

Chapter 8

The FUPOL Policy Lifecycle

Susanne Sonntagbauer
Cellent AG, Austria

Peter Sonntagbauer
Cellent AG, Austria

Kawa Nazemi
Fraunhofer Institute for Computer Graphics
Research (IGD), Germany

Dirk Burkhardt
Fraunhofer Institute for Computer Graphics
Research (IGD), Germany

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this chapter is to outline an advanced policy lifecycle, the FUPOL model with its ability to link technical features in the area of policy modeling. The FUPOL Policy Lifecycle is based on 6 stages, which are further divided into 8 main tasks. These main tasks are split up into 19 subtasks to provide a very detailed policy lifecycle structure. The detailed breakdown allows one to link each task to various technical features, such as opinion maps, policy indicator dashboard, knowledge database, and simulation and visualization tools. The chapter further argues that the methodology applied is future proof and has the potential of accommodating new technologies in the future.

INTRODUCTION

Public policy is the domain of local and national governments. They address a public issue by laws, regulations, decisions or actions. Many topics are usually treated by public policy such as economy, social welfare, crime, tourism, traffic, education, etc.

Governments take decisions for their citizens primarily based on their policy concept and the current economic and social development. All these decisions originate in many analysis and discussions with all relevant stakeholders, such as

companies, NGO's, governmental organisations, citizens, unions, organizations representing commerce and industry etc. Most of the decisions are empirical and are based on previous experiences in the specific policy domain.

In a rapidly changing world a very cautious and deliberate policy making is required and routinely decisions might be dangerous, because circumstances and framework conditions alter quickly. Likewise available data as well as the technologies to support policy design and implementation are evolving quickly.

This gives to the policy decisions the opportunity to associate the knowledge of the experiences and the political and ideological background with the availability of data and information that go beyond the boundaries of the internal traditional government knowledge and include external sources on the internet, like Social Networks or Internet of Things. This leads to better fact based decisions, although these are likely to be still influenced by political and ideological considerations. Policy decisions are always risky but facts based decisions overcome or mitigate those risks

Therefore it is very important to approach the policy lifecycle in a systematic way, which means describing all steps in high detail. Such a detailed description is also required to provide a complete picture, which technologies can support the policy design and implementation

The objective of this chapter is to work out a new enhanced and detailed policy lifecycle which has the ability to link technical features in the area of policy modeling. The methodology applied must be future-proof and have the potential of accommodating new upcoming technologies

BACKGROUND

Policy

Before discussing the policy lifecycle it has to be specified what is a policy in this specific context. In the context of public policy a policy is understood as a course of action, authorized by the government, to achieve predefined specific goals. Such a course of action may take many forms. It could, for example, be expressed in the form of a strategy, a program, a law or a statement made by an executive authority. (Hewlett, Ramesh and Perl, 2009)

Policies are not created in a vacuum. Many people affected by these policies have an interest in determining the content of that policy. Policies

can also be seen as processes. They change as they are implemented and rarely conform to plan. Policies can have intended and unintended outcomes.

Furthermore it is well known that public policy is a very complex task comprising many decisions influenced by citizens, politicians and companies on a national and on an international basis.

Policy Lifecycle Models

Hewlett, Ramesh and Perl (2009) point out that the most popular means of simplifying public policy making for analytical purposes has been to think of it as a process, that is, as a set of interrelated stages through which policy issues and deliberations flow in a more or less sequential fashion from “inputs” (problems) to “outputs” (policies).

The first one who tried to facilitate the policymaking process and to reduce it to different stages was Harold Lasswell. (Hewlett, Ramesh and Perl, 2009) The concept of policy lifecycle was developed by him in the USA in the 1950s. He was one of the pioneers of modern political science and he described public policy science as being multidisciplinary, problem-solving and explicitly normative. Based on these characteristics, he developed the concept of policy cycles, which he broke down into seven fundamental stages in decision-making (Hupe and Hill, 2006), such as intelligence, promotion, prescription, invocation, application, termination and appraisal.

After Lasswells definition of the seven-stages-model many variants of a process model, especially regarding the number of stages have been developed.

Jones (1984), Anderson (1996) and Brewer (1983) also defined policy modeling processes, which are not equal, but the specification of the required procedures for decision making and implementation of policies are analogical, using five to seven stages.

At present there is a consensus to use problem solving policy cycles, which are divided into five

27 more pages are available in the full version of this document, which may be purchased using the "Add to Cart" button on the publisher's webpage:

www.igi-global.com/chapter/the-fupol-policy-lifecycle/127849

Related Content

Smart Technologies, Digital Competencies, and Workforce Development: An Examination of the Government of Canada's Current and Future Capacities

Sandra Toze, Jeffrey Roy, Markus Sharaputand Lisette Wilson (2021). *International Journal of Public Administration in the Digital Age* (pp. 1-19).

www.irma-international.org/article/smart-technologies-digital-competencies-and-workforce-development/294121

Lessons Learned Building an Online Degree Program

Ottilie F. Austin, Gail M. Hungerand Julie J. Gray (2017). *Deconstructing the Education-Industrial Complex in the Digital Age* (pp. 172-182).

www.irma-international.org/chapter/lessons-learned-building-an-online-degree-program/175418

Underappreciated and Undervalued: Nurse Dissatisfaction and the COVID-19 Pandemic

Ursula Hersh (2023). *Handbook of Research on Transforming Government, Nonprofits, and Healthcare in a Post-Pandemic Era* (pp. 234-272).

www.irma-international.org/chapter/underappreciated-and-undervalued/315372

Participatory Mapping, E-Participation, and E-Governance: Applications in Environmental Policy

Pragati Rawatand Juita-Elena (Wie) Yusuf (2020). *Leveraging Digital Innovation for Governance, Public Administration, and Citizen Services: Emerging Research and Opportunities* (pp. 147-175).

www.irma-international.org/chapter/participatory-mapping-e-participation-and-e-governance/238954

Towards a Model for Engaging Citizens via Gov2.0 to Meet Evolving Public Value

Mohammed Aladalah, Yen Cheungand Vincent CS Lee (2018). *International Journal of Public Administration in the Digital Age* (pp. 1-17).

www.irma-international.org/article/towards-a-model-for-engaging-citizens-via-gov20-to-meet-evolving-public-value/190611