

Analyzing and Planning a Policy – Policy Paper Layout

1. A title that presents the public issue which is being dealt with.
2. A short preface presenting the problem, its severity and the importance of dealing with it for the improvement of social welfare.
3. A description of the main characteristics of the problem. Please describe main factors, without a comprehensive description of the actors and strategies.
4. An explanation of the analysis framework and of your planned steps. You should explain that the document is based on principles of policy analysis according to the steps of identifying a problem, identifying and considering alternatives and recommendations for policy. Moreover, You should explain that identifying the problem includes both failures economic failures and governmental failures and that at the stage of considering alternatives,
5. Defining guiding principles, emphasizing which goals we want to achieve. It should be thoroughly looked into a normative assessment and should be amplified on your case.
6. Identifying a problem – analyzing the markets' failures in your case. For this kind of analyze we should imagine a situation where there is a minimal governmental interfering or none at all and examine the actors and market's behavior as "the natural state". You should identify all of the market's failures that identify the situation but it is not necessary they will all be used in each case. The analyze of the market should be based on the developed models.
7. Identifying the problem – analyzing the government's failures in your case. This analyze shows the blocks among the way before solving the problem which is a component of a positive state evaluation – what are the guiding interests of the actors and how they can change the policy and harm the social welfare. You should address the representative democracy failures (politicians vs. the public) and public bureaucracy (bureaucrats vs. politicians). Each failure should be addressed briefly and then applied on your case. Apply it by showing how they are reflected through different interests (politicians, groups of interest, bureaucrats) in your case and how those reciprocal relations can create a potential for a failure and its strength. For example, is the public apathetic for the case (does it empower the strength of the interest groups)? Is the issue related to a dominant dimension that people point to? Is there a competition between interest groups? Is the system centralized in a way that creates a bureaucratic policy bias?
8. The Summary of the barriers by a balance of power made by the politician or other authority who makes the decision - who among all the players (interest groups and bureaucrats) are extremely important to him in terms of maximizing

the chances of elections, or gaining interest another of the decision makers, hence he is also the decisive player in which to evaluate the alternatives. For example, if there is a very strong economic group (for example, Dead Sea factories regarding mining near Arad) which enjoys the support of some bureaucrats (Ministry of Economy) and bureaucrats facing relatively weak ones (Ministry of Health and the Environment) while the local public is relatively weak because it does not vote in national elections by this issue and even then there is no uniformity in the interests of Arad among the people of Arad, the balance the politician will make will lead him to the conclusion that the player who can have the most significant influence on his chances of being elected) This, are the Dead Sea factories. Therefore, according to the Virginia scholarly, he will tip the policy to their advantage and always prefer alternatives to help them. This implies that in the positivist analysis they are the decisive player and the analysis of alternatives must be taken into account of their interests. Even if we design a normative alternative that is effective and useful in all respects, the recommendation is it will not be effective and applied if it materially contradicts the interests of the deciding player. It is in fact, a constraint is added to the guiding principles presented in section 5.

9. Identifying and assessing policy strategies in order to solve the failures and problems. It should be defined through a number of strategies for a solution for each of them and assess the way of dealing with the failures (pros) and on what level it creates new failures (cons). The assessment should be based on scientific literature, research papers and comparing other similar cases. It should be acknowledged through the elaborated term of Weimar and Vining. Other methods can be used as well for planning and managing the strategic aspect. The outcome should be balancing both pros and cons for each strategy and a given relative score. On this base the alternatives are ranked.
10. A practical analysis of the alternatives according to the abilities and key actors that was located in section 8. Here this should be addressed based on the blocks among each alternative. It is possible to do by using the new institutional infrastructure, reforms, and treating process goals as a way to overcome objections and barriers. The product is a practical plan of action as a policy recommendation.
11. Summary of the document and the link between the problem and the solutions.
12. List of sources.
13. Appendixes.