

Public innovation: a proposal for an analysis of the factors that influence innovation processes in the local public sector.

Pilar Mairal Medina

Instituto Complutense de Ciencia de la Administración
Universidad Complutense of Madrid
mmairal@cps.ucm.es



Received: 15/02/2020 / Accepted: 21/03/2020

Summary. Public innovation is an emerging object of research that offers different approaches to analyse change in public sector organisations. The local sphere has demonstrated its creative capacities in this sense, with an increasing number of interesting experiences related to the design of public policies, the establishment of political challenges and priorities, and the improvement of public services. However, despite the emerging emergence of non-state spaces linked to innovative experiences of social participation, public administrations generally identify innovations with technological integration and the cultural transformation of these organisations does not seem to be identified with innovation processes.

The article summarises the main factors identified in an empirical study that delimit the perception of local public innovation processes and their results, delimiting the conditioning factors of these processes and the challenges they pose for public organisations.

Keywords: Innovation, innovative public management, local administration, organisational culture, transformation and adaptive change.

Table of contents: 1. Introduction. 2. Research methodology. 3. The analysis of innovation at the local level: from public organisations to innovation ecosystems. 4. Distributed innovation and the return of public value in the processes of local innovation. 5. The conditioning factors of innovation: factors that operate on innovation processes in local administrations. 6. Conclusions.

How to cite: Mairal Medina, P. (2020): Public innovation: a proposal for analysing the factors that affect innovation processes in the local public sector, in *Cuadernos de Gobierno y Administración Pública* 7-1, 53-61.

1. Introduction

Public innovation has become a subject of growing interest and a focus of attention for the public sector. While in the business sphere innovation is seen as a key condition in the adaptation of organisations and their means of production to a more competitive globalised economy, in the public sphere it is seen as an opportunity to adapt the administration and its services to the demands of citizens, with greater doses of effectiveness, efficiency and transparency.

Over the last three decades, public organisations in the local environment have become a clear reference point for citizens, civil society organisations and businesses, and have consolidated themselves as necessary collaborators of national and regional governments in the deployment of policies and resources that materialise in the territories. From this perspective, the transformation of the role of *the local* level and its emergence and consolidation as agents of the paradigm shift in public policies in the face of social, economic, technological, and environmental challenges have made these organisations a reference point for innovation, given the numerous experiences that have been developed, the diversity of their themes and results. Along these lines, analysing the factors that influence public innovation processes is of particular interest in order to understand what public innovation is and to differentiate it from experiences which, although promoted by public bodies, do not always transfer the achievements to the organisations.

In order to explore these issues in greater depth in the field of public innovation in the local environment, an empirical study was carried out with the aim of identifying the main factors that affect public innovation processes in local administrations. The following sections contain the main results of the author's research.

2. Research methodology

The research was based on an exhaustive bibliographic review, from which a conceptual framework was formulated for empirical validation. To this end, a comprehensive analysis of public innovation trends and practices at the international level was carried out, based on which an analytical framework was developed to support the empirical research, centred on the analysis of public innovation experiences in the Spanish local sphere, and in which innovation processes based on new public policy approaches that incorporate international trends in the areas of the environment and sustainability, and citizen safety were taken as a reference.

An empirical analysis of these experiences was carried out using documentary and quantitative sources. For the quantitative analysis, a questionnaire was developed that included indicators of the main inputs, processes, and outputs of the innovation process itself, which had been formulated in the initial conceptual framework.

3. Analysing innovation at the local level: from public organisations to innovation ecosystems

Innovation in public administrations has been analysed by different authors as the result of a process of change in which different orientations can be distinguished, as Ramírez Alujas (2010) points out. One clear trend has been to analyse public innovation as a strategic element of administrative and institutional modernisation for management improvement (Borins, 2001; Mulgan and Albury, 2003; Moran, 2004; Osborne and Brown, 2005, 2011; Hartley, 2005; Hartley, Sorensen and Torfing, 2013). Other studies have focused on the innovation process itself, creating a conceptual and analytical framework that includes factors and components of the innovation process with the aim of generating successful models for application to the public sector (Borins, 2006; Pollitt, 2008; Bason, 2010; Bloch, 2013; OECD, 2016).

A review of the existing literature, both in terms of governmental approaches and orientations at different territorial levels, as well as scientific and technical production, reveals a trend that was already characterised in 1981 by Irwin and Erwin Feller in their article "Public Sector Innovation as Conspicuous Production": innovation as a growing object of study, elevated to the status of a performance indicator for political and administrative actors (Feller and Feller, 1981).

The approach from which the study was undertaken rests on a broad concept of public innovation that refers to processes and not only to products, to approaches, methodologies and expected and unexpected results and, very importantly, to the learning and knowledge generated despite the limited capacity and habit of systematisation and transfer in public entities. Also, to the knowledge arising from error. In short, to the non-disruptive changes that have been shaping new working methods in organisations and which, in turn, have made it possible to standardise new visions of the organisation itself and its impact on the territory and people, responding to the Management 2.0 model proposed by Ramírez-Alujas in 2010.

Innovation is therefore seen as a strategic element, due to the fact that society's needs and requirements are different and evolve rapidly in a global and interconnected world, in which governments and public organisations interact with different actors (assuming diverse and dynamic roles) in a scenario of enormous uncertainty that directly affects the local level.

Management processes based on local governance (Navarro, 2015) delimit many of the current public innovation scenarios, taking into account both sectoral policies and more general areas of public management (Natera, 2004; Longo, 2012; Brugué, Blanco and Boada, 2014; Zurbriggen and Lago, 2014; Mairal, Pastor and García, 2015). In these scenarios, innovation is posed as a challenge to improve administration from different institutional parameters (budget adjustment and cost reduction, effectiveness and efficiency, or transparency), although it is also an opportunity to consolidate administrative structures with better institutional capacities to respond to citizen demands.

From the municipal perspective, the local governance approach emphasises the encounter of people and citizens with the public services provided on the territory and which aim to respond to the needs of the local population closer to their daily life.

Chart 1. Factors driving the local environment as an innovation ecosystem.

Globalization	Concentration of population in urban settings.	Development of municipalism and recognition of the role of local authorities.	International and European recognition of cities and urban policies.
Multi-level government.			New challenges (social, environmental, technological, financial, socio-health) that generate new areas and approaches to public policy (environmental sustainability, resilience, transparency, and good governance, etc.).
Proactivity in the development of collaborative spaces and citizen participation and involvement.	Political and technical motivations: from the need for change to the opportunity to take initiatives, via globalised fashions.	Recognition and new approaches to the promotion of collaborative networks (intra- and inter-organizational).	The role of public-private partnerships (for-profit and not-for-profit): joint knowledge generation, exchange of experiences, creativity, and collective intelligence.

Source: (Mairal, 2019).

Together with them, companies and social organisations interact in a common space that marks the materialisation of the political-administrative system, its objectives, and the performance of its activity (Longo, 2009). All this within the framework of a changing scenario where new social challenges and proximity mark the interaction of government and public administration with citizens.

The participation of private entities in the management of public services has been a growing reality, parallel to the transformation of a citizenship that is increasingly closer to local administrations, in territories in which the result has been a relational government that has created networks of agents that operate alongside public institutions, with greater or lesser complexity and with new technological instruments on which these relations are articulated. These local realities can be seen in the collaboration networks between public entities, private for-profit and non-profit institutions, and organised citizens, intersectoral teams, collaborative leaderships, or the development of governance centred on the relationship with local communities (Mairal, 2011).

4. Distributed innovation and the return of public value in local innovation processes

If there is a space in which innovation is signified at the local level, it is linked to governance models associated with collaborative processes in the design of public services. We can speak of Governance of the Innovation understood as distributed innovation (Rivera, Simmonds, and Román, 2012), or innovation in governance (Conejero and Redondo, 2016). These approaches account for different models of co-creation including public and private agents, with different public-private partnership formats for the co-production of services, generating innovation ecosystems that converge in private initiative and the opening of policies and services to new actors.

Government Innovation Labs (GIL) are an emerging reference that has become widespread globally. They are Public Innovation Places (PIP) capable of facing greater risks of failure than in the framework of traditional public structures and which bring together organisations characterised by a direct connection with the public sector, created to challenge public problems (Zanardo, 2014). This is a leap in the co-design model to open up public resources (tangible and intangible) to networks of actors and share processes that seek to generate public value.

In relation to innovative governance models (innovation in governance), these focus on improving horizontal Governance, especially in primary services of direct attention to citizens, in many cases taking advantage of ICT to improve communication capacities. One of the first examples in Europe was the launch in 2009 of Total Place in the UK, a programme focused on local government to maximise the joint working of resources and services by promoting new forms of cooperation at local level, and between local and central administration¹.

Such programmes demonstrated the need to include more integrated approaches to management with citizen-centred services rather than maintaining the traditional logic of sectoral services more or less isolated in their planning, management, and evaluation processes (health, security, social services, etc.). The replicability of these models (transversality and coordination of multilevel government) initially offers different opportunities, despite the fact that it requires new models of coordination and information management, which are usually difficult in structures that manage excessively departmentalised services, and which sometimes feed "not my job" logics (Lee and Olshfski, 2002).

As we can see, local public innovation initiatives often focus on resource management structures and processes. The emphasis on the participation and collaboration of all actors within a territory has also been deployed from the

¹ Based on 13 pilot projects, the aim was to establish strategies to improve public services in the areas of employment, drug addiction prevention, treatment of people at risk and public safety. The role of associations, together with business groups and citizens themselves, highlighted the role of public servants in the design and supervision of innovative initiatives by improving evaluation processes (Office of Public Sector Information, 2010). The key aspect of the Total Place model was to implement a holistic concept of public services through open units for the co-design and coordinated management of services in the territories.

micro level down to the neighbourhood or district level with community-based approaches. The aim is to tackle polyhedral problems through collective and multidimensional solutions. Examples of this trend are programmes such as those already established in Berlin (Quarter Management) or the development of Buurt Managers in several Dutch municipalities. They are based on community management systems, which may include inter-sectoral teams, public-private networks, and citizen councils, coordinated for the implementation of synergistic actions that address the problems of the territory in a systemic way, and place value on collective intelligence (Klok, Denter, and Vrieling, 2013). Both cases are based on an approach of organisational redesign and distribution of functions between public and private actors.

As already noted, it is nowadays difficult to find a public innovation process that does not emphasise the importance of citizen or service user participation. Different co-production methodologies have been implemented in many localities in the European Union (Schaap, Geurtz, De Graaf and Karsten, 2010). In this point, the concept of distributed innovation puts the focus on the active role of the citizen in the co-production and often co-management and auditing of services. The use of digital solutions has again boosted more diffuse formats of citizen participation and offered new spaces for interaction with government in the decision-making process (the standardisation of technological platforms and applications generated to collect proposals, carry out citizen consultations or carry out electronic voting in the framework of participatory budgets is a good example of this), despite the limitations posed by the technological gap. In any case, these trends are consolidating over time, laying the foundations for future management approaches and methodologies that will be fed by new technological solutions.

It has also developed diverse experiences to facilitate the use of crowd sourcing through APIS (Application Programming Interface) that allow the contribution of ideas and knowledge, open to any citizen, and the collective elaboration of plans or projects, as well as the channelling of monetized resources. Innovative examples during the first decade of this century were the program "Cabinet Office's Tell Us how" (UK), the use of participatory cartography of problems or diverse information, such as Geodata in Germany, or crime mapping in the US and UK. Also, the Fixyourstreet initiative in Ireland, to communicate incidents in the territory on a cartographic basis that has been fed since 2011 to report on situations that require public action and on which the citizenry obtained a direct response from local councils (Rivera, Simmonds, and Román, 2012). Based on these reference cases since the first decade of the century, the experiences have been multiple and the formats and areas of public policy have been diverse and, as mentioned above, the opportunities are diverse given the rapid pace of evolution and digital transformation.

Along these lines, there are numerous and varied experiences in open government, and many initiatives are currently being developed that will undoubtedly be the subject of social research from different disciplinary perspectives. One of the most interesting lines is fuelled by tools to facilitate the use of open data offered by public administrations for reuse. In this field, progress is vertiginous, at the present times, more and more tools are being developed by the local public sector to support the development of solutions that enter the market to offer digital services related to the territory, and which are made available to the public (in terms of implementation and scope of data). At this point, it is worth highlighting a model that demonstrates the contribution of public action and the information generated to the development of new markets in the digital economy: administrations make available sets of open data (catalogues) that private developers use to feed applications that provide various services, and which are accessible to the public for consultation, enriching these catalogues with new data. The information is published regularly (open data) and reusable for everyone, without access restrictions, patents or other control or monetisation mechanisms, beyond the parameters delimited by the regulatory frameworks for the protection of personal data.

However, the question arises: although these innovation modes in governance environments are mainly advancing from the perspective of citizen participation, digital services and policy networks, are organisational structures motivated to participate or aligned with participatory processes beyond the understanding of participation as a service and not as a tool? Are organisational structures motivated to participate in or align with participatory processes, beyond understanding participation as a service rather than a tool? Have effective inter-institutional working methods been institutionalised to ensure optimal performance in inter-governmental or inter-organisational coordination scenarios?

As we have pointed out, while during the last decade an interesting space of opportunity has emerged for the analysis of public innovation in the local sphere, scientific publications show a special interest in addressing processes of participation in the co-production of services beyond analysing the innovations that have led to the increase of good practices in this area (Newman, Raine, and Skelcher, 2001; Pastor, 2018) and their returns to public organisations. In fact, there has recently been an increase in the visibility of experiences linked to social innovation, which is sometimes mistakenly treated as public innovation, despite the fact that these experiences focus on the development of initiatives of a communitarian, inter-entrepreneurial, etc. nature, and are clearly framed in non-state public spaces (Bresser-Pereira and Cunill, 1999). In many cases, these are initiatives supported by local governments and administrations which, as Carles Ramió argues, create public value by "working in a network, although dominating the network" (Ramió 2009: 20), despite the fact that their returns or profits do not always revert to the public organisations themselves.

At this point, we could also ask what initial motivations drive local administrations to innovate. Are they aware of the innovations they have already developed? Do they require new resources, or do they have sufficient resources despite not having strategies and methodologies to face innovation processes in a conscious and planned manner? Who assumes the risks of innovating? Some of the above questions could undoubtedly be asked about public organisations at the national or regional level, although the complexity of the local level (competence, financial, organisational, relational) allows us to offer a detailed vision of the factors that intervene in innovation processes, their relationship and impact on the organisations themselves.

5. The conditioning factors of innovation: factors operating on innovation processes in local administrations.

Beyond the working methods applied to innovation processes, which are currently especially linked to processes of co-production of policies and services and framed in experiences of social innovation, it is possible to establish elements that characterise public innovation in the field of local administration.

These processes have been based on the search for greater efficiency of administrative resources and have focused on digital integration to boost administrative modernisation through digital administration, in a first phase, which has been followed by the deployment of lines of innovation associated with different areas of public policy (health, services based on the Smart City approach for the remote management of basic resources and supplies, economic promotion and dynamization, citizen participation, etc.). These innovations are advancing with the integration of new solutions based on big data and artificial intelligence to provide new services and, from the perspective of the core functions of the public sector, will enable the incorporation of new tools for the planning, interaction, and monitoring of public resources.

Likewise, progress in citizen participation has meant the standardisation of tools aimed at improving the channels and methods of interaction between local administrations and the public, and in most cases the focus has been on digitalising consultation processes and also communication with the population (information and assistance services, tele-assistance, participatory budgets, transparency).

At this point, and from a broad perspective, it is worth highlighting the impact of different and diverse public-private collaboration processes on the progress of innovation processes in the local public sphere. Both interaction with private suppliers and collaboration with the third sector, technology centres and research teams have led to institutional recognition and development of the capacities of local environments to promote innovation ecosystems. Once again, these environments for the generation of new shared capacities recognise models of governance that highlight new methods of coordination, on which common objectives are aligned and experiences and resources are shared.

However, there are also key challenges linked to factors related to the questioning of the political capacities of the local administration itself, such as the sustainable mobilisation of the citizenry and the leap, once again, from co-design to co-production or, from another perspective, from participation to the involvement of the population, and of the technical staff itself, in the processes of public innovation and also in the implementation of the policies and services generated.

From this perspective, in addition to citizen motivation and the multiple socio-political factors that influence their willingness and attitude towards active participation, it is important to highlight the excessive weight of digital media in these processes and the limitations of the solutions applied in public organisations that have not faced up to the digital transformation due to cultural or financial factors, as well as the dysfunctions associated with the digital breach.

Another localised challenge associated with innovation processes is public value returns. It is understood that the diversity of actors and stakeholders, the governance models applied, and the confluence of different resources can generate multiplier effects on local public innovation capacities. However, the returns to public sector organisations are not always tangible and therefore not always recognised and measured. And in this term, the systematisation of results and learning is also a key factor associated with institutional recognition, organisational adaptation and the permeability and sustainability of the changes generated, whether from an organisational, methodological or technological point of view.

From the point of view of the factors influencing innovation processes, the results of the research carried out indicate the significant relevance of the leadership and involvement of political and technical managers during the innovation process, the knowledge and training of the municipal structure in process innovation, the forms of involvement of workers, and the incentives for innovation.

Figure 1. Most common characteristics of innovation in local public management.

INNOVATION ENABLERS	LINES OF INNOVATION	CHALLENGES
Efficiency in the management of resources	Digital public services and electronic administration.	Political uncertainty and reluctance towards citizen involvement.
resource management.	The integration of Smart City services.	Difficulties in involving the most vulnerable groups and the digital breach.
Access to co-financing.	Open government and distributed innovation.	Excessive emphasis on technology and not on processes, the adaptation of organisations and their structures, as well as redesign, testing and evaluating of new coordination and information management methodologies.
Development of digital solutions and technological integration.	Participatory structures management of local community resources (co-production, co-management).	Accountability.
Citizen demand for spaces for participation.	Digital communication with citizens (transparency, interaction) interaction).	The capture of resources generated in the initiatives that seek to increase the public value of institutional action.
Public-private collaboration.		
Competitiveness between territories.		

Source: own elaboration.

From the outset, several factors can be established that are considered as inducers in the promotion of public innovation initiatives. The first of these, political leadership, is understood as a driving force for the implementation of innovation processes and is linked to the motivation and channelling of information in organisations in terms of establishing objectives, and from this point of view it can be established as an inspirational, as well as instrumental, element of government action and a performance indicator by improving the analysis of the viability of processes in organisations.

This input is linked to another one that operates in a double sense. This is the decision-making process to find alternatives to the budget reductions carried out after the radical fall in local public sector income as a result of the 2008 global crisis. On the other hand, the lack of budgetary resources is also perceived as a brake on the organisations' capacities to promote processes of change, and the need for additional resources to promote public innovation is established, whether through more human resources, the availability of external services or the execution of investments. In this context, the participation of local public bodies in funds and grants that allow the co-financing of innovation projects has proved to be an incentive to promote processes of change and improvement based on existing solutions and methods that have already been tested in other local or regional environments.

The aforementioned advances another of the starting factors that are perceived as key, such as the degree of capacity of the technical structures to deal with these processes in terms of handling new tools and techniques, knowing the logic of the projects in order to be able to manage the monitoring or communication of the objectives achieved, or to be aware of similar experiences developed in other contexts in order to anticipate the challenges that these processes pose for the organisations themselves (changes in working structures and methodologies, new technological solutions requiring specific skills, etc.).

In the very process of implementing innovations, factors have also been detected to be acting as drivers and motivators or, conversely, as barriers that hinder the development of these innovations. As we will see below, the elements detected can be analysed by grouping them into four dimensions: the political dimension, the organisational culture, methodological and instrumental factors, and the governance dimension.

The first of these conditioning factors is the political commitment in terms of leadership and involvement of the organisation to align it with the objectives of innovation. Innovation as a political project is a factor of great relevance from the start in order to mobilise resources and motivate and involve the technical structures in a viable project with the capacity to be sustainable over time due to its logic of responding to the needs of the organisation and its environment.

This factor is associated with the perceived lack of incentives for innovation in teams and the interest and motivation of municipal staff, which in turn are key to the normalisation of attitudes favourable to change. These are conditioning factors linked to the organisational culture and dynamics of public sector organisations which, in the case of local administrations, combine singularities related to the visualisation of impacts on the territory, or the diversity of the public policy areas in which the technical teams interact. They are also affected by the impact of spending contraction policies on their structures and also on the policies and services they manage, despite the fact that local public policy frameworks have expanded with new approaches that respond to the global social and environmental challenges they must address.

For its part, and as mentioned above, it is also possible to consider a methodological dimension that brings together key process factors. In this point, the design of supervision and monitoring systems associated with the

innovation process in each of its phases to assess the results obtained, analyse potential bottlenecks, and take decisions for adjustment and improvement from a technical point of view. The degree of knowledge of innovation methodologies is also a key factor in aligning the objectives and efforts of the technical structures with the process and its logics, and the identification of these processes with innovation. It is perceived in this sense that the changes generated, or the new tools implemented, are not always visualised as a result of innovation, and this circumstance minimises the returns to the organisation in terms of motivation towards new processes.

Finally, and related to the growing implementation of digital solutions providing internal and external services in public organisations, it is perceived that the degree of integration of digital tools is another key instrumental factor of the innovation process itself.

The fourth dimension on which the process factors are articulated is related to the interaction of the agents that make up local public organisations, both from a technical and political point of view, with other agents in their environment. The governance approach makes it possible to establish factors associated with these dynamics. The first is of an internal nature and relates to governance in the organisations themselves and the vision of multidisciplinary and inter-area coordination in the management of innovation processes. This is a factor perceived as relevant for achieving success and for innovation to be permeable in organisations and for change to be valued as a positive step forward, minimising resistance and enhancing the capabilities of the work structures.

This vision corresponds to the starting thesis that highlights the incorporation of new, more integrated and transversal public policy approaches in local organisations, mainly due to the need to adapt to social, economic and technological change in order to respond to the challenges posed by the environment, which in most cases requires more integrated approaches to achieve more accurate impacts. The digital transformation needed to implement e-government through more or less integrated solutions, the multidimensionality of climate change, the commitment to environmental sustainability (efficiency of consumption, information and awareness, urban resilience, etc.), the fight against poverty (promotion of employment and self-employment, attention to groups at risk of social exclusion), or health crises such as those evidenced by global pandemics like COVID-19, are clear examples of the emergence of more transversal and collaborative models of local service management.

In parallel, both the generation of alliances with stake- holders facilitating public innovation processes and the search for external support to access technical and technological resources are linked to different models of public-private collaboration, beyond the contractual frameworks established to materialise this interaction. The sum of resources and, especially, of knowledge and visions on innovation processes, is perceived as a relevant opportunity by the technical structures. This perception, based on a vision of innovation and the organisational capacities of the public sector that is clearly aligned with the constraints already posed by the New Public Management approach, means that demands for collaboration with agents for the transfer of methodologies from the business sector (LEAN frameworks and agile methodologies) to incremental innovation processes in local public organisations are re-emerging.

For their part, the generation of collaborative networks with the third sector, involving communities in policy co-design processes and even the co-production of proximity services, are also part of this dimension of governance.

Figure 2. Factors influencing local public innovation processes.

STARTING POINTS	PROCESS FACTORS
Political leadership.	Commitment and political interest (innovation as a political project) project)
Budget reduction.	Perceived lack of incentives for innovation.
Degree of inter-area involvement in innovation processes.	Interest and motivation of municipal staff.
Training of technical staff.	Favourable attitudes towards change.
Perception of feasibility of the processes (needs-based technical design and needs-based technical design and process coordination methodologies).	Existence of a monitoring and follow-up system.
	Degree of knowledge about innovation initiatives and their identification as innovative experience.
	Degree of digital integration.
	Need for support from external professionals.
	Participation of multidisciplinary and multisectoral teams.

Source: own elaboration

6. Conclusion

This article presents some concluding elements on local public innovation. The general overview shows an extensive catalogue of experiences, in few cases based on evidence or systematised implementation procedures that favour rigorous evaluations or comparative studies. However, the challenge of addressing the factors that condition local public innovation makes it possible to establish public organisations as agents of adaptive change and their technical staff as potential prescriptions for innovation.

The aim of this reflection is to synthesise some of the aspects that provide proposals for analysis of public innovation and the emerging role of local governments and administrations in this area. Undoubtedly, these aspects require a multidimensional, integrated, and multidisciplinary view in order to address the challenges posed by a complex object of study (Mairal, 2018).

As pointed out at the beginning, in contrast to what happens in the private sphere, innovation has not traditionally been considered in public administrations as a conditioning factor for the transformation and improvement of public action. The reasons can be found in the lack of incentives and motivations, and the high risk associated with innovation due to the uncertainty it poses in relation to results, its political impact or technical performance, the perceived need to invest extraordinary resources, etc. (ANAO, 2009; Arundel, Bloch and Ferguson, 2019).

Despite the above, a theoretical account has been consolidated in relation to the relevance that the role of innovation has historically had in the public sector as a driving force for improving the effectiveness and efficiency of public services. However, the perception of innovation is a key factor in understanding the capacity of public organisations to innovate and certain limitations can be established in relation to the identification of the impact of the process and the results of the local innovations developed (non-disruptive adaptations of organisations, improvements in coordination processes, incorporation of new integrated approaches as reference frameworks for local policies and methodological frameworks in organisations, etc.). In this sense, it can be said that in many cases, improvements in internal processes, administrative and financial performance, in terms of agility, efficiency or cost savings, are not always valued when the evidence of results is not immediate (Mairal, 2018).

The research leads to the conclusion that the success or failure of a public innovation will depend not only on the qualities of the innovative project itself, but also on a series of characteristics of the organisation and its context that affect the innovation development process and that are managed more or less successfully.

In relation to the determining factors, the research carried out leads to the conclusion that there are factors that have a direct impact on the organisations themselves as initial conditioning factors, which can be considered from a systemic approach to innovation processes. Similarly, the processes themselves will have an impact on the results of innovation.

We can therefore state that organisational elements are key to analysing how public innovation processes unfold and which are the hotspots for planning: capacity, flexibility, limitations in inter-area coordination and communication, motivation, identification of innovation and its results... are factors that directly affect the innovative capacities of public organisations and, at the local level, are planned as conditioning factors of the spaces for interaction with other agents.

It is probably these inputs that motivate the effort to concentrate local innovations in sectoral initiatives articulated in the form of technology-based projects and in scenarios of lower institutional risk. In short, replicas of solutions that do not consider scalability and that are based on testing processes and previous development experiences in other environments.

By way of conclusion, some of the challenges observed can also be raised, such as the re-visioning of organisational architectures, the leap (in innovation processes) from co-design to the implementation of shared solutions and scarcity, the sustainable leadership of public organisations and the permeability towards the returns of innovation (knowledge, experience, methodologies), or the sustainability of the participation of non-state actors in the processes, facilitating medium and long-term involvement and strengthening co-responsibility.

Bibliography

- Arundel, A., Bloch, C. y Ferguson, B. (2019). "Advancing innovation in the public sector: Aligning innovation measurement with policy goals", en *Research Policy*, vol. 48, nº 3, pp.789-798. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.respol.2018.12.001>
- Australian National Audit Office – ANAO (2009). *Innovation in the Public Sector: Enabling Better Performance, Driving New Directions. Best Practices Guide*, Commonwealth of Australia.
- Bason, C. (2010). *Leading public sector innovation: Co-creating for a better society*, Bristol: Policy Press.
- Bloch, C. y Bugge, M. M. (2013). "Public sector innovation: From theory to measurement", en *Structural change and economic dynamics*, nº 27, pp. 133-145. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.strueco.2013.06.008>
- Borins, S. (2001). "Encouraging innovation in the public sector", en *Journal of intellectual capital*, vol. 2, nº 3, pp. 310-319.

- Bresser-Pereira, L. C., y Cunill, N. (1999). "Entre o Estado e o mercado: o público não-estatal", en Bresser-Pereira, L. C., y Cunill, N., *O público não-estatal na reforma do Estado*. Rio de Janeiro: FGV, pp. 15-48.
- Brugué, Q, Blanco, I. y Boada, J. (2014). "Entornos y motores para la innovación en las políticas públicas", en *Revista del CLAD Reforma y Democracia*, nº59, pp. 5-34.
- Conejero, E., y Redondo, J. C. (2016). "La innovación social desde el ámbito público: Conceptos, experiencias y obstáculos", en *Gestión y análisis de políticas públicas*, nº 15, pp. 23-42. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.24965/gapp.v0i15.10310>
- Feller, I., & Feller, E. (1981). "Public-Sector Innovation as Conspicuous Production", en *Policy Analysis*, vol. 7, nº1, pp. 1-20.
- Hartley, J. (2005). "Innovation in governance and public services: Past and present". *Public money and management*, vol. 25, nº1, pp. 27-34. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9302.2005.00447.x>
- Hartley, J., Sorensen, E. y Torfing, J. (2013). "Collaborative innovation: A viable alternative to market competition and organizational entrepreneurship", en *Public Administration Review*, vol. 73, nº 6, pp. 821-830. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1111/puar.12136>
- Lee, S. y Olshfski, D. (2002). "Employee commitment and firefighters: It's my job", en *Public Administration Review*, nº 62, pp.
- Longo, F. (2012). "Innovación en Gobernanza: entornos colaborativos y liderazgos relacionales", en *EKONOMIAZ*, vol. 80, nº 02, pp. 46-69.
- Mairal, P. (2011). "Incorporando procesos innovadores en la gestión del territorio. Modelos y casos de colaboración público- privada en el diseño de políticas y la gestión de servicios de proximidad", en ponencia presentada en el X Congreso AECPA. Murcia, septiembre.
- Mairal, P. (2018). "Gestión pública innovadora en las administraciones locales", en ponencia presentada en el II Congreso Internacional del Instituto Complutense de Ciencia de la Administración. Madrid, noviembre.
- Mairal, P. (2019). "La innovación pública en las Administraciones locales". Tesis doctoral. Madrid: Universidad Complutense de Madrid.
- Mairal, P., Pastor, G., y García, M.J. (2015). "La gobernanza local: Retos y oportunidades", en Gandarillas M. y Cueva A. (Coord.). *La gobernanza de la seguridad y justicia en la sociedad diversa*. Madrid: Ayuntamiento de Arganda del Rey, pp. 25-40.
- Mulgan, G. (2014). *Innovation in the public sector. How can public organisations better create, improve and adapt?* Londres: Nesta.
- Mulgan, G. y Albury, D. (2003). *Innovation in the public sector. Strategy unit*. London: Cabinet Office, pp. 1-40.
- Natera, F. (2004). "La noción de gobernanza como gestión pública participativa y reticular", en *Documentos de Trabajo Política y Gestión*, nº 2, pp. 1-35.
- Navarro, C. J. (2015). "Innovación social y Gobernanza urbana", en Subirats, J. y García Bernardos, A. (ed.). *Innovación Social y Políticas Urbanas en España*. Barcelona: Icaria, pp. 43-57.
- Newman, J., Raine, J. y Skelcher, C. (2001). "Developments: Transforming local government: Innovation and modernization", en *Public Money and Management*, vol. 21, nº 2, pp. 61-68. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9302.00262>
- OCDE (2016). *Innovation in the public sector: Making it happen*. Observatory of Public Sector Innovation (OPSI).
- Osborne, S. P. y Brown, K. (2005). *Managing change and innovation in public sector organisations*. London/New York: Routledge.
- Osborne, S. P. y Brown, L. (2011). "Innovation in public services: Engaging with risk", en *Public Money & Management*, vol. 31, nº 1, pp. 4-6. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/09540962.2011.545532>
- Pastor, G. (2018). "Colaboración abierta e innovación pública", en Rodríguez, J. y Lariguet, G. *Gobierno abierto y ética*. Argentina: Universidad Nacional de Córdoba, pp. 239-272.

- Pollitt, C. (2008). La innovación en el sector público. Discurso de Apertura de la Conferencia Anual del Grupo Europeo de Administración Pública. Erasmus Universiteit Róterdam. Holanda.
- Ramió, C. (2009). La colaboración público-privada y la creación de valor público. Barcelona: Diputación de Barcelona.
- Ramírez-Alujas, A. (2010) "Innovación en la Gestión Pública y Open Government (Gobierno Abierto): Una Vieja Nueva Idea", en Revista Buen Gobierno, nº 9. DOI: https://doi.org/10.35247/buengob_09_06
- Rivera, L., Simmonds, P. y Román, L. (2012). Trends and challenges in public sector innovation in Europe. Bruselas: DG Enterprise, Comisión Europea.
- Zanardo, S. (2014). "EU support for cities and social innovation. SEISMIC project Societal Engagement", Science, Mutual learning In Cities. Policy watch, 1. Bruselas: Eurocities.
- Zurbruggen, C. y Lago, M. G. (2014). "Innovación y co-creación. Nuevos desafíos para las políticas públicas", en Revista de Gestión Pública, vol. 3, nº 2, pp. 329-361.

Author's Biography

Pilar Mailar Medina: Associate Professor of Political Science and Public Administration (UCM). Member of the Complutense Institute of Public Administration Science. PhD in Political Science and Public Administration (UCM). Bachelor's Degree in Political Science and Public Administration (UCM). Master's Degree in Research, Management and Local Development, with a specialization in local policies. Within the framework of her professional activity, she has participated in various transnational projects focused on innovation in public services across different fields, especially those related to environmental sustainability policies and social innovation, along with initiatives based on innovative models of urban governance.