

# Implementing and evaluating public policy simulation summary\_303

[Law](#)



Check and balance is at the core of the functional determination of government policy and their enforcement. When policymakers are confined to the dictates of lobbyists without considering the overall effects that represent the other side of the spectrum, then politicians are bound to serve only one interest to the detriment of the majority. The existence of these interests groups that embody a different argument in the debate paints a more holistic picture of the entire issue. This serves as a balancing force that compels politicians to reconsider their stance on any given issue and how they shall act upon it fully knowing that there are people concerned and will criticize them if necessary.

Lobbyists have been known and branded for their influence on how policies are developed and which ones are actually seen by the light of day. Influence peddlers are rampant in the halls of Congress. Lobbying has turned into a profession and has since been regulated. "A professional lobbyist - one who has mastered the techniques of lobbying...- is a valuable ally to any interest group seeking to influence government" (Sidlow and Henschen, 2009, p. 141). They represent the loud minority view and quite often are fuelled by large corporations with deep pockets. In the given case involving Governor Nunez and outsourcing, one member of his team is Sylvia Baldwin, a corporate lobbyist for Levine & Associates closely associated to Information Technology. Another is Dr. Ramona Gaitanis who is an advocate of free trade and global competitiveness, which is the very essence of outsourcing. Seemingly, the only neutral member of the team is William Morrison who is an expert in policy initiatives but his stance on the issue was not made clear. Upon looking at the qualifications of the team members, it is apparent that

they are one-dimensional which makes it understandable why the Governor voted for outsourcing. Without powerful interest groups, lobbyists are bound to get their way with impunity disregarding other stakeholders. To reiterate, there is no black without white and that both must co-exist for the general good.

There is a great possibility that continued fine-tuning in policy implementation renders the implementer to overlook the core problem he is trying to solve. By trying to translate the spirit of the policy through its implementation, or at least make it workable, the implementer somewhat develops tunnel vision and forgets the main purpose of the policy. Program implementation is different from development and this is mainly affected the organization concerned. There is a discord “ between policy implementation and policy intentions” (Hill and Hupe, 2002, p. 162). They change things as they go along the way and find out what works and what does not. It becomes a prolonged progression of multiple trial and errors. All these alterations, small as they may be, when carried on and repeated to answer every other detail removes the essence of the ideals the policy intended. The enforcer removes himself from the simple fact of what was planned to be addressed initially.

The policy's termination can have a different effect depending on the reception of the public and its effectiveness. If a program is actually productive and directly addresses issues in the neighbourhood then its cessation might draw the ire of people especially those who benefit from it. When it is addressed to a specific dilemma then whatever progress might have already been achieved will be in vain and its abandonment might only

worsen the situation consequently. However, if the policy proved to be but a nuisance or that it fails to tackle an important issue then its termination will only return the neighbourhood to the previous status quo without qualifications and what was spent, monetarily or otherwise, had only been a futile exercise of government initiative.

### Bibliography

Hill, M. and Hupe, P. (2002). *Implementing public policy*. California: Sage Publications Inc. Retrieved September 16, 2012 from Google Books: [http://books.google.com.ph/books?id=gvOlV0ZiIBgC&printsec=frontcover&dq=policy+implementation&source=bl&ots=KfRepaVB2d&sig=ccsXpbwhDFzEM8d64XCqb-fcslg&hl=en&sa=X&ei=KsFUULu3GI6nrAeB0IG4Cg&redir\\_esc=y#v=onepage&q=policy%20implementation&f=false](http://books.google.com.ph/books?id=gvOlV0ZiIBgC&printsec=frontcover&dq=policy+implementation&source=bl&ots=KfRepaVB2d&sig=ccsXpbwhDFzEM8d64XCqb-fcslg&hl=en&sa=X&ei=KsFUULu3GI6nrAeB0IG4Cg&redir_esc=y#v=onepage&q=policy%20implementation&f=false).

Sidlow, E. and Henschen, B. (2009). *America at odds*. California: Wadsworth Cengage Learning. Retrieved September 16, 2012 from Google Books: [http://books.google.com.ph/books?id=EP8nsdd0IRgC&printsec=frontcover&dq=policy+implementation+lobbyist&source=bl&ots=ZiZxmzm0mF&sig=MCph4lsimQILn8nE8zMg6od0d0I&hl=en&sa=X&ei=Nl1UUIjdKs3jrAfRjoD4CA&redir\\_esc=y#v=onepage&q&f=false](http://books.google.com.ph/books?id=EP8nsdd0IRgC&printsec=frontcover&dq=policy+implementation+lobbyist&source=bl&ots=ZiZxmzm0mF&sig=MCph4lsimQILn8nE8zMg6od0d0I&hl=en&sa=X&ei=Nl1UUIjdKs3jrAfRjoD4CA&redir_esc=y#v=onepage&q&f=false)