International Journal for Multidisciplinary Research (IJFMR)
E-ISSN: 2582-2160 ● Website: www.ijfmr.com ● Email: editor@ijfmr.com

# Bridging Evidence and Action: Sector-Specific Policy Recommendations for Governing Digital Innovation in UAE Public Sector Organizations

**Raja Shaheen Alhammadi**

University of Dubai, Dubai, United Arab Emirates

**Abstract**

**Background:** Three companion papers established a theoretically grounded and empirically validated model of digital innovation performance in UAE public sectors, identifying digital transformation as the primary structural driver, digital governance as a critical mediator, and transformational leadership as a selective moderator that activates dormant ethics and adaptation pathways. However, translating these findings into differentiated, sector-specific policy guidance for the diverse landscape of UAE government organizations remains an unaddressed challenge.

**Objective:** This paper develops a comprehensive, sector-specific policy and applied model that translates the empirical evidence from the companion studies into actionable governance blueprints, leadership development strategies, data ethics regulatory recommendations, and digital innovation performance indicators tailored to the four primary UAE public sector domains: utilities, health, education, and municipalities.

**Methods:** Employing a policy translation methodology, this paper maps the empirically validated pathways onto the institutional characteristics, regulatory environments, and strategic priorities of each sector. It draws on the thesis data disaggregated by sector type (utilities, n = 75; municipalities, n = 35; health, n = 120; education, n = 174) and integrates these with the UAE National Innovation Strategy (NIS), the UAE Strategy for Artificial Intelligence, and smart city governance frameworks.

**Results:** The paper delivers five outputs: (a) a sector-specific applied model mapping dominant innovation pathways to each domain, (b) a Digital Governance Architecture specifying structural, procedural, and relational governance practices by sector, (c) a Data Ethics Regulatory Framework aligned with international standards and UAE legislation, (d) a Transformational Leadership Development Blueprint targeting competencies identified as critical by the empirical findings, and (e) a Digital Innovation Performance Scorecard with measurable indicators.

**Conclusions:** This paper provides the operational bridge between research evidence and government practice, offering Chief Innovation Officers and public sector leaders an evidence-based toolkit for accelerating digital innovation performance across the UAE government ecosystem.

**Keywords:** policy recommendations; digital governance architecture; data ethics regulation; transformational leadership development; digital innovation scorecard; UAE public sector; smart government; sector-specific innovation

## 1. Introduction

The United Arab Emirates has emerged as a frontrunner in global governmental innovation because of its extensive national development projects which include UAE Vision 2021 and the UAE Centennial Plan 2071 and the National Innovation Strategy and the UAE Strategy for Artificial Intelligence [1,2,3]. The NIS was also launched in 2015, and the UAE has been comparing itself with the Global Innovation Index; it is ranked first in 2017 and 2018, and all government departments now have a Chief Innovation Officer who works to inculcate the culture of innovation in government organizations [3]. The NIS requires all government agencies to dedicate one percent of their budgets for implementing new projects which will establish a complete database of innovative government practices that agencies can share with each other through training programs for government employees who will learn innovative skills [3].

Three companion papers of this research program establish the empirical and theoretical foundation which investigates digital innovation performance within the public sectors of the UAE. The conceptual framework of Paper 1 (Alhammadi, manuscript under review-a) is based on Diffusion of Innovation theory [4], Transformational Leadership theory [5], Institutional theory [6], and Teleological Ethical theory. Paper 2 (Alhammadi, manuscript under review-b) used PLS-SEM to test the framework with data from 404 employees across 26 organizations and showed that the model explains 71.2 percent of digital innovation performance variance. The Paper 3 study which is still in development according to Alhammadi's manuscript which is currently under review, created a three-tier pathway model. This model establishes three distinct pathways which describe digital transformation processes and governance-based innovation pathways and leadership-driven pathways which demonstrate organizational adaptation through transformational leadership . The empirical sample represented high organizational heterogeneity since the UAE public sector consists of over 400 organizations [7], and the technologies utilized in the study covered heavily regulated and technology-intensive settings where utilities organisations have essential infrastructure responsibilities, health organisations have essential data privacy stakes and patient safety demands, education organisations are human oriented institutions with pedagogical innovation and digital tools interacting, and municipalities handle multiple public services with critical urban planning, environmental management, and citizen engagement necessities [7,8].

The present paper aims to fill this gap through the creation of a sector-specific policy framework that includes five integrated parts which consist of an applied model that tracks empirically tested innovation pathways to the sector domains and a Digital Governance Architecture which defines governance practices through different sectors and a Data Ethics Regulatory Framework and a Transformational Leadership Development Blueprint and a Digital Innovation Performance Scorecard. The article contributes to existing literature by demonstrating how structural equation modeling empirical results can be converted into specific policy instruments whereas Chief Innovation Officers receive a literature-based toolkit that helps them advance digital innovation across the UAE government ecosystem.

## 2. Mapping Empirical Evidence to Sector-Specific Contexts

The companion empirical study (Alhammadi, manuscript under review-b) collected data across four sector types: utilities (4 organizations, 75 respondents), municipalities (2 organizations, 35 respondents), health (2 organizations, 120 respondents), and education (5 organizations, 174 respondents) [9]. While the aggregate model was tested at the full-sample level, the institutional theory underpinning the framework [6] predicts that different sectors will exhibit different pathway strengths based on their institutional environments. This section maps the empirically validated pathways onto the institutional characteristics

of each sector to develop sector-specific predictions.

**2.1 Utilities Sector: Technology-Governance Dominance**

The United Arab Emirates utilities sector which includes Dubai Electricity and Water Authority and Sharjah Electricity Gas and Water Authority exhibits operational needs that require advanced technological systems and critical infrastructure management and compliance with multiple regulations [7,9]. The organizations run their operations through complex systems which combine industrial Internet of Things technologies with automated monitoring and supervisory control and data acquisition systems and extensive data analysis capabilities used for grid management and resource optimization [10]. The utilities operations require a technology-intensive approach which makes Tier 1 structural pathway (digital transformation → digital governance → digital innovation performance) function as the main operational model. Utility companies need to establish data management and access control and cybersecurity governance systems which emerge from their digital transformation investments in smart grid technologies and automated metering infrastructure and predictive maintenance systems because these systems will generate measurable technological results through technology investments.

Digital transformation serves as the main driver which predicts innovation performance ($\beta = 0.379$, $p < 0.001$) and governance development ($\beta = 0.738$, $p < 0.001$), thus showing its true power as a predictor because utilities need to invest heavily in technology while their governance systems reach advanced stages. The policy recommendation for utilities organizations states that they need to invest continuously in their main operational framework which supports their IR 4.0 technology development and governance structure enhancement while also implementing special training for leaders on data ethics related to smart meter data and AI-based load optimization.

**2.2 Health Sector: Ethics-Leadership Sensitivity**

The Health Ministry and hospital authorities work within highly regulated systems which protect patient data and mandate strict confidentiality and maintain high ethical standards for health data innovation use according to [7,9]. The use of artificial intelligence in healthcare through clinical decision support systems and predictive analytics for patient outcomes and digital health records creates major ethical challenges because of algorithmic bias issues and consent requirements and explainability standards and accountability needs according to [11,12]. The traits of Tier 2 leadership activation pathways to improve health outcomes which Tier 2 leadership activation pathways operationalize show that this pathway produces significant health benefits. The research shows that transformational leadership creates a significant impact on how data ethics affects innovation processes (H7: $p = 0.047$) because health sector leaders who demonstrate ethical behavior through idealized influence together with their intellectual stimulation of staff members create ethical data use paths which lead to innovation for their organization. Health organizations face a unique governance problem which requires them to create data governance systems that enable AI-based clinical advancements through health data use while maintaining patient privacy protections and preventing harmful discriminatory outcomes from algorithms. According to the Information Commissioner's Office (ICO) organizations need to train their machine learning models with proper training data which reflects the actual deployment conditions of their algorithms according to the machine learning accuracy problems which the ICO identified. A well-known example is the COMPAS recidivism algorithm in the United States, which was found to be almost twice as likely to categorize Black offenders as high-risk compared to White offenders [13]. For UAE health organizations, the policy implication is that data ethics practices must go beyond compliance to become active innovation enablers, mediated by governance structures and activated by transformational leadership.

### 2.3 Education Sector: Adaptation-Leadership Primacy

Education sector organizations, including the Ministry of Education (MOE) and various university authorities, are human-centric institutions where innovation involves the integration of digital tools into pedagogical processes [7,9]. The education sector represented the largest proportion of the sample (174 respondents, 43%), reflecting the UAE government's strategic emphasis on educational innovation as a pillar of the NIS [3]. Technology adaptation in education involves not merely the adoption of digital platforms but their meaningful integration into teaching, learning, and assessment processes a process that is fundamentally dependent on human agency, motivation, and leadership support [14].

The empirical finding that transformational leadership significantly moderates the technology adaptation–innovation relationship (H8: $p = 0.003$) is highly relevant for the education sector. Teachers and educational administrators who receive intellectual stimulation from transformational leaders are more likely to move beyond superficial technology adoption to creative pedagogical innovation. The non-significant direct effect of technology adaptation on innovation performance (H3: $p = 0.583$) further reinforces the argument that in education, technology investment alone is insufficient; it must be activated by leadership that provides vision, motivation, and individualized support for educators navigating the complexities of digital pedagogical transformation [5,15]. Innovationommendations for the education sector should therefore prioritize transformational leadership development alongside technology provision, and innovation metrics should capture pedagogical innovation outcomes rather than merely technology adoption rates.

### 2.4 Municipalities Sector: Balanced Pathway Integration

Municipal organizations in the UAE manage diverse public services including urban planning, environmental management, waste management, public infrastructure maintenance, and citizen service delivery [7,9]. The diversity of municipal functions creates a context where both structural and leadership-activated pathways are relevant but where neither dominates. Municipal digital transformation involves smart city initiatives intelligent transportation systems, smart waste management, digital citizen service platforms, and environmental monitoring networks that require robust governance structures [16]. Simultaneously, the citizen-facing nature of municipal services creates ethical dimensions related to surveillance, data privacy in public spaces, and equitable access to digital services that require leadership-activated approaches.

A smart city has been described as a developed urban area that creates sustainable economic development and high quality of life by excelling in multiple areas: economy, mobility, environment, people, living, and government [17]. For public services, the law guarantees good governance by setting the standard for E-government implicitly, including for local government units within smart city ecosystems [7]. The policy implication for municipalities is that a balanced approach is needed investing simultaneously in the structural pathway (digital transformation and governance) and the leadership-activated pathway (ethics and adaptation through transformational leadership) with specific attention to the smart city integration requirements that distinguish municipal innovation from innovation in other sectors.

**Table 1 Sector-Specific Mapping of Dominant Innovation Pathways**

| Sector | Dominant Pathway | Key Driver | Critical Moderator | Innovation Focus |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Utilities** | Tier 1: Structural | DT → DG → DIP (β=0.738***) | Governance maturity | Smart grid, predictive maintenance, IoT optimization |
| **Health** | Tier 2: Ethics–Leadership | DE × TFL → DIP (p=0.047*) | Data ethics + TFL | AI diagnostics, health analytics, patient safety |
| **Education** | Tier 2: Adaptation–Leadership | TA × TFL → DIP (p=0.003**) | TFL activation | Digital pedagogy, learning analytics, EdTech integration |
| **Municipalities** | Balanced (Tier 1 + Tier 2) | DT + DE/TA through TFL | Governance + leadership | Smart city services, citizen platforms, urban analytics |

Note. DT = Digital Transformation; DG = Digital Governance; DIP = Digital Innovation Performance; DE = Data Ethics; TA = Technology Adaptation; TFL = Transformational Leadership.

### 3. Digital Governance Architecture by Sector

The empirical findings demonstrated that digital governance is a critical mediator in the digital transformation–innovation relationship (H6: VAF = 22%, p = 0.002), and that the path from digital transformation to digital governance is the strongest in the model (β = 0.738, p < 0.001) [9]. This section develops a sector-specific Digital Governance Architecture specifying the structural, procedural, and relational governance practices the three dimensions used in the empirical measurement of digital governance [18] that each sector should prioritize.

Structural governance practices refer to data ownership and assessments of data values and costs. Procedural governance practices refer to data retention policies, backup routines, monitoring access to data, classifying data, and monitoring cost versus value of data. Relational governance practices refer to educating users on storage application and costs and communicating regarding policy success and employee/customer requirements [18,19]. The empirical study measured digital governance using nine items across these three dimensions, demonstrating composite reliability of 0.956 and AVE of 0.706 [9].

**Table 2 Sector-Specific Digital Governance Architecture**

| Governance Dimension | Utilities | Health | Education |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Structural Practices** | SCADA data ownership protocols; IoT sensor data value assessment; critical infrastructure data classification | Patient data ownership with consent frameworks; health data value-cost assessment for AI | Student data ownership policies; learning analytics value assessment; institutional data custodianship |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | training; clinical data custodianship | aligned with academic freedom |
| **Procedural Practices** | Real-time grid monitoring; automated backup for operational data; cybersecurity incident response protocols; smart meter data retention policies | Health record retention aligned with medical regulations; encrypted backup systems; patient access audit trails; algorithmic decision monitoring | Learning management system data retention; academic records backup; access monitoring for student privacy; assessment data classification |
| **Relational Practices** | Technical staff training on data security; stakeholder communication on smart grid data policies; customer education on data use | Healthcare worker training on data ethics; patient communication on AI-assisted decisions; inter-departmental governance coordination | Teacher professional development on digital tools; student/parent communication on data use; cross-institutional knowledge sharing |

For municipalities, which manage the most diverse portfolio of public services, the governance architecture should integrate elements from all three sectors while adding smart city–specific governance dimensions: urban data integration protocols governing the combination of data streams from transportation, environmental, infrastructure, and citizen service systems; public space surveillance governance frameworks addressing ethical dimensions of smart city monitoring; and open data policies that balance innovation enablement through data sharing with privacy protection for citizens [16,17]. Top management should be jointly responsible for developing and enforcing data governance practices with other unit managers, since IT managers are often restricted in their access to other units' information and do not have the decisional power to enforce governance practices across organizational boundaries [20].

## 4. Data Ethics Regulatory Framework for UAE Public Sectors

The empirical findings revealed that data ethics does not exert a significant direct effect on digital innovation performance (H1: $p = 0.372$) but becomes consequential when moderated by transformational leadership (H7: $p = 0.047$) and when mediated through digital governance (H2: $p = 0.029$) [9]. Eight core themes have been identified in the data ethics literature: privacy, accountability, safety and security, transparency and explainability, fairness and non-discrimination, human control of technology, professional responsibility, and promotion of human values [21]. These themes provide the foundation for a UAE-specific regulatory framework.

The data minimization principle under the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) requires personal data to be adequate, relevant, and limited to what is necessary in relation to the purposes for which it is processed a principle that is almost by definition opposed to the big data paradigm, with its tendency to collect all data and repurpose it [13]. The ICO acknowledges this opposition and states that the challenge for organizations is to determine ahead of time what the purposes of processing will be and what data will be relevant [13]. For UAE public sectors, where national strategies encourage large-scale data analytics for government innovation, resolving this tension between data maximization for innovation and data minimization for ethics is a critical policy challenge.

**Table 3 Proposed Data Ethics Regulatory Framework for UAE Public Sectors**

| Ethics Principle | Policy Requirement | Sector Application |
|---|---|---|
| **Privacy** | Mandatory data protection impact assessments before deploying AI systems; privacy-by-design requirements for new digital services | Health: patient consent protocols for AI-assisted diagnosis; Education: student data protection standards; Utilities: smart meter data anonymization |
| **Accountability** | Designation of Ethics Officers within each government entity; mandatory ethics review boards for AI-based innovation projects | All sectors: Clear chains of accountability for algorithmic decisions; Health: clinical AI accountability frameworks |
| **Transparency & Explainability** | Right to explanation for automated decisions affecting citizens; algorithmic transparency registers for public-facing AI | Municipalities: transparent smart city monitoring policies; Health: explainable AI for clinical decision support |
| **Fairness & Non-discrimination** | Mandatory bias auditing for AI training data; representativeness requirements for datasets used in public service algorithms | Education: equitable learning analytics; Health: demographic fairness in predictive models; Municipalities: equitable digital service access |
| **Human Control** | Human-in-the-loop requirements for high-stakes automated decisions; override mechanisms for AI recommendations | Health: clinician override for AI diagnoses; Education: teacher authority over AI-generated assessments |
| **Professional Responsibility** | Digital ethics training mandated for all public sector employees involved in data-driven innovation; ethics certification for Chief Data Officers | All sectors: Annual ethics certification; integration into performance evaluation systems |

The policy implication of the empirical finding that data ethics requires leadership activation (H7) is that regulatory frameworks alone are insufficient. Ethics regulations must be accompanied by organizational leadership that models ethical behavior (idealized influence), communicates the strategic importance of ethics for innovation (inspirational motivation), challenges employees to find creative solutions to ethical dilemmas (intellectual stimulation), and supports individuals facing ethical challenges in their digital work (individualized consideration) [5]. Without this leadership activation, ethics regulations risk becoming compliance exercises rather than innovation enables a pattern consistent with the non-significant direct effect of ethics on innovation found in the empirical study.

## 5. Transformational Leadership Development Blueprint

The empirical findings identified transformational leadership as a selective moderator that activates dormant innovation pathways. Specifically, transformational leadership significantly moderated the ethics–innovation relationship (H7: $p = 0.047$) and the adaptation–innovation relationship (H8: $p = 0.003$) but not the transformation–innovation relationship (H9: $p = 0.572$) [9]. This pattern implies that leadership development should target the specific competencies needed to activate ethics and adaptation pathways, rather than providing generic leadership training. The four core components of transformational leadership idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration [5] each have specific implications for digital innovation that should be addressed in sector-appropriate development programs.

Leaders in the public sector should use selection criteria and selection methods that assess whether managers have the potential to demonstrate transformational leadership behaviors [22]. The importance of transformational leadership to enhance innovation performance requires organizations to invest in developing leaders who can create innovative organizational climates, particularly by empowering employees [15,23]. Organizations whose leaders determine transformational leadership behaviors carry a focused vision and provide inspirational motivation to the employees, which enhances innovation performance processes a long-term vision that inspires employees and mid-managers to create and execute creative and innovative ideas in the digitalized organization [24].

**Table 4 Transformational Leadership Development Blueprint by Sector**

| TFL Competency | Utilities Focus | Health Focus | Education Focus |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Idealized Influence** | Modeling cybersecurity discipline; demonstrating commitment to data integrity in critical infrastructure | Modeling ethical data stewardship for patient information; championing responsible AI adoption | Modeling digital pedagogical innovation; demonstrating commitment to equitable technological access |
| **Inspirational Motivation** | Articulating vision for smart grid and IoT innovation; connecting technology investments to sustainability goals | Communicating vision for AI-enhanced patient care; connecting data ethics to health outcome improvement | Sharing vision for digital learning transformation; connecting EdTech adoption to educational quality |
| **Intellectual Stimulation** | Encouraging creative approaches to operational optimization; challenging assumptions about legacy systems | Stimulating innovative approaches to clinical data use while maintaining ethical standards | Encouraging creative digital pedagogy; challenging traditional teaching approaches with evidence-based innovation |
| **Individualized Consideration** | Supporting technical staff through IR 4.0 transition; addressing | Addressing individual clinician concerns about AI replacing clinical | Supporting individual teachers in EdTech adoption; recognizing |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | individual cybersecurity skill gaps | judgment; personalized ethics support | diverse digital literacy levels |

The leadership development blueprint should be implemented through a multi-level approach. At the senior leadership level, Chief Innovation Officers and department heads should receive intensive training on the strategic role of transformational leadership in activating innovation pathways, with emphasis on the empirical evidence that ethics and adaptation pathways are dormant without leadership activation. At the middle management level, section heads and project managers should receive practical training on intellectual stimulation and individualized consideration techniques specific to their sector contexts. The empirical finding that transformational leadership was measured using only four items commitment, motivation, new opportunities, and leading force [9] suggests that leadership development should focus on depth rather than breadth, developing a concentrated set of transformational competencies to high proficiency rather than covering a wide range of generic leadership skills.

### 6. Digital Innovation Performance Scorecard

The empirical study measured digital innovation performance using eight items capturing the market introduction of technologically innovative and enhanced products, extensions and changes of existing products, the rate of replacement of used products, the percentage of technologically innovative or enhanced products in the business, and overall product innovation performance [9,25,26]. For policy implementation purposes, these academic measurement dimensions need to be translated into operationally measurable indicators that Chief Innovation Officers can track and report against the NIS requirements and Global Innovation Index benchmarks.

**Table 5 Digital Innovation Performance Scorecard by Sector**

| Dimension | Utilities Indicators | Health Indicators | Education Indicators |
|---|---|---|---|
| **New Service/Product Introduction** | Number of new smart services launched per year; new IoT-enabled customer products | Number of AI-assisted clinical tools deployed; new digital health services launched | Number of new digital learning platforms adopted; EdTech-enabled programs launched |
| **Service Enhancement** | Rate of digital upgrade to existing utility services; customer experience digital improvement index | Proportion of clinical pathways enhanced by digital tools; patient experience digital score | Proportion of courses digitally enhanced; student satisfaction with digital tools |
| **Innovation Replacement Rate** | Rate of legacy system replacement with IR 4.0 technology; digital vs. manual process ratio | Rate of paper-to-digital clinical workflow conversion; AI augmentation of manual diagnostic processes | Rate of traditional-to-digital pedagogy conversion; digital assessment adoption rate |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Innovation Intensity** | R&D investment as % of revenue; patent applications in smart utility technology | Digital health innovation budget as % of total; clinical AI research publications | EdTech innovation budget as % allocation; pedagogical innovation research outputs |
| **Overall Performance** | Composite smart utility innovation index; Global Innovation Index contribution | Composite digital health innovation index; patient outcome improvement rate | Composite digital education innovation index; learning outcome improvement rate |

The scorecard should be administered quarterly, with annual comprehensive reviews aligned with the NIS benchmarking cycle. The NIS aspires to introduce a comprehensive set of advanced tools to promote innovation within government entities and maintain an updated database of various national, regional, and innovative international practices that can be shared across public sector entities [3]. The Digital Innovation Performance Scorecard provides the measurement foundation for this database, enabling cross-sectoral comparison, identification of best practices, and evidence-based allocation of the one percent innovation budget mandated by the NIS.

## 7. Discussion

### 7.1 Contribution to Policy Translation

This paper addresses a recognized gap in the digital innovation literature: the scarcity of sector-specific, evidence-based policy frameworks for public sector organizations [27,28]. While the companion papers established theoretical and empirical foundations, this paper demonstrates how aggregate-level PLS-SEM findings can be systematically translated into differentiated policy instruments. The key insight is that a single model can generate multiple policy prescriptions depending on the institutional context of implementation a principle grounded in institutional theory's recognition that organizational behavior is shaped by field-level regulatory, normative, and cultural-cognitive pressures [6]. Utilities, health, education, and municipalities each operate within distinct institutional fields, and effective policy must account for these differences rather than applying a one-size-fits-all approach.

### 7.2 Contribution to UAE Smart Government Strategy

The sector-specific framework directly supports several pillars of the UAE's smart government agenda. The Digital Governance Architecture (Section 3) operationalizes the governance dimension of smart city development, ensuring that the technological infrastructure forming the smart backbone is accompanied by appropriate governance structures [17]. The Data Ethics Regulatory Framework (Section 4) addresses the growing need for ethical AI governance as the UAE implements its AI Strategy across government services [2]. The Transformational Leadership Development Blueprint (Section 5) supports the NIS objective of training and equipping government personnel with the right skills for innovation [3]. The Digital Innovation Performance Scorecard (Section 6) provides the measurement infrastructure for the NIS's ambition to maintain databases of innovative practices and benchmark against the Global Innovation Index.

The UAE's experience with Expo 2020 (held in 2021–2022) demonstrated the country's capacity for large-scale innovation and international collaboration, creating unique opportunities for building international relationships and new business opportunities that accelerate economic growth, technology,

and innovation [7]. The frameworks developed in this paper can support the continuation of this innovation momentum by providing structured, evidence-based approaches that Chief Innovation Officers can deploy across their organizations. By examining government transparency, the outputs of this research can be used to measure the effectiveness of public information disclosure and to determine the condition of E-government in local government as part of smart city development [7].

### 7.3 Bridging Big Data Analytics and Organizational Innovation

A common misconception in public sector organizations is that big data analytics is a solely technical activity involving the administration of databases, data collection and curating, and application of sophisticated algorithms [20]. The empirical and policy findings of this research series demonstrate that the main challenge in extracting value from digital investments does not primarily concern technical issues but rather embedding these technologies into the organizational fabric and leveraging them for strategic outcomes [20]. Digital governance provides a sense of direction for who does what and what belongs to whom that is essential for infusing data-driven logic into the organization [29]. The sector-specific governance architecture developed in this paper translates this principle into concrete structural, procedural, and relational practices tailored to the data environments of each sector.

Most digital innovations stem from cross-organizational partnerships, and in such cases, establishing solid data governance is of paramount importance [9]. For the public sector, it is necessary for the government to apply big data into administrative management and leadership, strengthen the construction of big data environments, and improve overall innovation levels toward the digital world [30]. High-tech organizations should attach attention to the role of data governance control practices on innovation activity, as organizations close to the governance position typically have more advantages in obtaining data and resources, which leads to higher innovation performance [30]. The sector-specific framework ensures that governance practices are tailored to the data characteristics, regulatory requirements, and innovation opportunities of each domain.

## 8. Limitations

This paper has several limitations. First, the specific recommendations are derived from theoretical mapping of aggregate-level empirical findings onto institutional characteristics, rather than from subgroup statistical analysis. The sample sizes within individual sectors (utilities: n = 75; municipalities: n = 35; health: n = 120; education: n = 174) were insufficient for reliable multi-group PLS-SEM analysis in the companion study, and the policy recommendations should be treated as theoretically grounded proposals requiring empirical validation through sector-specific studies with larger samples. Second, the policy framework is contextualized within the UAE's institutional and regulatory environment; its transferability to other GCC countries or national contexts requires assessment. Third, the implementation feasibility of proposed governance architectures, ethics frameworks, and leadership development programs has not been empirically evaluated through pilot implementation or action research. Fourth, the scorecard indicators are proposed based on the academic measurement constructs and NIS objectives; validation of their operational measurability and relevance should involve practitioner consultation and pilot testing within government entities.

## 9. Future Research Directions

Future research should pursue six priority directions arising from this paper. First, sector-specific empirical studies with adequately powered samples should test whether the pathway dominance patterns

proposed in Table 1 are confirmed through multi-group PLS-SEM analysis. Second, pilot implementation studies should evaluate the feasibility, costs, and outcomes of the sector-specific governance architecture, ethics frameworks, and leadership development programs in real government organizations. Third, longitudinal research designs should track whether the proposed policy interventions produce measurable improvements in digital innovation performance scorecard indicators over time. Fourth, comparative studies across GCC countries should evaluate the transferability of the sector-specific recommendations to different national governance systems. Fifth, qualitative research incorporating interviews with Chief Innovation Officers and Chief Data Officers should validate and refine the policy recommendations based on practitioner experience. Sixth, the rapid evolution of technologies such as blockchain, advanced AI, and quantum computing will require periodic updates to the governance architecture and ethics framework to ensure continued relevance as the technological landscape evolves. A particularly important frontier is the role of blockchain technology as a digital privacy component that offers secure data protection methods but requires robust digital governance to control its implementation processes [7].

## 10. Conclusion

The paper has also filled the gap between policy action and empirical research evidence by translating the validated results of three companion research papers into a coherent, sector-specific policy framework that would be used to regulate digital innovation within the context of the UAE public sector organizations. The framework consists of five synergized elements a sector-specific applied model, a Digital Governance Architecture, a Data Ethics Regulatory Framework, a Transformational Leadership Development Blueprint, and a Digital Innovation Performance Scorecard each specific to the institutional attributes of the utilities, health, education, and municipal sector.

The key idea behind this paper is that successful governance of digital innovation needs differentiation, as opposed to uniformity. The empirical data has shown that various pathways to innovation work through various mechanisms structural pathways via governance infrastructure and leadership-activated pathways via human agency and motivation and that the relative significance of a given pathway will vary across organizational and sectoral situations. Any policy framework that does not take this distinction into account is likely to cause resources to be misallocated: the areas of the economy that are technology-intensive like the utilities, and the areas that are human-based like education and health need a higher proportion of resources towards management development and ethics mobilization.

Combined, the four papers of this research series give a full circle of theory to practice, namely conceptual framework development (Paper 1), empirical validation (Paper 2), model refinement (Paper 3), and policy translation (this paper). The final contribution is a collection of scholarships that is both scholarly and practically useful in providing scholars and practitioners with the resources to comprehend and improve the performance of digital innovation in the public sector. As UAE works towards the goals of its Centennial Plan 2071 vision to become a global leader in innovation, the evidence-based policy frameworks created in this series offer the operating tools that can help turn strategic aspiration into tangible innovation results in the government ecosystem.

## References

1. UAE Vision 2021. National agenda. United Arab Emirates Government; 2018.
2. Government.ae. UAE strategy for artificial intelligence. United Arab Emirates Government; 2017.
3. Government.ae. National Innovation Strategy. United Arab Emirates Government; 2015.

4. Rogers EM. Diffusion of innovations. 5th ed. New York: Free Press; 2003.
5. Bass BM, Riggio RE. Transformational leadership. 2nd ed. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates; 2006.
6. Scott WR. Institutional theory: Contributing to a theoretical research program. In: Smith KG, Hitt MA, editors. Great minds in management. Oxford: Oxford University Press; 2004. p. 460–484.
7. Alhammadi RS. The antecedents and role of digital transformation, adaptation, ethics, and governance towards innovative performance in public sectors in the UAE [dissertation]. Dubai: University of Dubai; 2022.
8. Mikalef P, Pappas IO, Krogstie J, Giannakos MN. Big data analytics capabilities: A systematic review and research agenda. Information Systems and e-Business Management. 2018;16(3):547–578.
9. Alhammadi RS. Digital governance as a mediator and transformational leadership as a moderator of digital innovation performance: Evidence from UAE public sector organizations. Manuscript under review-b; 2024.
10. Rüßmann M, Lorenz M, Gerbert P, Waldner M, Justus J, Engel P, et al. Industry 4.0: The future of productivity and growth in manufacturing industries. Boston: BCG; 2015.
11. Floridi L. Soft ethics and the governance of the digital. Philosophy & Technology. 2018;31(1):1–8.
12. Rahwan I, Cebrian M, Obradovich N, Bongard J, Bonnefon JF, Breazeal C, et al. Machine behaviour. Nature. 2019;568(7753):477–486.
13. Information Commissioner's Office. Big data, artificial intelligence, machine learning and data protection. Wilmslow: ICO; 2017.
14. Marangunić N, Granić A. Technology acceptance model: A literature review from 1986 to 2013. Universal Access in the Information Society. 2015;14(1):81–95.
15. Jung DI, Chow C, Wu A. The role of transformational leadership in enhancing organizational innovation. The Leadership Quarterly. 2003;14(4–5):525–544.
16. Sancino A, Hudson L. Leadership in, of, and for smart cities: Case studies from Europe, America, and Australia. Public Management Review. 2020;22(5):1–20.
17. Washburn D, Sindhu U, Balaouras S, Dines RA, Hayes NM, Nelson LE. Helping CIOs understand smart city initiatives. Cambridge, MA: Forrester Research; 2010.
18. Weber K, Otto B, Österle H. One size does not fit all: A contingency approach to data governance. ACM Journal of Data and Information Quality. 2009;1(1):1–27.
19. Tallon PP, Ramirez RV, Short JE. The information artifact in IT governance: Toward a theory of information governance. Journal of Management Information Systems. 2013;30(3):141–178.
20. Davenport TH. Big data at work: Dispelling the myths, uncovering the opportunities. Boston: Harvard Business Review Press; 2014.
21. Jobin A, Ienca M, Vayena E. The global landscape of AI ethics guidelines. Nature Machine Intelligence. 2019;1(9):389–399.
22. Sheehan M, Garavan TN, Morley MJ. Transformational leadership and work unit innovation: A dyadic two-wave investigation. Journal of Business Research. 2020; 109:399–412.
23. Chou P. Does transformational leadership matter during organizational change? European Journal of Sustainable Development. 2014;3(3):49–62.
24. Northouse PG. Leadership: Theory and practice. 7th ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage; 2018.
25. OECD/Eurostat. Oslo Manual: Guidelines for collecting and interpreting innovative data. 3rd ed. Paris: OECD Publishing; 2005.

26. López-Cabrales A, Pérez-Luño A, Valle Cabrera R. Knowledge as a mediator between HRM practices and innovative activity. Human Resource Management. 2009;48(4):485–503.
27. Bryson JM, Crosby BC, Bloomberg L. Public value governance: Moving beyond traditional public administration and the new public management. Public Administration Review. 2014;74(4):445–456.
28. Ferreira JJM, Fernandes CI, Ferreira FAF. To be or not to be digital, that is the question: Firm innovation and performance. Journal of Business Research. 2019; 101:583–590.
29. Karafili E, Lupu EC, Sheridan J. Towards an ontology for data governance. Proceedings of the International Conference on Trust, Privacy and Security in Digital Business. 2018; 11033:56–66.
30. Lin Y, Li J, Wang Y. Big data governance, innovation, and digital transformation: A multi-level analysis. Government Information Quarterly. 2020;37(1):101406.