



## **Public Service Innovation In a Political Trap**

**Ria Ariany<sup>1\*</sup>**

**Novalinda<sup>2</sup>**

**Misnar Sitriwanti<sup>3</sup>**

<sup>1\*</sup>Faculty of Social and Political Sciences, Andalas University, Indonesia, Email: riaariany@soc.unand.ac.id

<sup>2</sup>Faculty of Cultural Sciences, Andalas University, Indonesia, Email: novalinda@hum.unand.ac.id

<sup>3</sup>BNM College of Administrative Sciences, Pariaman, Indonesia, Email: misnar2008@gmail.com

**\*Corresponding Author:** - Ria Ariany

\*Faculty of Social and Political Sciences, Andalas University, Indonesia, Email: riaariany@soc.unand.ac.id

### **ABSTRACT**

This study discusses the problem of public service innovation products born from the competition results. Some experts agree that innovation competition can spur the growth of Innovation in various public sectors (Jacob Torfing, 2016), so this model is widely practised in various countries, especially in developing countries that are transforming as a result of globalization. However, research focuses on public service innovation products featured in the Provincial-level Public Service Innovation competition in West Sumatra from 2014-to 2021, even being ranked in the TOP 45. TOP 99 national levels is not a guarantee that the Innovation can be implemented according to the formulation, even changing the face of public services in the regions to be better. Even some of these superior innovations are no longer running. In addition to these facts, the results of this research using qualitative methods located in West Sumatra province show that public service innovations superior to regions included as participants in this competition have two sides. On the one hand, it was born as part of the local government's efforts to improve the face of regional public services. On the other hand, it is full of political content, namely the development of the image of regional heads. The conclusion from this study is that the regional head with his authority is the key to changing the face of public services in the region since the built public service innovation model will not be able to run successfully without political support.

**Keywords:** Innovation; Competition; Services; Politics

### **1. INTRODUCTION**

Public service innovations in the West Sumatra region which are superior to the competition program, do not guarantee that these innovations can be implemented properly and run as in the concept. One of them is because the innovations included in the competition are often the political interests of the rulers, not only built from ideas that become problem-solving for problems that occur in the community but more on the importance of the image built by the region. In this case, the local political context also determines the success of innovation implementation because Innovation is not just an administrative procedure but also a political decision (Widiyahseno, 2018).

So far, local governments are given the authority to innovate as widely as possible, especially in the public service sector, to achieve maximum service to the community. Even though not many governments can keep their innovations running (**Kumorotomo, 2012; Prasojo & Kurniawan, 2008; Widiyahseno, 2018**). After the innovator is not in the same position, often the innovation system that has been built is no longer continued by his successor and is replaced with a different program. This condition also occurs in several TOP 99 National superior public service innovations in the province of West Sumatra, which in the second year of the Innovation are no longer running, even just disappear. This is a big question mark.

By some experts, the concept of spurring the growth of Innovation in the public sector through competition is considered an alternative (Pratama, 2019) to give birth to various innovations in

each public sector. This concept was also agreed upon by Jacob Torfing, who, in his quote, said that public sector innovation awards are increasing used to stimulate the search for next practices (**Borins 1998; Ferreira, Farah and Spink, 2008; in Torfing, 2016**), and a growing number of public innovation surveys report a rise in public Innovation (**Arundel and Smith 2013; Kattel et al. 2014; dalam Torfing 2016**).

It must be acknowledged that public service competitions organized by the government, both at the central and regional levels, are one of the driving forces for the birth of various innovations in various public sectors, both public and non-service sectors. In reality, Innovation in various public sectors is needed in the administration of a government which is to transform as an unavoidable impact of globalization.

The globalization of technology that enters all aspects of human life and has a dramatic impact (**Berry, Leonard L, 2019**) makes the government must be adaptive to these changes so that Innovation in state administration in all sectors is certainly needed. Innovation is an urgent need and can be a solution (**Walker et al., 2011; de Vries, M., 2013; and Hanggoro, 2021**) for government administration and public service problems in the community, although previously, Innovation was very foreign to the government bureaucracy that rigid. Innovation is often carried out in the private sector to exist in market competition (**Hanggoro, 2021**). Whereas in the public sector, Innovation aims to improve humans' quality and life expectancy (**Vincent K. Omachonu and Norman G. Einspruch, 2010**) through service channels that are more effective in achieving service goals.

This condition is a challenge for the Indonesian government amid the high economic, educational, social and cultural inequality in Indonesian society. Moreover, classic conditions that characterize developing countries, such as inequality in infrastructure development (**Govindarajan, Vijay, Chris Trimble, 2012**), are one of the causes of community backwardness in some areas, making the central and regional governments have to find solutions to be able to break through these obstacles. Innovation is one of the most rational alternatives that the government can do. Creating Innovation is one solution to the problem of limited conditions (**Torfing, 2016**) that the government is currently facing, especially in providing broad access to services for the community. This condition justifies the importance of giving birth to many innovations from various service sectors through public service innovation competitions.

The model of competition to produce many innovations was also adopted by the Ministry of Administrative Reform and Bureaucratic Reform (PAN&RB) in spurring the birth of various innovations in various public service sectors. Governments are often hasty in adopting a program or Innovation from another government (**Albury 2005; Altshuler and Behn 1997; F. S. Berry and W. D. Berry 1990; Bingham 1977; Bradach 2003; Damanpour and Schneider 2009; Danziger et al. 1982; Franz 2008; Frederickson et al. 2004; Kwon, Berry, and Feiock 2009; Mayer, Blakely, and Davidson 1986; Tolbert, Mossberger, and McNeal 2008; Walker 1969; Kyu-Nahm Jun and Christopher Weare, 2011**) without further examining the Innovation's suitability with the locus Recently. This has become one of the causes of failure in implementing adopted innovations. In addition, several factors such as bureaucratic politics and the motivation of implementing actors (**Kyu-Nahm Jun and Christopher Weare, 1998**) also contribute to the failure to implement an adopted innovation. Adoption of innovations or programs that are carried out is not wrong, but adopting good programs or innovations must also be supported by instruments capable of running the program.

In Indonesia, the Public Service Innovation competition, which is more popular with the acronym SINOVIK is assumed to give birth to many innovations in each sector, with the hope that replica studies can be carried out on innovations that are considered successful in several fields. However, adopting innovations has consequences that are not easy because each Innovation is formulated based on several factors: (1) the characteristics of the Innovation itself; (2) individual or organizational characteristics adopted; (3) the social system in which adoption occurs (**Damanpour and Schneider, 2009; Danziger et al. 1982; Moon and Norris, 2005; Weare, Musso, and Hale, 1999; Kyu-Nahm Jun and Christopher Weare, 2011**). Therefore, the adoption of innovations carried out must examine the environment and the readiness of human resources who will execute the Innovation because it is not uncommon for innovation adoption to require behavioural changes from the executors to be able to obtain benefits as in their original environment (**Kyu-Nahm Jun and Christopher Weare, 2011**).

In several previous studies that examined the issue of public service innovation, mostly conducted in western countries (Pratama, 2019), the emphasis of the research carried out was more on innovation measurement instruments, metrics and indexes Bloch & Bugge, 2013; Walker, Jeanes & Rowlands, 2002). Meanwhile, similar research in Indonesia places more emphasis on Innovation related to technology and is a case study (Anggadwita & Dhewanto, 2013; Fahlevi, 2014; Jati, 2011; Kusumasari, Setianto & Pang, 2018; Lembaga Administrasi Negara, 2014; Santoso, 2015; Sutanto, 2017). The studies that examine innovation competitions organized by the Indonesian government place more emphasis on a comprehensive perspective on the characteristics of selected innovations in public service innovation competitions in Indonesia from 2014-to 2016 (Pratama, 2019). Meanwhile, Wicaksono, 2018, also reviewed the Public Service Innovation of competitive products, which focused on the typology of the most innovative Innovation programs.

So from the many studies that examine the issue of public service innovation competition in Indonesia, this paper discusses the most innovative public service innovations in the national level Public Service Innovation competition but failed in their implementation.

## 2. RESEARCH METHOD

This research uses the descriptive qualitative method. In data collection conducted by the research team, several techniques were used, namely: initial observation at each research locus; conducting in-depth interviews with policymakers at the research locus; conducting in-depth interviews with Innovation implementing staff at each research locus; conducting forum group discussion (FGD) activities at the beginning of research activities with representatives of all work units that are the research locus; cross-check data (triangulate data sources). After the data was collected, the research team coded the data, reduced the data irrelevant to the research topic, and then analyzed the displayed data. Based on the results of data analysis, the existing data is mapped, referring to the theory that has been determined before the conclusion is formulated.

## RESULT AND DISCUSSION

### Innovation as a Public Service Vulnerability Solution

The concept of Innovation, according to Ackoff (1981), is the antithesis of machine-like behaviour. Innovation in its implementation in the public service sector implies that in pursuing service goals, a strategy or new products are needed that are out of the ordinary so that in addition to avoiding saturation in service patterns, Innovation is also a solution to various bureaucratic rigidities. However, according to **Widiyahseno (2015)**, Innovation should not only talk about "newness" issues. A bigger problem frames Innovation, namely the changes that occur (**Beck and Whistler, 1967; Osborne and Brown, 2005; Jawa Pos Autonomy, 2011**). ; in **Widiyahseno, 2015**). Moreover, in the innovations carried out in the government sector, the most important thing to study is the systemic changes which are the consequences of an implemented innovation.

In this fairly modern era, when almost most human activities begin to shift towards digital, the government must also adapt to this condition. Therefore, Innovation can be a smart solution to various problems faced by the government the diversity of problems faced. Innovation in the public sector in its implementation is not as easy as in the private sector because the public sector bureaucracy contains various obstacles to Innovation (**Halvorsen et al., 2005; Roste, 2005; Torfing, 2016**), such as bureaucratic rigidity to existing rules and procedures, lack of competition. The absence of incentives and the absence of bonus payments (**Borins, 2001b; Kelman, 2005; Torfing, 2016**) make the public sector inflexible in innovating. In addition, the resistance of public bureaucrats to novelty is still visible. The bureaucracy is still trapped in the routine activities that are its obligations.

The phenomenon of giving birth to Innovation has long developed in the work unit of public service providers through the discretionary spaces that exist at the street-level bureaucrats in the process of public service interaction (**Lipsky, Michael, 2010**). However, the innovations carried out are often personal, unsystematic and institutionalized because they are only to simplify the process and achieve service targets at that time. The discretion exercised at the street level is often uncontrolled, thus opening up spaces for "illegal transactions" that harm the community. Therefore, Innovation is needed to break the rigidity of the service process that has

been built up in the government bureaucracy, which is synonymous with complexity and injustice (**Lipsky**, 2010).

The complexity of Innovation that falls into the realm of discretion is also described by **Kline** and **Rosenberg** (1986). They say that Innovation tends to be complex, random, unpatterned and always follows conditions, so it is very dynamic. Furthermore, it is also said that Innovation tends to be difficult to measure, so to find out whether a service "product" is categorized in Innovation, it is necessary to have a very good assessment of service product users and whether they have achieved the targets that have been previously set.

Furthermore, from the government's perspective as a service provider, Innovation has become an unavoidable necessity, so motivating the apparatus to always produce Innovation in carrying out its main tasks and functions is a challenge. Based on a survey of policymakers in China, there are findings that personality affects the willingness to innovate and the effect of responsiveness to changes such as the risk experienced. Individual preferences for policy innovations are so important but less considered that the interaction between individual preferences and institutional incentives determines a policy innovation. Furthermore, individual preferences, or innovative personalities, are the basis for explaining constant renewal. The research data concluded that many local government officials did not want to take risks and chose to respect the hierarchy (the central leadership above it). Several things make local officials not want to innovate. The point is, when Innovation is carried out, there will be an increase in risk in almost the entire system or a lack of clarity regarding promotional incentives. However, several officials continue to innovate, even though they are under structural pressure but do not dampen their desire always to continue. However, what is done is not a small risk. This is so that it is still a question mark whose issue can be a topic in future research (Lewis et al., 2022).

Meanwhile, from the perspective of Public Service Innovation as a product of the local government, it becomes a high-value performance for the region and prestige for the regional head. So politically, Innovation can be used as a space to build regional heads' political image. In the political context, there are three forms of Innovation in political life, namely: 1) Policy innovation focuses on policies with new content and presented in new forms; 2) Procedural and organizational innovations focus on reforming formal and informal institutional rules; 3) Cultural Innovation which focuses on reforming the shape and perception of roles. In addition, there are also three drivers of policy innovation: leadership, competition, and collaboration (E Sørensen, 2016).

### **Political Context in Public Service Innovation**

Politics in the context of public service innovation competition plays a role in the realm of decision-makers on public service innovations that will be formulated and implemented, including when they will be completed. So it is not strange when the birth of public service innovation is created at the urging of political competition. So talking about policy innovation, it cannot be separated from the individual or group that makes the policy. The involvement of regional heads and heads of work units have great potential in creating Innovation, even to the extent that Innovation is sustainable. According to (Lewis et al., 2022), in their article explaining that the individual attributes of policymakers affect the willingness to engage in policy innovation, this influence is considered responsive. However, it is not determined by changes in the institutional structure.

The big role of leadership in the birth and implementation of Innovation also cannot be separated from the leadership position as the top decision-maker. According to (Scholten, 2010), making bold decisions they are divided into four main categories, namely: 1) Decisions are innovative; 2) Decisions have a major impact on society; 3) Decisions usually cause controversy from certain people who object or because they are considered not by the political and budgetary agenda, and 4) Decisions that dare to consider risk aspects. When a leader decides to make a policy innovation, it cannot be separated from the problems that must be solved. Innovations made should answer the problems that occur as a solution to solving problems.

In his 1984 book, *Political Innovation in America*, cited in (Torfing & Ansell, 2017), Polsby analyzes the role of politicians in encouraging policy innovation. According to Polsby, politicians are driven by competition for voters. They will utilize ritual events such as election campaigns, press conferences, party conferences and presidential speeches to the nation to market new and

innovative policy solutions that can win voters' support. However, on the other hand, politicians may play a key role in identifying and legitimizing problems and unmet needs that require policy innovation and in assessing the political distribution consequences of new policies. The role played is very limited in formulating policy issues, developing policy content, and proposals for new policies.

Moreover, it evaluates possible effects and outcomes (Polsby 1984, 55). The phases of problem definition, development, and evaluation of the search for policy solutions are generally carried out by administrators who run the executive government and are even assisted by scientific experts. Meanwhile, politicians are not involved in identifying problems but only looking for solutions to be offered to voters.

It should be remembered that the regional public leadership will not be separated from the party carrying the candidate during the election and the coalition of parties that won the election. Meanwhile, the relationship between public Innovation and political parties can be seen from the following four typologies: linkages, programs, interactions, and policies. One of the main expectations of the relationship is that hierarchical parties with centralized leadership can make more efficient decisions. However, the results of continuous Innovation proposed as collaborative efforts are easier to obtain from decentralized political parties with participatory internal democratic processes (Bischoff & Christiansen, 2017)

Meanwhile, policy innovation and policy diffusion between local governments in the structure of a unitary state can be influenced by the intensity of central intervention: First, mandatory vertical intervention from the central government. The mandatory vertical intervention relates to the process of policy diffusion, which has full support or is not recommended by the central government through an administrative mandate. In some policy cases, the central government requires the regions to learn from policy innovations initiated by pioneering regions with administrative mandates. In contrast, the central government has a non-interventional attitude towards regional policy innovations and diffusion activities in other policy areas. It can be concluded that the presence or absence of central government intervention affects diffusion and Innovation. Interventions carried out by the central government can affect the areas where inter-regional policy diffusion is decided by local officials, especially officials who are very concerned with future political careers. The second is horizontal political competition between local governments (Zhu, 2017).

Policy innovation is a key aspect of public Innovation, including public service innovation, which has been largely ignored. According to Carstensen and Bason 2012 (E Sørensen 2016), While policy-making is largely organized as an internal activity among politicians and administrators at the national and local government levels, there is little space and opportunity for dialogue, and knowledge exchange and collaboration between politicians and relevant and affected stakeholders. This statement implies the importance of collaboration and open spaces for dialogue and information exchange in policy-making involving relevant stakeholders. Suppose it is associated with public service innovation policies. In that case, it is hoped that the innovations carried out are necessary to solve public service problems and collect various views of all stakeholders on the problems that occur.

Learning from the many innovation failures, innovation policy instruments are important points that are often neglected in formulating an innovation. The urgency of the innovation instrument as a benchmark in the innovation implementation process so as not to lose direction in the implementation process. Innovation policy instruments must be understood as an operational form of government and public institutions intervention. Although the nature of the instrument is purposive (instruments related to something), it does not mean that all innovation policy instruments have been consciously selected and designed. The selection and use of innovation policy instruments sometimes do not pay attention to the clarity of government objectives. They are based on a clear identification of problems. Many instruments are selected through ad-hoc (or non-decision) decisions, largely based on the continuation of previous schemes or the outcome of a specific interest group lobbying process, rather than on visionary consideration of an overarching innovation policy and critical assessment of actual problems. Which action must be taken.

Three major instruments must be owned in innovation policy: regulations, economic transfers, and soft instruments. Each innovation policy instrument is unique. Although some instruments

are considered similar, there are always differences, especially in how the problem is defined and approached. There are differences in content, not only about how instruments are selected and designed. The overall aspects of an innovation policy instrument are social, political, economic, and organizational aspects that apply the instrument. This article also argues that the design and implementation of innovation policies are highly dependent on how innovation policies are defined, adjusted, and incorporated into various instruments that aim to overcome related problems in the system. Policy instruments are not comprehensive unless combined into various aspects that examine the complex nature of Innovation and are viewed in various dimensions (Borrás & Edquist, 2013).

### 3. Finding Data

Innovation in the realm of public services by various developing countries which are fixing the course of their government organizations has become very urgent. Therefore, competition or the like is a choice to spur the birth of Innovation in various sectors. Many developed countries have also carried out this condition (Pratama, 2019).

Likewise, with the Indonesian government in this era of bureaucratic reform, the innovation awards model organized by various ministries proved to have spawned many innovations, namely the Ministry of State Apparatus Empowerment and Bureaucratic Reform (KemenPAN & RB), Ministry of Home Affairs (KemenDagri), Ministry of Agriculture, and several Other ministries also organize various Awards to encourage the central and local governments always to be innovative.

The public service competition, which has been held effectively for the last seven years, has proven to be a stimulant in efforts to improve the face of public services in the regions, especially since the issuance of Ministerial Regulation & Bureaucratic Reform No. 15 of 2015 concerning Public Service Innovation Competitions in Ministries, Institutions and Local Governments in 2016, which is popularly known as SINOVIK (Public Service Innovation Competition) makes public service Innovation a must. In the concept, every public service work unit (UKPP) that creates Innovation in implementing public services has the right to participate in SINOVIK, which is held at the national level. This competition has become very prestigious. Apart from being held and announced directly by the Ministry of State Apparatus Empowerment and Bureaucratic Reform (PAN & RB), this competition has become a "prestige" for regions that have successfully entered the TOP 40 and TOP 99 Innovation categories set by the ministry.

It is undeniable that a prestigious competition like SINOVIK will not be separated from the various contents, especially for the participating districts/cities. This is a necessity. When a region's Innovation is included in the best category at a national level competition, it will improve the region's image and, of course, the image of the regional head, in addition to prizes in the form of regional incentives that will be obtained. The built image will certainly affect the political image of the regional head, so it is not surprising that building innovation cannot be separated from the content of regional politics, even though its main spirit is to create excellent service for the community.

It is well recognized that formulating an effective innovation implemented successfully in society is not easy. Many factors are considered in the innovative formulation, including health service innovation. These include economic, social, cultural and political factors. However, with a stimulus from the central and regional governments through competition, service sector innovation is not a "difficult" thing because almost every year, the public service delivery unit (UKPP) produces many innovations. Even several public service innovations from various cities and regencies in the province of West Sumatera that participated in the SINOVIK competition were included in the TOP 99 and even topped 45 at the national level.

The West Sumatra provincial government, through the Organizational Bureau of the management division, has initiated a public service competition event since 2009, involving representatives from several state universities, media, NGOs and other social institutions in the city of Padang. They are members of the Independent Assessment Team. Activities that refer to the MenPAN regulation No. 12 of 2009 concerning Guidelines for the Assessment of the Implementation of District/City Government Public Services, up to the latest regulation of MenPan R&B No. 7 of 2021 concerning Public Service Innovation Competitions in Ministries/Institutions, Regional Governments, State-Owned Enterprises, and Regional-Owned Enterprises, seems quite effective in spurring public service providers to create various

innovations in the implementation of public services which will have an impact on improvement. Public sector services.

West Sumatra Province, consisting of 7 (seven) city governments and 12 (twelve) district governments, is gradually making improvements to the public service sector simultaneously in each district/city government. One indication is the increasing trend of participants from district/city governments participating in public service competitions every year.

**Table 1.** Participants of the West Sumatra Province Public Service and Innovation Competition in 2019 – 2021

Year	Number of Districts	Number of Cities	UKPP West Sumatra Province	Total Participants
2019	9	7	10	26
2020	12	7	11	30
2021	12	7	8	27

Data Source: Bureau of Organization of West Sumatra Province, 2021

The data in table 1. shows the dominance of competition participants from districts and cities in the province of West Sumatra. In this competition organized by the Bureau of Organization of the Regional Secretariat of the Province of West Sumatra, each district/city government is only allowed to send one best Innovation representing its region. Meanwhile, the provincial government of West Sumatra, which has 46 Regional Apparatus Organizations (OPD), is encouraged to participate in the competition. Table 1 shows that all regencies/cities in the province of West Sumatra participated in the competition for public services and service innovation. In contrast, the competition participants from the provincial government tended to decline. This condition shows that the local government, in this case, the district and city governments, is the dominant actor contributing (Pratama, 2019) and implementing public service innovations. This position is because the district/city government is the front line of public services that interact directly with the community and knows the community's needs best.

The high participation of district/city governments in competition for excellent service and public service innovations at the provincial and SINOVIK levels at the national level indicates that the district/city governments in West Sumatra province have begun to focus on improving public services in various sectors through various innovations. Innovations that have been implemented for at least one year include being superior. This is evident from the inclusion of several innovations that were competed in the SINOVIK event, which succeeded in being included in the category of 99 innovative innovations, even being included in categories 45 and 40 national-level innovations since this competition was held by the Ministry of PAN & RB 2014. Following are the Leading Innovations from various regencies/cities in West Sumatra province that have succeeded in becoming superior at the National level:

**Table 2.** West Sumatra Public Service Innovations in the National SINOVIK Award-winning 2014 to 2021

No.	TYear	Innovation Name	Innovation Field	UKPP	Award
1.	2014	1. Performance of School Achievements (P2S) with an Environmentally Friendly, Social Friendly and Quality Culture approach	Education	Padang Pariaman District Education Office	TOP 40
		2. Child Development Services	Health	Tanah Garam Public Health Center, Solok City	TOP 99
2.	2016	Tigo Tungku Sajarangan: as an effort to treat MDR TB	Health	Achmad Mochtar Hospital (West Sumatra Province)	TOP 99
3.	2017	1. OASE Friends of the Heart: Online Anywhere Services	Administrasi	Department of Population and Civil Registration Kab. Flatland	TOP 99
		2. Quit Smoking Clinic	Health	Padang Karambia Health Center (Payakumbuh City)	TOP 99
4.	2018	1. BASABA (Father Loves Baby)	Health	1. Achmad Mochtar Hospital (West Sumatra Province)	TOP 40
		2. 2. IMUD (Young Mother Class)	Health	2. Padang Pasir Public Health Center (Padang City)	TOP 40
5.	2019	Feeling Soul (Healthy Alert Family)	Health	Naggalo Health Center (City of Padang)	TOP 99
6.	2020	1. Let's Prevent Stunting	Health	1. Andalas Health Center (City of Padang)	TOP 99

		2. MASPETTAG (community cares about Tuberculosis Tanjung Gadang)	Health	2. Tanjung Gadang Health Center (Sijunjung district)	TOP 45
		3. Family School	Sosial	3. DP3AKB Bukittinggi city	TOP 99
		4. SAD TO HAPPY (a tribe of children breaking through the forest for the sake of the Population admin)	Administration	4. Department of Population and Civil Registration Kab. Dharmasraya	TOP 99
7.	2021	1. PARADE LANSIA	Social	1. District Social Service. Sijunjung	TOP 45
		2. GL-Pro SASABESA (Saiyo Sakato Baringin Sakti Productive Elderly Movement)	Social	2. Social Service of Dharmasraya Regency	TOP 99
		3. ASRI Program	Health	3. Padang Lua Public Health Center (Agam Regency)	TOP 99
		4. GBS (Garbage Blessing Movement)	Environment	4. Department of Environment Kab. West Pasaman	TOP 99
		5. WISI (Graduation Immunization)	Health	5. Batu Bajaranjang Health Center Kab. solo	TOP 45
		6. SIPADUKO (Integrated Health Center Information System)	Health	6. Payakumbuh City Health Office	TOP 99

Source: Activity Report of the West Sumatra Provincial Secretariat Organization Bureau, 2021

In table 2. it can be seen that since 2014 and 6 consecutive years since 2016, there have been 11 districts/cities in the province of West Sumatra included in the category of the most innovative innovation version of the Ministry of PAN & RB, and dominated by the health sector. These data indicate that the region's direction of service improvement is still focused on the public health sector. This condition confirms the research conducted by Pratama (2019), which also shows that the most innovative programs in the 2014-2016 public service innovation competition held by the Ministry of PAN & RB are still dominated by health sector innovations from districts/cities. This fact shows that the condition of the community is still focused on meeting the basic needs, namely health; in other words, the health sector is still the main problem in Indonesia. From a different point of view, this condition shows an increase in the commitment of local governments to achieve service goals through various innovations. Politically, the display of regional public service innovations that receive national recognition will certainly positively impact public services themselves and the image of the region. and regional heads. In addition to public service innovations with the "innovative" brand, often used as a reference for various regions to be replicated, the brand also indirectly increases the region's popularity, thus encouraging local governments to create competitive innovations. This condition refers to table 1, which indicates that all district/city governments and provincial governments participate in the provincial level service and innovation competition for public services. However, in its implementation, the facts show that many of these superior innovations are no longer running with various arguments. This fact raises various questions, ranging from the assessment indicators used, and the innovation formulation process, to the urgency of the birth of Innovation. Because it is a little or not, giving birth to a successful innovation requires processes and stages that are not concise and require a lot of resources and time.

**Table 3.** Unsustainable SINOVIK Product Innovations in West Sumatra Province  
Source: research data, 2021

No.	Nama Inovasi	Bidang Inovasi	Pelaksana	Keterangan
1.	Tigo Tungku Sajarangan: as an effort to treat MDR TB	Health	RSAM Bukittinggi	Improper implementation /change of leadership
2.	Quit Smoking Clinic	Health	Bukitting Hospital, Padang Karambia Public Health Center, Payakumbuhgi City	It is no longer running/the manager does not exist/the facilities do not exist/change the leader.
3.	GBS (Garbage Blessing Movement)	Environment	District Environmental Service. West Pasaman	Change of leadership/ unclear planning
4.	GL-Pro SASABESA	Social	Social Service of Dharmasraya Regency	Change of leadership/no budget/unclear planning
5.	Family School	Social	DP3AKB Bukittinggi city	No budget/ unclear planning/ change of leadership
6.	ELDERLY PARADE	Social	District Social Service. Sijunjung	No budget/ unclear planning/ change of leadership
7.	SIPADUKO (Integrated Health Center Information System)	Health Administration	Payakumbuh City Health Office	Not socialized/unclear planning

Table 3 shows several reasons for discontinuing the implementation of the most innovative service innovations from the province of West Sumatra. The data obtained shows that there are



inappropriate innovation policy instruments and, more than that, the planning and execution of forced innovations.

### Discussion

An innovation assessment by the Ministry of PAN & RB, which is carried out through an online assessment of proposals submitted for the TOP 99 innovative category, and equipped with a day's field review for this TOP 45/40 innovative innovation, is a guarantee that the Innovation can be implemented as intended? ? And the impact on improving the targeted service sector? This still needs more in-depth research and a longer time to measure it.

However, it is an undeniable data-based fact that among the most innovative innovations in the case of West Sumatra province, as shown in table 3, it shows that there have been various obstacles in the implementation of these innovations for various reasons, namely lack of socialization, limited budget, lack of supporting facilities and infrastructure. Even the leadership change proves the government's lack of commitment to improving the face of services so that by 2022 this Innovation is no longer running or even lost. The existence of other reasons, such as the lack of careful planning, resource capacity, budget and rotation and promotion of human resources within the UKPP, became a classic reason for the innovation failure in the UKPP body. In addition, the failure of the monitoring and evaluation system that has been built is also one of the factors in the failure of implementing Innovation in the public service sector, which in the end only becomes "branding". All the reasons will lead to the political decisions of the government administration bureaucracy.

A different problem with the same impact on the continuity of Innovation is when there is a change of regional leadership. What generally happens is a massive overhaul of the placement of human resources in the bureaucratic structure, which will have an impact on the direction and regional policies, including current policies. In this condition, few elected regional leaders are willing to continue the previous leadership programs. Generally, the elected regional heads will carry out their programs by the vision and mission during the campaign so that it is not difficult for the government with new leaders to stop or even delete the previous program. This fact is in line with the findings in the field that the main problem, which is a factor in the failure of existing innovations (see table 3), is the change in the leadership of the work unit.

It is not wrong for the elected regional leaders to try to realize the vision and mission they carry. However, it has become commonplace that the vision and mission of the candidate pairs for regional heads do not refer to the previously formulated regional Long-Term Development Plan (RPJP) so that when the achievement of the vision and mission of the elected regional head is often unsustainable because changing regional heads will also change direction. Development of an area. The function of community control over local government implementation is also often weak because the spaces for community participation are often neglected so that the government seems to be running itself with its policies.

While Innovation is a political decision (**Widiyahsenno, 2015**), Innovation is not only limited to novelty issues but more than that. That Innovation will talk about systemic problems in which various interests will fill new spaces due to implementing Innovation. Therefore, Innovation is highly dependent on the leadership with its authority.

In retrospect, the commitment to improving the quality of public services should not only be the commitment of the unit providing public services. However, it must be broader than that of the regional leadership. This has become steady because improving the quality of public services in a government is closely related to the allocated budget and the proper placement of human resources. The goodwill of the regional head is the main key to improving public services because when the regional head has a high commitment to improving public services, it will be reflected in the programs and activities carried out. So Innovation, in this case, should not only be a promotional medium for image enhancement. Innovation is more about creating an idea or strategy and implementing it in real action to realize a change that leads to novelty (Wicaksono, 2018) to achieve the desired target. Regional heads which are highly committed to improving public services and successfully changing the face of their services do not need branding because the performance representing the regional head is the strongest and most unforgettable branding.

Innovation without full budget support and a clear system will fail because Innovation is a comprehensive systemic change (Wicaksono, 2018) that requires support from various parties, not only for physical facilities (Klein & Rosenberg, 1986) budget and resources. Humans implement Innovation, but more than that, Innovation also needs understanding from the community as a user so that it can be implemented successfully. This is where the important of identifying that the form of Innovation must be appropriate and placed in the right environment to ensure its implementation.

The details of Innovation do not stop at processes, products, services and delivery methods which significantly impact effectiveness, efficiency and quality (Albury, 2005). However, the diffusion of innovations (Rogers, 1983) is also very decisive in the success of innovation implementation. The Innovation built should be transferred to the right channels, time and target to be an important part of designing Innovation. Ideally, the innovation policy presented (Borrás & Edquist, 2013) should pay attention to various aspects of the social, political, economic, and implementing units. So Innovation looks good if it is not built on the consideration of these various aspects or only considers one aspect, namely the aspect of community needs, as is the case with UKPP, which is a participant in the Public Service and Innovation competition in the province of West Sumatra, is very unfortunate. In addition to having spent much money, time and thought building these innovations, the failure of Innovation in its implementation also hurts the credibility of the leadership and the organization they lead.

## 5. Conclusion

Undeniably, public service innovations are mostly triggered by problems that occur in the community and are competed with. However, the facts on the ground say that not all innovations built and implemented can run to achieve the targeted goals. Many factors cause innovation failure.

## REFERENCE:

### BOOK:

- Ackoff, R., 1981, *Creating The Corporate Future: Plan or Be Planned*. John Willey and Sons.
- Albury, D., 2005, *Fostering Innovation in Public Services*, Public Money and Management, 51-56.
- Govindarajan, Vijay dan Chris Trimble, 2012, *Reverse Innovation: Create Far From Home, Win Everywhere*, Harvard Business Review Press
- Kline, S., & Rosenberg, G., 1986. An Overview of Innovation: The Positive Sum Strategy. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.
- Lipsky, Michael, 2010, *Street-Level Bureaucracy: Dilemmas of the Individual in Public Services*. 30th Anniversary Expanded Edition. The Russell Sage Foundation: New York, NY

### JOURNALS AND DOI:

- Berry, Leonard L., 2019, Service innovation is urgent in healthcare; *AMS Review* (2019) 9:78–92 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13162-019-00135-x>.
- Bischoff, C. S., & Christiansen, F. J. (2017). Political parties and Innovation. *Public Management Review*, 19(1), 74–89. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14719037.2016.1200664>
- Borrás, S., & Edquist, C. (2013). The choice of innovation policy instruments. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, 80(8), 1513–1522. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2013.03.002>
- E Sørensen. (2016). Enhancing policy innovation by redesigning representative democracy. *Policy & Politics*, 44(2), 447–448.
- Jun, Kyu-Nahm, & Christopher Weare, 2011, Institutional Motivation in adopting Innovations: The Case of E-Government. Oxford University Press: *The Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, <https://academic.oup.com/jpart/article-pdf/21/3/495/2748811/muq020.pdf>
- Lewis, O. A., Teets, J. C., & Hasmath, R. (2022). Exploring political personalities: The micro-foundation of local policy innovation in China. *Governance*, 35(1), 103–122. <https://doi.org/10.1111/gove.12573>
- Scholten, P. (2010). Leadership in Policy Innovation: A Conceptual Map. *Nature and Culture*, 5(1), 31–48. <https://doi.org/10.3167/nc.2010.050103>
- Torring, J., & Ansell, C. (2017). Strengthening political leadership and policy innovation through the expansion of collaborative forms of governance. *Public Management Review*, 19(1), 37–54. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14719037.2016.1200662>
- Widiyahseno, Bambang, 2018, Politics In Innovation: Power Relationship in the mobilization of support in developing an Innovation Policy, *Jurnal Studi Pemerintahan*, <http://dx.doi.org/10.18196/jgp.2018.0160>. 161- 186
- Zhu, X. (2017). Inter-regional diffusion of policy innovation in China: A comparative case study. *Asian Journal of Political Science*, 25(3), 266–286. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02185377.2017.1339619>

- Ziegler, R. (2017). Social Innovation as a collaborative concept. *Innovation: The European Journal of Social Science Research*, 30(4), 388–405. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13511610.2017.1348935>
- Pratama, Arif Budy, 2019, The landscape of public service innovation in Indonesia: A comprehensive analysis of its characteristic and trend, *Innovation & Management Review*, Vol. 17, No. 1, 2020, pp. 25-40, Emerald Publishing Limited, <https://www.emerald.com/insight/2515-8961.htm>
- Wicaksono, Kristian Widya, 2018, Tipologi Inovasi Sektor Publik Pada Tiga Program Inovatif Pemerintah Daerah Kota Surabaya: (Tinjauan Reflektif terhadap Tiga Inovasi Pelayanan Publik Pemerintah Kota Surabaya Tahun 2018), *Jurnal Manajemen Pelayanan Publik*, Vol. 1, No.2., hal 196-205.,
- Widiyahseno, Bambang, 2015, Inovasi Bupati Diruang Demokrasi: Upaya membangun Kesadarann Inovasi Birokrasi, *Jurnal Ilmu Sosial dan Ilmu Politik*, Volume 18, Nomor 3, Maret 2015 (117-195), ISSN 1410 - 4946.
- Vincent K. Omachonu and Norman G. Einspruch, 2010, Innovation in Healthcare Delivery Systems: A Conceptual Framework, *The Innovation Journal: The Public Sector Innovation Journal*, Volume 15(1), 2010, Article 2

**THESIS:**

- Nuri, Setiani, 2019, Analisis Sistem Pelaksanaan Klinik Berhenti Merokok Puskesmas Padang Karambia Kota Payakumbuh, *Diploma Thesis*, Universitas Andalas.