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Abstract

This study aims to problematize the issue of government transparency in federative states. As the Brazilian case is analyzed, it also approaches the question of territorial heterogeneity and its effects. Methodology consisted of comparative analysis of the transparency indexes among the three different spheres of government: municipalities, states and central government. Observation of 125 public administration websites reveals that the more limited the sphere of government, the lower the level of transparency is. In other words, Brazilian central government is more transparent than the state ones, and these, in turn, are more transparent than the municipal governments. These differences do not corroborate the maxim employed by supporters of the federalism that local governments tend to establish closer relations with citizens. Furthermore, integrated action among all the government spheres may be recommendable to obtain better transparency outcomes.

1. Introduction

Governmental transparency is a normative requirement in contemporary democratic states and constitutes one of the requisites for citizens to exercise their fundamental right to accountability.

Recently, several studies have been conducted on this topic, most of them analyzing government structures and the degree of transparency of their actions and their accounting. This study aims to go further and problematize the issue of government transparency in federative states. It also intends to approach the issue of territorial heterogeneity and its effects.

For this purpose, the Brazilian case is quite suitable. The legal instruments that ensure governmental transparency in Brazil carry identical requirements for all the federative spheres in the country (central government, states and municipalities). However, as it will be seen in the present study, the more limited the sphere of government is, the less transparent it becomes. In other words, although local governments are closer to their citizens, municipal governments, especially those in less developed regions, are less transparent than the state and central governments.

Therefore, it is necessary to reassess the implementation strategies for governmental transparency in order for some particularities of federative states to be considered. One of the suggestions is to encourage wider social participation. Another is to increase grants to spheres with fewer resources. A final one is to establish continuous dialogue among federative agencies to define common strategies for transparency and information technology development.

2. Government transparency

Definitions of government transparency tend to encompass a number of components, including the availability, publicity and openness of government data, as well as accountability [53]. Availability and publicity are related to the disclosure of information on government activities and their results [7][55][53]. Governmental openness has to do with reducing information inequality between public agents and citizens, as transparency is associated with citizens monitoring public actions [33][23][32][30][38]. In turn, the relationship between transparency and accountability refers to the obligation of public agents to provide information on the use of public resources and the government being held accountable to the citizens and meeting their declared performance targets [6][12][13].

Therefore, in an attempt to include all of these elements, transparency will be defined in this article as the availability of information concerning an agency/government, which can be assessed by all citizens and which allows them to control and monitor the work of such agency/government. This is believed to be a broad definition that includes both the disclosure undertaken by the agency/government and
the process of government accountability, both of which are fundamental in a contemporary democracy.

3. ICT for transparency

Information and communication technologies (ICT) offer new ways of increasing governmental transparency [33]. ICT allow governments to store and divulge large amounts of data at a low cost [44][45], enabling citizens to inspect what the agencies are doing almost in real time. Websites are an important tool for transparency, allowing governmental organizations to provide information proactively [45]. Some scholars suggest that trust and belief in the government tend to be more positive as more information is showcased on its websites.

Transparency mediated by the ICT aims to improve government accountability, and enables third parties to access and inspect government actions. Better information access, in turn, empowers citizens, thus leading to more democratic and reliable governments [31][45]. This way, access to information may reduce the asymmetry between society and government [8], which makes it one of the most effective instruments for building an effective democracy [4].

Recent studies have identified the level of transparency of governmental websites, focusing on only one sphere of government, mainly the municipal one. When researching the transparency level of Italian municipalities, Cucinello found out that information published on websites is limited to certain types of political and institutional data. In Brazil, the findings of Corrêa et al. [19], Cruz and Alvaro [21], Jacques et al. [38] and Raupp and Pinho [52] were similar. In other words, the general degree of transparency on municipal websites is generally low. Corrêa et al. [19], for instance, unveils a certain amount of difficulty on the part of local government to comply even with the requirements of the Law of Access to Information (LAI), which refers only to fiscal transparency. It is even common to find a correlation between municipal transparency levels and local socio-economic indicators, in the sense that in places with low social or economic indexes the levels of transparency also tend to be low.

This study differs from the others by proposing a comparative analysis between the level of transparency in the three spheres of government (municipal, state and central). It is also different as it expands and aggregates diverse indicators to the usual research models. In the research developed, transparency is not limited to accounts or the publication of fiscal reports. Elements related to communication channels with citizens, facilities offered, general and access information are also considered in the analysis. Most importantly, the study approaches governmental transparency in federative states, focusing on territorial heterogeneity and its effects.

4. Federalism and transparency

Contemporary national states present two major forms of territorial power organization: the unitary state and the federation (other types, albeit minor, are confederations and associated states).

Whereas in unitary states the distribution of power between central and subnational governments is hierarchical and asymmetric, in federative states the sovereignty is shared amongst its entities, in a situation characteristic of “self-rule plus shared rule” [26].

There are currently 25 federalist countries in the world, with approximately 40% of the planet’s population under such territorial form. Even some typically unitary countries, such as Spain, the United Kingdom, Belgium, Italy and South Africa, have undergone a decentralization process in which federalism has been seen as an option for traditionally unitary organizations.

Federalism is typically implemented in territories with considerable internal heterogeneity, where there is a concomitant argument in favor of ‘union combined with autonomy’ [14]. Consequently, smaller members have original rights and autonomy that cannot be arbitrarily denied by the central government, which are usually better structured than the subnational governments [1].

Public policies implemented in a federal state system on the one hand imply a greater possibility of adapting to local situations. On the other hand, there is a need for active coordination for these policies to be put into practice homogeneously in the whole country. The same happens in the case of policies to improve state transparency.

While multilateral agencies and civilian organizations connected to the field use international ranking and pressure governments to adopt a policy of disclosure of all governmental actions, this sphere lacks effective instruments to ensure that the subnational entities implement the aimed policies.

4.1. Brazilian context

Brazil has been a federalist country since the end of its monarchical period, at the end of the XIX century. However, until the Federal Constitution of 1988, the nation had as federate entities only the federal government (the Union) and the member states. As of the validity of the current constitution, municipalities also came to be considered federative agencies. This means that in addition to the Union and the 26 member
states, the Brazilian state also has currently 5570 municipalities with political and administrative autonomy.

This situation, with uneven socio-economic indexes and heterogeneously distributed development patterns along the national territory, requires a higher level of articulation among the federative levels.

As shown on Table 1, the central government has improved its policies for transparency and access to information since the year 2000, which even provides the participation of subnational governments.

Table 1: Main legal instruments regarding governmental transparency in Brazil

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEGAL INSTRUMENT</th>
<th>BRIEF DESCRIPTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Complementary Law 101/2000</td>
<td>Enforces the publication of several governmental reports.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Law 12.527/2001</td>
<td>Determines that all information produced by governments, except that classified as secret information, be made available to citizens.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complementary Law 131/2009</td>
<td>Obliges real time access to financial and budgetary information of places with over 50,000 inhabitants.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Complementary Law 101/2000, known as the Fiscal Responsibility Law, obliges all federative agencies to make a series of government reports available. Only in 2008, however, did the National Treasury unify some rules and minimum standards by preparing a “Fiscal Statement Manual”. Non-compliance with some articles of the Fiscal Responsibility Law can result in institutional sanctions (e.g., suspension of voluntary transfers and contracting of credit operations) and personal sanctions against the public manager in question (fiscal crime). Even so, there are federative agencies that do not comply with the minimum fiscal disclosure requirements.

Federal Law 12.527/2001, known as the Law of Access to Information, determines that all information produced by the government or in custody of the government, providing it is not classified, must be made accessible to all citizens. There are minimum disclosure obligations: the organizational structure, time and place to provide service to the public, expenses, funds allocation and financial transfers, bidding and contractual proceedings, and most frequently asked questions from citizens to public agencies. Nevertheless, even with a fairly broad scope (direct and indirect public administration in the federal, state and municipal spheres) the law does not make provisions for an enforcement mechanism in the case of non compliance by subnational governments.

Finally, Complementary Law 131/2009 requires all agencies of the Brazilian federation with a population of over fifty thousand people to make data on their budget executions and finances available in real time, integrating such provisions with the Fiscal Responsibility Law.

5. Methodological Aspects

As the purpose of this study was to conduct a comparative analysis of the degrees of transparency in the different spheres of government, the sample was selected as follows. In the case of the central government, all ministries and secretariats with ministerial status were included. As for the subnational governments, studies were made of all the internet portals of the member states, the Federal District, all capital cities and all municipalities with a population of 400,000 or more, in accordance with the estimates of the Brazilian Institute of Geography and Statistics for 2014. As they are larger or more central, such cities tend to gather better conditions and structure for creating electronic portals.

Table 2 – Research Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SPHERE</th>
<th>MAIN PORTAL</th>
<th>MINISTERIAL SITES</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Municipal - Capitals</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Cities with over 400,000 residents</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal District</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data collection technique was through site observation. The main source of this research was limited to primary data, collected by a specially prepared research instrument. The data was collected between December of 2014 and March of 2015. Five researchers were trained and worked as a team at this stage. Content availability and records supplied on government websites (sites or main web portal) were examined. The portal for Sergipe state was not available.
available at the time of data collection, and for this reason it was not included in the analysis. A total of 125 portals were accessed during over 300 hours of observation.

The websites were observed using the special research instrument, as follows. When accessing the home page, content was sought from the links available on the main page and on the portal for the transparency of each element of the sample. Information that was not located was sought using a search engine if one was available on the site. If the information remained unfound, a search was made using the Google platform. In order to ensure the completeness of the data, the information was double-checked by two researchers, who confirmed all the responses to each observed indicator.

### 5.1. Data collection instrument and treatment procedures

The items that constitute the data collection instrument have as their reference the previous research experiences which were proposed to investigate government websites in order to evaluate their transparency, the applicable Brazilian legislation and the best practice codes developed by national and international non-governmental organizations and agencies. Ten works were located with mechanisms for observing government websites in academic periodicals between 2007 and 2014 [5][7][21][20][28][33][41][42][52][59]. Furthermore, eight instruments were found that were made available by agencies and national and international NGOs (CGI – Comitê Gestor da Internet, Contas Abertas, United Nations, W3C, ITA - Transparencia Internacional España, Sunlight Foundation). Other aspects were included, extracted from laws passed by the federal government regarding fiscal responsibility, transparency and access to information.

Studies that measure the level of government transparency normally focus exclusively on the availability of financial and fiscal information. As the purpose of this study is to examine transparency in a broader sense, an original research model was developed. This enabled the inclusion of other items such as accountability, incentives for citizens and governments to communicate with each other, social participation, ease of access and availability of general information.

As a result, an instrument was created to observe government websites based on seven categories: (1) forms of communication, (2) facilities offered on portals and websites, (3) profiles on social networks, (4) contact information, (5) access information, (6) general information and (7) accountability.

The first two categories have to do with forms of communication between government and citizens. They aim to gauge the existence of communication channels (ranging from the more basic, like the telephone, to the more formal, such as the ombudsman and more interactive options, such as chat channels) and presence on social networks [38][52]. There is also concern over having a space for denunciations, which is linked to liability [28].

The third category focuses on contact information. It aims to identify the disclosure of information that enables users to contact the government. This information includes telephone numbers, addresses and opening hours [52][16].

The fourth category is linked to capacity to offer help to facilitate access to information, i.e., tools that offer support, such as a site map or internal search engine [20][57][41][42][52], which are characteristics that enable users to trust the service provided and the practicality of the distribution of information [5].

The fifth category concerns access information, and seeks to pinpoint the portals’s functionalities which facilitate user access. Transparency is generally linked to the dimension of accessibility. Thus, issues are evaluated such as how receptive the site is to users, with training materials [5][52][59] and links to other sites and portals [52], and also whether the portal facilitates access to people with special needs [5][21][42].

The sixth category has to do with general information. Although transparency is closely linked to accounting and financial matters, it is by no means limited to this aspect. Therefore, in addition to budget laws, a transparent agency should also offer institutional and other more general information, including information on its representatives [7][21][38][57], the agency itself (structure, composition, competencies) [7][16][38] and the state or municipality in question [7][38].

Finally, the seventh category is concerned with accountability. Regarding the ‘content’ to be made transparent, accountability materializes in the form of disclosure of budgetary execution, the management of assets and the debts that the agency has to pay [21]. It is also shown in publications concerning bids and contracts [38] and the publication of the multi-year plan, the law of budgetary directives and the annual budget law [42][21][18], as well as accountability [20].

A workshop was also held to consult with seven specialists from a number of institutions to validate the instrument. Pre-testing was done. At every step, the instrument was improved.

The data collection instrument was used to construct a Transparency Index (TI). An index was created rather than a scale because of the formative
nature of the indicators [9], which determine a latent variable with formation meaning [24]. In this case, measurements of reliability, in the sense of internal consistency, are not used [37].

The transparency index is composed of the sum of the individual indexes of each category that contains the instrument. The indexes for each category, in turn, were calculated from the sum of points attributed by the existing observed items over the maximum points for the category. For instance, the access to information (AI) index is composed of the sum of the items found on a portal, divided by the maximum number of points for this category (five). Thus, all the indexes vary from 0 to 1 and have equal weights. The points system was attributed to binary logic, with 1 (one) meaning that the item exists and 0 (zero) meaning that it does not. Nevertheless, a few items were awarded a score of 0.5, when only part of the content was available. To enable better graphic visualization, all the indices were multiplied by ten.

6. Results

Analysis shows that the websites in the federal sphere tend to have higher transparency indicators than the state and municipal spheres. (Figure 1). The median TI for the ministries and secretariats with ministerial status of the central government was 54.47. The median for the states was 46.02 and for the municipalities, 43.53.

When we analyzed the seven categories that make up the Transparency Index separately (Figure 2), with only one exception the results followed the same trend: the broader governmental circumscription, the higher the indexes tended to be.

The analysis also evinced that the three governmental spheres achieved higher indexes in three categories: information on accountability, general information and contact information. Conversely, three categories had low indexes in the three spheres: communication channels opened by the government for citizens/users, features that facilitate access and use of the portal and presence on social networks.
Users’ (14% of the central government, 35% of the state governments and 17% of the municipalities).

- Regarding ‘Presence on Social Networks’, all the units in the study had a Facebook page and Twitter account.
- For ‘Contact Information’, addresses and websites are available on almost all the portals in question (97% in the federal sphere, 92% in the state sphere, and 100% at the municipal level). However, ‘Attention Hours’, albeit available on most federal portals (97%), is only found on 54% of the state portals and 64% of the municipal.
- Concerning ‘Access Information’, an ‘Open Data’ link is available on less than half the web portals in all three spheres (49% of central government portals, 23% of state governments and 10% of those of the municipalities). As for ‘Facilities for Access to People with Special Needs’, whereas all the federal portals facilitate access for them, only 69% of the states and 44% of the municipalities have this facility. When portals do have a feature of this kind, most only have an option for larger fonts (82%) or to adjust the contrast of the screen (33%).
- When it comes to the ‘General Information’ category, while 97% of the central government portals display an agenda, only 35% of the states and 10% of the municipalities publicize it. Regarding the Budget Laws, while all the central government and state portals allow users to access the Multi-year Plan, the Law of Budget Directives and the Annual Budget Law, 10% of the municipalities do not so. There were high indexes in all the spheres for ‘Information on the Government Representative’ (84% of federal portals, 92% of the states and 81% of the municipalities), the ‘List of Competencies’ (100% federal, 65% state and 93% municipal) and ‘Government Structure’ (97%, 96% and 92%).
- Finally, the ‘Accountability’ category showed the highest difference between central and subnational governments. All the federal portals that were visited showed, in addition to ‘Financial and Budget Information’ (revenue, expenditure, public debt), the ‘Plan of Government’, ‘Information on Fixed and Movable Assets’, ‘Public Payroll’, ‘Statistics of the Law of Access to Information’, ‘Accountability’ and ‘Information on Bidding Processes’. Although the subnational governments showed great concern over disclosing public accounts, (budgets, expenditure, revenue, budget, fiscal and financial reports) in compliance with the Fiscal Responsibility Law, a considerable percentage of them omitted information. For instance, 11% of the municipalities do not publish compulsory information determined by law. Only 15% of the states and 28% of the municipalities divulge the public payroll. 38% of the states and 22% of the municipalities list their fixed and movable assets.

Our analysis shows that the federal government web portals tend to be more transparent and comply with legal requirements. It should be highlighted that there is a standardization between all the portals of the ministries and special secretariats, which facilitates their use. Meanwhile, the state and municipal portals were all created independently, with no standardization.

### 6.2 Cluster Analysis

Two cluster analyses were conducted (among the states and among the municipalities) in order to identify whether there are different profiles among the elements of the sample. The performances obtained from the seven categories that constitute the Transparency Index were used as cohesive variables. The results show three different profiles: subnational governments with (1) high, (2) average and (3) low Transparency Indexes.

In the cluster analysis of the member states, it was through the K-means method that the results with the best solution for similarities within the groups and differences between them were obtained [34]. The performance in each category for the states in the sample led to three distinct clusters:

- **Cluster 1**, with 11 states (47%) and average levels of transparency;
- **Cluster 2**, with seven states (27%) and high levels of transparency;
- **Cluster 3**, with eight states (31%) and low levels of transparency.

In order to characterize the clusters, the average, maximum and minimum values of the socio-economic variables were analyzed, as shown on Table 3.

The results for each cluster are given below:

**Cluster 1: Average** states with an average TI and a median of 46.4. In general, these states have an intermediate profile. They are not very poor or small, but neither are they large and rich. They are concentrated in the central-West region and in the NorthEast. These states provide more general information and accountability on their websites. They also provide contact information.

**Cluster 2: Higher transparency index**: made up of the states with a higher transparency index and a median of 55.3. They are mostly more populous states with a higher GDP and income per capita. They also have a higher HDI. These states are mostly concentrated in the South and SouthEast. These states make it easy for users to access their sites and publish information that enables them to contact the government. They also provide general information about the government and
its representatives, and have tools that facilitate communication. There are also a variety of mechanisms available for accountability.

**Cluster 3: Lower transparency index:** made up of states with a lower transparency index, with a median of 36.7. These are less densely populated states with lower GDP and per capita income and the worst HDI. These states are concentrated in the North and NorthEast regions of the country. They only provide general information about a field of government and its representatives. They hardly have any tools for communication or facilities that enable higher interaction between government and citizens.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clusters</th>
<th>Nº of states</th>
<th>Median IT_E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cluster 1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cluster 2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cluster 3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 – States Clusters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Centers of Initial Clusters</th>
<th>FC</th>
<th>PRS</th>
<th>IC</th>
<th>IA</th>
<th>IG</th>
<th>PC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Median IT_E</td>
<td>0.6753</td>
<td>0.5795</td>
<td>0.7922</td>
<td>0.6364</td>
<td>0.7778</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDP per capita (in millions)</td>
<td>2244</td>
<td>24209</td>
<td>12515</td>
<td>682.8</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>0.7035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income per capita (in millions)</td>
<td>981.0</td>
<td>1117.7</td>
<td>682.8</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>0.7384</td>
<td>0.6785</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HDI</td>
<td>20606</td>
<td>25847</td>
<td>7796</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4 – Municipalities Clusters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cluster</th>
<th>Nº of Municipalities</th>
<th>Median IT_E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cluster 1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cluster 2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cluster 3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5.32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Centers of Initial Clusters</th>
<th>FC</th>
<th>PRS</th>
<th>IC</th>
<th>IA</th>
<th>IG</th>
<th>PC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Median IT_E</td>
<td>0.7768</td>
<td>0.6641</td>
<td>0.9583</td>
<td>0.7375</td>
<td>0.7535</td>
<td>0.6948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDP per capita (in millions)</td>
<td>35237</td>
<td>1041.4</td>
<td>1041.4</td>
<td>1041.4</td>
<td>1041.4</td>
<td>1041.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income per capita (in millions)</td>
<td>0.4743</td>
<td>0.545</td>
<td>0.6067</td>
<td>0.456</td>
<td>0.6133</td>
<td>0.5175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population in millions (in millions)</td>
<td>0.5952</td>
<td>0.5556</td>
<td>0.9167</td>
<td>0.6333</td>
<td>0.7593</td>
<td>0.5883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HDI</td>
<td>7796</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A description of each cluster is given below:

**Cluster 1: Higher Transparency Index:** these are the municipalities with the highest Transparency Index and a median of 53.2. In general, these municipalities have the best socio-economic indicators. They are mostly concentrated in the South and Southeastern regions and also in the Northeast of the country. They facilitate access to the site by publishing information that enables users to contact the government. They also provide general information on the government and its representatives and tools that facilitate communication. There are also several mechanisms concerning accountability.

**Cluster 2: Lower transparency index:** made up of municipalities with a low Transparency Index, averaging 35.6. These municipalities generally have the worst socio-economic indicators. They are located.
in every region of the country except the South. They provide little general information about a field of government and its representatives. They have almost no tools to enable greater interaction between government and citizens and little information regarding accountability, even though said information is required by law.

**Cluster 3: Average:** Municipalities with an average Transparency Index and a median of 45.3. These usually have an intermediate profile, not very poor or small, but not large or very rich. These municipalities provide general information and accountability data on their sites, along with contact information.

The results show that transparency levels are uneven among Brazilian states and municipalities. This inequality is reflected on the socio-economic, budgetary and regional indicators.

### 7. Final Considerations

An evaluation of government transparency in federative countries should consider the characteristics of this form of distribution of power over the territory. As the federative levels have a certain degree of political and administrative autonomy to exert their influences, the existence of federal legislation on its own does not guarantee that governmental data will be evenly distributed in the different spheres of government.

As shown in the present study, there may be differences in relation to the Transparency Indices depending on the different spheres of government. These differences do not necessarily corroborate the maxim employed by supporters of the federalist system of government that local administrations tend to be closer to their citizens.

At least in the Brazilian reality, the general scenario is that the wider the range of power, the higher the Transparency Index will be. In other words, the central government is more transparent than the state governments, and these, in turn, are more transparent than municipal governments.

There is, nonetheless, one more issue that needs to be broached, which is clarified in this study. Countries with high levels of social and economic inequality also have different levels of transparency endogenous to each government sphere. The evidence shows that lower socio-economic indicators mean a lower level of transparency.

Therefore, it is necessary to reassess the implementation strategies of government transparency, in order to take some particular aspects of federative states into account. It is suggested that there should be even higher stimulation of social participation, increased incentives (grants) for governmental spheres with fewer resources and continuous dialogue to be held between the federative entities to define transparency and information technology strategies.
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