



Mexico City, May 27, 2026.

OPINE WARNS OF RISKS TO ELECTORAL INTEGRITY FROM NEW REFORMS

- In the context of the extraordinary session period convened by the Permanent Commission, the Observatory reiterated that, under the standard of electoral integrity, the reform proposals being discussed in Congress do not represent a democratic strengthening.

The Permanent Observatory of Electoral Integrity (OPINE) expressed its concern over the accelerated discussion of three legal initiatives of profound significance which, under the argument of strengthening democracy, could weaken the institutional design and the constitutional principles that uphold electoral integrity in our country.

In the report "The risks to electoral integrity posed by the new electoral reforms," OPINE stated that, although each initiative identifies a real and documented problem, the proposed solutions generate operational and structural effects that outweigh the benefits they seek to achieve. Processing reforms of this magnitude with extreme haste means sacrificing the certainty, objectivity, and independence of the electoral arbiter.

Regarding the implications of the **proposed constitutional reform to the Federal Judiciary**, the report notes that the presidential initiative addresses a real logistical urgency by postponing the judicial election day to June 4, 2028. However, the proposed design underscores structural flaws and addresses only the immediate situation, leaving untouched the operational problems arising from the electoral concurrences already scheduled for 2030, 2033, and subsequent years.

OPINE warned that the initiative does not review the current low professional eligibility requirements (five years since obtaining a law degree), nor does it resolve the imbalance between judicial and electoral geography, both essential to guaranteeing the equality of the vote. Furthermore, it cautioned against an impact on judicial independence by granting the Judicial Discipline Tribunal a shared authority to provide training to judges.

Concerning the **proposal to create a Commission for the Verification of Candidate Integrity**, OPINE shared the urgency of establishing mechanisms to prevent the infiltration of organized crime into electoral processes. However, the Observatory noted that the initiative transfers to the electoral arbiter public security and intelligence functions for which it possesses neither the design, the constitutional mandate, nor the corresponding installed capacities: an incompatibility of functions and a cost to legitimacy.

"By having the National Electoral Institute (INE) operate as a receiving and transmitting



window for information generated by federal agencies, an asymmetry is created in which the electoral arbiter will absorb the reputational cost before public scrutiny for failures, omissions, or methodological deficiencies beyond its direct control," it emphasized.

In that same vein, in reviewing the **reform initiative on the annulment of elections due to foreign intervention**, the organizations that comprise OPiNe pointed out that the invalidation of a presidential or federal election represents the most severe constitutional sanction, which is why doctrine and jurisprudence require strict criteria of full evidentiary proof, gravity, systematicity, and quantitative determinacy. It warned that the wording proposed for Article 41 of the Constitution introduces an extremely lax and ambiguous standard.

It further stated that this regulatory laxity takes on critical dimensions when combined with the future design of the Electoral Tribunal of the Federal Judiciary (TEPJF), whose magistrates will be elected by popular vote starting in 2028 under rules that preserve organizational advantages for the ruling party, facilitating the discretionary and political use of annulment declarations.

Following the review and analysis of these three reforms, the Permanent Observatory of Electoral Integrity reiterated that, under the standard of electoral integrity, the reform proposals do not represent a democratic strengthening. On the contrary, they constitute an inconvenient reassignment of public capacities that centralizes political controls and undermines the administrative autonomy of the electoral arbiter.