

DIGITAL GOVERNANCE AND COMPREHENSIVE PROTECTION: OVERVIEW AND CHALLENGES OF USING SIPIA IN THE STATE OF PARÁ

GOVERNANÇA DIGITAL E PROTEÇÃO INTEGRAL: PANORAMA E DESAFIOS DO USO DO SIPIA NO ESTADO DO PARÁ

GOBERNANZA DIGITAL Y PROTECCIÓN INTEGRAL: PANORAMA GENERAL Y DESAFÍOS DEL USO DE SIPIA EN EL ESTADO DE PARÁ

Marcelo Pereira Aquino

Master's student in Business Administration at the Federal University of Southern
and Southeastern Pará (UNIFESSPA), Brazil
E-mail: marceloaquino@unifesspa.edu.br

Rodrigo Martins Lima

Master's student in Business Administration at the Federal University of Southern
and Southeastern Pará (UNIFESSPA), Brazil
E-mail: rodrigo.martins@unifesspa.edu.br

Jax Nildo Aragão Pinto

Postdoctoral researcher in Communication, Culture, and the Amazon at the Federal
University of Pará (UFPA), Brazil.
E-mail: jax@unifesspa.edu.br

Josianne Silva Gadioli

Master's student in Business Administration at the Federal University of Southern
and Southeastern Pará (UNIFESSPA), Brazil
Email: josiannesgadiole@gmail.com

Joyce Silva Gadioli

Master's student in Business Administration at the Federal University of Southern
and Southeastern Pará (UNIFESSPA), Brazil

Abstract

The Information System for Childhood and Adolescence (SIPIA) constitute one of the main tools for recording and monitoring violations of children's and adolescents' rights in Brazil, integrating essential data to support the work of Guardianship Councils and strengthen the protection network. This study analyzes the panorama of adherence to and use of SIPIA in the State of Pará, exploring its relationship with public policies for child protection, with emphasis on the factors influencing the effectiveness of its implementation. The research adopts a qualitative approach, with a descriptive-analytical nature, based on secondary data from official reports of the Ministry of Human Rights and Citizenship, institutional documents, CONANDA resolutions, and public information related to the UNICEF Seal. The results indicate that, although 65.3% of municipalities in Pará have formally adhered to the system, only about one-third maintain regular and consistent records, revealing gaps that compromise SIPIA's strategic role as a management and decision-making tool. Among the main challenges identified are the lack of mandatory legal enforcement at the federal level, weaknesses in technological infrastructure, insufficient continuous training, and high turnover among Guardianship Council members. It was also observed that participation in the UNICEF Seal is associated with higher levels of regular system use, although it does not guarantee satisfactory performance. The analysis highlights that strengthening SIPIA in Pará requires integrated strategies aimed at expanding coverage, improving data quality, and promoting interoperability with other national databases. It is concluded that, beyond being a technological resource, SIPIA represents a fundamental link between the legal framework and the daily practices of the child protection system, playing a crucial role in guiding effective public policies and ensuring the constitutional principle of absolute priority established in Article 227 of the Federal Constitution.

Keywords: Child Protection Council; public policies; child protection.

RESUMO

O Sistema de Informação para a Infância e Adolescência (SIPIA) constitui uma das principais ferramentas de registro e monitoramento das violações de direitos de crianças e adolescentes no Brasil, articulando dados essenciais para subsidiar a atuação dos Conselhos Tutelares e fortalecer a rede de proteção. Este estudo analisa o panorama de adesão e uso do SIPIA no Estado do Pará, explorando sua relação com políticas públicas de proteção à infância, com destaque para os fatores que influenciam a efetividade de sua implementação. A pesquisa, de abordagem qualitativa e natureza descritiva e analítica, baseou-se em dados secundários provenientes de boletins oficiais do Ministério dos Direitos Humanos e da Cidadania, documentos institucionais, resoluções do CONANDA e informações públicas relativas ao Selo UNICEF. Os resultados apontam que, embora 65,3% dos municípios paraenses tenham aderido formalmente ao sistema, apenas cerca de um terço realiza registros regulares e consistentes, revelando lacunas que comprometem a função estratégica do SIPIA como instrumento de gestão e tomada de decisão. Entre os principais entraves identificados estão a ausência de obrigatoriedade legal em nível federal, fragilidades na infraestrutura tecnológica, falta de capacitação contínua e rotatividade de conselheiros tutelares. Observou-se, ainda, que a participação no Selo UNICEF está associada a melhores índices de uso regular, embora não seja garantia de desempenho satisfatório. A análise evidencia que o fortalecimento do SIPIA no Pará exige estratégias integradas que ampliem a cobertura, qualifiquem o uso e promovam a integração de dados com outras bases nacionais. Conclui-se que, mais do que um recurso tecnológico, o SIPIA é um elo fundamental entre o arcabouço legal e a prática cotidiana da rede de garantia de direitos, sendo indispensável para orientar políticas públicas eficazes e assegurar a prioridade absoluta prevista no artigo 227 da Constituição.

Palavras-chave: Conselho Tutelar; políticas públicas; proteção à infância, Estado do Pará

RESUMEN

El Sistema de Información para la Infancia y la Adolescencia (SIPIA) constituye una de las principales herramientas para el registro y monitoreo de las violaciones de derechos de niños, niñas y adolescentes en Brasil, integrando datos esenciales para apoyar la actuación de los Consejos Tutelares y fortalecer la red de protección. Este estudio analiza el panorama de adhesión y uso del SIPIA en el Estado de Pará, explorando su relación con las políticas públicas de protección infantil, con énfasis en los factores que influyen en la efectividad de su implementación. La investigación adopta un enfoque cualitativo, de carácter descriptivo-analítico, basada en datos secundarios provenientes de informes oficiales del Ministerio de Derechos Humanos y Ciudadanía, documentos institucionales, resoluciones del CONANDA e información pública relacionada con el Sello UNICEF. Los resultados indican que, aunque el 65,3% de los municipios del estado han adherido formalmente al sistema, solo alrededor de un tercio realiza registros regulares y consistentes, evidenciando brechas que comprometen la función estratégica del SIPIA como herramienta de gestión y toma de decisiones. Entre los principales desafíos identificados se encuentran la ausencia de obligatoriedad legal a nivel federal, las deficiencias en la infraestructura tecnológica, la falta de capacitación continua y la alta rotación de los consejeros tutelares. Asimismo, se observó que la participación en el Sello UNICEF está asociada a mayores niveles de uso regular del sistema, aunque no garantiza un desempeño satisfactorio. El análisis evidencia que el fortalecimiento del SIPIA en Pará requiere estrategias integradas orientadas a ampliar la cobertura, mejorar la calidad del uso y promover la integración de datos con otras bases nacionales. Se concluye que, más que un recurso tecnológico, el SIPIA representa un vínculo fundamental entre el marco normativo y la práctica cotidiana del sistema de garantía de derechos, siendo indispensable para orientar políticas públicas eficaces y asegurar el principio de prioridad absoluta establecido en el artículo 227 de la Constitución Federal.

Palavras-chave: Conselho Tutelar; políticas públicas; proteção a la infancia.

1. INTRODUCTION

The development of public policies focused on children and adolescents in Brazil gained momentum as a constitutional and ethical commitment beginning in 1988, when the Federal Constitution established, in Article 227, the obligation of the family, society, and the State to ensure, with absolute priority, all the fundamental rights of children and adolescents. Subsequently, this was regulated by Law No. 8,069/1990, the Statute of the Child and Adolescent (ECA), which established the doctrine of comprehensive protection as a guiding paradigm, replacing the welfare and punitive models that characterized earlier periods (Brazil, 1990). However, the achievement of this historic and legal milestone still requires public management mechanisms capable of continuously diagnosing, monitoring, and evaluating the effectiveness of these policies, transforming information into coordinated and preventive actions.

In this sense, the Information System for Children and Adolescents (SIPIA) represent a significant advance by structuring itself as a technology-based public policy, focused on the recording, systematization, and analysis of services provided by the Guardianship Councils. Its objective is to standardize data on situations of threat or violation of the rights of children and adolescents, linking this information to the dynamics of the Rights Guarantee System (SGD) and providing concrete data for the planning and evaluation of programs and services. Thus, SIPIA is not limited to being merely a database; it is also a bridge between the reality experienced by children and adolescents and the formulation of effective public policies that support managers, enabling them to understand indicators of rights violations and direct resources and policies more efficiently (CONANDA, 2006).

In the state of Pará, the relevance of SIPIA takes on even greater significance due to a territorial expanse that challenges the logistics of public services and a cultural and socioeconomic diversity that reveals profound inequalities; the adoption and effective use of this tool are fundamental to ensuring that the protection of rights fully reaches its target audience. Currently, the state presents a diverse landscape in which, while some municipalities in Pará already use SIPIA systematically—generating local assessments and coordinating more efficient intersectoral responses—others face difficulties related to technological infrastructure, connectivity, a lack of operator training, and the absence of integration with other government databases.

These setbacks not only limit the system's potential but also have concrete effects on the management of public policies. The absence of complete records compromises the ability to map needs, evaluate results, and plan interventions equitably—a concern that is alarming given that this is such a vulnerable population. In a state marked by historical vulnerabilities and the need for effective action, this gap poses a risk to the effectiveness of comprehensive protection and to the fulfillment of the principle of absolute priority.

Given this scenario, the research question guiding this study is: what are the advances, challenges, and prospects for consolidating SIPIA as a tool for managing and strengthening public policies for the protection of children and

adolescents in the State of Pará? To answer this, this article aims to analyze the landscape of SIPIA use in the state of Pará, identifying the degree of municipal adoption, the barriers faced, and opportunities for improvement.

Specifically, the study seeks to: (a) interpret data on the adoption and use of the system in municipalities across Pará; (b) identify potential technical, institutional, and operational challenges that hinder the platform's effectiveness; and (c) propose recommendations to expand and enhance its use as a strategic tool for managing public policies focused on children and adolescents.

The relevance of this research lies in understanding SIPIA as part of a public policy that combines technology and human rights, recognizing it as an indispensable instrument for generating evidence and strengthening the protection network. By analyzing the case of Pará, the aim is to contribute both to academic debate and to administrative practice, offering insights for managers, child protection counselors, and other actors within the Child Protection System (SGD).

Finally, this article is structured into four sections, in addition to this introduction. The second section presents the theoretical and normative framework, discussing the legal, conceptual, and operational foundations of SIPIA and its importance for public policies on child and adolescent protection. The third section describes the methodology used, detailing the data sources and the method of analysis. The fourth section presents and analyzes the results, combining quantitative and qualitative data to understand the current state of SIPIA in Pará. Finally, the fifth section presents the concluding remarks and recommendations for strengthening the system, with a view to consolidating more effective and equitable public policies throughout the state.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Legal and Institutional Framework for the Protection of Children and Adolescents.

The comprehensive protection of children and adolescents in Brazil was established as a fundamental principle under the 1988 Federal Constitution, which

sets forth, in Article 227, the shared responsibility among the State, society, and the family to guarantee the fundamental rights of this population (Brazil, 1988).

This priority has direct implications for public administration, as it imposes on federal entities and civil society the obligation to formulate, finance, and implement public policies capable of ensuring the promotion, defense, and social oversight of the rights of children and adolescents (Pereira, 2010).

This constitutional framework was regulated by the Statute of the Child and Adolescent (ECA), which instituted a paradigm shift by recognizing children and adolescents as subjects of rights, overcoming the doctrine of irregular status (Veronese; Custódio, 2011).

Among the innovations of the ECA, the creation of the Guardianship Council (Articles 131–140) stands out; this is a permanent, autonomous, non-judicial body elected by the community and charged with ensuring the fulfillment of the rights of children and adolescents. Alongside the Rights Councils, which are involved in the formulation and oversight of public policies, the Guardianship Council plays a central role in directly addressing situations involving threats to or violations of rights.

This institutional framework is based on the Rights Guarantee System (SGD), established by the ECA. As a result, high-quality data emerges as a strategic element for providing accurate and standardized information on the situation of children and adolescents, an essential prerequisite for the formulation, implementation, and evaluation of public policies (Secchi, 2014; Lotta, 2019).

In this context, it is worth noting that the ECA established the Rights Guarantee System (SGD), structured around three complementary pillars: promotion, defense, and social control. The promotion pillar is implemented through universal policies such as health, education, social assistance, and culture; the defense pillar involves bodies such as the Guardianship Councils, the Public Prosecutor's Office, the Public Defender's Office, and the Judiciary; and social control is exercised, among others, by the Rights Councils, which formulate and oversee public policies for children and adolescents (Brazil, 1990).

As a result, quality information emerges as a strategic element. Secchi (2014) and Lotta (2019) emphasize that no public policy is effective without accurate assessments, constant monitoring, and evidence-based evaluation. The absence of reliable data or the fragmentation of information hinders resource allocation, the setting of priorities, and the effectiveness of actions. It is precisely to meet this need that national information systems, such as SIPIA, were designed, linked to the SGD and sectoral policies. It should be noted, however, that these data reflect the recorded reality and may be subject to limitations arising from underreporting and institutional capacity for data collection.

SIPIA, therefore, does not exist in isolation but as a concrete response to the legal mandate to prioritize children and adolescents, providing public managers, legal practitioners, and civil society with structured evidence for the formulation, implementation, and evaluation of protection policies. It embodies the constitutional principle of absolute priority by enabling the systematic monitoring of rights violations and the measures adopted, allowing the State and society to act in a proactive and coordinated manner.

2.2 The Information System for Children and Adolescents (SIPIA)

The Information System for Children and Adolescents (SIPIA) was designed in response to the need for standardized and systematic recording of cases handled by the Guardianship Councils, bodies established by Law No. 8,069/1990 (Statute of the Child and Adolescent – ECA) as permanent and autonomous bodies for the protection of the rights of children and adolescents (BRAZIL, 1990). By establishing, in Article 131, that the Guardianship Council is responsible for ensuring compliance with these rights, the ECA creates the institutional foundations for the production and organization of information regarding situations of violation.

In this context, SIPIA was formally established in 1997, within the framework of the National Human Rights Program (PNDH), at the initiative of the Ministry of Justice and with the support of the National Council for the Rights of Children and Adolescents (CONANDA), with the aim of integrating data on rights violations on a

national scale (Brazil, 1996; Brazil, 1997). According to the Ministry of Human Rights and Citizenship, the system was developed to record and process information related to the guarantee and defense of the fundamental rights provided for in the ECA, with a focus on the services provided by the Guardianship Councils (Brazil, 2024).

Although widely recommended as a strategic management tool, the use of SIPIA-CT is not legally mandatory at the federal level. This regulatory gap helps explain the discrepancies observed between formal adherence to and actual use of the system in municipalities. CONANDA has taken a step in this direction through Resolution No. 231/2022, which mandates the recording of services in SIPIA or an equivalent system when such a requirement is provided for in local regulations, thereby reinforcing the role of subnational entities in implementing this guideline.

The first version of SIPIA, which operated offline, depended on local installation and the periodic submission of files for consolidation at the state and national levels, which limited the timeliness and reliability of the information (Paraná, 1999). With advances in digital infrastructure, the SIPIA-CT Web version was launched in 2003, enabling online data entry and transmission, thereby expanding monitoring capabilities and integration across different levels of management (Brazil, 2010).

In recent years, the system has undergone modernization processes, including integration with the gov.br platform for secure authentication and compliance with the requirements of the General Personal Data Protection Law (Law No. 13,709/2018), particularly regarding the handling of sensitive data related to children and adolescents (Brazil, 2018). The platform now offers interactive reports, categorization by violation type, and territorial filters, expanding its potential for use within the Rights Guarantee System (SNDCA/MDHC, 2024).

Currently, the Ministry of Human Rights and Citizenship makes SIPIA open data available on the dados.gov.br portal, with periodic updates, which contributes to greater transparency and the possibility of social control over public policies (Brazil, 2024). This data openness expands the system's role beyond

administrative management, placing it within the field of data-driven public governance.

However, the use of SIPIA must be analyzed with caution, since the records reflect the reality institutionally observed and recorded by the Child Protection Councils. In this sense, the volume of data can be influenced by factors such as underreporting, access to services, institutional capacity to provide care, and local administrative routines, which impose limits on its interpretation as a direct indicator of the incidence of rights violations.

2.3 SIPIA as a Public Policy Tool

The Information System for Children and Adolescents (SIPIA) goes beyond the function of a recording tool and can be understood as a relevant instrument for public management, insofar as it interfaces with different phases of the public policy cycle—formulation, implementation, monitoring, and evaluation (Secchi, 2014; Howlett; Ramesh; Perl, 2013).

In the formulation phase, the data produced by the Guardianship Councils through SIPIA enable the mapping of patterns of violations, the identification of protection gaps, and the development of plans, programs, and projects focused on children and adolescents. As highlighted in the SIPIA-CT Manual, “the system should serve as a basis for public managers to plan and execute actions appropriate to the local reality” (Brazil, 2024, p. 12).

In practice, SIPIA functions as a repository and communication channel between the different levels of the Rights Guarantee System (SGD). By recording types of violations, protective measures, and referrals, it enables case tracking and facilitates coordination among the actors involved (Brazil, 2010).

Monitoring is strengthened by the system’s ability to generate periodic reports and indicators at different territorial scales. As LOTTA (2019) notes, evidence-based policies require up-to-date and reliable information, a condition that SIPIA seeks to meet, especially through the Ministry of Human Rights and Citizenship’s provision of data in open format.

In terms of evaluation, the historical record enables trend analysis and monitoring of the measures adopted by the Guardianship Councils. When linked to other databases, such as CadÚnico, the School Census, or health systems, SIPIA can contribute to intersectoral analyses and the improvement of public policies (Brazil, 2024).

In the context of the state of Pará, the adoption of SIPIA still faces significant challenges, such as inequalities in technological infrastructure among municipalities, variations in the training of child protection council members, unstable connectivity in rural areas, and low integration with other public policy systems. These factors compromise the standardization of information and affect the regularity of records (MDHC, 2024).

It should be noted, however, that the data produced by the system reflect the recorded reality and may be influenced by factors such as underreporting, access to services, and institutional capacity for data collection. Therefore, these data must be interpreted with analytical caution and cannot be taken as a direct measure of the total number of rights violations.

In this sense, SIPIA can be understood simultaneously as a technical tool—by organizing and classifying information for management—and as a relevant institutional instrument, by contributing to the realization of the principle of comprehensive protection provided for in the Federal Constitution and the Statute of the Child and Adolescent (Brazil, 1988; Brazil, 1990).

2.4 Relevance of SIPIA in the Context of the State of Pará

The public policy literature emphasizes that digital governance and state capacity materialize when informational tools structure diagnosis, coordination, and evaluation on an ongoing basis (Secchi, 2014; Gomide & Pires, 2014). In the case of the comprehensive protection provided for by the Statute of the Child and Adolescent (Brazil, 1990), SIPIA functions as an operational link between the legal framework and the network's activities; that is, it supports the Guardianship Council and sectoral policies (health, education, social assistance) to transform cases into actionable evidence. In Pará, this function is particularly strategic due to the

combination of territorial scale and municipal heterogeneity, which tends to fragment public action. The state covers 1,245,828.829 km² and comprises 144 municipalities (IBGE, 2022), a scale that in itself imposes coordination and monitoring costs that only systems like SIPIA can systematically mitigate.

One aspect that reinforces the centrality of SIPIA in Pará is the context of state public policies focused on children and adolescents. According to the 2023 Summary of Social Indicators (IBGE), the state has a monetary poverty rate of 47.8% of the population, with the highest incidence among children and adolescents. This scenario exacerbates situations of vulnerability and, according to UNICEF Brazil (2024), requires integrated policies that combine social protection, access to education, and the strengthening of the protection network against all forms of violence.

In the field of education, the 2023 School Census indicates that Pará maintains age-grade distortion rates higher than the national average in Lower Secondary Education (29.4% versus 17.8% in Brazil), an indicator strongly associated with the risk of school dropout and social vulnerability. When integrated into SIPIA, these data enable territorial correlations between rights violations and interrupted school trajectories, informing intersectoral actions within the Rights Guarantee System.

In the area of safety and protection, the 2024 Brazilian Public Safety Yearbook notes that the state ranks among the top five in the country for the highest rate of reported sexual violence against children and adolescents, a situation exacerbated in hard-to-reach areas and municipalities with weaker institutional infrastructure. The state policy to combat violence against children and adolescents, aligned with the National Plan to Combat Sexual Violence, includes SIPIA as a tool for monitoring and evaluating actions, reinforcing its role in policy governance.

These examples illustrate how SIPIA, when properly fed and analyzed, transcends bureaucratic record-keeping and becomes an evidence-based management tool. In Pará, integrating SIPIA data with other official databases—such as those of the IBGE, the Ministry of Health (SINAN), and the Ministry of

Education—strengthens the state’s capacity to formulate public policies responsive to the complex social and territorial reality of the state.

The pressure for protective policies is also reflected in national indicators that guide the state-level debate. The 2024 Brazilian Public Security Yearbook highlighted high rates of rape and sexual assault against vulnerable individuals in the country. According to the Ministry of Health (Brazil, 2024), 202,948 reports of sexual violence against children and adolescents were recorded in SINAN between 2015 and 2021, with an upward trend through 2019 and the highest figure in 2021—a sign that the visibility of the phenomenon increases as reporting improves. This is precisely the role that SIPIA plays: transforming events into historical series to guide prevention, protection, and accountability.

Network governance also requires incentives and transparency mechanisms. Since September 2024, the Ministry of Human Rights and Citizenship has been publishing open data from the SIPIA’s Guardianship Council module, updated monthly and preserving confidentiality in accordance with the LGPD (Brazil, 2024b). In theory, this creates a virtuous cycle: standardized data → comparable diagnostics → intersectoral coordination → public evaluation. For Pará, where municipal diversity is the norm, this transparency enables benchmarking among municipalities and strengthens social control by Rights Councils, the Public Prosecutor’s Office, and civil society.

Intersectorality, a requirement of the doctrine of comprehensive protection, depends on this informational foundation (Junqueira, 1997). The recent coordination between the UNICEF Seal and SIPIA demonstrates a supportive arrangement, where the Seal began to score SIPIA records (2021–2024 Edition, Indicator 6) and, in the new 2025–2028 edition, adherence to SIPIA-CT appears explicitly as a marker of municipal governance (UNICEF, 2024). For Pará, located in the heart of the Legal Amazon, this means aligning evidence (SIPIA) and incentives (Selo) to promote quality implementation at the local level, especially where administrative capacity is weakest.

Thus, the federal government’s official definition of SIPIA is: “a single national basis for formulating public policies in the sector” (Brazil, 2024b), which

provides institutional justification for its use as a policy instrument, and not merely as an administrative record. In theoretical terms, this places it at the center of the public policy cycle (diagnosis, prioritization, implementation, monitoring, and evaluation), offering Pará and all federal entities a decision-making infrastructure compatible with the challenges of scale, dispersion, and social vulnerability in the region.

3. METHODOLOGY

This is a documentary study of a descriptive-analytical nature, involving quantitative systematization of secondary data and qualitative interpretation, in light of the literature on public policy, digital governance, and the comprehensive protection of children and adolescents (Gil, 2008; Cellard, 2008).

The choice of this design is justified by the objective of analyzing the recorded use of the Information System for Children and Adolescents (SIPIA) in the State of Pará, based on official documents, institutional regulations, and secondary data made available by public agencies. Thus, the study does not seek to establish causal relationships, but rather to identify recent patterns of system use and interpret them in dialogue with the debate on state capacity, information management, and evidence-based public policies (Secchi, 2014; Lotta, 2019).

The research's documentary corpus consisted of state reports from SIPIA-PA made available by the system's state coordination; open data from SIPIA's Guardianship Council module, published by the Ministry of Human Rights and Citizenship; legal and sub-legal regulations related to comprehensive protection, especially the 1988 Federal Constitution, the Statute of the Child and Adolescent, and CONANDA resolutions; SIPIA technical manuals; and institutional documents linked to the UNICEF Seal, as systematized in Table 1.

Table 1 - Research Document Corpus

Document type	Source	Analytical purpose
SIPIA-PA State Reports	SIPIA State Coordination	Identify usage patterns and volume of records by municipality
SIPIA-CT open data	Ministry of Human Rights and Citizenship (MDHC)	Support comparative analysis
Regulations (ECA, CONANDA)	Federal Government / CONANDA	Underpin the legal framework
SIPIA technical manuals	MDHC	Understanding operational functioning
UNICEF Seal Documents	UNICEF Brazil	Identifying potential contributing factors

Source: Prepared by the authors.

The selection of sources followed the following inclusion criteria: direct relevance to the research topic; recognized institutional origin; availability of data on the use or operation of SIPIA; timeliness of the information; and the possibility of document verification. Opinion-based materials, texts without institutional identification, documents with no direct relation to SIPIA or to child and adolescent protection policy, as well as information with no possibility of verification, were excluded.

Data from the SIPIA state report were obtained from the state coordination office responsible for monitoring the system in Pará. Data collection took place in October 2025, covering the time period from January 1, 2024, to October 3, 2025. Whenever possible, the information was cross-checked with open data provided by the Ministry of Human Rights and Citizenship to verify overall consistency, identify potential gaps, and reduce inconsistencies in the interpretation of the records.

The variables extracted were: municipality, presence or absence of records during the analyzed period, total volume of records per municipality, and

classification into ranges of recorded usage intensity. The data were organized into spreadsheets, manually checked, and systematized into comparative tables.

The classification by ranges was used as an operational tool to organize the intensity of recorded use of SIPIA among municipalities in Pará, as presented in Table 2.

Table 2 – SIPIA Record Range

Range	Total range of records	Description
Inactive	0	No use of SIPIA during the period
Initial	1–30	Start of use; occasional records
Partial	31–100	Partial use; some recurrence without regularity
Functional	101–500	Functional use; increasing frequency
Managed	501–1000	Managed use; established routine
Institutionalized	≥1001	Institutionalized use; high volume and mature procedures

Source: Prepared by the authors based on data from SIPIA-PA, (Pará, 2025)

The classification by ranges was defined based on an operational criterion aimed at organizing and comparing empirical data, considering the observed distribution of the volume of records among municipalities during the analyzed period. It is, therefore, a typology constructed for analytical purposes, not derived from normative parameters or metrics established in the literature. In this sense, the categories indicate only levels of intensity of recorded system use and do not constitute a direct measure of governance, institutional capacity, or the quality of public management.

This typology is analytical and organizational in nature and does not constitute a direct measure of governance, institutional capacity, or the quality of public management; it may be influenced by factors such as population size, incidence of violations, administrative structure, connectivity, and institutional routines.

The analysis was developed based on the documentary analysis technique, structured in three stages: (i) exploratory reading and organization of the material (pre-analysis); (ii) categorization of the data; and (iii) interpretation of the results in dialogue with the theoretical framework (Bardin, 2011; Cellard, 2008).

A methodological limitation is the fact that the research relies exclusively on secondary data, without interviews with child protection council members, managers, or system operators. Furthermore, it was not possible to control the data by municipal population, child and youth population, number of Child Protection Councils, or administrative size of the municipalities. For this reason, the results should be interpreted as a descriptive and interpretive diagnosis of the recorded use of SIPIA, rather than as a definitive measure of the quality of municipal governance.

It should also be noted that municipal contextual variables, such as total population, child and youth population, number of Child Protection Councils, administrative size, or infrastructure indicators, were not incorporated. This absence limits direct comparisons between municipalities, since the volume of records may reflect not only the level of system use but also demographic, institutional, and territorial differences.

4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The results presented should be understood as an expression of the recorded level of SIPIA usage during the analyzed period; they do not, in isolation, allow for direct inferences regarding institutional capacity or the quality of municipal management. In this sense, the analysis seeks to identify patterns of system usage, articulating them interpretatively with the adopted theoretical framework.

4.1 General Distribution of Municipalities by Usage Range

The analysis of SIPIA-CT data for Pará, made available through the state SIPIA report, highlights the gap between formal adoption and actual use of the system, as shown in Table 3, which summarizes usage during the period from January 1, 2024, to October 3, 2025.

Table 3 – Status of municipalities in Pará regarding SIPIA use

Governance registration	Total number of records	No. of municipalities	Total records
Inactive	0	58	0
Home	1–30	51	364
Partial	31–100	10	596
Functional	101–500	19	3,534
Managed	501–1,000	3	2,386
Institutionalized	≥1,001	3	10,054
Total		144	16,934

Source: Prepared by the authors based on data from SIPIA-PA, (Pará, 2025)

The data should be interpreted with caution, as the absolute volume of records does not allow for direct comparisons between municipalities and may reflect differences in population size, demand for care, institutional capacity, and administrative routines. Thus, the results should be understood as indicative of patterns of recorded system use, and not as a direct measure of municipal management performance or quality.

Table 3 indicates the existence of significant weaknesses in the use of SIPIA in Pará, evidenced by the discrepancy between formal adherence and the actual creation of records during the analyzed period. In this context, 58 of the 144 municipalities appear inactive, with no records created during the analyzed period. This gap is not a technical detail; it may compromise the public policy cycle (diagnosis → decision → execution → monitoring → evaluation), undermining the very mandate of Article 136, IX of the ECA, which presupposes qualified information to advise the Executive Branch on budget formulation.

4.2 Municipal Heterogeneity and Possible Explanatory Factors

The distribution by ranges of recorded system usage among the 86 municipalities with usage should not be interpreted as a ranking, but rather as an organizational diagnosis: Initial/Partial indicate unstable routines; Functional/Managed indicate stabilized routines; and Institutionalized suggests

greater potential for using the data for planning and management purposes. This interpretation aligns with public policy literature that highlights state capacity and informational standardization as conditions for coordination and decision-making (Secchi, 2014; Lotta, 2019; Gomide & Pires, 2014).

In summary, the central issue can be understood not only as the volume of records but as SIPIA's capacity to convert service interactions into standardized information useful for decision-making, which, in the analyzed scenario, occurs in a heterogeneous manner.

The distribution by ranges highlights stages of institutional maturity in the use of SIPIA. In the Initial range (1–30 records), for example, Uruará (1) and Concórdia do Pará (30) illustrate profiles in which record-keeping is sporadic, lacking the regularity needed to transform cases into systematized information. This low regularity aligns with Howlett, Ramesh, and Perl (2013), indicating limitations in the public policy cycle when the information base is fragile.

4.3 Relationship between SIPIA, State Capacity, and Public Governance

This finding corroborates the theoretical framework employed in the study. The ECA and the doctrine of comprehensive protection presuppose instruments capable of diagnosing, monitoring, and evaluating public policies; without standardized information, the principle of absolute priority tends not to fully materialize in practice.

From an analytical perspective, the picture also suggests limits to the idea that formal adherence to SIPIA equates to effective use. The heterogeneity across groups reflects institutional and operational determinants, such as infrastructure, connectivity, continuing education, staff turnover, and administrative organization.

Two vectors of empirical corroboration emerge from the analyzed material. The first refers to the coexistence of participation in the UNICEF Seal and higher levels of recorded system use, without it being possible to establish a direct causal relationship. The second vector relates to the active transparency of the MDHC, with the availability of open data since 2024, which may contribute to more structured public evaluation processes.

There is also the regulatory factor: at the federal level, the use of SIPIA-CT is not mandatory, which helps explain the persistence of low usage rates. CONANDA Resolution No. 231/2022 establishes guidelines that gain strength when incorporated into local regulations, reinforcing the role of subnational entities in the implementation of the system.

4.4 Implications for public planning and budgeting

In light of the ECA and Article 136, IX, the breakdown by categories can be interpreted as an action plan for strengthening the system itself: expanding coverage, stabilizing data collection routines, and consolidating the strategic use of information.

In this context, the quality of information plays a central role, since its absence or fragmentation compromises resource allocation, priority setting, and intersectoral coordination, as discussed by SECCHI (2014) and LOTTA (2019).

4.5 Empirical examples of SIPIA use by category

Table 4 – Examples of municipalities using SIPIA

Municipality	Total records	Brackets	Record governance
Abaetetuba	7,830	≥1,001	Institutionalized
Benevides	1,032	≥1,001	Institutionalized
Breves	990	501–1,000	Managed
Tucumã	638	501–1000	Managed
Colares	317	101–500	Functional
Oeiras do Pará	102	101–500	Functional
Muaná	84	31–100	Partial
Canaã dos Carajás	33	31–100	Partial
Concórdia do Pará	30	1–30	Home
Uruará	1	1–30	Home

Source: Prepared by the authors based on data from SIPIA-PA, (Pará, 2025)

Analysis through examples allows for an applied illustration of the different levels of institutional maturity. In the Initial range, sporadic records indicate low

regularity of use; in the Partial range, there is limited recurrence; in the Functional range, greater stability is observed; in the Managed range, there is predictability and volume; and in the Institutionalized range, more consolidated routines for using the system are identified.

In summary, this analysis does not establish rankings, but highlights distinct degrees of consolidation of SIPIA as an information infrastructure for public management. Where this capacity is strengthened, the system tends to generate greater public value; where it is limited, its contribution to the decision-making process remains restricted.

5 CONCLUSION

This study sought to analyze the landscape of use and governance of the Information System for Children and Adolescents (SIPIA) in the State of Pará, integrating the theoretical debate on public policies and comprehensive protection with the empirical analysis of secondary data from official sources. The results indicate that, although the system is formally implemented in 86 of the 144 municipalities in Pará, the effectiveness of its use remains heterogeneous, with a predominance of the “Inactive” and “Initial” governance categories, highlighting institutional and operational inequalities among local entities.

The study engages with the literature of Secchi (2014), Lotta (2019), and Howlett, Ramesh, and Perl (2013) by reinforcing the importance of quality information as a prerequisite for the functioning of the public policy cycle, from diagnosis to evaluation. In this sense, the absence of regular records tends to compromise this cycle, whereas contexts with more regular use of the system indicate potential for consolidating SIPIA as a tool to support evidence-based public management.

Furthermore, a coexistence is observed between factors such as technical support, normative guidance (CONANDA, 2022), and institutional incentives, such as the UNICEF Seal, and higher levels of recorded system use, although it is not possible, however, to establish a direct causal relationship between these

variables. These elements may contribute to the consolidation of SIPIA as a relevant tool for public governance and planning.

It is acknowledged, however, that the research has methodological limitations. The exclusive use of secondary data implied a reliance on already published official information, making it impossible to capture qualitative dimensions of implementation, such as the perceptions of child protection council members and managers. Furthermore, the time frame restricted to the period from 2024 to 2025 does not allow for the observation of historical trends or long-term variations. Thus, the findings should be interpreted as an empirically grounded diagnosis of recent patterns of recorded system use, and not as an exhaustive representation of informational governance in the state.

From a theoretical and analytical perspective, the study reinforces that the consolidation of SIPIA is associated with institutional factors such as administrative capacity, regularity of recording, technical support, and intersectoral integration. In this sense, the system can contribute to strengthening public management, provided it is integrated into organizational routines and decision-making processes.

As a practical implication, the results highlight the need to strengthen the use of SIPIA at the state level, particularly by expanding the system's coverage, stabilizing registration routines, and institutionalizing the strategic use of data. Such measures can improve the quality of public planning and integration with budgetary instruments (PPA, LDO, and LOA), in accordance with the LGPD and the Access to Information Act.

Finally, it is recommended that future research proceed in two directions: (i) qualitative studies aimed at understanding the perceptions of child protection council members and managers regarding the challenges and potential of the system; and (ii) comparative analyses among states, especially in the Legal Amazon, with the objective of identifying factors associated with the institutionalization of SIPIA in different contexts.

REFERENCES

BRAZIL. Constitution of the Federative Republic of Brazil of 1988. Brasília: Federal Senate, 1988. Available at: https://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil_03/constituicao/constituicao.htm. Accessed on: Aug. 10, 2025.

BRAZIL. Law No. 8,069, of July 13, 1990. Statute of the Child and Adolescent. Brasília, 1990. Available at: https://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil_03/leis/l8069.htm. Accessed on: Aug. 10, 2025.

BRAZIL. Law No. 13,709, of August 14, 2018. General Personal Data Protection Law. Brasília, 2018. Available at: https://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil_03/ato2015-2018/2018/lei/l13709.htm. Accessed on: Aug. 10, 2025.

BRAZIL. National Council for the Rights of Children and Adolescents (CONANDA). Resolution No. 231, of December 28, 2022. Brasília, 2022. Available at: <https://www.in.gov.br/en/web/dou/-/resolucao-n-231-de-28-de-dezembro-de-2022-455013571>. Accessed on: Aug. 10, 2025.

CONANDA. Resolution No. 113, dated April 19, 2006. Brasília, 2006. Available at: <https://www.gov.br/mdh/pt-br/aceso-a-informacao/participacao-social/conselho-nacional-dos-direitos-da-crianca-e-do-adolescente-conanda/resolucoes/resolucao-no-113-de-19-04-06>. Accessed on: Aug. 12, 2025.

BRAZIL. Ministry of Human Rights and Citizenship. SIPIA-CT Manual. Brasília: MDHC, 2024. Available at: <https://www.gov.br/mdh/pt-br/navegue-por-temas/crianca-e-adolescente/sipia-ct/manual-sipia-ct.pdf>. Accessed on: Aug. 13, 2025.

BRAZIL. Ministry of Human Rights and Citizenship. SIPIA Open Data. Brasília: MDHC, 2024. Available at: <https://dados.gov.br/dados/conjuntos-dados/sipia-conselho-tutelar>. Accessed on: Aug. 13, 2025.

BRAZIL. Ministry of Health. Notifiable Diseases Information System (SINAN). Brasília, 2024. Available at: <https://datasus.saude.gov.br>. Accessed on: Aug. 15, 2025.

CELLARD, André Cellard. Documentary analysis. In: POUPART, Jean et al. *Qualitative research: epistemological and methodological approaches*. Petrópolis: Vozes, 2012. Available at: <https://bds.unb.br>. Accessed on: Aug. 10, 2025.

BRAZILIAN PUBLIC SECURITY FORUM. *Brazilian Yearbook of Public Security 2024*. São Paulo: FBSP, 2024. Available at: <https://forumseguranca.org.br/anuario-brasileiro-seguranca-publica/>. Accessed on: Aug. 15, 2025.

GIL, Antônio Carlos Gil. *Methods and Techniques of Social Research*. 6th ed. São Paulo: Atlas, 2008. Available at: <https://pergamum.bibliotecas.ufsc.br>. Accessed on: Aug. 10, 2025.

GOMIDE, Alexandre de Ávila Gomide; PIRES, Roberto Rocha Coelho Pires. *State Capacities and Democracy: Institutional Arrangements of Public Policies*. Brasília: IPEA, 2014. Available at: <https://repositorio.ipea.gov.br>. Accessed on: Aug. 10, 2025.

HOWLETT, Michael Howlett; RAMESH, M.; PERL, Anthony. *Public policies: their cycles and subsystems: an integrative approach*. Rio de Janeiro: Elsevier, 2013. Available at: <https://www.worldcat.org>. Accessed on: Aug. 10, 2025.

IBGE. 2022 Demographic Census. Rio de Janeiro: IBGE, 2022. Available at: <https://www.ibge.gov.br>. Accessed on: Aug. 15, 2025.

IBGE. Summary of Social Indicators 2023. Rio de Janeiro: IBGE, 2023. Available at: <https://www.ibge.gov.br>. Accessed on: Aug. 10, 2025.

INEP. School Census 2023. Brasília: INEP, 2023. Available at: <https://www.gov.br/inep/pt-br/aceso-a-informacao/dados-abertos/censo-escolar>. Accessed on: Aug. 10, 2025.

JUNQUEIRA, Luciano A. Prates Junqueira. New forms of health management: decentralization and intersectorality. *Saúde e Sociedade*, São Paulo, vol. 6, no. 2, pp. 31–46, 1997. Available at: <https://www.scielo.br>. Accessed on: Aug. 12, 2025.

LOTTA, Gabriela Spanghero Lotta. *Bureaucracy, management, and public policy in Brazil*. Brasília: ENAP, 2019. Available at: <https://repositorio.enap.gov.br>. Accessed on: Aug. 10, 2025.

SECCHI, Leonardo Secchi. *Public policies: concepts, analytical frameworks, practical cases*. 2nd ed. São Paulo: Cengage Learning, 2014. Available at: <https://pergamum.bibliotecas.ufsc.br>. Accessed on: Aug. 10, 2025.

UNICEF. *UNICEF Seal – Results Report 2021–2024*. Brasília: UNICEF, 2024. Available at: <https://www.unicef.org/brazil>. Accessed on: Aug. 13, 2025.

VERONESE, Josiane Rose Petry Veronese; CUSTÓDIO, André Viana Custódio. *Statute of the Child and Adolescent: 20 Years of Challenges and Achievements*. Florianópolis: Boiteux Foundation, 2011. Available at: <https://repositorio.ufsc.br>. Accessed on: Aug. 12, 2025.