



Policy Making and Role of Civil Services

Dr. Achchhan Rathore

Associate Professor, Dept. of Public Administration, MS College, Bikaner, Rajasthan, India

ABSTRACT: Policymaking demands the collection of relevant data and information to identify core issues. Civil servants owing to their diverse knowledge and expertise provide relevant data for substantiating policy proposals. Bureaucrats create and rephrase policy ideas based on their knowledge, experience, and understanding of public affairs, taking into account various aspects of the constitution, laws enacted by parliament, and other existing rules and regulations.

KEYWORDS- policy making, role, civil, services, parliament

I.INTRODUCTION

In India Civil Services are divided into 3 categories and these are: All India Service, Central Service, State Service. The members of these services perform their duties for both centre and state hence they are known as All India Services. Services with members working only for the Union Government are called Central Civil Services. In India state governments also have their own services. The services are divided in 4 categories (Group: A, B, C and D.) and this categorisation is same in centre and state both.

- The importance of the civil services is huge, especially in a country like India. Diversity is every aspect and meeting the constitutional goals for social, political, and economic justice, reducing inequality, providing etc. Hence in this task the role of the civil Services is very crucial for achieving inclusive growth and greater improving quality of life.[1,2,3]

Basis of Governance:

- The main role of Civil Services is in transformation policies from on paper to grass root level. Like Government forms policies at the top level then these policies have some programmes for achieving specific targets and for achieving said objectives and targets these programmes transformed into projects and then to task at very micro level. The role of Bureaucracy nowadays is becoming very crucial as now the government is looking to reduce its role to just “regulator, mediator, underwriter, provider of services, promoter of national standards of decent living and economic and social diagnostician and repairman”.
- Be it any political system parliamentary or Presidential, Democratic or Communists all these countries or political systems need Regardless of their political system (democratic or communist), all countries require administrative apparatus to carry out policy.
- Policy Making and Policy Implementation and Collection of Relevant Data: Policymaking demands the collection of relevant data and information to identify core issues. Civil servants owing to their diverse knowledge and expertise provide relevant data for substantiating policy proposals.
- Think-Tanks of the Government: Since civil servants work on ground realities, they well understand the problems and their likely solutions. Their diverse knowledge and experience are then put to use by assuming the role of think tanks of the government.
- Policy Formulation: Bureaucrats create and rephrase policy ideas based on their knowledge, experience, and understanding of public affairs, taking into account various aspects of the constitution, laws enacted by parliament, and other existing rules and regulations.
- Implementing Laws and Policies of the Government: Civil servants regulate the behaviour of the people by implementing laws and policies. Civil services provide the administrative machinery through which the development objective of the government is achieved.



- Provisioning Services to the People:

⇒ Maintaining law and order. Example: Prevention of organised crime, hate crimes, maintain peace and harmony among various sections of the society.

⇒ Protection of the environment against pollution, illegal cutting of forest, illegal sand mining, or other unauthorised extraction of natural resources.

⇒ Management of public enterprises in order to achieve socio-economic equality.[4,5,6] Between 1995 and 2012, E.g., E. Sreedharan, a civil engineer, is credited with changing the face of public transportation in India with his leadership in the construction of the Konkan Railway and the Delhi Metro while serving as managing director of the Delhi Metro Rail Corporation (DMRC).

- Welfare Services: Civil servants ensure the welfare of the people by implementing various government schemes such as MGNREGA, Beti Bachao Beti Padhao, PM Garib Kalyan Yojana, PM Matru Vandana yojana, and so on. Most importantly the efforts and level of the administrative system worked in Pandemic/ Covid-19.
- Maintain Continuity in Administration: Being a permanent executive, Bureaucracy is called as steel frame hence even after change in government after every 5 years. For example, when the President’s rule imposed in any state under the A-356 Governor carries out administration with aid and help from the Chief Secretary of the state and as usual other officials and staff.

- Important Functions Carried Out by the Civil Servants:

⇒ In every ministries/ department policy and work is carried out by the civil servants.

⇒ Management and administration of financial operations like collection of taxes (both direct and indirect) etc is one of the key responsibilities of the Bureaucracy.

⇒ With various organisational methods for reforms has been used for efficient and effective administration also they perform various responsibilities like performing administrative adjudication and tribunals etc.

II.DISCUSSION

We believe in the potential of government to bring about better outcomes for people. Yet, we have found that the systems, structures, and processes of government today are often not set up to respond to the complex challenges we face as a society. [7,8,9]

That’s why we have an emerging vision to reimagine government so that it works for everyone.

We act as a learning partner for governments, public servants, and the diverse network of changemakers leading the charge to reimagine government. We work with them to hold space to collectively make sense of the complex challenges we face and drive meaningful change through experimentation and learning.

As policy making has increasingly been recognized to involve interest groups, analytical frameworks have been developed of state–interest group relations. Initially, there were limited and simple categories, such as issue networks, iron triangles, and policy communities. However, more complex policy network ‘models’ have been created that offer typologies of state–interest group relations and then seek to explain the forms of such relations. Most recently interorganizational approaches to policy networks have been established that draw on institutional and collective action frameworks that examine policy making by studying how the formation of ties among actors influences network output and the interaction among actors. Network frameworks allow inclusion of public and private actors and represent a move away from seeing policy making as an activity confined to public actors arranged in a simple hierarchy of relations.

III.RESULTS

1) Public Policy Process

Policy-making processes or cycles emphasize an initiative to solve problems and may take the form of programs, projects, and budget allocations. Scholars have identified various interfaces to map the stages of the policy cycle,



thereby helping to structure its analysis. In this framework, public policy is seen as a sequence of functional activities. Dye (1981) presents the following interfaces of policy process:

- Problem Identification—identifying societal problems, publicizing the problems, expressing demands for government action.
- Agenda Setting—deciding issues and problems and their alternatives to be addressed by the government.
- Policy Formulation—developing policy proposals to resolve issues and ameliorate problems.
- Policy Legitimation—selecting a proposal, developing political support for it, and enacting it into law.
- Policy Implementation—to carry a policy into effect.
- Policy Evaluation—reporting outputs of government programs, evaluating impacts of policies on target groups, and proposing changes and reforms.

In actuality, policy-making often does chronologically follow the sequence of activities listed above. It helps to capture the flow of action in the policy process. However, in order to simplify the discussion, the policy-making process is classified into three broad stages—policy formulation, policy implementation, and policy evaluation.[10,11,12]

The first stage, which is policy formulation, involves developing pertinent and acceptable proposed courses of action for dealing with public problems. Through this process the demands of the system are converted into policies. But before this it has to be clearly recognized as to which demands require to be converted into policies. At the policy interpretation level, the formulated public policy is further clarified and interpreted in order to make it fully understandable. Thus, before proceeding to the next stage at least, the technical soundness of the proposed policy is analyzed and ascertained. The goals of the policy are prioritized, the means of achieving them identified, the time requirements for each goal established, and the physical and human resource requirements identified. The government through several channels of mass media attempts to make the people aware of the formulated and adopted policies.

In any modern political systems, after the formulation stage comes the stage of policy implementation (the most critical stage of policy cycle), when the policies are systematically executed by bureaucracy (administrative agencies) at the central, state, and local levels. Policy implementation is not an easy task as it involves the conscious conversion of policy commitments into reality. To ascertain the impact of policies, it is very essential to keep an eye on the implementation process, to see that expenditure does not exceed the possessions accessible and to see that policies are positively affecting those for whom they are being made (Abdulsalami, 1987). The final stage is the policy evaluation stage which involves the assessment of a public policy in terms of its perceived intentions and results. Proper and appropriate administrative and adjudicative functions are needed for keeping a complete control in excess of the public policies. In a world of uncertainty, this stage is very crucial in the life of a public policy.[13,14,15]

The advantages of policy evaluation are that it enables policy-makers to record their experience for future use; information gathered from the exercise forms the basis for making adjustments in the existing policy. In an incrementalist policy process, the new information is a raw material for new policies (Anderson, 1997). Because of the continuing and cyclic nature of policy process in government, the starting and ending points in the flow of activities are not easy to locate in practice.

Budgeting and Public Policy

Not many public policies can be put into action without the expenditure of funds. The effectiveness of programs, such as those involving construction of highways and agricultural development, is often largely determined by the amount of money available for their implementation. At an extreme, a policy without funding will be a nullity (Anderson, 1997). Let us use budget process in Nigeria as a case study.

Budget Process in Nigeria

In Nigeria, budget process is a system of rules governing the decision-making that leads to a budget, from its formulation, through its legislative approval, to its execution and evaluation. This system of rules, according to National Bureau of Statistics (NBS), is rooted in constitutional mandates, statutory requirements, House and Senate



rules and practices (as in the federal level), and administrative directives (NBS, 2004). The budget process can dictate both the degree to which a policy debate can actually occur as well as the policy outcomes. Not only that, the system of rules provides several avenues by which the Parliament and/or the President can change, reform, or bungle the various elements of the budget process toward actualizing an effective federal budget.

In Nigeria, the preparation of the federal budget is a shared responsibility of the executive and legislative arms of the federal government. The budget, which is officially referred to as the Appropriation Act, is introduced by the executive, approved by the legislature, and signed into law by the President. A summary of the Nigerian budget process is explained here.

Budget Formulation

The Budget Office of the Ministry of Finance develops the budget in accordance with the federal government's fiscal policy. The Budget Office meets early in the fiscal year with key revenue generating agencies (including the Federal Inland Revenue Service, Nigerian Customs Service, and the Nigerian National Petroleum Corporation) as well as key economic agencies (including NBS, National Planning Commission, NPC, and Central Bank of Nigeria, CBN) to assess and determine trends in revenue performance and macroeconomic indicators and the implication of such trends for the next three fiscal years. This discussion leads to the preparation of a Medium-Term Revenue Framework (MTRF) pursuant to which projected revenue from various oil and nonoil sources is determined over the medium term (NBS, 2004). Following this determination with respect to revenue, the MTEF is developed outlining key areas of expenditure (statutory transfers, debt service, expenditures of ministries, departments, and agencies, MDAs) as well as the projected fiscal balance. If this fiscal balance is a deficit, sources of financing this deficit are also considered. MDAs' expenditures comprise both capital and recurrent expenditures. Since 2005, the government has used the Medium-Term Sector Strategies to prioritise and align the capital expenditure of large-spending MDAs with its development objectives.

Historically, this has been focused on NEEDS, the MDGs, the Seven-Point Agenda and, the Vision 20:2020 as well as the First National Implementation Plan (NIP). The MTEF is further developed into a formal Medium-Term Expenditure Framework Report, which includes the Fiscal Strategy Paper and MDAs expenditure ceilings. This formal MTEF/Fiscal Strategy Paper is required, under the Fiscal Responsibility Act, to be presented by the Minister of Finance first to the Federal Executive Council and then to the National Assembly for consideration and approval.[16,17,18]

Budget Call Circular and Preparation of the Executive Budget Proposal

Once the MTEF, Fiscal Strategy Paper, and MDAs' expenditure ceilings have been approved by the Federal Executive Council, the Budget Office, under the supervision of the Minister of Finance, issues a Call Circular. The Call Circular instructs the MDAs to allocate their allotted capital expenditure ceilings across their existing and new projects, programs, and other initiatives. MDAs are also required to submit estimates of their recurrent expenditure requirements for personnel costs and overhead. The Budget Office evaluates and consolidates the submissions of the various MDAs and prepares the draft budget. This process most times takes place in August.

Presidential Submission to the National Assembly

The draft budget is presented by the Minister of Finance to the President for approval. The approved draft budget, together with supporting documents, is formally presented by the President to the National Assembly for consideration and appropriation, typically at a joint session of the Senate and the House of Representatives.

Legislative Scrutiny and Approval

The budget is considered separately by the House of Representatives and the Senate of the National Assembly in accordance with the legislative practice and procedures. The two houses harmonize their drafts and the recommendations of their various committees with areas of difference sorted out. The harmonized budget is approved separately by each chamber of the National Assembly. It should, however, be noted that during the deliberation of the Appropriation Bill in both Chambers of the National Assembly, all the relevant Committees in both Houses review and recommend changes to various segments of the budget. During the process, there is usually horse trading between the executive and the legislature looking for a common ground for speedy passage of the Appropriation Bill (Anyebe, 2018). Various parameters used in drafting the budget are debated and in some cases adjusted by the relevant committees in the Senate and the House of Representatives, particularly by the Finance and Appropriation Committees during their deliberation on the Medium-Term Expenditure Framework submitted by the Executive to the National Assembly.



Their decisions guide the general debate in the plenary who also adjust other benchmarks such as the oil price benchmark, the production of crude oil, and the size of funding for oil and gas production in the joint venture agreement, as well as the level of debt repayments to be made in any fiscal year. In the past the budget allocation for running the legislature is also debated upon but it is now on first line charge and no longer subject to debate and horse trading. The debates and horse trading that ensue during legislative scrutiny of the Appropriation often leave the public wondering whether or not the legislature has the constitutional right to propose increases or not and whether it should only raise issues and queries and request for reasonable explanation (Anyebe, 2018). These are some of the issues contained in the institutional bottlenecks that prolong the passage of the budget and eventually reduce the implementation period of the budget. The fine-tuned budget passed by the National Assembly is finally submitted to the President for his assent and when approved it becomes a national budget.[19,20,21]

If the Bill is passed by the National Assembly and presented to the President for assent and the President withholds assent or fails to signify his assent to the Appropriation Bill or any Money Bill within thirty days, the National Assembly will by two-thirds majority of members of both Houses sitting in a Joint Session of the National Assembly override the President's veto, and thus pass the bill again which shall become law and the assent of the President shall not be required.

Budget Implementation

The implementation of the budget is carried out by the various MDAs of the federal government. Funds for capital projects are released on a quarterly basis to the relevant spending MDAs in line with what is allocated to them in the budget. It should be noted that the Federal Ministry of Finance instituted since 2005, a cash Management Committee, that ensures funds availability for the smooth financing of government budget (NBS, 2004). This structure reduces discretionary borrowing from the overdraft account of the Central Bank and avoids delays toward completing capital projects.

Monitoring and Evaluation of the Federal Budget

The oversight of budget implementation is the final stage of the budget process. The monitoring is done by the Ministry of Finance, the NPC, the National Assembly, the National Economic Intelligence Agency (NEIA), the Presidential Monitoring Committee (PMC), the Office of the Auditor-General of the Federation, and the Accountant-General of the Federation. Actual inspection of the capital projects is carried by these agencies in various capacities, predominant among them is the Ministry of Finance, the NPC, and National Assembly through its think-tank—National Institute for Legislative Studies (NILS). While copies of the budget implementation reports are on the Website of the Federal Ministry of Finance, such reports from the NILS are made available to the National Assembly presiding officers and relevant Committees.

IV.CONCLUSION

“Policy making is a risky business,” one group of analysts has acknowledged. But, they continue, “regardless of the varied desires and political pressures, we believe that it is the responsibility of analysts forcefully to advocate rational decision methods in public policy making, especially for those with high risk” (Hardaker et al., 2009). Or as Elisabeth Paté-Cornell observes, if rational approaches to public policy making are not applied, politically-driven processes “may lead to raising unnecessary fears, wasting scarce resources, or ignoring important problems” (Paté-Cornell, 2002). And, one might add, when public safety is the issue at hand, irrational policy may cost lives.

Terrorism in the United States and in just about all of the developed world is, as noted frequently in this book, a rare phenomenon that, seen broadly, inflicts only quite limited damage. If only 6 people die each year from that hazard under present circumstances, heroic and expensive efforts to reduce that number to, say, 3 per year, scarcely seems justified.

Unlike many other hazards, terrorism can inspire a great deal of fear, however irrational and unjustified. But, outside of 9/11, this fear does not seem to have had extended effects on behavior.

Moreover, it simply does not seem possible to reduce fear levels. The remarkable increase in spending on domestic homeland security since 9/11 has totaled well over \$1.5 trillion while efforts to chase down and eliminate terrorists abroad have cost trillions more (Mueller and Stewart, 2016). Nonetheless, the percentage of the people who profess to have confidence in the government’s ability to prevent further terrorist attacks remained in 2013 at about the same level as in 2002[22,23,24]



REFERENCES

1. "UK Civil Service – Definitions – What is a Civil Servant?". civilservant.org.uk. Archived from the original on 11 October 2019. Retrieved 5 November 2019.
2. ^ "Managing Conflict of Interest in the Public Service - OECD". Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). 2005. Archived from the original on 2019-08-05. Retrieved 2018-12-09.
3. ^ "China's Examination Hell: The Civil Service Examinations of Imperial China". History Today. Archived from the original on March 19, 2012. Retrieved October 25, 2011.
4. ^ "Imperial China: Civil Service Examinations" (PDF). Princeton University. Archived (PDF) from the original on April 1, 2011. Retrieved October 25, 2011.
5. ^ :^a ^b "Confucianism and the Chinese Scholastic System: The Chinese Imperial Examination System". California State Polytechnic University, Pomona. Archived from the original on April 18, 2000. Retrieved December 7, 2011.
6. ^ Paludan, Ann (1998). *Chronicle of the Chinese Emperors: The Reign-by-Reign Record of the Rulers of Imperial China*. New York: Thames and Hudson. ISBN 0-500-05090-2
7. ^ Roberts, J. A. G. (1999). *A Concise History of China*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. ISBN 0-674-00075-7.
8. ^ "Chinese civil service". Encyclopædia Britannica. Archived from the original on December 16, 2011. Retrieved December 7, 2011.
9. ^ Xianzu, Tang (2018). *The Complete Works of Tang Xianzu*.
10. ^ Brook, Timothy (1999). *China and Historical Capitalism*. New York: Cambridge University Press. ISBN 0-521-64029-6.
11. ^ Coolican (2018). Chapter 5: The Northcote–Trevelyan Report. pp. 106–107.
12. ^ :^a ^b ^c ^d Bodde, Derke. "China: A Teaching Workbook". Columbia University. Archived from the original on 2012-01-04. Retrieved 2012-08-05.
13. ^ Mark W. Huddleston, William W. Boyer (1996). *The Higher Civil Service in the United States: Quest for Reform*. University of Pittsburgh Press. ISBN 978-0822974734.
14. ^ Kazin; Edwards; Rothman, eds. (2010). *The Princeton Encyclopedia of American Political History*. p. 142. ISBN 9780691129716.
15. ^ Walker, David (2003-07-09). "Fair game". *The Guardian*. London. Archived from the original on 2013-12-28. Retrieved 2003-07-09.
16. ^ Naithani, Sadhana (2006). *In quest of Indian folktales: Pandit Ram Gharib Chaube and William Crooke*. Indiana University Press. p. 6. ISBN 978-0-253-34544-8. Archived from the original on 2016-05-12. Retrieved 2015-10-14.
17. ^ Maia, B. (30 September 2020). "A institucionalização do concurso público no Brasil: uma análise sócio-histórica". *Revista do Serviço Público*. 72 (3): 663–684. doi:10.21874/rsp.v72.i3.4639. ISSN 2357-8017. S2CID 247648128.
18. ^ "Concurso Público In Brazil". *The Brazil Business*. 24 July 2014. Archived from the original on 2020-09-12. Retrieved 2020-09-12.
19. ^ R. MacGregor Dawson, *The Civil Service of Canada (1929)*; Jack Granatstein, *The Ottawa Men: The Civil Service Mandarins, 1935–1957* (Oxford UP, 1982); J.E. Hodgetts, *Pioneer Public Service: An Administrative History of United Canada, 1841–1867*. (U of Toronto Press, 1955).
20. ^ :^a ^b Government of Canada (2011-04-18). "Population of the Federal Public Service". Her Majesty the Queen in Right of Canada. Archived from the original on 2016-06-22. Retrieved 25 June 2016.
21. ^ "ENAP – Canadian governments compared > Provincial". *etatscanadiens-canadiangovernments.enap.ca*. Archived from the original on 2011-09-13. Retrieved 2011-07-27.
22. ^ "2012 Census of Governments: Employment Summary Report" (PDF). United States Census Bureau. 6 March 2014. Archived (PDF) from the original on 28 March 2015. Retrieved 8 December 2014.
23. ^ "Federal Government, Excluding the Postal Service". Bureau of Labor Statistics. March 12, 2008. Archived from the original on 2009-01-14.
24. ^ "Louisiana State University Libraries – Federal Agency Index". Lib.lsu.edu. 2009-09-15. Archived from the original on 2014-09-24. Retrieved 2014-02-18.