Health regulation and technological development: innovative strategies for accessing medicines in the SUS

Abstract  Regulatory science involves articulating knowledge that can establish the scientific bases for the definition of adequate and efficient regulatory mechanisms and practices. The interfaces between systemic and sectoral health and technological development policies were studied based on documentary analysis, especially from the National Pharmaceutical Policy (PNAF), with impacts on health regulation and stimulating the production of medicines of interest to the Unified Health System (SUS). The initiatives for the nationalized production of ARV “Efavirenz”, which was the subject of a compulsory license in 2007, and the establishment of Partnerships for Productive Development (PDP), contributed to defining innovative regulatory frameworks and practices, emphasizing the Regulatory Technical Committees (CTR) for monitoring the internalization of technologies and health registration of the resulting products. The permeation capacity of the principles and strategic axes of the PNAF was identified in the sectoral policies that were analyzed. As of 2014, no macro or sectoral policies on expanding access to medicines in the SUS with impacts on regulations were identified.
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Introduction

The Brazilian setting requires the consideration of health regulation and its permeation in the context of public policies in light of the process of construction of the right to health, the Unified Health System (SUS), and the formulation of the National Health Policy, which includes the National Pharmaceutical Policy (PNAF) as one of its components\(^1\), and other sectoral policies.

In the field of health, the relationships of production and consumption of goods, services, or technologies are marked by their comprehensive interfaces, especially in the sectors underpinning the so-called Health Economic-Industrial Complex (CEIS). This complex can be defined as a selected set of productive activities that maintain cross-sector relationships for the purchase and sale of goods, services, or knowledge and technology, with a clear sector interdependence relationship\(^2\). These relationships are subject to the actions of the State as a promoter of possible interfaces and regulator in the relationships established in the context of the CEIS\(^4\). This complex has a common institutionality, represented by the entities of health regulation, technological incorporation, and research ethics\(^4\).

The development of new technologies and their availability for global consumption requires regulatory definitions that transcend the limits of the countries of origin\(^5\)-\(^7\), generating constant challenges to the action of regulatory bodies and states\(^8\)-\(^10\), which calls for the strengthening of regulatory systems, components of health systems\(^11\),\(^12\).

Although the term “Health Surveillance” is unique to Brazil, health regulation does not diverge from internationally accepted concepts\(^13\),\(^14\). The dynamics of health surveillance are linked to scientific and technological development and the political processes that permeate the State, the market, and societies.

In this context, regulatory science is a field of knowledge in which the articulation and interfaces between different types of knowledge enable the development of scientific bases that can be used to ensure the safety, quality, and effectiveness of products and services made available to societies, and of instruments and practices that contribute to the decision and implementation of regulatory mechanisms\(^15\)-\(^17\). This field of knowledge has been the focus of attention of regulatory agencies recognized globally\(^18\),\(^19\).

This study aimed to identify and analyze interfaces between sectoral policies geared to technological development for the production of medicines of interest to the Brazilian Unified Health System (SUS) and health regulation, guided by the PNAF, to identify regulatory actions and practices that can contribute to reducing SUS vulnerabilities and achieve sustainable access to medicines.

Methods

This study was carried out by documentary research, adopting the model proposed by Walt and Gilson\(^20\) to analyze health policies (Health Policy Analysis, HPA). The analytical model is comprehensive and analyzes complex relationships, highlighting the interrelationship between the four constituent elements of the so-called “policy analysis triangle” and its categories, namely, context, content, and process, for which different stakeholders can contribute. Concerning the content analysis of the policies, the strategies defined in the Situational Strategic Planning method described by Matus\(^21\) were used. The association of different analytical tools is supported by different authors\(^22\),\(^23\), which may contribute to the greater strength and scope of the analyses performed.

Given the polysemic nature of the term “policy”, the study adopted the understanding of “public policy” as a process in which public action programs are elaborated and implemented, considering political-administrative devices coordinated around the explicit objectives of the governmental action in a defined sector or geographic space\(^24\).

The study covered the period from 2003 to 2019, referring to the formulation and 15 years of PNAF’s implementation. Documents were searched on the websites of the Ministries of Health, Economy and Science, Technology and Innovation, the National Health Council, the National Health Surveillance Agency (ANVISA), and the National Bank for Economic and Social Development (BNDES) and printed publications of these institutions.

The study included public actions related to the development and internalization of technologies to produce medicines of interest to the SUS, access to, and health regulation of medicines. Documents addressing only organizational aspects and administrative rules were excluded from the analysis. The search identified 212 documents, which were read in full. The inclusion and exclusion criteria shortlisted this number to 110 documents for analysis.
Results

Chart 1 presents the synthesis of the analysis regarding the typology and content of public policies with identified interfaces between technological development and health regulation during the study period. The contexts, processes, and stakeholders related to the policies mentioned above were analyzed from these data, the results of which are shown in Chart 2. References to health regulation or health surveillance held a prominent place in the analyses.

Discussion

In 2003, pharmaceutical care was defined as one of the priorities of the Brazilian Ministry of Health, reflected in the establishment of the Secretariat of Science, Technology and Strategic Supplies (SCTIE), its Department of Pharmaceutical Care and Strategic Supplies (DAF)\textsuperscript{25,26}, and holding the First National Conference on Medicines and Pharmaceutical Policy\textsuperscript{27,28}. The National Pharmaceutical Policy (PNAF) was established in the National Health Council (CNS) by Resolution CNS No. 338/2004\textsuperscript{1}, and ratified by the Minister of Health\textsuperscript{29}, consolidating the permeations between access and rational use of medicines with the intersectoral policies of scientific, technological and industrial, development in Brazil\textsuperscript{26,27}.

The PNAF was the first public policy formulated and established within the social control of the SUS\textsuperscript{30}, assuming a strategic role beyond the health care process. Its principle is its guiding role in formulating other sectoral policies, emphasizing medicines, industrial development,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Macropolitics (Systemic policy)</th>
<th>Micropolitics (Sectoral policy)</th>
<th>Desired situation</th>
<th>Policy content</th>
<th>Ações</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2003-2004</td>
<td>Formulating the National Pharmaceutica Care Policy (PNAF)</td>
<td>Institutionalizing the PNAF, at the different levels of management and performance of the SUS</td>
<td>Fragmented actions within the federal management of the SUS Users difficult access to medicines in the SUS Disconnection between access to medication and health care actions</td>
<td>Overcoming the fragmentation of actions involving planning, acquisition, distribution and access to medicines in the SUS The SUS as a guide for the demand for medicines from the pharmaceutical productive sectors, with qualification of the health care process</td>
<td>Conducting a national thematic conference and identifying the PNAF assumptions Defining and institutionalizing the PNAF, with characteristics of intersectorality and guidance for other policies Qualifying the PNAF as a priority strategic policy within the scope of federal management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003-2006</td>
<td>Strengthening the pharmaceutical production chain and technological development in the sector</td>
<td>Including the Ministry of Health in conducting the Pharmaceutical Productive Chain Competitiveness Forum</td>
<td>Strong retraction of the Brazilian pharmaceutical industry and setting worsened by the adoption of the Industrial Property Law (1996)</td>
<td>Stimulus for sustainable development in the sector, with the aggregation of capacities for the internalization and development of technologies of interest to the SUS</td>
<td>Identification of consensuses to stimulate the development of the (private and public) pharmaceutical productive sectors and inclusion of Drugs and Medicines as priorities in the Brazilian Industrial, Technological, and Foreign Trade Policy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Macropolitics (Systemic policy)</th>
<th>Micropolitics (Sectoral policy)</th>
<th>Policy content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Desired situation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Formulating the National Policy on Science, Technology, and Innovation in Health (PNCTIS)</td>
<td>Institutionalizing the PNCTIS</td>
<td>Incipient development of science, technology and innovation activities in the health-related structures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Reducing the vulnerability of the National STD/AIDS Program and ensuring access to ARVs in the SUS</td>
<td>Maintaining the feasibility of financing for the acquisition of ARVs</td>
<td>The cost of drug Efavirenz aggravates the vulnerability of the SUS and fruitless negotiations for price reductions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Formulating the Productive Development Policy</td>
<td>CEIS as a mobilizing program in the strategic area of health</td>
<td>Little encouragement to productive health-related structures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Empowering the CEIS as an instrument of Brazilian industrial policy</td>
<td>Articulation of the productive sectors with the demands of the SUS</td>
<td>Growing SUS demand for technologies and increased spending on medicines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Strengthening the national industry, with increased productive capacity, innovation, and competitiveness</td>
<td>Structuring and modernization of public health technology and innovation infrastructure</td>
<td>Structural and financing difficulties for the internalization of high-priced technology with a great health impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Rationalizing the State’s purchasing power</td>
<td>Redefining the guidelines and criteria for the definition of strategic products for the SUS and establishment of PDPs</td>
<td>Need to improve the regulatory framework of PDPs and the process of defining strategic products</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Elaborated by the authors, based on analytical models proposed by Walt and Gilson20 and Matus21.
and science and technology policies. Concerning health regulation, the PNAF defined the construction of a health surveillance policy to guarantee people’s access to safe, effective, and quality services and products as one of its priority axes. This construction is still underway since Brazil has not yet advanced in establishing a national health surveillance policy. Regarding medicines, the PNAF assumes the strategic role of systemic policy (macropolitics), while the SUS guides the demand to the productive pharmaceutical sectors, whose capillarity began to influence the formulation or decision-making within other systemic public policies and sectoral policies (micropolitics).

From 2003 to 2006, the Ministry of Health worked painstakingly in joint coordination with the Ministry of Development, Industry, and For-
The pharmaceutical industrial policy as a “government priority” and “State policy” and recommending the prioritization of public policies geared to modernization and training of public pharmaceutical laboratories to conduct research and development (R&D) activities, and the implementation of public-private partnerships as a mechanism for inducing industrial production.

eign Trade of the Forum on Competitiveness of the Pharmaceutical Productive Chain\textsuperscript{31}, and the stakeholders involved advanced discussions on scientific, technological, and industrial development to meet the demands of the SUS. In a context marked by the search for consensus, the Forum identified the economic and strategic relevance of medicines for the SUS, characterizing

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Macropolitics (Systemic policy)</th>
<th>Impact on health regulations</th>
<th>Processes identified</th>
<th>Stakeholders involved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Reducing the vulnerability of the National STD/AIDS Program and ensuring access to ARVs in the SUS</td>
<td>Edition of Ordinance No. 583/2007/Anvisa, which established the Technical-Regulatory Committee (CTR) within ANVISA to monitor the development, production and registration in Brazil of the drug object of Decree no. 6,108 of May 4, 2007</td>
<td>Statement by the Brazilian government regarding the public interest of patent rights over drug Efavirenz to grant a compulsory license for non-commercial use Edition of Presidential Decree No. 6.108/2007, establishing the compulsory licensing of Efavirenz Edition of Interministerial Ordinance No. 128/2008, which established the guidelines for contracting drugs and medicines by the bodies and entities that make up the Unified Health System</td>
<td>Ministry of Health Ministry of Justice Civil House of the Presidency of the Republic ANVISA Oswaldo Cruz Foundation, including the direction of the Pharmaceutical Technology Institute – Farmanguinhos Non-governmental organizations representing the segments of people living with HIV/AIDS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>The Productive Development Policy</td>
<td>Executive Group of the Health Industrial Complex (GECIS) responsible for actions to ensure equality in health regulation, support for the quality of national production, modernization of health surveillance actions, simplification and streamlining of regulatory processes</td>
<td>Resumption and expansion of the scope and depth of the Industrial, Technological and Foreign Trade Policy (PITCE) established in 2004, with the definition of CEIS as one of its priorities The national entity managing the SUS assumes the role of conducting intersectoral initiatives to regulate and improve the efficiency of the CEIS, involving the industrial, economic, and technological fields to meet the demands of the SUS</td>
<td>Ministry of Health Civil House of the Presidency of the Republic Ministries of Development, Industry and Trade; Finance; Planning; Foreign Affairs; and Science, Technology, and Innovation ANVISA and other national regulatory and development agencies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
in the sector. These definitions were aligned with those indicated by the PNAF.

A relevant consequence of the Forum was the inclusion of the topic “pharmaceuticals and medicines” as one of the four priorities of the Industrial, Technological, and Foreign Trade Policy (PITCE), an important advance in the coordination of sectoral policies to support the development of productive health sectors. A more immediate result of such prioritization, in April 2004, the National Bank for Economic and Social Development (BNDES) launched the Pharmaceutical Chain Support Program (PROFARMA), initially to enable investments to adapt the national pharmaceutical park to new regulatory requirements and induce innovative activity in the pharmaceutical chain. Although the Forum’s recommendations indicated the need for the National Health Surveillance System (SNVS) to adopt mechanisms for internalizing the guidelines resulting from the consensus obtained, no concrete actions in this regard had been identified until late 2006.

In 2004, the challenge of formulating a National Policy on Science, Technology, and Innovation in Health (PNCTIS) found a political-institutional context favorable to the resumption of discussions emanating from the First Thematic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Macropolitics (Systemic policy)</th>
<th>Impact on health regulations</th>
<th>Processes identified</th>
<th>Stakeholders involved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Empowering the CEIS as an instrument of Brazilian industrial policy</td>
<td>Edition of the Resolution of the Collegiate Board of ANVISA (RDC) No. 02/2011, establishing Technical-Regulatory Committees (CTR) to follow-up and monitor the Partnerships for Productive Development (PDP)</td>
<td>GECIS defining the PDPs as industrial policy mechanisms used in health to internalize the production and transfer of drug technology, active pharmaceutical ingredients, and products of interest to the SUS</td>
<td>ANVISA’s technical and management body</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PDP as an instrument of the health policy to encourage the CEIS and meet the demands of the SUS</td>
<td>Representations of public pharmaceutical laboratories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Representations of the private companies that are part of the PDP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Strengthening the national industry, with increased productive capacity, innovation, and competitiveness</td>
<td>Inclusion of Anvisa in the managing committee of the Program for the Development of the Health Industrial Complex (PROCIS) and edition of ANVISA’s RDC No. 50/2012, which provided for the procedures for registration of products in the process of developing or transferring technologies subject to public-public or public-private PDP of interest to the SUS</td>
<td>Incorporating the GECIS into the “Brasil Maior” Plan, established in 2011 by Decree No. 7.540</td>
<td>ANVISA’s technical and management body</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Establishing the Program for the Development of the Health Industrial Complex (PROCIS) through the Ministry of Health Ordinance No. 506/2012 to strengthen the infrastructure of production and innovation in health in the public sector</td>
<td>PROCIS Steering Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Defining the guidelines for the establishment of PDPs, through Ministry of Health Ordinance No. 837/2012</td>
<td>Public and private producers participating in the PDPs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chart 2. Public policies with interfaces with technological development in the area of medicines, their impacts on the health regulatory field, and stakeholders involved, in the 2003-2019 period.
Conference held in 1994\textsuperscript{35}, in so far as science and technology policy in health is a component of the National Health Policy\textsuperscript{35,36}. The establishment of the Secretariat of Science, Technology, and Strategic Supplies (SCTIE)/MS contributed to this positive setting. The Second National Conference on Science, Technology and Innovation in Health (CNCTIS) held in July 2004 resulted in the proposed consolidated text of the PNCTIS, which was submitted for deliberation by the CNS\textsuperscript{37}. Many items defined by the PNCTIS had an unequivocal relationship with the definitions of the PNAF, and regarding health regulation, the PNCTIS highlighted the role of ANVISA regarding the prior consent for patenting of health supplies\textsuperscript{37}.

In April 2007, after fruitless negotiations with the company holding the patent, the Brazilian government declared the patent rights on Efavirenz a matter of public interest to grant a compulsory license for non-commercial use\textsuperscript{40}, which was followed by the enactment of the Presidential Decree Nº 6.108/2007, establishing the compulsory licensing of Efavirenz\textsuperscript{41}, government re-
sponse to the context of high vulnerability of the National STD/AIDS Program (PN DST/AIDS), established in 1986 and whose free access to medicines by people living with HIV was established by Law No. 9.313, of November 1996. The impacts of the Brazilian Patent Law46 and the constant price hike of ARVs started to affect the sustainability of the Brazilian program, with around 70% of the PN STD/AIDS budget in the 2006-2007 period committed to the acquisition of imported ARVs47. After adopting the compulsory license, the national production of Efavirenz was taken over by the Farmanguinhos/Fiocruz, Pharmaceutical Technology Institute, facilitated by partnerships with national pharmaceutical and pharmacomedical companies.

This initiative was anchored in the Interministerial Ordinance No. 128/2008, which established the guidelines for contracting drugs and medicines by the bodies and entities that make up the Unified Health System48,49. This productive arrangement was one of the pioneering examples of the use of the strategy that would later shape the Partnerships for Productive Development (PDP)4. These actions were aligned with the principles and strategic axes of PNAF41.

In this scenario, ANVISA acted proactively and published Ordinance No. 583/2007, which established the Technical-Regulatory Committee (CTR) within ANVISA to monitor the development, production, and registration of the drug object of the Decree No. 6.108 in Brazil, dated May 4, 200751. This definition was innovative in the Brazilian regulatory-health setting, enabling an early and collaborative interface between the regulatory authority and the productive entities responsible for technological development initiatives of national interest. In February 2009, Farmanguinhos/Fiocruz delivered to the Ministry of Health the first batches of nationalized production of ARV Efavirenz52, facilitated by the reduced regulatory times promoted by the CTR.

The National Policy for Productive Development was established in May 2008 as one of the initiatives to confront the marked acceleration of the deficit in the Brazilian trade balance in the pharmaceutical and medicine segments since the 2000s53. It defined the Economic-Industrial Health Complex (CEIS) as one of its priorities, accompanied by the establishment of the Executive Group for the Health Industrial Complex (GECIS) through Decree/200854,55. The development policy defined in 2008 resumed and expanded the breadth and depth of the PITCE established in 200457. As provided for in the Decree of its establishment55, the setting of a permanent forum for articulation with civil society to provide advice to the GECIS was defined, which placed the premise for the different social stakeholders’ participation in proposing strategies actions for the development of the health sector54. Regarding health regulation, GECIS’ competencies included actions to guarantee isonomic health regulation and support the quality of national production, including the modernization of health surveillance actions and the establishment of a support network for the quality and competitiveness of local production and the simplification and streamlining of regulatory processes56,53. These definitions reinforced ANVISA's initiatives to adopt the CTRs as a regulatory practice, especially from the positive results observed in the process resulting from the compulsory license adopted in 2007.

In the setting where public health policies were directed towards a virtuous articulation between health care and industrial development59, public procurement has become a vital instrument for inducing technological training and development of the productive base to reduce the vulnerability of the SUS and generate investments, employment, and income60. These assumptions are aligned with the guidelines and strategic axes established in the PNAF. As of 2009, PDPs were defined as an instrument established within the health policy to stimulate the CEIS and meet SUS demands61. They are, therefore, an industrial policy mechanism used in health to internalize production and transfer drug technology, active pharmaceutical ingredients, and products of interest to the SUS62. This initiative occurs under the coordination of the Ministry of Health presented under the GECIS in 200961, through the establishment of a partnership between the technology holding company and a public producer entity qualified to supply the product to the SUS during the period of technological absorption, with the centralized acquisition by the Ministry of Health4,63,64. This strategy was a practical consequence of the inclusion of CEIS among the strategic axes of national health planning, strengthening the national pharmacochemical industry and official pharmaceutical laboratories, based on the arrangement for the transfer of technologies demanded...
by the SUS. In building and implementing the PDPS, the Ministry of Health, primarily through the SCTIE, assumed a prominent role as an institutional actor, with significant results for the sustainability of access to medicines in the SUS. From 2011 to early 2017, the savings resulting from the centralized purchase of medicines covered by the PDP reached BRL 4.68 billion. In this context, ANVISA defined the establishment of Technical-Regulatory Committees (CTR) to follow up and monitor the different partnerships defined for each public pharmaceutical laboratory involved. Such CTRs were formally anchored in the Resolution of the Collegiate Board of Directors (RDC) of ANVISA of 02/2011, building on the successful regulatory practice experience adopted when the compulsory license of Efavirenz was issued in 2007.

The actions to include the CEIS in the national development policy and its strengthening to meet the demands of the SUS were reinforced with the incorporation of the GECIS into the Brasil Maior Plan, established in 2011 by Decree No. 7.540. In this new setting, the Ministry of Health established the Program for the Development of the Health Industrial Complex (PROCIS) through MS Ordinance No. 506/2012 to strengthen the infrastructure of production and innovation in health in the public sector. In this context, the guidelines for establishing PDPS were defined through the Ministry of Health’s Ordinance No. 837/2012, which was based on the National Health Plan.

The interfaces of PROCIS with health surveillance are shown by the inclusion of ANVISA in its management committee and the actions of this agency geared to technological and industrial development, such as the edition of RDC No. 50/2012, which provided for the procedures for the registration of products in the process of developing or transferring technologies that are the object of public-public or public-private Productive Development Partnerships of interest to the Unified Health System. This regulatory-sanitary definition innovated by setting mechanisms for the systematic internalization of all information related to the development of drugs subject to PDP, resulting in the gradual and monitored composition of product dossiers, with the reduced regulatory time required for the analysis and definition of the respective records and acceleration of their availability in the SUS.

The revision of the legal framework supporting the PDPS was defined by the Ministry of Health’s Ordinance No. 2.531/2014. This regulation is related to the macro-policy of use and rationalization of the State’s purchasing power, including the criteria for defining strategic products for the SUS and fostering the development of the CEIS. The regulation of the use of the State’s purchasing power was the object of the National Policy for Technological Innovation in Health (PNITS), defined by Decree No. 9.245/2017, in a weakening Brazilian democracy promoted by the legal-parliamentary coup of 2016. However, the PNITS did not add any advances regarding health regulation. The context in which the PDP regulation was revised was marked by the need for greater transparency in the processes for its definition and the search for greater legal certainty for decision-making within public management. The initiatives adopted were strongly influenced by the recommendations resulting from the audit carried out by the Federal Court of Accounts (TCU), which assessed the regularity of the PDP signed by the Ministry of Health. The new legal framework was an evolution regarding the criteria for defining strategic products for the SUS established in 2008 by Ordinance MS No. 978. However, a recent study indicates that the criteria adopted for constructing a strategic list of products for the SUS do not incorporate elements of health technology assessment and the use of evidence, and the process lacks interactions between researchers and decision-makers. Concerning health regulation, the revised legal guidelines of the PDP reaffirmed the role of the CTR and included ANVISA in the Technical Assessment Committees (CTA), responsible for analyzing and evaluating the PDP proposals. Such definitions reinforce ANVISA’s strategic role in the context of the CEIS incentive policy and understanding CTR as a practice model in the health-regulatory field.

**Final considerations**

The study identified essential interfaces between the evolution of regulatory frameworks and practices with initiatives to foster technological development for the national production of medicines of interest to the SUS, based on the guidelines of the National Pharmaceutical Care Policy (PNAF).

Establishing the PDPS was an essential strategy for reducing SUS vulnerabilities. It implemented the Technical Regulatory Committees (CTR) as an innovative practice in health surveillance, considering the successful experience
carried out during the compulsory license for the national production of Efavirenz in 2007. The incentives to the CEIS also boosted the adoption of new milestones and new regulatory practices regarding the internalization and development of technologies, keeping interfaces with PNAF’s guiding capacity on sectorial policies aimed at people’s access to medicines, with a reduction in time for its availability in the SUS, cost reduction, and addressing SUS vulnerabilities. However, as of 2014, no significant developments were identified in this context.

Although the study period was capped at year 2019, it was essential to refer to the current situation of the COVID-19 pandemic, which shows that investments in scientific and technological development and the adoption of milestones and new regulatory practices are fundamental for the country. Likewise, Brazil must overcome the gaps generated in the sectoral policies with the resumption and enhancement of the advances achieved. To this end, it is crucial to observe the principles defined in the national health policy and its social control, the strengthening of the national system of science, technology, and innovation, and the preservation of state companies with impacts on the health sector, where the State is a regulator that can prioritize national development, as opposed to subordinating it to particular economic interests or institutional neglect.
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