

**THE NATIONAL PROGRAM OF PUBLIC
MANAGEMENT AND DEBUREAUCRATIZATION
(GesPública) IN BRAZIL: A CASE OF POLICY
DOMAIN IN A SETTING OF INSTITUTIONAL AND
ADMINISTRATIVE CHANGE**

Author:

Eduardo José Grin, Fundação Getulio Vargas (Brasil)

**Prepared for delivery at the International Conference on Public
Policy**

Milan, 01- 04 July, 2015

The National Program of Public Management and Debureaucratization (GesPública) in Brazil: a case of policy domain in a setting of institutional and administrative change

Eduardo José Grin
Researcher at Getulio Vargas Foundation (Brazil)

ABSTRACT

The article analyses the GesPública launched by the Brazilian federal government in 2005 based on two objectives. The first is to discuss if the program incorporated assumptions of the so-called New Public Management, theoretical view which dominated the debate in the central government by the year of 2002. The second one is to analyze if it is a program whose path incorporates elements of previous initiatives, especially the managerial reform proposed by the federal government in the 90s. The aim is to examine therefore whether the program had a more incremental character before of being innovator for proposing the modernization of public administration in Brazil. The work is an exploratory case study and qualitative conducted in a longitudinal way inserting the analysis in a temporal clipping wider to compare it with the previous policy adopted by federal government before 2002. The paper uses the methodology of process tracing to produce causal inferences about the events that influenced the design of this program, as wells as the resource of counterfactual analysis to compare it with the previous proposal of the managerial reform. For the treatment of materials, the technique used was content analysis. The article concludes that this program approaches its proposals to the theses of the new public management, but misses the main issue of contracting for results. It appears that even presenting itself as innovative, its design is linked to the history of the program that preceded it, resulting in incremental changes toward the previous model. In short, it is more adaptive policy rather than innovation in the field of public management.

Keywords: management – results – modernization – quality – focus for citizens

Introduction

The 80s and 90s were periods of significant changes in conceptions of public administration in several countries. Despite the differences of the proposed models, the main reason for this process was about the criticism about of inefficiency in bureaucracy like organizational form. The modernizing answer of the public administration was constituted around what became known as New Public Management. In Brazil, this proposal had its peak during the two terms of Fernando Henrique Cardoso (FHC), between 1995-2002, especially through a proposal presented by MARE (Ministry of Administration and State Reform). In the core of modernizing view to Brazilian state was the stress on managing for results, focus on citizens and reorganization of activities in opposition to the so-called traditional public administration. The state should be turned on its main goals and break away from a logic-based over rules and procedures far from the demands of society. Thus, the implementation of more modern managerial models would be the strategic support to achieve the goal of reordering the State in order to guide the public policies for citizens.

The first goal of this article is to analyze if the National Program of Public Management and Debureaucratization (GesPública), policy of public management launched by the Federal Government in 2005, incorporated this debate about the managerial State reform such as presented in the literature. Thus, the paper analyzes the dialogue of this program what became the main initiative of Lula's government seeking to modernize the

Brazilian public administration in this period. Especially to analyze the influence of the so-called New Public Management as the main view that dominated the debate in the federal government by the year of 2002. However, it's outside the scope of this text to make a comparison between the terms of PSDB and PT ahead of the federal government, because the emphasis is to verify continuities and disruptions in the policies dedicated to qualify the public management and their dialogue with academic debate in this field.

The second goal is to discuss if the GesPública is a public policy whose path incorporates elements of previous initiatives aimed at modernizing the Brazilian public administration, especially the managerial reform proposed by Mare in the 90s. The article seeks to analyze if the proposal of GesPública had a more incremental feature instead of being a comprehensive innovation focused on modernization of the public administration in Brazil.

It is important to discuss this program because it is a public policy that has been in existence for more than seven years since 2005 in every level of government in the country, and at three branches of government. Secondly, the analysis of GesPública is part of a broader discussion about the actions promoted by Lula's government (2003-2010) to modernize the public administration, especially in the federal level. The conjugation of these two issues shows the existence of a gap in the literature about this theme because the debate was dated to 2002 in the end of Fernando Henrique Cardoso's government. Even though the PT's governments has not proposed a broad managerial reform in public administration, as done by the previous government, the GesPública indicates that the course of modernization of the state apparatus was maintained, although with less comprehensive goals. According to Nicolau (2010), there is a gap in the analysis of Brazilian political parties: the absence of works about the performance of PSDB and PT ahead of the Federal government. This article seeks to contribute to this debate about proposals focused to modernize the public administration present in the last 18 years in Brazil.

The article is organized in four sections. Firstly, the methodology used for this research. The second section provides a review of literature about the new public management in order to identify the main features of this approach as well as the incrementalism and historic neoinstitutionalism. Both discussions will be useful to analyze the GesPública. The first approach is useful to analyze the conception of program and the second one to insert it into a path of policies of modernization in public management. Next we discuss the nexus between the GesPública and their theoretical links and design with previous initiatives from the Brazilian public administration, especially the connection with the reform proposed by Mare during the government of Fernando Henrique Cardoso (1995-2002). Finally, we compare the GesPública with New Public Management to identify the dialogue existing between both views. In the conclusion we went back to the hypotheses presented to discuss how they are useful to discuss the case of GesPública.

Methodological Procedures

Considering that the GesPública exists since 2005, and gives the scarcity of academic papers about this program, the discussion in this text has an exploratory goal. To this end it uses the case qualitative analysis historically located (Ragin, 1987; Tilly, 1983). For both authors, this kind of analysis permits the contextual understanding, guided in a deductive manner, of causal conditions inserted in a juncture analyzed as a comprehensive totality. The GesPública is the unity of contextualized analysis, related to the debate on management reform of the state, and compared to previous experiences. According to this methodology, the analysis of a single case can be considered in its singularity, but yet it's possible to identify similarities and differences with other initiatives in the same field of public policies. Because of this we made a longitudinal analysis, considering the earlier path of the GesPública and their incremental advances, especially since the 90s.

The case study will rely on the process tracing methodology, according to Gerring (2007): contextual evidence makes sense if it can adjust itself in an universe of causal relations understandable, ordered, and “narrated” if it is supported in broader theoretical assumptions. This method is useful to constitute the multiple links in a causal chain and a sequence of events that identify the mechanisms helping to explain a phenomenon under study. Before that $X1 \rightarrow Y$ (common in large samples), the process tracing examines a single example of $X1 \rightarrow X2 \rightarrow X3 \rightarrow X4 \rightarrow Y$, because the particular antecedents generate their own effects. Finally, the resource of counterfactual analysis, according to Sekhon (2004), is useful to engender causal inferences using conditional probabilities. Thus, for instance, would be more probable that GesPública was more different if it had adopted in a full or partial way the model of State reform proposed during the government of Fernando Henrique Cardoso (FHC) (1995-2002)? Considering the GesPública as the object of direct interest, the counterfactual analysis can estimate what has been changed in the conception and implementation of this program, treating it as a “target group”, and comparing it with the “control group” represented by the project of state reform of MARE between 1995-2002.

The main question in this article is to evaluate the matching between the proposed reform of the state of Fernando Henrique Cardoso’s government, and its linkages with the institutional path and design assumed by GesPública after 2005. To this end, technique of content analysis, according to Bardin (1979), seeks to generate inferences and knowledge about the conditions of its own production. Getting inferences is the main point in order to obtain, in a logical way, knowledge from, among other sources, documentary basis existing that, in this case, constitute what the author calls *empirical corpus*. In this article, the empirical analysis is limited to official documents or publications, and for this set of information will be done a comparative interpretation of both policies of public management during the terms of FHC and Lula ahead of the federal government.

The empirical research was based in secondary sources from the federal government. In the FHC's period (1995-2002), the basic material was the “Cadernos Mare” elaborated by the Ministry responsible for the managerial reform. In the period of Lula's government, and after 2005, the documents of GesPública elaborated by the governmental bodies, especially the Ministry of Planning and Management that coordinated this program. In addition, articles presented in forums dedicated to debate the public management were analyzed, what deserves two initial observations: a) the papers have the year of 2009 as a departure point because the federal government devoted this year to the matter of the public management, which included supporting the achievement of XIV Congress of CLAD (*Consejo Latinoamericano de Administración para el Desarrollo*) in Salvador (Brazil). In this occasion many papers presented by federal public bodies were related to the GesPública; b) in other forums the papers sought to describe the experience of the authors with the implementation of GesPública in their organizations. Anyway, in neither case there is a scholarly analysis and a theoretical discussion of the program, as this article intends to accomplish. The materials collected were analyzed of this way:

- a) Collated with the theoretical discussion about the incrementalism and neoinstitutionalism in order to identify regularities in the speech presented by GesPública related to past initiatives of modernization in the public administration;
- b) Comparative analysis among themselves seeking to find similarities and differences of approach in their purposes. This is an important question because during their seven years of existence the program has been changing its focus so that it's important to verify the regularities in its presentation;
- c) Contextualized in relation to approaches to managerial administration because some of their initiatives go beyond the boundaries of this theoretical debate.

Another important methodological consideration is that the GesPública will be discussed addressing, regarding of the cycle of public policy, only in the stage of its formulation. The stages of implementation and evaluation of results will not be covered because this effort goes beyond the goals and space available in this article. But considering the lifetime of this program would be interesting further analysis treating its implementation and results. The hypothesis to be investigated is that GesPública is in line with the debate of new public management, but innovated of incremental way in relation with previous proposals of modernization of the state, especially the reform proposed by MARE after 1995.

Finally, the terms New Public Management, managerial reform of the State and managerial public administration are used in interchangeable ways. How we understand that the three views have theoretical affinities for what is essential to the purpose of the article there is not analytical harm in doing this.

The theoretical referential adopted to case analysis

The theoretical framework will be formed for two different views, but complementary for the goals of this article. Firstly, we discuss the main questions in the debate around the managerial reform of State to collate it with the design assumed by the GesPública. We don't make a broad review of this bibliography because the focus is to stress the most important thesis for the theme in this article. Next two theoretical views about the formulation in public policies will be presented: incrementalism and historic neoinstitutionalism. This section seeks to show how the thesis of both approaches can be additional each other to discuss public policies regarding of the choices made by political actors and their institutional context.

The ideas in debate in the literature about managerial state reform

The 80s and 90s were period of intense debate around the managerial reform of the State. According to Costa (2002), the New Public Management (NGP) presented as a set of ideas such as quality of management, evaluation of performance and a style of management that emphasized goals, periodic contracts and managerial autonomy. In "Cadernos MARE" n. 12 the public administration was seen as a body that should be the answer to new circumstances of that current world where the review of actions and ways of behavior of State was changing, especially to meet the requirements of contemporary democracies wherein the power and functionality of bureaucracy were questioned. Questions as accountability, empowerment, quality in the provision of public services, focus on results and their measurement were important to implement changes in the public management and for public services with more responsibility and transparency. The focus was to reinforce the public management ("the more effective the better") instead of the view "smaller is better" related to size of the State (Ozlak, 1999). Around this general view this section presents some aspects of the literature that addresses this subject matter.

An important point of managerial reform of the State approach is the orientation of government to offer public value for citizens to meet their demands as Moore (2005: 17) presents:

Consists of important purposes that can enhance the degree of individual satisfaction enjoyed by members of a polity that will not necessarily be achieved by competitive markets operating by themselves, and which the polity has assigned government to help them achieve collectively for their individual benefit. In this conception, government is specially authorized and required to deal with a particular set of conditions where markets will not function well to maximize the sum of (technically feasible) individual satisfactions. [...] These circumstances prevent the market of doing the work of allowing individuals to exchange things that they own with one another in ways that will aggregate to the maximum individual welfare.

Thus, the democratic legitimacy of agenda to modernize the public administration would be expanded because it has a dimension also of political order that emphasizes the performance of the State to assure public value as a right for citizens.

The seeking for more quality in the public sector focusing in the citizens was, according to Abrucio (2006), one of “main revolutions in the managerial model”. This view started with the “Citizen’s Charts” implemented in England in the 80s. This chart was based under the principle that public service must be oriented by needs of the affected publics and to evaluate their performance with users (Abrucio, 2006; CLAD, 1998). This view demanded: a) to decentralize competences to enlarge the autonomy and the flexibility of public bureaucracy; b) to increase the competition among unities of government for citizens to choose their service providers; c) to implement contractual relations among unities of government and other service providers to the users. The last aspect would be essential to permit to the citizen to control and to evaluate the quality of services under a contractual term where the government is accountable for its performance (Abrucio, 2006). For this reason, the management contracts influence in the trust of government with the society by enabling its participation in the evaluation of services as a source to get results (CLAD, 1998; Caiden, 1998; Manning *et al*, 2009).

According to Behn (1998), to NGP is key the performance of the institutions and their management capabilities to implement actions, which approximates the managing for results oriented by goals of the demands from the society. And when governments are accountable before the society to evaluate their performance it contributes to increase the quality of the public management (Caiden & Caiden, 1998; Osborne, 1998; Alabavera, 2003). Furthermore, the managing for results would seek: a) to enlarge the managerial responsibility linking managers with results; b) to integrate the management to optimize its operation; c) to implement a managerial culture to results instead of bureaucraties activities (CLAD, 2007, p. 13). If the main goal is to improve the achieved results, according to Kettl (1998), is more useful to think in managerial performance than measuring performance as an end itself. And this, besides of contributing for the continuous evaluation of governments, makes the measurement to become a theme of communication and transparency with the society.

For this model would be important to expand the organizational flexibility in place of bureaucratic administration because their stiff rules wouldn’t permit the control of results (Bresser Pereira, 1998). So, according to Bresser Pereira (2006), the managerial public administration, when combining orientation for citizens and obtaining of results, needs to modernize. To encourage the innovative and entrepreneurial behavior of public employees the management contracts would be the more efficient form to manage the State and the performance of managers. Besides of decentralizing tasks and to expand the decisional autonomy of managers about how they should act (Barzelay, 1999). And the greater managerial discretionary asks for the creation of institutional incentives to bureaucracies (Kettl, 1996), being the management contracts considered the key mechanisms of this process.

Moreover, by emphasizing the expansion of management responsibilities to society, the new public management helps to defend public property and republican principles. The evaluation of results is also relevant for learning organization because the accountability for goals helps to review the performance of public management (CLAD, 1998). This educational process supported on management contracts would permit to evaluate the efficacy, efficiency and effectiveness of actions, beyond to increase the transparency to disclosure beforehand the desired results from the society for the public bodies (CLAD, 1998: 16). For this, indicators and goals of performance need to be consistent with public interest (Bresser Pereira, 2009).

According to Kettl (1996), the measurement of performance needs to concentrate more on results and outputs rather than inputs, and at same time, to enlarge the delegation of power (empowerment). To deploy indicators of performance is essential to feedback a managerial

model in which governments seek to be guided by demands from the citizen. But these “demand-side reforms” require that governments adjust services to these preferences (more responsiveness) and ensure quality in supply (best performance) (Manning *et al*, 2009). For these authors such aspects help to overcome the inertia bureaucracy as an obstacle to efficiency of public management. According to Kettl (1996), the traditional bureaucratic hierarchy needs to be changed by the conception of “let the managers manage” because they know what must be done, even though of administrative rules create barriers for their actions. Thereby the managers would have flexibility to make the governments work better in answering the demands from the citizen.

This form of management increases the capacities of governments to align goals, desired results and the choice of actions to improve their performance (Peters, 2003; Manning *et al*, 2009). This point of view is in line with Manning *et al* (2009, p. 104): “the notion of performance is seen as crucial for the modern state: governments need to improve the way to get legitimacy for the supply of promised services”. On the other hand, there is a relation among the public value, governmental transparency and democracy in public administration (Cunnill Grau & Ospina, 2003). One resource to reach such a result is the accountability, considered by Bresser Pereira (2009) the greatest change brought by managerial reforms. For this reason, it is not just issues of organizational structure, but also of changing in the managerial process (Aguillar, 2007).

In this line, according to Kamarck (2003), is important that governments seek quality in their services to improve the delivering to citizens in order to get support from society, as the example of Citizen’s Chart has already been quoted. In the total quality implemented in companies there are three assumptions: the customer, the product and the organization. In public administration, for Kamarck (2003: 22-23), the quality seeks: to meet the demands of citizens and use them to shape the behavior of bureaucratic organizations, to disseminate performance standards and measurement of performance, including public officials in organizational redesign to create collective bodies of participants, further to teach and to assure incentives to civil servants when meeting the demands of citizens. As this changes are of great magnitude, the author emphasizes the importance of organizational and political leadership as a contextual and relevante variable. Furthermore, to stress to the bureaucracies that this process that share the learning of the implemented innovations should be institutionalized, as occurred in Italy, New Zeland and United States, for instance.

Historic neoinstitutionalism and incrementalism in public policy analysis

The incrementalist approach proposed by Lindblom (1959, 1979) understands that the treatment of complex issues in public administration demands decisions that hardly generate large changes. Especially, the author argues that the plot of arenas, actors and interests at stake renders more difficult to propose innovations without to create some kind of mediations, which makes policy changes a more incremental process. Ultimately, in the absence of an intentional approach to the actors seeking to contemplate the views around a theme, incrementalism can also be the result of lack of proposals. Anyway, the preferences of actors are central to this analytical view of public policies. It's better to make decisions that don't involve every variables of a problem because this hinder the building of consensus and could derail advances, even if these are smaller than those desired by individual actors. Thus, the preference for changes in public policies rests on controllable elements in their triggered events and anticipated effects. In sum, the great is enemy of the good for the incrementalism, and thus minimal agreement around the agenda in public policies are assured. This method is based on five core aspects:

- a) Selection of goals of a policy and its empirical analysis focused on an action aren't different phases because to define goals and to act are interconnected very closely;

- b) The analysis of means and ends is usually limited or inappropriate, because the impossibility to analyze “everything” can generate inaction, being preferable to do something consciously incomplete, but able to promote actions. If mistakes are made, as they are smaller actions”, they can be reviewed and their harmful effects are usually not of major consequence. So, in the alliances around policies prevail interests instead of ideologies, and this is the best way to build agreements that reduce resistances and distances because confrontations can be costly, uncertain and not being successful;
- c) The test of a “good public policy” occurs when there is a deal of actors involved instead of guessing that one must be consistent between its ends and means, because before the theoretical criteria prevail the pragmatic meaning of agreement on some points of action. By reducing the polarization of interests, increases the chance of success because, on the contrary, it can arise deadlocks that paralyze the public agenda and government. The preferences of actors are politically mediated to seek the possible agreements, at the same time in which decision-makers focus on marginal gains of a policy as a tangible product.
- d) The analysis of reality is limited because possible results are consciously neglected as well as alternatives of public policies and divergent values too. This provides greater security for the decision makers not to get involved with issues of major proportions by choosing a combination of stability and controlled changing in direction of a policy. Thus, innovation and continuity don’t need to be contradictory.
- e) A succession of comparisons among policies once adopted enables to reduce or to eliminate the theoretical dependency because the concrete experience serves as a guide to make decisions. Therefore, to avoid the analysis of all variables, as does the synoptic model, and reduces the menu of options to formulate and to deploy policy agendas.

In short, the stability of public policies increases the probability of incremental advances more than to think of great changes as advocates the synoptic model. The underlying logical is to avoid risks of greatest changes that are linger, costly and can be risky for the interests of the actors. The incrementalism presupposes that structurally actors deal with essential questions (ideologies, values, goals and so on), making of politics and public policy a process of bargaining guided by changes directed to a “mean point”. Considering these characteristics of incrementalism, it is possible collate them with the historic neoinstitutionalism, even though this approach is dealing with the institutions as the main independent variables, and not as preferences from the actors. The logical of path dependence in public policies discussed by (Pierson, 2000; Hall, 2003) is based on the view of “increasing returns” (Artur, 1990).

Underlying this conception is the explanatory mechanism of positive feedback. A sequence of events stabilizes around a model of action or options of policies that generated balance over time, so that choices of actors adapt to existent paradigms, although they may be lower if compared to others. However, the preferences and strategies of the actors are endogenous in institutions because conditioning the way as the public policies are formulated and implemented. The reinforcement of managerial standards into government, for instance, can lay down the ground for some rules and models of policies ending up influencing the way as public managers may act. There is, in this case, a possible parallel between the stability of public policies in incrementalism and the regularity that institutions engender. An explanatory mechanism of this proximity, for instance, between the public policy, the preferences of actors and the structural conditions is presented by the rules of the game (Immergut, 1992). Institutions don’t decide or act, despite of presenting the general parameters conditioning the

possibilities of action by political actors, and can thus influence the course of policy that remains with minor changes.

It is in this sense that the concept of path dependence by Pierson (2004) points out that the regularities of policies, may not even be the best alternatives in all contexts, including switching costs that influence the choices of actors. Thus, the maintenance of a public policy can, however, be more a product of options what reinforces “increasing returns”, even though different alternative arise for political actors. In this case, the institutional choices are dependent variables because there is the calculus of political actors about the cost of changes in a policy. Walking for existing paths can be an alternative in the menu of possibilities reinforcing changes in a more incremental way. However, as Pierson (2004) states, the previous path of policies does not create a lock in process, but expands the likelihood of actors who keep the institutions already operating. The institutions influence but don’t decide or substitute political actors and their actions. Because of this, would be mistaken to confuse the historic neoinstitutionalism approach with hurry reading of sociological functionalism wherein external factors would determine the human being in their actions.

The contingency into the action derived from political actors doesn’t stay subsumed to the institutions but conditioned by the presence of previous path initiatives with their rules and standards. Especially, as states Artur (1990), with a larger the adhesion of the actors to a policy, lesser likely would be its alteration in function of the burden of change. Of course, this assertion always demands empirical analysis to generate real evidences of linkage between stability and institutional change. Thus, is not the design of policy itself that creates the path dependence, but rather the self strengthening due to switching costs, combined with the existence of positive externalities that help to sustain its maintenance for the political actors. According to Hall & Taylor (2003), this is one of the aspects to explain the resilience of institutions shaping the worldview of those concerned. Even to the authors, might be that issues of political nature have their view subordinated by the presence of institutions because it may be considered more reasonable to keep the actions in their trajectory than walking for uncertain paths.

Further, this institutional view takes the contextual analysis to identify the causal factors that are specific to each sector policy, the dynamics of power, and the existing networks. That, as Immergut (1998), generates contextual logics of causal path dependent in public policies and their rules of the game. The historic contingency (for instance, when changes the parties in the government) are process through by which the institutions can mediate preferences of the stakeholders with the existing structure of policies. The resulting contour of policies arising in this process is conditioned by its path, but it is not an automatic product that can neglect the choices of political actors. For Weir (2006), institutional regularities exist but generate multiple identities and the political actors can define their interests on many ways. The space of the agency and the politics is always present, without the explanations of nature that structural-functionalist end up being the best way to understand the nature of the institutions. Hence to opt for the stability of a policy by introducing incremental changes that underpin its essence is one of the choices in the range of possibilities that political actors have.

For this reason, for Weir (2006), usually occurs a kind of process called “bounded innovation of policies” due to institutional arrangements to create opportunities for changes that, at the same time, limit the action of political actors. In the course of time, some ideas become less likely to influence political institutions, can reduce the incentives, and even so to determine the choices made by the political actors. The institutional design of the State can narrow the course of a policy innovation, the political actors may act to the detriment of deeper changes, which influence to maintain the *status quo* or to generate a more incremental process of changes in its institutions.

Some key issues of debate around the new public management, and its nexus with incrementalism and historic neoinstitutionalism were presented, and in the next section we will begin the analysis and discussion of GesPública.

Analysis and discussion of GesPública: nexus between the theoretical debate and previous policies

This section aims to collate the main goals of GesPública with those proposed by the management reform formulated by MARE in the 90s, especially to discuss the similarities between the concepts and the approach. Accordingly, the emphasis of the discussion will deal with the overall vision and strategy of the two initiatives and will not address their implementation mechanisms. Considering the theoretical referential the section has two parts. The first analyzes the influence of previous policies related to out the scope of GesPública. The second one discusses the program in the light of literature on new public management.

The link with the path and incremental changes in the proposal of GesPública

In the path of Brazilian federal government's actions dealing with administrative modernization possibly the first reference worthy of mention was the creation of Bureaucratic Simplification Committee by the President Juscelino Kubitscheck in 1956. After this initiative, at the end of military regimen, in 1979, was launched the National Debureaucratization Program. It was recognized that to protect the citizen against the formalism in public bureaucracy was essential to improve service delivery (Ayres, 2012). The Decree creating this program highlighted as one of its main goal to improve the public service for the users. Moreover, the program had a focus on management by proposing to replace the previous control by effective monitoring of the implementation and strengthening of surveillance directed to identify and correct problems.

If Sarney's government (1985-1989) was absent of acting in this field, Collor de Mello's administration, started in 1990, contributed to resume this kind of actions. In 1990 the Brazilian Program of Quality and Productivity was created with a Sub committee for Public Administration, the embryo of Quality Program in Public Service. Its purpose, according to the GesPública (2009), was to expand the quality and productivity of those public bodies to make them more efficient in resource management and more geared to meet the demands of society instead of just returning to bureaucratic processes.

In 1995, when State Reform started, the Program of Quality and Participation in Public Administration (PAQP) was established. The seeking for quality come to be a goal and managerial tool to modernize the state apparatus according to national and international parameters of public and private management. In 1999, the Ministry of Management, Planning and Budget (MPOG) unified both of the previous programs focusing the citizen service and demands of the society instead of internal bureaucratic process. From this time deploying surveys of users satisfaction, standards to attend citizen, and Citizen Support Services. The citizen came to be seen as a recipient of the actions from the public administration and someone to whom the governments are to be accountable (Ferreira, 2009).

According to the Reform Plan of State Apparatus (1995), the goal was "to increase the governance of State, in other words, its administrative capacity to govern with effectiveness and efficiency, turning the actions of State services to meet citizens needs". The main changes were cultural and managerial in order to transform attitudes and to establish new referential for public management like the PQPSP, from 1999 to 2004, seeking to deploy participatory, transparent and results-oriented public administration.

In 2005, the Federal Government launched the National Program of Public Management and Debureaucratization (GesPública) unifying the PQPSP with the Debureaucratization National Program (Ferreira, 2009: 1). Its mission was to promote the

excellence in public management aiming at contributing to improve the quality in public services offered for citizens, and to increase the competitiveness of the country. The program also presents itself as a powerful instrument of citizenship for citizens and public officials the practical exercise of an ethic, participatory, decentralized, promoter of social control, and results-oriented public administration. Featured here is the verb to lead what seems to indicate a path to the public bureaucracy and society to modernize the public management, the actions of citizens for social control, and the links between the State and the society. Aggregating for the goals above quoted, the intention of contributing to expand the systemic competitiveness of the country we see that the program seeks to reach broad marks through public management.

According to the Reference Document (2009: 10, our emphasis), “GESPÚBLICA is a **forefront** public policy formulated to the management, underpinned in a singular public management model incorporated for the technical dimension, typical of administration, also the social dimension hitherto restricted to the political dimension”. Hence, this program sees itself as innovative because it would not perform in this way if it was not its official self-image. After all, as GesPública (2009: 5), for this program:

The conquest of democracy demands a new standard of deliberation considering the citizen as the focus of public action. This challenging situation demands a strategy of transformation of public management to provide a reshaping of public institutions to a new profile of State conceived and implemented by consensus.

Their core assumptions are presented in the Reference Document (2009):

- a) Being of a public nature, considering that public management can and need to be excellent, but may not and should not stop being public in its configuration. The support for it is on constitutional principles of impersonality, legality, morality, publicity and efficiency;
- b) Being focused in results and institutional performance to meet the demands of the society by departing from the logic of public service restricted for bureaucratic rules. The efficiency and efficacy must be evaluated by the capacity of the public management to improve the quality of life of citizens. Further, the “impact of performance of GesPública is evidenced in every public organization that deploys management practices with beneficial outcomes for citizens and competitiveness for the country” (GESPÚBLICA, 2009, p. 9);
- c) Having a federative and republican character because the conceptual ground and their instruments are applicable in public administration in all levels.

This presentation of fundamentals of what GesPública understands to be its innovative essence yet doesn't seem so different from the previous actions created by the federal government. Firstly, the debureacratization was already in the agenda of federal government since the late 70s. The focus on results and citizens was already present in many documents that supported the debate in the Brazilian State reform in the 90s. According to Bresser Pereira (2009: 31), minister that led the State Reform Plan during Fernando Henrique's government, the managerial administration “is supported on accountability for results [...] and auditory of results”. Or as emphasized in *Cadernos Mare* n. 6 (1997: 7) that the management reform would review the conventional controls turned to process to redirect them to results. An example always remembered at the time to evaluate public services are indicators of citizen satisfaction. Not coincidentally this same notebook (*Cadernos*) has a section titled “What the society gets from the Reform”, with highlight for efficient public administration capable of generating more benefits for citizens, and to deliver service with more quality.

Hence, the result of the management reform should be “a more efficient State which answer to whom in fact must answer: the citizen” (CADERNOS MARE 1, 1997: 52). This view in nothing differs from the innovator meaning wherewith GesPública presents because its goal of building public organization oriented to citizen as the recipient of public service to

whom the State “must be accountable” has the same sense that oriented the management reform in the 90s. Thus, the logic of a public management focused on society was already presented in the project of State reform in the 90s, and there were not innovations introduced by GesPública such as this program seeks to stress. Therefore, the inclusion of the expression “public value aggregated” in the texts of GesPública portrays more as semantic question instead of an effective innovation, as we will see ahead.

The social dimension, in order to stimulate practices of public control over the state apparatus, likewise was already present as an issue in the managerial reform of the 90s. In Cadernos Mare 1 (1997), in a section titled “Range of Controls Mechanisms”, it is argued that the social control obeys the principles of the increase in no-state public space, and the larger diffusion of power to complement the basis of representative democracy. By means of social control, society can be organized formally and informally to monitor public and private institutions, and this helps them to be more efficient as a key economic principle in their administrative performance. The Cadernos Mare 4 (1997:16) also highlights that among the specific goals of PQPSP are “to conceive mechanisms seeking the integration of citizens in the process that defines the implementation and evaluation of public action”. One of the main mechanisms to put this goal in place is the definition of performance indicators to evaluate the results and levels of satisfaction of external and internal customers, and also to stimulate its use. Finally, it is important to mention that the expression *accountability* is commonly used in “Cadernos Mare” and translated as “responsibility” of the State and their leaders before the society. It is a conceived dimension as an intrinsic part of the management reform of the State considering its focus on the demands of the citizens. But this view, or at least this expression, is not present in the texts of GesPública because the emphasis is to generate aggregated public value, while the accountability of State before the society receives less attention. Thus, the GestPública translates, as will be seen, *accountability* as transparency of public acts.

Either the discussion of quality in the public management can be seen as an innovative issue because it is part of an international movement existing since the 80s in many countries. According to Cadernos Mare n. 15 (1997), the program of Restructuring and Quality sought to implement measures turned to review structures and competences of Ministries as strategic planning and the improvement of the management. Among those, to be considered in excellent managerial level, the Ministries would be evaluated by several criteria that, according to the adopted methodology, gave to the generation of institutional results a significant weight. It is understood that of this way the methodology adapted from the National Quality Award (PNQ) could measure the adherence of the organization to a standard of **excellence in management**” (Cadernos MARE 15, 1997: 75, our emphasis). Still considering PQPSP is worth noting, according to Caderno Mare 4 (1997: 12), the same point:

Emerges as the main instrument for the change in a bureaucratic culture to a managerial culture, responsible for promoting the revolution in the established values in the political-philosophical plane, required to implement a new State model: participation, recognition of potential of civil servant and their relevance in the productive process, equal opportunities, and the option for citizenship; being associated to educational process that lead to a renewed worldview.

Moreover, the emphasis on ethic and participatory character of the public management is not an innovation arising with GesPública, as suggested by its presentation. Even the decentralization as an important point is not new because the PQPSP had it as one of their general goals to change the bureaucratic culture in favor of a managerial culture. This goal would be reached by the reinforcement of delegation of activities, beyond helping to stimulate the civil servants and generating more control of results. This is because, for Cadernos Mare 4 (1997: 18), the “highest administration, the managerial body and the operational basis need to

involve with the “Quality, assuming the commitment with the continuous improvement of Public Administration”. Thus, participatory administration should establish the cooperation between the managers and the managed by putting the decision as close as possible to the action, which means to decentralize information and policy objectives, according to the Master Plan for State Reform (1995).

Finally, to associate this program to republican practices and provisions of Article 37 of the Constitution adds a little to the debate because it is mandatory for all public administration. Further, the managerial reform in the 90s already contemplated this view, according to Bresser Pereira (2009: 33), when emphasized that the guarantee of social and republican rights are beyond of the capabilities of a traditional public administration because it demands a State with more managerial efficiency. Similarly can not be said that the reform plan by Mare was devoid of federative concerns, as can be seen in the Cadernos Mare 6 (1997) that emphasized the balance of account in States and municipalities to reduce their levels of delinquency. On federal matters, in the presentation of structure and operation of PQPSP, the so-called project V – “Articulation with States, cities and other powers” highlights the relevance of stimulating, supporting and monitoring this initiative in other levels of government. The proposed strategy would adapt the methodology to be applied as well in with states and municipalities.

However, there is a difference of federative organization between the PQPSP and the GesPública that deserves to be highlighted. The first one sought to institute a Consultant Network that would be coordinated by MARE *ad hoc* and composed only by civil servants having enough knowledge in management to act as facilitators in public bodies. Thus, the federative character of this program would be met when recruiting civil servants in many regions of the country, and willing to collaborate with the propagation of managerial and quality culture. The GesPública proposed the creation of a National Network of Public Management in which not only federal employees, but also organizations from the society and individuals could act as volunteer partners. Because of this, the strategy of learning organization inserted in GesPública appears to be larger than Consultant Network of PQPSP because the possibility of exchanging experiences is expanded in terms of number and differentiation of participant actors.

Nevertheless, the table below indicates how GesPública sees itself as innovator before the path of previous initiatives of modernization in Brazilian public administration. The program believes to be an innovative conception even if in the official documents it's highlighted that its “landmarks do not represent ruptures but important increments from the initial design of Brazilian Program of Quality and Productivity” (GESPÚBLICA, 2009: 7).

Table1 – The evolution of debureaucratization and quality actions in Brazilian public administration

Year	Name of the initiative
1979	National Program of Debureaucratization
1990	PBQP (Brazilian Program of Quality and Productivity (focus on process).
1991	FPNQ (Foundation for National Quality Award) and PNQ (National Quality Program).
1995	MARE (Ministry of Administration and State Reform/Reform Plan of the State).
1996	PQAP (Subprogram of Quality and Participation in Public Administration (focus in management and results).
1998	PQGF (Award of Quality in Public Management)
1999	Extinction of MARE and PQGF is transferred to the Ministry of Planning and Management
2000	Changing of PQAP in PQPSP (Program of Quality in Public Service) (quality service for citizens).
2005	GESPÚBLICA (National Program of Debureaucratization and Public Management (managing for results and focused for citizens)

Source: GesPública (2008), Hosken (2011) and Ferreira (2009). Adapted by author.

The GesPública is guided by the so-called “Model of Excellence in Public Management” (MEGP), to be analyzed ahead. For now it is relevant to detach that for this conception, the public administration needs to adopt “practices in management in order to lead the Brazilian public organizations to higher standards of performance and excellence in management” (MPOG, 2009: 9). But this model of excellence began in 1998 based on the criteria proposed by National Quality Foundation that, according to Ferreira (2009), promoted by the approaching with the PQPSP. It was this contact that allowed to adapt this methodology to the public administration.

On the other hand, the schematic division among the periods, the programs and their purposes are unconvincing because in trying to create a differentiation of positioning from the GesPública. In effect, this is not the situation when we compare the GesPública with the previous policies until 2002. As we have been seeing, the focus on citizen as an axis is a constant since the 90s. In this case, try to distinguish “quality service for citizens” of “management for the citizen” does not represent a innovation but more an incremental adjust of organizational practices similar to what occurred, for instance, with advance of information technology. As well as seen, the focus in management and results can't be considered an introduction of “vanguard” because this speech was present in the proposals of State reform plan proposed by Mare in the 90s.

The GesPública, therefore, incorporated previous policies of public management to propose incremental changes as: a) its nationwide to “articulate and to coordinate a network of strategic partners to underpin the building and implementation of a broad national agenda for the improvement of public management” (MPOG, 2009: 4), which is a differential in this program. Even so it is important to emphasize that since the beginning of movement of quality in Brazilian public administration in the 90s already existed a similar form of organization in order to involve common mechanisms of political representation in representative democracy. But the overview of GesPública is similar to its predecessor, the PQPSP, because both see the citizen as their finality.

Therefore, it is debatable the official version of the program when to try saying that, almost ten years after the beginning of the State reform, that GesPública shaped a new model of management to Brazilian public administration (MPOG, 2009). Thus, to highlight social control with transparency like an innovation does not leave clear the difference from what already existed in proposed State reform by Mare after 1995. The same goes to participatory management that values cooperation among people, already suggested in Cadernos Mare 4, as we seen above.

But on the other hand, we need to understand better the narrative of the presentation of GesPública because it is also seen as “an **evolution of initiatives** [...] for the improvement in the quality of public services [...]” (Palvarini, 2009, our emphasis). Or, according to Hosken (2011: 8, our emphasis), a program that “needed to **adapt** the model because the public sector has as characteristics the fact of being public, oriented to citizen and has the duty to respect the constitutional principles [...]”.

From this angle, the speech of innovation can be moderated because it has a more incremental bias instead of creating a new conception to modernize the Brazilian public management. It seems to be a more adequate way to understand the GesPública, less than see it as an innovation to Brazilian public administration, because it introduced minor modifications in relation to management reform in the 90s.

The GesPública and its dialogue with managerial public administration

By and large is possible to say that the GesPública underpins on assumptions of managerial public administration starting with its direction to citizens and the application of managerial tools. Keep the GesPública as “expression of “state of art” of contemporary

management and representation of a system of management aiming to increase the efficiency, the efficacy, and the effectiveness of public actions” (MPOG, 2009) also dialogues with New Public Management. According to the article of Decree 378/2005, that instituted this program, the goal was: a) promote good governance and to increase the capacity of formulation, implementation and evaluation of public policies; b) assure efficacy and effectiveness of governmental action to generate results for society; c) promote democratic, participatory and transparent management; c) promote efficiency and seeking for results in the public action. But for Ayres (2012), although the GesPública is based on New Public Management, since 1995, when the National Program of Public Management was created, there were actions promoting the managing for results in Brazil.

The GesPública inserts in a changing context of bureaucratic administration to managerial administration that, as already presented in the Cadernos Mare 12 (1999), try to expand the administrative decentralization, delegating authority and enlarging the autonomy of the public managers. Therefore, it proposed organizational formats more flexible instead of more rigid bureaucratic structures. Especially, the core goal was to deploy the control for results a *posteriori* in place of a control of *inputs* and *ex ante*. Such assumptions would lead the public administration to meet the demands from the citizens and qualify the social control.

According to MPOG (2009), the guidelines of “Model of Excellence in Public Management” are: a) managerial excellence (leadership, strategies and plans, citizens, society, information and knowledge, people, process and results); b) technology applied to management (citizen’s chart, satisfaction surveys, guide of process management, guide of administrative simplification and an instrument of continuous evaluation of management); c) management practices that serve as reference to the actions of modernization; d) continuous innovation initiatives of the model in its communication with the society and ensure of their maintenance.

At the center of GesPública is the aim of guiding the demands of citizens and to deploy a managing for results to reach marks defined by the public organizations. The way to reach this goal is the shaping and reinforcement of the institutions inserted in State, considering the demands from the elected governments and issues raised by political system and public bureaucracy.

The overview of proposed model

Regarding the first item, excellence, there is a dialogue with the new public management, but the "pursuit of excellence" approximates the GesPública of theories of total quality also already present in its previous path since the 90s. But what seems to have occurred with the GesPública is a larger inflexion to adopt the model of quality total as reference, as we will see ahead. The installation, in 1998, of Quality Award in Public Management shows as quality total was seen as a “fundament of managerial culture to excellence” in Brazilian public administration. Not by chance the Model of Excellence in Award National Quality and Model of Excellence in Public Administration, henceforth MEGP, have the same fundamentals (including, it is a common expression in the program documentation) (MPOG, 2009).

In the case of GesPública quality in public service is adopted as a mean of management and finality considering the focus on the demands from the citizens. At the same time, quality is taken as a managerial tool and a view capable to generate aggregated public value to society and which aligns the GesPública with the debate on new public management. The picture below helps to show the design of this program.

Picture 1 – Systemic overview of GesPública



Source: Mello Júnior (2010).

There is an “elective affinity” in many respects presented in the “Reference Document” (2009) and the view of New Public Management such as the emphasis in “learning organization” and sharing of knowledge taking the “mistakes as educational tools” in order to generate continuous improvements in public administration. This goal is aligned with the seeking of a “culture of continuous managerial innovation” wherein the implementation of new ideas helps to produce a differential in the action of public organizations. The dissemination of this practice is useful to expand the “generation of public value and the achieving of results for citizens”. Further, as citizens and society are the focus of GesPública, they indicate the direction of public policies and management effort being undertaken by the State and by the public administration, because for the MPOG (2009: 16-17):

The democratic State has been prompted, in a more intense way, by many sectors of the society, to accomplish its primary function of developing public policies directed to assure the equality of opportunities, basic rights of citizens and the sustained developing producing efficient and effective results. At the same time, the society is increasingly complex as to its organization, functioning and dynamics of demand for public services. In this sense, the GESPÚBLICA understands that quality of management bodies and public entities is important to generate public positive value for society.

It is along this view that the managing for results is to be monitored, evaluated and measured through indicators, connects with the grounds presented above. But if the indicators do not serve to the learning organization, stimulus to innovate and to evaluate results of public policies, especially with citizens, this debate would make little sense with the new public management. The emphasis of New Public Management (NGP) to change managerial practice, for another hand, understands the importance of commitment with public employees because this is another key point proposed by the GesPública. However, even though the aim of developing the skills of people, little is emphasized the “practice of incentive to recognizing” and of institutional stimulus. This is an important issue in the view of NGP to stimulate adhesion of civil servants to new management models, but appears in an incidental manner in the formulation of GesPública.

Accordingly, the speech of “participatory management” as management style to get cooperation and synergy of teams work can configure a model with more fragile characteristics without the proposition of institutional stimulus. In the design of GesPública this seems to be a gap that can compromise the goals of participatory administration seeking to value people and to expand their autonomy to reach individual and collective marks. If the program seeks the “recognizing for good performance establishing relations with people and creating conditions for improving quality in work” (MPOG, 2009), the alignment with the NGP, in terms of incentives to public employees, is not remembered as a means to reach these kinds of goals.

Technologies management presented by GesPública

Regarding the second point, technologies management, assumes highlight the Charter Service Citizen that MPOG (2009) quotes as a successful practice in Spain, Italy, Mexico, Norway and Argentina. Through this document, the organizations should release to citizens the services provided, as to access them, the assumed compromises and the standards of quality. “Her practice involves a process of transformation for the organization, sustained in fundamentals principles – commitment, information and transparency, learning and participation of citizen. This principles are premised on the focus on the citizen and the induction of social control” (MPOG, 2009: 12).

Here there is a parallel with the *Citizen’s Chart*, although these do not speak of “social control” as proposed by the GesPública in the Charter of Service. The reason, maybe less technical and more political, is that the participation of society in the planning, monitoring and evaluating of public administration expresses a management style which should reflect the maturity of democracy in Brazil (Ferreira, 2009: 18). The argument is that the Constitution assures civil and social rights for citizens, and public organizations should foster their participation in the evaluation of offered services, besides of creating communication channels to claims and suggestions.

This kind of political inflexion also exists in new public management but is less marked because it emphasizes the pursuit of efficiency in the relationship with citizens and in the service deliver. The State is not seen as a mean “to induce the citizenship” and “to promote social control”. But for the MPOG (2009: 10), “the citizen is seen as a main agent of change and effectively participates in the improvements offered by public services”, and government needs to provide conditions for society charge of the state such proposals. Therefore, the program is presented as a “national tool of citizenship to accomplish the mission of assuring the welfare of society” (MPOG, 2009).

Here inserts the issue of accountability arising in the design of the Charters as “guarantee of transparency” considered essential by the contemporary public administration in democratic regimes. If public organizations need to identify the media with citizens this process acquires, for Kettl (1996), a political dimension when meets demands from the society and fosters collection actions with governments. So, the GesPública understands that transparency and participation of society are central to get social control and to prepare the government to answer these demands. Thus, the visibility of government actions and the implementation of mechanisms of social participation are seen as faces of the same process. Once more, it is important to emphasize that new public management underpins in accountability as synonym of transparency in government actions, but does not conceive the public power as inducer and promoter of mechanisms of social control. Here possibly there is an innovative inflexion in the GesPública’s speech that does not deny its path but adds one aspect of the role of the republican state.

Moreover, according to the MPOG (2009), this process helps to "build trust and credibility of the society in public administration when it perceives a continuous improvement

in its efficiency and efficacy”. The seeking for legitimacy of public action, such as discussed by new public management, is present in the GesPública. Another issue wherein GesPública and NGP approach, according to the total quality management, relates to monitor and evaluate the compliance with the commitment of promoting the continuous improvement of offered services. This process is completed with planning and implementation of actions that also help in the learning organization (MPOG, 2009).

For the GesPública, the Charters of Services are instruments that guide public administration to citizen seeking to add value to society. It is said that the relationship with citizen will be more transparent because it will allow that society surveillance and control the services through periodic means of evaluation. However, if NGP purposes contracts between public sector and users, the GesPública speaks of public commitment. Nevertheless, if Charters of Service admit the social participation to control the quality of received treatment it seems more fragile in terms of the links between public organizations and citizens. For example, in the design of GesPública is not defended the view of competition between providers giving to citizens a chance to opt for one of them, which is considered by NGP a stimulus to public organizations to strengthen links and add value for citizens.

But despite the speech of innovation in the Charters of Service the worry with quality of public services for citizens since 2000 was already a target of federal government action. The Decree 3507/2000 dealt of this issue when established quality standards for citizens. For occasion of launching of the Charters of Service in 2009 the Ministry of Planning recognized this earlier path of actions to generate and to evaluate quality standards. Above all, the institutionalization of the Project Quality's Standards in Citizen Service with the participation of organizations that met the citizen. For the MPOG (2009: 1, our emphasis), the Charter of Services is a project with a **new format and application methodology** as described in, the Decree 6.932/2009. According to the article 11 of this Decree, the federal public organizations that offer services for citizens must elaborate and release the Charter of Services in their field of action. But it seems that the proposals of Charters of Services were more incremental than innovative before the previous actions focused to improve services for citizens through improvement in service deliver.

Internally the public administration, the Charters of Services should be guided by participation and commitment of public employees, what unfold on two debatable assumptions: a) the more participation generates the more satisfaction in the work and results in citizens more satisfied; b) the more participation the more the learning because the people motivate themselves to innovate. These normative issues only can be empirically analyzed. But still on the ground of comparison with the NGP, there is a gap in the proposal of GesPública when it doesn't contemplate the management contracts. Keys characteristics of the NGP as autonomy, empowerment and participation of public employees in the management, associated with more flexible organizational forms, but with the agreed targets to be fulfilled are not inserted in the design of the GesPública. Instead of “contract” it seeks “commit people” to develop skills based on incentives (quoted in general way and without clear proposal of implementation) and professional recognition. Possibly this is a more fragile point in the formulation of GesPública when compared to the importance of management contracts for the NGP, because according to the MPOG (2009: 25):

Assumes give autonomy to achieve goals and achieve results, take risks, create opportunities for learning and skills development. It also involves recognizing good performance, creating flexible and productive practices to attract and retain talent, providing a participatory and pleasant organizational climate.

Create a flexible and stimulating environment for the generation of knowledge, disseminate the values and beliefs of the organization and ensure an open and continuous flow of information is essential for people to be motivated and act with autonomy and responsibility.

The speech of participatory management is also present in the new public management, but in the GesPública lacks of institutional stimulus despite of highlighting the seeking for results. It is a paradox because it is proposed a managing for results focused on the citizen but without suggesting the same philosophy for the internal management of the public organizations.¹ Instead of this contractual logic seems to apply an idea of what the involvement of public employees in projects of managerial change will get stimulate their participation in organizational arrangements with collective basis. As if, when urged to attend, officials could generate learning in favor of the continuous improvement of services to citizens as Palvarini (2009) asserts:

The adoption of MEGP is a relevant aspect of cultural change that is intended to adopt in the field of public management trying to help the civil servant to recognize the impact of their work on the institutional strategy [...] we believe that investing in it is how we will succeed in management programs, out of sight operation of tools for the strategic vision itself.

It is not clear if the evaluation of performance of the managers is no longer *ex ante* and passes to be *ex post* with defined goals. Maybe the underlying logical is that material incentives generate “the risk of losing a model based on the trust and solidarity among civil servants for other that basically works around of contractual relations and detailed performance evaluation systems feeding the mutual “distrust” between principal and agents” (Costa, 2002: 12). This would be one of issues that would deserve to be better investigated because the lack of clearer mechanisms seems to make the GesPública more a program of voluntary adhesion wherein the charges of results are not relevant.

Just to illustrate this decoupling of GesPública with contracting for results the own bylaws of MPOG divide tasks that withdraw responsibilities from that program with this managerial tool. In Article 26 present activities of the Department of Developing and Institutional Performance which is responsible for: to propose mechanisms of pact results and incentives and to identify and diffuse best practices of managing for results in public sector. By Article 24 the Department of Innovation and Improvement Management is responsible for to propose actions and to execute them to reinforce and to better the management of process in the federal public administration, and especially of GesPública. Thus, in the Ministry of Planning there are rules and organizational structures separating innovation in public management from issue turned on managerial performance that, according to the debate in the managerial public administration, are combined dimensions of the same process.

It seems that democratic and participatory management, and the seeking for a “flexible and stimulating environment”, are the solutions of managerial modernization unless means to put in place the contracting for results. And, accordingly, there is another important inflexion of GesPública in comparison with New Public Management (NGP): the issue of organizational leadership. For the NGP, as Behn (1998), the entrepreneurship as a factor of

¹ As to contracting for results, the Management Secretary (Seges) of MPOG elaborated, in 2010, a project in order to regulate this issue. But there are managerial contracts wherein the Seges participates of Committee of Monitoring and Evaluation involving: Ministry of Economical Developing, Industry and Trade; Ministry of Science and Technology and the Center of Management and Strategic Studies; National Network of Research; Ministry of Health; National Agency of Sanitary Surveillance, National Agency of Complementary Health (ANS), National Institute for Weights and Measures (INMETRO), and the Institute Mamirauá for Sustainable Developing. This is another example of path dependence because some contracts, as exemplified in the last two on the list, according to Costa (2002), were signed by MPOG during the second term of FHC’s government. But the GesPública, the main program to modernize the public administration, has not this kind of tool in its conformation and their packages of managerial technology. Further, the managerial contracts, besides being absent in the discourse, not even have the good practices cited, as might be the case of Minas Gerais (state of Brazil with good management experience since 2003). Even with the gaps in this experience, according to Oliveira (2012), still is a initiative with a good institutional accumulation and learning in public management.

innovation is one of the three big questions of public management, which combines with micromanagement to ease the achievement of results and performance measurement.

But the GesPública emphasizes the function of the leader as promoter of management, responsible for guide, to foster and to generate commitment with organizational results. The leader would be the inspirational and motivator of people to develop a culture for excellence in favor of public interest (MPOG, 2009). However, it is not clear the link between motivation, performance and management into the design of GesPública.

One of the initial answers for this disjunction, as shown by the program documents, is that relationship between principal and agent is not adopted as a model of contracting managerial results. If right this hypothesis, it makes sense the critical by Lynn (1994) of what the emphasis of some “new practical models of intervention” overestimates the role of the organizational leader to promote changes. The risk would be emphasize skills and personal profile of the organizational leader unless a systemic conception about the managerial modernization. This view being more “art” of management and less “science” it runs the risk of the public management debate turn into a theology to nurture the leader's role (LYNN, 1994: 242). So, before generating mechanisms to contract results, stimuli derived from organizational leadership, as support for models of participatory management, would be more effective in getting support and membership of managers and civil servants.

Among the tools of continuous assessment, another managerial technology of menu conceived by the GesPública, is possible to quote the “Reference Guide to Performance Measurement and Manual for Construction for Indicators” (2009). To this end, studies and research on literature and national and international experiences were performed aiming at making available methodologies and benchmarks for public organizations. The direction of the efforts seem to be aligned with the vision of the managerial public administration and managing for results, despite the reduced implementation to monitor, to evaluate and to provide feedback for public policies. And this gap is important because without indicators how to generate objectivity in a managerial model seeking to be guided for results? How to create accountability and transparency without objective means of assessing reached goals?

But for GesPública to assess also is synonym of comparing of management system with the “Model of Excellence in Public Management – MEGP” to check the adherence of managerial practices according to predefined criteria. It is using previously established parameters for evaluating the level of modernization of management. Through them is possible “to measure” the management levels of organization in relation to “state of the art,” advocated by the model” (Ferreira, 2009). However, when this model is presented as a necessary and sufficient condition to modernize the public administration it is proposed as “universal solution” of management. Proposing the same managerial model indiscriminately for every public organization, the GesPública disregards the contextual variables that can be relevant to introduce a new culture of management. This contradiction is present in the internal debate of GesPública because, on the other hand, it seems to flirt with the logic of *one fit for all* (“all plans must be aligned with the Excellence Model of the PQGF”). But to ensure that when “the evaluation is systematized it works as a way of learning about the organization itself, and as well as tool for managerial improvement” it seems to consider the institutional singularities. Both approaches can be complementary, but the proposed synthesis by the GesPública between the NGP and total quality generates this kind of contradictions that are not clearly presented and described in the program documents.

This discussion can be expanded with other statements contained in “Reference Document of GesPública”. First, the managerial evaluation is seen in a more instrumental way when it uses an “ideal type” and their “criteria of excellence”. The assessment tools “suggest a progressive path of the self-evaluation process” (MPOG, 2009: 36), assuming that the model probably can fit in all situations. But if the new public management proposed the total quality

as a resource of modernization (Bresser Pereira, 2006), GesPública seems to adopt the TQC (Total Quality Management) as the unique pattern of response. On the other hand, the learning and continuous improvement are seen as essential to excellence in public management because they are crosscutting requirements to all evaluation criteria (Ferreira, 2009). For this view, the adaptation of learned lessons seem to be the tonic which to reinforce the contextual analysis. However, if GesPública is derived from PQPSP, its implementation seems to be less flexible. But if the organizational flexibility is key to the NGP, maybe the proposal by GesPública may reintroduce some rigidity of organizational and administrative models if asked the institutions fit for their style.

A third technology of management is the “Process Management Guide to Government” (2011) to conduct the mean activities to reach results. For the MPOG (2009: 12), this is a practical core of action of the management excellence because the processes turn inputs in products and services with high added value for citizens. Hence the prominence it gives to bind management process, obtaining results and Charter of Service. Therefore the commitment to quality in the Chart’s Citizens describes results to be reached by the managerial processes. The goal is the debureaucratization of “documents that don’t add value to the services provided and further undermine the final results of the public actions” (MPOG, 2009: 42). Here GesPública is aligned with the new public management because the inefficient processes that don’t add public value should be revised and/or eliminated. Yet, it is not also an innovation but another incremental improvement because the management process was already included as an action of Program of Quality in Public Administration according to Cadernos Mare n. 4 (1997).

Conclusion

Considering the goals of this article, the analysis showed that although GesPública presents as new policy there is a great deal of continuity with previous initiatives proposed amid Brazilian managerial reform in the 90s, and that the dialogue with the literature of this field is quite significant. Even so, the hypothesis that GesPública is in line with the discussion of the new public management, but innovated in an incremental way in relation to previous proposes of State modernization, especially the envisaged reform by the MARE in the 90s, was not totally confirmed.

The analysis of this program showed that exist relevant issues to the view of the new public management that are not include in their formulation, as is the case of contracting for results. Although the speech program and the Decree that created it indicate this possibility, in fact this is not included in the menu of management technologies proposed in its model. And this is a significant omission, because for the NGP it is key to bureaucratic administration is replaced for a view that prioritizes the seeking for results.

At the very core of management reform proposed by Mare the emphasis on contractual mechanisms are configured as an essential managerial resource, especially to evaluate the performance and achievements of the program. It is, as shown in Cadernos Mare (1997), one of the main points of the reform proposal to change the bureaucratic culture in favor of a managerial culture. The Master Plan for State Reform (1995: 62) is even clearer for this respect when treats of the issue of performance through indicators that “will be the basis to celebrate managerial contracts between the principal of the entity and its respective minister. And from the managerial contracts will be possible to deploy a model of new public management”. Thus, between the design of GesPública and their tools of action, with respect to this core issue to NGP, there is a incongruity still don’t resolved in the design of program. As was seen, the performance management and managerial innovation are disjointed agendas in the structure of the MPOG, which help to highlight this difference between GesPública and NGP.

Another distinction in relation to new public management, although more nuanced, is to enhance the role of the organizational leadership and participatory and democratic management almost as a substitute of managing for results. In this case, the speech of appreciation from managers and public employees, associated with management models organized in collective basis, is the emphasis of GesPública before the management for results. This concept refers to the theme of the discretion of managers, which for the NGP has results-based management a means of *ex post* control, in addition to institutionalize a rule to address the relationship between the principal and the agent. As well remembered by Costa (2002), such a model may seem opposite to the ethos of trust and, as such, introduce different issues in comparison with the classical view about the management of public affairs. The GesPública doesn't face this debate in its design, even tough of fostering the autonomy of managers and to support the easing in public organizations.

For the NGP, the link between accountability and empowerment of civil servants is conceived in the institutional framework that aims to expand the delegation and decentralization of powers, but with accountability for results. This point of view is not clearly established in the design of GesPública because the normative assumptions seem to be that satisfied civil servants, if recognized and appreciated, could generate more results. Not in the Charters of Service, which are means of accountability to communicate standards of quality service for the citizens, there is the resort to the expedient of managing for results. Thus, if the Service's Chart seeks to measure indicators of quality service for citizens, there is not managerial translation suggested by the GesPública into the public organizations. The reason for this is the contention that professional appreciation, and more involvement in the daily management translate into more job satisfaction and results in user better served.

Anyway, the readback of GesPública with literature about incrementalism shows closeness with theoretical theses of this tradition. Foremost, the program created by the federal government in 2005 used the test of "good policy" and maintained the basis of the actions that have been performing since the 90s to modernize the Brazilian public management. The presentation of GesPública appears to show that there was an agreement of the political actors who conceived it that was possible to keep points of action already in progress, since changes were introduced with a focus on managerial performance and the quality of services for citizens. Certainly this line of action, that can be considered pragmatic, in terms of Lindblom (1979), fostered smaller modifications in relation to similar initiatives already present in the proposal of managerial reform in the 90s. Strictly speaking, there was not an ideological confrontation with the past path of policies to qualify the public administration, because the GesPública herewith as innovation or sometimes sees itself as continuity from actions that started to be implemented in the early of the 90s. According to incrementalism approach, innovation and continuity don't need to be considered opposite poles to generate public policies. In the case of GesPública it seems that the comparison with other policies already adopted served as guide to make decision about how balance the foundations of what was being done with its proposed character of novelty. However as seen, the menu to formulate and to deploy the actions of GesPública characterized more for accommodation and adaptation of projects and program already in course up to 2004.

As for the linkage of GesPública and the path of similar public policies in Brazil, evidences indicate that the hypothesis adopted in this article gets validated. Even with the speech of innovation being the tonic of the proposed management model, there are many affinities with debate of managerial reform of State that already existed, especially since 1995. The GesPública, therefore, introduced incremental changes in relation to the themes present in the new public management agenda in Brazil. Accordingly, as seen, in many respects there are affinities of this program and the assumptions of managerial reform of the State. The trajectory of GesPública can be understood based on the assumptions presented by

Weir (2006), according to which a policy has its configuration conditioned by the actions that preceded it, although the contingency of political actors in the initiative is relevant.

However, as in the case examined, the balance between the institutional regularities and the preferences of political actors eventually were solved in an incremental way, which is nonetheless a political option as well as about policies in set of available possibilities. According to Weir (1992), these choice influence directly in the design of a public policy and the way as will be deployed, thus configuring a process that her calls “bounded innovation policies” because the institutional arrangements create opportunities for change but also constrain the actions of actors. If these limits are taken as reference for action usually the results are incremental changes, which seem to fit the reality of GesPública compared with managerial reform presented in the 90s.

The counterfactual analysis, in this case, reinforces the approach adopted in this article because the structure, projects and design of GesPública wouldn't be different if it had not adopted the previous models of managerial reform proposed in the 90s. That is because the trajectory of policies makes differences and their formats condition subsequent changes. However, perhaps the most important reminder is that the adaptation of public policies, before of being presented as new, must look at what the original models effectively proposed. The analyzed case evidences that both the configuration of new public programs as well as the preferences resulting from political actors can be explained considering the setting and the influence exerted by the earlier policies.

References

- ABRUCIO, F.L. Os avanços e os dilemas do modelo pós-burocrático: a reforma da administração pública à luz da experiência internacional recente. In: *Reforma do Estado e administração pública gerencial*. 7ª ed. BRESSER PEREIRA, L. C. e SPINK, P.K. Rio de Janeiro: Editora FGV, 2006, Cap. 7, pp. 173-199.
- AGUILLAR, L. F. El aporte de la Política Pública y de la Nueva Gestión Pública a la gobernanza. *Revista Reforma y Democracia*, Caracas, n. 39, p. 1-15, Oct. 2007.
- ALBAVERA, F.S. *Planificación estratégica y gestión pública por objetivos*. Santiago do Chile: Instituto Latinoamericano y del Caribe de Planificación Económica y Social (ILPES), 2003. Série Gestión Pública, 32.
- ARTHUR, B. Positive Feedbacks in the economy. *Scientific American*, New York, n. 262, p. 92-99, February 1990
- AYRES, A. B. N. *Investigação sobre a utilização do Programa GESPÚBLICA em instituição voltada para ciência, tecnologia e saúde: um estudo de caso na Fundação Oswaldo Cruz*. 2012. 145 p. Dissertação. UNIGRANRIO, Rio de Janeiro, 2012.
- BARDIN, L. *Análise de Conteúdo*. Reimpressão. Lisboa: Edições 70, 2008. 281 p.
- BARZELAY, M. & ARMAJANI, B.J. Atravesando la burocracia. In: *Clásicos de la Administración Pública*. SHAFRITZ, J. M & HYDE, A .C. México D. F.: Fondo de Cultura Económica, 1999. Cap. XLVII. pp. 951-989.
- BEHN, R. D. O novo paradigma da gestão pública e a busca da *accountability* democrática. *Revista do Serviço Público, Brasília*, v. 49, n.4, p. 5-45, out./dez. 1998.
- _____. The big questions of public management. *Public Administration Review*, v.55.n.4, pp.313–24, 1995.
- BRASIL, PRESIDÊNCIA DA REPÚBLICA (F.H. Cardoso). *Plano Diretor da Reforma do Aparelho do Estado*. Brasília: Presidência da República, Câmara da Reforma do Estado. Ministério da Administração Federal e Reforma do Estado, 1995. 68 p..

BRESSER-PEREIRA, L. C. A. *Reforma do Estado dos anos 90: Lógica e Mecanismos de Controle*, Brasília: Ministério da Administração e Reforma do Estado, Cadernos Mare da reforma do estado, v. 1. 58 p.

_____. Uma reforma gerencial da Administração Pública no Brasil. *Revista do Serviço Público*, Brasília, v.49, n. 1, pp.5-41, jan.-abr. 1998.

_____. Gestão do setor público: estratégia e estrutura para um novo Estado. In: *Reforma do Estado e administração pública gerencial*. 7ª ed. BRESSER PEREIRA, L. C. e SPINK, P.K. Rio de Janeiro: Editora FGV, 2006, Cap. 1, pp. 21-38.

_____. Os primeiros passos da Reforma Gerencial do Estado de 1995. In: MEDEIROS, P. C. e EVELYN L. *Novos Caminhos da Gestão Pública: olhares e dilemas*. Rio de Janeiro: Qualitymark, 2009. Cap. 1. pp.3-44.

CAIDEN, G. E.; CAIDEN, N. J. Enfoques y lineamientos para el seguimiento, la medición y la evaluación del desempeño en programas del sector público. *Revista do Serviço Público*. v. 52, n. 1, Jan-Mar 2001, pp. 78-102. Brasília: Escola Nacional de Administração Pública.

CLAD. *Una nueva gestión pública para América Latina*. Caracas, CLAD, 1998. Disponível < em <http://www.clad.org.ve/fulltext/0032400.pdf>. > Acesso em 05-05-2008.

CLAD/BID. *Modelo abierto de gestión para resultados en el sector público*. Banco Interamericano del Desarrollo: New York; CLAD: Caracas: Documentos Debate del CLAD: 2007. Estado, Administración Pública y Sociedad, 11. 67 p.

COSTA, V. M. F. A dinâmica institucional da reforma do Estado: um balanço do período FHC. In: ABRUCIO, F. e LOUREIRO, M. R. *O Estado numa Era de Reformas: os Anos FHC*. Brasília: MP, SEGES, 2002. Cap. 1, pp. 9-56.

CUNILL GRAU, N. & OSPINA, S. *Evaluación de resultados para una gestión pública democrática y moderna: experiencias latinoamericanas*. Caracas: CLAD, 2003.

FERREIRA, A R.. *Modelo de excelência em gestão pública no governo brasileiro: importância e aplicação*. In: XIV Congreso Internacional del CLAD sobre la Reforma del Estado y de la Administración Pública, 2009, Salvador. Anais: Documentos. Salvador: Brasil, 2009.

GERRING, J. *Case Study Research: Principles and Practices*. Boston University: Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, New York, Melbourne, Madrid, Cape Town, Singapore, São Paulo, 2007. 265p.

HALL, P.A & TAYLOR, R.S.R. As três versões do neo-institucionalismo. *Lua Nova Revista de Cultura e Política*, São Paulo, n. 58, p. 193-223, 2003.

IMMERGUT, E. The rules of the game: The logic of health policy-making in France, Switzerland, and Sweden. In: STEINMO, S.; THELEN, K.; LONGSTREH, F. *Structuring politics: historical institutionalism in comparative analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; 1992. Cap. 3, pp. 57-89.

_____. The theoretical Core of the New Institutionalism. *Politics & Society*, v. 26, n. 1, p. 5-34, March, 1998.

KAMARCK, E. *Government Innovation around the World*. Ash Institute for Democratic Governance and Innovation. Harvard University, 2003. 50 p.

KETTL, D.F. The global revolution in public management: driving themes, missing links. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, v. 16.n. 3, pp. 446-462, Summer 1997.

LINDBLOM, C. E. The Science of Muddling Through. *Public Administration Review*, v. 2, n. 19, p. 79-88, Spring, 1959.

_____. Still muddling, not yet through. *Public Administration Review*, v. 39, n. 6, p. 517-526, November-December, 1979.

- LYNN Jr., L. E. Public Management Research: The Triumph of Art over Science. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, v.13, n.2, pp :231-259, Spring 1994.
- MANNING, N. *et al* Reformas de Gestão Pública: o que a América Latina tem a aprender com a OCDE? In: MEDEIROS, P. C. e EVELYN, L. *Novos caminhos da Gestão Pública: olhares e dilemas*. Rio de Janeiro: Qualitymark, 2009. Cap. 3, pp. 97-116.
- MELLO, E. C. J. *O GesPública e o modelo de excelência gerencial buscado pelo sistema Confea/Crea*. Available in < http://www.confea.org.br/media/edson_mello.pdf > Acesso em 28-09-2012.
- MINISTÉRIO DA ADMINISTRAÇÃO FEDERAL E REFORMA DO ESTADO. *Programa de Qualidade e Participação na Administração Pública*, Cadernos Mare, n. 4, Brasília: Mare, 1997. 59 p.
- _____. A Reforma do Aparelho do Estado e as Mudanças Constitucionais: Síntese & Respostas a Dúvidas mais Comuns, *Cadernos Mare*, n.6, Brasília: Mare, 1997, 23 p.
- _____. Programa de Reestruturação e Qualidade dos Ministérios, *Cadernos Mare*, n. 12, Brasília: Mare, 1997. 47 p.
- _____. Os avanços na reforma na administração pública: 1995-1998. *Cadernos Mare*, n. 15, Brasília: Mare, 1997. 127 p.
- MPOG: MF: SERPRO. *Programa Nacional de Gestão Pública e Desburocratização – GesPública*. Guia de Gestão de Processos do Governo. Brasília: MPOG: Serpro, 93 p.
- MPOG. Secretaria de Gestão. Programa Nacional de Gestão Pública e Desburocratização – GesPública; Prêmio Nacional da Gestão Pública – PQGF. *Carta de Serviços ao Cidadão*. Brasília: MPOG: Seges, 2009. Versão 1/2009. 42 p.
- _____. Secretaria de Gestão. *Melhoria da gestão pública brasileira por meio da definição de um guia referencial para medição de desempenho da gestão, e controle para o gerenciamento dos indicadores de eficiência, eficácia e de resultados do Programa Nacional de Gestão Pública e Desburocratização*. Brasília: MP: SEGES, 2009. 113 p.
- _____. Secretaria de Gestão. *Programa Nacional de Gestão Pública e Desburocratização – GesPública; Prêmio Nacional da Gestão Pública – PQGF; Documento de Referência; Fórum Nacional 2008/2009*. Brasília: Ministério do Planejamento, Orçamento e Gestão, Subsecretaria de Planejamento, Orçamento e Gestão: MP: SEGES, 2009. 56 p.
- _____. Secretaria de Gestão. *Balanço das principais ações realizadas de janeiro de 2008 a julho de 2009*. 17 p.
- MOORE, M. H. *Creating public value through private/public partnerships*. In: X Congreso Internacional del CLAD sobre la Reforma del Estado y de la Administración Pública, 2005, Santiago. Anais: Documentos. Santiago: Chile, 2005. 1 CD-ROM.
- NICOLAU, J. Partidos e Sistemas Partidários: 1985-2009. In: *Horizontes das Ciências Sociais no Brasil: Ciência Política*. LESSA, R.. São Paulo: Barcarola, 2010, Introdução, pp. 217-240.
- NOSKEN, J. T. *A implantação de um programa de qualidade em busca da excelência em gestão na Sedesc-RJ no período 2007/2010*. In: VII Congresso Nacional de Excelência em Gestão, 2011, Rio de Janeiro. Anais: Documentos. Rio de Janeiro: Brasil, 2011. 1 CD-ROM.
- OLIVEIRA, A.C. P. *Flexibilidade de gestão e desempenho do aparelho do Estado: explorando causalidades e conexões*. 2012. 149 p. Dissertação. Escola de Administração de Empresas de São Paulo, São Paulo, 2012.
- OSBORNE, D. & GAEBLER, T. *Reinventando o governo: como o espírito empreendedor está transformando o setor público*, Brasília: MH Comunicação, 1998. 436 p.

- OZSLAK, O. De menor a mejor: el desafío de la segunda reforma del Estado. *Revista Nueva Sociedad*, Caracas, n. 160, pp. 82-100, mar-abr.1999.
- PALVARINI, B. C. *O Programa Nacional de Gestão Pública e Desburocratização (GesPública) voltado para o cidadão*. In: XIV Congreso Internacional del CLAD sobre la Reforma del Estado y de la Administración Pública, 2009, Salvador. Anais: Documentos. Lisboa: Portugal, 2009. 1 CD-ROM.
- PIERSON, P. *Politics in Time: History, Institutions, and Social Analysis*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2004. 208 p.
- PETERS, B. G. ¿La capacidad para gobernar: retrocediendo hacia al centro? *Revista Reforma y Democracia*, Caracas, n. 27, p. 7-32, Oct. 2003.
- RAGIN, C.C. *The Comparative Method: moving beyond qualitative and quantitative strategies*. California: University California Press, 1987. 185 p.
- TILLY, C. *Big structures, large process, huge comparisons*. Michigan: University of Michigan, 1983. 143 p.
- SEKHON, J. S. Quality Meets Quantity: Case Studies, Conditional Probability, and Counterfactuals. *Perspectives on Politics*, Washington, DC, v. 2, n.2, p. 281-293, Jun. 2004.
- WEIR, M. Ideas and politics of bounded innovation. In: *Structuring politics: historical institutionalism in comparative analysis*. STEINMO, S.; THELEN, K. & LONGSTREH, F., Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992, Cap. 7, pp. 188-216.
- _____. When does politics create policy? The Organizational Politics of Change. In: *Rethinking Political Institutions*. SHAPIRO, I., SKOWRONEK, S. and GALVIN, D. New York: New York University Press, 2006. Cap.7, pp. 171-186.