Policy Design and Practice

ISSN: 2574-1292 (Online) Journal homepage: www.tandfonline.com/journals/rpdp20

Collaborative innovation in the public sector and the policy design dilemma: a promising analytical perspective

Mattia Casula & Andrea Migone

To cite this article: Mattia Casula & Andrea Migone (2025) Collaborative innovation in the public sector and the policy design dilemma: a promising analytical perspective, Policy Design and Practice, 8:2, 149-158, DOI: 10.1080/25741292.2025.2539570

To link to this article: https://doi.org/10.1080/25741292.2025.2539570

© 2025 The Author(s). Published by Informa UK Limited, trading as Taylor & Francis Group.

Published online: 08 Aug 2025.

Submit your article to this journal

Article views: 1121

View related articles

View Crossmark data

Citing articles: 1 View citing articles

Full Terms & Conditions of access and use can be found at
https://www.tandfonline.com/action/journalInformation?journalCode=rpdp20

POLICY DESIGN AND PRACTICE
2025, VOL. 8, NO. 2, 149–158
https://doi.org/10.1080/25741292.2025.2539570

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group

INTRODUCTION

OPEN ACCESS Check for updates

Collaborative innovation in the public sector and the policy design dilemma: a promising analytical perspective

Mattia Casula[a] and Andrea Migone[b]

[a]University of Bologna, Bologna, Italy; [b]Simon Fraser University, Burnaby, Canada

ABSTRACT

Collaborative Public Sector Innovation (CPSI) is emerging as a new concept aimed at transforming public sector policymaking in a post-New Public Management (NPM) world. It harnesses the potential of emerging governance networks to foster innovation and generate public value. Despite a growing interest among public policy and public administration scholars, CPSI remains an underexplored framework for public sector innovation, particularly regarding its relevance to policy design. This article evaluates this emerging theoretical framework and offers recommendations to advance the analysis of CPSI as a novel approach to public sector reforms. Drawing on the findings from the articles comprising this special collection, it also highlights the theoretical, analytical, and empirical challenges that lie ahead for the consolidation of CPSI, encouraging debate among both academics and policy practitioners. The discussion, structured around a set of identified challenges for the development of CPSI, reflects not only on the concept itself and the theories that support this emerging post-NPM approach to public administration reforms, but also on its relationships with policy design and policy implementation. Additionally, the article examines the added value that specifically designed arrangements should bring to public sector innovation outputs and outcomes.

ARTICLE HISTORY
Received 15 July 2025
Accepted 16 July 2025

KEYWORDS
Public sector innovation; collaborative innovation; co-design; institutional design

1. Introduction: a landscape of change and innovation in the public sector

Over the past thirty years, both organizations and individuals have increasingly faced a range of complex, interconnected challenges requiring proactive responses (Casula and Steinebach 2025; Howlett and Ramesh 2016; Steinebach, Knill, and Casula 2025; Steinebach and Knill 2017). These challenges include shifting demographics within traditional state boundaries and globally, the rise of populist movements, the processes of economic and political globalization, the rapid advancement of diverse technologies, and ongoing fiscal constraints. In response, there has been a strong call for change and innovation to address the growing unpredictability and complexity of the system (Farazmand 2017; Hartley 2005; Osborne and Strokosch 2013).

To adapt to these challenges, organizations have started to adopt citizen-centered approaches, embrace agile practices, become more open to partnerships, engage in co-design, and enhance digital governance (Kekez, Howlett, and Ramesh 2018). Additionally, they are focusing on open data, design thinking, and other modern strategies (Meijer 2012; Casula, Leonardi, and Zancanaro 2022).

Public servants face specific and often unique challenges when innovating (Howlett and Walker 2012; Kekez, Howlett, and Ramesh 2019). Traditionally, public service organizations are often philosophically designed to maintain control and adhere to established processes; hence, they can be risk-averse (Osborne and Brown 2011; Bovaird et al. 2015). While public servants are not necessarily against change—historically a constant in their environments—their approach to change is often influenced by complex and multi-layered systems of risk management (de Vries, Tummers, and Bekkers 2018). Ultimately, the nature of the services and products they provide, coupled with the

CONTACT Mattia Casula mattia.casula@hotmail.it Department of Political and Social Sciences, University of Bologna, Strada Maggiore 45, Bologna 40125, Italy.

© 2025 The Author(s). Published by Informa UK Limited, trading as Taylor & Francis Group.
This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited. The terms on which this article has been published allow the posting of the Accepted Manuscript in a repository by the author(s) or with their consent.

environments in which they operate, places government organizations in a dual position: they are eager to innovate, sometimes driven by external pressures, yet they also approach innovation with caution and concern.

Furthermore, there are several structural and strategic barriers challenging public sector organizations when it comes to innovation (Campomori and Casula 2022; Chalmers 2013). These organizations are typically designed to solve problems and seize opportunities by standardizing and routinizing their processes. For example, government agencies streamline tasks to ensure citizens receive essential services like driver's licenses or passports. This standardization leads to well-defined outcomes, with optimization often being the guiding principle. As a result, predictability and stability become critical traits of these organizations, causing both internal and external stakeholders to view change with skepticism. This can create difficulties in achieving 'organizational ambidexterity,' which is the ability to simultaneously explore new opportunities and efficiently exploit existing ones (Boukamel and Emery 2017; Cannaerts, Segers, and Warsen 2020).

Additionally, the nature of political and administrative accountability contributes to a culture of blame avoidance and risk aversion among elected officials and public servants (Howlett 2014). While this isn't always the case, it can foster a "wait-and-see" mentality, where individuals and departments hesitate to initiate change, preferring to let others take the lead in order to mitigate their own risk. This environment can lead to discomfort with presenting new ideas and frustration over the lack of innovation within the organization. Furthermore, there is often a perception of innovation that resembles a tidal wave, with expectations for revolutionary change. It's easy to see how such pressure can leave the typical public servant feeling anxious and discouraged about pursuing innovation in public service.

However, it is important to recognize that today's public service operates in a fluid and dynamic environment that is constantly evolving. For over a decade, this reality has prompted increasing calls for more innovation in public service, often framed around the need for design and foresight in public sector initiatives. In this changing context, sub-national governments play a crucial role in innovation. Research (e.g., Casula 2017; Hartley and Rashman 2018; Howlett, Kekez, and Poocharoen 2017; Sorrentino, Sicilia, and Howlett 2018) indicates that local and regional organizations exhibit characteristics of ambidexterity. However, there is still tension in this process, particularly regarding the mechanisms employed in specific innovation processes and the roles of different actors in managing an organization.

Innovation encompasses many activities in the public sector, including policy development, partnerships, service delivery, and citizen engagement. While some forms of innovation are relatively common, others, like policy innovation, tend to be less frequent and often face challenges, with scholars distinguishing between exploitative and explorative approaches to innovation (Barrutia and Echebarria 2019; Choi and Chandler 2015).

While, the debate surrounding innovation is quite nuanced, the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD 2015), particularly through its Observatory for Public Sector Innovation (OPSI 2019:14), has provided a clear concept and definition related to public sector innovation, by identifying its three essential characteristics: 1) Novelty: The innovation must include an element of newness; 2) Implementation: It must be put into practice rather than remaining purely theoretical; 3) Impact: The innovation should aim to achieve better results.

While the OPSI definition is useful to understand public sector innovation (PSI), it encompasses everything from minor incremental changes in processes to revolutionary inventions. Often, the latter is seen as the default image of innovation. Although it is true that innovation "involves a step change that problematizes and transforms the way that things are usually imagined and done" (Torfing 2019: 1), successful innovation in any field is more likely to consist of a series of mutually supportive steps rather than a sudden surge of change. Hence, it becomes necessary to dispel the 'heroic' image of public sector innovation, where a single individual designs, implements, and supports a tidal wave of change.

In the context of change and innovation within the public sector, it has become clear that complex issues cannot be solved by any single organization. Therefore, the collaborative model has emerged as a vital component of many academic and public sector initiatives (Alibašić and Casula 2024; Kekez, Howlett, and Ramesh 2024; Torfing 2019).

This Special Issue focuses on analyzing how the new collaborative model acts as an agent of change and innovation within the public sector, with a particular emphasis on the concept of Collaborative Public Sector Innovation (CPSI). The collection aims to contribute to both academic and policy discussions regarding how this governance model—which brings together various public and private actors and stakeholders to create, develop, and implement innovative ideas, processes, and practices—affects formal and consensus-based decision-making.

2. Collaborative public sector innovation: Assessment and prospects of an emerging theoretical framework

In the wake of the post-New Public Management (NPM) era, which is marked by significant change and innovation within the public sector, the public policy and public administration communities are increasingly adopting the concept of PSI to highlights a crucial reform trajectory and various frameworks that are shaping the current public sector reform landscape (Callens et al. 2022; de Vries, Bekkers, and Tummers 2016). Recent PSI literature has examined how collaboration between public sector organizations, businesses, universities, and citizens is increasingly driving innovation in the public sector (Cinar 2021; Alibašić and Casula 2024). Unlike the hierarchical control that has long hindered innovation in the public sector (Cinar, Trott, and Simms 2019), this branch of the PSI literature assumes the existence of a positive relationship between public sector collaboration and innovation outcomes (e.g., Cinar, Trott, and Simms 2023; Clausen, Demircioglu, and Alsos 2020), including the production of public value (Crosby, 't Hart, and Torfing 2017; Yuan and Gasco-Hernandez 2021).

To address the need for transformation in public sector policymaking and to highlight the collaborative aspect of innovation, some theoretical and analytical studies have introduced the term CPSI. Among the various definitions, we refer to Torfing's (2016: 29) conceptualization of CPSI as an "intended but inherently contingent process that involves the development, realization, and often dissemination of new and creative ideas that challenge conventional wisdom and disrupt established practices within a specific context". Consequently, CPSI can be seen as a specific form of collaborative governance that promotes the exchange of knowledge between public agencies and multiple stakeholders, enhancing the understanding of the challenges at hand and expanding the pool of creative solutions to address them (Di Mascio, Coletti, and Natalini 2025: 3).

Hence, CPSI is particularly relevant in situations where conventional solutions are insufficient for addressing complex, 'wicked' problems (Campomori and Casula 2023). This concept encapsulates the capacity and potential of these new governance networks to address complex and emerging challenges, providing a fresh framework for public sector innovation. Furthermore, much of the work surrounding CPSI has a direct connection with the broad practice of governments and administrations, including the work of policy labs (Wellstead, Gofen, and Carter 2021), how they partner with various actors (Brock 2021), and the nature of governance arrangements in those spaces (Ferreira and Botero 2020; Ferrarezi, Brandalise, and Lemos 2021). Furthermore, these collaborative efforts effectively fit within the broader policy landscape and align with established policy design principles (Junginger 2013; McGann, Blomkamp, and Lewis 2018; Morisson and Doussineau 2019). In fact, CPSI involves engaging in a trust-based dialogue among multiple public and private actors who are affected by the same problem to reach a shared, innovative decision for its resolution (Vaz Lopes and Farias 2022).

Despite this interest in CPSI within public policy and public administration communities, its theoretical and empirical development is still ongoing, with several challenges to its consolidation in both academic and policy-oriented literature needing to be addressed (see, among others: Howlett 2014; Bugge and Bloch 2016; Torfing 2019; Gieske et al. 2020; Cinar 2021).

A first, theoretical challenge concerns the relationship between CPSI and other post-NPM concepts and ideas, such as new public governance, the neo-Weberian state, public value, digital-era governance, and public service logic. In fact, little is known about the layering effect between the CPSI and other post-NPM reform trajectories, or about whether and how CPSI concepts, practices, and measures are combined with them.

Second, and stemming from the first challenge, the analytical dimensions of the two canonical approaches used to distinguish the governance of public sector collaboration and to understand the

complexities of the actors involved – respectively, the top-down/hands-on (Vento 2020) and the bottom-up/hands-off (Sørensen and Torfing 2017) – have never been placed side-by-side with the other post-NPM principles, and their empirical understanding is lacking.

Third, more analysis is needed on the connection between CPSI and the policy space. This is relevant not only to the emergence of specific spaces when innovation is designed and tested like policy labs (McGann, Blomkamp, and Lewis 2018; Wellstead, Gofen, and Carter 2021), but also to how CPSI is 'designed' in the policy process and how it affects policy design.

Fourth, relatively little is known about the stage(s) of the policy-making process during which collaboration mainly occurs, or at which stage a greater positive relationship between collaboration and public sector innovation outcomes occur. While it is established that collaboration can occur at the level of co-initiation, co-development, co-implementation, and co-evaluation, the analysis of the type of collaborative actors involved in this process and how they ultimately contribute to innovation continues to be limited.

Fifth, the analysis of which constructs of collaboration are critical for positive innovation outcomes across different jurisdictions and policy sectors has not yet been a specific subject of investigation until now.

Ultimately, by considering these five challenges in context, empirical research has largely been confined to studies within single countries, primarily focusing on Western nations and regions such as North America, Western Europe, and Australia. Cross-country and cross-sectoral studies of how collaboration in the public sector differs and how it ultimately impacts innovation outcomes continue to be circumscribed, thus limiting the possibility of reaching generalizations on CPSI knowledge and of providing a theoretical advance on CPSI concept and practices.

This special collection acknowledges the challenges faced in the CPSI literature, viewing them not as limitations but as opportunities for theoretical, analytical, and empirical development in the coming years. It aims to enhance both academic and policy-oriented understanding of the approach to public sector reforms and the nature of current collaboration in PSI.

3. This Special collection: advancing the debate among academics and policy practitioners on Collaborative public sector innovation

The articles included in this Special Issue aim to enhance the discussion on CPSI for both academics and policy practitioners, particularly its connection to policy design problems. These articles feature a diverse group of authors to represent the complexity and heterogeneity of the topic. The goal is to offer both theoretical and empirical contributions that enrich the discourse on CPSI as it relates to the challenges mentioned in the previous paragraph.

Each of the nine articles in this collective work addresses four key elements: 1) the concept of CPSI itself; 2) the theories underpinning this emerging post-NPM approach to public administration reforms; 3) the relationship between policy design, policy implementation, and CPSI; and 4) the added value of specific collaborative practices and their impact on public sector innovation outcomes.

In the article "Constructed Collaboration: Facilitating Innovative Exchange When Networks are Thin or Divided," Weimer (2025) developed a typology to categorize arrangements for creating collaborative arenas along two dimensions: the nature of stakeholder involvement in informing policy design (which includes expertise sharing, policy development, and policy choice) and the type of participation (ad hoc versus ongoing). The article provides examples from U.S. policymaking to illustrate these different types of institutional arrangements. These arrangements vary in the extent to which stakeholders are engaged in complex policy design and must address the challenges of involving stakeholders so that they can contribute their expertise and at least consent to policy decisions.

In "Collaborative Public Sector Innovation in a post-NPM era: A Design Perspective", Casula and Migone (2025) present a unique theoretical and analytical perspective on the topic by emphasizing the critical elements of collaboration needed to design effective CPSI. They interpret CPSI as a new and emerging approach to public administration reforms, arguing that multiple layers of collaboration influence public service design. The analysis reveals various methods for implementing and

conceptualizing collaboration. The authors emphasize that strategically connecting innovation with design processes is crucial for the success of CPSI.

In their contribution "How Institutional Design and Leadership Sustain Collaborative Public Sector Innovation: The Case of Administrative Simplification in Italy," Di Mascio, Coletti, and Natalini (2025) examine a previously underexplored aspect of CPSI literature—the role of institutional design and leadership. By analyzing the evolution of administrative simplification in Italy from 1993 to 2024, they demonstrate that institutional design alone has not been sufficient for promoting collaborative public sector innovation. Effective leadership, characterized by critical success conditions like prior experience in administrative simplification, strong connections with a network of experts, and trusting relationships with the Prime Minister, is essential.

In the article "Policy Entrepreneurship in Collaborative Governance: Transformative Innovation in Catalonia's Sustainability Transition," Acebillo-Baqué, Velasco, and Boni (2025) examine how policy entrepreneurship strategies contribute to CPSI by shaping policy design processes within transformative innovation policy. Focusing on the Shared-Agendas initiative in Catalonia, they analyze how public sector actors are organized to assist in the final policy design. The authors demonstrate that policy entrepreneurs influence these processes by reframing problems from a systemic perspective, co-constructing shared visions, enabling experimental implementation, and institutionalizing learning practices.

In "Advancing the Collaborative and Democratic Practices of Policy Innovation Labs with Community Engaged Scholarship," Levac and Chan (2025) use policy innovation labs (PILs) as a case study to enhance the discussion around the structures and operations of CPSI. They focus on a PIL located in a mid-sized city in Canada to argue that community-engaged scholarship methodology can fill knowledge gaps related to the practice of CPSI and help overcome obstacles to democratic innovations.

Guo and Mallinson (2025) in their "Dilemmas in Collaborative Public Sector Innovation: The Case of State Energy Efficiency Policy," analyze the top-down/hands-on and the bottom-up/hands-off tensions inherent in CPSI by exploring the perceived enablers of CPSI within the mandated policy specifications and identifying institutional and interactive factors that hinder innovation as the policy evolves. They select the electricity sector as the context for their analysis due to its relevance in addressing the challenges posed by post-NPM to CPSI in energy efficiency and conservation policy-making in Pennsylvania. The authors conclude that effective and sustainable CPSI requires policy design to evolve continuously, addressing emerging internal and external challenges while adapting to stakeholders' changing interpretations of policy objectives and evaluation methods.

In the article "Navigating the Challenges of Community Renewable Energy: Collaborative Public Sector Innovation in Taiwan", Wong (2025) uses five local initiates where communities actively participate in the transition toward a sustainable energy future to provide an in-depth understanding of CPSI in an East Asian country by way of the understanding of the actors of collaboration, how collaboration happens across innovation stages, the aspects of collaboration influencing positive outcomes, and the governance of collaboration. Her analysis shows that, while stakeholders' interaction in policy design is essential for CPSI to occur, bureaucracy remains a crucial factor in the process of practical implementation to avoid stagnation of these practices.

In their article "Co-design is Not Enough: Reflections on Creative Collaborative Public Sector Innovation to Deliver Net Zero Policy Outcomes in Scotland," Broadley and her colleagues (2025) critically examine the role, capacity, and limitations of co-design in advancing the net-zero policy agenda in Scotland's northern region. While they acknowledge that co-design provides valuable, context-sensitive tools within the framework of CPSI, the authors argue that this approach alone is insufficient to achieve meaningful impact at a systemic level. Therefore, for co-design to be truly effective, it must be integrated within a broader framework of governance, procedural elements, and institutional conditions.

"Driving Public Value Through Co-production: Digital Transformation in Colombia", by Garcia Camargo et al. (2025) proposes a comprehensive analysis of the coproduction processes between public agencies and a university innovation lab that is leading digital transformation in Colombia. The authors argue that these processes are crucial for the success of such programs. To foster a more inclusive approach to digital transformation, it is essential to link these efforts to effective design

processes, actively engage in coproduction mechanisms, and appropriately measure the costs and benefits involved. In other words, policy design is not necessarily simplified by a CPSI approach, but its benefits can be transformational for both the programs and the citizens.

In conclusion, the articles included in this Special Issue enhance our understanding of the CPSI framework and make significant contributions to the theoretical challenges identified in the previous paragraph. Table 1 summarizes the characteristics of each paper, highlighting their main theoretical contributions and the implications of their findings for policy design, relevant to both academics and policy practitioners. This Special Collection features both empirical and theory-oriented articles, encompassing findings from various regions, including Southern and Western Europe, Northern and Southern America, and East Asia. The articles employ both single and comparative analyses across a range of policy sectors, such as childcare, energy policy, transformative innovation policy, and administrative simplification policy. Importantly, this special collection demonstrates that the CPSI framework is valuable for analyzing innovation processes related to both national policies and sub-national (regional and local) ones.

4. Concluding remarks and future outlook

While this special collection represents only part of the evolution in the sub-field, some general points can be made about how the contributions included here can support the advancement of CPSI analysis as a novel approach to public sector reforms if we look at the responses the authors provide to the identified gaps in the literature. On the one hand, CPSI appears to be an effective approach to overcoming the limits of NPM. If innovation is to move to integrate its various orders (Sørensen and Torfing 2022), then it makes sense to do so within a post-NPM framing, where the market mechanisms have a place, but one that is incremental and not always suited to the complex societal challenges of the current period. In other words, in a post-NPM world, the complexity of current public problems demands CPSI. Connected to this point is the discussion on the use of top-down/hands-on and the bottom-up/hands-off approaches to innovation. Because CPSI mechanisms can be adaptive, since they are based on cultural context and politico-administrative traditions, we can have both top-down and bottom-up approaches depending on the condition. This allows us to use NPM tools, like performance indicators, but CPSI is both malleable and robust enough to allow within its scope the NPG idea of plural state as well as the request of the Neo-Weberian State for state actors to be able to conduct and coordinate innovation processes.

This, in turn, brings us to the policy and design space: this flexibility and robustness are necessary but not sufficient to ensure good chances of policy success. Leadership, both in terms of technical and political leaders, has been shown as necessary in various of the special issue's contributions. The same is true of policy design, which appears to operate almost as the 'connecting tissue' of many of these projects. In fact, it is at the design level that CPSI's contribution appears to be critically located – to some extent, then slightly fading into the background when the implementation stage takes over and the actors involved tend to hand over more responsibility to the state apparatus. Finally, as we can see in Weimer's (2025) contribution, different institutional arrangements may very well lead to both different outputs and outcomes in CPSI.

In terms of future research directions, the sub-field will need to continue building on the theoretical framing of CPSI: in particular the insights about the importance of different institutional arrangements, the possible 'hand over' among a broader set of actors and a primarily administrative group at the time of implementation, and the relevance of policy design in fostering and maintaining cooperation all need to be assessed within the scope of a theoretical framework.

We need more contributions from the South of the world, not just because of a 'balance' issue, but because if CPSI truly operates at its best within an adaptive framework – and we firmly believe so – then these examples are vital in shaping an effective understanding of the praxis and theory of CPSI. This analysis promises to be very fruitful, potentially extending much beyond case studies and theoretically offering a lens with which to assess the successes and failures of NPM institutional reforms in the South of the world during the 1980s and 1990s.

Table 1. Synthesizing contributions in this special collection.

Title	Methodological Perspective Adopted	Geographical Area Covered	Main CPSI issue covered	Main theoretical contribution	Main implication for practice
Constructed Collaboration: Facilitating Innovative Exchange When Networks are Thin or Divided	Theoretical Contribution	North America	Analysis of the constructs of collaboration and of the role of design in CPSI	Creating a typology to classify the nature and role of collaborative arenas in policy design	Policy designers should create institutional arrangements that facilitate the sharing of expertise and support for innovations
Collaborative Public Sector Innovation in a post-NPM era: A Design Perspective	Theoretical and prescriptive contribution: Analysis of the collaboration constructs to enhance the discussion surrounding the CPSI framework, with insights from the childcare sector	North America and Western Europe	Analysis of CPSI as a new and emerging approach to public administration reforms	Advancing theoretical reflections on the crucial role of diversity as a vital component for conceptualizing and implementing CPSI	To achieve better outcomes in CPSI, policymakers should strategically connect innovation with design processes
How Institutional Design and Leadership Sustain Collaborative Public Sector Innovation: The Case of Administrative Simplification in Italy	Empirical Contribution: Analysis of the evolution of administrative simplification in Italy over the period 1993-2024	Southern Europe	Analysis of the connection between CPSI and the policy space	Linking institutional design and leadership to spur CPSI outcomes	To achieve successful collaborative innovation outcomes, effective leadership must take on a steward role to facilitate alignment, learning, and joint decision-making among participants, particularly in contexts where a tradition of CPSI is absent, such as in Napoleonic countries
Policy Entrepreneurship in Collaborative Governance: Transformative Innovation in Catalonia's Sustainability Transition	Empirical Contribution: Analysis of the Shared Agendas initiative in Catalonia	Southern Europe	Analysis of the connection between CPSI and the policy space	Understanding how agency drives CPSI and adaptive policymaking within complex governance settings	Collaborative innovation practices should be seen as an agent-driven, iterative process that is intrinsically connected to the design and adjustment of evolving policy mixes, guided by principles of transformative directionality
Advancing the Collaborative and Democratic Practices of Policy Innovation Labs with Community Engaged Scholarship	Empirical Contribution: Analysis of a Policy Innovation Lab in a Canadian city	North America	Analysis of the connection between CPSI and the policy space	Understanding the relationship between CPSI and democratic innovations, as well as their roles in the policy space and policymaking processes	Recommendations for policymakers on engaging diverse residents during the CPSI process, including strategies to invite and motivate them to contribute their resources
Dilemmas in Collaborative Public Sector Innovation: The Case of State Energy Efficiency Policy	Empirical Contribution: Analysis of the State Energy Efficiency Policy in Pennsylvania	North America	Analysis of the top-down/hands-on and the bottom-up/hands-off approaches to CPSI in a post-NPM world	Examining stakeholder interactions within policy design to clarify the conditions that lead to CPSI occurring or stagnating	Innovation is more likely to thrive when performance metrics are developed collaboratively, monitored together, and aligned with key indicators that assess the success of the collaborative innovation process itself, rather than focusing solely on policy design
Navigating the Challenges of Community Renewable Energy: Collaborative Public Sector Innovation in Taiwan	Empirical Contribution: Analysis of five case studies of community renewable energy projects in Taiwan	East Asia	Analysis of the collaborative actors involved in the stages of the policy-making process and their contributions to innovation outcomes	Understanding if and how public organizations facilitate or hinder the design and implementation of CPSI	Successful CPSI requires policymakers to streamline bureaucratic processes, enhance financial incentives, and promote greater community engagement and participation
Co-design is Not Enough: Reflections on Creative Collaborative Public Sector Innovation to Deliver Net Zero Policy Outcomes in Scotland	Empirical Contribution: Analysis of a regionally focused Net Zero Transformation program in Scotland	Western Europe	Analysis of the constructs of collaboration and of the role of design in CPSI	Analyzing the benefits and limitations of applying co-design in mission-led CPSI	The benefits of CPSI are greater when policymakers utilize co-design methods to address systemic innovation challenges and foster inclusive cross-sector collaboration through a creative and adaptive approach
Driving Public Value through Co-production: Digital Transformation in Colombia	Empirical Contribution: Analysis of collaborative digital transformation processes in Colombia's public sector	South America	Analysis of the constructs of collaboration and of the role of design in CPSI	Understanding the complex ecosystem in which CPSI meets digital transformation	While collaborations between university innovation labs and public entities are essential not only for the success of digital transformation initiatives but also for creating an inclusive digital system, they need careful attention to coproduction and policy design processes

Finally, a critical field for future analysis can be found in developing a better understanding of how the various actors involved in CPSI operate across different policy fields and sectors: how do they come together, what are their approaches to policy design, and how ideas are finalized into a viable policy or program are just a few of the areas ripe for research here.

ORCID

Mattia Casula http://orcid.org/0000-0002-7081-8153
Andrea Migone http://orcid.org/0000-0001-8521-5024

References

Acebillo-Baqué, Míriam, Diana Velasco, and Alejandra Boni. 2025. "Policy Entrepreneurship in Collaborative Governance: Transformative Innovation in Catalonia's Sustainability Transition." *Policy Design and Practice* 1–16. https://doi.org/10.1080/25741292.2025.2515732.

Alibašić, Haris, and Mattia Casula. 2024. "Navigating Collaborative Governance in Florida: An Analysis of Local Governments Resilience Amidst the COVID-19 Pandemic." *Journal of Public Affairs* 24 (1): e2890. https://doi.org/10.1002/pa.2890.

Barrutia, Jose M., and Carmen Echebarria. 2019. "Drivers of Exploitative and Explorative Innovation in a Collaborative Public-Sector Context." *Public Management Review* 21 (3): 446–472. https://doi.org/10.1080/14719037.2018.1500630.

Boukamel, Owen, and Yves Emery. 2017. "Evolution of Organizational Ambidexterity in the Public Sector and Current Challenges of Innovation Capabilities." *The Innovation Journal: The Public Sector Innovation Journal* 22 (2): 2.

Bovaird, T., G. G. VAN Ryzin, E. Loeffler, and S. Parrado. 2015. "Activating Citizens to Participate in Collective Co-Production of Public Services." *Journal of Social Policy* 44 (1): 1–23. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047279414000567.

Brock, Kathy L. 2021. "Policy Labs, Partners and Policy Effectiveness in Canada." *Policy Design and Practice* 4 (2): 228–241. https://doi.org/10.1080/25741292.2021.1880063.

Bugge, Markus M., and Carter W. Bloch. 2016. "Between Bricolage and Breakthroughs—Framing the Many Faces of Public Sector Innovation." *Public Money & Management* 36 (4): 281–288. https://doi.org/10.1080/09540962.2016.1162599.

Callens, Chesney, Jan Wynen, Jan Boon, and Koen Verhoest. 2022. "Internal and External Exploration for Public Service Innovation–Measuring the Impact of a Climate for Creativity and Collaborative Diversity on Innovation." *Public Policy and Administration*. https://doi.org/10.1177/09520767221135686.

Campomori, Francesca, and Mattia Casula. 2022. "Institutionalizing Innovation in Welfare Local Services through Co-Production: Toward a Neo-Weberian State?" *Italian Political Science Review/Rivista Italiana Di Scienza Politica* 52 (3): 313–327. https://doi.org/10.1017/ipo.2021.43.

Campomori, Francesca, and Mattia Casula. 2023. "How to Frame the Governance Dimension of Social Innovation: Theoretical Considerations and Empirical Evidence." *Innovation: The European Journal of Social Science Research* 36 (2): 171–189. https://doi.org/10.1080/13511610.2022.2036952.

Cannaerts, Nele, Jesse Segers, and Rianne Warsen. 2020. "Ambidexterity and Public Organizations: A Configurational Perspective." *Public Performance & Management Review* 43 (3): 688–712. https://doi.org/10.1080/15309576.2019.1676272.

Casula, Mattia and Andrea Migone. 2025. "Collaborative Public Sector Innovation in a Post-NPM Era: A Design Perspective." Policy Design and Practice. https://doi.org/10.1080/25741292.2025.2539569.

Casula, Mattia, and Yves Steinebach. 2025. "Implementation Arrangements in the Era of Grand Challenges." *Review of Policy Research* 42 (2): 154–163. https://doi.org/10.1111/ropr.70004.

Casula, Mattia, Chiara Leonardi, and Massimo Zancanaro. 2022. "How Does Digital Technology Impact on the Co-Production of Local Services? Evidence from a Childcare Experience." *Public Money & Management* 42 (2): 87–97. https://doi.org/10.1080/09540962.2020.1728066.

Casula, Mattia. 2017. "Who Governs in (Local) Governance? Theoretical Considerations and Empirical Evidence." *Revista De Administração Pública* 51 (6): 1121–1138. https://doi.org/10.1590/0034-7612161618.

Chalmers, Dominic. 2013. "Social Innovation: An Exploration of the Barriers Faced by Innovating Organizations in the Social Economy." *Local Economy: The Journal of the Local Economy Policy Unit* 28 (1): 17–34. https://doi.org/10.1177/0269094212463677.

Choi, Taehyon, and Susan Meyers Chandler. 2015. "Exploration, Exploitation, and Public Sector Innovation: An Organizational Learning Perspective for the Public Sector." *Human Service Organizations: Management, Leadership & Governance* 39 (2): 139–151. https://doi.org/10.1080/23303131.2015.1011762.

Cinar, E. 2021. "Public Sector Innovation." In *Innovation Management and New Product Development*, edited by Trott, P, 7th ed, 80–96. London: Pearson.

Cinar, Emre, Paul Trott, and Christopher Simms. 2019. "A Systematic Review of Barriers to Public Sector Innovation Process." *Public Management Review* 21 (2): 264–290. https://doi.org/10.1080/14719037.2018.1473477.
Cinar, Emre, Paul Trott, and Christopher Simms. 2023. "Collaborative Public Sector Innovation: An Analysis of Italy, Japan, and Turkey." *Governance* 36 (2): 379–400. https://doi.org/10.1111/gove.12673.
Clausen, Tommy H., Mehmet A. Demircioglu, and Gry A. Alsos. 2020. "Intensity of Innovation in Public Sector Organizations: The Role of Push and Pull Factors." *Public Administration* 98 (1): 159–176. https://doi.org/10.1111/padm.12617.
Crosby, Barbara C., Paul 't Hart, and Jacob Torfing. 2017. "Public Value Creation through Collaborative Innovation." *Public Management Review* 19 (5): 655–669. https://doi.org/10.1080/14719037.2016.1192165.
de Vries, Hanna, Lars Tummers, and Victor Bekkers. 2018. "A Stakeholder Perspective on Public Sector Innovation: Why Position Matters." *International Review of Administrative Sciences* 84 (2): 269–287. https://doi.org/10.1177/0020852317715513.
de Vries, Hanna, Victor Bekkers, and Lars Tummers. 2016. "Innovation in the Public Sector: A Systematic Review and Future Research Agenda." *Public Administration* 94 (1): 146–166. https://doi.org/10.1111/padm.12209.
Di Mascio, Fabrizio, Paola Coletti, and Alessandro Natalini. 2025. "How Institutional Design and Leadership Sustain Collaborative Public Sector Innovation: The Case of Administrative Simplification in Italy." *Policy Design and Practice* 1–16. https://doi.org/10.1080/25741292.2025.2514341.
Farazmand, Ali. 2017. "Governance Reforms: The Good, the Bad, and the Ugly; and the Sound: Examining the past and Exploring the Future of Public Organizations." *Public Organization Review* 17 (4): 595–617. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11115-017-0398-y.
Ferrarezi, Elisabete, Isabella Brandalise, and Joselene Lemos. 2021. "Evaluating Experimentation in the Public Sector: Learning from a Brazilian Innovation Lab." *Policy Design and Practice* 4 (2): 292–308. https://doi.org/10.1080/25741292.2021.1930686.
Ferreira, María, and Andrea Botero. 2020. "Experimental Governance? The Emergence of Public Sector Innovation Labs in Latin America." *Policy Design and Practice* 3 (2): 150–162. https://doi.org/10.1080/25741292.2020.1759761.
García Camargo, J., Linares Anzola, J., Cardozo Guerrero, L., Egas Naranjo, M., & Bejarano Gómez, A. (2025). Driving public value through co-production: digital transformation in Colombia. Policy Design and Practice, 1–12. https://doi.org/10.1080/25741292.2025.2532214
Gieske, Hanneke, Bert George, Ingmar van Meerkerk, and Arwin van Buuren. 2020. "Innovating and Optimizing in Public Organizations: Does More Become Less?" *Public Management Review* 22 (4): 475–497. https://doi.org/10.1080/14719037.2019.1588356.
Guo, Jingyu, and Daniel J. Mallinson. 2025. "Dilemmas in Collaborative Public Sector Innovation: The Case of State Energy Efficiency Policy." *Policy Design and Practice*: 1–15. https://doi.org/10.1080/25741292.2025.2523103.
Hartley, Jean, and Lindsey Rashman. 2018. "Innovation and Inter-Organizational Learning in the Context of Public Service Reform." *International Review of Administrative Sciences* 84 (2): 231–248. https://doi.org/10.1177/002085231876230.
Hartley, Jean. 2005. "Innovation in Governance and Public Services: Past and Present." *Public Money and Management* 25 (1): 27–34. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9302.2005.00447.x.
Howlett, Micahel, Anka Kekez, and Ora-Orn Poocharoen. 2017. "Understanding Co-Production as a Policy Tool: Integrating New Public Governance and Comparative Policy Theory." *Journal of Comparative Policy Analysis: Research and Practice* 19 (5): 487–501. https://doi.org/10.1080/13876988.2017.1287445.
Howlett, Michael, and M. Ramesh. 2016. "Achilles' Heels of Governance: Critical Capacity Deficits and Their Role in Governance Failures." *Regulation & Governance* 10 (4): 301–313. https://doi.org/10.1111/rego.12091.
Howlett, Michael, and Richard M. Walker. 2012. "Public Managers in the Policy Process: More Evidence on the Missing Variable?" *Policy Studies Journal* 40 (2): 211–233. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1541-0072.2012.00450.x.
Howlett, Michael. 2014. "Why Are Policy Innovations Rare and so Often Negative? Blame Avoidance and Problem Denial in Climate Change Policy-Making." *Global Environmental Change* 29 (1): 395–403. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2013.12.009.
Junginger, Sabine. 2013. "Design and Innovation in the Public Sector: Matters of Design in Policy-Making and Policy Implementation." *Annual Review of Policy Design* 1 (1): 1–11.
Kekez, Anka, Michael Howlett, and M. Ramesh. 2018. "Varieties of Collaboration in Public Service Delivery." *Policy Design and Practice* 1 (4): 243–252. https://doi.org/10.1080/25741292.2018.1532026.
Kekez, Anka, Michael Howlett, and M. Ramesh. 2019. "Collaboration in Public Service Delivery: What, When and How." In *Collaboration in Public Service. Delivery*, edited by Anka Kekez, Michael Howlett, and M. Ramesh, 2–20, Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing.
Kekez, Anka, Michael Howlett, and M. Ramesh. 2024. "Hybrid co-Production of Public Services." In *Handbook of Public Policy Implementation*, edited by Fritz Sager, Céline Mavrot, Lael R. Keiser, 448–459. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing.
Levac, Leah, and Wai Yin Chan. 2025. "Advancing the Collaborative and Democratic Practices of Policy Innovation Labs with Community Engaged Scholarship." *Policy Design and Practice* 1–16. https://doi.org/10.1080/25741292.2025.2514336.

McGann, Michael, Emma Blomkamp, and Jenny M. Lewis. 2018. "The Rise of Public Sector Innovation Labs: Experiments in Design Thinking for Policy." *Policy Sciences* 51 (3): 249–267. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11077-018-9315-7.

Meijer, Albert J. 2012. "Co-Production in an Information Age: Individual and Community Engagement Supported by New Media." *VOLUNTAS: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations* 23 (4): 1156–1172. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11266-012-9311-z.

Morisson, Arnault, and Mathieu Doussineau. 2019. "Regional Innovation Governance and Place-Based Policies: Design, Implementation and Implications." *Regional Studies, Regional Science* 6 (1): 101–116. https://doi.org/10.1080/21681376.2019.1578257.

OECD. 2015. *The Innovation Imperative in the Public Sector: Setting an Agenda for Action*. Paris: OECD.

OPSI. 2019. *Public Consultation on a Draft Declaration on Public Sector Innovation*. Paris: Observatory of Public Sector Innovation. https://oecd-opsi.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/01/Innovation-Declaration-EN.pdf

Osborne, Stephen P., and Kirsty Strokosch. 2013. "It Takes Two to Tango? Understanding the co-Production of Public Services by Integrating the Services Management and Public Administration Perspectives." *British Journal of Management* 24 (S1): S31–S47. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8551.12010.

Osborne, Stephen P., and Louise Brown. 2011. "Innovation, Public Policy and Public Services Delivery in the UK: The Word That Would be King?" *Public Administration* 89 (4): 1335–1350. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9299.2011.01932.x.

Sørensen, Eva, and Jacob Torfing. 2017. "Metagoverning Collaborative Innovation in Governance Networks." *The American Review of Public Administration* 47 (7): 826–839. https://doi.org/10.1177/0275074016643181.

Sørensen, Eva, and Jacob Torfing. 2022. "The Three Orders of Public Innovation: Implications for Research and Practice." *Nordic Journal of Innovation in the Public Sector* 1 (1): 35–52. https://doi.org/10.18261/njips.1.1.3.

Sorrentino, Maddalena, Mariafrancesca Sicilia, and Michael Howlett. 2018. "Understanding co-Production as a New Public Governance Tool." *Policy and Society* 37 (3): 277–293. https://doi.org/10.1080/14494035.2018.1521676.

Steinebach, Y., C. Knill, and M. Casula. 2025. "Policy Growth and Its Impacts on Policy Implementation: Changes, Challenges and Chances." *Regulation & Governance* 19 (3): 601–606. https://doi.org/10.1111/rego.70041.

Steinebach, Yves, and Christoph Knill. 2017. "Social Policy in Hard Times: crisis-Coping Strategies in Europe from 1976 to 2013." *International Journal of Public Administration* 40 (14): 1164–1174. https://doi.org/10.1080/01900692.2017.1317802.

Torfing, Jacob. 2016. *Collaborative Innovation in the Public Sector*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.

Torfing, Jacob. 2019. "Collaborative Innovation in the Public Sector: The Argument." *Public Management Review* 21 (1): 1–11. https://doi.org/10.1080/14719037.2018.1430248.

Vaz Lopes, André, and Josivania Silva Farias. 2022. "How Can Governance Support Collaborative Innovation in the Public Sector? A Systematic Review of the Literature." *International Review of Administrative Sciences* 88 (1): 114–130. https://doi.org/10.1177/0020852319893444.

Vento, Isak. 2020. "Hands-off or Hands-on Governance for Public Innovation? A Comparative Case Study in the EU Cohesion Policy Implementation in Finland." *International Journal of Public Administration* 43 (11): 989–999. https://doi.org/10.1080/01900692.2019.1665065.

Weimer, David L. 2025. "Constructed Collaboration: Facilitating Innovative Exchange When Networks Are Thin or Divided." *Policy Design and Practice* 1–14. https://doi.org/10.1080/25741292.2025.2514337.

Wellstead, Adam M., Anat Gofen, and Angie Carter. 2021. "Policy Innovation Lab Scholarship: Past, Present, and the Future – Introduction to the Special Issue on Policy Innovation Labs." *Policy Design and Practice* 4 (2): 193–211. https://doi.org/10.1080/25741292.2021.1940700.

Wong, N. W. M. 2025. "Navigating the Challenges of Community Renewable Energy: Collaborative Public Sector Innovation in Taiwan." *Policy Design and Practice* 1–12. https://doi.org/10.1080/25741292.2025.2529623.

Yuan, Qianli, and Mila Gasco-Hernandez. 2021. "Open Innovation in the Public Sector: Creating Public Value through Civic Hackathons." *Public Management Review* 23 (4): 523–544. https://doi.org/10.1080/14719037.2019.1695884.