	1011	2014
Mexico	Mexico City, Guadalajara, Monterrey	Data Opinion Publica y Mercados	Face-to-face	1005	2014
Moldova	Chisinau, Balti, Cahul	Market Research & Polls - EURASIA (MRP-EUR-ASIA)	Face-to-face	1000	2014
Mongolia	Ulaanbaatar, Darkhan, Erdenet	Sant Maral	Face-to-face	1000	2014
Morocco	Casablanca, Rabat, Marrakesh	Ipsos Public Affairs	Face-to-face	1000	2013
Myanmar	Mandalay, Naypyidaw, Yangon	IBI Partners	Face-to-face	1004	2013
Nepal	Kathmandu, Pokhara, Biratnagar	Solutions Consultant	Face-to-face	1000	2014
Netherlands	Amsterdam, Rotterdam, The Hague	Survey Sampling International	Online	1000	2013
New Zealand	Auckland, Wellington, Canterbury	IBI Partners	Telephone	1003	2014
Nicaragua	Managua, Masaya, Leon	CID-Gallup Latin America	Face-to-face	1020	2014
Nigeria	Lagos, Oyo, Kano	Marketing Support Consultancy	Face-to-face	1048	2013
Norway	Oslo, Bergen, Trondheim	SIS International Research	Online	1050	2014
Pakistan	Karachi, Lahore, Faisalabad	Gallup Pakistan	Face-to-face	2007	2014
Panama	Panama City, San Miguelito, David	CID-Gallup Latin America	Face-to-face	1020	2014
Peru	Lima, Trujillo, Arequipa	Prime Consulting	Face-to-face	1231	2013
Philippines	Manila, Davao, Cebu	IBI Partners	Face-to-face	1000	2013
Poland	Warsaw, Lodz, Cracow	Market Research & Polls - EURASIA (MRP-EUR-ASIA)	Face-to-face	1000	2013
Portugal	Lisbon, Villa Nova de Gaia, Sintra	Survey Sampling International	Online	1001	2014
Republic of Korea	Seoul, Busan, Incheon	IBI Partners	Face-to-face	1004	2013
Romania	Bucharest, Cluj-Napoco, Timisoara	Market Research & Polls - EURASIA (MRP-EUR-ASIA)	Face-to-face	1000	2013
Russia	Moscow, Saint Petersburg, Novosibirsk	VCIOM	Face-to-face	1000	2013
Senegal	Dakar, Thies, Saint-Louis	Liaison Marketing	Face-to-face	1001	2014
Serbia	Belgrade, Novi Sad, Nis	Market Research & Polls - EURASIA (MRP-EUR-ASIA)	Face-to-face	1000	2014

Country/Territory	Cities Covered	Polling Company	Methodology	Sample	Year
Sierra Leone	Freetown, Kenema, Makeni	TNS-RMS Cameroun Ltd.	Face-to-face	1005	2012
Singapore	Singapore	Survey Sampling International	Online	1000	2014
Slovenia	Ljubljana, Maribor, Oelje	Market Research & Polls - EURASIA (MRP-EUR-ASIA)	Face-to-face	1000	2014
South Africa	Johannesburg, Cape Town, Durban	Quest Research Services	Face-to-face	1000	2013
Spain	Madrid, Barcelona, Valencia	Survey Sampling International	Online	1000	2013
Sri Lanka	Colombo, Negombo, Kandy	PepperCube Consultants	Face-to-face	1030	2014
Sweden	Stockholm, Gothenburg, Malmo	Survey Sampling International	Online	1000	2013
Tanzania	Dar es Salaam, Mwanza, Shinyanga	Consumer Options Ltd.	Face-to-face	1000	2012
Thailand	Bangkok, Nonthaburi, Pak Kret	IBI Partners	Face-to-face	1008	2013
Tunisia	Tunis, Sfax, Sousse	BJKA Consulting (BJ Group)	Face-to-face	1000	2014
Turkey	Istanbul, Ankara, Izmir	TNS Turkey	Face-to-face	1003	2013
Uganda	Kampala, Mbale, Mbarara	TNS-RMS	Face-to-face	1002	2013
Ukraine	Kiev, Kharkiv, Odesa	Market Research & Polls - EURASIA (MRP-EUR-ASIA)	Face-to-face	1000	2014
United Arab Emirates	Dubai, Sharjah, Abu-Dhabi	Dolfin Market Research & Consultancy (DolfinX)	Face-to-face	1610	2014
United Kingdom	London, Birmingham, Glasgow	Survey Sampling International	Online	1000	2013
United States	New York, Los Angeles, Chicago	Survey Sampling International	Online	1002	2014
Uruguay	Montevideo, Salto, Paysandu	Statmark Group	Telephone	1000	2012
Uzbekistan	Tashkent, Samarkand, Fergana	Market Research & Polls - EURASIA (MRP-EUR-ASIA)	Face-to-face	1000	2014
Venezuela	Caracas, Maracaibo, Barquisimeto	WJP in collaboration with local partner	Face-to-face	1000	2013
Vietnam	Hanoi, Haiphong, Ho Chi Minh City	Indochina Research	Face-to-face	1000	2014
Zambia	Lusaka, Ndola, Kitwe	Quest Research Services	Face-to-face	1000	2014
Zimbabwe	Harare, Bulawayo, Chitungwiza	SIS International Research	Face-to-face	1005	2012

# Variables Used to Construct the Open Government Index

This table lists the individual variables used to construct the dimensions of the WJP Open Government Index. The table consists of four columns. The first column lists the variable's identification number. The second column lists the individual questionnaires in which a variable was included. For variables included in the Qualified Respondent Questionnaires (QRQ) the following abbreviations are used: CC for the Civil and Commercial Law questionnaire, CJ for the Criminal Law questionnaire, LB for the Labor Law questionnaire, and PH for the Public Health questionnaire. The third column lists the qualitative and quantitative scales for each variable. The fourth column states the survey text of the variable. The formulas used to calculate the sub-dimensions, dimensions and the WJP Open Government Index are presented next to each composite indicator.

Open Government Index   AVERAGE(1, 2, 3, 4)			
1 Publicized laws and government data   AVERAGE(1.1, 1.2)			
1.1 Information in plain language and in all official languages   AVERAGE(GPP1,AVERAGE(GPP2:QRQ1),AVERAGE(GPP3:QRQ2),QRQ3)			
<b>GPP1</b>	GPP	Very Well (1), Fairly Well (.667), Fairly Badly (.333), Very Badly (0)	Could you please tell us how well or badly you think your local government is performing in the following procedures? Providing information in plain language about people's legal rights, so that everybody can understand them?
<b>GPP2</b>	GPP	Strongly Agree (1), Agree (.667), Disagree (.333), Strongly Disagree (0)	In practice, the basic laws of [COUNTRY] are explained in plain language, so that people can understand them.
<b>QRQ1</b>	QRQ (CC, CJ, LB, PH)	Almost Always (1), In Most Cases (.667), In Some Cases (.333), Almost Never (0)	In practice, the local government provides easy-to-understand information on people's legal rights (criminal suspects' rights; workers' basic rights; public health issues).
<b>GPP3</b>	GPP	Strongly Agree (1), Agree (.667), Disagree (.333), Strongly Disagree (0)	In practice, the basic laws of [COUNTRY] are available in all official languages
<b>QRQ2</b>	QRQ (CC, CJ, LB, PH)	Almost Always (1), In Most Cases (.667), In Some Cases (.333), Almost Never (0)	The basic laws are publicly available in all official languages.
<b>QRQ3</b>	QRQ (CC, CJ, LB, PH)	Almost Always (1), In Most Cases (.667), In Some Cases (.333), Almost Never (0)	In practice, the government strives to make the laws accessible in languages spoken by significant segments of the population, even if they are not "official" language.
1.2 Publicized laws and government data   AVERAGE(GPP4:QRQ8)			
<b>GPP4</b>	GPP	Very Well (1), Fairly Well (.667), Fairly Badly (.333), Very Badly (0)	Could you please tell us how well or badly you think your local government is performing in the following procedures? Providing citizens information about the government expenditures?

<b>GPP5</b>	GPP	Very good (1), Good (2), Bad (3), Very bad (4)	How would you rate the information published by the government in print or on the web in terms of quality of the information?
<b>GPP6</b>	GPP	Very good (1), Good (2), Bad (3), Very bad (4)	How would you rate the information published by the government in print or on the web in terms of quantity of the information?
<b>GPP7</b>	GPP	Very good (1), Good (2), Bad (3), Very bad (4)	How would you rate the information published by the government in print or on the web in terms of accessibility of the information?
<b>GPP8</b>	GPP	Very good (1), Good (2), Bad (3), Very bad (4)	How would you rate the information published by the government in print or on the web in terms of reliability of the information?
<b>GPP9</b>	GPP	Very good (1), Good (2), Bad (3), Very bad (4)	How would you rate the information published by the government in print or on the web in terms of format of the information?
<b>QRQ4</b>	QRQ (CC, CJ, LB, PH)	Almost Always (1), In Most Cases (.667), In Some Cases (.333), Almost Never (0)	In practice, national regulations are published on a timely basis (i.e. within the timelines mandated by the applicable law or regulation).
<b>QRQ5</b>	QRQ (CC, CJ, LB, PH)	Almost Always (1), In Most Cases (.667), In Some Cases (.333), Almost Never (0)	In practice, administrative regulations can be obtained at little cost, such as by mail, or online.
<b>QRQ6</b>	QRQ (CC, CJ, LB, PH)	Almost Always (1), In Most Cases (.667), In Some Cases (.333), Almost Never (0)	In practice, judicial decisions of the highest court are published on a timely basis.
<b>QRQ7</b>	QRQ(CC)	Almost Always (1), In Most Cases (.667), In Some Cases (.333), Almost Never (0)	In practice, drafts of legislation (bills) to be discussed in the legislative body are made available to the public on a timely basis.
<b>QRQ8</b>	QRQ(CC)	Almost Always (1), In Most Cases (.667), In Some Cases (.333), Almost Never (0)	In practice, legislative proceedings (e.g. bills submitted or presented before the legislature for consideration or approval) are broadcast to the public by radio or TV.
<b>2 Right to Information   AVERAGE (2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, 2.5, 2.6)</b>			
2.1 Awareness of right to information   AVERAGE(GPP10:GPP11)			
<b>GPP10</b>	GPP	Yes (1), No (0)	Are you aware of any laws that are intended to provide individuals with the right to access information held by government agencies?
<b>GPP11</b>	GPP	Yes (1), No (0)	Have you not requested information from a government agency because you did not know you can ask the government for information?
2.2 Information requests - responsiveness   AVERAGE(GPP12:QRQ10)			
<b>GPP12</b>	GPP	Yes (1), No (0)	Did you receive the information from the official or government agency from which you requested it?
<b>GPP13</b>	GPP	Yes (1), No (0)	Were you satisfied with the reasons given for not granting the information that you requested?
<b>GPP14</b>	GPP	Very satisfied (1), satisfied (.667), dissatisfied (.333), very dissatisfied (0)	How satisfied were you with the process of requesting the information?
<b>GPP15</b>	GPP	Yes (1), No (0)	Have you not requested information from a government agency because you didn't think the government would give it to you?
<b>GPP16</b>	GPP	Very Likely (1), Likely (.667), Unlikely (.333), Very Unlikely (0)	If you could request to have access to information held by a government agency, how likely do you think it is that the agency will grant it, assuming the information is both public and properly requested?
<b>QRQ9</b>	QRQ(CC)	Very Likely (1), Likely (.667), Unlikely (.333), Very Unlikely (0)	If the residents request a copy of the project design documentation prior to the initiation of the construction project, how likely are the relevant government authorities to provide them with such a copy?



<b>QRQ10</b>	QRQ(CC)	Very Likely (1), Likely (.667), Unlikely (.333), Very Unlikely (0)	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?
2.3 Information requests - quality   AVERAGE(GPP17:QRQ11)			
<b>GPP17</b>	GPP	Pertinent and Complete (1), Incomplete (.667), Vague/unclear (.333), evasive/doubtful (0)	In terms of the specifics of the information you requested, would you describe the information that was supplied to you as being:
<b>QRQ11</b>	QRQ(CC)	Very Likely (1), Likely (.667), Unlikely (.333), Very Unlikely (0)	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 information provided is pertinent and complete?
2.4 Information requests - timeliness   AVERAGE(GPP18:QRQ12)			
<b>GPP18</b>	GPP	Less than a week (1), between one week and one month (.75), between one month and three months (.5), between three months and six months (.25), more than six months (0)	Approximately how long did it take to obtain the information that you requested?
<b>QRQ12</b>	QRQ(CC)	Very Likely (1), Likely (.667), Unlikely (.333), Very Unlikely (0)	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 will grant such information within a reasonable time period?
2.5 Information requests - affordability and trust   AVERAGE(GPP19:QRQ14)			
<b>GPP19</b>	GPP	Open response	If you had to pay a fee to the official to obtain the information, what was the amount of that fee?
<b>GPP20</b>	GPP	Yes (1), No (0)	Did you have to pay a bribe (or money above that required by law) in order to obtain the information?
<b>GPP21</b>	GPP	Yes (1), No (0)	Have you not requested information from a government agency because you don't trust the government as a source for this type of information?
<b>QRQ13</b>	QRQ(CC)	Very Likely (1), Likely (.667), Unlikely (.333), Very Unlikely (0)	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 will grant such information at a reasonable cost?
<b>QRQ14</b>	QRQ(CC)	Very Likely (1), Likely (.667), Unlikely (.333), Very Unlikely (0)	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 will grant such information without having to pay a bribe?
2.6 Information requests - general accessibility of information   AVERAGE(QRQ15:QRQ22)			
<b>QRQ15</b>	QRQ (CC, CJ, LB, PH)	Very accessible (1), slightly accessible (.5), not accessible at all (0)	How accessible are budget figures of government agencies in your country?
<b>QRQ16</b>	QRQ (CC, CJ, LB, PH)	Very accessible (1), slightly accessible (.5), not accessible at all (0)	How accessible are copies of government contracts in your country?
<b>QRQ17</b>	QRQ (CC, CJ, LB, PH)	Very accessible (1), slightly accessible (.5), not accessible at all (0)	How accessible are sources of campaign financing of elected officials and legislators in your country?
<b>QRQ18</b>	QRQ (CC, CJ, LB, PH)	Very accessible (1), slightly accessible (.5), not accessible at all (0)	How accessible are disclosure records of senior government officials in your country?
<b>QRQ19</b>	QRQ (CC, CJ, LB, PH)	Very accessible (1), slightly accessible (.5), not accessible at all (0)	How accessible are reports of the national human rights institution in your country?
<b>QRQ20</b>	QRQ (CC, CJ, LB, PH)	Very accessible (1), slightly accessible (.5), not accessible at all (0)	How accessible are copies of administrative decisions made by national government agencies in your country?
<b>QRQ21</b>	QRQ (CC, CJ, LB, PH)	Very accessible (1), slightly accessible (.5), not accessible at all (0)	How accessible are copies of administrative decisions made by local government agencies in your country?

<b>QRQ22</b>	QRQ (CC, CJ, LB, PH)	Very accessible (1), slightly accessible (.5), not accessible at all (0)	How accessible are transcripts of administrative proceedings in your country?
<b>3 Civic participation   AVERAGE (3.1, 3.2)</b>			
3.1 Freedom of opinion and expression is effectively guaranteed   AVERAGE(QRQ23, QRQ24, GPP22)			
3.1 A People are free to express political opinions alone or in peaceful association with others   AVERAGE(AVERAGE(QRQ23:QRQ24),GPP22)			
<b>QRQ23</b>	QRQ (CC, CJ, LB, PH)	Very Likely (0), Likely (.333), Unlikely (.667), Very Unlikely (1)	How likely is a citizen to be beaten by the police, without justification, for participating in a non-violent public demonstration in [COUNTRY]?
<b>QRQ24</b>	QRQ (CC, CJ, LB, PH)	Strongly Agree (1), Agree (.667), Disagree (.333), Strongly Disagree (0)	In practice, people in [COUNTRY] can freely hold public non-violent demonstrations without fear of reprisal.
<b>GPP22</b>	GPP	Strongly Agree (1), Agree (.667), Disagree (.333), Strongly Disagree (0)	In [COUNTRY], people can freely express opinions against the government.
3.1 B Freedom of the media is respected   AVERAGE(AVERAGE(QRQ25:QRQ29),AVERAGE(GPP23:GPP24))			
<b>QRQ25</b>	QRQ (CC, CJ, LB, PH)	Strongly Agree (1), Agree (.667), Disagree (.333), Strongly Disagree (0)	In practice, the media (TV, radio, newspapers) in [COUNTRY] can freely expose cases of corruption by high-ranking government officers without fear of retaliation.
<b>QRQ26</b>	QRQ (CC, CJ, LB, PH)	Strongly Agree (1), Agree (.667), Disagree (.333), Strongly Disagree (0)	In practice, the media (TV, radio, newspapers) in [COUNTRY] can freely express opinions against government policies without fear of retaliation.
<b>QRQ27</b>	QRQ (CC, CJ, LB, PH)	Very Likely (0), Likely (.333), Unlikely (.667), Very Unlikely (1)	How likely is a journalist to be attacked by the police, without justification, for covering a non-violent public demonstration in [COUNTRY]?
<b>QRQ28</b>	QRQ (CJ)	Very Likely (0), Likely (.333), Unlikely (.667), Very Unlikely (1)	How likely is the newspaper reporter to be threatened, imprisoned, or punished (either through official or unofficial means), either by the police or by the organized criminal organization?
<b>QRQ29</b>	QRQ (CC, CJ, LB, PH)	Strongly Agree (1), Agree (.667), Disagree (.333), Strongly Disagree (0)	In practice in [COUNTRY], the government does not prevent citizens from accessing content published online.
<b>GPP23</b>	GPP	Strongly Agree (1), Agree (.667), Disagree (.333), Strongly Disagree (0)	In [COUNTRY], the media (TV, radio, newspapers) can freely expose cases of corruption by high-ranking government officers without fear of retaliation.
<b>GPP24</b>	GPP	Strongly Agree (1), Agree (.667), Disagree (.333), Strongly Disagree (0)	In [COUNTRY], the media (TV, radio, newspapers) can freely express opinions against government policies and actions without fear of retaliation.
3.1 C Freedom of civil and political organization is respected (NGOs and political parties)   AVERAGE(AVERAGE(QRQ30:GPP25),AVERAGE(QRQ31:GPP26))			
<b>QRQ30</b>	QRQ (CC, CJ, LB, PH)	Strongly Agree (1), Agree (.667), Disagree (.333), Strongly Disagree (0)	In practice, civil society organizations in [COUNTRY] can freely express opinions against government policies and actions without fear of retaliation.
<b>GPP25</b>	GPP	Strongly Agree (1), Agree (.667), Disagree (.333), Strongly Disagree (0)	In [COUNTRY], civil society organizations can freely express opinions against government policies and actions without fear of retaliation.
<b>GPP26</b>	GPP	Strongly Agree (1), Agree (.667), Disagree (.333), Strongly Disagree (0)	In [COUNTRY], political parties can freely express opinions against government policies and actions without fear of retaliation.
<b>QRQ31</b>	QRQ (CC, CJ, LB, PH)	Strongly Agree (1), Agree (.667), Disagree (.333), Strongly Disagree (0)	In practice in [COUNTRY], opposition parties can freely express opinions against government policies without fear of retaliation.
<b>QRQ32</b>	QRQ (CC, CJ, LB, PH)	Strongly Agree (1), Agree (.667), Disagree (.333), Strongly Disagree (0)	In practice, opposing factions within the dominant party can freely express opinions in public without fear of facing substantial negative consequences.
3.2 Freedom of assembly and association is effectively guaranteed   AVERAGE(AVERAGE(QRQ33:QRQ36),AVERAGE(GPP27:GPP29))			
<b>QRQ33</b>	QRQ (CC, CJ, LB, PH)	Strongly Agree (1), Agree (.667), Disagree (.333), Strongly Disagree (0)	In practice, civil society organizations in [COUNTRY] can freely express opinions against government policies and actions without fear of retaliation.
<b>QRQ34</b>	QRQ (CC, CJ, LB, PH)	Strongly Agree (1), Agree (.667), Disagree (.333), Strongly Disagree (0)	In practice, people in [COUNTRY] can freely join together with others to draw attention to an issue or sign a petition.
<b>QRQ35</b>	QRQ (CC, CJ, LB, PH)	Strongly Agree (1), Agree (.667), Disagree (.333), Strongly Disagree (0)	In practice, people can freely join any political organization they want.

<b>QRQ36</b>	QRQ (CC, CJ, LB, PH)	Strongly Agree (1), Agree (.667), Disagree (.333), Strongly Disagree (0)	In practice, people in [COUNTRY] can freely hold public nonviolent demonstrations without fear of reprisal.
<b>GPP27</b>	GPP	Strongly Agree (1), Agree (.667), Disagree (.333), Strongly Disagree (0)	In [COUNTRY], people can freely attend community meetings.
<b>GPP28</b>	GPP	Strongly Agree (1), Agree (.667), Disagree (.333), Strongly Disagree (0)	In [COUNTRY], people can freely join together with others to draw attention to an issue or sign a petition.
<b>GPP29</b>	GPP	Strongly Agree (1), Agree (.667), Disagree (.333), Strongly Disagree (0)	In [COUNTRY], people can freely join any (unforbidden) political organization they want.
<b>3.3 Right to petition and civic engagement   AVERAGE(GPP30:QRQ39)</b>			
<b>GPP30</b>	GPP	Strongly Agree (1), Agree (.667), Disagree (.333), Strongly Disagree (0)	In practice, people in this neighborhood can get together with others and present their concerns to members of Congress.
<b>GPP31</b>	GPP	Strongly Agree (1), Agree (.667), Disagree (.333), Strongly Disagree (0)	In practice, people in this neighborhood can get together with others and present their concerns to local government officials.
<b>GPP32</b>	GPP	Strongly Agree (1), Agree (.667), Disagree (.333), Strongly Disagree (0)	In [COUNTRY], people can freely join together with others to draw attention to an issue or sign a petition.
<b>GPP33</b>	GPP	Very Well (1), Fairly Well (.667), Fairly Badly (.333), Very Badly (0)	When talking to people about their local government, we often find important differences in how well local governments perform their duties. Could you please tell us how well or badly you think your local government (Metropolitan, Municipal, or District administration) is performing in the following procedures? Responding to people's concerns about community matters.
<b>GPP34</b>	GPP	Very Well (1), Fairly Well (.667), Fairly Badly (.333), Very Badly (0)	When talking to people about their local government, we often find important differences in how well local governments perform their duties. Could you please tell us how well or badly you think your local government (Metropolitan, Municipal, or District administration) is performing in the following procedures? Consulting traditional, civil, and community leaders before making decisions.
<b>GPP35</b>	GPP	Yes (1), No (0)	Now, here is a list of actions that people sometimes do. For each of these, please tell me whether you, personally, have done any of these things during the past 12 months? Attend a community meeting.
<b>QRQ37</b>	QRQ (CC)	Very Likely (1), Likely (.667), Unlikely (.333), Very Unlikely (0)	In practice, how likely are local residents to receive sufficient advance notice of the impending construction project?
<b>QRQ38</b>	QRQ (CC)	Very Likely (1), Likely (.667), Unlikely (.333), Very Unlikely (0)	In practice, if a large number of residents file an urgent petition proposing an alternative construction plan before the relevant administrative or judicial authority, how likely is the relevant administrative or judicial authority to suspend the project until the residents' alternative construction plan can be considered?
<b>QRQ39</b>	QRQ (CC)	Strongly Agree (1), Agree (.667), Disagree (.333), Strongly Disagree (0)	In practice, people in [COUNTRY] can get together with others and present their concerns to local government officials
<b>4 Complaint mechanisms   AVERAGE(GPP29:QRQ28)</b>			
<b>GPP36</b>	GPP	Very Well (1), Fairly Well (.667), Fairly Badly (.333), Very Badly (0)	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?
<b>GPP37</b>	GPP	Very Well (1), Fairly Well (.667), Fairly Badly (.333), Very Badly (0)	Could you please tell us how well or badly you think your local government is performing in providing effective ways to handle complaints against local government officials
<b>QRQ40</b>	QRQ(CC)	Very Likely (1), Likely (.667), Unlikely (.333), Very Unlikely (0)	In practice, how likely are the residents to be given the opportunity to present their objections or comments to the relevant government authorities prior to the start of the construction project?
<b>QRQ41</b>	QRQ(CC)	Strongly Agree (1), Agree (.667), Disagree (.333), Strongly Disagree (0)	To what extent do you agree with the following statements: By law, if a government agency denies a citizens' request for information, citizens have the right to challenge this decision before another government agency or a judge
<b>QRQ42</b>	QRQ(CC)	Strongly Agree (1), Agree (.667), Disagree (.333), Strongly Disagree (0)	In practice, if a government agency denies a citizens' request for information, citizens can effectively challenge this decision before another government agency or a judge