Journal of Applied Finance & Banking, vol.4, no.1, 2014, 193-207
ISSN: 1792-6580 (print version), 1792-6599 (online)
Scienpress Ltd, 2014

Factoring as a financial alternative to firms

(Case of study of firms providing services to the Federal Electricity Commission)

Arturo García-Santillán[1*], Elena Moreno-García[2], and Aseneth del Carmen Aguirre Núñez[3]

Abstract

The purpose of this study is to ascertain why the companies providing services from the Southeast Regional Management Production (SRMP) of the Federal Electricity Commission (FEC) do not take advantage of the program for Productive Chains that National Financier (NF) offers to operate financial factoring. A questionnaire was administered to 260 companies in order to identify the knowledge they have on the program, the complexity degree to cover the requirements and the convenience in the discount rates. The results show that these companies do not make use of factoring due to a lack of knowledge on the tool as well as by the amount of requirements to cover.

Keywords: Factoring, liquidity, productive chains
JEL classification numbers: G20, G21, G29

---

[1] Administrative-Economic Research Center at Universidad Cristóbal Colón, Veracruz, México, e-mail: arturogarciasantillan@yahoo.com
* Corresponding Author.
[2] Administrative-Economic Research Center at Universidad Cristóbal Colón, Veracruz, México, e-mail: moreno.garciae12@gmail.com
[3] Southeast Regional Management Production at Comisión Federal de Electricidad, Veracruz, México. e-mail: asenetha@gmail.com

Article Info: *Received* : June 28, 2013. *Revised* : July 30, 2013.
Published online : January 1, 2014.

1 Introduction

The Federal Electricity Commission (FEC) is a company of the Mexican government, which generates, transmits, distributes and sells electricity to more than 35.6 million customers (Comisión Federal de Electricidad- CFE). The company's commitment is to provide excellent services, ensuring high levels of quality in all its processes, at the same level of the best electric companies of the world, bringing it to have the best quality infrastructure, with quality controls, safety and environmental protection.

FEC is supported by national and foreign companies as providers of goods and services and the recruitment procedures were carried out looking for the best conditions, with impartiality, more simplified processes and with greater efficiency and transparency, in order to establish mechanisms that allow them to recognize committed contractors and suppliers which led the company to a contractual relationship without rights prejudices according to the guidelines in the area of procurement, leases, public works and services.

Suppliers of FEC are mostly medium and large companies that must comply with high quality standards, safety and technology and to achieve this, they must keep healthy finances that allow them to respond or engage in new business opportunities. However, sometimes, the FEC's payment mechanism affect their cash flows and risk the compliance of their delivery dates, that is the reason why they should consider strategies that guarantee the liquidity they need in order to operate.

One of the alternatives that exist to ensure the liquidity of these companies is financial factoring. In Mexico, factoring exists since the sixties, with the Walter E. Heller of Mexico Company, that today is a company of General Electric Capital Factoring, but it was not until 1990 when the General Law of Credit Organizations was published and which nowadays regulates its operation.

Currently, the contract of factoring is known as a financing instrument due to its prominent feature to obtain advance payments on invoiced loans, where granted funds do not have a default destination -like leasing-, but by the advance of funds that involves the term (Feng, 2009).

This research will analyze if the financial factoring may encourage cash flow of the providing services companies of the Southeast Regional Management Production (SRMP) of Federal Electricity Commission (FEC). This management is responsible for the generation of electrical power through thermoelectric power plants, hydroelectric, and wind geo electrics which are located in the Southeast of Mexico, in the States of Veracruz, San Luis Potosi, Oaxaca, Chiapas, Campeche, Yucatan, Quintana Roo, Puebla and South Tamaulipas (GRPSE, 2013).

Next is the approach to the problem and the question formulation that guides the research, it also presents the objective of the research and the hypothesis. Then, it describes the methodological design of the work and the statistical procedure to finally expose the results found as well as the conclusions and recommendations.

1.1 Approach to the problem

The institutional financing to the micro, small and medium-sized enterprises (MSME) in Mexico is low, and expensive. In a truncated range to 10%, the upper limit at which the interest rates arrived in 2008 was 25%, which may be considered as representative of the cost of the money for the smallest business. This involves real rates close to 20% and transaction costs too high to deal with the competition (Kato and Huerta, 2002).

National and regional government programs of financial support to small business have been made to reduce financing costs through the issuance of guarantees in credits that private brokers attach to these companies. The incentive funds for MSME have similar characteristics in the entire country regarding the amount of the guaranteed loans, market interest rates, and the collateral guarantees that are given by type of loan. Unfortunately, it also resembles the growing difficulties they face to collect resources because of the budget´s constraints faced by regional governments (Martínez-Tovilla, 2001).

The financial costs of the factoring that charge the private banking groups in Mexico is very high. That is why FEC promotes NF to its suppliers and contractors to access financing schemes, electronic orders and factoring called Productive Chains of National Financier in accordance with the general provisions published by the Official Journal of the Federation that will allow them to have liquidity and fulfill in time and form with the contracts awarded.

FEC through its Finance Direction signed an agreement with NF, which sets out terms and conditions by which payable accounts are incorporated and operated. The purpose of the program of Production Chains that NF has with FEC for its suppliers and contractors is the operation of the financial factoring, a resource that allows them to obtain liquidity on the receivable accounts prior to its maturity, then it is possible for the companies to reinvest the resources and generate more revenues.

The mechanism under which it operates is as follows: NF establishes conventions with the country´s largest companies to discount the unpaid invoices to SMSE. Companies announce by a Web page the different terms invoices that must pay to its suppliers and these are registered with NF to operate the chain. The Internet page reported also the interest rate at which the invoices will be deducted and the SMES choose the bank that offers them greater benefits. The bank immediately loads the discounted amount in the account that SME must open, because Nafin gives a warranty to the company (Garrido, 2005).

Through this program, big companies reduce financial cost of their factoring because NF guarantees full payment of their receivable accounts, does not charge commissions, and charges the lowest interest rate of the market, however, the opacity of the intermediation is maintained and to operate the scheme, these companies need to have a bank account with a credit line to discount the documents and, like small supplier companies, they must accept terms established by intermediaries to administrate these accounts.

Then, if financial factoring encourages cash flow of companies that provide services to the Southeast Regional Management of Production belonging to FEC, why these companies are not making use of this financial modality to obtain resources? With all above mentioned, now we have the next:

1.1. Question research

Why only 30% of the invoices published by Productive Chain´s system of the GRPSE are operating?

1.2. Objective of the study

To know the causes why only 30% of the invoices published by Productive Chain´s system of the GRPSE are operating

1.3. Hypothesis

H1: Companies that provide services to the Southeast Regional Management of Production do not use financial factoring because they are not aware of "Productive Chains".

H2: Companies that provide services to the Southeast Regional Management of Production do not use electronic factoring because of the big amount of requirements.

H3: Companies that provide services to the Southeast Regional Management of Production do not take invoices for factoring because the discount rate is very high.

1.2 Methodological Design

The population of this study includes company's suppliers of goods and services of the Southeast Regional Management of Production of FEC that until 2012 were subscribed to the program of production chains. Also are included in the study those companies which are not part of the program of production chains, with the consent of the supplier or provider of service, conditioning the inclusion of these to the subscription of the program. The exclusion criterion then, is established in the same terms, in an opposite interpretation, this is, goods or services that may not, by its nature, be settled through this program, are excluded.

The information obtained from this population makes possible an analysis for the appropriate tests and to explain the theoretical model of study proposed in this research. The population under study is 800 providers of goods and services and the sample is estimated by the following formula:

$$n = \frac{NZ^2(P)(Q)}{(e)^2(N-1)+(Z)^2(p)(q)}$$

where:

$N =$ Population, $n =$ sample, $e =$ error allowed (0.05), $Z =$ level of reliability (1.96), $P =$ probability of the event (.5), $Q =$ probability against the event (.5)

Therefore:

$$n = \frac{800 \cdot (1.96)^2 \cdot (.5) \cdot (.5)}{(.05)^2 (800-1) + (1.96)^2 \cdot (.5) \cdot (.5)} = \frac{800 \cdot 3.8416 \cdot (.25)}{(0.00255) \cdot 799 + 3.8416 \cdot (.25)}$$

$$= \frac{768.32}{1.9975 + .9604} = \frac{768.32}{2.9579} = 259.75$$

$$n = 260$$

A questionnaire was designed (which is attached as annex) in order to measure the knowledge of the electronic factoring program, the degree of complexity to reach requirements for suppliers and service providers and the discount rate´s convenience. Data collection was obtained by the application of the questionnaire. Participants were selected randomly using a generator random number´s program that allowed the identification of the provider.

1.3 Statistical Procedure

For evaluation and interpretation of the data collected, it follows the statistical procedure of multivariate factorial analysis. To do that, it was established the following criterion: Statistical hypothesis : Ho: ρ=0 there is no correlation Hi: ρ≠0 there is a correlation.

The statistical test is χ^2 and the Barlett´s test of sphericity KMO (Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin), MSA (Measure sample adequacy) for each variable of the model. This statistical is asymptotically distributed with p(p-1)/2 freedom degrees, a significance level: α = 0.01, p<0.01 or <0.05 load factorial of 0.70 ; and loads increased to 0.55

If *Ho* is true, values worth 1 and its logarithm would be zero, therefore the statistical test´s worth zero, otherwise with high values of χ^2 and a low determinant, it would suggest that there is a high correlation, then if the critical value: χ^2 calc > χ^2 tables, there is evidence to reject of *Ho*, so the decision rule is

Criterion: KMO > 0.5 ; MSA >0.5 ; p<0.01 Thus: Decision: Reject: Ho if χ^2 calc > χ^2 tables

In order to measure data obtained from the 260 goods and services providers, it was taken the procedure proposed by García-Santillán *et al* (2012) and obtains the following matrix:

Suppliers	Variables $X_1, X_2, ..., X_p$
1	$X_{11}, X_{12}, ..., X_{1p}$

2	$X_{21}, X_{22}, ..., X_{2p}$
…	…
260	$X_{n1}, X_{n2}, ..., X_{np}$

The above is given by the following equation:

$$X_1 = F_1 a_{11} + F_2 a_{12} + ... + F_k a_{1k} + u_1$$
$$X_2 = F_1 a_{21} + F_2 a_{22} + ... + F_k a_{2k} + u_2$$
$$.$$
$$.$$
$$.$$
$$X_p = F_1 a_{p1} + F_2 a_{p2} + ... + F_k a_{pk} + u_p$$

Therefore, the expression is as follows:

$$X = Af + u\hat{U}X = FA' + U \quad (1)$$

where:

Data Matrix	Factorial load Matrix	Factorial matrix
$X = \begin{pmatrix} x_1 \\ x_2 \\ \vdots \\ x_p \end{pmatrix}$ $f = \begin{pmatrix} F_1 \\ F_2 \\ \vdots \\ F_3 \end{pmatrix}$ $u = \begin{pmatrix} u_1 \\ u_2 \\ \vdots \\ u_3 \end{pmatrix}$	$A = \begin{pmatrix} a_{11} & a_{12} & \cdots & a_{1k} \\ a_{21} & a_{22} & \cdots & a_{2k} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \cdots & \vdots \\ a_{p1} & a_{p2} & \cdots & a_{pk} \end{pmatrix}$	$F = \begin{pmatrix} f_{11} & f_{12} & \cdots & f_{1k} \\ f_{21} & f_{22} & \cdots & f_{2k} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \cdots & \vdots \\ f_{p1} & f_{p2} & \cdots & f_{pk} \end{pmatrix}$

With a variance equal to:

$$Var(X_i) = \sum_{j=1}^{k} a_{ij}^2 + \Psi_i = h_i^2 + \Psi_i \; ; \quad i = 1, 2, ..., p \quad (2)$$

$$h_i^2 = Var\left(\sum_{j=1}^{k} a_{ij} F_j \right) ...y... \Psi_i = Var(u_i) \quad (3)$$

This equation corresponds to the communalities and the specificity of variable X_i. Thus, the variance of each variable can be divided into two parts:

A) In their communalities h_i^2 representing the variance explained by common factors, and

B) The specificity Ψ_i that represents the specific variance of each variable.

Thus obtaining:

$$Cov(X_i, X_l) = Cov\left(\sum_{j=1}^{k} a_{ij}F_j, \sum_{j=1}^{k} a_{lj}F_j\right) = \sum_{j=1}^{k} a_{ij}a_{lj} \quad , \quad \forall i \neq l \tag{4}$$

With the transformation of the correlation matrix determinants, it was obtained Bartlett´s test of sphericity, and it is given by the following equation:

$$d_R = -\left[n - 1 - \frac{1}{6}(2p+5)\ln|R|\right] = -\left[n - \frac{2p+11}{6}\right]\sum_{j=1}^{p}\log(\lambda_j) \tag{5}$$

where:

N = sample size, ln= natural logarithm, λ_j ($j = 1, 2, ..., p$) values pertaining of R, R = correlation matrix.

In order to compare the magnitude of the observed coefficients correlation with the magnitudes of the coefficients partial correlation, it is carried out a measurement of the sample adequacy (KMO) proposal by Kaiser, Meyer and Olkin, and similar to KMO index, the measure of sampling adequacy for each variable (MSA) can be calculated, in which it only includes the coefficients of the variable to be tested. Both measurements are given by the following expressions:

$$\text{KMO} = \frac{\sum_{j \neq i}\sum_{i \neq j} r_{ij}^2}{\sum_{j \neq i}\sum_{i \neq j} r_{ij}^2 + \sum_{j \neq i}\sum_{i \neq j} r_{ij(p)}^2} \qquad \text{MSA} = \frac{\sum_{i^1 j} r_{ij}^2}{\sum_{i^1 j} r_{ij}^2 + \sum_{i^1 j} r_{ij(p)}^2}; i = 1, ..., p \tag{6}$$

where:

$r_{ij(p)}$ is the ratio of the partial correlation among variables X_i and X_j in all cases. Finally, to calculate principal components: For all cases we will have "*p*" initials variables:

$$X' = \left[X_1, X_2, ..., X_p\right] \tag{7}$$

Thus, we build ***p*** principal components guided by: (1) linear function of the original variables, (2) absorbing the maximum variation of the variables *X* and (3) that are uncorrelated.

$$Y_{ij} = \hat{\beta}_{i1}X_{1j} + \hat{\beta}_{i2}X_{2j} + ... + \hat{\beta}_{ip}X_{pj} \quad ; \quad j = 1, 2, ..., n \tag{8}$$

$$Y_i = X\hat{\beta}_i \tag{9}$$

$$Y_i = \begin{bmatrix} Y_{i1} \\ Y_{i2} \\ . \\ . \\ Y_{in} \end{bmatrix}; \qquad X = \begin{bmatrix} X_{11} & X_{21} & ..... & X_{p1} \\ X_{12} & X_{22} & ..... & X_{p2} \\ ..... & ..... & ..... & ..... \\ ..... & ..... & ..... & ..... \\ X_{1n} & X_{2n} & ..... & X_{pn} \end{bmatrix}; \qquad \hat{\beta}_i = \begin{bmatrix} \hat{\beta}_{i1} \\ \hat{\beta}_{i2} \\ . \\ . \\ \hat{\beta}_{ip} \end{bmatrix} \tag{10}$$

The variation of variable Y_i, will be:

$$Y_i^{'} Y_i = \hat{\beta}_i^{'} S \beta_i \tag{11}$$

where:

$$S = X^{'} X$$

In order to obtain the first and the second component, we have the following procedure:

The first component is: $Y_1 = X\hat{\beta}_1$ so we need seek to maximize: $Y_1^{'} Y_1 = \hat{\beta}_1^{'} S \beta_1$ and to address the process we must require: $\hat{\beta}_1^{'} \hat{\beta}_1 = 1$ ..... Therefore, to the end:

$$Max \quad Z = \hat{\beta}_1^{'} S \hat{\beta}_1 - \hat{\lambda}_1 (\hat{\beta}_1^{'} \hat{\beta}_1 - 1) \quad \text{..... ie:}$$

$$\frac{\partial Z}{\partial \hat{\beta}_1} = 2S\hat{\beta}_1 - 2\hat{\lambda}_1 \hat{\beta}_1 = 0$$

$$S\hat{\beta}_1 - \hat{\lambda}_1 \hat{\beta}_1 = 0 \tag{12}$$

$$(S - \hat{\lambda}_1 I)\hat{\beta}_1 = 0$$

Leaving the trivial solution we have: $\left| S - \hat{\lambda}_1 I \right| = 0$ starting from here, we found $\hat{\lambda}_1$ that substituted at $(S - \hat{\lambda}_1 I)\hat{\beta}_1 = 0$ gives us $\hat{\beta}_1$.

The second component is: $Y_2 = X\hat{\beta}_2$ and once again we need seek to maximize $Y_2^{'} Y_2 = \hat{\beta}_2^{'} S \beta_2$ once again subject to $\hat{\beta}_1^{'} \hat{\beta}_1 = 1$ to which we now add the lack of correlation with the first component: $Y_2^{'} Y_1 = 0$..... Which equal $\hat{\beta}_2^{'} S \hat{\beta}_1 = 0$ Which may be written as well as $\hat{\beta}_2^{'} \hat{\beta}_1 = 0$.

Therefore, the function to maximize is:

$$Max \quad Z = \hat{\beta}_2^{'} S \hat{\beta}_2 - \hat{\lambda}_2 (\hat{\beta}_2^{'} \hat{\beta}_2 - 1) - \mu_1 (\hat{\beta}_2^{'} \hat{\beta}_1) \tag{13}$$

After finding the first derivative and carrying out a series of reductions, we have:

$$S\hat{\beta}_2 - \hat{\lambda}_2\hat{\beta}_2 = 0 \quad (14)$$

ie..... $$(S - \hat{\lambda}_2 I)\hat{\beta}_2 = 0 \quad (14.1)$$

Therefore, it is solved using the same method used for the first component: Thus, with all above mentioned, now we have the next empirical outcomes:

2 Main Results

Factorial analysis results allow, first, notice that not all the correlations between variables are significant (knowledge and discount rate sig.= 0,455 , r = - 0.16 : discount rate and utility gis.= 0.51 ; r = .234) as shown in Table 1.

Table 1: Correlations matrix of KMO and Bartlett's test

	Variables	Knowledge	Excess Requirements	Rate of Discount	Utility
Correlation	Knowledge	1,000	0,586	**-0.016**	0,406
	Excess of Requirements		1,000	0,305	0,286
	Discount Rate			1,000	**0,234**
	Utility				1,000
GIS. (Unilateral)	Knowledge		0,000	**0,455**	0,002
	Excess of Requirements			0,016	0,022
	Discount Rate				0,051
	Utility				
Test of sphericity Bartlett		39,277 (A=0.00) gl 6			
Measure of sampling adequacy general 0,478					
A determinant = .432.					

Source: own

Values Bartlett test of sphericity indicates that the correlations matrix is significant when all variables are considered; therefore it is necessary to note that the measure of general sampling adequacy (MSA) is 0.478, lower than the acceptable value (0.50).

Examination of values of each variable shows that two variables (knowledge 0.464 and discount rate 0.317) have values lower than 0.5, due to the discount rate variable, with the smallest value, will be omitted in order to obtain a set of variables that may not exceed the minimum acceptable levels of MSA (Table 2).

Table 2: Measures of adequacy of sampling and partial correlations

Variables	Knowledge	Excess of Requirements	Discount Rate	Utility
Knowledge	**0.464a**	-0.593	0,322	-0.364
Excess of Requirements	-0.593	**0.508a**	-0.386	0,042
Discount Rate	0,322	-0.386	**0.317[a]**	-0.259
Utility	-0.364	0,042	-0.259	**0.599a**

Source: own

Table 3, with the adaptation, shows the correlations matrix for the revised set of variables, the measure of sample adequacy and Bartlett´s values. Results show that all variables are significant.

Table 3: Correlations matrix, KMO and Bartlett's test

	Variables	Knowledge	Excess Requirements	Rate Of Discount	Utility
Correlation	Knowledge	1,000	0,586	**-0.016**	0,406
	Excess of Requirements		1,000	0,305	0,286
	Utility				1,000
Next (Unilateral)	Knowledge		0,000	**0,455**	0,002
	Excess of Requirements			0,016	0,022
	Utility				
Bartlett test of sphericity		**28,545** (A=0.00 ; d.f. = 3)			
Measure of sampling adequacy general		**0,604**			

Source: own

Bartlett´s contrast shows that no null correlations exist on a significant level of 0.01 the reduced set of collective variables reaches the value of 0,604 (Table 3) and each variable exceeds the threshold value of 0.5 (Table 4).

Table 4 reveals that all correlations values are low, which indicates the strength of relationships between variables and therefore appropriateness factor analysis.

Finally, Table 5 shows a three variables factor: knowledge, excess of requirements and utility, and their contribution expressed by their eigenvalues (1.865).

Table 4: Measures of sampling adequacy and partial correlations

Variables	Knowledge	Excess of Requirements	Utility
Knowledge	**.571a**		
Excess of Requirements	-.537	**.593ª**	
Utility	-.307	-.065	**.715a**

Source: own

Values in the first column reflect the load factor of each variable and the second column shows how each variable is explained by its components. Then, it is possible to note that “knowledge” is the best explained variable, followed by “excess of requirements” and finally “utility”.

Table 5: Measure of sampling adequacy and partial correlation

Variables	Component 1	Communalities
Knowledge	0,867	0,751
Excess of Requirements	0,811	0,658
Utility	0,675	0,456
Eigenvalue	1,865	
Variance %	62,155	

Source: own

Results show that the companies that provide goods and services to the Southeast Regional Management of Production do not use electronic factoring due to their ignorance about the tool "productive chains", as well as the number of requirements to meet. In contrast, discount rate was not significant for the study that is why it was necessary to exclude it from the model.

3 Conclusions

The financial factoring is a facilitator of the administrative and financial management. This kind of support improves decision-making, allows a better use of the company’s material, human, technical and economic resources, and makes possible maximizing profits, have a greater market penetration and to provide a service to the society to keep work sources, among others.

Federal Electricity Commission supports the use of factoring between their suppliers because it ensures the supply of goods and services, because gives the

opportunity to suppliers to receive almost the total of the sale. That is why companies should not have economic problems to meet with their commitment and this even avoids expenditures due to effective sanctions or contracts cancellations.

From the contractor's side and service provider there are also benefits because it allows them to grow without loans, getting enough capital to invest in other business options, to begin another contract or simply to have a gratifying performance without any other form of financing.

In this research, three possible causes were analyzed why the majority of the suppliers do not use factoring for financing and it was possible to identify that the two main causes are: the suppliers' lack of knowledge and a perception of excessive requirements in order to use the financial factoring. Then, it is suggested that areas that belong to FCE, such as Southeast Regional Management of Production, should have a permanent campaign toward the suppliers and service providers in order to let them know in a simple way the usefulness of this tool, as well as the procedure to follow in order to be able to access it.

Acknowledgements. The authors are very grateful to the anonymous blind-reviewer for all suggestions, to *Universidad Cristobal Colon* and *Comisión Federal de Electricidad (Gerencia Regional de Producción Sureste)* for all their help and support. Also, in a very special way, our gratitude goes to Prof. Santiago González Gómez, Ph.D. (ABD) from *Universidad Politécnica de Aguascalientes* for all his suggestions in the grammatical review process.

References

[1] Y. Feng, Factoring: An Effective Financing Option to SMEs in China, (2009), Retrieved at: http://www.seiofbluemountain.com/upload/product/200911/2009zxqyhy03a18.pdf

[2] A. García-Santillán, E. Moreno, J. Carlos, J. Zamudio and J. Garduño, Cognitive, Affective and Behavioral Components that explain Attitude toward Statistics, *Journal of Mathematics Research*, **4**(5), (October 2012), 8-16. Available at http://dx.doi.org/10.5539/jmr.v4n5p8

[3] C. Garrido, Desarrollo Económico y Procesos de Financiamiento en México. Transformaciones contemporáneas y dilemas actuales [Economic Development and Financing Processes in Mexico. Contemporary transformations and current dilemmas], UAM-Azcapotzalco-Siglo XXI, México, (2005).

[4] L. Kato and G. Huerta, Micro, pequeñas y medianas empresas (MPyME) en México. Una visión global: competencia, empleo y salarios, y financiamiento, [Micro, small and medium enterprises (MSMEs) in Mexico, An overview:

competition, employment and wages, and financing], *Economía. Teoría y Práctica*, **16**, (2002).
[5] C. Martínez-Tovilla, Intervención financiera y apoyo a la micro y pequeña empresa en México [Financial intervention and support to MSMEs in Mexico], Comercio Exterior, **51**(8), (August, 2001).
[6] Information: Take it from: http://grpse.cfemex.com/grpse [15/06/2012]

Annex

FEDERAL ELECTRICITY COMMISSION
SOUTHEAST REGIONAL MANAGEMENT OF PRODUCTION
REGIONAL DEPARTMENT OF FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT

General data:
Company´s name_____ sector type_____
Employee´s number_____Phone number_____
Address_____
Name _____ position_____

Could you please answer the level you consider toward the different concepts (variables) about electronic financial factoring: Where (7.- totally agree, 6.- sometimes agree, 5.- rarely agree, 4.- neutral, 3.- rarely disagree, 2.- sometimes disagree, 1.- always disagree).

KNOWLEDGE ABOUT FINANCIAL FACTORING. Assuming you know the program "Production Chains" of NF:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
• Do you think that you know the concept financial factoring?							
• Do you think that you know the concept rights transfer of electronic collection?							
• Do you think that you know the NF's "Production Chains" program?							
• Do you think that you know the procedure to pay invoices to a financial intermediary?							

• In general terms, do you think that you are very familiar with the handling of the financial factoring?							
EXCESS OF REQUIREMENTS FOR THE USE OF FINANCIAL FACTORING - Assuming that the interviewed has came to NF to enroll in the program of production chains.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
• Do you think that it has been easy to access to the program for productive chains for NF?							
• Do you believe that it has been easy to perform a transfer of rights payment outside the program of production chains in FEC?							
• Do you think it is easy to demonstrate that it is a company with business activity legally constituted in the Mexican Republic?							
• Do you think that NF has a good counseling service and a good integration process of the dossier in order to belong to the program production chains?							
• In general terms, do you think that the process to register for the program of production chains is complicated?							
DISCOUNT RATE HIGH IN THE FINANCIAL FACTORING - Assuming that the interviewed has used the financial factoring of productive chains	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
• Do you consider that the discount rate charged by financial intermediaries in the financial factoring is higher than a credit card´s rate?							
• Do you believe that the discount rate charged by financial intermediaries in the financial factoring is higher than a normal bank´s loan?							
• Do you think that the discount rate charged by financial intermediaries in the financial factoring is higher than any other form of financing different from the previous ones?							

• Do you think that in addition to the discount rate, the financial intermediaries of the program of production chains could charge commissions?							
• In general terms, do you think that the discount rate of NF´s financial factoring is high?							
USE OF FACTORING FINANCIAL - Assuming that the interviewed does not always use the financial factoring of productive chains.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
• Do you think that the use of financial factoring has to be performed with all of their invoices?							
• Do you believe that the use of financial factoring should be done only when liquidity is needed to make more business?							
• Do you think that the use of factoring financial streamlines the company´s invoice collection?							
• Do you think that the use of financial factoring improves the efficiency of working capital for your business?							
• In general terms, do you consider necessary the use of financial factoring in all of your accounts receivable?							

Thank you.