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Abstract:

During the 32 years of the Federal Constitution of 1988, around 6.4 million norms were edited in Brazil. Several researchers have claimed that the country faces a scenario of legislative inflation - a process of unbridled growth in the quantity of legal norms. In this context, it is reasonable to assume that it is impossible to follow the national normative production by Official Gazettes, as fixed by law. The State and its institutions must have a proactive attitude, maintaining efficient digital tools that assemble and provide legislative information, ensuring access to information and legal certainty. Furthermore, the information available in the legislation databases needs to be complete, secure, and appropriately treated. Considering the importance of correctly providing legal information and its close relationship with legal certainty, access to information, transparency, and the exercise of citizenship, the Legislative and Jurisprudence Monitoring Committee (CALJ) of the National Council of Prosecution Services (CNMP) developed the “Qualification Project of the Legislation Websites of the Brazilian Prosecution Service”, which aims to promote the excellence of its legislation websites. This paper aims to present an experience report of the project, conducted by a multidisciplinary and inter-institutional working group, composed of jurists, statisticians, and a librarian. The methodology used was adapted from the research methodology developed by one of its members in a master’s degree. The action resulted in the publication of a report entitled “Diagnosis of the Brazilian Prosecution Service's Legislation Websites”, accompanied by a Business Intelligence dashboard, as well as the presentation of a proposal for regulation of legislation websites, stipulating minimum technical quality requirements for every unity of Brazil’s Prosecution Service.
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Introduction

The United Nations’ Universal Declaration of Human Rights recognizes the freedom to seek and receive information as basic human right. As stated in the *IFLA Statement on Government Provision of Public Legal Information in the Digital Age*¹, this is particularly important regarding legal information, and it is the responsibility of governments to provide trustworthy access to this type of information to ensure transparency, accountability, civic engagement, and a just society.

Aware of this, the National Council of Prosecution Services (CNMP) created the "Qualification Project of the Legislation Websites of the Brazilian Prosecution Service", led by the Legislative and Jurisprudence Monitoring Committee (CALJ).

This paper intends to offer an overview of the aforementioned project, which aims to promote excellence in the digital and open availability of legal information produced by the Units of the Brazilian Prosecution Service to civil society, ensuring access to information, transparency, legal certainty, and exercise of citizenship.

Distinguishing between common and civil law systems

To understand the importance of properly providing legislative information and, consequently, the Qualification Project of the Legislation Websites of the Brazilian Prosecution Service, it is important to have a basic understanding of the legal system adopted in Brazil (civil law) and differentiate it from the common law system.

The legal system of each country and each era encompasses a system of methods, rules, and concepts that have been established over time and are not altered by a mere legislative act but by social evolution, being closely linked to the culture of each civilization and how they produce and apply their own norms (Matias, 2019). Legal systems consist of the way in which law develops and are typically classified according to their historical origin and how they are structured and operationalized.

The common law system, originating from English law and typical of Anglo-Saxon colonized countries, has its roots in customary law. In this system, judicial decisions are the primary source of law and have binding and general effects (David, 2014). The legal norm corresponds to the holding extracted from a decision rendered in a specific case and will be applied, by induction, to solve identical conflicts in the future (Barroso and Mello, 2017).

In its origin, the common law system did not have a reference to precedents, which suggests that the binding nature of courts to previous judicial decisions is a product of their own experience (Pugliese, 2011). The doctrine of stare decisis and the rule of precedent was only incorporated into the common law system centuries later, initially limited to general customs determined by Englishmen (Marinoni, 2013 apud Carvalho, 2015).

Although there are written laws in this system, they are considered secondary sources of law. In addition, in the common law system, the judiciary plays a prominent role as it constructs a positive system through its decisions (judge-made law). It is important to note, however, that judges are bound by the normative parameters established in previous decisions (prior cases), known as precedents (binding by precedents, mandatory precedent, or binding authority) (Bussi, 2019).

In contrast, the civil law system, which originates from Roman-Germanic tradition, considers legislation as the primary source of law. The legal norm constitutes a general and abstract command that aims to encompass a variety of future cases within its framework. The application of the norm is done through deductive reasoning, starting from the general command to regulate the specific situation. In this system, judicial decisions generally do not have binding effects on the judgment of similar future cases, and therefore, they are said to play a secondary role as a source of law (Barroso and Mello, 2017).

A significant milestone in the development of civil law was the codification of Roman law, which compiled customary norms, scattered written norms, judicial decisions, and doctrinal principles into harmonious texts, providing a rational structure to the casuistic and unsystematic solutions of the Romans. In the genesis of this system, there is a concern for establishing a rational order of concepts, presenting law as a system: a set of precepts that should be grouped together, like a living organism (Soares, 1999).

Although both systems seek legal certainty, the civil law system has always limited the judge to act within the law, whereas the common law has never restricted the judge's role, allowing them to use judicial precedents (Marinoni, 2016). Despite the differences between common law and civil law, it is observed that these systems have not evolved in isolation. On the contrary, there is a relative consensus that they are in a process of convergence (Barroso and Mello, 2017).

In Brazil, the tradition of civil law system was brought about by the enforcement of Portuguese law. One of its main characteristics is the excessive quantity of codes, laws, and other types of written norms.

However, it is worth noting that the Brazilian legal system has been gradually changing, moving away from old premises typical of civil law and adopting trends from common law. In a context of globalization and social and cultural transformation, the introduction of binding precedents by the Brazilian Code of Civil Procedure of 2015 signifies a departure from a Romanistic paradigm and a convergence between the civil law and common law systems in Brazilian law (Barroso and Mello, 2017).

Indeed, the legislation remains the primary source of law in Brazil, and due to the federal system in place, although there is a central government, power and competencies in Brazil are divided among the federative entities. Both the Union and the 26 states, the Federal District, and the 5,568 municipalities have the power to legislate concurrently.

In this scenario of true legislative inflation, it is essential for Brazilian institutions to properly provide and promote wide access to legislative information, ensuring that Brazilian citizens have the right to know the current laws in their country.
The importance of organizing legislative information in the Brazilian system

Every Brazilian citizen is obligated to know the legislation of the country. This is established in the Law of Introduction to the Norms of Brazilian Law and in the Penal Code, respectively: "Article 3 - No one can excuse themselves from complying with the law by claiming ignorance of it" and "Article 21 - Ignorance of the law is inexcusable." This is, in fact, an ancient principle found in all civil codes of Roman tradition: ignorantia legis non excusat (Barité and López-Huertas, 2004, p. 31).

However, the Brazilian legal system is of a unique magnitude. If in 1989, the year following the publication of the Constitution, there were just over 500,000 norms enacted in Brazil, by 2020, that number had reached approximately 6.4 million. We are talking about the publication of an average of 800 legal norms per business day (Amaral et al., 2020).

Based on these numbers, several researchers affirm that Brazil is experiencing a scenario of legislative inflation. Unlike legislative expansion, a natural phenomenon resulting from the increasing complexity of society, legislative inflation is a process of unrestrained growth in the quantity of legal norms. (Faria, 1994).

Given this scenario, it is reasonable to assume that it is impossible to follow the national normative production by Official Gazettes, as fixed by law. The State and its institutions must have a proactive attitude, maintaining efficient digital tools that assemble and provide legislative information, ensuring access to information and legal certainty.

Furthermore, the information available in the legislation databases needs to be complete, secure, and appropriately treated. This is because omission or bias in this type of information can be more harmful than its complete absence. Therefore, when a database is built incompletely, it is providing a disservice. (Passos, 2009). In the field of common bibliographic data, a recall rate of 90% can be considered excellent, but in the field of legislative information, only a recall rate of 100% is valid. This is because the information would have no validity if a substantial amendment or revocation were present in the missing 10% (Dutra, 1977).

Bobbio (2014) teaches us that legal norms do not exist in isolation but in a context of interconnected norms - also known as a legal system. The author clarifies that "law is not a single norm, but an orderly set of norms, being evident that a legal norm is never alone but is connected to other norms with which it forms a normative system" (Bobbio, 2014, p. 37).

Therefore, in addition to the security and completeness of legislation websites, it is not sufficient for them to be mere file repositories. The information made available must be properly processed: interrelating the legal norms, providing information on their validity, consolidating the text after amendments, tracing their history, ensuring retrievability, providing search mechanisms, etc.

But what does the Public Prosecution Service have to do with this?

---

2 By legal norms, we refer to those listed in the "Hierarchy of Brazilian norms" chart on page 6.

3 The recall rate refers to the number of retrieved documents and can be measured by the ratio between the number of relevant documents on a particular topic retrieved by the search system and the total number of documents on the topic existing in the system's records. (Rubi, 2009).
What about the Public Prosecution Service?

The reader may be thinking that the importance of properly providing legislative information has been proven, but that this topic is not related to the Public Prosecution Service’s affairs.

Although the enactment of laws *stricto sensu* is a responsibility of the legislative branch, the Public Prosecution Service publishes *general administrative acts* with coercive power and social impact, which also form part of the entirety called *legislation*. Therefore, these acts, like laws, need to be properly published and organized.

General administrative acts are understood as:

General administrative acts, also called as normative acts, are those that regulate an undetermined number of individuals who are in the same legal situation. Examples include regulations, normative instructions, etc. General or normative acts are considered legislative in nature, as they embody the aspects of generality, abstraction, and impersonality. (Carvalho Filho, 2019, p. 134).

In the Brazilian legal system, general administrative acts are considered as norms of *infralegal* hierarchy.

---

**Hierarchy of legal norms**

- Constitutional
- Supralegal
- Legal
- Infralegal

Source: Cavalcante Filho, 2012, p. 40
For the purposes of the project presented in this paper, therefore, legislation websites of the Public Prosecution Service will be considered as websites/databases dedicated to the orderly provision of normative acts issued by each unit. It is important to note that, in addition to general administrative acts, legislation websites may also provide, on a non-obligatory basis, individual acts, state and federal legislation, among other examples.

The project, its methodology and the results

Considering the importance of correctly providing legal information and its close relationship with legal certainty, access to information, transparency, and the exercise of citizenship, the Legislative and Jurisprudence Monitoring Committee (CALJ)\(^\text{4}\) of the National Council of Prosecution Services (CNMP)\(^\text{5}\) developed a project which aims to promote the excellence of the legislation websites of the Brazilian Public Prosecution Service.

The project, called "Qualification Project of the Legislation Websites of the Brazilian Prosecution Service", was divided into the following steps:

1 - Diagnosis of the current situation of the legislation websites of the Brazilian Prosecution Service.
   1.1 - Technical visits to selected units;
   1.2 - Distribution of a questionnaire to all branches and units of the Brazilian Prosecution Service;
   1.3 - Audit of the received data;

---

\(^{4}\) In portuguese, Comissão de Acompanhamento Legislativo e de Jurisprudência (CALJ).

\(^{5}\) In portuguese, Conselho Nacional do Ministério Público (CNMP).
1.4 - Compilation of data into a business intelligence dashboard;  
1.5 - Publication of a technical analytical report;  

**2 – Formal recommendation proposal of the Nacional Council to the branches and units of the Brazilian Prosecution Service to observe minimum technical quality requirements in their legislation websites.**

The project was conducted by a multidisciplinary and interinstitutional Working Group (WG) linked to CALJ, designated in CNMP-PRESI Ordinance No. 4, dated February 11, 2019. The WG consisted of Suzanna do Carmo Louzada, Analyst (Library Science) at the Public Prosecutor's Office of Rio Grande do Sul; Renata Girão Carneiro, Legal Analyst at CNMP; Sávio Neves do Nascimento, Statistical Analyst at CNMP; André de Araújo Rosa Cruz, Statistical Analyst at CNMP; Patrícia Ferreira Wanderley de Siqueira Goulding, Prosecutor Assistant at CNMP; Marina Figueiredo Coelho, Legal Analyst at CNMP; and Camila Abreu dos Santos, Administrative Technician at CNMP.

The methodology employed for the diagnosis, the first stage of the project, was an adaptation of the methodology and evaluation instrument for legislation websites developed as part of Suzanna Louzada's master's research (Louzada, 2018). Based on bibliographic research, Louzada developed a checklist composed of five parameters - usability, coverage, accessibility, relationships, and tools - divided into 26 criteria considered as general desirable characteristics for a Brazilian legislation website. Thus, the assertion that the website meets a particular technical requirement is always positive, and the assertion that the requirement was not found is always negative. The higher the number of technical criteria marked as "yes," therefore, the higher the quality of the website.

The units of the Brazilian Prosecution Service have functional and administrative autonomy, but it is responsibility of the National Council of Prosecution Services to oversee the administrative, financial, and disciplinary aspects of the Public Prosecution Service and its members. The CNMP has the authority to issue regulatory acts within its jurisdiction or recommend actions.

Given that this project was promoted by CNMP and aimed not only to evaluate legislation websites but also to identify best practices that could become institutional policies, administrative aspects of the websites were included in the instrument. Within this scope, basic issues regarding the size and qualification of the responsible teams, as well as organizational and managerial unity, were evaluated.

To ensure that the evaluation instrument was fair and realistic, the working group also held face-to-face meetings at the Federal Prosecution Service, the Public Prosecutor's Office of the Federal District and Territories (MPDFT), the Public Prosecutor's Office of the State of Espírito Santo (MPES), and the Public Prosecutor's Office of the State of São Paulo (MPSP), where they sought to understand the work already carried out by the units and the challenges they

---

6 Available at: https://www.cnmp.mp.br/portal/images/Portarias_Presidencia_nova_2019/2019.Portaria-CNMP-PRESI.4-1.pdf

7 The evaluation instrument was designed for assessing legislation websites of norms with legal hierarchy. Since the project aimed to evaluate legislation websites of norms with infralegal hierarchy, 22 out of the 26 mentioned criteria were used.

8 This power is established by Article 130-A, § 2 of the Federal Constitution.
faced. In addition to these meetings, a virtual meeting was held with the Public Prosecutor's Office of the State of Roraima (MPRR).

With the tools mentioned above, for the diagnostic phase, the working group developed a questionnaire subdivided into 1 - General Information, 2 - Technical Aspects, and 3 - Administrative Aspects.

The questionnaire is attached to this article, and it is highly recommended to consult it for a proper understanding of the work conducted.

The questionnaire was sent to all units of the Brazilian Prosecution Service on October 23, 2020, with a response deadline of November 23, 2020. In order to maintain the coherence and credibility of the work, all responses were audited by the working group. Any responses that were not in accordance with the research methodology were modified after proper notification and the opportunity for the respective unit to contest. It is important to note that the possibility of adopting this measure was previously informed to the recipients of the letters, as stated in item 4.2 of the questionnaire.

Once the data audit stage was completed, the statisticians consolidated the information into a business intelligence (BI) dashboard, created to provide a clear and informative overview of the diagnosis of legislation websites.

The Diagnosis of Legislation Websites of the Brazilian Prosecution Service, therefore, consisting of an extensive and detailed report accompanied by a BI dashboard depicting the status of legislation websites of the Prosecution Services in Brazil, was presented to the plenary of the National Council of Prosecution Services in December 2022.

Presentation of the project to the National Council of Prosecution Services Plenary

(September 20th, 2022)
In a general overview, the results allow us to conclude that the access to information on legislation websites of the Brazilian Prosecution Service is precarious, and there is a need for efforts to improve them.

Considering these results and aiming to promote concrete improvements, the working group submitted a recommendation proposal, presented by Counselor Rodrigo Badaró to the plenary of the National Council of Prosecution Services, recommending "that the branches and units of the Brazilian Prosecution Service provide to citizens a legislation website on their official website that comply with minimum requirements of technical quality."¹⁰ The proposal is fully based on the questionnaire and the research conducted by Louzada (2018), and is currently in the voting phase.

---

⁹ Available at: https://www.cnmp.mp.br/portal/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=15668&Itemid=2223
¹⁰ Proposition 1.01245/2022-40
The main results of the project can be found in the following links:

- **Presentation of the project to the National Council of Prosecution Services Plenary** (start at time 2:21:00): https://bit.ly/44cM9LX
- **BI of the Legislative Websites Diagnosis**: https://bit.ly/3Hml2Ez
- **CNMP news about the launch of Legislative Websites Diagnosis**: https://bit.ly/3neH1qa
- **MPRS news about the launch of Legislative Websites Diagnosis**: https://bit.ly/44baq5a

**Conclusion**

"The multitude of laws drowns the jurist, crushes the lawyer, stuns the citizen, and disorients the judge. The border between licit and illicit becomes uncertain. The security of social relations, the main merit of written law, evaporates." (Cavalcante Filho, 2014, p. 35).

Citizens are obliged to know the law. The principle *ignorantia juris neminem excusat* rests on a social interest reason, as we would live in a chaos if the obligation to comply with the law depended on the ignorance or knowledge of its existence by the recipient, especially in Brazil, considering the legislative inflation we witness. (Diniz, 2012). No legal system would survive without this assumption. (Coelho, 2015).

At the same time, in modern democracies, the counterpart to this principle is the state's obligation to facilitate and ensure access to legislation. The legislator itself considers it...
essential to correctly provide information produced by the government, as ruled in Access to Information Law (Law 12.527). Article 5, for example, states: "It is the duty of the State to guarantee the right of access to information, which shall be granted, through objective and agile procedures, in a transparent, clear, and easily understandable language." In article 6, paragraph I, it is established that "it is up to the organs and entities of the public power, observing the specific rules and procedures applicable, to ensure: I - transparent management of information, providing broad access to it and its dissemination." Article 8, paragraph 2 of Law 12.527 also provides that the disclosure of information of collective interest produced by public agencies and entities on the internet is mandatory. Just to mention a few articles.

In the information society and with the tools made available by technology, the State must assume new obligations to ensure the exercise of citizenship - and this effort is reflected in the presentation of websites/databases created specifically to provide legal information. (Barité and López-Huertas, 2004).

These tools are even guarantors of legal certainty - since one of the dimensions of legal certainty, one of the most important principles of law, is precisely the certainty regarding the norms that regulate social acts, or the certainty of law in a stricto sensu. (Gutierrez, 1965 and Knijnik, 1995).

Information, as we have gathered, is one of the pillars of legal certainty.

This is such an important matter that the United Nations listed it as one of Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) – Target 16.10: Ensure public access to information and protect fundamental freedoms, in accordance with national legislation and international agreements. More than that, United Nations’ Universal Declaration of Human Rights says, in Article 19, that freedom to seek and receive information is a basic human right.

To fulfill its function, however, the provision of legal information cannot be done haphazardly and requires rigorous quality control. The information system will only serve the community if it offers timeliness, accuracy of data, completeness of legal norms production, control of the relationship between legal norms, and access to the complete content. Its credibility also depends on adopting as a standard the review and reliability of information taken from official sources, just to mention a few requirements. (Sow, 2013).

Taking this into account, the National Council of Prosecution Services created, through the Legislative and Jurisprudence Monitoring Committee, the project for the Qualification of the Legislation Websites of the Brazilian Prosecution Service, presented in this paper.

We believe that with this project, we have contributed to the concrete and effective promotion of access to information within the Brazilian Prosecution Service, effectively aligning the Brazilian government with constitutional and international guidelines regarding access to information, transparency, legal certainty, and exercise of citizenship.
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# Questionnaire for evaluation of legislation websites of the Brazilian Prosecution Service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Analysis parameters</th>
<th>Questionnaire</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. GENERAL INFORMATION</td>
<td>1.1. What is your unit of the Brazilian Prosecution Service?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|                     | 1.2. Does this unit provide to the public a fully open access legislation website on its homepage?  
  Note: If this question is answered negatively, the subsequent questions are affected, apart from question 4.1, which requests the identification of the respondent.  
  ( ) Yes  
  ( ) No |
|                     | 1.3. Please provide the URL of the legislation website of this unit.  
  Note: The website indicated in this question will be the subject of the entire research. If there is more than one legislation websites available on the internet page, please indicate the one considered the principal, and all the answers in this questionnaire should be based on the characteristics of the indicated website. |
|                     | 1.4. In this unit, are there different legislation websites available on both the internet page and the intranet page?  
  ( ) Yes  
  ( ) No |
|                     | 1.5. Is there more than one legislation website on the internet page in this?  
  ( ) Yes  
  ( ) No |
| 2. TECHNICAL USABILITY Visibility | 2.1. Is the link to the legislation website available on the homepage of the Public Prosecutor's Office website?  
  ( ) Yes  
  ( ) No |
| **URL** | 2.2. Is the URL of the legislation website mnemonic?  
Note: It is considered mnemonic when the URL is composed of the protocol, server, and a term or expression similar to the word "legislation," separated by at most one special character. Example: https://www.mprs.mp.br/legislacao/  
( ) Yes  
( ) No |
|---|---|
| **Search tool** | 2.3. Does the URL of the website clearly define its authorship?  
Note: To clearly define its authorship, the URL of the legislation portal should be associated with the MP's website domain. An example of a URL that DOES NOT clearly define its authorship would be: http://www.legislacao compilada.com.br/mpes/.  
( ) Yes  
( ) No |
| **Available norms** | 2.4. Is there a search tool available?  
Note: Mark the option "Yes" only if there is a dedicated search tool exclusively for the legislation website. For the purposes of this research, do not consider the general search tool of the Public Prosecutor’s Office website.  
( ) Yes  
( ) No |
| **Available period** | 2.5. Is the search tool prominently displayed?  
Note: Mark the option "Yes" if the search tool is provided centrally and clearly on the homepage of the legislation website.  
( ) Yes  
( ) No |
| **Updating** | 2.6. Is there information about the norms available on the website?  
Note: Mark the option "Yes" if there is informative text about the scope of the content available on the legislation website.  
( ) Yes  
( ) No |
| **COVERAGE** | 2.7. Is there completeness since 1988?  
Note: Mark the option "Yes" if all normative acts published by the Public Prosecutor's Office since the Federal Constitution of 1988 are available on the legislation website.  
( ) Yes  
( ) No |
| **Updating** | 2.8. Is there information about the frequency of updates to the website?  
Note: Mark the option "Yes" if there is informative text about the frequency of updates of the legislation website.  
( ) Yes  
( ) No |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Access points</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.9. Is there an option of search by the number of the legal norm?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Note: Mark the option &quot;Yes&quot; if there is an option to locate legal norms by their number through the search tool.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( ) Yes</td>
<td>( ) No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10. Is there an option of search by the number of the legal norm?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Note: Mark the option &quot;Yes&quot; if there is an option to locate legal norms by the year of publication, either through the search tool or by organizing them with hyperlinks.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( ) Yes</td>
<td>( ) No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11. Is there an option to search by the type of legal norm?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Note: Mark the option &quot;Yes&quot; if there is an option to locate legal norms by their type, either through the search tool or by hyperlinks structure. Examples of normative types include resolution, ordinance, provision, administrative order, etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( ) Sim</td>
<td>( ) Não</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12. Is there an option to search by the subject of the legal norm?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obs.: Mark the option &quot;Yes&quot; if there is an option to locate legal norms by their subject, either through the search tool or by hyperlinks structure.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( ) Yes</td>
<td>( ) No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13. Is the full text of the legal norms made available in a searchable format?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Note: A searchable text format is one that allows search engines to identify alphanumeric codes. For this and following questions select &quot;Partially&quot; if the criteria for the &quot;Yes&quot; option applies to more than 50%, but not the entirety, of the available standards on the website.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( ) Yes</td>
<td>( ) Partially</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14. Is the original text of legal norms available?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Note: The original text refers to the initial wording of the regulation, without subsequent modifications.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( ) Yes</td>
<td>( ) Partially</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15. Is the amended text of legal norms available?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Note: The amended text of the legal norm corresponds to the version that displays the current text along with the repealed sections, usually marked.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( ) Yes</td>
<td>( ) Partially</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.16. Is the consolidated text of the legal norms available?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Note: The consolidated text of the legal norm corresponds to the updated version of the norm, omitting sections that have been amended or repealed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( ) Yes</td>
<td>( ) Partially</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RELATIONSHIPS</strong></td>
<td>Relationship between legal norms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.17.</strong> Is there information about related legal norms (amendments, repeal, regulation, etc.)?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Note: Select &quot;Yes&quot; if there is clear information about related legal norms, such as within the text of the norm, at the beginning of the publication, or in the technical sheet.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( ) Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( ) Partially</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( ) No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.18. Are there hyperlinks to related legal norms?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Note: Select &quot;Yes&quot; if there are hyperlinks to related regulations, which may appear in the technical specifications or throughout the text.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( ) Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( ) Partially</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( ) No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Source** | |
| **2.19. Is there information about the publication source of legal norms (Official Gazette, etc.)?** |
| Note: Select "Yes" if the publication source is provided with the norm itself (it can be in the full text, search menu, technical sheet, etc.). |
| ( ) Yes |
| ( ) Partially |
| ( ) No |

| **TOOLS** | Technical sheet |
| **2.20. Is a technical sheet provided with an overview of all the information about the legal norm: heading, summary, date of publication, status (in force, repealed, amended), and relationships?** |
| Obs.: Check an example of technical sheet on the image ahead. |
| ( ) Yes |
| ( ) Partially |
| ( ) No |

| **Responsibility** | |
| **2.21. Is there clear information about the authorship and responsibility for the website?** |
| Note: Select “Yes” if there is, on the legislation website, text identifying those who are responsible for the database. |
| ( ) Yes |
| ( ) No |
### Contact

2.22. Is there information for direct contact by citizens?  
Note: Select "Yes" only if there are direct contact information (email, phone, address, or form) available for contacting the team responsible for the legislation website.  

( ) Sim  
( ) Não

### 3. ADMINISTRATIVE ASPECTS

3.1. How many collaborators are responsible for feeding and updating the legislation website?  

____________________________________________________________

3.2. What are the positions of the employees mentioned in the previous question?  
Note: It is possible to select more than one option.  

( ) Coordinator or similar  
( ) Public employee  
( ) Intern  
( ) Contractor  
( ) Other: ___________________

3.3. The employees responsible for the legislation website are associated with which sector(s)?  

___________________________________________________________

3.4. What is the educational background of the employees responsible for the legislation website?  
Note: It is possible to select more than one option. In case the employees have postgraduate degrees, indicate only the undergraduate area.  

( ) Bachelor’s degree in Law  
( ) Bachelor’s degree in the field of Information Science  
( ) Bachelor’s degree in other areas  
( ) Incomplete higher education  
( ) Others: _______________________________________________

3.5. Is the work of the employees responsible for the legislation website managed by a specific department?  
Note: Mark the option "Yes" if there is a department, whether exclusively dedicated to the legislation website or not, that manages the overall work of content provision on the database.  

( ) Yes  
( ) No

3.6. From the date of publication of the legal norm, how long does it take for the content to be made available on the legislation website?  
Note: The objective of the question is to understand what usually happens, without considering the existence or absence of a formal rule establishing a minimum time for publication.  

( ) Within 5 business days.  
( ) Between 6 and 10 business days.  
( ) Between 11 and 20 business days.  
( ) There is no pre-established deadline.
<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>4. FINAL INFORMATIONS</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1. Please provide the Public Prosecutor or Server responsible for the provided information and the contact details.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name:______________________________________________________</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position:____________________________________________________</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department:_________________________________________________</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-mail:_____________________________________________________</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone:_____________________________________________________</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2. I declare that I am aware that the information provided regarding the characteristics of the legislation website of this Prosecution Service unit will be audited by the Work Group responsible for the research, and if they are not in accordance with the adopted methodology, they may be changed in the final evaluation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( ) I agree.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>