

TRANSVERSAL PLANNING IN THE 2024–2027 PPA: CHILDREN’S AND ADOLESCENTS’ RIGHTS AGENDA.

Manuscript Info

Abstract

Manuscript History

Received: xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

Final Accepted: xxxxxxxxxxxx

Published: xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

Key words: *Transversal Agenda; Rights of Children And Adolescents.*

This study analyzes the Transversal Agenda for the Rights of Children and Adolescents within the Multiannual Plan (PPA) 2024–2027, assessing its technical, institutional, and

operational coherence as an instrument of transversal planning in Brazil. Grounded in the principles of comprehensive protection and absolute priority, the agenda articulates programs from different ministries across seven structural dimensions, seeking integrated responses to problems historically addressed in a fragmented manner. The research adopts a qualitative approach and documentary analysis, identifying advances such as the incorporation of a multidimensional perspective on child poverty, the establishment of goals and indicators, and alignment with international standards. Nevertheless, critical challenges persist, including budgetary fragmentation, the absence of robust governance mechanisms, insufficiently disaggregated indicators, weak federative coordination, limited and poorly qualified social participation, and vulnerability to administrative discontinuity. The conclusions indicate that the effectiveness of the agenda requires structural reforms, such as the creation of a central coordinating body, permanent interministerial committees, interoperable information systems, a dedicated age-based budget, and stable channels for social participation, including the active listening of children and adolescents.

Copyright, IJAR, 2025. All rights reserved.

1

Introduction:-

The Transversal Agenda for the Rights of Children and Adolescents, established within the 2024–2027 Multiannual Plan (PPA), represents a normative and strategic innovation in federal public planning by recognizing the need to incorporate the rights of childhood and adolescence in a structured and integrated manner into the formulation, implementation, and evaluation of public policies. Grounded in the principle of comprehensive protection and the logic of transversality, the agenda proposes coordinated articulation among different areas of government and federative levels, mobilizing resources, expertise, and monitoring instruments to address problems historically treated in a fragmented and sectoral way.

The context in which this agenda was conceived is marked by persistent structural challenges: socioeconomic and territorial inequalities, insufficient intersectoral integration, low institutionalization of collaborative governance practices, and, above all, administrative discontinuity. Classic studies on public policies in Brazil (Bresser-Pereira, 2007; Faria & Ribeiro, 2010; Cruz & Farah, 2016) indicate that the absence of permanent coordination mechanisms

and vulnerability to political cycles undermine the State's capacity to implement long-term policies. In the specific case of children and adolescents, this vulnerability is even more severe, as this group's development and protection require consistent, intergenerational actions based on State commitments, rather than merely governmental ones.

The analysis conducted in this study reveals that, although the Transversal Agenda presents normative potential to promote policy integration, persistent weaknesses compromise its effectiveness. An examination of the associated actions and indicators, systematized in Annex V of the PPA (2024–2027), demonstrates the absence of robust mechanisms to ensure administrative continuity, such as permanent intersectoral coordination bodies or formalized cooperation protocols among federative entities. It is also observed that, in several of the programs analyzed, the expected results are not clearly articulated with impact indicators, which hinders systematic monitoring and evaluation of outcomes. In some cases, particularly those related to early childhood, the lack of disaggregation by age group, race, gender, and territory undermines the capacity to identify inequalities and allocate resources equitably.

These findings reinforce the need to move beyond a predominantly declarative logic and advance toward a technically structured approach, in which the agenda's objectives and indicators are grounded in precise diagnostics and linked to governance mechanisms capable of transcending governmental mandates. Measures such as the establishment of intersectoral committees with federative representation and qualified social participation, the consolidation of technical teams, the formalization of long-term cooperation agreements, and the adoption of disaggregated indicators are essential conditions for transversalization to cease being merely a normative statement and become an institutionalized practice.

In this context, the present research is justified by the need to critically assess the formulation of the Transversal Agenda for the Rights of Children and Adolescents within the PPA 2024–2027, examining whether its structural components, general and specific objectives, outputs, and indicators demonstrate sufficient coherence and internal articulation to sustain a consistent policy model of effective transversal planning. The central objective is to understand the extent to which the agenda, as conceived, brings together the technical, institutional, and operational conditions necessary to consolidate itself as a stable state practice, contributing to the reduction of inequalities and the full guarantee of the rights of children and adolescents.

To achieve this objective, a qualitative approach is adopted, based on a documentary analysis of the PPA and its related normative frameworks, consultation of specialized literature on transversalization, governance, and results-oriented planning, and a comparison of these references with the findings of the technical analysis of actions and indicators. The article is structured into five sections: the first presents the context and justification; the second outlines the theoretical framework underpinning the analysis; the third describes the methodology employed; the fourth develops a critical analysis of the agenda, examining its constituent elements and limitations; and the fifth synthesizes the conclusions, offering recommendations for the technical and institutional strengthening of transversalization in federal public planning.

Transversality In Public Policies: Conceptual Foundations And Its Application In Brazilian State Planning

The distinction between intersectorality and transversality is central to the debate on public policies and governmental planning instruments. The former refers to technical cooperation among sectors to address complex problems, while the latter implies a reorganization of the State, requiring the incorporation of structural themes—such as childhood, racial and gender equity, and environmental sustainability—across all stages of the policy cycle (Arretche, 1999; Marcondes, Diniz, Farah, 2020). This new paradigm guides governmental action based on ethical and political values and demands thematic integration, the overcoming of institutional fragmentation, and sustained political commitment (Cruz, Farah, 2016; Cunill-Grau, 2014; Mendes, 2018).

Nogueira and Forte (2019), drawing on the concept proposed by Gallo (2007, apud Avelino & Santos, 2014), emphasize that transversality is characterized by the mutual intersection among fields of knowledge, without dissolving sectoral specificities. This understanding reinforces the perspective advanced by Brugué (2008, 2010), Quinhões and Fava (2010), and Souza (2015), according to which transversality promotes collaboration among diverse actors, thereby expanding the State's capacity to formulate integrated responses. The literature identifies three priority fronts in this process: overcoming organizational compartmentalization (Veiga & Bronzo, 2014); building effective coordination mechanisms among institutional actors (Costa & Bronzo, 2012); and sharing diagnoses and information as a condition for reducing power and information asymmetries (Souza, 2015). This set of requirements is linked to the need for institutional pacts that ensure stability and legitimacy in decision-making, as highlighted by Cruz, Marcondes, and Farah (2024) and Lima et al. (2015).

According to Marcondes, Sandim, and Diniz (2018), transversality also emerges as a response to the fragmentation of public policies and the low effectiveness of state action, assuming the role of an organizing principle oriented toward social justice. Along the same lines, Lassance (2024), in a study conducted within the scope of IPEA, identifies transversality as a central dimension of the Brazilian State's political-institutional agenda, insofar as it articulates multisectoral themes and guides budgetary execution, distinguishing itself from intersectorality by its normative and structuring character. This concept presupposes the institutionalization of shared governance systems, the systematic incorporation of disaggregated indicators, and the consolidation of political and administrative consensus capable of ensuring the sustainability of intersectoral coordination (Mendes, 2018).

Within the realm of governmental planning, the centrality of transversality was formally recognized with the institutionalization of transversal agendas in the PPA 2024–2027. The plan introduced mechanisms to identify objectives, results, and indicators, thereby enhancing transparency and facilitating monitoring (Lemos & Ângelis, 2024). Five agendas were established—Childhood and Adolescence, Women, Racial Equality, Indigenous Peoples, and Environmental Issues—each with centralized technical coordination and decentralized implementation. The formulation process, conducted by the National School of Public Administration (ENAP), was based on intersectoral workshops and technical agreements that conferred a procedural character on the transversal logic (Lemos & Ângelis, 2024). This arrangement sought to identify overlaps and gaps, improve governance, ensure greater social intelligibility of planning, and strengthen public accountability mechanisms.

Transversality thus consolidates itself as a structuring principle of contemporary public planning. Its adoption implies the continuous and mandatory integration of priority themes throughout the entire management cycle, promoting greater coherence, effectiveness, and equity in state action. By aligning objectives, resources, and actions with universalistic values, the State's capacity to confront historical inequalities and consolidate rights in an intergenerational and sustainable manner is expanded.

Methodology

This research adopts a qualitative, descriptive, and exploratory approach, centered on the analysis of the Transversal Agenda for the Rights of Children and Adolescents within the 2024–2027 Multi-Year Plan (PPA). The methodological choice stems from the complexity of the topic, which requires examining its formulation, structure, intersectoral coordination, technical coherence, and potential effectiveness in light of public policy frameworks and children's rights. According to Minayo (2012) and Gil (2017), qualitative, descriptive, and exploratory research is appropriate for interpreting complex social phenomena, characterizing public policies, and identifying gaps in institutional models.

The methodological design, following Lakatos and Marconi (2003), combines documentary and bibliographic research across three complementary analytical fronts: literature review, normative analysis, and exploration of structured public data. The first front systematized the theoretical framework on transversality in public planning

and results-oriented policies, prioritizing prominent authors such as Souza (2006), Arretche (1999), Lotta (2010), and Pires (2011). The search conducted in the SciELO database yielded 123 articles, of which six were selected, while Google Scholar identified only two articles published in the last five years.

The second front focused on the documentary analysis of the Agenda, particularly Annex V of the PPA 2024–2027, complemented by technical manuals, budgetary regulations, and minutes from the Inter-Council Forum, with the objective of assessing normative coherence, adherence to the logical model, and governance mechanisms. The third front organized and processed data available on the Federal Government's open data portal, including deliverables, objectives, indicators, and physical and budgetary targets. Of the 41 programs linked to the Agenda, only 31 had defined targets, while the remainder lacked budgetary allocation.

These data were processed in Microsoft Excel, eliminating duplications, thematically regrouping the information, and classifying deliverables according to Jannuzzi's (2001) typology: inputs, processes, outputs, outcomes, and impacts. The aim was to assess the coherence between deliverables, specific objectives, and indicators. For the analysis, a documentary content analysis technique was adopted, with categories defined based on the literature: (i) clarity of objectives and intersectoral coordination, (ii) budgetary coherence, (iii) monitoring capacity, (iv) governance, and (v) innovation and learning, ensuring interpretive coherence and the replicability of results.

Development

Transversal Agenda For The Rights Of Children And Adolescents

The Transversal Agenda for the Rights of Children and Adolescents, institutionalized in the 2024–2027 PPA, exemplifies the application of transversality to planning by articulating programs from different ministries around shared objectives (Bellini et al., 2020). The centrality of children's rights in public policy formulation derives from the 1988 Federal Constitution and the 1990 Statute of the Child and Adolescent (ECA), which enshrine the principles of absolute priority and comprehensive protection (Brazil, 1988; 1990). These normative frameworks assign childhood a structuring role within the State's agenda, requiring integrated and intersectoral approaches.

According to Bellini et al. (2020), these rights function as natural articulators among social policies, requiring simultaneous actions in the areas of health, education, social assistance, security, and culture. This transversality enables childhood to act as a catalyst for intersectoral agendas, provided there is institutional convergence, clearly defined responsibilities, and effective coordination mechanisms.

The literature emphasizes that a rights-based perspective, when adopted as a guiding principle, breaks with fragmented and assistentialist practices, promoting universal guarantees and continuity in public action (Nascimento, 2010). However, Monnerat and Souza (2009) warn of the gap between the formal recognition of rights and their effective implementation, often limited to abstract guidelines with little impact on planning formulation or budget execution. This disconnection undermines intersectoral agendas, reducing integration and hindering the achievement of objectives.

In this context, the Transversal Agenda for the Rights of Children and Adolescents (2024–2028) emerges as a concrete attempt to overcome these limitations through the establishment of interinstitutional commitments and coordination among different levels of government around priority objectives. For Bellini et al. (2020), this agenda represents a methodological and political innovation by institutionalizing intersectorality within state planning.

Despite these advances, its implementation faces challenges related to disputes over competencies, budgetary fragmentation, and the absence of consistent monitoring. As noted by Nascimento (2010), the persistence of

clientelist cultures hampers the consolidation of integrated strategies, reinforcing the need for institutional agreements that ensure continuity and democratic governance. Understanding childhood as a structuring axis of planning therefore implies not only prioritizing this population, but also redefining the production and management of public policies. This perspective is further developed in the next section, through an analysis of the Transversal Agenda for the Rights of Children and Adolescents, highlighting both the advances and the obstacles of transversality in practice.

Limits And Possibilities Of Transversal Planning In The Childhood And Adolescence Agenda

Clarity of objectives and intersectoral and institutional coordination

An analysis of the clarity of objectives and the intersectoral and institutional coordination present in Annex V of the 2024–2027 Multiannual Plan (PPA) reveals advances, but also structural weaknesses already addressed in the literature on public policies in Brazil. Government actions were organized into seven dimensions: food security and income, education and information, eradication of child labor, combating violence and access to rights, housing, water and sanitation, health, sport, leisure and culture, and institutional capacity. This configuration resembles UNICEF's multidimensional poverty model, which recognizes the need to simultaneously address multiple determinants. The detailing of the implementation process demonstrates an effort to address the rights of children and adolescents in an integrated manner, but it also highlights the importance of clear objectives as a common language for intersectoral action (Gomide; Pires, 2014).

In the food security and income axis, the Bolsa Família Program (PBF) constitutes a paradigmatic example of intersectoral coordination. Its conditionalities involve the Ministry of Social Development and Assistance, Family and Fight Against Hunger (MDS), the Ministry of Education (MEC), and the Ministry of Health (MS), linking cash transfers to school attendance and health monitoring. The disaggregation of targets by age group and region strengthens monitoring capacity; however, the absence of intersectoral funds or specific budget allocations limits the stability of cooperation, confirming the vulnerability highlighted by Radin (2010) in agendas subject to political and budgetary cycles.

In the educational dimension, in addition to the leading role of the Ministry of Education (MEC), other ministries contribute complementary actions, such as the Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change (MMA), with environmental education policies, and the Ministry of Defense (MD), with cooperation programs for national development. This diversity enhances transversality, but, as observed by Teixeira and Paim (2000), the mere presence of multiple actors does not guarantee effective cooperation; it is necessary to formalize theories of action that articulate objectives, outcomes, and timelines.

The axis of eradicating child labor and combating violence involves a broad network integrating the Ministry of Social Development and Assistance, Family and Fight Against Hunger (MDS), the Ministry of Labor and Employment (MTE), the Ministry of Human Rights and Citizenship (MDHC), the Ministry of Justice and Public Security (MJSP), and the Ministry of Integration and Regional Development (MIDR). The PPA establishes policies aimed at promoting decent work, structuring care policies, strengthening the protection network, and incorporating targets for family-based care; however, the effectiveness of this coordination depends on robust instruments, integrated registries, and standardized indicators (Bichir, 2011; Licio, 2012).

In the area of housing, water, and sanitation, programs such as Minha Casa, Minha Vida (MCMV) and the National Program for the Promotion of the Rights of the Homeless Population demonstrate recognition of the social determinants of childhood and are articulated with Indigenous health policies. This territorialization is consistent with Inojosa (1998) and Souza (2006), but there is a lack of inter-federative committees and stable financing mechanisms to ensure continuity and accountability.

In the health field, the Ministry of Health (MS) leads policies ranging from vaccination to early childhood care and Indigenous health, with disaggregated indicators that strengthen monitoring. The Indigenous Health Program is exemplary; however, as warned by De Toni (2021), its effectiveness depends on the existence of a core of government capable of aligning mission, objectives, and indicators throughout the budgetary cycle (PPA, LDO, LOA), which is not yet consistently evident.

Policies related to sport, culture, tourism, and science, under the responsibility of the Ministry of Culture (MINC), the Ministry of Sport (MESP), the Ministry of Tourism (MTUR), and the Ministry of Science, Technology and Innovation (MCTI), expand access for children, adolescents, and youth to cultural and scientific activities. Nevertheless, governance could be strengthened through permanent collegiate bodies (O'Toole Jr., 2010).

Finally, the institutional capacity axis, transversal to all areas, encompasses governance, data production, training of public servants, and social participation. Examples such as the Continuous Cash Benefit at School (BPC Escola) and the Brazil Without Extreme Poverty Plan demonstrate advances; however, formal instruments of intersectoral coordination, such as permanent interministerial committees and inter-federative agreements, remain scarce. This absence confirms the diagnosis of Gomide and Pires (2014), according to which the lack of institutionalization compromises the sustainability of transversal agendas.

Indicators and monitoring

An analysis of the monitoring component and indicators of the Childhood and Adolescence Transversal Agenda of the 2024–2027 Multiannual Plan (PPA) reveals significant institutional advances, but also structural, methodological, and political limitations, in line with the historical weaknesses in the monitoring of public policies in Brazil (Bresser-Pereira, 2007; Bresser-Pereira; Spink, 2006; Giacomoni, 2010). Among the most relevant advances are the establishment of regional targets, baselines, and specific results linked to systems such as the Unified Registry (Cadastro Único) and the Budget and Financial System (Sicon), as well as the adoption of UNICEF's multidimensional child poverty methodology, which aligns diagnostics with consolidated international standards.

Despite these advances, the limited disaggregation of data by race, ethnicity, gender, and age group hinders the precision of diagnostics and equity in policies. Many indicators remain aggregated for the general population, even when some are intended specifically for children and adolescents. This limitation confirms Patton's (2008) critique of methodological fragmentation, as it conflates continuous monitoring with occasional evaluations based on incomplete data. For example, when counting families benefiting from income transfer programs, the number of children served and their sociodemographic profiles are not identified. Indicators disaggregated by life cycle (early childhood, childhood, and adolescence) would be more effective and consistent with the logic of transversality.

Methodologically, the agenda relies on secondary sources such as the Unified Registry (Cadastro Único), the School Census, the Mortality Information System (SIM), the Live Birth Information System (SINASC), and administrative records, confirming the diagnosis by Vaitsman and Paes-Sousa (2011) regarding the limitations of systems not designed for transversal analyses. Although robust, these systems lack full interoperability, which hampers the construction of an integrated indicator dashboard by territory and social group. The proposal to create a "Citizen Dashboard" emerges as a strategic opportunity; however, as noted by Defourny (2006), its effectiveness will depend on the institutionalization of protocols that ensure continuous updating, transparency, and effective application in public management.

Another critical issue is the lack of methodological detail in defining regional and annual objectives. Without clear criteria, it becomes impossible to assess whether targets are ambitious or merely formal. This lack of transparency undermines the credibility of the agenda and restricts the qualified participation of councils, civil society, and

oversight bodies, running counter to Nogueira and Cavalcante (2009), who argue that monitoring should be a permanent practice open to social scrutiny.

The analysis also highlights the predominance of process and output indicators, such as the number of services delivered or infrastructures provided, to the detriment of outcome and social impact metrics, such as reductions in school dropout rates or domestic violence. Weiss (1988) and Wholey, Hatry, and Newcomer (2010) emphasize that impact indicators are essential for assessing the effectiveness and sustainability of actions, especially in childhood, where effects are cumulative and intergenerational. By prioritizing short-term metrics, there is a risk that monitoring becomes a merely formal exercise, disconnected from real transformations.

Finally, the document does not present a strategy for the continuous evaluation of the indicators themselves, nor does it incorporate emerging issues, such as the effects of climate change on childhood. The involvement of universities and research centers, as well as the creation of intersectoral technical committees, could strengthen methodologies, in line with Arretche (1998). Without unified protocols, even attempts at integration—such as the combined use of data from health, education, and social assistance—remain fragmented.

Budgetary Fragmentation

The debate on the indicators of the Childhood and Adolescence Transversal Agenda must be linked to budgetary analysis, an essential element for ensuring policy feasibility. The Planning Series report associates the agenda with 41 of the 88 programs of the 2024–2027 Multiannual Plan (PPA) and presents only the total expenditure per program, without explaining how transversal actions will be financed, nor the amounts allocated to monitor their implementation. This gap reflects the historical weaknesses of budgetary planning in Brazil, where financial fragmentation constitutes a central obstacle to the consolidation of intersectoral policies (Wanderley; Martinelli; Paz, 2020).

The absence of a unified budget line for childhood and adolescence, associated by Marcondes and Farah (2020) with institutional rigidity and competition for resources, represents a significant barrier to the governance of transversal policies. In the current model, resources are distributed sectorally, according to the logic of each ministry, resulting in dispersed budgets even for core programs within the childhood and youth agenda. The fragmentation of financial responsibility among the areas of Health, Education, Social Assistance, and Justice, in the absence of a coordinating body with authority for integrated management, weakens the capacity to plan, prioritize, and oversee resources.

This configuration reveals a weakness in budgetary governance, as there is neither a specific center of financial control nor a formally identifiable budget line within the Integrated Planning and Budget System (SIOP). As noted by Calmon and Gusso (2003), the lack of a specific budgetary center hinders systematic monitoring and reduces transparency, undermining coherence between the principle of absolute priority, established in the Federal Constitution and the Statute of the Child and Adolescent, and its effective financial execution. Without consolidated estimates by age group and clear allocation criteria, it is impossible to determine what share of the budget reaches children and youth, deepening their invisibility and limiting social control.

The literature offers alternatives to overcome these limitations. Marcondes and Farah (2020) suggest specific mechanisms, such as intersectoral funds and budgetary actions with dedicated codes, which increase flexibility and managerial control. International experiences, particularly in Latin America, demonstrate the effectiveness of budget-tagging methodologies applied to agendas such as gender and climate change, as they allow the identification of resources allocated to target populations within existing programs (Bellini et al., 2020). This practice enhances expenditure visibility, improves monitoring, and strengthens intersectoral planning.

Another fundamental aspect is the strengthening of governance and social participation. As argued by Wanderley, Martinelli, and Paz (2020), Councils for the Rights of Children and Adolescents and Civil Society Organizations should participate not only in implementation but also in the formulation and approval of budgetary laws. This expansion legitimizes investment decisions, reinforces transparency, and ensures greater responsiveness to the demands of childhood and adolescence.

Therefore, consolidating the Transversal Agenda requires reforms in public planning and budgetary instruments that integrate financing, execution, and evaluation. The creation of intersectoral funds, the implementation of co-financing mechanisms among federative entities and sectors, and the development of budgetary monitoring systems with disaggregation by age group and thematic area align with international best practices and the recommendations of Calmon and Gusso (2003). Without these innovations, transversal approaches risk remaining normative guidelines, without effective translation into budgetary priorities or concrete impact on the lives of children and adolescents.

Governance and intersectoral coordination in the public sector

The governance of the Transversal Agenda for the Rights of Children and Adolescents should be conceived as an institutional arrangement capable of coordinating sectors and levels of government around shared objectives, overcoming the administrative fragmentation that characterizes Brazilian public management (Wanderley; Martinelli; Paz, 2020). Such coordination is essential given the multifaceted nature of childhood and adolescence needs, which encompass health, education, social assistance, culture, and justice. National and international experience indicates that intersectoral cooperation is consolidated only when formal agreements, shared resources, and political leadership capable of mediating interests are in place (Cunill-Grau, 2014).

The National Planning Series document that addresses the Transversal Agenda acknowledges the importance of governance structures, mentioning bodies such as the Inter-Council Forum. However, it does not present a clear and institutionalized governance proposal specifically for the childhood and adolescence agenda. It fails to define a coordinating body, deliberative instances, decision-making processes, conflict resolution mechanisms, accountability instruments, or forms of dialogue with civil society. In the absence of such elements, there is a risk of repeating experiences such as that of Niterói, studied by Monnerat and Souza (2010), in which the lack of political support and partisan disputes undermined promising intersectoral initiatives.

The literature highlights that the inclusion of intersectoral actions without robust governance mechanisms tends to result in rhetoric or isolated initiatives (Cruz; Farah, 2016; Cunill-Grau, 2014). The Brasil Carinhoso program illustrates this limitation: although designed as a transversal program, it faced barriers at the subnational level due to sectoral logics and the lack of incentives for cooperation. This reinforces the need for a solid institutional architecture, supported by instruments that promote political and financial integration, similar to the models of the Unified Health System (SUS) and the Unified Social Assistance System (SUAS).

For the PPA Transversal Agenda, a coherent institutional design should include: (1) the creation or designation of a central coordinating body, preferably within the Civil House or the General Secretariat of the Presidency of the Republic, endowed with technical and political authority to coordinate ministries, manage indicators, and monitor resources; (2) a Permanent Interministerial Committee with representatives from all involved ministries, regular meetings, clearly defined responsibilities, and integration with the budgetary cycle; (3) an Executive Technical Secretariat responsible for integrated data management, diagnostics, and support to policy formulation; (4) organic links with the National Council for the Rights of Children and Adolescents (CONANDA), articulated with state and municipal councils, ensuring qualified social participation; (5) interoperable information systems integrating databases from education, health, social assistance, and public security; and (6) federative pact instruments with

financial and technical incentives for the participation of states and municipalities, inspired by the co-financing mechanisms of SUS and SUAS.

Consolidating this governance framework also requires a robust legal foundation. Institutionalizing the agenda through a decree or specific law can protect it from political setbacks and ensure continuity. Interministerial protocols, intersectoral action plans, and technical cooperation agreements among ministries are essential tools to guarantee predictability and stability.

Qualified social participation and institutional sustainability

The communicational dimension and the participation of civil society, both fundamental to the effectiveness of intersectoral policies, constitute a central element of the Transversal Agenda for the Rights of Children and Adolescents. The Multiannual Plan (PPA) document mentions the Inter-Council Forum and multisectoral workshops as part of the participatory process, but it does not present a clear and continuous public communication strategy, nor a specific mobilization plan focused on childhood, adolescence, and their advocates. The absence of campaigns, accessible materials, permanent listening channels, and accountability mechanisms reduces social understanding, monitoring, and active participation, which is particularly serious given that children and adolescents have indirect political representation and depend on the action of civil society, Rights Councils, and oversight bodies.

Social participation, a structuring component of the entire public policy cycle, must be present not only at consultative stages but also in formulation, monitoring, and evaluation. The institutionalization of specific listening mechanisms, such as Children's Councils, public consultations directed at children, thematic hearings, and inclusive digital tools, is necessary to legitimize the agenda. Transversality, far from implying homogenization, should translate into equitable differentiation, capable of recognizing structural inequalities related to race, gender, disability, and territory (rural, peripheral, Indigenous peoples, quilombola communities, etc.) and generating public responses sensitive to these diversities.

Brazil Participatory, the process through which the 2024–2027 Multiannual Plan (PPA) was constructed, with the unprecedented opening of digital channels for the submission of proposals and voting, represents an important innovation in Brazilian public management. However, such initiatives become fragile if they are not accompanied by stable feedback routines, clear criteria for reception, and ex post evaluation, as warned by Lima (2024). The communicational dimension of the Agenda, mentioned only sporadically, lacks a continuous social participation plan and systematic accountability mechanisms. Local experiences of participatory PPAs that applied methodologies such as ZOPP and Metaplan (Silva; Bolzan, 2018) demonstrate that consensus on priorities and citizen co-authorship do not result from spontaneous processes, but from methodological agreements capable of transforming objectives into a common language and generating shared responsibility.

The limited social appropriation of the Agenda, constrained by the absence of specific campaigns and permanent listening channels, finds support in the experience of the São Paulo Master Plan (Kira, 2020), which demonstrates how legal frameworks can create institutional conditions for participation and legitimize new forms of engagement. Transversal approaches, without legal backing, tend to dissipate amid sectoral disputes and political instability. Participatory processes, without guarantees or adequate funding, risk being captured by power asymmetries, turning into mere legitimization of previously defined decisions (Teixeira, 2007). The sustainability of participation, which depends on active councils, dialogical processes, and trained professionals, requires investment in continuing education, the adoption of collaborative methodologies, and the strengthening of local mechanisms of integrated management (Mendonça; Talbot, 2014). The articulation between universal policies and specific affirmative actions is essential to ensure that transversality is translated into concrete public policies that respect the diversity of childhood and youth.

The challenge of institutional sustainability, exacerbated by administrative discontinuity and the risk of budget cuts, highlights the vulnerability of the Agenda in the absence of protective legal frameworks and minimum spending norms by age group. Ibero-American experience, analyzed by Cardoso Jr. and García (2014), reinforces that public planning is effective only when it combines spaces for participation with state capacities and robust coordination mechanisms.

Administrative discontinuity

Administrative discontinuity represents one of the most critical risks to the effectiveness of the Multiannual Plan (PPA) with regard to the Transversal Agenda for the Rights of Children and Adolescents. As highlighted by Faria and Ribeiro (2010), the high turnover of technical teams and the frequent alternation of priorities between administrations—especially at the state and municipal levels—interrupt cooperation flows, demobilize protection networks, and undermine shared governance processes, weakening the institutional strengthening required for long-term policies. In the field of transversality, Cruz and Farah (2016) warn that the absence of institutional protection mechanisms, such as state-level laws, durable federative pacts, or permanent inter-federative consortia, exposes strategic agendas to recurring risks, including abrupt changes in ministerial structures, budget cuts, and programmatic redesigns. These factors weaken intersectoral integration and compromise core issues such as comprehensive protection, equity, and the tackling of inequalities, whose consolidation depends on stability.

An analysis of the content of the Transversal Agenda for the Rights of Children and Adolescents in the 2024–2027 PPA indicates that, although transversal strategies and multisectoral programs are mentioned, there is no identification of robust mechanisms to ensure the administrative continuity of this agenda across different mandates. There are no provisions establishing permanent coordinating bodies, formalized cooperation protocols, or long-term legal instruments capable of guaranteeing the institutionalization of transversal themes throughout all stages of the public policy cycle, from formulation to monitoring and evaluation. This gap causes the agenda to rely excessively on contingent political will, which is incompatible with the structural and intergenerational nature of children's and adolescents' rights.

Overcoming administrative discontinuity requires strengthening state capacities and establishing permanent coordination mechanisms capable of transcending electoral cycles and consolidating themselves as commitments of the State. Recommended measures include: (1) formalizing legal frameworks that mandate the integration of children's and adolescents' rights into all programs and transversal actions, regardless of the administration in office; (2) creating permanent intersectoral committees with federative representation and qualified social participation; (3) stabilizing and ensuring continuity in the training of technical teams, safeguarding institutional development and the preservation of organizational memory; and (4) incorporating indicators disaggregated by age, gender, race, and territory, in order to systematically monitor the impact of policies on this population.

The adoption of these measures can transform transversality from a governmental guideline into a State strategy, ensuring that advances in the protection and promotion of the rights of children and adolescents are preserved regardless of changes in government, fiscal volatility, or institutional reconfigurations.

Conclusions And Recommendations

The analysis of the Transversal Agenda for the Rights of Children and Adolescents in the 2024–2027 Multiannual Plan (PPA) highlights advances in the institutionalization of intersectoral planning in Brazil by positioning childhood as a structuring axis of public policies. Its formulation seeks to break with the fragmented logic of traditional administration, articulating programs, targets, and indicators from multiple sectors around shared

objectives for the guarantee of rights, in line with the Federal Constitution, the Statute of the Child and Adolescent (ECA), and international standards of comprehensive protection.

Despite these merits, obstacles remain that limit its effectiveness, such as budgetary fragmentation, the absence of solid governance, weak federative coordination, administrative discontinuity, insufficient disaggregation of indicators, and the lack of permanent channels for social participation. The weak articulation with Rights Councils and the absence of stable protocols reduce the legitimacy and sustainability of the agenda. The literature and comparative experiences demonstrate that intersectoral planning requires more than normative statements; it demands institutional capacity, a collaborative culture, and governance mechanisms that ensure effective cooperation. Without these elements, transversality risks remaining rhetorical, without generating concrete impacts on the lives of children and adolescents.

Another limitation stems from policy design, which is often formulated without coordination among sectors, thereby undermining implementation and the definition of shared responsibilities. Low levels of social participation and the restricted role of Councils hinder policy articulation and monitoring. In the field of evaluation, there is a predominance of outcome indicators to the detriment of impact metrics disaggregated by age, race, gender, and territory—essential for capturing real transformations and ensuring equity.

International experiences, such as those of the United Kingdom and Canada, demonstrate that progress is possible when solid governance, consistent indicators, and stable financing are in place. To this end, the Agenda must consolidate structural conditions: a central coordinating body with technical and political authority, permanent interministerial committees, interoperable information systems, a dedicated budget, and channels for qualified participation that include the active listening of children and adolescents.

Overcoming these challenges requires structural reforms, investments in capacity building, incentives for cooperation, and cultural transformations that value interdependence among sectors. Thus, although the Transversal Agenda for Childhood and Adolescence represents a significant advance in aligning public planning with the principle of absolute priority, its success depends on translating its guidelines into effective and democratic practices. Strengthening transversal governance and mobilizing an institutional coalition around childhood are decisive steps to ensure that children and adolescents can fully enjoy their rights.

Bibliographical References

Agência Metropolitana da Baixada Santista. (n.d.). *A estratégia de articulação intergovernamental na implantação de políticas públicas metropolitanas: Construindo um conceito e evidenciando a aplicação prática*. Santos.

Arretche, M. (1998). Tendências no estudo sobre avaliação. *Cadernos de Pesquisa*, 104(1), 5–18.

Arriagada, I. (2005). Dimensiones de la pobreza y políticas desde una perspectiva de género. *Revista de la CEPAL*, 85, 101–113.

Astelarra, J. (2004). *Políticas de género en la Unión Europea y algunos apuntes sobre América Latina*. CEPAL.

Bandeira, L. (2005). *Brasil: Fortalecimento da Secretaria Especial de Políticas para as Mulheres*. CEPAL.

Benería, L. (2003). Introducción: La mujer y el género en la economía. In P. de Villota (Ed.), *Economía y género* (pp. 23–74). Icaria.

Bichir, R. M. (2014). *Para além da transferência de renda? Limites e possibilidades na articulação intersetorial de políticas sociais*. Cadernos de Estudos – Desenvolvimento Social em Debate, 26. MDS.

Bichir, R. M., & Licio, E. (2014). *Cadastro Único e IGD: Instrumentos de coordenação federativa*. Cadernos de Estudos – Desenvolvimento Social em Debate, 26. MDS.

Bortolini, G. A., Basso, C., & Jaime, P. C. (2025). Recomendações para o fortalecimento da implementação da Política Nacional de Alimentação e Nutrição. *Ciência & Saúde Coletiva*, 30(2). <https://doi.org/10.1590/1413-81232025302.1089023>

Brasil. Ministério do Desenvolvimento Social. (2014). *Cadernos de Estudos – Desenvolvimento Social em Debate* (No. 26). MDS.

Bresser-Pereira, L. C. (2007). *Burocracia pública e reforma gerencial*. Editora FGV.

Bresser-Pereira, L. C., & Spink, P. K. (2006). *Reforma do Estado e administração pública gerencial* (7th ed.). Editora FGV.

Budlender, D., & Sharp, R. (1998). *How to do a gender-sensitive budget analysis*. Commonwealth Secretariat/AusAID.

Cagatay, N. (2003). Gender budgets and beyond: Feminist fiscal policy in the context of globalization. *Gender and Development*, 11(1), 15–24.

Cardoso Jr., J. C., & Garcia, R. C. (Eds.). (2014). *Planejamento estratégico governamental em contexto democrático: Lições da América Latina*. ENAP.

Carrasco, C. (1999). *Mujeres y economía: Nuevas perspectivas*. Icaria.

Corrêa, A. M. C. J., & Figueiredo, N. M. S. (2006). Riqueza, desigualdade e pobreza. *Pesquisa e Debate*, 17(1), 45–65.

Costa, D. M. (2003). *A gramática do orçamento a partir de uma perspectiva de gênero e raça*. [Unpublished manuscript].

Cruz, M. C. M. T., Marcondes, M. M., & Farah, M. F. S. (2024). Intersetorialidade e transversalidade: Análise do Brasil Carinhoso (2012–2015). *Cadernos de Pesquisa*, 54. <https://doi.org/10.1590/1980531410394>

De Toni, J. (2021). *Reflexões sobre o planejamento estratégico no setor público* (Cadernos ENAP, No. 84). ENAP.

Deere, C. D., & León, M. (2002). *O empoderamento da mulher: Direitos à terra*. UFRGS.

Defourny, J. (2006). *Social enterprise in an enlarged Europe: Concept and realities*. EMES European Research Network Working Paper, 06/02.

Dominici, M. C. (2017). *A importância da articulação intersetorial na administração pública* (Texto para Discussão No. 31). Codeplan.

Elson, D. (1998). Integrating gender issues into national budgetary policies and procedures. *Journal of International Development*, 10(8), 929–941.

Elson, D., & Cagatay, N. (2003). El contenido social de las políticas macroeconómicas. In P. de Villota (Ed.), *Economía y género* (pp. 75–110). Icaria.

Faria, C. A. P. (n.d.). *Governança metropolitana e dilemas da ação coletiva*. [Unpublished manuscript].

Filice, R. C. G., & Muller, C. B. (2024). Transversalidade e interseccionalidade em políticas públicas LGBTQIA+ em Florianópolis. *Revista Estudos Feministas*, 32(3). <https://doi.org/10.1590/1806-9584-2024v32n387784>

- Giacomoni, J. (2010). *Orçamento público* (14th ed.). Atlas.
- Gomide, A., & Pires, R. (Eds.). (2014). *Capacidades estatais e democracia: Arranjos institucionais de políticas públicas*. Ipea.
- Grasel, D., et al. (2008). Desigualdade, pobreza e crescimento. *Textos de Economia*, 11(1), 54–78.
- Inojosa, R. (n.d.). *Intersetorialidade: Um novo paradigma em políticas públicas*. [Unpublished manuscript].
- Junqueira, L., Inojosa, R., & Komatsu, S. (1997). Intersetorialidade e integralidade. In *Gestão intersetorial das políticas sociais*. Cortez.
- Kira, B. (2020). *Planejamento urbano e participação social: O processo de revisão do Plano Diretor Estratégico do Município de São Paulo*. SSRN Working Paper.
- Lascombes, P., & Le Galès, P. (2007). *Sociologie de l'action publique*. Armand Colin.
- Lassance, A. (2025). *Análise da agenda político-institucional do Estado brasileiro: 2024* (Texto para Discussão No. 3013). Ipea.
- Lima, G. M. (2024). *Os desafios para a reconstrução e fortalecimento da democracia participativa* (Undergraduate thesis). UFRJ/IPPUR.
- Marcondes, M. M., & Farah, M. F. S. (2021). Transversalidade de gênero em política pública. *Revista Estudos Feministas*, 29(1). <https://doi.org/10.1590/1806-9584-2021v29n165398>
- Marcondes, M. M., Araújo, M. A. D., Souza, W. J., & Nascimento, C. C. C. (2022). Transversalidade de gênero em políticas públicas no Rio Grande do Norte (2003–2021). *Revista de Administração Pública*, 56(3). <https://doi.org/10.1590/0034-761220220018>
- Marcondes, M. M., Sandim, T. L., & Diniz, A. P. R. (2018). Transversalidade e intersetorialidade: Mapeamento do debate conceitual no cenário brasileiro. *Administração Pública e Gestão Social*, 10(1), 22–33.
- Mendonça, F., & Talbot, V. (2014). Participação social na gestão de unidades de conservação. *Biodiversidade Brasileira*, 4(1), 211–234.
- Natalino, M. A. (2009). Avanços e desafios da transversalidade. In *Brasil em desenvolvimento: Estado, planejamento e políticas públicas* (Vol. 3). Ipea.
- Nogueira, C. A. G., & Forte, S. H. A. C. (2019). Efeitos intersetoriais e transversais. *Revista de Administração Pública*, 53(1). <https://doi.org/10.1590/0034-761220170087>
- Nogueira, R. P., & Cavalcante, P. L. (2009). Avaliação de políticas públicas. *Revista do Serviço Público*, 60(3), 291–309.
- Ollaik, L., & Medeiros, J. (2011). Instrumentos governamentais. *Revista de Administração Pública*, 45(6).
- O'Toole, L. J. (2010). Relações interorganizacionais no processo de implementação. In G. Peters & J. Pierre (Eds.), *Administração pública*. ENAP.
- Patton, M. Q. (2008). *Utilization-focused evaluation* (4th ed.). Sage.
- Pereira, R. S., Silva, K. P., & Ciriaco, C. D. (2010). Transversalidade de gênero e políticas sociais. *Revista Estudos Feministas*, 18(2). <https://doi.org/10.1590/S0104-026X2010000200008>

PNUD. (2002). *Informe sobre desarrollo humano*. Mundi Prensa.

Radin, B. (2010). Os instrumentos da gestão intergovernamental. In G. Peters & J. Pierre (Eds.), *Administração pública*. ENAP.

Salamon, L. (2002). *The tools of government*. Oxford University Press.

Sen, A. (2000). *Desenvolvimento como liberdade*. Companhia das Letras.

Sen, G., & Grown, C. (1987). *Development, crises and alternative visions*. Monthly Review Press.

Silva, R. B., & Bolzan, R. (2018). Inovação no setor público. *Revista Práticas de Administração Pública*, 2(3), 2–22.

Souza, C. (n.d.). *Coordenação federativa e políticas públicas*. [Unpublished manuscript].

Teixeira, C. F., & Paim, J. S. (2000). Planejamento e programação intersetorial. *Revista de Administração Pública*, 34(6).

Teixeira, S. M. (2007). Descentralização e participação social. *Revista Katálýsis*, 10(2), 154–163.

UNIFEM. (2009). *Progresso das mulheres do mundo 2008/2009*. UNIFEM.

Vaitsman, J., & Paes-Sousa, R. (2011). *Políticas e programas sociais: Avaliação e monitoramento*. Ipea.

Vieira, C., et al. (2005). *Orçamento mulher*. Cfemea.

Villota, P. de (Ed.). (2003). *Economía y género*. Icaria.

Weiss, C. H. (1988). *Evaluation research* (2nd ed.). Prentice-Hall.

Wholey, J. S., Hatry, H. P., & Newcomer, K. E. (2010). *Handbook of practical program evaluation* (3rd ed.). Jossey-Bass.