



Journal Homepage: - www.journalijar.com

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF ADVANCED RESEARCH (IJAR)

Article DOI: 10.21474/IJAR01/22548
DOI URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.21474/IJAR01/22548>



RESEARCH ARTICLE

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

Renato Eliseu Costa¹ and Beatriz Celestino de Brito²

1. University of Sao Paulo, Laboratory of Socio-Environmental Studies (LES), “Luiz de Queiroz” College of Agriculture (ESALQ), Sao Paulo, Brazil.
2. U Researcher, Department of Public Policy Management, School of Arts, Sciences and Humanities, University of Sao Paulo, Sao Paulo, Brazil.

Manuscript Info

Manuscript History

Received: 04 November 2025
Final Accepted: 06 December 2025
Published: January 2026

Key words:-

Transversal Agenda; Rights of Children and Adolescents.

Abstract

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 channel for social participation, including the active listening of children and adolescents.

"© 2026 by the Author(s). Published by IJAR under CC BY 4.0. Unrestricted use allowed with credit to the author."

Introduction:-

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 2024–2027 Multiannual Plan (PPA) 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 the systematic monitoring and evaluation of policy outcomes. In some cases, particularly those related to early childhood, the

insufficient disaggregation of data by age group, race, gender, and territory undermines the capacity to identify inequalities and to allocate public resources equitably.

These findings point to a central analytical problem: the gap between the normative potential of the Transversal Agenda and its effective conditions of institutionalization as a public planning instrument. This diagnosis reinforces the need to move beyond a predominantly declaratory logic and advance toward a technically structured approach, in which the agenda's objectives and indicators are grounded in precise diagnostics and articulated with 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 permanent technical teams, the formalization of long-term cooperation agreements, and the systematic adoption of disaggregated indicators constitute essential conditions for transversality to cease being merely a normative statement and become an institutionalized planning practice.

In this context, the present study is guided by the following research question: to what extent does the Transversal Agenda for the Rights of Children and Adolescents, as formulated in the 2024–2027 PPA, demonstrate sufficient technical, institutional, and operational coherence to consolidate itself as a stable practice of transversal planning within the Brazilian State, rather than merely a declaratory normative guideline? Addressing this question is essential to critically assess the formulation of the Transversal Agenda for the Rights of Children and Adolescents within the PPA 2024–2027 and to examine whether its structural components, general and specific objectives, outputs, and indicators display sufficient internal coherence and articulation to sustain a consistent model of effective transversal planning.

The central objective of the study 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, capable of contributing to the reduction of inequalities and to the full guarantee of the rights of children and adolescents. To achieve this objective, the research adopts a qualitative approach based on documentary analysis of the PPA and its associated normative frameworks, combined with a review of specialized literature on transversality, governance, and results-oriented public planning, and a systematic comparison of these references with the findings of the technical analysis of actions and indicators.

The article is structured into five sections. The first section presents the research context and justification; the second outlines the theoretical framework underpinning the analysis; the third describes the methodological procedures employed; the fourth develops a critical analysis of the Transversal Agenda, examining its constituent elements and limitations; and the fifth synthesizes the conclusions, offering recommendations for the technical and institutional strengthening of transversality in federal public planning.

Transversality In Public Policies: Conceptual Foundations And Its Application In Brazilian State Planning:- The distinction between intersectorality and transversality constitutes a central analytical axis in contemporary debates on public policies and governmental planning instruments. While intersectorality primarily refers to technical cooperation among sectors to address complex and multidimensional problems, transversality implies a deeper reconfiguration of State action. It presupposes the incorporation of structurally relevant themes, such as childhood, racial and gender equality, and environmental sustainability, across all stages of the public policy cycle, from agenda-setting and formulation to implementation, monitoring, and evaluation (Arretche, 1999; Marcondes; Diniz; Farah, 2020). In this sense, transversality is not limited to an operational arrangement but is configured as a normative and institutional principle aimed at realigning public action around ethical, political, and distributive values (Cruz; Farah, 2016; Cunill-Grau, 2014; Mendes, 2018).

This conceptual distinction is directly relevant to the empirical analysis developed in this study. The examination of the Transversal Agenda for the Rights of Children and Adolescents within the 2024–2027 Multiannual Plan (PPA) indicates that, although the document formally adopts the language of transversality, its practical implementation frequently reproduces intersectoral coordination dynamics without fully achieving transversal integration. This gap is manifested, among other aspects, in the absence of permanent governance mechanisms, the weak articulation between objectives and impact indicators, and the lack of institutional instruments capable of ensuring the continuity of actions beyond governmental mandates.

Drawing on the concept of transversality formulated by Gallo and mobilized by Nogueira and Forte (2019), as discussed by Avelino and Santos (2014), transversality is understood as the intersection of distinct fields of knowledge and action, without dissolving sectoral specificities. This approach reinforces the arguments advanced by Brugué (2008, 2010), Quinhões and Fava (2010), and Souza (2015), according to which transversality expands the State's capacity to formulate integrated responses by fostering collaboration among diverse actors and policy domains. However, as demonstrated by the empirical findings of this article, such collaboration remains fragile in the absence of institutionalized coordination bodies, formal cooperation protocols, and shared accountability mechanisms.

The specialized literature identifies three interdependent fronts as necessary conditions for the effective implementation of transversality, overcoming organizational compartmentalization (Veiga; Bronzo, 2014), building stable and authoritative coordination mechanisms among institutional actors (Costa; Bronzo, 2012), and sharing diagnoses, data, and information as a strategy to reduce power and informational asymmetries (Souza, 2015). These elements are analytically mobilized in this study to assess the Transversal Agenda in the PPA, particularly through the analysis of Annex V, which reveals persistent budgetary fragmentation, limited interoperability of information systems, and insufficient disaggregation of indicators by age group, race, gender, and territory. Such limitations directly undermine the transversal logic announced at the normative level.

Furthermore, as emphasized by Cruz, Marcondes, and Farah (2024) and Lima et al. (2015), transversality requires institutional pacts capable of ensuring stability, legitimacy, and continuity in decision-making processes. The empirical analysis conducted indicates that, despite the formal recognition of transversal agendas in the PPA 2024–2027, these pacts remain weakly institutionalized, rendering the agenda vulnerable to administrative discontinuity and political oscillations.

From a broader perspective, transversality also emerges as a response to the historical fragmentation and limited effectiveness of public policies, assuming the role of an organizing principle oriented toward social justice (Marcondes; Sandim; Diniz, 2018). 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, precisely due to its normative and structuring character, which distinguishes it from intersectorality. Nevertheless, as evidenced by the results of this article, the consolidation of this character depends on the institutionalization of shared governance systems, the systematic adoption of disaggregated indicators, and the construction of political and administrative consensus capable of sustaining coordination over time (Mendes, 2018).

In the specific field of governmental planning, the institutionalization of transversal agendas in the 2024–2027 PPA represents a relevant advance. The creation of five agendas, Children and Adolescents, Women, Racial Equality, Indigenous Peoples, and Environmental Issues, introduced mechanisms for identifying objectives, results, and indicators, thereby enhancing transparency and monitoring potential (Lemos; Ângelis, 2024). However, the empirical evidence analyzed in this study indicates that the procedural advances observed during the formulation phase, coordinated by ENAP through intersectoral workshops and technical agreements, were not fully translated into robust governance arrangements or binding instruments for policy implementation and evaluation.

Thus, transversality consolidates itself, from a theoretical standpoint, as a structuring principle of contemporary public planning by presupposing the continuous and mandatory integration of priority themes throughout the entire management cycle. Empirically, however, the analysis of the Transversal Agenda for the Rights of Children and Adolescents demonstrates that this principle remains only partially realized. Aligning objectives, resources, actions, and indicators with universalistic values requires not only normative recognition but also institutional density, technical coherence, and political commitment capable of transforming transversal planning into a stable State practice. It is precisely this tension between conceptual robustness and operational fragility that the present study seeks to elucidate.

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 Brazil's 2024–2027 Multiannual Plan (PPA). The methodological choice derives from the complexity of the research object, which requires examining its formulation,

structural design, intersectoral coordination, technical coherence, and potential effectiveness in light of public policy frameworks and children's rights. As indicated by Minayo (2012) and Gil (2017), qualitative, descriptive, and exploratory research is appropriate for the interpretation of complex social phenomena, the characterization of public policies, and the identification of institutional gaps.

Following Lakatos and Marconi (2003), the methodological design combines documentary and bibliographic research structured around three complementary analytical fronts: (i) literature review, (ii) normative and documentary analysis, and (iii) exploration of structured public data. The first analytical front aimed to systematize the theoretical framework on transversality in public planning and results-oriented policies. The selection of bibliographic sources followed explicit criteria: priority was given to peer-reviewed articles, books, and institutional publications that (a) addressed transversality, intersectorality, governance, or public planning; (b) were frequently cited in the Brazilian public policy literature; and (c) presented analytical or conceptual contributions relevant to the assessment of planning instruments. The search conducted in the SciELO database yielded 123 articles, of which six were selected based on relevance, thematic alignment, and analytical depth. Complementarily, a search in Google Scholar identified two articles published in the last five years that directly addressed transversal agendas in public planning.

The second analytical front consisted of a documentary analysis of the Transversal Agenda itself, with a particular focus on Annex V of the PPA 2024–2027. This material was complemented by technical manuals, budgetary regulations, and official minutes from the Inter-Council Forum. The selection of documents followed predefined criteria: (a) formal linkage to the formulation, implementation, or monitoring of the Transversal Agenda; (b) official publication by federal government bodies; and (c) direct relevance to the agenda's objectives, governance arrangements, or monitoring instruments. The objective of this stage was to assess normative coherence, adherence to the logical planning model, and the existence and robustness of governance mechanisms.

The third analytical front involved the organization and processing of structured data available on the Federal Government's open data portal. The dataset included information on deliverables, objectives, indicators, and physical and budgetary targets associated with programs linked to the Agenda. The inclusion criterion for programs was their explicit identification as part of the Transversal Agenda in official PPA documentation. Of the 41 programs identified, 31 presented defined physical or budgetary targets, while the remaining programs were excluded from the indicator coherence analysis due to the absence of allocative or monitoring information.

All data were processed using Microsoft Excel, with procedures that included the elimination of duplications, thematic regrouping of actions and deliverables, and the classification of outputs according to Jannuzzi's (2001) typology: inputs, processes, outputs, outcomes, and impacts. This procedure enabled a systematic assessment of the coherence between deliverables, specific objectives, and indicators. The analytical strategy adopted was documentary content analysis, with analytical categories defined a priori based on the literature: (i) clarity of objectives and intersectoral coordination; (ii) budgetary coherence; (iii) monitoring capacity; (iv) governance arrangements; and (v) innovation and institutional learning. The explicit definition of selection criteria, analytical categories, and data treatment procedures ensures interpretive consistency and supports the replicability of the research.

Development:-

Transversal Agenda For The Rights Of Children And Adolescents:-

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

From this perspective, the rights of children and adolescents operate as articulating elements across social policies, demanding coordinated action in health, education, social assistance, public security, culture, and territorial

development. Bellini et al. (2020) emphasize that such transversality allows childhood to function as a catalyst for intersectoral agendas, provided it is supported by institutional convergence, clearly defined responsibilities, and effective coordination mechanisms. When guided by a rights-based approach, public action tends to move away from fragmented and assistentialist practices, favoring universal guarantees and greater institutional continuity (Nascimento, 2010).

The literature, however, consistently points to a gap between the normative recognition of rights and their effective implementation. Monnerat and Souza (2009) note that rights are often incorporated as generic guidelines, with limited impact on planning and budget execution, which weakens intersectoral integration. It is within this context that the Transversal Agenda for the Rights of Children and Adolescents emerges as a methodological and political innovation, seeking to institutionalize intersectorality in state planning and overcome historically fragmented arrangements (Bellini et al., 2020).

Despite this potential, implementation remains marked by disputes over competencies, budgetary fragmentation, and limitations in monitoring and governance instruments. As Nascimento (2010) observes, the persistence of clientelist practices and fragile institutional agreements hinders the consolidation of integrated strategies. Incorporating childhood as a structuring axis of public planning therefore implies not only thematic prioritization, but also adjustments in coordination, management, and policy sustainability over time.

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

Clarity of objectives and intersectoral and institutional coordination:-

The effectiveness of the Transversal Agenda is directly associated with the clarity of its objectives and the capacity for intersectoral and institutional coordination. Analysis of Annex V of the 2024–2027 PPA reveals important advances, while also exposing structural weaknesses widely discussed in the Brazilian public policy literature. Government actions are 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, sports, leisure and culture, and institutional capacity. This configuration is aligned with UNICEF's multidimensional poverty model and recognizes the need to address multiple determinants simultaneously.

This organization reflects an effort to construct a common language for intersectoral action, a condition identified by Gomide and Pires (2014) as central to coordination. In the area of food security and income, the Bolsa Família Program (PBF) exemplifies a consolidated intersectoral articulation, involving the Ministry of Social Development and Assistance, Family and the Fight against Hunger (MDS), the Ministry of Education (MEC), and the Ministry of Health (MS), by linking income transfers to school attendance and health monitoring. Although the disaggregation of targets by age group and region strengthens monitoring, the absence of intersectoral funds or dedicated budget allocations limits the stability of this cooperation, as noted by Radin (2010).

In the educational dimension, while the MEC plays a central role, other ministries contribute complementary actions, such as the Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change (MMA), through environmental education, and the Ministry of Defense (MD), through cooperation programs for national development. This diversity broadens the scope of transversality but does not eliminate the need for clearly formulated theories of action capable of linking objectives, outcomes, and timelines, as emphasized by Teixeira and Paim (2000).

The eradication of child labor and the fight against violence mobilize an even broader network, involving the 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 foresees policies aimed at promoting decent work, strengthening protection networks, and expanding family-based care, whose effectiveness depends on robust instruments, integrated registries, and standardized indicators (Bichir, 2011; Licio, 2012).

In 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 recognize the social determinants of childhood and articulate territorial policies with indigenous health actions. This territorialized approach is consistent with Inojosa

(1998) and Souza (2006), but remains limited by the absence of inter-federative committees and stable financing mechanisms.

In the health sector, the Ministry of Health leads policies ranging from vaccination to early childhood care and indigenous health, supported by disaggregated indicators that strengthen monitoring. The Indigenous Health Program stands out in this set, although, as De Toni (2021) notes, its effectiveness depends on alignment between mission, objectives, and indicators throughout the budget cycle.

Policies related to sports, culture, tourism, and science expand children's and adolescents' access to cultural and scientific goods, under the responsibility of ministries such as MINC, MESP, MTUR, and MCTI. These initiatives broaden the scope of rights, but could be strengthened through permanent collegial bodies, as suggested by O'Toole Jr. (2010). The institutional capacity dimension, transversal to all others, encompasses governance, data production, civil servant training, and social participation. Although programs such as BPC Escola indicate progress, formal intersectoral coordination instruments remain limited, confirming the fragility of institutionalization identified by Gomide and Pires (2014).

Analysis of these arrangements shows that articulation between sectors, while necessary, is insufficient to ensure the effectiveness of transversality, which highlights the centrality of monitoring instruments.

Indicators and monitoring:-

Indicators and monitoring mechanisms play a central role in translating the normative objectives of the Transversal Agenda into operational parameters for evaluation. In the 2024–2027 PPA, advances can be observed, such as the definition of regional targets, baselines, and outcomes associated with consolidated systems, including the Single Registry (Cadastro Único) and Sicon, as well as the incorporation of UNICEF's multidimensional poverty methodology.

Significant limitations persist. Low data disaggregation by race, ethnicity, gender, age group, and territory restricts diagnostic precision and the capacity to promote equity. Many indicators remain aggregated for the general population, even when specifically aimed at children and adolescents, corroborating Patton's (2008) critique of methodological fragmentation. Income transfer programs, for example, often fail to identify the number and profile of children effectively benefiting.

From a methodological standpoint, reliance on secondary sources, such as Cadastro Único, the School Census, SIM, and SINASC, demonstrates the robustness of existing systems, but also their limited interoperability, as highlighted by Vaitsman and Paes-Sousa (2011). The lack of integrated databases hampers the construction of territorialized dashboards capable of revealing inequalities. Proposals such as the creation of a "Citizen Panel" represent potential advances, whose effectiveness depends on the institutionalization of protocols for updating, transparency, and managerial use (Defourny, 2006).

Another challenge concerns the absence of explicit methodological criteria for defining regional and annual targets, which makes it difficult to assess their ambition and effectiveness. This gap undermines the credibility of the agenda and limits qualified participation by councils, civil society, and oversight bodies, contrary to the principles discussed by Nogueira and Cavalcante (2009). Added to this is the predominance of process and output indicators over outcome and impact metrics, which are essential for capturing real transformations in cumulative and intergenerational policies (Weiss, 1988; Wholey et al., 2010).

These limitations become even more evident when considered alongside the budgetary structure that sustains the Agenda.

Budgetary Fragmentation:-

Analysis of the PPA's budgetary architecture reveals that, although the Transversal Agenda is associated with 41 programs, financial allocations are presented in aggregated form, without specifying how transversal actions are financed or monitored. This configuration reflects historical weaknesses in Brazilian budgetary planning, in which financial fragmentation constitutes a central obstacle to the consolidation of intersectoral policies (Wanderley, Martinelli, Paz, 2020).

The absence of a unified budget line for children and adolescents reinforces institutional rigidity and competition for resources (Marcondes, Farah, 2020). Sectoral distribution among health, education, social assistance, and justice, combined with the lack of a coordinating body with financial authority, weakens the capacity for planning, prioritization, and resource oversight. As Calmon and Gusso (2003) observe, without a specific budgetary center, systematic monitoring is limited and transparency is reduced.

The literature points to alternatives for addressing these limitations, such as intersectoral funds, budget tagging mechanisms, and dedicated action codes, already used in gender and climate agendas in Latin America (Bellini et al., 2020). Such instruments enhance expenditure visibility and promote greater intersectoral coherence. The participation of Rights Councils and civil society in the formulation and approval of budget laws is also crucial, as it strengthens the legitimacy of investment decisions.

These budgetary constraints are not limited to technical aspects, but reflect broader weaknesses in governance and institutional coordination arrangements.

Governance and intersectoral coordination in the public sector:-

The governance of the Transversal Agenda for the Rights of Children and Adolescents should be understood 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). This coordination is particularly relevant 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 effectively in place (Cunill-Grau, 2014).

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

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

In the case of the PPA Transversal Agenda, a coherent institutional design would require the establishment of a central coordinating body endowed with technical and political authority to articulate ministries, manage indicators, and monitor resources. This would also involve permanent interministerial coordination spaces, supported by an executive technical structure responsible for integrated data management and policy support, as well as interoperable information systems connecting education, health, social assistance, and public security databases. Equally relevant

is the organic articulation with the National Council for the Rights of Children and Adolescents (CONANDA) and its state and municipal counterparts, ensuring qualified social participation and federative alignment.

The consolidation of this governance framework also depends on a robust legal foundation. Institutionalizing the agenda through a decree or specific legislation can reduce vulnerability to political setbacks and ensure continuity across administrations. Interministerial protocols, joint action plans, and technical cooperation agreements are essential instruments to guarantee predictability, coordination, and institutional stability over time.

Qualified social participation and institutional sustainability:-

The communicational dimension and the participation of civil society constitute central elements for the effectiveness of intersectoral policies and are therefore fundamental to the Transversal Agenda for the Rights of Children and Adolescents. Although the Multiannual Plan (PPA) refers to mechanisms such as the Inter-Council Forum and multisectoral workshops, 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 public campaigns, accessible informational materials, permanent listening channels, and systematic accountability mechanisms limits social appropriation of the agenda, 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, as a structuring component of the public policy cycle, must extend beyond consultative moments and be incorporated into policy formulation, monitoring, and evaluation. The institutionalization of specific listening mechanisms, such as Children's Councils, thematic hearings, targeted public consultations, and inclusive digital tools, is essential to confer legitimacy and substantive content to the agenda. Transversality, rather than implying homogenization, should enable equitable differentiation, recognizing structural inequalities related to race, gender, disability, and territory, including rural areas, peripheral neighborhoods, Indigenous peoples, and quilombola communities.

The Brazil Participatory process, through which the 2024–2027 PPA was constructed, represents a relevant innovation in Brazilian public management by opening digital channels for proposal submission and voting. However, as Lima (2024) warns, participatory innovations become fragile when they are not accompanied by stable feedback routines, clear criteria for proposal incorporation, and systematic ex post evaluation. In the case of the Transversal Agenda, the communicational dimension remains underdeveloped, lacking a continuous participation plan and institutionalized accountability practices.

Empirical evidence from local participatory planning experiences, such as those employing ZOPP and Metaplan methodologies (Silva, Bolzan, 2018), demonstrates that consensus-building and citizen co-authorship do not emerge spontaneously, but rather from methodological arrangements capable of translating objectives into shared languages and generating collective responsibility. Similarly, the experience of the São Paulo Master Plan (Kira, 2020) illustrates how legal frameworks can create institutional conditions for participation and legitimize new forms of civic engagement.

Without legal safeguards and adequate funding, participatory processes risk being captured by existing power asymmetries, turning into mechanisms that merely legitimize previously defined decisions (Teixeira, 2007). The sustainability of participation requires active councils, dialogical processes, and trained professionals, supported by investments in continuing education, collaborative methodologies, and strengthened local governance structures (Mendonça, Talbot, 2014). The articulation between universal policies and targeted affirmative actions is therefore essential for translating transversality into concrete public policies capable of respecting the diversity of childhood and youth.

The challenge of institutional sustainability, exacerbated by contexts of political instability and budgetary constraints, highlights the vulnerability of the Agenda in the absence of protective legal frameworks and minimum age-based financing norms. Ibero-American experience, analyzed by Cardoso Jr. and García (2014), reinforces that public planning becomes effective only when participatory spaces are combined with consolidated state capacities and robust coordination mechanisms. In the absence of these conditions, even relatively structured governance and

participation arrangements remain fragile in the face of administrative changes and shifting governmental priorities, which directly points to the problem of administrative discontinuity as a central risk to the effectiveness of the Transversal Agenda.

Administrative discontinuity:-

Administrative discontinuity represents one of the most critical risks to the effectiveness of the Transversal Agenda. High turnover of technical teams and shifts in political priorities interrupt cooperation flows and weaken institutional memory (Faria, Ribeiro, 2010). The PPA does not establish robust mechanisms to protect the Agenda against such discontinuities, making it excessively dependent on contingent political will.

Overcoming this vulnerability requires legal frameworks, permanent coordination bodies, stable technical teams, and disaggregated indicators capable of sustaining long-term monitoring. In the absence of such measures, transversality tends to remain a governmental guideline rather than a State strategy, undermining the intergenerational protection of children's and adolescents' rights.

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:-

1. 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.
2. Arretche, M. (1998). Tendências no estudo sobre avaliação. *Cadernos de Pesquisa*, 104(1), 5–18.
3. Arriagada, I. (2005). Dimensiones de la pobreza y políticas desde una perspectiva de género. *Revista de la CEPAL*, 85, 101–113.
4. Astelarra, J. (2004). Políticas de género en la Unión Europea y algunos apuntes sobre América Latina. CEPAL.
5. Bandeira, L. (2005). Brasil: Fortalecimento da Secretaria Especial de Políticas para as Mulheres. CEPAL.

6. Benería, L. (2003). Introducción: La mujer y el género en la economía. In P. de Villota (Ed.), Economía y género (pp. 23–74). Icaria.
7. 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.
8. Bichir, R. M., & Licio, E. (2014). Cadastro Único e IGD: Instrumentos de coordenação federativa. *Cadernos de Estudos – Desenvolvimento Social em Debate*, 26. MDS.
9. 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>
10. Brasil. Ministério do Desenvolvimento Social. (2014). *Cadernos de Estudos – Desenvolvimento Social em Debate* (No. 26). MDS.
11. Bresser-Pereira, L. C. (2007). Burocracia pública e reforma gerencial. Editora FGV.
12. Bresser-Pereira, L. C., & Spink, P. K. (2006). Reforma do Estado e administração pública gerencial (7th ed.). Editora FGV.
13. Budlender, D., & Sharp, R. (1998). How to do a gender-sensitive budget analysis. Commonwealth Secretariat/AusAID.
14. Cagatay, N. (2003). Gender budgets and beyond: Feminist fiscal policy in the context of globalization. *Gender and Development*, 11(1), 15–24.
15. Cardoso Jr., J. C., & Garcia, R. C. (Eds.). (2014). Planejamento estratégico governamental em contexto democrático: Lições da América Latina. ENAP.
16. Carrasco, C. (1999). Mujeres y economía: Nuevas perspectivas. Icaria.
17. Corrêa, A. M. C. J., & Figueiredo, N. M. S. (2006). Riqueza, desigualdade e pobreza. *Pesquisa e Debate*, 17(1), 45–65.
18. Costa, D. M. (2003). A gramática do orçamento a partir de uma perspectiva de gênero e raça. [Unpublished manuscript].
19. 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>
20. De Toni, J. (2021). Reflexões sobre o planejamento estratégico no setor público (*Cadernos ENAP*, No. 84). ENAP.
21. Deere, C. D., & León, M. (2002). O empoderamento da mulher: Direitos à terra. UFRGS.
22. Defourny, J. (2006). Social enterprise in an enlarged Europe: Concept and realities. EMES European Research Network Working Paper, 06/02.
23. Dominici, M. C. (2017). A importância da articulação intersetorial na administração pública (Texto para Discussão No. 31). Codeplan.
24. Elson, D. (1998). Integrating gender issues into national budgetary policies and procedures. *Journal of International Development*, 10(8), 929–941.
25. Elson, D., & Cagatay, N. (2003). El contenido social de las políticas macroeconómicas. In P. de Villota (Ed.), Economía y género (pp. 75–110). Icaria.
26. Faria, C. A. P. (n.d.). Governança metropolitana e dilemas da ação coletiva. [Unpublished manuscript].
27. 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>
28. Giacomoni, J. (2010). Orçamento público (14th ed.). Atlas.
29. Gomide, A., & Pires, R. (Eds.). (2014). Capacidades estatais e democracia: Arranjos institucionais de políticas públicas. Ipea.
30. Grasel, D., et al. (2008). Desigualdade, pobreza e crescimento. *Textos de Economia*, 11(1), 54–78.
31. Inojosa, R. (n.d.). Intersetorialidade: Um novo paradigma em políticas públicas. [Unpublished manuscript].
32. Junqueira, L., Inojosa, R., & Komatsu, S. (1997). Intersetorialidade e integralidade. In Gestão intersetorial das políticas sociais. Cortez.
33. Kira, B. (2020). Planejamento urbano e participação social: O processo de revisão do Plano Diretor Estratégico do Município de São Paulo. SSRN Working Paper.
34. Lascoumes, P., & Le Galès, P. (2007). Sociologie de l'action publique. Armand Colin.
35. Lassance, A. (2025). Análise da agenda político-institucional do Estado brasileiro: 2024 (Texto para Discussão No. 3013). Ipea.
36. Lima, G. M. (2024). Os desafios para a reconstrução e fortalecimento da democracia participativa (Undergraduate thesis). UFRJ/IPPUR.

37. 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>
38. 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>
39. 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.
40. Mendonça, F., & Talbot, V. (2014). Participação social na gestão de unidades de conservação. *Biodiversidade Brasileira*, 4(1), 211–234.
41. Natalino, M. A. (2009). Avanços e desafios da transversalidade. In *Brasil em desenvolvimento: Estado, planejamento e políticas públicas* (Vol. 3). Ipea.
42. 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>
43. Nogueira, R. P., & Cavalcante, P. L. (2009). Avaliação de políticas públicas. *Revista do Serviço Público*, 60(3), 291–309.
44. Ollaik, L., & Medeiros, J. (2011). Instrumentos governamentais. *Revista de Administração Pública*, 45(6).
45. O'Toole, L. J. (2010). Relações interorganizacionais no processo de implementação. In G. Peters & J. Pierre (Eds.), *Administração pública*. ENAP.
46. Patton, M. Q. (2008). *Utilization-focused evaluation* (4th ed.). Sage.
47. 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>
48. PNUD. (2002). *Informe sobre desarrollo humano*. Mundi Prensa.
49. Radin, B. (2010). Os instrumentos da gestão intergovernamental. In G. Peters & J. Pierre (Eds.), *Administração pública*. ENAP.
50. Salamon, L. (2002). *The tools of government*. Oxford University Press.
51. Sen, A. (2000). Desenvolvimento como liberdade. Companhia das Letras.
52. Sen, G., & Grown, C. (1987). *Development, crises and alternative visions*. Monthly Review Press.
53. Silva, R. B., & Bolzan, R. (2018). Inovação no setor público. *Revista Práticas de Administração Pública*, 2(3), 2–22.
54. Souza, C. (n.d.). Coordenação federativa e políticas públicas. [Unpublished manuscript].
55. Teixeira, C. F., & Paim, J. S. (2000). Planejamento e programação intersetorial. *Revista de Administração Pública*, 34(6).
56. Teixeira, S. M. (2007). Descentralização e participação social. *Revista Katálysis*, 10(2), 154–163.
57. UNIFEM. (2009). *Progresso das mulheres do mundo 2008/2009*. UNIFEM.
58. Vaitsman, J., & Paes-Sousa, R. (2011). Políticas e programas sociais: Avaliação e monitoramento. Ipea.
59. Vieira, C., et al. (2005). *Orçamento mulher*. Cfemea.
60. Villota, P. de (Ed.). (2003). *Economía y género*. Icaria.
61. Weiss, C. H. (1988). *Evaluation research* (2nd ed.). Prentice-Hall.
62. Wholey, J. S., Hatry, H. P., & Newcomer, K. E. (2010). *Handbook of practical program evaluation* (3rd ed.). Jossey-Bass.