

Examining Recent Developments in Governing Innovations

***Dr. Mahendra**

Abstract

Strategies that overlap such as innovation, reform, and reinvention are implemented during times of organisational crisis, such as when the capacity of the public sector to respond to a tragedy is insufficient. They are the inevitable result of designs aimed at ensuring the species' continued existence or a dogged determination to outperform a rival in a contest. On the other hand, some might even be the result of mistakes made in the past. Time and money are saved as a result of innovations, and the innovations also act as a catalyst for the three "Rs" of recognition, replication, and research. Since the advent of globalisation, a great deal of research, such as studies on administrative innovations at the Department of Administrative Reforms and Public Grievances' (DARPG) best administrative practises research on innovation, has been carried out. This was made possible by a combination of computers and information technology, on the one hand, and re-conceptualization of interagency collaboration and network research, on the other. Because these values become components of sustainability and continuity in innovations, conventional public sector values such as equity, fairness, and probity are not circumvented in the pursuit of improved efficiency through the use of innovations. The government has a part to play in public sector innovations by fostering an atmosphere that encourages scientific curiosity, democratic freedom, and decentralised governance, as well as by making it easier for individuals to exercise their freedom to innovate. The spirit of entrepreneurship is currently being considered as a gateway to innovations, and the mushrooming of startups is being treated as the unleashing of innovations that may revolutionise the way that public administration is carried out in India. Both of these ideas are gaining popularity. The innovation theory was debunked, however, by the numerous failed enterprises. In order to be successful and maintain themselves over time, innovations require a number of necessary components.

Keywords: Best practises, innovation, reform, and reinvention

Why Bother with Innovations?

Before continuing with this discussion any further in this post, we need to get one thing straight: innovation, administrative changes, and reinventing governance are all concepts that sound similar to one another. On the other hand, the term "innovations" should not be confused with "inventions" and "discoveries," both of which refer to obvious departures from the norms that had previously been followed.

Innovations are subtle devices that are introduced to remove impediments to an established pattern

Examining Recent Development in Governing Innovations

Dr. Mahendra

of activity, a mode of production, or a strategy that is obviously wasteful. This paves the way for incremental transformation. In this context, the emergence of e-governance in the late 1990s and early 2000s made it possible for many such innovations to be implemented in stock markets, banks, offices, schools, and income tax collections. It underwent a change. The non-functional citizen's charters as well as the service and procurement fees that are rife with corruption into an open and transparent field of citizen-administration engagement. However, even the most ground-breaking innovations eventually become obsolete. The very same invention may at one point in time become a drag in governance, which may highlight the requirement for yet another shift or innovation. The accumulation of knowledge gained through the application of innovative practises reveals that most innovations are tied to a particular point in time and location. Despite this, it is possible to strengthen the innovative capacity already present within a system by fostering an innate natural elasticity and adaptability to change. It is impossible for an idea for administrative reform to develop into an innovation unless there is a balance between the requirements of the community and the capabilities of the available technology. The majority of the successful e-governance-led innovations were anchored in field-based practises and grassroots groups such as market cooperatives, community-based organisations, resident welfare organisations, Ward Committees (in metropolitan areas), or Panchayats and Gram Sabhas (in rural areas). One such example is the Bhagidari in Delhi, which was classified as an extraordinary innovation in its early years but has since been replaced with a more comprehensive programme known as Mission Convergence since it is unable to meet the objectives of equity and decentralisation.

Nevertheless, under the new administration in Delhi, Mission Convergence has been replaced with the more democratic Saheli Samanvay Kendra (SSK). Instead than being the outcome of a sudden surge of extraordinary leadership, innovations are more likely to be the product of persistent conflict with established governance norms, according to the message that is conveyed. Therefore, innovations are born not only from technological advancements but also from the processes of governance in the real world. Several instances of liberalising state policy methods, such as "competition," "information," "trade in institutions," or "changing culture towards rule compliance," were originally considered to be growth-enhancing advances. In a similar vein, judicial proclamations and actions in the courtroom have been responsible for triggering innovations by combining moral and ethical ideas into law and justice. Principles such as "Pacta sunt servanda" (which translates to "agreements must be kept"), "nemo iudex causa sua" (which translates to "no one should be a judge in one's own cause"), and "promissory estoppel" (which translates to "promises are binding, and no one would be allowed to go back on his words") have expanded the scope of fairness principles in law. These are innovations in the law that have become standard operating procedures in the administration of justice.

The "3 Cs" of New Product Development

As the next three Cs imply, innovations are not merely sterile implantations of mechanical technology; rather, they provide a platform for democratic involvement.

- Connection to both individuals and the government

Examining Recent Development in Governing Innovations

Dr. Mahendra

- Communicating with those in charge of making decisions at the national and international levels
- Information about awareness cascading down from a global level to a local level

Innovation Goals Based on the "3 As"

Continual activity toward retrofitting organisational requirements, such as intra- and inter-agency collaboration, clarity of allotted roles, and dispute resolution, are indicated through innovations. The following examples illustrate this point:

- Align with peer departments
- Clearly assign responsibilities to each party.
- Come together in order to settle disagreements.

The debate up to this point implies that innovations are shifts that may not represent a radical rupture from pre-existing conditions in the form of shifting power fulcrums, but which nevertheless have the ability to steer future activity towards a cost-effective and holistic transformation. People and governments alike are more likely to embrace it without fear of retaliation since it does not threaten the stability of vested interests in a direct head-on confrontation. Marginalization. On the basis of the information presented above, innovations have been defined in a novel way as "the search for new ideas and concepts, technologies, techniques and methods, forms, systems, and procedures to create meaningful interactions between the government and the society in order to deal with a number of societal problems". This definition is a welcome change from the traditional definition of innovations, which was "the search for new ideas and concepts, technologies, techniques and methods, forms, systems, and procedures to create Others have made the connection between democracy and innovative performance, saying things like, "Democracy encourages innovative performance; autocracy often demonstrates worse technological innovation performance." The Ash Institute of Democratic Governance at Harvard University's Kennedy School, and more specifically its Government Innovators Network, which is led by a former Mayor, Professor Stephen Goldsmith, have been conducting research on innovations for a long time and have been deepening their investigation of the topic for a long time, long before any other institutions in the world began working on the subject. Because it occurred at a time when awareness of inventions was getting degraded as a result of dominant global macroeconomic demands to generate greater riches, this was a contribution that was truly remarkable. The appointment of Gawher Rizvi as director of the Institute brought about a significant shift in how innovations are conceptualised. Because he was from Bangladesh, he was more inclined than other people at the Ash Institute to incorporate innovations going place in South Asia into their mainstream innovation study. These innovations were taking place at the local community level, such as Md. Yunus' Grameen Bank, which is a village micro-credit bank; Fazle Hasan Abed's Bangladesh Rural Advancement Committee, which builds the capacity of returnees of Bangladesh's war migrants; or Aruna Roy's People's Movement in Rajasthan in India, which advocates for the right to information and transparency in administration.

At approximately the same time, S. Borins was released as a book, in which it explored advancements

Examining Recent Development in Governing Innovations

Dr. Mahendra

in a larger variety of approaches, models, methodology, and governmental changes. E-governance 'Best Practices Evaluation' initiative was made possible thanks to support from the Department of Administrative Reforms and Public Grievances (DARPG). The advances prompted significant research not only from all over the country but also from the Ash Center for Democratic Governance and Innovation at Harvard University. Community policing and the school reforms implemented by the Delhi government can be compared to the Chicago Police Department Reforms and the Boston School Innovation Programme, respectively. The reforms that were implemented in the Chicago Police Department made it possible for local community groups to conduct accountability checks on the police. The issues of children, the back-home families of those who are incarcerated, and petty crimes in poor localities were brought up during a meeting between the tough uniformed police of Chicago's police headquarters and three local non-governmental organisations (NGOs), which were led by women for the most part. Although there were several instances in which local groups were aggressively establishing boundaries to police operations, this appeared to be a forerunner to post-2008 community policing in India that aimed to operate in collaboration rather than conflict overall. The Boston School reforms reduced the number of students from low-income communities who dropped out of school and provided additional incentives to instructors in the form of further education scholarships for those who met their goals. The Lehman Brothers collapse and other economic catastrophes wreaked havoc on a society that had become accustomed to the rapid accumulation of assets supported by banking schemes. When Lehman Brothers, which had borrowed considerable amounts to fund this sector prior to its bankruptcy in 2008, was declared insolvent, the situation was dangerously close to spiralling out of control, particularly in the housing assets mortgage origination market. In the midst of catastrophes of extraordinary scale, innovation tends to accelerate. Ironically, Bangladesh was already employing the solution to the Lehman Brothers collapse in the form of "solidarity lending," in which the community owns the bank and maintains openness in the lending process. These improvements, which took place in Bangladesh and India, were a huge assistance in expanding the reach of microcredit banking and improving its efficiency. In 1975, India saw the establishment of its first Regional Rural Bank, which was given the name Prathama Grameen Bank. This event contributed to an increase in the need for institutional credit to rural development. When the agriculture credit functions of the Reserve Bank of India and the refinance functions of the Agriculture Refinance and Development Corporation (ARDC) were transferred to this bank in 1982, it marked the beginning of an institutional innovation known as the National Bank for Agriculture and Rural Development (NABARD). This new approach addresses the liabilities and dangers of 'solidarity lending,' which were rendered secure by the government's handholding of community credit support.

The Three Rs That Drive Innovation

Following what has been said above, there should be no room for debate in seeing innovations as more comprehensive systems of governance. The innovations that are recognised, replicated, and researched thoroughly are the ones that are most likely to be successful. Recognizing an innovation requires a certain level of intellectual effort. According to Archon Fung, these designs are not intended to improve merely existing operations or services through structural management; instead,

Examining Recent Development in Governing Innovations

Dr. Mahendra

they "reach beyond the boundaries of public agencies to incorporate views of citizens and to enlist their energies to the production of, what Mark Moore in his felicitous phrase called "public value.""

Since the turn of the millennium, various international think tanks that focus on public administration have shifted their attention to administrative strategies that are aimed at easing the process of conducting international business and bringing about local development in the most efficient way possible. The following categories were identified as characteristics of innovations:

- Ancestry in the area
- Global support
- Relevance to development

It is necessary to collaborate and coordinate with a network of stakeholders inside government departments in order to replicate administrative activities. In Bundelkhand, one such innovation was the Tarahaat experiment, which was implemented in collaboration with the non-governmental organisation Developmental Alternatives. This experiment had the potential to transform the lives of people living below the poverty line, who were landless and mostly surviving through deadly spells of starvation every summer. When the tribal communities in the hamlet of Niwari moved their money-making 'Mandi' to fifty additional villages, it didn't take long for this innovation to be replicated quickly. These villages are located in the region extending from Orchha in Madhya Pradesh to Jhansi in Uttar Pradesh.

In the districts of Ajmer, Alwar, and Rajsamund in Rajasthan, a community non-governmental organisation known as the Mazdoor Kisan Shakti Sangathan (MKSS) was the impetus for an innovation that has received widespread praise. The 'right to information' movement began as a modest demand made by villagers who wanted permission to see the official register kept by the village Panchayat. This demand eventually grew into a full-blown campaign. Corroboration of the data is the third and final step in the research process.

Utilizing probability analysis and regression, we were able to determine a robust innovation. Without exercises that are supported by research, innovations may continue to be susceptible to failure. This means that the entire conversation about accessibility, affordability, transparency, and stakeholder participation is a direct result of research on innovations. Innovations are given structure by the combination of the three R's, which are recognition, replication, and research.

The Part Played by Governments in the Process of Creating an Innovative Economy

The majority of innovations are either never implemented or are abandoned throughout the process. Scholars describe the role of the government in innovation as that of an executor, a supporter, and a manager; nevertheless, the role of the government as a capacity builder in order to take innovation to the next level is the most significant role that the government plays. Gary P. Pisano, a renowned innovation strategist at Harvard Business School, says that adhocism, as opposed to an innovation strategy, is a cause of innovation failures. A cohesive reinforcement of personnel, material, resources, leadership, and skills that prevents an innovation from collapsing is what we mean when we talk

Examining Recent Development in Governing Innovations

Dr. Mahendra

about an innovation strategy. Some of the most innovative companies, including Microsoft, Hewlett-Packard, Nokia, and a great many others, went bankrupt due to a lack of a coherent business strategy. In today's highly interconnected world, innovations require backing on both the national and international levels.

After the United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs (UNDESA) and then the International Institute of Administrative Sciences (IIAS) realised the need for it in 2002–2003, international support for innovations gained steam and spread around the globe. It is abundantly clear that routine systems of government, the majority of which are relics from the colonial era, need to change. This was made abundantly clear by the memories of many blatant failures that beset public administration in the UN, declared first, second, and third development decades starting in 1960. The most important factor in determining the course of socioeconomic shifts is now innovation. Additionally, it was regarded as a necessary precondition for the development of a competitive economy in India. The introduction of innovations results in the establishment of an institutional setting that facilitates the horizontal and vertical dissemination of knowledge and information. The new epoch of the knowledge economy, in which their newly developed knowledge products and services have the potential to become innovations, sets the pace for the evolution of administrative processes. According to what Daniel writes in a prophetic manner, "the most important thing to understand about a post-industrial society is that knowledge and information become the strategic and transforming resources of the society," in the same way that capital and labour have been the strategic and transforming resources of industrial society.

Needs or demands often serve as the impetus for the production of innovations. There are three historical events that stand out as having created a phenomenal demand for new governmental policies and practises; in their absence, governance would be severely compromised. The Supreme Court's ruling in the Maneka Gandhi case, which was heard in 1978, is considered by many to be a watershed moment in Indian legal history against the Union of India by connecting Article 21 to Article 14 (Equality Before the Law) and Article 19, the notion of 'Right to Existence' under Article 21 was given a broader meaning to include a dignified life. This was accomplished by linking Article 21 to Article 14. (Freedom of Expression). This immediately sparked demands for every other right, which hardly ever featured on the agenda of governance set by the government. The subsequent onslaught of demands could only be satisfied through the implementation of novel approaches to the provision of fundamental rights such as the right to food, medical care, clean water, clean air, education, swift trials, livelihood, legal aid, and protection in old age. As a result of this, government agencies were required to find ways to work that went beyond the simple fulfilment of an official task. As a result of this, some of the most innovative ideas came to light at the district level, such as the information kiosks in Punjab and Bundelkhand or the kitchen technology used by the Akshaya Patra project across the country.

The Price Paid for Innovations

Experiments that have the potential to become hugely successful but also have the risk of failing miserably and being extremely expensive. In the same way that a failed practise may become a

Examining Recent Development in Governing Innovations

Dr. Mahendra

burden for the state as well as for the economy of the state, a successful practise is also a narrative of excellent economics. The reform package that was developed as a result of the Washington Consensus in 1992 fit in seamlessly within the context of the New Public Management initiative for reforms in the public sector. Ironically, this experiment that was supposed to be a breakthrough in administrative practises ended up being a catastrophic failure when it was carried out in the Sub-Saharan region. An unsuccessful invention not only hinders change for a considerable amount of time in the future, but it also slows down public organisation as a result of the administrative desire to cover failures, and it also has the potential to transform the platform of innovation into a den of corruption. A disproportionate focus on "best practises" has turned it into a "cage," where "this dark side receives little attention: failures and conflicts of public innovation often remain obscure." This is because little research has been done on failed innovations, and the "cage" has been turned into a "cage" as a result. Meijer and Thaens recently published a paper in which they conducted an exploratory study on the negative aspects of innovation, which they collectively refer to as "perverse effects." They came to the conclusion that these "effects are not coincidental but emerge from key properties of innovation processes such as creating niches for innovation and accepting uncertainty about public value outcomes."

From 2002 to 2005, India was home to a plethora of game-changing innovations that brought about a sea change in the manner in which the country's public administration carried out its duties. "Gyandoot" in the state of Madhya Pradesh, "Bhoomi" in the state of Karnataka, "Ahmedabad Municipal Corporation" (AMC) in the state of Gujarat, and "CARD-Computer Aided Administration of Revenue Distribution" in the state of Andhra Pradesh.

There are a number of departments that can be cited here, including "Registration Department" in Andhra Pradesh. The DARPG's partnership with academic institutions throughout the evaluation of these procedures resulted in the production of a somewhat holistic image, as opposed to the bureaucratic centralism that plagues evaluation activities.

Conclusion

This buzz phrase of 'innovation,' which was taken out of a magical hat by an administrator, diverts attention for its promises to efficiency and cost-saving outputs. However, there are a greater number of innovations that are unsuccessful compared to those that succeed in establishing themselves as viable administrative changes. There is a great deal of ambiguity surrounding the meaning, understanding, and forms of behaviours that have the potential to be labelled as innovations. The discussion of innovations that is presented in this article focuses attention on a few key themes, which are as follows:

- The term "innovation" does not refer to the same thing as "invention" or "discovery," which both denote obvious departures from previously used methods. The capacity to duplicate an innovation is generated as a result of cost savings and improvements in efficiency. Innovations are a kind of the radical new design.
- The origin of innovations lies in existing challenges in the real world, and these innovations should

Examining Recent Development in Governing Innovations

Dr. Mahendra

not be confused with technologically-driven policy procedures. They become more robust when technology is used to help them in the role of a tool rather than as a master.

- The capacity of innovations to develop in line with demand, increase accessibility for people's engagement, and adapt to changing times should be integrated in as part of the design process.
- The government's subtle rejection of an innovation strategy in favour of ad hocism is one cause that is ascribed to a high failure rate of inventions. This is one of the reasons why the rate is so high. This prevents the development of a novel practise into an institutional reform that could otherwise have been pursued.
- Innovations are not limited to the implementation of new technologies; rather, they encompass the entirety of a process involving a shift in attitude on the part of administrative professionals. This shift in attitude is only made possible by substantial and comprehensive administrative reforms.

It is possible to transform innovation into a nationwide movement that includes not only technologists but also everyone else who is a part of any skillset in society, with the goal of effortlessly achieving the much-needed needs of equity, fairness, and inclusive governance with the innovation package.

***Lecturer**
Department of Public Administration
MBR Govt. P.G. College
Balotra, Barmer (Raj.)

References:

1. Agarwal, A., Narain, S., & Sen, S. (Eds). (1999). State of India's environment – 1999: Citizens' fifth report. Centre for Science and Environment
2. Bell, D. (1979). Thinking ahead. Harvard Business Review, 57(3), 20–42.
3. Bertucci, G., & Duggett, M. (2002). The turning world: Globalization and governance at the start of the 21st century. IIAS/UNDESA, IOS Press Borins, S. (Ed.). (2008). Innovations in government: Research, recognition, and replication. Brookings Institution Press.
4. Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. (2008). House of Representatives, Hearing at the 110th Congress, 2nd Session, October 2. <https://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/CHRG-110hhrg55766/html/CHRG-110hhrg55766.htm>
5. Fisman, R., & Werker, E. (2010). Innovations in governance. <https://sites.bu.edu/fisman/files/2015/11/innovationsgovernance.pdf>
6. Fung, A. (2008). Citizen participation in government innovations. In S. Borins (Ed) Innovations in government: Research, recognition and replication (pp. 52–70). Brookings Institution Press.

Examining Recent Development in Governing Innovations

Dr. Mahendra

7. Goldsmith, S., & Eggers, W.D. (2004). *Governing by network: The new shape of the public sector*. Brookings Institution Press.
8. Grace, J.P. (1984). *Burning money: The waste of your tax dollars*. Macmillan Publishers
9. Ronfeldt, D., & Varda, D. (2008). *The prospects for cyberocracy (revisited)* [Working paper no. 29]. http://opensiuc.lib.siu.edu/pn_wp/29
10. Singh, A., Kapoor, K., & Bhattacharyya, R. (2008). *Governance and poverty reduction: Beyond the cage of best practices*. PHI