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The elements under analysis are holding back elements; however, the actors have also shown adaptation to this situation, providing insight on resilience to change (both positive and negative). This is explained by the fact that actors’ objectives are multiple and though some are constraints, others are advanced (i.e. population has concerns beyond water supply, such as public lighting, streets improvements, public spaces, etc. and authorities meet most of these demands, reducing the pressure of inhabitants complaints). All pesos figures shall be multiplied by 13.51 (2009 average exchange rate MXN – USD). The project is called Water Supply Project for Santa Catarina and San Lorenzo, two territories of the Iztapalapa Borough. No data is available at territory level, but at colonia (area) or borough level. The lowest administrative structure at which data are available is the borough, and the most recent source is the national population census conducted in 2010. At the time of writing the article, data was not available at borough level, but it can be updated. The most relevant fact is that the project developed by SACM estimated 800 000 beneficiaries.

The 1997 and 2001 references correspond to articles explaining the methodology 'stakeholder analysis', which is still replicated by current research. 158 interviews were conducted: 11 to water utility staff, 3 to financers, 4 to enterprises staff, 2 to authorities, 3 to academia, 83 to users and 52 to community members. Interviews were semi structured following the main question: What are your (or your organisation’s) objectives and constraints (in general and in the matter of water)? Except for users and communities, actors provided information beyond the SCWSP level, sometimes at the borough, federal district and national level; generalisations are inferred from actors’ generalisations.

The results show conclusions from the data analysis, but supportive statements from the interviews and content analysis could be incorporated in an appendix. Research was conducted ex-post, providing a comparison between SACM’s ex ante evaluation and what was found with the research.

Those responsible of improving water supply (according to the formal institutional framework) shift the responsibility to each other, while users facing multiple objectives and constraints show conformism when some of them are met. This shows a problem of democracy and citizenship. Further research is needed on the matter of the channels available to users for the execution of their right to water.