**Interviewer: Are there any portfolio-like functions in your organisation? How did you manage innovation within your organisation before? Whose responsibility this is normally (if at all)?**

**Interviewee A:** The organisation doesn`t have any tools for portfolio overview. There is a couple of individuals that know about everything and are working with innovation. But there is no a tool as a such.

**Interviewer: Did you learn something new about your organisation after running the tool and obtaining the results? Was your organisation in line with the innovation portfolio outcome from the tool? If no, then why do you think it was the case. Did any of the outcomes surprise you?**

**Interviewee A:** The tool gave more insights into particular methods as well as the variety of methods used and particular aspects of decision-making processes. It gave more elaboration about things but nothing particularly new. We have tried different versions of the Portfolio Exploration Tool over time. The first results put the organisation in anticipatory and they thought they were well-aligned. A later version of the tool put them more into the adaptive facet with still a good degree in anticipatory. The organisation identifies themselves more into the anticipatory facet, which wasn´t reflected into the results of the later versions of the tool.

The part of “How well your organisation supports portfolio management”, does not give much information to be honest. The tool does not explain what for example “medium” means, what that outcome means. I guess they have a medium overview of their portfolio, but they didn´t get a lot of information so they did not pay much attention to that.

**Interviewer: Are you considering rebalancing your innovation portfolio based on what you learned after running the tool/during the workshop? If yes, which facets/type of innovation are you planning to strengthen? How would you manage your portfolio differently based on the exercise?**

**Interviewee A:** Not necessarily, it depends on what it is meant by rebalancing. The organisation uses another model to clarify how they move projects across. It is from outside the organisational sphere to the unknown sphere, so more anticipatory/ adaptive towards the different zone of influence within the organisation. There is another model they work with, it is on colors with yellow, green, and blue zones. There they see an overlay with the portfolio model. They work to move projects with innovation processes across these things so it gets a home within the organisation and becomes a more continuous improvement. They see themselves as they work in this area of the field of the anticipatory/adaptive and we need to work in collaboration with other teams, that we can pass the ball to them and move the process. I´m not sure if that is considered re-balancing because their straighten is working with a particular part of the portfolio, but they see the need to link up with other teams, work in other parts of the portfolio, and to be able to move innovation projects across, like in different areas of the facets. They are using the facets model together with other models, and they see their part of the portfolio is only a piece of the puzzle. There is a small team within the local organisation and other teams working with innovation in different aspects and thematic areas. They see the facets model and this portfolio management as a nice way of verbalizing both how they work with innovation and the different stages of innovation project cycles. Also, to point out the necessity to have proper commences and resources to be able to work with innovation in early phases like in anticipatory phases and the ability to see the broader, more holistic view of a portfolio. So, not just the things that they work with but what the other innovation teams work with, so they can think strategically about how to link up with other teams and kind of pass the ball basically across the field.

**Interviewer: Who participated in the exercise? What were your expectations? Would you do it again in your organisation? Kindly provide feedback regarding what you liked and what you would change about the workshop and the tool.**

**Interviewee A:** We did the Portfolio Exploration Tool workshop in two different teams within the same department working on XXXXal sustainability. The workshop provided many not new insights but a new way of looking at things. A new way of verbalizing how they work and criticizing the need to link up with other teams so they do not see themselves in isolation. The organisation is a part of a broader portfolio of actors working with innovation and their projects were part of broader portfolio projects. So that was a new insight, it was just like a chance to reflect and realize that there are some new words, we can share and talk about each other innovation activities. That would be the new thing: the insight to be part of a broader picture that the different teams are working in different ways.

The organisation would run the tool again, we have run Module 1 and Module 2 several times.

Module 1 was comprehensive in a way that it went through organisational decision aspects, methods used, and things like this. It provokes discussions and alternative ways of viewing things- it brought up different perspectives in the team. It lifted things to be discussed and the discussion was the really good part of the tool. About Module 1, we would change the framing of the organisation. Both teams found it quite difficult to continue to answer the questions as a team because a lot of the questions were taking the organisational perspective: how are decisions made, how are resources used. Those decisions and resourcing kind of things are done at a team level, but they are also done on an organisational level. So, the different questions have to be answered in a different perspective or organisational level and that was very difficult. It let the teams wondering if this confuses results. I think there are like an input set of questions, what type of organisation are you, to be able to kind of frame the questions. Maybe some of the questions wouldn`t be relevant for teams versus the depending type of organisation and the level in the organisation, some questions might be formulated differently. That was a difficult thing. For Module 2, the team thought that it was in such strong contrast from Module 1 and there were a bunch of questions to get it felt like a comprehensive way to get the results, mapping the portfolio snapshot. Whereas in Module 2 there are three questions that can be hacked immediately, if you answer this question this way, you know what results you could obtain. They didn´t think it provided such value-added, they thought that it was more beneficial to think themselves how they understand the facets model to discuss and position their projects on a facets model. They had a discussion about that, what does that mean in teams, in terms of what we want to move in this project. Do we want to be active in other aspects of the facets model to get a relevant result…

Also, the opportunity to benchmark, that once you got the results, your snapshot or profile looks similar to the whenever benchmark. There were missing one additional thing, potentially learn from others. They thought that the tool was good because it was digital but it requires a little bit of terminology. It would be more helpful if there is a neutral facilitator who pushes the discussion forward and kind of draws out what are the key messages. Someone to guide the discussion, to guide how to use the results at the end. Someone that is more familiar with the tool. We are getting there but it is almost like you need a kind of training to be able to run the tool. There could be done practice runs, how to push the discussion further, what to do next after you run the tool, what could be the next activities that could help the organisation help to use the insights provided or things like this. These kinds of models and tools are only part of a broader process, so it is interesting and provokes a lot of discussions, but there should be a guide like how we should continue to use this and how to apply it. Another situation is to see how the portfolio snapshots relate to one another but in different organisations, to get different pieces of the puzzle. Depending on the organisation, you get different parts and if you zoom out you could see a big diamond and different organisations have different parts. If you can see all these different organisations what part of the portfolio innovation activity are in a place or around a certain thematic area, would it be possible to get this overly of the portfolio of different organisations. Could you color code different thematic areas so the teams are working in mobility projects, energy projects, would you find a way to demonstrate movements of different projects over time…. Other ways of seeing the potential of this model to be applied, like to take these snapshots in a different time and it is not just the organisation, but it is also their portfolio activities. From an organisational angle, it is how that could be coupled to more specific implications in terms of resourcing or the tool points out that you might consider spending in other activities and other facets. It could be also interesting to know if you are quite active in these facets it typically means that you might need this kind of skills or methods, resources. I mean that like if you want to act more mission-oriented, what does that mean. How could you use the model, based on decisions, or change focus, move products across the portfolio? I thought that it was interesting how we can use this; how can we apply this and use it to discuss this kind of decisions with management.

**Interviewer: How do you determine on which future challenges to focus? Do you check innovation studies/ trends on a week basis as part of your main tasks? Are you exploring foresight studies to better understand future societal needs? Do you discuss innovation with other people, inside but also outside the organisation?**

**Interviewee A:** They keep an eye on studies and of course read national and regional studies, but I think most of the signals come from the actors and the system. There are different stakeholders in the system and they are talking with them and they kind of make themselves available to the actors as well as reach them out. Across the team there are different specialties, some are focused on mobility, some are focused on entrepreneurship or the creative sector, others are focused on digitalization. As they have the “know”, they get legitimacy among the stakeholders. So, I think knowing the local organisation, their needs and vision and then understanding what is going on in the system in the local innovation system is key for them. For example, they think “…if we match this person, with this other person, may take us somewhere.” So, it is not based on theoretical studies mostly, I would say that is a very small source of idea. They test, they learn by doing, like which solution would be most relevant, So, they put a little bit of effort and a little bit of money into different ideas for different potential solutions, so it is experimentation in a way. It consists in testing different approaches.

They have digital solutions, they invest in digital infrastructure, and then they also invest in different software platforms, digital translation to make sense of the data they are gathering. They also may invest in different services or ideas. They would encourage maybe multiple software solutions to translate the information. They encourage a lot of companies to use this open data and to see what it can tell us and what kind of sources could be developed. They are encouraging different innovation activities, using something that they invested in. So, the XXXX invests in certain digital infrastructure, and then the organisation encourages a lot of testing, piloting, and development, they might even assist this whole process.

**Interviewer: Do people in your organisation have the necessary independence, space and time to explore new ideas? Do you organize internal workshops/ team activities focused on how to improve your yet established practices? Are there any reward systems for people developing innovations?**

**Interviewee A:** They are very much on the move and very much focused on action. They realize that they don´t have time for this strategic reflection and development. They do organize some workshops and they have partner meetings, inviting partners from all different areas to participate. So, they do have workshops and do have kind of collective meetings for the partner group, but they would like to do more strategic overviews. They are realizing that they have a good history, being able to develop and deliver, so now they are considering other ways and other organisational sett ups, this is an ongoing discussion with the local leadership, the political leadership. What these teams can do, what the XXXX and the whole system of actors move forward.

**Interviewer: How do you respond to unforeseen events and new developments? Do you consider involving the users(citizens) in the process of innovation?**

**Interviewee A:** They really want to involve the citizens. The organisation is really aware that this is a huge asset, to involve citizens and in particular students in the innovation process. They had discussions with the university for years so we can do this in a more structure way. They do it on an ad hoc basis, they have different programs for students and they run cases but they want to be more ambitious. They just haven´t got there yet. I think that when it comes to reacting in a crisis, they are very agile and they are very much about kind of feeling what the users would need, so they are responsible for business development in the XXXX. They just look how things are going and try to start new services. So, for instance when COVID-19 came, they set up basically a team within the XXXX. It was like emergency support but also business development, so it is like combining different aspects of business development together. They provided financial support, by helping to access national funding, help to negotiate their rent. So, they provided this kind of developed agile services.

**Interviewer: Which do you think is the biggest impediment to innovate in public sector? How do you think this could be addressed? What kind of resources do you need in order to promote innovation in your organisation?**

**Interviewee A:** In general, I think it is sticking to the localorganisational boundaries. In a sense that the majority people outside the organisation, working with innovation in the XXXX thinks of it as “…. we can do new things, we can buy new things though procurement, and we can improve existing things”. It is mainly focused on improvement and enhancement angles and anything within procurements regulations. We are not allowed to go beyond the boundaries of our localorganisation, so I think that is what I have observed to be the biggest impediments.

The organisation has an expressed role to go beyond the boundaries and work with these other actors. On the other hand, there is this mindset of “... innovative public procurement is more like a partnership process. We are buying a process; we are not buying a thing or a solution”. There are localservants that think in a broader perspective, but I think that the majority are impeded by this “... the law says that we are not allowed to work with innovation”, so we are limited to the boundaries of our organisation.

This could be addressed by enabling the XXXX to take on this role. In the case of the organisation, they remit to take on this role. The way they act and how they are doing with external actors came from padding the budget and basically from a state of approval from the national innovation agency. They gave certain budget for an innovation platform program to work with innovation and to work with external actors. So, they did and they have done a really good job. This funding is in a project form and they don´t have the budget nor the stamp and the “ok” to act in this way. In this way and to develop this kind of skills, I think they need to be given the “ok” to think beyond the organisational borders. Also, they need an additional tool in a sense of different skills, different mindsets, different working practices, they can be located in different places as they do. It is also about resources, a little bit of investment to get the ball rolling, to kick off ideas and help them grow. There is not just the public sector, there is not just the XXXX or the national actors. There are also other stakeholders in the system.

**Interviewer: Are there any portfolio-like functions in your organisation? Whose responsibility this is normally (if at all)?**

**Interviewee B:** The answer is yes. It is important to distinguish between the problematic portfolio, so the portfolio related to the covidence of a specific country. We have a portfolio covidence in XXXX, but that is probably not what you are referring to the innovation portfolio within the organisation. The answer there is that we do have existing portfolios in the sense that we have thematic portfolios, so we have thematic leads for innovations and areas such as agriculture, health, education and we have horizontal portfolios, that look at advising all programs across the board and on improving the internal capability of the organisation. Then we also have in our team invention focus innovation capability portfolio for horizontal scanning to identify new challenges and incubate new work tracks. Also we have different programs focused on a new way of working. So, you could argue that we have a deep sector portfolio, we have a horizontal portfolio, and we have an exploration portfolio.

There is no one person responsible, but different people. These portfolios are not designed from scratch but like one strategy we got in mind and it emerged organically.

**Interviewer: How do you decide on which future challenges to focus? Do you check innovation studies/ trends on a week basis as part of your main tasks? Are you exploring foresight studies to better understand future societal needs? Do you discuss innovation with other people, inside but also outside the organisation?**

**Interviewee B:** The answer is yes to all of those. How we identify future needs is a combination of governments from both sides: governmental office and the science department that has a futures and foresight branch and they invest a lot in future studies- they are one source. We internally undertake on a regular basis the corporate foresight scenario exercises, and then thirdly I and my team responsible of another future scope exercise, which is quite qualitative. So, it is part of my job to think about what are future changes that are not yet covered by our work and part of the development humanitarian actors. So, it is a combination of all what you said, studies, research on triggering news journals, and conversations, internally and externally. They happen all the time, across the organisation, across donors, and with other innovation actors.

**Interviewer: Do people in your organisation have the necessary independence, space and time to explore new ideas? Do you organize internal workshops/ team activities focused on how to improve your yet established practices? Are there any reward systems for people developing innovations?**

**Interviewee B:** The people have the independence but, of course, in the confines of program policy rules are linear multi-planning. They hardly have the time that is a phenomenon, especially in the development world. People from this sector, expect often than kind of program management responsibilities and work less on their expertise and work much more on program management. So, time is the main constrain. Workshops do happen but they are mainly isolated exercises offered by my team where country offices can apply to have support services in the form of workshops and training but they have to compete for that. Then if that happens, for a like a week and the remote work it is less sustainable.

We do collaborate with other organisations to promote innovation and that happens in different ways. So, we offer a service to country offices, they can apply to get the support service and if it is successfully, they are engaged in a co-designing week where they are supported with the institutional foresight functions and they are exposed to the local innovation system ecosystem actors. We do research in developing, who is interested to work on the ground in countries such as XXXX, and then we connect these actors to our country office. So that is a first, kind of, leak of players, local innovators, from tech innovators to positive outliers in communities fund ingenious solutions problems to government innovators. Another class of partners is our donators, they have innovation from about 14 donations, foundations, and then we have an informal relationship with XXXX for example, and with a bunch of universities. I could probably name more, but I think these examples provide a good sample.

**Interviewer: How do you respond to unforeseen circumstances and new developments? Do you consider involving the users(citizens) in the process of innovation?**

**Interviewee B:** We do of course, but we are not a direct implementor. So, unlike let's say, local municipalities have a direct interface with citizens, we do not have that. So, we work through third parties who implement our work. That can be refugee agencies, can be international NGOs, can be local NGOs, and support them to directly engage citizens. We have a specific guide that we actually work on. It is part of our adaptive management working program that we endorsed last year. It has some other guidelines to really encourage to involve citizens in the design process and in designing meaningful feedback loops between citizens and implementors. It has many components in our context because we work in a context where we support refugees that have been displaced for decades with pretty low levels of literacy and education. The reality is radically different than if you work with local municipalities and citizens in a medium-sized country in XXXX, for example. So, there is no one-size approach for us when it comes to citizens engagement because we are mindful of the different context we work in and what we are mindful of is feedback groups that are meant to not only get invoices from the citizens to inform design processes with the government but then the government reports back what has been done with inputs and feedback. In international development you have a real problem with over consulting communities, going a bunch of questions and people don't really see a change in their life, which is kind of unproductive.

**Interviewer: Which do you think is the biggest impediment to innovate in public sector? How do you think this could be addressed? What kind of resources do you need in order to promote innovation in your organisation?**

**Interviewee B:** Based on some qualitative research inside our organisations, is the lack of time. The second one is the rules and policies for program management that require people to plan in a linear fashion for years ahead and commit to spend a certain amount of money and to report against indicators that focus on progress but not on learning. You have to prove that you have some kind of contribution to development changes and that makes it pretty hard to adapt to the changing circumstances.

To address this is needed not to focus only on the mindset of governmental officials to innovate if the behaviors drivers that are baked in the systems to rules and procedures are not changed. Therefore, it should be kind of parallel, you cannot just innovate yourself out of confined and refrains. So, what we are doing is, we invest a lot in the sense not in the label "innovation", but in adaptive management and in changing the rule box and enabling people to program differently, to propose to test new indicators that argue at adaptation, parallel experiments and building on what you learn incrementally and not a linear plan for years. Speaking in a more technical term, in my world we have a framework to plan years ahead and we have tested different modalities, such as the XXXX and then for example the rules in my organization change, that if you want to design a program you also have other kinds of instruments, not just the main framework. There is huge pressure, as we operate with taxpayer money to show value for money. So, to go back on the portfolio approach, a more general innovation portfolio approach where you split your investments in investments that are tangible, so we can report them back. However, you are also mindful of is you want to really advance development you can't only invest in incremental quantifiable changes. You have to invest in coalition building a thinking of assisting dynamics and more intangible investments to advance change.

**Interviewer: Are there any portfolio-like functions in your organisation? How did you manage innovation within your organisation before? Whose responsibility this is normally (if at all)?**

**Interviewee C:** I believe that before we knew the tool, we had several different ways to organize and manage the innovation inside the organization. By nature, we are a local NGO, but we are constantly close to innovation parts, so we have been applying social innovation principles and other different kinds of innovation tools and methodologies inside the organization in order to empower the different types of projects that we have. We have been starting to experiment with a little bit, we don't have the full scope of the tool applied to the organization portfolio. We believe we have some scope in it. That is one of the things we have been working on. We have like a short term strategy to cover and apply the tool, we have talked with part of our advisors and internal team in order to adopt the tool. I am the head of design innovation and strategy, we have created this specific area couple of years ago. I started as Innovation manager and design strategist but then I started to incorporate a different kind of methodologies and tool to the organizations. For instance design thinking, we have been experimenting with our own tools. We have developed around agile workshop methodologies and we have been learning proactively with foresight, future thinking from a couple of years ago. Also, systems thinking and systems practice mythologies, we have been pretty active in this learning process. It has been quite an interesting way to apply it to different projects that we have.

**Interviewer: Did you learn something new about your organization after running the tool and obtaining the results? Was your organisation in line with the innovation portfolio outcome from the tool? If no, then why do you think it was the case. Did any of the outcomes surprise you?**

**Interviewee C:** The result was pretty interesting I did the workshop with the director of the organization. It was interesting to see that we have a kind of equilibrium in the results, in most of the areas we scored almost the same. We knew that for instance, anticipatory innovation were some areas that we need to reinforce, but they were pretty close to reality.

**Interviewer: Are you considering rebalancing your innovation portfolio based on what you learned after running the tool/during the workshop? If yes, which facets/type of innovation are you planning to strengthen? How would you manage your portfolio differently based on the exercise?**

**Interviewee C:** At the moment we are still very a small organization, we work by projects most of the time, so we apply to different grants and different projects. We are invited to participate in different organisations, international agencies, etc, but we are still in this process of development. So, we are starting to know how we are going to manage the innovation part in the different projects that are coming in the near future. We are starting to put the baselines in all of them. We are starting to understand our roles and prepositions, we believe that innovation is one of the things that differences us from other organizations at the local and national level. In terms of anticipatory and the planning of the organization, we believe that the tool will help us to restructure some of the strategies that we have scoping in the innovation part. For instance, about the budget planning, of course, the information is taken from the people we work on the population that we are aiming our advocacy model, or advocacy work is an important part for us. We are trying to understand how to manage the tool.

**Interviewer: Who participated in the exercise? What were your expectations? Would you do it again in your organization? Kindly provide feedback regarding what you liked and what you would change about the workshop and the tool.**

**Interviewee C:** We ran the tool with the director, but we are considering to run own workshop internally with our team next year with the other part of the team. Maybe we were pretty open to the tool and to the workshop, we knew that we are going to have a sort of evaluation of the capacities and activities but maybe one of the things that we wanted to see in the workshop was to have a toolkit and some kind of guides applied to our practice. We have the resources, and the whole website guides, but maybe the interface and the whole methodology needs to have maybe more things closest to the people. Sometimes, the tool seems a little bit "serious" or "cold", so maybe this is some kind of feedback that I would like to give. We have some expectancy on having more local languages or maybe some toolkit or guide in order to implement the tool. We liked the holistic, systemic view of the tool. When we see innovation in the wild is like in very short term, or just quick wins, not precisely scoped to planning and capacity or our advocacy. This tool is very holistic, very systems-views. We like the access, it is very clear how to order the different innovations that we have, that part is pretty interesting. Again, we would like to see maybe how other organizations successfully applied some sort of the practices of the tool, how to manage it through the time, in the short, medium, and long term. We have different scopes, different types of things to consider. Having these examples of how people or groups are applying the tool in different kinds of context is very important. The part of the toolkit to have different tools for different stages, areas of the tool, would be very useful.

**Interviewer: How do you decide on which future challenges to focus? Do you check innovation studies/ trends weekly as part of your main tasks? Are you exploring foresight studies to better understand future societal needs? Do you discuss innovation with other people, inside but also outside the organisation?**

**Interviewee C:** Absolutely. It is one of the things that we do as part of our work. We try to identify signals with some methods of future-thinking, we try to see the trends and the social and political trends. We are a small team, but this helps us to work closely and to have quick information and to interchange. We recruit people that are pretty sensitive not only to political or social contexts to also to other topics. We have this idea of how a multidisciplinary organization, we want to incorporate different profiles like scientists, biologists, physics, or any other profiles in order to intersect the knowledge and straight to keep experimenting. As I said, we try to have methods and we also the other part that is more like sensitive, experimenting, and trying to identify the signals and the document it. We also, talk to the people, we have indicators, a theory of change of each project, a logical framework model for each project. We also detect some population that is closely related to our advocacy and work, we try to connect with them, and to have this message interchange, to understand what are they doing. In the end, also the people are starting to search our organization for some references and work that we are doing. Of course, we believe that we are a human-central organization, so we want to reinforce to keep building this capacity inside the organization.

**Interviewer: Do people in your organisation have the necessary independence, space, and time to explore new ideas? Do you organize internal workshops/ team activities focused on how to improve your yet established practices? Are there any reward systems for people developing innovations?**

**Interviewee C:** We invite to the conversation, our accountants or administrators and they are surprised because other organisations they have been working never invited them to this type of conversation. For instance anti-corruption, justice, or innovation. On Friday, each month we are having these types of conversations, to show the teams what we are working on, and to talk about the new steps. We discuss innovation in informal and formal ways externally and internally.  For example, with people working on other topics. We have very interesting feedback from them. We also like to do research, formal and informal.

**Interviewer: How do you respond to unforeseen circumstances and new developments? Do you consider involving the users(citizens) in the process of innovation?**

**Interviewee C:** Yes, absolutely. This is one of the things that we are doing. It is very important for us to consider the context and the people. It is absolutely important because that is one of the things that is going to influence our decision-making, we have the responsibility for people. We work with important issues, so in the end, we have the responsibility to consider them all the time, we don not see that in other organizations and we don not understand why. It is a positive critic, but we are pushing the conversation at the public level, to consider the people.

**Interviewer: Which do you think is the biggest impediment to innovation in the public sector? How do you think this could be addressed? What kind of resources do you need in order to promote innovation in your organisation?**

**Interviewee C:** The public sector could be as big as the whole country, but for instance for public agencies innovation is like one thing that just shines or tries to make more pretty their activity, in general of course. In general, they don't see innovation as an investment, or as a revenue. They don't see innovation as a strategic component, but just to have a good image. So, this is one of the things that we see here. The other thing is of course the budget. Innovation is seen as an expense and not as an investment. Without innovation we can not keep track and also in order to have prosperity and harmony in the system. Innovation is fundamental. The other one is of course capacity, they don't understand or maybe they don't have the right people pushing, or like the social pulse in order to incorporate it in the inside. They don't have the technical capacity or the sensitivity to facilitate and to understand what really is for instance design thinking. They are starting to incorporating some sort of things but it is not part of their DNA.

For instance, the Portfolio Exploration Tool tool would be a powerful way to support the innovation movement. For example in our observatory, we did innovation jams, it was an event with other servants. We presented OPSI as a good practice for the public servants. This year they put eyes, it is an international level organization,  and they have a reputation. We presented the Portfolio Exploration Tool and they were like " ...this is very interesting, we could apply it to our operational and innovation part...", but they just say it, they didn't really do it. I believe that with the right guidance and consultancy to these people, for instance, public organizations, the Portfolio Exploration Tool could be supporting to give them more idea or more vision of why innovation is important for them...

Having the support of international level organizations is important, but sometimes they have the vision that these big organizations are a reference and a good starting point. They are reliable sources but they see them as they could be a pretty good reference, but they don't understand the local level and what we are working on, they don't understand what we are facing here in our context. So that is one of the things I would suggest to the tool or the methodologies for the PET tool, to consider the local level and the context. Also, the empathy with the people and the problems they are facing in front of these big issues that we are having especially in the developing countries. There are huge challenges not only in the health, or the justice sector.

**Interviewer: Are there any portfolio-like functions in your organisation? How did you manage innovation within your organisation before? Whose responsibility this is normally (if at all)?**

**Interviewee D:** It is not something centralized, which derives from the mission of the organization. Actually, the process of innovation as an intend started in 2016, and we are a very small team engaged in innovation. The budget is quite small, resources are scarce but it is not something centralised, more like the team is working on specific problems derived either from internal processes or user demands. There is an enhancement innovation and small steps in innovation, this is the approach to innovation in our organization. There is not a specific person that is engaged to manage innovation, we act on ad hoc.

**Interviewer: Did you learn something new about your organisation after running the tool and obtaining the results? Was your organisation in line with the innovation portfolio outcome from the tool? If no, then why do you think it was the case. Did any of the outcomes surprise you?**

**Interviewee D:** Yes, we ran the tool in our department and we found out that we have a different perspective of the work we do here. My boss sees it as anticipatory innovation and other colleagues see it as enhancement and mission-oriented. We don't have a coherent vision of the work we are doing. We agree with the results obtained, but it should be more specific regarding certain areas like budget, human resources, and the legal and regulatory constraints. I saw that many NGOs participated and their activity is quite different from the activity of the governmental organizations. They have more freedom, and we must stick to the rules which make it more difficult to implement something new and to explain it to the users.

**Interviewer: Are you considering rebalancing your innovation portfolio based on what you learned after running the tool/during the workshop? If yes, which facets/type of innovation are you planning to strengthen? How would you manage your portfolio differently based on the exercise?**

**Interviewee D:** I don't think we are going to rebalance the portfolio because it depends on regulations and the law, as well as on the budget that we will have for the next few years. Now we are five people, working on innovation but as I said it mostly depends on the regulations and the budget. Maybe we will push more on the enhancement part which is more suitable for our type of organization, mainly developing a process which can be suitable for all the internal processes. There are multiple internal processes for production which can be suitable for this type of innovation. We plan to engage a small part of these processes and transform them. We also need some benchmarks, this part was missing from the Portfolio Exploration Tool, I think the benchmark.... what is the standard for measuring our progress, maybe we are going in a wrong way or doing something, this is the blurry part. I would like to compare our results with other similar organizations.

**Interviewer: Who participated in the exercise? What were your expectations? Would you do it again in your organisation? Kindly provide feedback regarding what you liked and what you would change about the workshop and the tool.**

**Interviewee D:** Five people participated in the exercise, my boss and some other colleagues, we are from the same department and team. We consider that it is easier to conduct portfolio exploration session on this level because we are focused on the same subject matter. It is quite difficult to engage other people in this type of activity, considering they are too busy with other types of work.

We wanted to measure innovation and to compare it to other types of organizations or in similar types of organizations. We would do it again, probably within other departments as well.

I liked how the questions were formulated, they were easy to respond. I liked the intuitive part, the interface of the questionnaire. I would change for example is that Module 1 and Module 2 are quite uneven in size, Module 2 depends on how many projects you have on your portfolio, but they are quite uneven.

Module 2 uses the request presented in Module 1, the two modules aren't balanced. Some questions need a bit more explanation or some references. The vocabulary is quite specific for somebody who doesn't work in that type of field. I think a tutorial before running the tool, would be helpful. Also, I think that innovation is strongly linked with the change, it would be nice to understand how innovation worked and how change drives innovation. Also, an explanation of why we need innovation. Overall, the tool gives a framework to understand innovation, it is quite useful and that could be the standard to measure innovation inside different types of organizations. Maybe, a more structured approach would be if there are different types of tools, for the different organizations. I believe NGOs should have the tool tailored for their specific need, a tool for governmental organizations, which have to operate in a different XXXXs and budget restrictions, and a tool for general types of organizations.

**Interviewer: How do you decide on which future challenges to focus? Do you check innovation studies/ trends on a week basis as part of your main tasks? Are you exploring foresight studies to better understand future societal needs? Do you discuss innovation with other people, inside but also outside the organisation?**

**Interviewee D:** Actually, we are part of a broader network system. It is driven by research and we are involved in this part of this research network. This is part of our general way to face innovation, exchange ideas, and so forth. We discuss innovation with other organizations. We also communicate with other organisations, present results, exchange ideas.

**Interviewer: Do people in your organisation have the necessary independence, space and time to explore new ideas? Do you organize internal workshops/ team activities focused on how to improve your yet established practices? Are there any reward systems for people developing innovations?**

**Interviewee D:** Yes, some people are interested in these types of activities. They have the freedom to participate in all kinds of workshops and to present their ideas to the general management. Usually, they are very open to this. There are no rewarding, we work on a quite strict budget.

**Interviewer: How do you respond to unforeseen circumstances and new developments? Do you consider involving the users(citizens) in the process of innovation?**

**Interviewee D:** Right now, we do not take into consideration involving the citizens. It is quite difficult and expensive to maintain, working channel and communication with the users. Also, for the user, it is not easy to understand what kind of information we are asking him and also we don't understand what the user is requiring from us. This is a very expensive process, usually, we work with other government agencies in this direction. Also, if we consider other government agencies as our users, we exchange ideas with them and help ourselves, but with the general public, like the citizens, right now we do not take into consideration engaging them in this process. In the future, we could involve them in the process. For example, citizens can use mobile devices, they can install an application an that application automatically collects the different type of data, regarding the user patterns and behavior, movement pattern, movement patterns. However, we are still far from this point. There is not a level of trust to implement something like this right now. We would need a greater transparency in the process, I believe, and communicating with the user almost real-time.

I believe the technological cost would be the main obstacle in implementing this innovation. I believe this process should be centralized, we should have a system that is accessible to all countries and citizens and this could be devoted to the necessary specificities or types or problems for each country. It could be more transparent and more cost-efficient.

**Interviewer: Which do you think is the biggest impediment to innovate in public sector? How do you think this could be addressed? What kind of resources do you need in order to promote innovation in your organisation?**

**Interviewee D:** The budget and the laws that are in force right now, I would define as the biggest impediment. There are competing theories about the public sector and one is that the public sector is a very inefficient manager of the society and the innovation and other types of processes are done by NGOs or other types of entities with a social role. The role of the state, of the government, is to manage to create an XXXX to play for all other actors.

The public sector should encourage other actors and the private sector to innovate and create the conditions for them to do so, but the government shouldn't be that innovative. The government is a pure manager of innovation of other types of activities and the economy. The public sector should be less engaged and let the companies to compete among themselves and to provide the goods and services to the public. They are very costly to produce inside the government. I don't believe that budget spent on innovation inside the government is quite as effective as the budget allocated for competing companies, doing the same type of job. The government of the national agencies work regulated by the law, where we have different types of objectives.

I think some kind of innovation is useful, like the enhancement innovation, in small steps. Also, I believe that people inside our organization or government agencies should be more aware of their role as vectors for innovation. They should put some pressure, to change the internal rules, which should be done by the citizens. I believe that these processes of innovation should be driven by the management and the management in our case are the elected ones, the government or those from the Parliament. They should stress more on this. It should come from a very high level of management, like from the representative of the citizens, we should push on innovation. We exchange ideas with the government and with an agency inside the government They asked us how the portfolio session was done internally and they are quite interested in doing something similar inside the government. I think that by organizing workshops and event on innovation, would be a way to promote innovation. It is an activity that should be done on national level and then on international level.

**Interviewer: Are there any portfolio-like functions in your organisation? How did you manage innovation within your organisation before? Whose responsibility this is normally (if at all)?**

**Interviewee E:** Our organisation is fairly new. I don´t think we have a formal portfolio project at the moment, definitely not on the whole organisational scale. There are many little departments and some of these departments may have any innovation portfolios, but definitely there is not a portfolio on a cross-organisational scale.

We do not have a structure approach on how to do innovation, however this does not mean we do not have an approach at all. We are a quite newly formed team, the organisation has been created seven years ago, which in public sector terms is considered as a new organisation. In our team, we have responsibilities across many different things. We do have an approach but it is an informal and ad-hoc one. In terms of responsibility, it is probably straight across the organisation, there would be certain people that have responsibility for undertaking innovative approaches. There are people responsibility to coordinate, however there is nobody directly responsible for innovation. We have a commercial department and there are also particular people that have quite strong view on innovation and sometimes they may have a bit more experience on that as well. There is a person that is quite familiar with portfolio approach and this person could have certain responsibility on innovation in that aspect of the business.

**Interviewer: Did you learn something new about your organisation after running the tool and obtaining the results? Was your organisation in line with the innovation portfolio outcome from the tool? If no, then why do you think it was the case. Did any of the outcomes surprise you?**

**Interviewee E:** Ok, so when we tried out the tool, we did it with quite a small subsection of our staff. So, we have something there is a so called “cross-innovation group”. This is the group of staff in the organisation interested in innovation. We come from different departments, and this is not necessarily representative of our whole organisation. So, because we were using this in a quite small subsection, I think that what we learned from the tool was not as much as what it would be if we have run it in a more diverse group. Definitely found a new way of talking about innovation, I think the conversations that came out from using the tool were really useful. In terms of how our organisations was before, we probably discovered a new way to talk about things rather than revealing something that we did not know about.

It gave us a nice conceptual framework and how to talk about innovation. I quite liked the facets model and I was quite skeptical of it before running the tool. There are a lot of frameworks and approaches and I thought it was another flow diagram or chart, but it is a new set of terminology, a new set of language. For me, we need to develop more the anticipation facet and I think the tool gave us a way to talk about that in a more quantifiable way. As mentioned before, we worked in a small subsection and I am not quite sure it was entirely correct. We tried out the tool on organisation level and also on a project level. The organisation level is more helpful, even though the orgisational one is quite more tangible. In order to tackle the big problems based on the XXXX, we really need to change the way we are doing things, so incremental innovation responding to small mission challenges probably is not enough. I think what I liked about the tool is it gave us a nice framework to start pushing a little bit more on new technologies, new frames and methods on how to anticipate this area of innovation. I found a new language and new terminology on how to talk about innovation. Somehow the results of the tool, are not as important, as the process of using the tool and creating the results. For us the process of using the tool was more important as we did it in a very small group.

**Interviewer: Are you considering rebalancing your innovation portfolio based on what you learned after running the tool/during the workshop? If yes, which facets/type of innovation are you planning to strengthen? How would you manage your portfolio differently based on the exercise?**

**Interviewee E:** I think the conversation we had was that we probably need to leave some space to anticipate innovation. This is definitely something that we would be taking forward. We also have been working on new innovation strategy, so it is helping us to more formally build this strategy. One of the big things we learned as well is specially using the project tool. In using that tool, you have to think about what are our innovation products, and actually that is not something that we have along at the moment. So, just going through the process of thinking of what we do. We got the full facets, the mission, adapted, anticipatory, and probably without using the tool we could not explain those. So, now we know the language and the terminology of using, that is interesting. If you explained it before using the tool and asked, where would I would like us to be, I would like us to be more in the anticipatory space based on the definition on what is anticipatory innovation. What is interesting is that when looking at the results, this one was our lowest scored facet, so for me the highlight the fact that we need to shift that more forward looking, anticipatory oriented innovation space. In terms of rebalancing the portfolio, yes and no. In some sense, we didn’t even know we had a portfolio when tried to run this, so yes it helped us to rebalance, because as I said, we would like to push more into the anticipatory oriented space. I don´t think this is the same as rebalancing a portfolio, I think it is saying, we developed a portfolio that focuses on theses spaces. We had a lot of discussion on what the problems in enrolment are, so we would straighten the anticipatory innovation. The main problems are unsustainable production, and sustainable consumption. In order to tackle these challenges, enhancing the things that we are already doing with slightly more innovation is not going to help us achieve big things. That won´t help us tackle climate change or another type of emergency.

**Interviewer: Who participated in the exercise? What were your expectations? Would you do it again in your organisation? Kindly provide feedback regarding what you liked and what you would change about the workshop and the tool.**

**Interviewee E:** This was something that was run in an internal innovation group, so it is a quite small subsection of our organisation. We´d definitely like to run it again, I consider as quite a few opportunities to how we are using different ways and I think one of the ways would be interesting is we to run the tool. Specifically, to run the organisational tool with different departments and finally compare the results to see if there are some areas of the organisation that operate more in one or another facet of the model and try to understand why that is and what kind of structure are making us innovating in certain way or another. I consider that the projects one, as I already mentioned, we are currently building the portfolio. I think that just having an exercise approach to identify the projects to put in that kind of tool is quite a good way to validate how to do it so we are less concerned about the outcome rather than the process, as we said before.

I would change the projects part of the tool. When we run it in the group, we found that the questions were a little bit transparent and are showing which facet they were. So, by knowing that, you may be influenced and go towards certain facet for your project, the questions were quite transparent. Another thing is maybe we need more guidance of what kind of innovative project because definitely that is the first question. We would need guidance on explaining where do you find that type of innovation.

The think I liked about the tool I suppose is that it gives you a framework to talking about quite abstract concepts. When we talk the word innovation, there are a few people that understand it and work with it on a daily basis. In our organisation, in the vast majority we do not see innovation as a topic of work, we associate it with something abstract. The tool gave us quite a loose way of structuring messy stuff. The reason why I´d run it again would be to stimulate more discussion and I think by being able running with somebody you have the discussion in the organisation. Just by running it and see the results and how this could affect the decision making, if that makes any sense. If we just send it to the boss, I don´t think they would necessarily pick it up, so if I can change something about the tool is not something about the tool. I think I would change the preamble or the explanation why the tool should be used on the first place. I don´t think there was enough. I would say it lack the sales material to make us use the tool. If I have to go and convince the Manager he really needs to understand the approach of portfolio innovation, so why we try to convince him about the need. The tool is quite ineffective in that way, I think possibly more examples would be helpful. So, give some examples of what mission-oriented approach looks like, some case studies. I´d make the tool more a sales tool, maybe.

**Interviewer: How do you determine on which future challenges to focus? Do you check innovation studies/ trends on a week basis as part of your main tasks? Are you exploring foresight studies to better understand future societal needs? Do you discuss innovation with other people, inside but also outside the organisation?**

**Interviewee E:** In terms looking at the first part of the question, about the priority it will come primary from legislation. The government could regulate the body, the purposes and why do we exist. Then, in terms of foresight, this is something that we are trying to expand at the moment, basically focusing on future thinking, supporting arousing scanning around the organisation. So, I think it has always been around the organisation, but not as much as we would like. We try to expand that at the moment. For example, something we are working right now is we have started to form a scanning database, looking for foresights with signals that give us hints about what the future might be. So, we are looking at things like emerging technologies or anything that may be relevant to our work. We also collaborate with other sectors in the national public sector and try to get a broader view. In terms of how that relates to innovation, I think our goal is that we reach a point in which if we see a specific technology that creates efficiency in the way we do monitoring, is something that we are looking to adopting. It is on a very early stage.

I think it is interesting talking about futures, to talk about how we start our jobs.

Foresights, we are connected with the government, so we speak with the government both nationally and regionally. We have been in touch with OPSI, we have a partnership with academic institution, which operates on a hybrid model. Working with different researchers from there to explore opportunities to innovation that is how we started our journey. It served us to understand a bit more who is doing what in the country in terms of the public sector. In serval service in our particular case, one issue that we have is that we have key player that switch positions over time. We are connected talking about innovation and talking about futures in the public sector and I think that there are gaps or lack of force even though we have good marvels and mechanism to achieving that. The whole academic knowledge hasn’t been applied yet from a theoretical perspective.

**Interviewer: Do people in your organisation have the necessary independence, space and time to explore new ideas? Do you organize internal workshops/ team activities focused on how to improve your yet established practices? Are there any reward systems for people developing innovations?**

**Interviewee E:** It really dependents on which department you are in, which topic you work on, it should not be the same for the whole organisation. However, what we are looking at is to identify these areas that we can change and support innovation just in general terms of innovation.We face limitations and barriers like quite long process involved in getting anything done. For example, the signing of documents in terms of funding some project, could involve two different people that are difficult to reach out. There are also barriers in terms of culture, barriers about people afraid of failure and not trying something new. We definitely are looking on ways that we can address in terms of how they differ in the different departments. Not easy, because there is difference across departments. For example, there are two departments that are trying to implement high new piece of technology, so if you are in the that department, there is a very clear technological product.

Overall, there is long internal bureaucracy, we need strong arguments why something should be approved. There is also a slight contradiction in the sense that it needs to be innovative in order to address the challenges we face and, on the other hand we need to be conscious about risks and to be quite systematic as we are regulated. Actually, we don´t want new innovation all the time, what we want is innovation in some part of the business as there is very sensible status quo business as usual. We try to organize workshops to address barriers and find opportunities in areas of innovation focused on so I think it also we are aware of the problems we are starting to mitigate them – resources is always the issue and how much time does we have.

**Interviewer: How do you respond to unforeseen events and new developments? Do you consider involving the users(citizens) in the process of innovation?**

**Interviewee E:** I think this is one of the biggest disruptions of our generation. We have a lot of experience with “events” as we are emergency respondent (for example pollution). So, in terms of how, it depends on unforeseen circumstances. Regarding involving citizens to the process, we are trying to legislate it, to involve citizens in the decision making. The reality how we actually do that is difficult, if we consult and do things with people, it comes more costly, more difficult, more time consuming. So, on one hand you can say we are doing it, but maybe we are not doing it enough. It is quite hard to address that. Overall, I´d say, we attempt to consult the citizens then it could be quite difficult when we do it on technical topics. There are opportunities to consult people and we attempt to speak to the people on regional level and on the other hand, it is very difficult because we listen but we don´t do anything about it. There are examples in which we can talk about a decision-making based on community sense approach and on the other hand it is still hard to consult citizens on every topic.

**Interviewer: Which do you think is the biggest impediment to innovate in public sector? How do you think this could be addressed? What kind of resources do you need in order to promote innovation in your organisation?**

**Interviewee E:** In terms of risk, I think often we don´t consider what is the risk of doing nothing. I think that the risk of doing nothing is really high but we really don’t take that into account in our decisions and that can make innovation a bit difficult because there is a really strong pattern to stick with business as usual.

Looking it in a smaller scaler, I think that it would be helpful if within department you had funding in time that was specifically considered for innovation, so it was protected and there wasn´t possibility for that money to be used elsewhere while other things come up. Innovation shouldn´t be separated completely from government but on a organizational scale.

The risk of not acting is very difficult to articulate. I feel like, public sector by default has a quite strong established processes and as they want to make sure they spend money correctly. We also operate on political time scales, and by financial years and this obsession with year-to-year funding and four-year political time on long term vision put you in the here and now draw or kicking it another road to another generation`s problem. We have this position where you know where the issue is but do not know how to address it. If you have a particular government broadly speaking in four years times scale, expecting the government to commit to a slightly longer-term trends in a seven- or eight-year time that is very, very difficult to do. If you get to commit to a very aspirational language, to make the world better in short time. This is an issue for innovation because in 3,5 years there would been a lot of ad-hoc savings that would have been prevented on a project- difficult to quantify. The short term financial budgets, get some money spend some money and get some output. Also, you have the lobbying XXXXal – get a new legislation, the gap seems to be this messy bit in the middle where probably in 20 years things are going to change radically in terms how the public sector manages the budget. For me is that inability to talk the benefits of innovation beyond of a political and funding time scale. Time scale typically operates in cycles, so you do what you are going to do so did you get the outputs, did you spend the money. What I´m trying to say is that there is no mechanism to go beyond a four- or five-years political time scale. The evidence of if the innovation is successful might be in a very long term, there are no chances of immediate results. There are no mechanisms to measure the midterm. Nobody gets fired for not innovating, innovate badly and do something that explodes on you and it seems to be a very risky gamble. Where we really struggle is to convince Management is that they expect many projects to succeed.

Government should be strongly involved in providing the landscape for innovation to happen and why our country is quite successful is to create programs in your expertise, so I think governments have a role to fund and support research and development which is linked to innovation. One of the fears I have is that governments tend to spend on projects that are tangible, which does not give space to be innovative and develop because a lot of things should fail. So, I actually think government should fund innovation and not expect it to work. Only funding thing that are going to work, only funding those machine projects that is going to deliver X, Y, Z. In the case of some innovations, so really don´t know what the outcome will be, so you need to experiment. Governments should be involved, but they should not be prescriptive about what problem is solved. Going back to the PET tool, we spend a lot of time doing enhancement or adaptive which is working on non-problems and incrementally making thing to innovative approaches. A space that is not legislated would be a helpful solution to this.

**Interview G**

**Interviewer: Are there any portfolio-like functions in your organisation? How did you manage innovation within your organisation before? Whose responsibility this is normally (if at all)?**

**Interviewee G:** That is what I lead with my team. So, it is a portfolio innovation if you want to put it that way. There might be a couple of others, but to be honest I don't think they really are set up as portfolios. I will speak specifically about the work that my team and I do. I have responsibilities for the corporate innovation pile in the government of XXXX. We are about 10 000+ person organisation, obviously with multiple departments, agencies and so on so forth. So, the type of work that my team and I focus on is really about continuing to raise the awareness of what innovation public service looks like and what it means. Also building that capacity through a series of workshops, training, and various awareness activities. For example, we hold an annual innovation festival which allows departments and teams to showcase innovations, and to share them broadly. We also, within my portfolio have a policy matters toolkit. It includes tools such as behavioral insights, and strategic foresight, we do a lot of sprints, design thinking, systems thinking, and a variety of other tools. Basically, we focus on our challenges in the complex space within the government and I apply these tools to the challenges in order to come up with a solution. The areas within we focus in the government are quite wide and varied, it is not specific to a particular department or program area. Specifically focuses on increasing the number of diverse suppliers that are used within the public service. Another good example is the quality of life initiative. So we are applying with a group of students from the university here. All the projects are very different, there are many different groups involved, different stakeholders, different approaches, and different tools. So, again, we work not in a particular kind of program, but from a systems perspective, when some of those challenges that need to be introduced at the systems level. Then, again, we are working horizontally with stakeholders.

**Interviewer: Did you learn something new about your organisation after running the tool and obtaining the results? Was your organisation in line with the innovation portfolio outcome from the tool? If no, then why do you think it was the case. Did any of the outcomes surprise you?**

**Interviewee G:** That is very interesting. I took the test through the tool and I also had my director do it. We came up with very different responses. This isn't surprising because although we work very closely and collaboratively, the types of discussions that I had and my senior level experience within the government are quite different from the ones of my director. I have been working on the senior level in government for a while in several different departments, so I tend to bring in at least my starting point is quite different. So when I was filling out the tool, even though I was trying to keep it specific to what my team and I do, I was thinking about the broader context within which we work and some of the challenges that we face there in the system. So, I know my team and I are very agile and I suppose experts, we definitely are experts in this area, but again we are working within the bureaucracy. So when I was answering the questions, I was struggling with this separation, while my director, was able to stay focused on our immediate team. This is my explanation regarding the two different results in terms of what we came up with. I agree with what came out from with but with her having different results, I agree with her version too. So, again I think it just depends on what perspective and where you sit in our organisation, what has been told in the backend.

I liked the questions for frames, particularly the ones about risk. It had me reflecting just on our risk tolerance within our public service. Obviously, our risk tolerance within the innovation portfolio looks quite different. We are an organisation that does very different types of work and have a different kind of risk tolerances associated with their particular work. So, I did agree with the outcomes.

**Interviewer: Are you considering rebalancing your innovation portfolio based on what you learned after running the tool/during the workshop? If yes, which facets/type of innovation are you planning to strengthen?**

**Interviewee G:**  I have been fairly focused on the complexity of space. We do a lot in the adaptive and anticipatory space. We also take directions, we get a lot in the mission-oriented space too. Broadly speaking, within the organisation, it is most comfortable in the enhancement orientation space.

**Interviewer: Who participated in the exercise? What were your expectations? Would you do it again in your organisation? Kindly provide feedback regarding what you liked and what you would change about the workshop and the tool.**

**Interviewee G:** I struggled because I thought I had to complete it from an organisational perspective and then you have a separate one for my immediate team. So, when I am thinking of someone who is leading an innovation portfolio within an organisation like ours, I almost needed a two set of questions in order to be able to map organisationally where we were at from my perspective, and then my team and then map those to each other. For me, I think that something like that would be quite helpful. I recognize that not everyone would need that, but again, the space within which I work and the level of seniority and because I am involved in other types of conversations, that for me would be helpful.

I thought the questions were great, they were clear. I think in some cases, certain questions gave me a moment pause, because I was thinking if I am answering this from the perspective of innovation within our government broadly speaking- I would answer one way. Then if I answer that specific to my team and the work we do, I would answer differently. That was where I would have benefitted from separation.

**Interviewer: How do you determine which future challenges to focus on? Do you check innovation studies/ trends weekly as part of your main tasks? Are you exploring foresight studies to better understand future societal needs? Do you discuss innovation with other people, inside but also outside the organisation?**

**Interviewee G:** So, I have a broad network across the world. I am constantly connecting with colleagues in other public services. Also in different parts of XXXX, there are some key groups that I connect with regularly. In terms of how I kind of identify where we focus on, it is working with senior leaders for the most parts who have identified a challenge. It happens through this networking and key partnership, they are such a big part of the work we do. We have a real robust network, so we have no shortage of work coming in. One of the things that I and my team need to do is start defining and intake the process. So when I think of the Cynefin framework and it is really focused on the complexity space, there is another group already well established, and expert in dealing with challenges that otherwise in the complicated domain or to simplify the complicated domain. So, for the most part, we push them off to and say " this is the group that actually whose more appropriate to support you in terms of your particular needs". So, in that way, we spend more time in the complexity space.

**Interviewer: Do people in your organisation have the necessary independence, space, and time to explore new ideas? Do you organize internal workshops/ team activities focused on how to improve your yet established practices? Are there any reward systems for people developing innovations?**

**Interviewee G:** My team does, that is part of my role. It is to make sure that people on my team have that time and the capacity that they need to do that. I would say I find that I don't have enough time for that and it is because I am getting pulled into a lot of the bureaucratic kind of pieces of my work. From my perspective, I am not sure if that is the best use of my time, but I still have a responsibility in terms of my role in the government as a public servant to respond to these things. For me, it is a constant challenge in terms of my time and then in terms of my role is to protect my team that they are given that space and they are not getting stuck into a lot of these corporate things.

**Interviewer: How do you respond to unforeseen events and new developments? Do you consider involving the users(citizens) in the process of innovation?**

**Interviewee G:** Yes, it is absolutely critical. So, even when I think about the work that we are doing with the quality of life index, and mapping that to the work that has been done to the accessibility directorate, and again it is really important to have persons speaking what actually matters. When we consider this work, it would be absolutely inappropriate for us to undertake this work without having their voices at the table. It would be the same as all of our work. The citizens, the person, the people, the user that is directly affected, need to be part of that whole process. So it is not just getting their insights and doing stuff with this. It is a collaborative process all along the way in order to ensure that we are co-designing, we are co-creating solutions that make sense for everyone.

**Interviewer: Which do you think is the biggest impediment to innovation in the public sector? How do you think this could be addressed? What kind of resources do you need in order to promote innovation in your organisation?**

**Interviewee G:** When we think about the government, the public sector, we have responsibilities around regulation, accountability to the public for the public money which is essentially funding all of our work. So when you think about innovation, it doesn't work without saying a set of drivers who are fundamental, in some ways, coming from a different way. I think it is constantly thinking and balancing in terms of those responsibilities as public servants while continuing innovation that isn't always as readily rubbed up, it never is actually. To promote innovation, you need strong champions. You need people to understand what you are doing and what value you are adding. Without having those components, it is just not feasible. There are so many competing priorities when we think about the rule and mandate, and responsibility of government. It is a huge entity, so without having people understanding the true value, you are not going to move forward. The champions need to be at the deputy level, you have to have that deputy support in order to drive innovation. If you don't have that senior-level support would be impossible.

What I find as an effective approach, given the amount of uncertainty, and the fact that you are typically working in a space where no playbox exists. We are working with different stakeholders and groups. I typically frame it up as a pilot with the intention of developing a prototype. In our case that seems to give people a bit of that security that doing a small-scaled thing at a pilot level with the intention of a prototype that can be used or tested. It tends to be our best approach when it comes to manage the risk of uncertainty.

**Interview F**

**Interviewer: Are there any portfolio-like functions in your organization? How did you manage innovation within your organization before? Whose responsibility this is normally (if at all)?**

**Interviewee F:** Well, this is the thing, this is actually what we are trying to create- portfolio thinking practice. So, the answer is "no", there are no portfolios. If we look on a XXX level, they have portfolio management for the central district of XXXX. Except for that, we have actors working with XXXX and XXXX and they also have a lot of experience working with different kinds of projects of innovation. So, they might have some kind of understanding of where they work with innovation, so it facilitates their sort of management procedures. I don't know if you could call that a portfolio, but they should have a quite good understanding of what they do.

We have several actors responsible for innovation within our organization. We have a Director of Innovation, we have a new program focusing on the quality that the XXXX should sort of deliver in relation to the citizens. Here you also push for working with innovation as a facilitator for delivering this high quality now and in the future. We also have policy documents pushing for this and we have Innovation Managers and different parts of the broader organization. We have understood that our work and the part that I manage is that even though we have those actors they are not coordinated, they are not aware of their own join existence. So, now our focus is to try to improve those transdisciplinary relations with the XXXX to be a better actor in the external context.

**Interviewer: Did you learn something new about your organization after running the tool and obtaining the results? Was your organization in line with the innovation portfolio outcome from the tool? If no, then why do you think it was the case. Did any of the outcomes surprise you?**

**Interviewee F:** No, as we only did it in our small project team. We didn't have the knowledge among us to make any judgments of the full picture of the broader organization, but it was really interesting. What I understood, performing the self-assessment, looking at my own diamond and looking at those of my colleagues was quite interesting. I was more in that anticipatory innovation, as a manager I sort of look where we stand in a quite agile manner. Take one step at a time in order to ensure, as not sort of pushing different actors away of us, but finding a way of interact and strengthen each other. While my colleague tends to like to work more mission-oriented top-down and I work more bottom-up in this more anticipatory manner. So, this was really interesting and good for me as a Project Leader to be able to understand why we have sort of discussion and I can talk now in a better way and to say, this is decided top-down and this is not… We will always exist in both worlds, we will both have a mission and this more bottom-up approach and we have to be able to manage both. So, it was also interesting to me.

**Interviewer: Are you considering rebalancing your innovation portfolio based on what you learned after running the tool/during the workshop? If yes, which facets/type of innovation are you planning to strengthen? How would you manage your portfolio differently based on the exercise?**

**Interviewee F:** Not immediately there, but what we will suggest to the steering committee of our project is to try to do some kind of version of the tool. To try and put their own work in procedures in those different sections of the diamond in order to be able to see the whole picture of what is going on in the XXXX. Then I have to modify the diamond, I have to do it in our language, I will have to sort of skip the self-assessment part. It is really difficult even for me who is always working with innovation, to understand if I interpreted the questions correctly, if I understand what I am supposed to answer. So, I don't think we are going to do that part. However, using the diamond and introducing the different sections of the diamond to the actors and letting them put their own working procedures in the different parts of it. That would be interesting for them, to kind of see what is its aim. I think I see a lot of the mission-orientated innovation, top-down, and not being aware of the procedures going on bottom-up. They should also understand that in order to be good leaders of the XXXX. This would be some kind of workshop leaning on the tool as a base.

I think that the most important part is to actually improve the understanding of our system of how to go from the bottom up to top-down in order to facilitate the broader implementation of good innovation starting points in the bottom-up of the system. Top-down, I think we have politicians understanding the need for innovation. They try to use the projects as a way to push the system in front of them. However, since we have a four-year political cycle when the leaders of today are changed, then their ideas of what should be done will be reformulated, even if they are good. It affects the speed of innovation. I think leaders on the top should be more aware of what the needs are relating to mission-driven innovation. They should know that you could succeed in those four years cycle, and if you don’t succeed then might at least understand how they can work even though they might be pushed away after four years. They could ensure that some of these things will continue regardless using a different kind of formulations in the budget or whatever. So, I think this is important. Also, they have to be aware that they are, at the moment, losing a lot of resources not focusing on the bottom-up approach, when you have these starting points out in the system. They don't understand why they started, how they could be sort of introduced in the broader context. I think that is also needed, we need to improve the understanding of what is going on in the bottom segment of this organizational pyramid, which I am actually against.

**Interviewer: Who participated in the exercise? What were your expectations? Would you do it again in your organization? Kindly provide feedback regarding what you liked and what you would change about the workshop and the tool.**

**Interviewee F:** The project leader, I am the project manager of the innovation platform, and then I have a co-project leader. They are more focused on communication, working with research and innovation network. One actor is a researcher, an action researcher, always looking on our shoulders, trying to understand what we are doing, and having a lot of things to say about how and what we do. It is very, very good. Then we have a coordinated Artificial Intelligence work. We have a person working with the bottom-up projects, trying to help actors out of the organization to understand the needs and to initiate new starting points for innovation. She is the one that tends to work mission-oriented, so when she has an assignment from the top then she wants to go immediately to the bottom and try to make them understand what the top wants them to do. As I work more among the actors in the bottom, then striving to the top to actually make them understand more about how the possibilities actually look for those actors to make more out of what they are working with.

I didn't really have any expectations about the tool. We heard that other of the participants liked it, so we decided to try it as well. We always look for new ways to sort of communicate. For me, this tool helps me to understand that what is proposed in the tool could happen. I really liked the diamond, when I performed my research myself, I also ended up in this four square definition of innovation. It went from this more technical definition of innovation and the approach and explained that innovation is much more than technical aspects. It is also about how we behave around the technical device and how we organize our societies around this technical solution. I like this way of visualizing things. The diamond really appeals to me and it is a good way to plot the different innovation activities in the relation to each other. Not saying that any of these is wrong, but you should see the whole picture and then decide "...should we do less of this or more of that, or what should we do strategically in order to do more forward...". Then we have a creative and constructing discussion about this.

The language is an issue since our organization is a XXXX talking organization. You can say this is how it looks in XXXX, XXXX and other countries. When you work in a XXXX, you talk in your own language. This how it is. So, the language is an issue. If you want to sort of make people understand your things and sort of release and understand this tool, as well as relate that to what they do- then the language becomes a barrier. If you talk English in a workshop and then you want to explain it to your colleagues what you did and you don't know how to express it in XXXX, so sadly this becomes a barrier. This is one thing, and of course, the possibility of interpreting the question in the self-assessment. In our project team, it would have been possible to do the self-assessment as a joint group. But for the broader organization, that of course is really difficult and then you have to look at the questions. maybe start with removing questions that might not add that much to the process of creating the diamond. Then, you should sort of description. When you go to a theater, you have a scene, you have a kind of place where you understand "... ok, it is in a forest, and everything happens in the forest." So, you need this scene to be able to better work with this tool. You have to create this description, so this is where your brain should be at this moment, answering this question in the self-assessment, something like that. When you introduce this tool to new actors, it actually takes more than two hours. That is not enough. I think I am quite fast, but not that fast. I think I would like to extend this. If you have done it four times it is very easy probably, but the first time you need more time, you need time to prepare, time to understand the language, to sort of understand the "scene". Also, I think it should say six hours. I mean, otherwise, you risk the understanding of why you are doing this. You can make it in steps. First, you read all the material and that will take you like an hour. Then, you do this that, then you can choose if you want to skip any of the steps.

**Interviewer: How do you determine which future challenges to focus on? Do you check innovation studies/ trends weekly as part of your main tasks? Are you exploring foresight studies to better understand future societal needs? Do you discuss innovation with other people, inside but also outside the organization?**

**Interviewee F:** Yes, of course. I need to always have a strong relationship with the Head of Innovation to know what is going on. So, I can sort of push forward, in the sense that I think they should know and understand innovation. Then we have an action researcher, which is a real blessing. Yes, to all of that. We have the national gathering of all the six innovation platforms, financed by XXXX. This is also a big support. It is a critical platform for these kinds of broader knowledge fields that we need to be aware of and take part. Of course, I have my research career and I have a lot of knowledge there. Then my colleagues have their networks, and as we have project team meetings, we always sort of getting to understand each other processes and what is going on their side of the project. I would say, it is a lot of information passing through all the time.

**Interviewer: Do people in your organization have the necessary independence, space, and time to explore new ideas? Do you organize internal workshops/ team activities focused on how to improve your yet established practices? Are there any reward systems for people developing innovations?**

**Interviewee F:** We have this network for innovation, that I mentioned. We are working for four or five years with that network. So, we organize those meetings together, putting in the agenda that is relevant and having also workshops related to each of the actors. We also relate this network to the SDGs and the ways the XXXX works with the SDGs. We have this, but it is still project-oriented, it is related to my project. We have it, yes, but we still have to ensure the organization of this network. This is the only well-known board for innovation internally. We have different networks, related to quality, etc. I don't think they are managed in the same manner. Their agenda is decided top-down. In our case is not the same what we do during the innovation network is a joint work. While several of the other networks are more top-down. It is quite a big difference.

**Interviewer: How do you respond to unforeseen events and new developments? Do you consider involving the users(citizens) in the process of innovation?**

**Interviewee F:** This is a go. Partly we do this already, in some areas of the organization. We work close to the citizens, then we have quite a close dialogue in improving the quality of what we are doing. We do this and we do it in the XXXX planning procedure and so on. I would say the complexity of this, or the problem of what we are doing at the moment is that this is done quite out from the organization at the bottom but this knowledge is not extracted and put together with the XXXX hall. So, they understand how the open structures and the whole organization needs to adapt to new needs told by the citizens. We have things going on, but it is not coordinated. It is like when you have a big store from which you are buying stuff, and when you don't like something you go there to complain, you don't care who is going to solve your problem, you want to have your money back. I think that the municipalities need this call center, where whatever is wrong you should be able to contact the XXXX and say what is happening and that you what them to solve it. In that case, it is not up to the citizen that called to understand who takes care of this question. It is up to the organization to make sure this actor has whatever it needs. We don't have this, so I think we have a lot to do. Both, to facilitate already ongoing procedure and make this knowledge of what and how they are doing. This is important for other actors in the XXXX, but also the leaders, to better understand what is happening and that there is a need to extract this information for them to also understand what is done there.

In our traffic department, for example, when someone sees something that doesn't look good in the XXXX, the citizens can take a picture and upload it to an app so they go there and fix it. That is one of the things that I am trying to make visible for more actors. The people who got the signals from this app, the people that were supposed to answer and take care of the questions, were spread out in the organization. They were all sitting in completely different departments within the traffic department. What they did was to reorganize it, so that everyone working with this app, sort of could help each other and to ensure that nothing was left in between. That is fantastic. The idea is great. The work that has been done is perfect, but it needs good leaders who take action. We lack this kind of leaders, who want to take part of the change that we need.

**Interviewer: Which do you think is the biggest impediment to be able to innovate in the public sector? How do you think this could be addressed? What kind of resources do you need to promote innovation in your organization?**

**Interviewee F:** I think one part is that we have too many heads with a mandate. You have this top-down structure, the more heads you have in the system, the more heads you need, each of them has a mandate. This is catastrophic for everyone that tries to implement any kind of innovation. If you are supposed, as an innovator or entrepreneur, to the first talk to someone, who is supposed to talk to another person, who is supposed to talk to the next. In the end, you have the same effect as in this game that we used to play as children, I think it is called cracked phone. It is even worse than this game because you are not even able to say "...no, this wasn't what I was trying to say. This is what I wanted to say". So, this is really, really difficult. You need a radical push for the re-development of this kind of structure. I think the private sector has already understood this, I think they would not perform management as it is done in the public sector. It depends on what kind of field you are working in, but it is not efficient. If you work in a hospital or as a teacher, you need different things. However, you always should reflect if we manage this in a good manner. Do we take care of the resources and if the resources are then in the cost of the people working in the system. They are the sources. We need to take care of them because otherwise, they won't produce what we need from them. They will produce something else. Something of bad quality is you are not taking care of them. So, I mean, I think that is the most hindering part actually, at the moment. This tool is a good way to promote innovation in the organization. It is a way to facilitate the dialogue with the leaders, and make them see the same needs, that I see as a project leader of this innovation platform. I then think that actually the most. I need more people to understand what we did in order to succeed when working with innovation. The difficulties and if we are talking about the needs of the organization, you will need a real reorganization in the whole public sector. It will be sort of hindered my several actors. My idea is to take it step by step by introducing transdisciplinary procedures making them aware for all the existing managers. This would make things more efficient, some kind of the research developing network.