Policy Implementation and Evaluation

The verb to implement means in its most basic sense, to carry out, to fulfill, or to accomplish. When applied to public policy, implementation is the process of putting into effect or carrying out an authoritative decision of Government. Implementation puts the objectives of policy adopters into action in an effort to accomplish desired results.\(^1\)

Policy implementation is of critical importance to the success of Government. No policy can succeed if the implementation does not bear relationship to the intentions of policy adopters. Policy implementation is the process of putting policy into action. Implementation is the phase between a decision and operation. It seeks to determine whether an organization is able to carry out and achieve its stated objectives. Policy implementation is broadly defined as “what happens between the establishment of an apparent intention on the part of the Government to do something, or to stop doing something, and the ultimate impact in the world of action.”\(^2\) Donald Van Meter and Carl Van Horn observed: “Policy Implementation encompasses those actions by public or private individuals (and groups) that are directed at the achievement of goals and objectives set forth in prior policy decisions.”\(^3\) The task of implementation is to form a bridge that allows the objectives of public policies to be achieved as outcomes of Government activities. Implementation involves the “creation of a policy delivery system in which specific mechanisms are designed and pursued

---

in the hope of reaching particular ends”. Thus, public policies in the form of a statement of goals and objectives are put into action-programs with an aim to realize the ends stated in the policy. According to Moore and Allison, “in designing and advocating policies, we must be able to anticipate the actual performance of the Government in adopting and implementing the proposed policy. This anticipating in turn requires analytic procedures that enable us to: (1) outline the main features of the political and the bureaucratic settings within with specific policy proposal will be considered, and (2) make reliable judgments about whether the setting is hospitable or inimical to the proposed policy.5

Policy making is not concluded, however, once a policy decision has been expressed in statutory or other official form. The policies that are embodied in statutes often are in skeleton form and require much additional developments to implement the policies. Administrative agencies are often delegated discretion or latitude to issue rules and directives that will fall in the details of policy and make it more specific. Much of what agencies do during the implementation of policies may appear to be routine, mundane, or tedious – processing requests or application, inspecting records, collection information, writing reports and so forth. The consequences of implementation for the content or substance of policy, and for its impact and degree of success are every bit as important as what transpires during the formulation and adoption stage. If implementation fails, than all that preceded was of no avail. The detection of the implementation
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stage as a missing link \textsuperscript{6} in the study of policy making can be regarded as one of the most of important conceptual innovations of policy research in the 1970s. Earlier, implementation of policies was not recognized as a separate stage within or element of the policy making process. Most of the implementation studies take either a “top down” or “bottom-up” approach. Top-downers focus on the actions of top-level officials, the factors affecting their behavior, whether policy goals are attained, and whether policy was reformulated on the basis of experience. Bottom uppers contend that this approach gives too much attention to top-level official and either ignores or underestimates the efforts of lower level (or “street level”) officials to either avoid policy or divert it to their own purposes. Implementation studies, they argue, should focus on lower – level officials and how they interact with their clients. State and local economic condition the attitude of local officials and the action of client are among the factor affecting implementation. As one would expect, there have also been efforts to combine these two approaches.\textsuperscript{7}

Policy implementation is formally the domain of administrative agencies, often referred as bureaucratic, a term that carries both descriptive and pejorative connotations.\textsuperscript{8} Administrative agencies perform most of the day to day work of Government, their action affects citizens more regularly and directly than those of other governmental bodies. Administrative agencies often are provided with broad and ambiguous statutory mandates that leave them with much room for choice in deciding what should or should not be done on some matters.


Legislature have delegated much policy making authority to administrative agencies, it should not be assumed that legislature cannot act with specificity. Implementation generates outputs and what utilizes the scarce resources. Policy making does not come to an end once a policy is approved or adopted. Implementation is merely one stage in a logical sequence of the policy process. As Anderson nicely expresses it, “policy is being made as it is being administered and administered as it is being made”.

**Major Agencies Involved In Policy Implementation**

Public policy making in democratic countries is a complex process which has a number of not only governmental agencies and actor but also non-governmental agencies and actors playing an important role. Unless and until the policies formulated are executed in a fair, impartial, and effective way, howsoever good the policy intents may be the outcomes can never be achieved. The Indian Constitution, modeled on the British parliamentary system, has entrusted the basic responsibility of executing the policies approved by the legislature, and overseen by the judiciary, to the executive. The key role of governance and management of the country’s affairs vests with the executive, to whom all successes and failures of the same are attributed. The political executive is essentially akin to the board of directors in a large cooperation, with functionaries, i.e. the permanent executive manning implementation positions at all levels. It is a vast machine with complicated internal structures.

**Parliament and Policy Implementation**

In a parliamentary democracy, the legislature or Parliament is the most appropriate site for policy making as well as the site for evaluation and

---

monitoring for its implementation. However, Parliament in India finds it increasingly difficult to legislate in detail, and the degree of discretion that results from regulation increases also. The amount of regulation is so extensive that discretion is used even about which rule to apply. Furthermore most legislators are unable or unwilling to arrive at precise Statements of the conflicting interest on many issues.\textsuperscript{10}

Lack of expertise, time and reliable data may also contribute to the delegation of broad authority to administrative agencies. While administrative organization (here this means the bureaucracy) are the primary implementers of public policy, the legislative bodies are also involved in policy implementation though their role is not very crucial, the legislature may affect the administrative organization in several ways.\textsuperscript{11} Parliament of India exercise control over executive through its Committees. The most important Standing Committees of Parliament are those that exercise control over the finances: the Public Accounts Committee, the Committee on Estimate and the Committee on Public Undertaking. The Public Accounts Committee examines the accounts for the sums granted by the Parliament to the Government of India and the financial accounts of the Government. This Committee has helped greatly in improving financial control by the administration and assisted in the detection of many irregularities and even dishonesties. By its constant vigil, the Committee has introduced financial discipline not only in the expenditure but also in revenue.\textsuperscript{12}

The post facto examination of Government accounts conducted by the public
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Accounts Committee (PAC) is intended to further strengthen legislative oversight. It represents the legislature in miniature and functions on non-partisan lines. Government department are required to revert to the PAC with reports of action taken by them on its recommendations. The objective is to hold the executive accountable for over spending and to learn and implement lessons for the future. The main function of Estimate Committee is to report what economies, improvements organization, efficiency or administrative reform, consistent with the policy underlying the estimate may be affected and to suggest alternative policies in order to bring about efficiency and economy in administration. The Committee on Public Undertaking examines the functioning of State owned enterprises.

To make the parliamentary activity more effective and to make the executive more accountable to the legislature, a beginning had been made in the Eight Lok Sabha in 1989 by setting up 3 Department Related Standing Committees, one each on (i) Agriculture, (ii) Science and Technology, and (iii) Environment and forests.\textsuperscript{13} Third Report of the Rules Committee, adopted by Lok Sabha on 29 March, 1993, paved the way for setting up of 17 Departmentally Related Standing Committee covering under their jurisdiction all the ministries/departments of Union Government.\textsuperscript{14} In July 2004, rules were amended to provide for the Constitution of seven more such Committees, thus raising the number of DRSCs from 17 to 24. The Department Related Standing Committees (DRSCs) are supposed to act as watchdogs, and make the executive more accountable to the legislature. These Department Related Standing
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Committees scrutinize the work of ministries and departments and their implementation of planned objectives on an ongoing basis, in addition to examining their demands for grants in the budget.\footnote{Devesh Kapur, Pratap Bhanu Mehta, \textit{Public Institutions in India: Performance and Design}, New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 2005, pp. 90-92.}

The newly constituted Departmentally Related Standing Committee system is a path breaking endeavor of the parliamentary surveillance over administration with the emphasis of their functioning to concentration long term plans, policies and the philosophies guiding the working of the executive, these Committees will be in a very privileged position to provide necessary direction, guidance and inputs for broad policy formulations and in achievement of the long term national perspective by the executive.\footnote{http://www.parliamentaryindia.nic.in/Is/intro/p22.htm assessed on 10 January, 2011} Parliamentary approval is required for many top level administrative appointment, and this may be used to influence the implementation process.

During the general discussion on Finance Bill and submission of Demands for grants, Members of Parliament gets opportunity to discuss the budget proposals and general taxation policy. Members of Lok Sabha can move motions to reduce any demands for grant. Such motions are called as ‘cut motions’ which are of three kind: (1) disapproval of policy cut motion represents the disapproval of the policy underlying the demand, (2) economy cut motion represents the economy that be affected in the proposed expenditure. (3) token cut motion ventilates specific grievances which are within the sphere of responsibility of the Government of India. Issues of policy, economy, efficiency, and grievance may be raised and the minister concerned has to respond the questions.
The first hour of every Parliament sitting is allotted to raise questions on executive’s functioning. The ‘question hour’ is the forum where members can elicit information on any aspect of the performance of the executive. Besides the question hour, there is the zero hour discussion, adjournment debates and no confidence motions provide occasions when the entire or part of the Government policy is criticized. Audit system is an important tool of parliamentary control over administration. The Comptroller and Auditor General of India (CAG), on behalf of the Parliament, audit the account of Government. It is one of the duties of the Comptroller and Auditor General (CAG) of India, to report whether the money shown in the accounts as having been disbursed were legally available for and applicable to the service or purpose to which they have been applied. The CAG reports cases of excess expenditure both through his audit reports and as part of the appropriation accounts audited and certified by him and submitted to the Governor/President who causes them to be laid before the legislature.\textsuperscript{17} The Report of CAG highlights the improper, illegal, unwise, uneconomical and irregular expenditures of the Government. The financial accountability of the Government to the Parliament is secured through the Audit Report of the CAG.

The control exercised by the Parliament over the executive is indirect inducing self-control and responsibility under the threat of exposure, rather than control in the sense of actually implementing policies.

**Judiciary in Policy Implementation**

The Indian judiciary has a unique position, under the Constitution as an independent organ of State designed to provide a countervailing check on the
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functioning of the other two organs in their respective spheres. Armed with the power to strike down executive, quasi-judicial and legislative actions as unconstitutional, the judiciary has, as the ultimate interpreter of Constitutional provisions\textsuperscript{18}, expounded the basic features of the Constitution of which the power of judicial review has been recognized as forming an integral part.\textsuperscript{19} Every attempt at diluting or dispensing the power of judicial review through statute or constitutional amendments has been rebuffed with certainty.\textsuperscript{20} Secondly, the Supreme Court’s declaration of the law is mandatorily binding “on all courts within the territory of India”\textsuperscript{21} and all authorities, civil and judicial, in the territory of India shall act in aid of the Supreme Court of India.\textsuperscript{22} This coupled with the power to punish for contempt of the court\textsuperscript{23}, reinforces the position of the judiciary as a constitutional authority that enforces accountability and answerability of the other organs of the State. The implementation of policies, in many fields has been influenced by judicial decisions. The judicial bodies can help, obstruct and nullify the implementation of particular policies through their interpretations of Statutes and decisions.

The innovation of Public Interest Litigation (PIL) as a tool to achieve social objectives by enabling easy access to courts for those disadvantaged socially and economically. A conscious attempt was made to relax the rules of standing and procedure and free litigants from the strength of law and lawyering.\textsuperscript{24} The expanded notion of the right to life enabled the court, in its PIL
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jurisdiction, to overcome objections on grounds of justifiability to its adjudicating the enforceability of economic social and cultural rights. The early PIL cases witnessed attempts by the court to rescue bonded labor from dehumanizing conditions of work\textsuperscript{25}, ensuring availability of free legal aid to destitute under trial prisoners\textsuperscript{26} and protecting the rights of pavement dwellers to processual due process while facing forced eviction.\textsuperscript{27}

In Bandhua Mukti Morcha\textsuperscript{28}, the court declared that the non-enforcement of welfare legislation like the Minimum Wages Act, 1948 and the Bonded Labor (Abolition) Act, 1976 would tantamount to “denial of the right to live with human dignity enshrined under Article 21 of the Constitution. The court has also stressed that its intervention is warranted only where it finds that there has been a failure by those charged with performing their statutory and Constitutional functions to address the problem.\textsuperscript{29} It is in this context that the court intervened to direct the Governments at the Center and the States to make available food grains, overflowing in State go downs, to be made available on a priority basis to those living below the poverty line.\textsuperscript{30} In the mid-90s, following a writ petition, the Supreme Court took cognizance of the growing mismanagement of hazardous waste and constituted a High Powered Committee chaired by Prof. M.G.K. Menon to look into the problems and present the findings periodically for immediate and appropriate action. The comprehensive review was necessitated primarily due to the myriad issues for consideration and shed light on several flaws in the administration of the hazardous waste legislation. The
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various areas that the recommendation covered include the need for immediate closure of industries operating without authorization or without having fulfilled the conditions under which the consent to operate was established; the development of clear mechanisms for improved implementation; the need for environmental projection authorities to adhere to the purposes of their creation and the creation of structures and agencies that would supplement or supervise in order to ensure implementation remains effective.  

The Committee concluded with a significant recommendation of setting up a monitoring Committee akin to the role of a ‘project manager’ to ensure that the tasks that required to be carried out time bound out and more importantly supervised.

Based on the report of MGK Menon Committee, the Supreme Court passed a detailed order on the issue of implementation of hazardous waste management in October 2003. As recommended, the Honorable Court also constituted the Supreme Court Monitoring Committee (SCMC). The SCMC, while supervising the execution of the order passed directives from time to time to SPSBS on pressing issues – control of flaring by petrochemical plants in Manali industrial area (North Chennai), on closure of units in Cuddalore SIPCOT industrial area (Cuddalore, Tamil Nadu) or remediation/restoration orders pertaining to the mercury pollution caused by a thermometer manufacturing plant (Kodaikanal, Tamil Nadu), to name a few in the State of Tamil Nadu alone. Further, the SCMC, in consonance with the order, directed the SPCBs to convene Local Area Environment Committees (LAECs) to assist in implementation at the level of the region (town, industrial State, industrial

clusters or individual industries). These LAECs included members of the local communities, experts and NGO representatives and were meant to be ‘eyes’ and ‘ears’ of the SCMC in reporting mismanagement and violations.

The judicial control over administration stems from the doctrine of rule of law, which finds its classic exposition in the writing of A.V. Dicey. Dicey explains this doctrine as follows: “No man is punishable or can be lawfully made to suffer in body or goods except for a distinct breach of law established in the ordinary legal manner before the ordinary courts of land…. no man is above the law, but … . Every man, whatever be his rank or condition, is subject to the ordinary law of the realm and amenable to the jurisdiction of the ordinary tribunals… every official from the Prime Minister down to a constable or a collector of taxes, is under the same responsibility for every act done without legal justification as any other citizen… the general principle of Constitution… are with us the result of judicial decision determining the rights of private persons in particular cases brought before the courts”. 33

The judiciary can intervene in the administrative acts under the following circumstances:

- Lack of jurisdiction,
- Error of law,
- Error in fact finding,
- Abuse of authority,
- Error of procedure.
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The citizens who are aggrieved by these cases can seek the intervention of judiciary in administrative acts. Judicial bodies including administrative tribunals and agencies for administrative adjudication operate to exercise checks on the functioning of the implementing agencies and whosoever feel affected can approach these bodies. In order to have an effective check on the functioning of administrative tribunals, some safeguards have been provided in the Constitution. As per Article 32(2) of the Indian Constitution, the Supreme Court is empowered to issue writs, viz. Habeas Corpus, Mandamus, Prohibition, Quo Warranto, and Certiorari. Any individual feeling that his Fundamental Rights are being infringed through the implementation of a given policy and has failed to get justice through the administrative adjudication agency or tribunal, could move to the court for protection and safeguarding of his rights. The Court attempts to strike a balance between remaining within its sphere of influence while continuing to ensure answerability and accountability of the organ of the state. Thus, the ordinary courts and the administrative tribunals have a creative role in the implementation of public policies.

**Policy Implementation and Bureaucracy**

The contribution of the higher civil services and the higher judiciary to the nation has been immense. But the institution which has held the country in the first sixty years after the independence and contributed most to its progress and development till now is undoubtedly ‘the higher civil service’. Bureaucracy plays different role in decision making and implementation in different systems. Bureaucracy is considered merely an agent of the policy formulators. As Wallace Sayre has, aptly put it, as ‘not an autonomous brain in its own right but
rather the neutral executor of plans made by other. But this is not true for all systems. In most countries, bureaucracy is one of the important actors in making governmental decisions. In most contemporary systems, its power as decision maker has been steadily increasing. In some system bureaucracy takes initiative in policy proposal while in others it merely waits upon these proposals from its political bosses.

The role of bureaucracy in developing countries assumes a new significance in the post-independence era. Societies in developing countries are mostly traditional and stand in a need to get modernized with the help of science and technology. The activities of the State have increased manifold thereby making involvement of people and their representatives a pre-requisite for the formulation of policies, determination of priorities of programs and implementation of schemes. Thus bureaucracies of developing societies have to bear the brunt of these heavy responsibilities: First, in adjusting themselves to the new needs, aspirations and images of the new regimes and, secondly, in equipping themselves to face new challenges and cope with them by means of whatever manpower they have. Therefore, a change in attitudes, behavioral patterns, standards and ethics of performance has been considered necessary. Notably, the bureaucracy in a developing country enjoys virtual monopoly in terms of expertise, knowledge of rules and procedures. The political executives tend to lean heavily on bureaucracy for advice, guidance and counsel in policy formulation also.

The bureaucracy is classically considered an executive branch of the Government. This is a premier institution which performs most of the day to day work of Government. It is the bureaucracy that controls the personnel, resources, materials and legal powers of Government, and it is this institution that receives most of the implementation directives from the executive, legislative and judicial decision maker.\textsuperscript{35} Scholars have identified five key parameters of policy and decision making within the executive.\textsuperscript{36} First is the basic function of anticipating policy needs. Secondly, the bureaucracy has to develop systematically the various alternative course of action, indicated by the value premises, and an assessment of possibility. Thirdly, the bureaucracy is expected to suggest a specific choice of alternatives depending upon its assessment of what course of action would yield the optimum achievement of objectives. Fourthly, as the expert group and directly concerned party, the bureaucracy is expected to decide upon the instruments of implementation. Lastly, the bureaucracy has to apply general policy to specific instances that is to say, decide in individual cases. This consumes maximum time and attention of the bureaucracy and is the most obvious part of the policy implementation process.

Theoretically it may be assumed that the political machinery sets the national objectives and priorities, decides upon important policies, adopt development plans, allocate resources and provides bureaucracy with the necessary guidance for action, while it is the responsibility of bureaucracy to execute policies and plans that are formulated by the political leaders and to get
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things done in accordance with the political directives.\textsuperscript{37} The interaction between the political executive and bureaucracy is fundamental to the determination of bureaucratic influence in policy process. In a democratic State, the political executive represents victorious party at the poll. In non-democratic societies, it represents the ruling canons that preside over the destinies of the State. And in both democratic and non-democratic States, the task of preserving a stable balance between political and career officials is a continuing source of difficulty in framing Government policy.\textsuperscript{38} In some system, the political administrative division of the two groups of participants is marked more clearly and rigidly, and associated with a definite and well-understood differentiation of roles.

Merilee S. Grindle considers implementation to be a “general process of administrative action” which can be evaluated by measuring program outcomes against policy goals.\textsuperscript{39} The major task of administration in any given system is the implementation of public policies. Therefore, public administration as a discipline and as a functional system has basically concentrated on the machinery for the implementation of public policies, as given, rather than on making them.\textsuperscript{40} Civil servants are mainly concerned with the policy implementation. Political executives decide on policies, and civil servants implement those policies. Policy program implementation by the administrator feeds backs into policy formulation so that he can advise authoritatively from experience on the practicability of different policy options. Knowledge derived from policy implementation stage gives the senior administrator a near
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monopoly of knowledge relevant to policy making. As repositories of knowledge and experience, senior administrators are able to give instruction and advice to the lower staff as to how to implement policy decisions. They can foresee the administrative and political difficulties likely to be encountered from the interest more affected. They are able to argue about new methods of dealing with policy implementation problems. In this way the administrator’s role in policy implementation is of considerable importance. R.B. Jain in his article writes that it is the “responsibility of the bureaucracy to ensure that the policies are conceived so as to be relevant to prevailing conditions and implemented with patience and convictions”.

Legislation is never self-implementing but always requires delegation to appropriate organization and personnel. Placing a program in its perspective is the first task of implementation, and administering the day to day work of an established program is the second. It is because delegation and discretion permeates bureaucratic implementation that it plays a crucial role in the power structure of policy making and policy action. Technically the task of all public organizations and personnel is to implement, execute and enforce laws and policies. As Davis Remarks: “perhaps nine-tenths of the injustice in our legal system flows from discretion and perhaps only ten percent from rules”. In policy implementation, administrator especially senior executive should have the following functions and role to perform. Administrator must clearly understand the nature and significance of policies which the political master has set. They

are responsible for advising in the formulation of policies designed to achieve goals, and also mobilizing, organizing and managing the resources necessary to carry through these policies. Second, they should assist policy makers to avoid ambiguities. They should advise them on the importance of adopting policies which can be implemented. Third, they should be able to translate the general policies and their objectives into operational target. This function should also include analysis of probable costs and benefits of each for achieving the operational targets. As far as possible they should adopt a rational approach and use management techniques to implement policies. Finally, they should be able to pay special attention to the question of coordination of policies and policy instrument. They should analyze the policy in question in relation to other policies to see if any inconsistencies exist, and examine whether it complements or supplements other policies to produce better results.43

A U.N. publication points out:

They must always be aware that what they are asked to do may cause popular distress, disapproval or resistance. They should be aware of how subordinates, supported by the power of their offices, are likely to act, and what the consequence may be. They should be sensitive to the injuries that individuals will sustain if particular courses of action are followed.44 Moreover simple hierarchies and tiers in the system have given way to policy delivery system which uses a mix of partnership between the public and private sector, market mechanism and the voluntary sector.

T.N. Chautrvedi has commented that the civil service in India is expected to manifold roles. There is a need to match the role perception and role expectation so that, the role performed by the civil service is the maximum and satisfy the emergent needs of the community. Civil service is an instrument for implementation of people’s will and aspirations as expressed in the Constitution.\(^\text{45}\) In 1997 the Supreme Court of India felt impelled to pronounce on the normative functions that the bureaucracy needs must perform: “Every public servant is a trustee of the society and in all facets of public administration, every public servant has to exhibit honesty, integrity, sincerity and faithfulness in implementation of the political, social, economic and constitutional policies to integrate the nation, to achieve excellence and efficiency in the public administration. A public servant entrusted with duty and power to implement constitutional policy under Article 16(4), 16(4A), 15(4), 335 and all inter-related directive principles, should exhibit transparency in implementation and be accountable for due effectuation of constitutional goals”\(^\text{46}\).

In developing countries bureaucracy are actively involved in politics. And the reasons responsible for this blurring of the two areas are the ever-growing range and variety of governmental functions and their increasingly complex character. Consequently, needs of delegation in zones of sub policy arises where political executive is compelled to delegate its power to the administrative system. Secondly, a civil servant does not generally execute policies and decisions without his involvement in such decisions and policies. Practical


implications of policy are always relevant to the advice tendered by him and many a time, practical and political considerations become indistinguishable.

Implementation implies discretion and enthusiasm on the part of officials. Although it is possible for an individual to subjugate his personal wishes to carry out categorical imperatives of a superior authority, but as a senior civil servant observed, “where the thought process has to be invoked, where an element of discretion is involved, it is contrary to human nature to expect that he will be able to substitute his own thinking by that of rulers and exercise the discretion fully consistent with all the nuances of the original policy objectives. However, for a civil servant functioning at the higher level, such an exercise of discretion is essential, for no policy directive can cover all the circumstances which may arise from day to day on the basis of which numerous decision have to be taken”.

In any complex situation, policy making and policy execution are inter-related phenomena and influence each other. Often, policies have to be modified and revised in the course of their execution after taking into account the experience gained. Besides, policies are often subject to various interpretations. In such cases, the administrators responsible for the implementation of a policy can use their own discretion in its interpretation. Thus the modern State is heavily dependent upon bureaucracy both for policy formulation as well as policy execution.

**Interest Groups in Policy Implementation**

Interest groups exercise influence on the implementation process. Interest group is an important channel of communication for ordinary citizen. Dror
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nicely points out: “Because of discretion often vested in agencies by legislation, once an act is adopted, the group struggle shifts from the legislative to the administrative arena”.\footnote{Y. Dror, Public Policy Making Reexamined, New Brunswick: Transaction Publisher, 1989, p. 97.} Powerful interest groups pursue their interest at every stage in the policy implementation chain and use their tactics on weak links of the chain to influence the implementation process. In sphere like pollution control, land and agriculture policy, and in many other social policy areas, the interest groups affect administration. The cooperation with in the social implementation processes is seen as a way of managing and channeling conflicts of interest. Middlemas has put it thus, “As institutions cross the threshold separating pressure groups from a share of the State’s powers and authority, they enhance the tendency already present among Governments to categorize political choices in terms of the national interest, over and above class or sectional interest, and to accept as necessary an interdependence almost as binding as the medieval doctrine of organic society”.\footnote{K. Middlemas, Politics and Industrial Society, London: Croom Helm, 1979, p. 381.} Political parties also affect the policy implementation process. Political parties are often seen to be exerting their influence on both the executive and its branch, the bureaucracy, to implement policies which serve their purposes. They have been considered agents for establishing popular control over Government and policies.

**Problems in Policy Implementation**

Woodrow Wilson had emphasized the need for sound implementation of policies and programs and advocated politics – administration dichotomy. Though the Wilsonian dichotomy is no longer accepted. The soundness of his observation that ‘it is getting to be harder to run a Constitution than to frame...
made in 1887 is universally acknowledged. A policy or program is necessarily implemented in the field though it is made in the Secretariat. The implementation process necessarily gets tied up with the dynamics of relationship between different implementing agencies in the field. Plan implementation requires cooperation, coordination and commitment at all levels of implementing machinery starting with the ministries at the Central State level through the various non-secretariat organizations in the field of at district, block or village level. And policy is only as good as its implementation. The National Environment Policy outlines a significant number of new and continuing initiatives for enhancing environmental conservation. This requires the coordinated actions of diverse actor, for the major part organized and stimulated by one or more public agencies.

While coordination and review mechanism are necessary in respect of the individual action plans under each of the strategic themes at relevant operational levels, a formal, periodic high level review of implementation of different elements of the National Environment Policy is essential. This would enhance accountability of the different public agencies responsible for implementation. It would also reveal practical issues in implementation, including absence of political will at concerned level or official indifference\(^{51}\) effective implementation requires sustained political and administration commitment and support for the policy. The political environment inevitably affects implementation process in varying ways. Planning and implementation are

\(^{50}\) Woodrow Wilson, The Study of Public Administration, *Political Science Quarterly*, June 1887, p. 4.

intimately connected. To quote Mr. Goetz, “plan alone cannot make an enterprise successful. Action is required, the enterprise must operate. Plan can, however, focus action on purposes. They can forecast which action will tend toward the ultimate objective… which tend away, which will likely offset one another, and which are merely irrelevant. Managerial planning seeks to achieve a consistent coordinated structures of operations focused on desired ends. Without plans, action must become random activity, producing nothing but chaos”.  

Implementation highlights the crucial role which the lower echelons of administration necessarily play. As B. Guy Peter observes, “It is the top on the beat as opposed to the commissioner, chief of police or other level personnel, who determines what the operational policy is going to be … As a general rule, it is necessary to discuss and understand the operations of the lowest levels of administration into order to fully understand administration. Unfortunately, most of the literature on administration deals only with the upper echelon”. Brian Hogwood and Guy Peters rightly observed: the field staff must actually put the new policy into effect on the ground and it is therefore crucial to co-opt the field staff into the acceptance – it not support of a new policy. It is perhaps more important to influence the field staff than the top leadership. They continue: it is at that level that real decision about clients will be reached, and perhaps an importantly as it is at that level of the organization that the new programs will have to be ‘sold’ to client who may be skeptical or outright hostile to the changes in their programs. 

Lack of administrative capability in implementation also poses a threat to successful implementation. Administrative capability is the capacity to obtain proposed results with the help of organization. In an organization resources are mobilized and transformed by use of administrative skills and technology to achieve desired goals. Administrative leadership or capability is an important means of converting or processing programs inputs into outputs. It has been mentioned by Gabriel that “what makes the leadership variable so crucial in the implementation process is its dynamic, not passive equality, i.e., its capability to act and react on these critical inputs. It is this manipulative and transferring quality of leadership that could significantly determine the administrative capability of implementing organization.55

Communication is an essential element of policy implementation. Through communication, orders to implement policies are transmitted to appropriate personnel in a clear manner while such orders must be accurate and consistent. Broadly speaking communication is the means by which intentions of the program are classified to ensure fruitful result. It may even be looked upon as the means by which special information inputs are fed into social systems. It is the means by which behavior of personnel engaged in the program is modified; change is affected, information is made productive and goals are achieved.56 Barnard has rightly viewed it as the means by which people can be linked together in an organization to achieve the objective of program.57

55. Gabriel V. Iglesias, College of Public Administration, University of Philippines, “Administrative Capability as neglected dimension in the implementation of Developing program and projects”, Seventh General Assembly and Conference of EROPA on “Implementation, the problem of achieving results”, 24-31, October 1973, vol. II.
Inadequate information can lead to misinterpretation by implementers may cause serious obstacles to policy implementation problems. Distorted communication can destroy the objective of policy. Order should be transmitted in clear terms; this will maximize the acceptance of orders. There must be effective communication between the target groups and implementers of policy programs.

One major cause of weak implementation is that organizational structure of Government is incompatible with the functional requirement of national development. In developing countries institutions engaged in policy planning and implementation are generally weak and low performance. The institutional structures in their current form are inadequate for responding to the emerging environmental challenges, including river cleaning, management of waste, hazardous substances and plastic management, dealing with chemical contamination, monitoring compliance with environmental clearances, etc. There is no suitable authority to comprehensively and efficiently implement the Environment Protection Act 1986. Several recent reports have called for an institutional redesign. The Report of the Steering Committee on the Environment and Forest Sector for the 11th Five Year Plan (2007) recommended the setting up of a National Environment Clearance Authority. The report also found it critical to urgently upgrade and strengthen the Pollution Regulatory Authority. Similarly, the 192nd report (2008) of the Departmental Parliamentary Standing Committee on Science and Technology and Environment and Forest on the functioning of Central Pollution Control Board on various counts.58
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Public involvement in policy implementation is of crucial importance. For policies to be successful the target group should be involved actively. The target group should allow participating in policies intended to benefit them. Participation will give the target group a sense of belonging as well as get them committed to the successful implementation of policy. The non-attainment of the birth rate targets adopted in the plans is largely on account of our inability to carry forward the program throughout the country with the active involvement of the people. Jagmohan Singh Verma has rightly mentioned that, “A widely prevalent notion in this country is that family planning is a program imposed arbitrarily by Government due to its firm belief in the controlled rate of population growth for the progress of nation, and people have not yet realized the intensity of the need to practice family planning”. Public enthusiasm and community participation in the program which is necessary for its success has not been generated in adequate measures. This program is still viewed by the public as a routine governmental activity. There is a need for projecting the program as a people program backed by support from governmental and non-governmental agencies.\textsuperscript{59} The chief of the implementing agency must properly educate the personnel along with the citizens regarding different facets of the policy being implemented. It would also facilitate the support and cooperation form the public for policy. The implementers should strive to mobilize public support and form favorable public opinion regarding the objectives of policy to be implemented by them.

Corruption has greatly contributed to the failure of policy implementation. Lack of motivation, misutilization of funds, no coercive actions against defaulters and poor working condition also hinders the implementation process. Comptroller and Auditor General in its report bring out a number of irregularities in the implementation of the Rural Employment Programs. These irregularities include “diversion of funds to other programs, works undertaken which were not approved under the program, misappropriation of large amount of funds, delay in payment of wages, and payment of wages at lower than the minimum wage, non-adherence to the stipulated minimum 60 per cent of the total expenditure on wage component to maximize the primary objective of employment generation, failure to prepare and follow the shelf of projects and annual action plan, engagement of contractor for JRY/EAS works depriving employment generation which could be provided in the contractor margin, creation of non-durable assets, particularly rural katcha roads, abandoned works, non-utilization and non-maintenance of assets created under the program, etc.”

Policy goals can be achieved only when there is an effective system of implementation and monitoring. Effective monitoring can ensure the proper execution of policy with good result in the shortest amount of time. Policy monitoring has come to mean the process of observing policy implementation progress and resource utilization, and anticipating deviations from expected policy outcomes. “Monitoring can be defined to be the process of inducing action for adherence to schedule”. 61

10th five year plan has observed that in “the absence of adequate monitoring and evaluation of plan programs and other non-
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plan activities, there is a considerable amount of wastage, leakages and spill over of programs over successive plans, leading to less than optimal use of the scarce public resources in the development process”.

This is an account of the fact that the existing mechanism for monitoring and evaluation have neither been adequately used by the agencies responsible for implementing various programs nor has there been any visible effort to improve and strengthen these mechanism over time. CAG in its reports find that inadequate monitoring hampered the overall effectiveness of implementation of projects/schemes. In a project on “Bio-remediation of Raila Devi lake in Thane district, Maharashtra” a monitoring Committee constituted for the project not only once against four prescribed meeting leading to non-preparation of action plan, delays in completion of project and non-reviewed of final technical reports by the monitoring Committee. Lack of monitoring poses a serious threat to implementation process and also leads to corruption which is another hindrance to policy process.

In developing countries, most of the policies are not implemented in full scale because of lack of trained staff and financial resources. The CPCB and the State Board are heavily reliant on the funds directly provided by the Ministry of Environment and Forests. The SPCBs especially receive only marginal funding from the Central Government and mostly through specific projects to be executed at a State level. According to the CPCB, the SPCBs are dependent on
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63 Ibid., p. 186.
the reimbursement of cess/tax collected under the water (Prevention and control of pollution) Act and other consent and authorization fees imposed on industries. The Departments of Environment at the State level also face a similar problem, being unable to enforce laws due to adequate financial support. For a country with about 7500 kms. of coastline, the Coastal Regulation Zone (CRZ) Notification 1991 set out a range of activities for its own implementation such as preparation of maps, coastal zone, management plans and zone demarcation. Such a significant statute was not backed up with finding support, thereby all the above activities necessary for its effective implementation did not quite enthusiastic to the State Governments. Implementation implies allocating personnel resources to the appropriate task and activities to achieve the policy objective. All the personnels engaged in a policy implementation program need to work as a unit for the purpose of achieving policy results. But sometime lack of the allocation of work to personnel also hinders implementation other problems could be paucity of staff; financial and infrastructural constraints; unrealistic targets; and shortage of time. A more effective implementation demands a lighter project planning implementation shortfall reveal imperfect knowledge about the micro situation, inadequate data base and time resource constraints.

Lack of dedicated staff at block district and State level and non-compliance to policy guidelines also hinders the implementation process. Many policies are not performing well up to their potential because of these lacunas. Audit report 2009 on implementation of NREGs in Orissa highlighted that “Dedicated administrative and account assistants were not posted in any of the blocks of the State for proper record keeping and financial management. Despite
mandatory requirement, project executed by line department were neither identified nor approved by gram sabha. The Act and the Government of India’s operational guideline issued there under provided for a full time dedicated Program Officer (PO) for each block and executive staff at GP block, district and State level for planning, implementation monitoring of the schemes. Problems connected with policy implementation in developing countries are intertwined with basic socio-economic and political conditions. The policy maker must be able to consider the environment – social, economic, political in which policy are formulated. Policy implementation requires State stability and sustained political and administration commitment and support for the decided course of action. The political environment inevitably affects implementation processes in varying ways. Even organizational hierarchy have to contend with problem of rationality, sub unit loyalty, weak supervision etc. which impair implementation. Implementation is not an easy task the utmost care must be taken to ensure effective execution.

The Economic Administration Reform Commission headed by L.K. Jha was confronted by the widely held belief that India’s major failure has been on the administrative front and that the machinery for the implementation of plan has not been equal to the tasks emphasized the need for step which can be taken to improve the implementation of plans. Public policies are formulated by the political executive but executed by the bureaucracy, which is rule bound and rigid. The success and failures of various programs of socio-economic

development have depended on the capacity of bureaucracies. Implementation is intertwined with the nature of policies. Implementation problems must be explicitly considered when policies are formulated.

Effective implementation of a policy depends largely on a well-made policy. It is not easy to discern or decide as to what is a well-made or the right in a given sector, in a given situation. Disagreements, even strong ones, are common and, in a democratic society, both are inevitable and healthy. Yehezkel Dror has mentioned that “qualified manpower in the developing countries is the scarcest resource of all”. He observed that there is a lack of qualified professional in policy making occupations, and few qualified personnel for central policy making puts a street specific limit on how good policy making can be. According to him “knowledge and information are another very scarce resource, partly because of the lack of professionally qualified manpower, but more importantly because the knowledge, both factual data about the respective countries and scientific theories that could help accelerate development, often does not exist”. Qualified manpower and knowledge are crucial factor for sound policy formulation. Lack of sound policy design also affects the implementation process. Sometime policy designs are not compatible to the capacity of implementation agencies. W. Williams makes an attempt to identify ways in which policy failure can be prevented. He exhorts policy makers to pay more attention to implementation capacity and sets out a checklist of questions: (a) How well articulated is the policy to the implementers? (b) How capable are the
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policy makers of developing meaningful guidelines for assisting the implementers? (c) How capable are the implementers to develop and carry out new policy? (d) How much ability/ power do either (i.e. the policy makers or implementers) have to change the order?

For efficient implementation of public policy, the internal procedure should be simple and clearly defined. They should define the roles at different levels. These procedures should also take into account the speed and responsiveness; avoid unnecessary delays and incorporate the insight of intermediaries. Simple internal procedures, where in roles at specific levels are defined clearly, result in efficient implementation.72 According to C. Hood, efficient implementation requires the fulfillment of the following conditions:

1. “The subject matter of implementation must gain complete political acceptability and import. This is a pre-requisite.

2. The resource availability of required scale and quality must be ensured.

3. The administrative system for the program must be organized on the army line with a single line of command. The administrative system must in other words, be unitary.

4. Rules to be enforced must be uniform and objective must clearly ascertainable.

5. Existence of well enforced obedience and administrative control.

6. High level communication and coordination should prevail between administrative units”73

Effective implementation hinges on such factors as availability and skill of personnel, complementary activities and supportive roles of participating agencies, acceptance from the target group and persistence of organized effort. Effective and successful implementation requires that implementers know what they are supposed to do. If involves the degree to which program/project objectives and standard are transmitted to implementers clearly and accurately. Effective implementation is the combination of design features, agency behavior, and target group reactions. The implementation rate can be quickened by improving program/project management and success is verifiable by focusing on performance. Policy statement should be in clear terms. The implementers often face a number of problems because they do not find the policy statement made in clear terms. To minimize implementation deficit and to achieve stated objectives, implementors should insist on ensuring the unambiguous nature of program/project, keeping links in the chain to a minimum and preventing undue outside interference. According to C. Han and M. Hill, successful implementation must require satisfactory solution of the following problems:

1. “Nature of the policy the policy should be unambiguous.

2. The links in the chain of the implementation structure must be kept to minimum.

3. Prevention of outside interference.

4. Control over implementing actors”.  
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Sabatier and Mazmanian go further and identify five conditions for effective policy implementation. These are: (1) the policy is based on a study theory relating changes in target group behavior to the achievements of the desired end-State (objectives); (2) the statute (or other basic policy decision) contains unambiguous policy directives and structure of the implementation so as to maximize the likelihood that target groups will perform as desired; (3) the leaders of the implementation agencies possess substantial managerial and political skill and are committed to statutory goals; (4) the policy is actively supported by organized constituency groups and by a key legislator (or the chief executive) throughout the implementation process, with the court being neutral or supportive and (5) The relative priority of statutory objectives is not significantly undermined over time by the emergence of conflicting public policies or by change in relevant socio-economic conditions that undermine the statute’s technical theory or political support.  

The argument put forward by these authors is that problems can be avoided by anticipating complications and difficulties prior to implementation. Implementation needs to be dynamic, flexible and adaptable to changing situation. Support building is critical to effective implementation. The quality of the agency personnel influences implementation effective communication network, necessary control over staff, leadership style influence individual identification with the agency goals and objective also facilitate the effective implementation.

Policy Evaluation and Impact

Policy Evaluation plays a noteworthy role in the policy process. Evaluation is concerned with what happens once a policy has been put it into effect. It is concerned with the worth or social utility of a policy or program. Policy evaluation is a means of getting the policy makers the relevant information and knowledge regarding a policy problem, about the relative purposefulness and effectiveness of past and prevailing strategies for addressing, reducing or eliminating the problem, and regarding the observed effectiveness of specific policies. According to J.S. Wholey “Policy evaluation is the assessment of the overall effectiveness of a national program in meeting its objectives, or assessment of the relative effectiveness of two or more programs in meeting common objectives.”77 The major aim of policy evaluation is to determine the impact of the policies and provide required feedback to the policy framers and implementers for ushering improvements in the policy already made or in its executing mechanism.

Evaluation performs several functions in policy analysis, it provides reliable information about policy performance. The objective of evaluation here is to measure the impact of policies on society. It reveals the goal achievement level and helps to understand the degree to which policy issues have been resolved. Evaluation also helps to clarify the values that underline the selection of goals and objectives. Since appropriateness of policy goals and objectives can be questioned in relation to the problem being addressed, evaluation provides procedures for valuing the goals objectives on its own. Evaluation may also

result in efforts to restructure policy problems. It may also contribute to the emergence of new objectives and potential solutions. Evaluation is primarily an effort to analyze policy outcomes in terms of some sets of objectives.

When evaluating the success or failure of programs, multiple criteria are available among which evaluators must choose.\textsuperscript{78} Frohock\textsuperscript{79} has suggested four concepts – Equity, Efficiency, Pareto Optimality and Public Interest as helpful in evaluating policy. Dunn’s six dimensional criteria for evaluation provide the following: Effectiveness concern, “Has the valued outcome been achieved?” Efficiency Measures,” How much effort was required to achieve a valued result?” Adequacy is, “To what extent does the achievement of a valued outcome resolve the problem? Equity involves the question, “Are costs and benefit distributed equitably among different groups?” Responsiveness concerns the question, “Do policy outcomes satisfy the needs, preference or values of particular groups?” Appropriateness seeks an answer to “Are desired outcomes (objectives) actually worthy and valuable?”\textsuperscript{80} Smith has suggested three major categories for policy judgment. First, there is criterion of the policy design which views the policy from the perspective of its appropriateness and agreement with its objective and means, second criterion deals with policy process. The third criteria relates to policy achievement.\textsuperscript{81}

Public policies can be judged in terms of their design, different policies are evaluated by using different criteria depend on the nature of policy. The

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{81} Thomas B. Smith, Analysis of Policy Failure: A Three Dimensional Framework”, op. cit., p. 3.
\end{itemize}
Criterion of appropriateness is used to evaluate such policies where conflicts are likely to be more instance. Appropriateness refers to value of the objectives of program. Is the policy based upon appropriate values and ideologies? Will the policies lead to disruption and violence, or be greeted with agreement. This dimension is concerned with judgment about a policy’s fitness and suitability. Redistributive public policies generate intense conflicts by those who feel they are losing from the policy. Such policies cannot be judged on effectiveness and efficiency criteria, though are achieving their objective in an efficient manner.

Some policies are evaluated on the basis of responsiveness which means that a policy satisfies the needs or values of a particular group. “Policy makers place premium upon agreement and consensus among participants in the policy making process. Compromise and accommodation become the central concern, as the determination of ends and objectives become tangled with the search for suitable means and alternatives to achieve those objectives”.82 The success of a policy is measured by the extent to which there is consensus and agreement that the policy is acceptable to the policy actors; those who have formulated it, the implementers and the affected target group. Failure occurs when a policy generates excessive conflict, dissension, opposition and perhaps violence.83

Another criterion for evaluation of public policies is on the basis of its effectiveness. Effectiveness is a measure of the policy programs productivity in yielding desired technical results. This criteria cannot measure the success and failure of a particular policy meant to reduced poverty, raise living standard, provide education and health so forth. Efficiency is equated with economic
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rationality, economic analysis stresses that the program or project with the highest benefit to cost ratio is most efficient and should have an edge over others. Making judgment about efficiency requires a perspective of public policy in terms of identifiable sub unit, such as projects or particular work practices. This criterion cannot be used to evaluate all Government policies. Because it is difficult to break Government agencies and public policies into small sector unit for analysis, although some public sector unit can be assessed this way.

Adequacy refers to whether given level of effectiveness results in the satisfaction of needs or values. While the policy effectiveness criteria deals with the relationship between policy goals and what is achieved, the adequacy of a policy refers to the relationship between the policy and the problem to which it is addressed. Some policies may achieve its stated objective, but it has a little impact upon the problem being addressed by the policy. In India sustained efforts are being made to deal with the homeless problem, but the problem persists. In this criterion of policy judgment, beneficiaries and target groups often view Government action as not adequate, while the political executive is prone to argue that enough is being done.

The criteria of equity is closely related to fair or just distribution of effects and efforts. Policies designed to redistribute income, employment opportunities are often recommended on the basis of equity criteria. Individuals and groups have different objectives and values what satisfies one person or a group may not satisfy other.
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Another criterion suggested by Frohock\textsuperscript{85} for evaluating public policy is Pareto Optimality. According to Pareto Optimality criteria, a policy that makes one or several persons better off without hurting anyone else is desirable. A policy that helps some at the expense of others is, therefore, undesirable. Welfare policies cannot be evaluated on the basis of this criteria. In welfare policies someone’s benefits may be a loss for another. Public interest is another criteria for judging a policy’s success or failure. People’s participation is an important dimension of policy making process. The Government should accordingly come out with policies that serve the needs of the people. After implementation, the policy monitors and evaluators should focus on policy objectives.

The descriptions of these eight dimensional criteria are not always applied. It is often found that policy and program evaluators have primarily focus upon the effectiveness and efficiency criteria or a combination of both. However, in third world countries evaluators use narrow economic criteria or to present glowing accounts rather than grim realities. A serious evaluation can end as “an exercise in public relations or as a form of window dressing.”\textsuperscript{86}

Some third world nations have democratic society, the public role in the policy process is expanded and a far more conducive environment for program evaluation exists.\textsuperscript{87} Evaluation is conditioned by the political environment. Policies and policy process are not static entities in an unchanging environment.

\textsuperscript{85} Fred M. Frohock, op.cit., pp.88-98
of the public policy process. In western democracies regular elections allow citizens to evaluate the performance of political leaders and the Government in making and implementing public policies. Individuals and groups freely participate in the political process and may be critical of what Government is doing without fear of arrest or harassment. The media and the opposition leadership are free to highlight the ineptitude and success of Government and public policies using criteria such as efficiency, effectiveness, the appropriateness of policy, its adequacy to resolve the problem or in regard to implementation slippage.\footnote{88} While in some third world nations having democratic system, the public’s role in the policy process is expanded and a far more conducive environment for program evaluation exists in India, Evaluation research has been encouraged which is highly critical of Government programs. Important program, such as the Integrated Rural Development Program, have undergone continuous rigorous evaluation by several individuals and organizations\footnote{89} while policy evaluation in authoritarian regimes by analyst as well as the media and citizens is discouraged, and if conducted, tends to avoid focusing upon effectiveness, or implementation.\footnote{90}

**Policy Impact**

“Impact assessment are undertaken to estimate whether or not intervention produce their intended effects….. The basic aim of an impact assessment is to produce an estimate of the ‘net-effects’ of an intervention”.\footnote{91}
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\footnote{90}{T.B. Smith, Policy Evaluation in Third World Countries: Some issues and Problems, op. cit., pp. 55-68.}
According to Thomas R. Dye, the impact of a policy includes:

1. “It's Impact on the target situation or group.
2. Its impact on situations or groups other than target (Spillover effects”)
3. Its impact on future as well as immediate conditions.
4. Its direct costs, in terms of resources devoted to the program.
5. Its indirect costs including loss of opportunities to do other things”.

The impact of a policy includes both its symbolic and tangible effects.

Impact assessment involves identity changes in the environment or the political system that are associated with measures of Government activity. It is difficult to identify the indirect and symbolic costs of public programs. It is also difficult to measure benefit in terms of general social wellbeing. Impact evaluation is done at the post implementation stage of a policy cycle. Ineffective implementation effects policy impacts, Rothchild and Curry note that,

“….where policies can be implemented it becomes difficult in developing countries to appraise the effect of these actions on the economy and the society. The problem of evaluation, substantially greater than in the more developed countries, is primarily attributable to a lack of reliable knowledge. Because feedback information is often inadequate, planning organization find it difficult to determine the effect public measures have had in the real world. …policy making agencies in developing lands find themselves isolated (often in the main urban center) from events taking place around them, unable to gauge the actual consequences of public decision through lack of contact and communication.”

Impact evaluation seeks to measure how the policy/program has actually
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impacted upon the problems to which it was addressed. The utility of a policy could be ascertained through the impact assessment. If the policy fails to deliver the intended services, it could be terminated. Policy impact contributes the process of a policy change.

Recent researches in policy outcomes in India indicate that the impact of Government policies on various aspects of economic and industrial outcomes (GNP, employment, inflation, and soon) is at best marginal, compared with wider factors, such as the impact of the international economy. In a review of certain policies of France, Japan, U.K. and U.S.A., Martin Haroop concludes that the impact of public policies is in reality, for more limited than is generally supposed: “Changes within sectors are driven by more fundamental forces than Government policy. In health, current improvements in the population’s health once more to changing lifestyle than to publicly funded treatment. In law and order, the crime rate responds more to trends such as urbanization, than to policy strategies. In minority’s policies, improved life chances for minorities owe more to changing attitudes than to legislation. And in industry, Governments are just one of many influences on economic competitiveness. In short, liberal democratic Governments operate at the margin, seeking to react to developments they do not control and which often they cannot foresee.”

To argue that policy outcomes are the results of social and economic forces is to underestimate the importance of policies. As Sharpe and Newton Comment in their defense of politics: “Viewed as a whole process of policy making the political factor embraces not just the determinant of public policy
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outputs, but also the selection and processing of the inputs of the political system. The shape or the path of policy outcomes must be set in the context of a multiplicity of factors: political leadership, economic and social conditions, technology, international economic forces, political parties and interest groups, present and past politics, institutional arrangement and distribution of power. One or more of these forces as having a determining or dominant role would contribute to outcomes of public policy.