

## Appendix 1

Appendix 1. Official Government Statistics on Requests for Brazilian State Capitals									
State Capital*	Years of Data Available	Number of Requests	% of Responses	% of Full Responses	% of Partial Responses	Request-to-Response Time (days)	% of Denials	Number of Appeals	Applicant Profile
Aracajú	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Belém	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Belo Horizonte	2012 - 2016	778 (2703)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Boa Vista	2015 - 2016	80 (108)	97,5% (96,29%)	-	-	-	-	-	-
Brasília	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Campo Grande	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Cuiabá	**	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Curitiba	2016	1307	93,34%	-	-	-	-	11	✓
Florianópolis	2016	1041	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Fortaleza	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Goiânia	2014 - 2016	257 (299)	80,54% (83,28%)	-	-	-	-	-	-
João Pessoa	2012 - 2015	416 (891)	67,54% (83,16%)	-	-	-	-	-	✓
Macapá	2015 - 2016	214 (287)	77,57% (79,09%)	-	-	-	15,42% (15,67%)	-	-
Maceió	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Manaus	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Natal	***	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Palmas	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Porto Alegre	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Porto Velho	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Recife	2015 - 2016	625 (1355)	84,96% (83,98%)	-	-	-	11,68% (7,84%)	-	-
Rio Branco	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Rio de Janeiro	2016	406	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Salvador	2015 - 2016	113 (175)	94.7% (92.35%)	92.9% (91.45%)	-	-	1.7% (1.7%)	-	✓
São Luís	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
São Paulo	†	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Teresina	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Vitória	2012 - 2015	270 (729)	100%	65% (70%)	-	8 (8.75)	4% (8.27%)	-	-

\* The sample is composed only by requests sent to the Executive branch. Data from jurisdictions which received less than 20 requests were excluded from the table.

\*\* Portal da Transparência was down between April 17th and 21th.

\*\*\* Portal da Transparência was down between April 17th and 21th.

† Statistics Reports page was down between April 17th and 21th.

## Appendix 2

Appendix 2. Data on Requesters for States and Capitals - Numbers for Last Year Available and (Aggregate)																				
Jurisdiction	Years of Data Available	Number of Requesters	Legal Status		Gender		Education			Profession							Age			
			Natural Persons / Juridical Persons	Female / Male	School Level	Graduate Level	Postgraduate Level	Not Informed	Employee from the Private Sector	Independent Professional	NGO Employee	Public Servant	Academic	Media	Others	Up to 20 Years	From 21 to 40 Years	From 41 to 59 Years	Above 59 Years	
AM	2016	385	95,85% / 4,15%	-	40%	31,00%	11%	17%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	9%	59%	16%	2% †††
DF	2013 - 2015	-	96% / 4%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
MA	2015 - 2016	-	78% (88%)*	21% 21,5(%) / 54 (62%)***	11% (14,5 %)	30% (27%)	19% (20%)	40% (38,5%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3% (2%)	44% (41,5%)	10% (13%)	1% (1%) §
MG	2016	3233	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
MT	2012 - 2016	-	-	34,6% - 2016 / 63,4% - 2016	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
PE	2013 - 2015	-	81% (84%) / 19% (16%)	33% (35,3%) / 67% (64,7%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
SC	2013 - 2016	-	23,22% / 2,28%**	5,78% (7%) / 17,44% (15,86%)†	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
TO	2012 - 2016	-	100% (100%)	58% (56,5%) / 42% (43,5%)	24% (23%)	49% (51,5%)	27% (25,5%)	-	13% (12%)	4% (4,5%)	1% (0,5%)	26% (28,5%)	31% (32%)	5% (3,5%)	20% (19%)	-	-	-	-	-
Curitiba	2016	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
João Pessoa	2012 - 2015	-	-	-	9% (2016)	91% -2016	-	-	-	-	-	-	69% - 2016	-	31% - 2016	-	-	-	-	-
Salvador	2015- 2016	-	94,7% (84%) / 5,3% (16%)	43,5% (33%) / 51,5% (49,5%)††	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

\* Not informed: 22% (12%)

\*\* Not informed: 74,5%

\*\*\* No informed: 25% (16,5%)

† Not informed: 74,4%(77,25%)

†† Not informed: 2% (2,5%)

††† Not informed: 14%

§ Not informed: 42% (42%)

### Appendix 3

Appendix 3. Official Government Statistics for Requests for Brazilian States*									
State	Years of Data Available	Number of Requests	% of Requests Responded	% of Full Responses	% of Partial Responses	Request-to-Response Time (days)	% of Denials	Number of Appeals	Applicant Profile
AC	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
AL	2012 - 2016	1040 (2204)	-	-	-	-	-	70 - 2016	-
AM	2016	604	97%	-	-	-	3%	-	✓
AP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
BA	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
CE	2012 - 2015	5978 (11083)	100% (100%)	-	-	-	0,013% (0,01%)	-	-
DF	2013 - 2015	5846 (14223)	(99%)	-	-	-	-	-	✓
ES	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
GO	2015 - 2016	4724 (7820)	95% (95%)	-	-	13 (14)	-	250 (388)	-
MA	2015 - 2016	1159 (1493)	97% (98%)	-	-	-	-	77 (103)	✓
MG	2016	6196 - 2016	99.9% - 2016	91.55% - 2016	6,7% - 2016	17.2 - 2016	3% - 2016	397 - 2016	✓
MS	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
MT	2012 - 2016	368 (716)	98.75% (99,4%)	58,7% (58,65%)	0% (0,3%)	-	17,4% (17%)	2 (16)	✓
PA	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
PB	2012 - 2016	914 (3934)	100% (100%)	100% (99,8%)	-	6,3 (9)	0% (0%)	-	-
PE	2013 - 2016	996 (2520)	99% (96%)	71,3% (85,2%)	0,1% (0,05%)	16 (20,3)	15,1% (11,9%)	-	✓
PI	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
PR	2015 - 2016	755 (1558)	99,2% (97,2%)	-	-	-	-	-	-
RJ	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
RN	2015 - 2016	1072 (1385)	98,1% (96,4%)	-	-	-	11,6% (9,4%)	-	-
RO	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
RR	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
RS	2012 - 2016	2482 (11236)	45.2% (81,2%)	-	-	18 (14)	0,5% (0,1%)	-	-
SC	2013 - 2016	982 (2810)	-	-	-	-	-	-	✓
SE	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
SP	2012 - 2016	17988 (65806)	98% (99,3%)	89,9% (92,5%)	0,05% (0,04%)	-	0,02% (0,02%)	50 (115)	-
TO	2012 - 2016	1256 (6586)	100% - 2012-2015	88.2% - 2012-2015	0% - 2012-2015	24 (15,06)	0.3% - 2012-2015	-	✓

\* The search on the Portais da Transparência of each jurisdiction was conducted between 15 to 25 of April, 2017. For those cases where LAI statistical reports covered between 6 and 11 months of a year (i.e. at least half of the year, but not the full year), the available data was generalized.

## Appendix 4

Appendix 4. Brazilian States													
Jurisdiction**	Compliance*								Implementation				
	Number of Requests	Response Rate (%) / Accuracy of Responses (%)	Average Response Time (in days)	Active Transparency Evaluation by PTP †	EBT - CGU (2nd Edition) ††	RNT - MPF †††	Combined Active Transparency Grade	Regulation Evaluation***	Adherence to PBT ‡	Oversight Agency ††	LAI Unit implemented ##	e-SIC implemented ###	Years of Data Available
AC	33	0,00%	-	1,7	3,3	5,6	3,5	4	✓	✓	-	✓	-
AL	-	-	-	7	7,9	9,8	8,0	4	-	✓	✓	-	2012 - 2016
AM	43	2.3% / 50%	10	2	1,4	7,5	4,0	-	✓	-	-	✓	2016
AP	27	0,00%	-	2,3	0	8	3,4	-	✓	-	-	-	-
BA	-	-	-	3,7	10	4,1	5,9	4	-	-	-	✓	-
CE	-	-	-	5,7	8,1	10	7,9	5	-	✓	✓	-	2012 - 2015
DF	54	68.5% / 59.4%	28,1	3,3	10	7,6	7,0	5	✓	✓	✓	✓	2013 - 2015
ES	-	-	-	3,8	10	10	7,9	-	✓	-	-	-	-
GO	20	55% / 13.6%	4	3,7	10	9,8	7,8	1	-	✓	-	✓	2015 - 2016
MA	31	29% / 100%	17	6	10	8,5	8,1	3	-	-	✓	✓	2015 - 2016
MG	53	83% / 28.4%	25,5	4	10	9,7	7,9	4	✓	-	✓	✓	2016
MS	-	-	-	4,3	2,5	9,1	5,3	3	✓	-	✓	✓	-
MT	29	48% / 100%	7	2,3	8,6	9,8	6,9	5	-	-	✓	✓	2012 - 2016
PA	53	24.5% / 0%	20	2,9	9	8,3	6,7	5	-	-	-	✓	-
PB	-	-	-	1,5	8,8	7,3	5,9	5	-	✓	-	✓	2012 - 2016
PE	-	-	-	3,7	6,7	8,8	6,4	3	-	✓	✓	✓	2013 - 2016
PI	-	-	-	3,5	8,5	8	6,7	5	✓	✓	-	✓	-
PR	25	68% / 20.6%	30	8,7	9,3	8,7	8,9	5	-	✓	✓	-	2015 - 2016
RJ	57	29.8% / 20.6%	7,8	3	7,1	8,7	6,2	2	-	-	-	-	-
RN	-	-	-	8,6	8,2	9,2	8,7	2	✓	-	-	-	2015 - 2016
RO	31	3.2% / DNA #	DNA	3,3	4,4	10	5,9	5	✓	-	-	✓	-
RR	29	3.4% / DNA	8	2,5	2,5	3,8	2,9	3	-	-	✓	✓	-
RS	-	-	-	4	8,9	8,6	7,1	3	✓	-	✓	✓	2012 - 2016
SC	-	-	-	5,3	6,9	9,2	7,1	3	-	-	✓	✓	2013 - 2016
SE	-	-	-	0	2,1	8,1	3,4	-	✓	-	-	-	-
SP	54	57.4% / 51.6%	32,5	4,8	10	9,7	8,2	5	-	✓	-	✓	2012 - 2016

\*Aggregated results from the evaluations conducted by Programa de Transparência Pública (PTP-FGV), Bizzo (2015) and Velasco (2016).

\*\* The sample is composed only by requests sent to the Executive branch. Data from jurisdictions which received less than 20 requests were excluded from the table.

\*\*\* Scale from 0 (no regulation) to 5 (good regulation). The rate is a simple average of the results of the evaluation undertaken PTP (MICHENER, 2016, p.28-29). Data collection: June, 2016.

† Evaluation conducted by Programa de Transparência Pública da FGV (PTP-FGV). Extracted from (MICHENER, 2016, p.58)

†† Escala Brasil Transparente by CGU. Results available at: <<http://www.cgu.gov.br/assuntos/transparencia-publica/escala-brasil-transparente/escala-brasil-transparente>>

††† Ranking Índice Nacional de Transparência by Ministério Público Federal. Results available at: <<http://combateacorrupcao.mpf.mp.br/ranking>>

‡ Programa Brasil Transparente. A initiative undertaken by the CGU from 2012. It is only considered if the state government, TCE or the Secretaria de Transparência signed the term.

‡‡ The evaluation was conducted in march, 2017. According to the methodology, the jurisdiction will be considered as having an oversight agency when the regulation specify an agency as responsible for the task of "monitoramento" or "fiscalização" of the whole jurisdiction government or at least of the Executive branch. The regulations of the States of Amapá, Pará and Sergipe couldn't be found.

# DNA - Data Not Available

## Data extracted from (MICHENER, 2016, p.40-41)

### This evaluation is based on the data collected in June, 2016 within the scope of the Transparência Local no Brasil report. The e-SIC definition presented here matches with the methodology (p.30) engaged in the former study. Accordingly, when a jurisdiction achieved 100 points in the "1. Comunicação na Plataforma" variable and 100 points in the "2.Login e Recibos" variable it was considered as having an e-SIC structure. The data collection was double coded and when there was a conflict between the coders evaluation, the higher punctuation was considered for the calculation.

## Appendix 5

Appendix 5. Overview of Brazilian Capitals									
Jurisdiction**	Compliance*					Implementation			
	Active Transparency by PTP †	EBT (2nd Edition) ††	RNT - MPF †††	Combined Active Transparency Grade	Regulation Evaluation***	Adherence to PBT §	Oversight Agency §§	LAI Unit Implemented	e-SIC Implemented
Aracaju	1,5	2,2	5,2	3,0	0	-	-	-	✓
Belém	4,1	4,7	9,7	6,1	5	-	-	-	✓
Belo Horizonte	5,8	8,8	8,2	7,6	5	✓	✓	✓	-
Boa Vista	4	4,4	7,2	5,2	5	✓	✓	✓	✓
Brasília	-	-	-	-	5	✓	✓	-	✓
Campo Grande	1,4	6,8	4,1	4,1	3	✓	✓	-	✓
Cuiabá	4,2	9,2	8,5	7,3	4	-	-	✓	-
Curitiba	4,3	10	8,1	7,5	5	✓	✓	✓	-
Florianópolis	4,7	8,8	7,7	7,1	1	✓	-	✓	✓
Fortaleza	1,3	8,2	8	5,8	4	✓	✓	✓	-
Goiânia	0,7	8,3	5,4	4,8	4	✓	✓	✓	✓
João Pessoa	6,6	10	9	8,5	5	✓	✓	✓	-
Macapá	2,5	6,1	4,3	4,3	4	✓	-	✓	✓
Maceió	2	3,9	9	5,0	5	✓	✓	-	✓
Manaus	3,7	3,9	3,9	3,8	4	✓	✓	-	-
Natal	1,3	7,4	6,5	5,1	4	✓	✓	-	-
Palmas	4,2	8,2	9,3	7,2	5	✓	-	✓	✓
Porto Alegre	3,3	5,8	10	6,4	5	✓	-	-	-
Porto Velho	3,3	0	6,4	3,2	5	-	✓	✓	✓
Recife	4,4	10	8,4	7,6	2	✓	✓	✓	✓
Rio Branco	2,5	10	6,2	6,2	5	✓	✓	✓	-
Rio de Janeiro	1,6	8,6	8,5	6,2	4	-	-	-	-
Salvador	3,9	5,8	6,4	5,4	2	-	-	✓	-
São Luís	3,2	9,6	7	6,6	5	✓	-	✓	✓
São Paulo	6,2	10	9,3	8,5	5	✓	✓	✓	✓
Teresina	1,3	3,8	6,9	4	1	-	-	-	✓
Vitória	3,2	8,8	7,8	6,6	5	✓	✓	-	-

\* Aggregated results from the evaluations conducted by Programa de Transparência Pública (PTP-FGV), Bizzo (2015) and Velasco (2016).

\*\* The sample is composed only by requests sent to the Executive branch. Data from jurisdictions which received less than 20 requests were excluded from the table.

\*\*\* Scale from 0 (no regulation) to 5 (good regulation). The rate is a simple average of the results of the evaluation undertaken (MICHENER, 2016, p.28-29). Data collection: June, 2016.

† Evaluation conducted by Programa de Transparência Pública da FGV (PTP-FGV). Extracted from (MICHENER, 2016, p.58)

†† Escala Brasil Transparente by CGU. Results available at: <<http://www.cgu.gov.br/assuntos/transparencia-publica/escala-brasil-transparente/escala-brasil-transparente>>

††† Ranking Índice Nacional de Transparência by Ministério Público Federal. Results available at: <<http://combateacorrupcao.mpf.mp.br/ranking>>

§ The adherence was considered when it was signed by the mayor, the Transparency Municipal Agency or by the Comptroller General.

§§ The evaluation was conducted in march, 2017. According to the methodology, the jurisdiction will be considered as having an oversight agency when the regulation specify an agency as responsible for the task of "monitoramento" or "fiscalização" of the whole jurisdiction government or at least of the Executive branch. The regulations of the Capitals of Aracaju, Belém and São Luís couldn't be found.