

# Policy brief

INNOVATION FOR INCLUSIVE DEVELOPMENT

29 November 2018

## *INNOVATION FOR BASIC SERVICE DELIVERY: ENHANCING MUNICIPAL INNOVATION MATURITY*

### EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Municipal Innovation Maturity Index (MIMI) is a tool for assessing the capabilities of municipalities to support innovation for improved basic service delivery. The tool was developed by the Human Sciences Research Council (HSRC) in response to the general lack of appropriate instruments for understanding and evaluating the innovation capabilities of local and district municipalities in South Africa. This policy brief aims to investigate the extent to which municipalities develop their innovation capabilities as a result of exposure to innovations demonstrated at distressed municipalities as part of the Innovation Partnership for Rural Development Programme (IPRDP). The results reveal a marginal increase in the overall innovation maturity of the municipalities that were surveyed, suggesting that learning is taking as a result of exposure to the IPRDP. The MIMI results further show that even though municipalities are aware of and understand basic service delivery innovations, they have yet not reached a stage where innovation principles are entrenched in their organisations. The organisational enablers to foster an enabling environment for innovation maturity are generally lacking. In terms of leadership and management support for innovation, we stress that more should be done to encourage staff to learn about innovation. Moreover, local municipalities should be supported to strengthen their innovation capabilities and embed innovation in local government.

# Policy brief

## POLICY CONTEXT

Local municipalities are concerned with delivering basic services and improving the wellbeing of the people in their areas. The consensus among policy makers and researchers is that innovation can play an important role in enhancing the access to basic services. The question then is, how ready are municipal officials, and municipalities as organisations, to foster public sector innovation in the local government space? That is, are the municipalities, mandated to be developmental in their approach, capable to find and implement innovative solutions to pressing basic service delivery backlogs or breakdowns in distressed municipalities and rural communities (see Ramoroka et al. 2017)?

The South African science, innovation and technology (STI) policies underscore that research and innovation should inter alia be directed at basic community needs and reducing the total cost of infrastructure. Local STI policies, therefore, embrace a development agenda, which provide a rationale for innovation to ensure pro-poor benefits and enhance inclusive development (see Ramaroka et al. 2017). This corresponds with the Constitutional imperatives to improve access to water, sanitation, education and housing as outlined in the Bill of Rights, and also with the Batho Pele (people first) principle in public service.

The Department of Science and Technology (DST) has been instrumental in promoting policy shifts towards innovation for inclusive development. Key policies include the recent draft White Paper on Science and Technology (2018) and the Innovation for Local Economic Development Strategy (2016). In addition to the work of DST, a number of government departments and agencies support the advancement of public sector innovation towards promoting development. The Centre for Public Service Innovation (CPSI) hosts events, including conferences, workshops and training programmes where decision-makers and practitioners are exposed to innovative practices and where experts provide guidance on building an innovative public sector. Innovation has also been embraced by a number of government departments including the Department of Cooperative Governance and Traditional

# Policy brief

Affairs (COGTA, see the Back to Basics Strategy, 2014); Department of Human Settlements (Breaking New Ground in Housing Policy, 2004); and Department of Water and Sanitation (the National Sanitation Policy, 2016) to name a few. The Extended Public Works Programme, adopted by various government departments, which provides employment and training opportunities to the poor, is considered a further example of public sector innovation in South Africa. Additionally, the South African Local Government Association (SALGA) regards innovation as strategically important for service delivery in the context of developmental local government.

A key consideration regarding the take-up of public sector innovation is the capabilities of public officials and maturity organisations to learn, identify, and implement innovations. They should also be to share ideas (knowledge) about innovations with relevant stakeholders for greater innovation diffusion at various government levels, be it local, regional or national. Appropriate measurement tools are required to obtain reliable, timely and meaningful information about the innovation capabilities of municipal officials (Sinyolo et al. 2018). It is against this background that the MIMI was developed by the HSRC as a tool to assess and develop the innovation capabilities in the public sector. The aim of this policy brief is to outline the extent to which municipalities develop their innovation capabilities as a result of exposure to basic service delivery innovations part of the IPRDP.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> This brief is part of a series of policy briefs. Two other policy briefs focus on lessons learnt in relation to the demonstration of IPRDP technologies in rural settlements (see Hart et al. 2018) and the experiences of communities exposed to IPRDP technologies.

# Policy brief

## WHAT IS THE MIMI?

The MIMI measures the capabilities of individual employees and organisation to learn and implement. The tool determines the innovation maturity (see Figure 1) of municipalities to adopt innovations aimed at improving the delivery of basic public services, particularly water, sanitation and energy.

The MIMI framework consist of 33 items (or indicators) organised into four constructs, assessing the extent to which:

- a) the organisation (municipality) offers an enabling environment for innovation,
- b) municipal management provides leadership and support for innovation,
- c) individual officials learn and expand their innovation capabilities, and
- d) innovation is regarded as important for the municipality's activities and processes.

**Figure 1: MIMI Maturity Level Descriptions**

Maturity level 1	Maturity level 2	Maturity level 3	Maturity level 4
<i>Limited, if any</i>	<i>Define &amp; apply</i>	<i>Manage &amp; entrench</i>	<i>Share learning externally</i>
Limited, if any, awareness or evidence of innovation on the part of individual officials or the organisation.	Innovation is defined, applied and repeatable. Officials understand innovation principles, but innovation activities occur irregularly.	Innovation is managed and innovation principles are entrenched in the organisation. Officials seek to optimise and evaluate solutions, and improve on these for internal benefit.	Innovation is open and outward looking. New knowledge is applied creatively, based on evidence, in different contexts and shared with others outside of the organisation.

# Policy brief

The process of developing the MIMI instrument involved several steps. The first step was to design the tool based on literature regarding innovation capabilities, government maturity, public sector innovation, and capability maturity models. The instrument was then tested by interviewing 18 officials at six local municipalities, not participating in the IPRDP, after which the instrument was revised. The final instrument was then used to undertake two surveys. Officials involved in the IPRDP, and their managers, were interviewed in a sample of IPRDP districts. The first round data was collected in November 2016, and included interviews with 34 municipal officials from six municipalities. The second round survey was completed in November 2017, and 30 municipal officials from four of the original six municipalities were interviewed.


## **MIMI RESULTS: THE EFFECT OF IPRDP EXPOSURE ON INNOVATION MATURITY**

In terms of the simple average scores for both survey rounds, a marginal increase in the overall innovation maturity of municipalities is observed. In round one of the survey (MIMI 1), the total average score amounted to 2.5, increasing to 2.7 in round two (MIMI 2). The increase in the maturity levels suggests that learning is taking place due to exposure to the IPRDP. However, none of the municipalities surveyed reached maturity level three or four in either of the survey rounds, indicating that innovation principles and practices have not been adequately entrenched in the municipal operations, nor have the municipalities begun actively sharing knowledge with other stakeholders to diffuse innovation for wider impact. This is not unexpected, since the development of an innovation orientation along with innovation capabilities at organisational level are long term, strategic objectives.

Figure 2 shows the average scores for the MIMI constructs. In order to determine the effect of IPRDP exposure on organisational innovation capabilities, Construct A i.e. Organisational enables for innovation, and Construct B i.e. Leadership and management support for innovation are unpacked further. Marginal increases are observed in both constructs in line with the overall increase between MIMI 1 and MIMI 2. However, Construct A scored lower

# Policy brief

than Construct B in both rounds, which indicates that municipal officials felt that the innovation maturity of their managers was higher than the organisational maturity of the municipalities to provide an enabling environment for innovation.




**Figure 2: Average (mean) scores per MIMI construct**

Further analysis was done to indicate the specific items that were scored the lowest or highest, so as to make recommendations regarding specific interventions at these municipalities to improve their innovation capabilities. For this purpose, the data from the two surveys were pooled and analysed. Construct A is considered first (Figure 3). Whether innovation is linked to the overall organisational strategy and the allocation of human resources for innovation scored highest. This suggests that the municipalities which have been exposed to innovation through the IPRDP, are making efforts to align

# Policy brief

their strategies and staff to their innovation objectives. However, physical resources, knowledge management tools and staff incentives for innovation emerge as areas for improvement. These indicators scored lowest (2.2 or below). At the same time, the effectiveness of municipalities in delivering basic public services and financial resources for innovation also scored quite low (at 2.3 and 2.4 respectively).




**Figure 3: Average scores per item in Construct A**

# Policy brief

Attention now turns to Construct B. Figure 4 shows that leadership and management support for the assessment of the physical environment and community needs for innovation interventions are at a high maturity level. However, support from managers in terms of encouraging staff to learn, deepening their understanding of innovation processes; and promoting accountability and transparency are issues of concern.

**Figure 4: Average scores per item in Construct B**



# Policy brief

## CONCLUSIONS AND POLICY ACTIONS

In order to improve basic service delivery, municipalities no doubt require new or improved ways of doing things, that is an innovation orientation. Yet, the level of innovation maturity, and the extent to which municipalities learn and improve their innovation capabilities are largely unknown. The findings of this brief indicates that, while the municipalities are beyond the maturity level of awareness and understanding of innovation, they have not reached a stage where innovation principles are entrenched in their organisations. Also shown is that exposure to the IPRDP has resulted in a positive increase in innovation maturity, albeit marginal. This increase indicates that there is learning taking place due to exposure to IPRDP activities, and that should lead to further innovation maturity in the medium to long term. It, therefore, is recommended that municipalities should continue to be exposed to innovation projects such as IPRDP to foster and nurture innovation-driven basic service delivery. The Learning Forums held as part of this research in which municipalities involved in the IDRDP and others have participated and shared their experiences is a powerful example of self-reflecting learning towards fostering innovation maturity.

The study also demonstrates that the organisational enablers to create an enabling environment for innovation are generally lacking. In terms of leadership and management support for innovation, the results indicate that more should be done to encourage staff to learn about innovation. Additionally, a key policy insight is that local municipalities need the support from organisations in the local government system like SALGA and COGTA, and other also STI actors like DST, to strengthen innovation capabilities and to embed innovation at the local government level. It is recognised that there are broader governance and supportive factors that impact on the innovation ability and performance of municipalities. Indicators from secondary sources should to be incorporated in future refinements of the tool to contextualise the external environment in which municipalities operate.

# Policy brief

Specific recommendations to enhance organisational capabilities of distressed municipalities to foster innovation maturity include to:

- Provide access to and allocate physical and financial resources for innovation outcomes;
- Develop management tools for innovation purposes, in other words put systems in place to record, store and retrieve learning and knowledge about potential innovations;
- Incentivise staff members based on performance targets for the introducing innovations; and
- Encourage learning by providing management support to individual staff members to explore new ideas and different options, and learn about innovation processes

**Figure 5: Enhancing the organisational capabilities for municipal innovation maturity**



# Policy brief

## REFERENCES

Hart, T.G.B, Booyens, I., Fakudze, B. D., and Jacobs, P.T. (2018). *Innovation for basic service delivery: Key lessons for the demonstration of technologies in rural settlements*. HSRC Policy Brief. Cape Town, HSRC

Ramoroka, K.H., Booyens, I. & Jacobs, P.T. (2017). *Innovation by local government for improved basic service delivery in South Africa*. IPRDP Concept Paper #1. Cape Town, HSRC.

Sinyolo, S., Booyens, I. & Jacobs, P.T. (2018). *Innovation in local municipalities: tool shows officials lack capacity*. HSRC Review, 16(1), 24-25

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The DST commissioned and funded this research on the IPRDP undertaken by the HSRC. We acknowledge the inputs of colleagues who collaborated with us, particularly Kgabo Ramoroka, Siyanda Jonas, Bhekiwe Fakudze, Ronald Mudimeli and Alexandra Mhula-Links. The views expressed remain those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect those of any other party.

## AUTHORS

**Irma Booyens**, Senior Research Specialist, Economic Performance and Development (EPD) Research Programme, HSRC

**Sikhulumile Sinyolo**, Research Specialist, EPD, HSRC

**Peters Jacobs**, Research Director, EPD, HSRC

**Tim Hart**, Senior Research Manager, EPD, HSRC



29 November 2018