

Paper prepared for the:
International Public Policy Association, IPPA,
4th International Conference on Public Policy, Montreal, 2019
Panel: Ambiguity and Public Policy

**EXPLORING HOW POLICY STREAMS-ADVOCACY/LEARNING RELATIONS
CAN INFLUENCE POLICY CAPACITY AND RE-DESIGN: A FRAMEWORK TO
UNCOVER THE RE-FORMULATION PROCESS – APPLIED TO A BRAZILIAN
PROGRAM (PMAQ, 3rd ROUND)**

Authors:

Dr. Fabiana C. Saddi, Federal University of Goias (UFG, Brazil), University of Kent (UK),
British Academy Newton Advanced Fellow - fabianasaddi1@gmail.com

Prof. Stephen Peckham, University of Kent - s.peckham@kent.ac.uk

Germano Araujo Coelho, Master researcher in Political Science, UFG germanoac@gmail.com

Jaqueline Damasceno Silva, MA in Economics, UFG jaquelineeconomist@gmail.com

Maria Barretos, Graduate student in Social Sciences, UFG marialpb420@gmail.com

Gabriela Alves Rocha, Graduate student in Social Sciences UFG marialpb420@gmail.com

Alexandra E. Novais, Graduate student in Social Sciences, UFG alenovais18@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

We develop a public policy theory-driven political framework to explore how politically relevant policy frameworks and theories can enable us to understand why and how the (re)formulation process of a policy can be understood as an effective response to realistic implementation challenges. The framework is afterwards empirically employed to understand the reformulation process of a Brazilian pay for performance program in primary health care (PMAQ) during its 3rd round.

The framework presents three main correlated dimensions: political, learning/informational and capacity/redesign. It employs concepts/elements coming from the multiple streams and advocacy coalition frameworks, as well as from policy theories such as policy learning and feedback, policy capacity and policy design. These three main correlated dimensions are structured by the institutional arrangement (or governance arrangement) that defines the formal possibilities of choice/influence in the reformulation.

Empirically, we aim to understand how diverse stream-coalitions/learning combinations/routes, formally and informally (old and new), have taken place and influenced [strengthened or not] the policy capacity of Brazilian policymakers/the Ministry of Health (MoH) in the reformulation of PMAQ. The analysis will be developed according to two specific phases of the broad (re)formulation process: appraisal and discussions/negotiations and the final formulation or re-design.

Research Questions:

Main questions: How have distinct political-learning (stream-coalition/learning) associations/routes effectively impacted the capacity of policymakers to make choices and re-

formulate the PMAQ? Sub-questions: Who were the main actors involved in the appraisal and discussions/negotiations, and how have tensions and ambiguities coming from different stream-coalitions/learning possibilities characterized the process? How can stream-coalition/learning possibilities influence the policy capacity of the MoH when re-designing the program? To what extent was the redesign of the program more in accordance to the reality of implementation?

Methodology

We will hypothetically suggest three broad different scenarios/circumstances expressing how stream-coalition/learning relationships can influence (or not) the policy capacity (competences and capabilities) of formulators and produce effective changes in the policy. Our main assumption is that the effective impact of a policy stream will depend on the types of coalitions and learning/feedback taking place, as well as on the reasons why formulators have chosen to use at least one of the (initial) stream-coalition/learning routes to enhance (or not) its policy capacity to frame options within a politically constrained context/governance arrangement.

We are undertaking interviews with the main actors involved in the re-formulation: policymakers at the MoH (13), members of health councils (8), external evaluators (10) and a few international experts (3). We will perform a thematic framework analysis of interviews, with a few elements of process tracing analysis. Percentages/hierarchy and patterns of themes will be used to establish inferences and cause/effect relations. Analysis so far reveals that more reflexive types of learning, coupled with negative feedback, have led the MoH team to consider other non-dominant types of learning to enhance its capacity in the redesign of PMAQ.

1.Introduction: Ambiguity and policy formulation

It is highly known that the policymaking process is ambiguous and time constrained by nature, with diverse ideas and institutions trying to influence the formulation of policies or programs. Policymakers have to deal with ambiguity and make choices within a limited period (Kingdon, 1995) (Zahariadis, 2003) (Herweg et al, 2017). These choices are based not only on knowledge and evidence highlighted by formal actors/coalitions acting within the governance structure and subsystem - as a result of struggle between coalitions (Sabatier, 1988) (Weible et al, 2011) (Breton, Gagnon and Bergeron, 2014) (Jenkins-Smith et al, 2018). They are also based on more diverse (new and old) problems/solutions claimed by streams that are trying to provoke changes in the policy.

In a somehow stable governance scenario, with the same coalitions competing or dominant in the policymaking process - and where problems occurring during the implementation have not been fully integrated in the formulation process -, some politically significant questions arise: To what extent have those coalitions been impacting the capacity of the government to redesign policies so that they would be more in accordance with the reality of implementation? If/how have new and old streams (problems, policy and politics), in the agenda and formulation phases, impacted governments decisions and introduced changes in the policy?

These questions are particularly relevant when we think in terms of policies or programs focusing on performance-based results, such as pay for performance programs. Coalitions involved in the discussion and decision process have been much too concerned with end results, which do not always reveal the reality of implementation and actual situations/challenges taking place at the implementation/local level. In those cases, new streams have been attempting to influence the policy-making process, calling attention to issues such as lack of evidence, or to more complex contextual and political evidence that could be employed to improve the design of those programs/policies, impacting the quality of services. This case seems to be more relevant when few actors/coalitions can more prominently influence the policymaking process, not bringing more diverse type of actors, such as local actors or regional/federal unities (states and/or municipalities, street level workers) to participate in the discussion and appraisal process. Therefore, some significant complementary questions might be: if/how have diverse problems, policy and problem streams taken part in the policymaking process?

This paper introduces a framework analysis built to study the re-formulation process of policies/programs in which the same coalitions have dominated the policymaking process of a government-centered program. This program, operated via a governance structure as well as a constitutional/political structure of decision, has old/new problem and political streams trying to influence the formal process.

The paper also applies this framework to the analysis of the reformulation process of a Brazilian pay for performance program in primary health care: the National Program for Improving Access and Quality to Primary Care (PMAQ). Our main objective is to explore how distinct political-learning (stream-coalition/learning) associations/routes have effectively impacted the capacity of policymakers to make choices and re-formulate PMAQ.

First, we make a brief introduction of the main frameworks and theories used in our framework analysis. Second, we will present our framework analysis, showing in what ways we have reconciled elements common in the public policy frameworks and theories we resort to, and if/what sorts of adaptation we have made regarding those frameworks (and theories). Assumptions and hypotheses of our Formulation Process and Performance Framework (FPF) will also be presented. Afterwards, we will apply the framework to analyse the formulation process of the Brazilian PMAQ, taking interviews into account. Finally, we will make some considerations on how our framework analysis is advancing or not the application of both the Multiple Streams Framework (MSF) and the Advocacy Coalitions Framework (ACF), and present some future prospects or implications regarding the Brazilian case.

2. Summarising Public Policy Frameworks and Theories Employed to Construct our Framework Analysis

The Multiple Streams Framework (MSF)

The MSF was initially built to study the agenda process (Kingdon, 1995). Kingdon did not formulate a institutional/structural type of analysis, a point of criticism by some authors.

The MSF has been employed in many case and comparative analyses, which have expanded Kingdon's model. When either advancing or applying the MSF, scholars have not

only incorporated a subsystem and/or governance arrangement situation, but also the formulation process or other phases of the formulation (Zahariadis, 2003) (Ackrill and Kay, 2011) (Zohlnhöfer, Herweg, Huß, 2016). Researchers are also trying to utilize the MSF to analyse implementation processes.

The framework was initially based on the garbage can theory, and therefore ambiguity is maintained as one, if not the main, assumption of the MSF. Other assumptions are concerning time restrictions, problematic policy preferences, unclear technology, fluid participation and dependence between the streams (Kingdon, 1995) (Zahariadis, 2003) (Herweg et al, 2017).

The MSF presents five main elements: the problems streams (information and feedback), the policy streams (experts), the politics streams, the policy (agenda) window and the policy entrepreneur. The problem stream entails a social problem construction, for not just facts are considered important to verify how a problem is defined and how its solution(s) are proposed. It's due to the policy entrepreneur's ability to couple specific problems and solutions. The policy stream refers to policy alternatives brought by policy communities, represented by academics, researchers, experts, consultants and similar actors. The main form of interaction in the policy stream is characterized by arguing. The strength of the policy community will depend on various factors, such as its level of integration, and how it processes or not consensus and negotiations. The politics stream is located at the same level as the political system. Bargaining and powering are its main form of interaction. The national mood is an important factor, and interest groups and government are the actors characterizing this stream (Kingdon, 1995) (Zahariadis, 2003) (Herweg et al, 2017).

A policy window is defined by Kingdon as an “opportunity for advocates of proposals to push their pet solutions, or to push attention to their special problems” (Kingdon, 1995, p. 165). These actors can open both the problem and politics streams as a result of deterioration of indicators, changes in politics, an uprising of new ideas or alterations in the national mood. Moreover, focused events and feedback can also explain the opening of the agenda window.

A policy entrepreneur is the person or institution who introduces the proposal in the policy streams and adapts it in order to find broad support. He/she holds the skill necessary to attach problems to solutions.

The general hypothesis of the framework is: “*Agenda change becomes more likely if (a) a policy window opens, (b) the streams are ready for coupling and (c) a policy entrepreneur promotes the agenda change*” (Herweg, Zahariadis and Zohlnhofer, 1980 p.30)

The Advocacy Coalition Framework (ACF)

The main assumptions of the ACF is that the analysis/policy making will take place in the policy subsystems, in which actors act in advocacy coalitions, with core beliefs and coordinated strategies. Beliefs and knowledge to influence policy are employed within a structure of a coalition and in a long-term process. The beliefs and theories of one or more coalitions result in the production of programs/policies, as they are translated into objectives, goals and rules (Sabatier, 1988, p.158) (Weible et al., 2011) (Jenkins-Smith et al., 2018).

The belief system of actors/coalitions is characterized by three main elements: “a Deep Core of fundamental normative and ontological axioms, a Policy Core of basic policy choices and causal assumptions, and a set of Secondary (implementing) Aspects” (Sabatier, 1988, p.158).

Regarding ACF’s scope, it includes questions regarding coalition formation and maintenance, learning and policy change and high conflict situations (or coordination) at subsystems’ level of analysis. Changes depend on relatively stable parameters, as well as on external subsystem events.

Relatively stable system parameters, “maybe within or external to the policy subsystem” (Sabatier, 1988, p.135), consist of: basic attributes of the problem, basic distribution of resources, fundamental social cultural values and social structure, and basic constitutional structure (rule). External system events (or dynamic system events) can vary substantially over the course of a few years or a decade. They refer to factors external to the subsystem, such as: changes in social economic conditions, changes in systemic governing coalitions, policy decisions and impact from other subsystems. (Sabatier, 1988)

The ACF enables us to ask “*how scientific and technical explanations are integrated into (or deflected from) belief systems, used in political debates and negotiations*” (Jenkins-Smith et al., 2018, p. 142)

ACF main hypothesis related to possibilities of change are:

“Hypothesis 1 - Significant perturbations external or internal to the subsystems, policy-oriented learning, negotiated agreement, or some combination thereof, is a necessary, but not sufficient source of policy change in the policy core attributes of a governmental program.” (...)

“Hypothesis 2 - The policy core attributes of a government program in a specific jurisdiction will not be significantly revised as long as the advocacy coalition that initiated the program remains in power with that jurisdiction, except when the change is imposed by a hierarchically superior jurisdiction.” (Jenkins-Smith et al., 2018, p. 147)

Box 1 - Comparisons between MSF and ACF: elements of the policy process emphasized by each framework

	The decision making actors	Institutions considered rules/venues of decision making	Networks/ Subsystems	Ideas or Beliefs	Context	Events
(MSF)	Policy entrepreneurs and policymakers	Institutional rules and formal venues, recognized but institutions not emphasized	Broad policy community of actors, with relatively little focus on insulated subsystems	Policy solutions proposed and amended over time to become acceptable to a policy community	National mood, policy conditions, pressure groups, administration turnover, etc	Focusing on some events draw attention to problems

(ACF)	Policy actors who form coalitions, act strategically, learn, etc.	Types of policy venues and rules in the broader context, but less directly	Subsystems and coalitions	Belief systems that commands policy actors' behaviour	Stable parameters - social, cultural, economic, physical, and institutions structuring the subsystem	External and internal events (e.g., shocks, change to governing coalition)
-------	---	--	---------------------------	---	--	--

Source: Heikkila and Cairney, 2018, p. 315.

Policy Learning theory (PLT) (work in process)

Policy oriented learning (ACF - Sabatier)

Types and forms of policy learning (Dunlop, 2017) (Dunlop, Radaelli, 2013)

Learning aggregation effects (micro-to-macro)? Reflexive learning?

Policy feedback theory (PFT) (work in process)

Feedback effects (Pierson, 1993) (Mettler and SoRelle, 2018)

Negative and positive feedback (Jacobs and Weaver, 2010)

Policy Design (PDT) (work in process)

Design as implementation challenges

(May, 1991 and 2003) (Howlett et al, 2013) (Colebatch, 2018)

(Jordan and Turnpenny, 2015) (Howlett, Mukherjee and Woo, 2018)

Payment for performance (P4P) (work in process)

(Pollitt) (Saddi, Peckham, Mundim, 2018) (Saddi and Peckham, 2017)

2. Formulation Process and Performance Framework (FPF)

2.1. Main adaptations in the MSF and ACF

In our framework, we bring the MSF to the initial phases of the formulation process, involving discussions and appraisal of the policy within a subsystem. We maintain the three streams (problems, policy and politics) of the framework and employ the concept of policy window and policy entrepreneurs to detect if/how policymakers, acting as policy entrepreneurs and outside the governance arrangement of a policy (PMAQ), have managed to couple the problem and political streams, introducing additional (or some initial) changes in the program. These changes may occur in the official documents of the program or in complementary strategies adopted after the main decision. This means that new changes might comprise a broad or narrow/initial pattern of change, and this will depend on the coalitions/streams relation within the subsystem and the capacity of policy entrepreneurs to take advantage of policy windows opened by focused events/critical conjunctures.

In relation to the ACF, we have kept the main assumptions and concepts, and will be using a belief system, “relatively stable system parameters” and “external system events” to better understand the coalition maintenance, policy learning and policy change.

The framework takes the characteristics of national subsystems into account to better map structures of discussion and decision, as well as possibilities of actions made by coalitions and streams within a subsystem/program. In the Brazilian case, for instance, the Brazilian Constitution determines that all decisions within the Unified Health System (SUS) needs to have a three-party format, at the federal level, state level and municipalities. Besides the existence of this constitutional three-party forum, a governance arrangement was created for the program, including the federal government and experts from universities.

In order to present our hypotheses regarding actors (coalitions and streams) influencing formulation and policy change, the main hypotheses of ACF have been combined with hypothesis from MSF, and framed by a double political structure of formulation (formal discussions and decisions). Alone, learning is considered as insufficient to bring changes in the policy (Sabatier, 1988) (Breton, Gagnon and Bergeron, 2014) (Jenkins-Smith et al., 2018). As a result we have included not only learning/feedback, but also focused events, events external to the subsystem, changes in stable parameters, conflicts over secondary beliefs, streams/entrepreneurial actions. They are all variables, influencing the policy capacity of the government. Given the specificity of the subsystem to be analysed (health system), and considering the ACF hypothesis that controversy can remain relatively stable over a period of a decade (Sabatier, 1988, p.141), we included as a relatively stable parameter the production of consensus/power relations between coalitions acting within the double political structure. A key issue would be to examine in what terms belief systems changed over time, altering the configuration of consensus/negotiations within coalitions that act in two different political structures.

The MSF will enable us to explore new changes taking place outside the formal governance arrangements and constitutional decision-making structure, while the ACF will be used to confirm (or not) the stability of the main coalitions competing in the policymaking. The re-formulation process of the Brazilian program is characterised by both a formal attachment to the governance arrangement and within the constitutional decision making process of the subsystem, as well as from old/new stream dynamics outside PMAQ’s governance structure.

2.2. Propositions, contexts and concepts/theories

We have constructed a framework to study the formulation process, characterized by discussions and decisions lead by political coalitions located in the formal structure of policymaking - governance arrangement and subsystem - and old and new streams that seek to influence and provoke change in the formulation process of a specific subsystem.

Coalitions participate in the formulation and decision processes in various ways and with distinct levels of influence. The participation of coalition actors during the formulation is dictated by systemic/constitutional rules already established by the subsystem and/or due to the creation of a new governance structure (for the program). These political coalitions are formed by actors engaged in the formulation along with the implementation (or in specific phases of

it) of the program. Each of the actors have distinct roles in the formulation process and advocate different types of knowledge that, in distinct manners, align themselves or not to the reality of the implementation of the public policy. There is tension among coalitions that formally take action in governance and/or constitutional arrangements/subsystem arrangements, and this, in respect to themes and tools that should guide the policy's reformulation.

One of the political coalitions can still take action in a more exclusive (or hegemonic) manner during the discussion and proposition phases (formulation) in the governance structure built for the respective program or public policy; while others – shaped by bureaucrats and politicians – act directly in the decision making phase, as foreseen by the Constitution/subsystem. One or both of these are in the governance of the program. Since the participation of regional or federal entities concerning the decision can be verified through representation, these variations will depend on the subsystem's characteristics and the program's governance.

Still, new and old streams – problems, policy and politics –, encountered outside of the main coalition's domain, may influence governmental decisions too.

In other words, in a complementary manner, streams from actors that aren't directly part of neither the governance structure nor the formal decision making/subsystem can also impact the formulation process of the program. The streams' influence can occur with less emphasis or isn't visible in formal documents of the program. It tends to result in additional actions or strategies, used by policy entrepreneurs, to jumpstart change. Entrepreneurs may be, for example, policymakers that can't effectively cause change inside the governance structure, and use policy windows and problem-solution coupling to generate change.

Streams and coalitions use distinct learning and feedback types/ways. While positive feedback tends to be used prevalently among coalitions in the structure of governance; the streams, conducted by active parallel actors who are directly (or not) in the formal formulation process, especially resort to negative feedback, since their aim is to introduce changes in the process. The kinds of ideas/knowledge from the streams represent problems/themes, as well as incorporate non-priority or difficult political aspects/solutions to be negotiated with among dominant coalitions in the governance structure and/or subsystem coalition. The type of knowledge used by coalitions are differentiated, which is due to the distinct positions and roles the actors perform. Coalitions can also use this knowledge in a more reflexive way, listening to various actors, or even make use of specialized consultancy or punctual consults with some groups/experts, without altering their core beliefs and with the objective of maintaining or improving their power in the decision making structure (governance structure and/or constitutional decision making)

Amid action/competition between coalitions that produce the program's formal document, new and old streams coupled by policy entrepreneurs can produce actions or complementary strategies, also outside the space of conflict (or stability) of the program's governance structure, initiating the change process. However, depending on the tension level/demands and ways that coalitions interact, new decisions may be configured as negotiations allowing the program's continuity.

Box 2 - Summary: Formulation Process and Performance Framework (FPF)

ASSUMPTIONS	
<p>Structuring the analysis: Subsystem, governance arrangement of the program/policy Formulation/Policy-making process: Phases of discussions/appraisal and decision Uncertainty, ambiguity, time constraints. Critical conjunctures and focused events can result in minor changes within each coalition or restructure the balance of power among coalitions within the same governance arrangement, as well as enable the action of policy entrepreneurs to influence the policy process. [Coalitions] Coalitions acting in governance and subsystem shaping the policy [Streams] New and old problems and politics streams trying to influence the policymaking. [Learning and feedback] Coalitions and streams characterized by distinct forms of learning and feedback: Coalition/Governance: Learning attached to coalitions' field of knowledge; some prevalence of positive feedback. New and old streams: more varied forms of learning, prevalence of negative feedback. Gradual initial changes in the program aiming to start bring other types of implementation challenges to policy-making. [Decisions] Policy/Program results from formal negotiations within the coalition as well as from entrepreneurs' actions coupling streams in a policy window.</p>	
DIMENSIONS	Theories and concepts/elements
Political	Elements from Advocacy Coalition Framework (ACF)
	Elements from Multiple Streams Framework (MSF) -
Informational	(ACF/P4P) Elements from ACF: system of beliefs and learning
	(PFT/P4P) Elements from Policy Feedback Theory (PFT): Actors/coalitions and streams positive and negative feedbacks, feedback effects
	(PKT/P4P) Elements from Policy Knowledge Theory (PKT) – Actors/coalitions and streams forms and types of policy learning. Learning aggregation effects (micro-to-macro)? Reflexive learning?
	Learning/feedback (Discussion/appraisal) content to be privileged: (P4P) Performance and P4P political literature - Theory – alternative logics (Pollitt). - P4P Reviews – not enough evidence of improvement in quality of services - P4P Case studies – work process (front liners and managers) needs to be considered, not only result indicators
Capacity (in redesign)	(PCT/ACT & MSF) Elements from Policy Capacity (PCT) – as capacity of the policymakers (government) to make choices via negotiations with coalitions and coupling of streams
	(ACF/P4P) Negotiations with coalitions in the governance arrangement and subsystem
	(MSF/P4P) Capacity of policymakers to act as policy entrepreneurs coupling streams in policy windows during critical conjunctures/focused events
	(PDT/P4P) Elements from Policy Design Theory (PDT) – design as implementation challenge, collaborative design x tools/strategies
QUESTIONS	
General question	How have distinct political-learning (Stream-Coalition/Leaning) associations/routes effectively impacted the capacity of policymakers to make choices and re-formulate a pay for performance program?
Sub-questions	Q1 - Who were the main actors involved in the appraisal and discussions/negotiations, and how did tensions and ambiguities from different Stream-Coalitions/Learning possibilities characterize the process?
	Q2 - How can Stream-Coalition/Learning possibilities influence the policy capacity of policymakers (MoH or other) when re-designing the program?
	Q3 - To what extent was the re-design of the program more in accordance to the reality of implementation?

Hypotheses

General Hypothesis – [Stable/slow process of change] The initial process of changes of a policy constructed by a stable governance arrangement/ Coalitions will not significantly alter the configuration of the governing coalition and negotiations taking place (as they may continue to be more predominant). Concomitantly/or in a sequence, and due to focused events or results of learning, we may see some additional changes influenced by policy entrepreneurs' actions in a policy window, resulting, either in changes in the main documents of the program, or in the formulation of additional actions/instruments.

Hypothesis 1 - H1 [policy adoption via coalitions] Focused events and critical conjectures in the subsystems and within the governance arrangement, though significant, will not be a sufficient source of change in the program/policy due to the remaining types/forms of feedback and learning within the predominant coalitions. The main characteristics/features of the government program will not be significantly revised with the continuation of the same coalitions in the governance arrangement of the program.

Hypothesis 2 - H2 [policy adoption via streams] Focused events and critical conjunctures might open policy windows for the operation of policy entrepreneurs. The effective impact of new/old streams will depend on the types of coalitions and learning/feedback taking place, as well as on the reasons that formulators have chosen to use at least one of the (initial) Stream-Coalitions/Learning routes to enhance (or not) its policy capacity to frame options, within a politically constrained context/governance arrangement.

Hypothesis 3 - H3 [policy capacity] (Policy capacity = response to coalitions/streams + feedback/learning). The government's policy capacity of framing options and decision making will depend on the policymakers' political capacity to respond/negotiate/couple streams/decide, in the midst of coalition/streams and feedback/learning relationships. In different ways and weights (scenarios), policy options/choices can be derived from both (a) the official discussions/consensus/negotiations within the coalitions/governance arrangement and from (b) policy entrepreneurs' actions, coupling(s) new/old streams in a policy window.

We employ the concept of political capacity, a type of policy capacity (Wu, Ramesh and Howlett, 2015), to offer a typology of policy capacity. Three possible scenarios regarding political possibilities of change in the policy capacity of policymakers might be:

Scenario 1 – Choices offered by streams influence mainly the production of additional actions/strategies, as options offered by coalitions (and dominance of one or a few coalitions) continue to guide the formulation of the main documents/tools of the program. Policymakers start to act as policy entrepreneurs, producing some alternative actions/strategies. In this scenario, decisions might result from focused/critical conjunctural events, policymakers learning in process, additional actions and strategies, and an emergence of policy windows.

Scenario 2 – Problem streams can start to exert a minor influence on the design/production of the main documents, as we might **start to see a decrease in the consensus** among coalitions (or an increase of discontentment from one coalition). Streams also influence the production of additional actions/strategies related to the program. Policymakers are the main actors playing the role as policy entrepreneurs, though some few actors from coalitions could also start playing this role as well. Decisions made due to focused

events/critical conjunctures and learning/feedback, and initial criticism coming from the subsystem (alterations in relatively stable parameters).

Scenario 3 – We can see a few initial alterations in the balance of power of coalitions (or better: among coalitions, relationships/negotiations take place in the two formulation structures). There might be a shift in the policy core and secondary (implementation) aspects of at least one coalition's belief system. The coupling of streams are built by actors/coalition members trying to remain in/regain political power in the subsystem and/or in the governance arrangement. Coalition members can start to act as policy entrepreneurs. Policymakers continuously act as policy entrepreneurs. However, changes do not alter coalitions, nor core beliefs. Decisions are made due to the changes in the subsystem's external environment, the more eminent role played by problem stream, and some changes in relatively stable parameters.

Those three scenarios give us elements to build a typology in which policy capacity (Wu, Ramesh and Howlett, 2015) is understood in terms of political capacity of policymakers to establish negotiations/intermediations or more responsive relationships within or/and outside the formal structures of formulation.

Box 3 - Types of political capacity - Negotiations as distinct levels of responsive relationships (as degrees/forms of responding to implementation challenges)

Type of Political Capacity	Negotiations and responsive relationships (as degrees/forms of responding to implementation challenges)
Very low political capacity (low capacity of response)	Policymakers' capacity is limited by main coalition. Low capacity of negotiation with the main coalition. Policymakers show a low level of response towards implementation challenges, limited to the beliefs/interests of the main coalition.
Low-Moderate political capacity (low-moderate responsive relationship)	Policymakers manage to negotiate with coalitions (moderate), or start to negotiate at least with one of them (low). Policymakers start to give some answers (low-moderate) to more diverse types of beliefs/interests and to implementation challenges.
Increased political capacity (more responsive)	Policymaker managers increase their political capacity to redesign the policy as response to implementation challenges. They establish balanced negotiations within the formal structure, and respond in more significant ways to implementation challenges.

Although the FPF has been built to study a performance-based program, it could also be employed to analyse the formulation process of a policy whose implementation challenges have not been always taken into account in the formal formulation process, whose issues are related to the service quality at stake or that should be more broadly considered.

3. Applying the FPF to analyse the formulation process of the Brazilian PMAQ

3.1. The PMAQ (work in progress)

The main objective of PMAQ is to "to induce the expansion of access and improvement of the quality of basic care, with the guarantee of a comparable quality standard nationally, regionally and locally, in order to allow greater transparency and effectiveness of governmental

actions directed to Primary Health Care (Brasil, 2015). The program has been implemented since 2011. It takes place about every three years and mobilize practically all municipalities in the country.

PMAQ's reformulation process can be characterized by two main phases: discussions and decisions.

Discussions are fomented and organised by the PMAQ team (or Coordination of Evaluation of Primary Care) at the Department of Basic Health (DAB) at the Ministry of Health (MoH). The National Coordination of PMAQ is the more influential *locus* of discussion about the program, which a governance arrangement created to deliberate the main discussions and important decisions about the program. This national coordination is formed by the DAB/MoH [the new Secretariat of PHC] and members of the external evaluation of PMAQ, who are prestigious or senior research universities contracted by the MoH to collect PMAQ's data in health unities in municipalities all over Brazil.

Discussions are also developed within the Three-party Health Commission (CIT) working group, where technical staff of the National Councils of State and Municipalities health secretariats (CONASS and CONASEMS) discuss programs with the DAB.

The external evaluation network of researchers and CONASS/CONASEMS are the two (main) coalitions, operating in the formal structure of formulation of PMAQ (Box 4). Other discussions are performed with diverse actors outside the formal structure of formulation (Box 5).

Decisions are made by the team at the DBH/MoH and deliberated at the Three-party Health Commission (CIT) Meeting. CIT is made up of representatives of the state and municipal health secretaries, and the Ministry of Health. Therefore, all three federal units are represented in the CIT. After discussions and negotiations in the CIT meeting, PMAQ was approved and had its *Portaria* (Law) released.

Implementation challenges (Saddi et al, 2018) (Saddi and Peckham, 2018)

3.2. Interviews and analysis

- Adopting the FPF framework together with interview and some elements of process tracing analysis
- Purposive sample
 - o Participants (13 + 6 + 3):
 - Members of the PMAQ team working at the DAB/Minister of Health, policymakers working in other groups at the DAB/MOH.
 - Coordinators of the external evaluation of PMAQ, who are university researchers in the Public Health or Collective Health fields.
 - National and international experts who have been involed in discussions at the DAB/MoH
 - o Interview guide: framework concepts/questions
- Analysis of interviews:
 - o Familiarization and Management: Using NVIVO software, Word and Excel. (Spenser et al, 2014)

Work in process: not for citation or distribution. Contact the author for more recent version

- WORD/Excel: initial familiarization, first index and discussions with research group. We have built a framework matrix in Excel to perform the preliminary indexations/extraction against the matrix.
 - NVIVO: Coding, searching, note productions, production of queries (work in a process).
- Phases of the analysis: (Ritchie, Lewis and Ostrom, 2014)
 - Preliminary indexation: 1st coding - Categorization of themes/indexation - Thematic framework analysis (Word and Excel) (Spenser et al, 2014)
 - Coding/ Indexation - Categorization of sub-themes/indexation - categorizing interviews/texts according to concepts/themes used in the framework (Word/Excel and NVivo)
 - Summary - summarizing themes/subthemes
 - Using reports (by themes and subthemes) generated by NVivo/ Word file by theme/subthemes
 - Thematic Synthesis (or further abstraction or organization)
 - Organizing themes, subthemes and concepts in a matrix. Linking themes and sub-themes by concepts and actors (synthesis and further classification of themes/subthemes)
 - Construction of typologies (Ritchie et al., 2014) (Lewis et al, 2014)
 - Establishing multi-links via matrix
 - Verifying the logic/patterns of relationships between types of statements/perceptions and concepts in each interview and across all interviews (by reading and re-reading, constant comparisons, searching and re-searching of themes, generation of queries).
 - Organizing multi-links in a box (matrix format), in which actors/streams/units of analysis are placed in rows; while themes, concepts and inferences/typologies are placed in columns.
 - Types of multi-links performed: to map actors, themes and concepts:
 - Typologies created (Box 8 and later Boxes 9 and 10):
 - **Types of discussions.** Classified as high, medium and low **levels of efficacy**, revealing the possibilities/power of influence that policy learning and feedback, through coalitions/streams, can exert on policymaking (Box 8)
 - **Types of decisions.** Classified as high, medium and low **levels of effectiveness**, entailing different possibilities to make effective changes of decisions in accordance with implementation challenges.
 - **Types of political capacity** (see Box 3). Classified as very low, low-moderate and increased levels of political capacity. Establish relationships between types of discussions and types of decisions

3.3. A limited number of elements of process tracing (cause-effect analysis):

- Via intrinsic or extrinsic textual inference.

Work in process: not for citation or distribution. Contact the author for more recent version

- Intrinsic: The inference (sequence/effect of a phenomena) is given by the interview
- Extrinsic: The inference is built in the analysis: investigating the logic and patterns of change within the interviews/framework, looking for other similar logics/patterns within the texts/framework (themes and sub-themes) that can show that a pattern/logic is taking place.
- To understand changes in the discussion - explore if/how critical conjunctures/inconclusive permanent discussions within the main streams/coalition have affected the stream/coalition and learning/feedback, causing changes in the program.
- To understand changes in the decision/design - how changes in streams/coalitions and learning/feedback may affect the sequence of PMAQ
- To understand how streams/coalitions and policy entrepreneur(s) have acted in promoting changes in the discussion and decision

4. Preliminary Results (work in process)

4.1. Actors/coalitions knowledge and influence over discussions (Q1)

Question 1 (Q1) - Who were the main actors involved in the appraisal and discussions/negotiations, and how did tensions and ambiguities from different Stream-Coalitions/Learning possibilities characterize the process?

- Common core belief stated by all types of actors: a free public health system for the entire population, provided by the State (Brazilian Constitution of 1988)

Analysis of interviews:

- The main kind of actors/coalitions and streams, their policy beliefs and relationships with the DAB through discussions/conflicts within the formal structure or via new/old problem streams and policy windows, respectively mapped in Boxes 4 and 5
- Coalitions/Streams learning and feedback possibilities are understood/interpreted in terms of policy efficacy/effect (Boxes 4 and 5)
- We make multi-links between interviewers' perceptions/opinions about forms of learning and concepts related to policy learning. Those relationships are interpreted in terms of levels of efficacy or power to influence the design of the program according to implementation challenges. Those relationships are shown in Box 6.
- We also make links between interviewers' perceptions or evaluations about forms of feedback developed by types of actors (coalitions and streams) and concepts related to policy feedback. Similar to procedures adopted in Box 6, in Box 7 those relationships are interpreted in terms of levels of efficacy of feedback.
- We finally establish links between types of actors (coalitions and streams) and types of learning and feedback (levels of efficacy of learning and feedback) to map the types of discussions and appraisal taking place in the formulation process of PMAQ (Box 8). Types of discussions/appraisals are interpreted as possibilities to make effective changes in/influence decisions vis-à-vis implementation challenges.

Box 4 – Links of types of COALITIONS, beliefs, and discussions: actors acting at PMAQ's formal structure of formulation

3 main Types of actors/ 2 main coalitions	Beliefs/Interests	Discussions within the formal structure of formulation (Roles and conflicts: DAB and the coalitions)	Logical inferences regarding DAB's relationships with coalitions
Formulator DAB/Ministry of Health (MoH) responsible for the formulation of basic health care policies in the same Ministry No regiment of the DAB	Beliefs/Interests MoH's/manager's interest: manage and formulate the policy at the federal level, in relation with states and municipalities. Technical and political perspective of the Brazilian Universal Health System (SUS) Relationship with other actors DAB in the middle of a redistributive dispute, originated from coalitions. PMAQ deals with a double conflict: health manager's and academic interests Ambiguity: External evaluators (EE) x CONASS/CONASEMS Duality/conflict of objectives: evaluation of P4P DAB's proximity with actors PMAQ team in the CGA Coordination has more contact with universities Some actors in the PMAQ Task Group are in contact with state managers to better the notions of PMAQ	Formulation of the general redesign The general redesign, in PMAQ's formulation and structure, was elaborated internally by the DAB After the finished redesign and project, there were discussions with third parties No initial discussions were made with universities that do field work Reformulation of the instrument Discussion about instrument with universities in the 3 rd cycle, and afterwards as well Moment to include other demands and perceptions in formulation agenda	Moment of internal formulation, independently from the PMAQ National Congress (CN-PMAQ). This provides for more inclusion of other demands and perceptions in the formulation agenda The ambiguous character of the program, as well as the redistributive dispute, explains the double character conflict inside the formal structure of the formulation
Coalition 1 External evaluators (EE) -Prestigious University coalition – network funded by the DAB/MoH DAB - EE/engaged actors -Acting, together with the DAB, in the governance arrangement created for the PMAQ	Beliefs/Interesse Academic ideas about implementation Interested in publications: continuity of collection/data is a major issue Focusing on the material survival of their researchers Coordinators consider that there is an "importance of universities, for they guarantee instrument standardization transparent data collection" (Katia) And "We keep the knowledge" (Katia) Relationship with DAB PMAQ has to deal with the academic interest (EE)... in certain moments that EE e DAB draw nearer and farther.	Lively conflict with DAB during discussion/instrument revision Instrument is heavily the university's concern (DAB) Tool discussed exclusively between MoH and universities (EE) Dispute concerning resource maintenance/no cuts to instrument and fieldwork Refusal to validate new proposal of instrument	Conflict with power concession to dominant coalition, present in the CN-PMAQ
Coalition 2 CONASS and CONASEMS Established by the Brazilian Constitution of 1988: one of the three-party councils responsible to decide about health policies within the Triparty Inter-management Commission (CIT). CONASEMS represents municipal managers, and CONASS, the state secretariats	Beliefs/Interests Practical ideas about implementation Interested in improving health services Relationship with DAB -CONASEMS technicians never try to influence the beginning or end of the instrument's redaction (DAB) - PMAQ has a large amount of influence in CONASS e CONASEMS (but not with the instrument).	CONASEMS/Manager doesn't participate in neither the discussions concerning tools, nor the methodology Councils revendicate instrument slimming according to reality/demands Dispute for the larger resource available Barred attempts in altering the instrument Universities: "We have redone the instrument revised by DAB/CIT" Negotiation with the DAB about continuity:	Conflict and agreement with CONASS/ CONASEMS DAB tries to minimize conflict

Box 5 - Discussing PMAQ with old/new streams: Actors/Streams that act outside of the formul structure of decision making of PMAQ

<u>Streams</u> <u>Beliefs/interests</u>	<u>Policy windows</u>	Logical inferences regarding DAB's relationships with problems and political streams
<p><u>Municipal and state managers (through other kinds of communication/approximations)</u> There is a large interaction among managers and attend events or enter in contact with DAB</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Initial process of discussion/formulation, after the 2nd round. - During implementation of the 3rd round - Forum of Basic Health – organised by DAB in every state. - Supporting discussions/conferences dealing with more diverse/process discussions in the country, with participation of international experts. - Discussions with other researchers at the DAB (outside the NC-PMAQ). 	<p><u>Evidences of new discussions/new streams</u></p> <p>Evidences that DAB has brought new actors/streams to discuss and propose solutions for the program – acting outside of, or more independently in relation to, the formal coalitions</p>
<p><u>Front line workers (through other kinds of communication/approximations)</u> Technicians of municipalities in the 3rd cycle <i>“In the third cycle, the team’s technicians tried to bring more frontline elements to think about possibly interesting changes. It was the first time that we were validated by municipality guests”.</i></p>	<p>During the formulation process</p>	<p>DAB approximates itself to other ideas/kinds of knowledge, other than EE and political positions of CONASS/CONASEMS</p>
<p><u>Other Researchers (outside of NC-PMAQ) that study Basic Healthcare</u> <u>More diverse types of discussions about PMAQ</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Qualitative analyses - Implementation process - New publications on policy process/qualitative analysis <p>Support of discussions in national Forum/conferences to discuss the PMAQ from a policy process and qualitative analysis perspective</p>	<p>Initial process of discussion/formulation, after the 2nd round. During implementation of the 3rd round When supporting discussions/conferences in the country</p>	<p>Assumption: In diverse forms, DAB will be trying to use those ideas/streams in the policymaking process</p>
<p><u>National and international experts</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Expert who has implemented a similar program in one city in Brazil • International scholars studying P4P programs <p>International workshop organised at the beginning of the discussions of the formulation process for the 3rd round International experts recommend reduction in the number of indicators for both P4P reasons and evaluation reasons</p> <p>National workshop with a variety of actors and experts Lack of knowledge about process and effects in the work process. Recommendation to foster the development of qualitative or process analysis</p> <p>Workshop at the end of 3rd round at DAB</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <u>Initial process of discussion/formulation, after the 2nd round.</u> - <u>At the end of the 3rd round</u> 	

Box 6 - Linking forms of learning and concepts related to learning - What is the possible level of efficacy of Policy Learning?

LEARNING/KNOWLEDGE Linking forms of policy learning and concepts/perceptions about policy learning		Caracterizar as Discussões/Tensões/Ambiguidades como possibilidade de influenciar desenho vis-à-vis implementação
<p><u>Forms of learning</u></p> <p><i>EE-Universities</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Larger kinds of change due to the universities' contributions • Discussion rounds with universities about publications 	<p><u>Concepts about policy learning</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Insufficient • Learning via publications about Primary Healthcare (non PMAQ: with a predominant number of epidemiologic analyses, e Primary Healthcare profiling/mapping • Gaps/conflicts concerning knowledge transmission during the implementation process • With reluctance to realize/publish critical analyses about the PMAQ policy process • "We are the ones with the knowledge" 	<p><u>Policy Learning Level of Efficacy</u></p> <p>Learning within the main coalition regarding implementation, not sufficient enough to make changes.</p>
<p><i>People from the PMAQ Task Group (GT-PMAQ)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DAB learning comes from contact from the GT-PMAQ 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Subutilized – lack of structure • Subutilized – lack of time • DAB limitation in evaluation data • Lack of registration from state and municipal management 	<p>Learning limited by lack of time, structure, registration at state and municipal levels</p>
<p><i>Meetings with state and municipal managers</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Learning through GT-PMAQ, established by meetings with state and municipal managers • Territorial data from encounters with technical area staff (Superintendence or Secretariat) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Insufficient • Subutilized – lack of time • Lack of registration from state and municipal management 	<p>A possibility from learning, used by the less predominant coalition - structured via constitution -, tends to generate a medium level, when not in conflict with the dominant coalition, or a low level, when there is conflicts.</p>
<p><i>Diverse researchers in Primary Healthcare</i></p> <p>DAB's learning occurs through its contact with these researchers</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Insufficient • Learning about the profile/Basic Healthcare frame • More ample learning with a small number of qualitative/process analyses 	<p>Influence of researchers who are not included in the main coalition tend to be low, or medium if released via a policy entrepreneur who wishes to make changes in the policy.</p>
<p>Result: Policy Learning tends to have mainly a low (and sometimes a medium) level of efficacy (power to produce an effect) within the formal structure of formulation</p>		

Box 7 - Relations between forms of feedback and concepts related to feedback - What is the possible level of efficacy of Policy Feedback?

POLICY FEEDBACK Linking forms of feedback and concepts about policy feedback		Characterize Discussions/Tensions/Ambiguities as possible kinds of feedback to influence the design vis-à-vis implementation
Feedback Forms/Channels	Concepts About Feedback	Policy Feedback Level of Efficacy
<p>Coordination with EE</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Feedback occurs in CN-PMAQ meetings with EE Feedback occurs in field (with the EE present) between DAB e universities Feedback occurs with data entry and evaluation reports 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Insufficient Feedback Feedback is little in comparison to actor engagement Need to rethink feedback strategies Positive feedback is more prevalent (“There isn’t anything to say to criticize PMAQ”) 	Feedback within the main coalition regarding implementation is not sufficient to make changes. It’s also not sufficient to make changes, given the characteristics and main objectives/policy beliefs of the coalition.
<p>CONASS & CONASEMS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Councils receive and give municipality feedback and tries to facilitate the process for higher grades and more chances of resource Political feedback from managers Feedback from and about the implementation and PMAQ (lack of) effect on it 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Negative feedback Insufficient Feedback to make changes in the program 	A possibility of feedback, by less predominant coalitions (CONASS and CONSEMS) – inside the coalition structure established by the constitution – tends to result in a low or medium level when there is conflict. It also depends on political conjunctures and level of pressures.
<p>DAB Supporter</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Feedback from an institutional supporter about implementation in states/municipalities The supporter’s feedback is in the agenda through the meetings 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Partial Feedback (Insufficient) Lack of feedback (at states where the GT-PMAQ does not function) 	Lack or fragile kind of feedback from the implementation concerning managers and frontliners since the GT-PMAQ doesn’t function in all states. Lack of registration
<p>Publications about PMAQ from a diverse number of researchers</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Predominantly quantitative/result analyses Few qualitative analyses 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> More complex feedback Sporadic feedback 	Forms of learning and feedback outside of the coalition could have higher level of applicability (medium or high), with a less brief interference of coalition disputes. It could be absorbed by teams due to the coupling of problem/political streams.
<p>E-mail</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Feedback made through demands and questions sent by e-mail 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Insufficient feedback Need to rethink feedback strategies 	
<p>Result: Policy Feedbacks tend to have low level of efficacy (power to produce an effect) within the formal structure of formulation, where coalitions are in disputes and influencing the formulation process (Types of discussion and appraisal: High, Medium, Low levels of efficacy, in terms of influence in policy design)</p>		

Box 8 - Relationships between Actors (coalitions/streams), types of policy learning and feedback efficacy: types of discussions/appraisals (as possibilities to make effective changes in/ influence decisions vis-à-vis implantation challenges)

Formal/ Outside	Actors (Coalitions/streams)	Policy learning level of efficacy/ implementation challenges (Box 4)	Policy Feedback level of efficacy/ implementation challenges (Box 5)	Types of Discussions and appraisals
Formal structures – formulation process	PMAQ teams at DAB			
	EE-Universities -Coalition leading discussions at CN-PMAQ, together with the DAB/MoH -Dominant coalition: included in the governance arrangement of PMAQ	Low efficacy of Policy learning - Predominance of policy beliefs - Focus on academic purposes, not on policy related implementation purposes - Interest in the material survival of researchers	Low Efficacy of Policy Feedback - Insufficient feedback from implementation field - Insufficient feedback about implementation process in publications	Low level of effectiveness/ implementation challenges
	CONASS-CONASEMS - Councils representing state and city health secretariats of health, acting in the CIT Task Group together with the DAB/MoH - According to the Constitution, all health system decisions need to be made by the three levels of government	Low-medium Efficacy of Policy Learning -holds a technical team working in the production of knowledge and also develops dialogues/discussions with parties involved (state and municipalities), but their knowledge does not influence the program when problems/solutions contradict the main coalition Low/Null level of efficacy to influence the design or revision of PMAQs instrument	Policy Learning Low-medium Efficacy - receive feedback from state/municipal managers, but do not manage to include it in the program when problems contradict the main coalition - Low/Null level of efficacy to influence the design or revision of PMAQ's instrument	Low level of effectiveness – regarding influence on the instrument OR Medium level of effectiveness in other aspects
	Supporters/ Managers through GT-PMAQ in states	Low-Medium level of efficacy of Learning and Feedback - Low level where states are not working, or not managed sufficiently so as to involve municipalities (even if by state health secretariats) - Workshops developed with too many people (multitude in gymnasium), led by one policymaker from DAB - Medium size meetings are more efficacious in terms of policy learning		Low-medium level of effectiveness of discussions
Streams coming outside the formal structure of formulation	Researchers working in primary health care	Medium-low efficacy of policy learning Via publications	Medium-low efficacy of policy feedback Via seminars, discussions	Low-medium level of effectiveness of discussions
	Front liners and managers	Low efficacy of policy learning - Frontliners' reflections about PMAQ are not structured - Practice community does not function anymore/or with other purposes	Low efficacy of policy feedback Lack of registrations Via personal contacts during seminars and workshops Via e-mail (not catalogued/registered for policymaking effect reasons)	Low level of effectiveness of discussions
	Consultants/ Experts	Medium efficacy of policy learning - Medium efficacy when coming from a prestigious international expert/consultant, and if not in disagreement with main coalition - Low efficacy (mainly) when coming from national experts	Medium-Low efficacy of policy learning	Medium level of effectiveness of discussions OR Low level of effectiveness of discussions (when contrary to the main coalition)

4.2. How Stream-Coalition/Learning influence the policy capacity of policymakers? (Q2)

- Question 2 (Q2) - How can Stream-Coalition/Learning possibilities influence the policy capacity of policymakers (MoH or other) when re-designing the program?
 - o We also use thematic framework analysis to verify the types of decisions taking place at the formulation process of PMAQ. Types of decision are interpreted as distinct policy capacity.
 - o In our analysis (work in process), the DAB's capacity to decide/redesign will depend on how (a) types of discussions/appraisal are related to either (b) focused events/stable parameters/critical conjunctures and (c) diverse forms of relationships/intermediation of the debate/discussions between DAB and actors.
 - o DAB negotiates within the governance arrangement and subsystem. It negotiates with the Task Group of the CIT. It also takes advantages of windows of opportunities to launch some new decisions.
 - o Issues being analysed:
 - how interviewers perceive changes occurring in the decision making and design of the program
 - changes in strategies and tools - the meaning of those changes
 - window openings, coupled with entrepreneurs' actions
 - additional actions/strategies
 - changes in stable parameters
 - focused events with cause-effect relations
 - critical conjunctures - cause-effect

4.3. Re-design of the program was more in accordance to the reality of implementation?(work in process)

- Question 3 (Q3) - To what extent was the re-design of the program more in accordance to the reality of implementation?
 - o We are establishing links between types of discussions (Q1) and types of decisions (Q2), in order to construct and propose distinct types of decisions characterizing the formulation process of PMAQ. They will be interpreted/classified as DAB's political capacity to respond to implementation challenges.
 - o The aim is to see how patterns of discussions and decisions can affect the political capacity of the government (DAB's policymakers) to design/reformulate the program according to implementation challenges.
 - o We will use those interrelations to verify each scenario(s) and type(s) of political capacity that can characterize the formulation process of PMAQ in its 3rd round.

6. Discussion (work in progress)

- Challenges regarding policy feedback and policy learning/ types of discussions
 - o In relation to the PMAQs coalition/theory
 - o In relation to multiple streams/theory
- Challenges regarding types of decisions
 - o In relation to the PMAQs coalition/theory
 - o In relation to multiple streams/theory
- Political challenges regarding DAB's capacity to reformulate the PMAQ in the next round
 - o In relation to the PMAQs coalition/theory
 - o In relation to multiple streams/theory

7. Conclusions (work in progress)

- How this analysis advances in the application of MSF/ACF?
 - o On how MSF and ACF can be employed in a LMIC, in a scenario dominated by one/few coalitions, and streams are gradually/initially employed to bring changes to the process of discussions and decision. The coupling of streams, as well as negotiations with coalitions, can be seen as a political resource used by the government to increase its political capacity to redesign a program vis-à-vis to implementation challenges. **(work in progress)**.
- What lessons this analysis bring to the formulation process of the Brazilian PMAQ?
 - o Discussions are characterized by low levels of effectiveness or possibilities to make effective changes vis-à-vis implementation challenges when associated with the hegemonic coalition. They are characterized by low-medium levels of effectiveness when associated with the other coalition and streams (Box 8).
 - Low levels of learning and feedback efficacy are associated with levels of effectiveness of discussions. In this case, discussions and the instrument are highly influenced by the dominant coalition acting in the National Coordination of the Program - the network of researchers (external evaluators) (box 8).
 - o Policy Learning tends to have mainly a low level and sometimes a low-medium level of efficacy (power to produce an effect) within the governance arrangement (coalition 1).
 - o Policy Feedbacks also tend to have low level of efficacy (power to produce an effect) within the formal governance arrangement/coalition 1 (Box 1).
 - o Policy leaning and feedback tend to have a low-medium levels of efficacy when associated with the actions/influence of the less dominant coalition and streams.
- How would it be possible to start making changes?
 - o Scenario 1 is more prevalent. Although we can see some elements of scenario 2 in the formulation process of PMAQ

Work in process: not for citation or distribution. Contact the author for more recent version

- Analysis so far reveals that more reflexive types of learning, generated from previous round, as well as from old/new streams - interactions with consultants, front liners and researchers not working in the governance arrangement of PMAQ (Box 8) -, coupled with the increase of negative feedback, and political demands from states and municipalities, have led the MoH team to consider other non-dominant types of learning and influence to start enhancing its capacity in the redesign of PMAQ during the formulation process in the 3rd round.
- The effect of changes in the future is open and will depend on the associations existent on stream/coalitions and learning/feedback and on how policy entrepreneurs will manage or not to increase their capacity to promote changes in the program.
 - Given the fact that CONASEMS and CONASS have made negotiation with DAB and are now doing consultations with implementers in the country in order to produce a suggestion to change the PMAQ, we might see a shift from scenario 1-2 to scenario 3, or have a mix of the three scenarios.
 - If this combination of scenarios succeeds and we happen to have the continuation of PMAQ in the present government, the political capacity of the government (policymakers) to respond to implementation challenges might increase in the next round. This is because policymakers would probably manage, in a more balanced way, to respond to coalitions. They might also be able to couple more diverse problem and politics streams taking advantage of policy windows to make changes. **(work in progress)**.

8. Ethics statement: Authorized by the Brazilian National Research Ethics Committee and UFG's Research Ethics Committee. CAAE 95307418.0.0000.5083, 6 November 2018.

9. Funding: British Academy and Newton Fund. British Academy Newton Advanced Fellowship – NAF2R2\100106, 2017.

10. References

Ackrill, Robert; Kay, Adrian (2011) Multiple streams in EU policy-making: the case of the 2005 sugar reform, *Journal of European Public Policy*, 18:1, 72-89, DOI:10.1080/13501763.2011.520879

Bandelow, Nils C.; Vogeler, Colette S.; Hornung, Johanna; Kuhlmann, Johanna; Heidrich, Sebastian. (2019) Learning as a Necessary but Not Sufficient Condition for Major Health Policy Change: A Qualitative Comparative Analysis Combining ACF and MSF, *Journal of Comparative Policy Analysis: Research and Practice*, 21:2, 167-182, DOI:10.1080/13876988.2017.1393920

Béland, Daniel; Howlett, M. (2016) The Role and Impact of the Multiple Streams Approach in Comparative Policy Analysis, *Journal of Comparative Policy Analysis: Research and Practice*, 18:3, 221-227, DOI: 10.1080/13876988.2016.1174410

Brasil. Ministério da Saúde. Secretaria de Atenção à Saúde. Departamento de Atenção Básica. Dispõe sobre o Programa Nacional de Melhoria do Acesso e da Qualidade da Atenção Básica (PMAQ-AB). Portaria n1.645, de 2 de outubro de 2015, Brasília: Ministério da Saúde; 2015. https://www.poderesaude.com.br/novosite/images/publicacoes_05.10.2015-I.pdf. Accessed 10 Apr 2019

Bretonm, E; Richard, L; Gagnon, F; Jacques, M; Bergeron, P. (2014) Coalition advocacy action and research for policy development (Chapter 3). In: Carole Clavier and Evelyne de Leeuw Ed. *Health Promotion and the Policy Process*. Oxford University Press/ Published to Oxford Scholarship Online: January 2014.

Christopher M. Weible, Paul A. Sabatier, Hank C. Jenkins-Smith, Daniel Nohrstedt, Adam Douglas Henry, and Peter deLeon (2011) A Quarter Century of the Advocacy Coalition Framework: An Introduction to the Special Issue. *The Policy Studies Journal*, Vol. 39, No. 3, 2011, 349-360

Colebatch, H.K. (2018). Design as a window on the policy process. In: H.K. Colebatch and Robert Hoppe, eds. *Handbook on Policy, Process and Governing*. Cheltenham, Edward Elgar Publishing Limited

Dunlop, C., Radaelli, C. (2013). Systematising policy learning: From monolith to dimensions. *Political Studies*, 61, 599–619.

Dunlop, Claire A. (2017) The irony of epistemic learning: epistemic communities, policy learning and the case of Europe's hormones saga, *Policy and Society*, 36:2, 215-232, DOI:10.1080/14494035.2017.1322260

Heikkila, T., Cairney, P. (2018) Comparisons of Theories of the Policy Process. In: In: Weible, C. M., Sabatier, P. (2018). *Theories of the policy process*. New York: Routledge Taylor and Francis Group.

Herweg, N., Zahariadis, N., Zohlnhofer. (2018). The Multiple Streams Framework: Foundations, Refinements, and Empirical Applications. In: In: Weible, C. M., Sabatier, P. (2018). *Theories of the policy process*. New York: Routledge Taylor and Francis Group.

Howlett, M., McConnell, A., Perl, A. (2016). Moving Policy Theory Forward: Connecting Multiple Stream and Advocacy Coalition Frameworks to Policy Cycle Models of Analysis. *Australian Journal of Public Administration*, vol. 76, no 01, pp. 65-79.

Howlett, Michael; Mukherjee, Ishani and Woo, J.J.. (2018) Thirty years of research on policy instruments. In: H.K. Colebatch and Robert Hoppe, eds. *Handbook on Policy, Process and Governing*. Cheltenham, Edward Elgar Publishing Limited

Howlett M, Ramesh M, Perl A. *Política Pública: Seus ciclos e subsistemas*. 3rd ed. Rio de Janeiro: Campus; 2013.

Jacobs AM, Weaver RK. Policy Feedback and Policy Change. APSA 2010 Annual Meeting Paper. 2010. <https://ssrn.com/abstract=1642636>. Accessed 10 Apr 2019.

Jenkins-Smith, H. C., Nohrstedt, D., Weible, C. M., Ingold, K. (2018). The Advocacy Coalition: An Overview of the Research program. In: Weible, C. M., Sabatier, P. (2018). Theories of the policy process. New York: Routledge Taylor and Francis Group.

Jordan, J; Turnpenney, JR eds. (2015) The Tools of Policy Formulation. Actors, Capacities, Venues and Effects. Edward Elgar Publishing.

Kingdon, John W. (1995). Agendas, Alternatives and Public Policies. 2nd Ed. 1995. New York, HarperCollins College Publishers.

Lewis, J., Ritchie, J., Ormston, Rachel, Morell, G. Generalising from Qualitative Research. In: Ritchie J, Lewis J, McNaughton Nicholls C, Ormston R, editors. Qualitative Research Practice. London: SAGE; 2014.

May, Peter (1991). Reconsidering Policy Design: Policies and Publics. *Journal of Public Policy*. Vol. 11, No. 2 (Apr. - Jun., 1991), pp. 187-206

May, Peter (2003). Policy design and Implementation. In: Guy Peters and Jon Pierre (eds). Handbook of Public Administration. London, Sage Publications. 2003. pp. 223-233

Mettler, S. SoRelle, M. Policy Feedback Theory. (2018). In: Weible, C. M., Sabatier, P. (2018). Theories of the policy process. New York: Routledge Taylor and Francis Group.

Pierson, P. When Effect Becomes Cause: Policy Feedback and Political Change. *World Politics*, Vol. 45, No. 4 (Jul., 1993), pp. 595-628

Ritchie J, Lewis J, McNaughton Nicholls C, Ormston R, editors. Qualitative Research Practice. London: SAGE; 2014.

Roberts, Alasdair. (1994). Review: Policy Change and Learning: An Advocacy Coalition Approach by Paul A. Sabatier and Hank C. Jenkins-Smith. *Canadian Public Policy / Analyse de Politiques*, Vol. 20, No. 3 (Sep., 1994), pp. 334-335.

Saddi FC, Peckham S. Brazilian Payment for Performance (PMAQ) Seen From a Global Health and Public Policy Perspective. *J Ambul Care Manage*. 2018; doi: 10.1097/JAC.000000000000220.

Saddi FC, Peckham S, dos Santos Mundim P. Presentation: Pay for Performance, Formulation, Implementation and Policy Success: in Low, Middle and High Income Countries. *Sociedade e Cultura*. 2018; doi: 10.5216/sec.v21i2.5630

Saddi, F. C. et al, 2019. How To Strengthen Leadership and the Workforce Through the Re-Design and Implementation of a Pay For Performance Program (PMAQ) in PHC in Brazil?. Manuscript under submission.

Sabatier, Paul A. (1988) An Advocacy Coalition Framework of Policy Change and the Role of Policy-Oriented Learning Therein. *Policy Sciences*, Vol. 21, No. 2/3, pp. 129-168

Spenser, L., Ritchie, J., O'Connor, W., Morell, G., Ormston, R. Analysis in Practice. In: Ritchie J, Lewis J, McNaughton Nicholls C, Ormston R, editors. *Qualitative Research Practice*. London: SAGE; 2014.

Stéphane Moyson, Peter Scholten & Christopher M. Weible (2017) Policy learning and policy change: theorizing their relations from different perspectives, *Policy and Society*, 36:2, 161-177, DOI: 10.1080/14494035.2017.1331879

Wu, X., Ramesh, M. & Howlett, M. (2015) Policy capacity: A conceptual framework for understanding policy competences and capabilities, *Policy and Society*, 34:3-4, 165-171, DOI: 10.1016/j.polsoc.2015.09.001

Zahariadis, Nikolaos. (2003). *Ambiguity and Choice in Public Policy: Political Decision Making in Modern democracies*. Washington: Georgetown University Press

Zohlnhöfer, Reimut, Herweg, Nicole; Huß, Christian (2016) Bringing Formal Political Institutions into the Multiple Streams Framework: An Analytical Proposal for Comparative Policy Analysis, *Journal of Comparative Policy Analysis: Research and Practice*, 18:3, 243-256, DOI: 10.1080/13876988.2015.1095428.