



UNIONE EUROPEA
Fondi Strutturali e di Investimento Europei

**Independent valuation service
in favour of the Management Authority of the NOP
Metropolitan Cities 2014-2020 with regard to the
interventions of Axis 4 for social inclusion of the NOP
METRO**

**Synthesis
Final Report**

CIG 97147029B1 – CUP E81H17000000007

30th November 2023



CLES

Centro di Ricerche
e Studi sui Problemi del Lavoro,
dell'Economia e dello Sviluppo



MIPA

Consorzio per lo sviluppo
delle metodologie e delle innovazioni
nelle pubbliche amministrazioni

1. INTRODUCTION

This document constitutes the summary of the final report of the Independent Evaluation Service created for the Management Authority of the NOP Metropolitan Cities 2014-2020, Axis 4 – “Infrastructures for Social Inclusion”, awarded to RTI Cles S.r.l. by the Mipa Consortium.

The evaluation activity pursued the following objectives:

- **investigate the state of implementation of the interventions** carried out by the Intermediate Bodies (IBs) in pursuing the objectives of Axis 4 of the Programme;
- highlight the **obstacle factors** arising during the process of implementing the redevelopment interventions of spaces for living and social innovation in degraded areas;
- detect **any solutions** adopted by the IB connected to the obstacles recorded during the implementation of the Action;
- **identify areas for improvement** and any corrective measures in the implementation mechanisms adopted, also to formulate suggestions and indications to improve the effectiveness of interventions in the 2021-2027 programming cycle.

2. EVALUATION FRAMEWORK

The intervention dimension of the Programme was the territory of 14 metropolitan cities, classified as Intermediate Organisations, realities in demographic expansion with multidimensional characteristics in terms of innovation and culture, but also presenting phenomena of hardship potentially leading to situations of extreme marginality.

The NOP, with an endowment of 873.9 million euros, 650 from the Regional Development Fund (ERDF) and 208.7 from the European Social Fund (ESF), was reprogrammed using the EC Decision of 09/08/2021. This introduced three new axes and a substantial financial commitment (920 Meuro) to contribute to overcoming the consequences related to Covid-19, according to the strategy envisaged in the REACT-EU Programme. Specifically, the evaluation focused on the following actions:

- **4.1.1 – Creation and recovery of housing** (RA 9.4 - Reduction of the number of families with particular social and economic fragility in difficult housing conditions), through which the creation of public works aimed at the creation or recovery of housing to be allocated to individuals and families with particular social and economic fragilities.
- **4.2.1 – Recovery of unused properties and definition of equipped spaces to be used for services of social value** (RA A 9.6 - Increase in legality within areas of high social exclusion and the improvement of the urban fabric in areas with a low level of legality), aimed at supporting the improvement of the urban fabric through the activation of the social economy for the start-up of new local services in highly critical territories and neighbourhoods.

In terms of financial progress, a total cost for operations was recorded as equal to approximately 129.2 million euros, the majority pertaining to the municipalities of less developed regions (approximately 77.5 million euros, while for more developed regions, this can be assessed as equal to approximately 45.4 million)¹.

¹ Data from the monitoring system updated as of 1.11.2023.

3. EVALUATION QUESTIONS AND METHODOLOGY

The summary table follows the evaluation questions and investigation methods and tools used.

Evaluation Questions	Methods /Tools
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ What are the differences in reference contexts? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ↳ Desk and document analysis <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Secondary data aimed at reconstructing the starting situation (ISTAT, Open Coesione, etc.) ▪ Planning and implementation documents
<p><i>Governance</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ How do the interventions differ in relation to the regions and cities involved and the <i>governance</i> models? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Desk analysis and interviews to IBs <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Planning and implementation documents ▪ Direct investigations ▪ Construction of qualitative matrices summarizing the results of the analysis
<p><i>Selection process</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ What are the strategic and governance structures underlying the selection of interventions? ▪ Have participatory processes been activated? With what outcome? ▪ How were targets and interventions selected? ▪ What is the consistency with the administration's territorial strategy and planning tools? ▪ What is the synergy with Axis 3 interventions relating to the ESF or with other financial resources? ▪ Were there alternative and/or complementary financing lines considered in the selection? Which ones? ▪ What are the reasons for any cancellations by the IBs? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ↳ Desk analysis <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Analysis of monitoring data, primary source information held by the Administration (Operational Plans, documentation of the selection process, methodological documents, etc.) ▪ Construction of qualitative matrices summarizing the results of the analysis ↳ Direct investigations <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Interviews with IBs ▪ CAWI interviews (SPMS and officials involved) ▪ Case studies
<p><i>Implementation process</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ What actions have been implemented? ▪ How did the implementation differ from the planning of the interventions? ▪ What are the delay factors in implementation times? ▪ What causes prevented/prevent the realization of the projects and what factors seemed to determine their success? ▪ Are the interventions efficient? ▪ What physical and financial indicators accrued? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ What do the indicators tell you? (properties recovered/built/purchased, subjects involved, redeveloped closed and open public spaces, additional environmental impact indicators) ▪ Which relevant aspects have not, however, been intercepted by the indicators? ▪ Are the interventions effective and sustainable (from a social and financial point of view)? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ↳ Desk analysis <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Analysis of monitoring data, primary source information held by the Administration (Operational Plans, documentation of the selection process, methodological documents, etc...) ↳ Direct investigations <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Interviews with IBs ▪ CAWI interviews (SPMS and officials involved) ▪ CAWI interviews – representatives of the municipal offices involved with expertise in social policies ▪ Case studies

Evaluation Questions	Methods /Tools
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ What impact will the interventions implemented have on the reference areas? ▪ How has the condition of the target subjects changed? And that of the other subjects involved in the interventions? ▪ What impact will the interventions implemented have on the reference areas? ▪ How has the condition of the target subjects changed? And that of the other subjects involved in the interventions? 	
<p><i>Learning and Suggestions</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ What are any elements of success in the selection, implementation and time planning phases of the interventions? ▪ What are the appreciable elements of discontinuity and innovation with respect to existing policies and practices? ▪ What continuity with the 21-27 Programming and what learning should be emphasised? ▪ What are any elements of success in the selection, implementation and temporal planning phases of the interventions? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Desk analysis <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Construction of qualitative matrices summarizing the results of the analysis ➤ Direct investigations <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Interviews with IBs ▪ CAWI interviews (SPMS and officials involved) ▪ CAWI interviews – representatives of the municipal offices involved with expertise in social policies ▪ Case studies

4. DIFFERENCES IN REFERENCE CONTEXTS

What are the differences in reference contexts?

Since 2007, and exacerbated by the Covid 19 pandemic and the war in Ukraine, the crisis context has influenced the territories covered by the PON Metro interventions, deepening the gaps between the Centre and the North and the metropolitan cities of the South.

From a population point of view, among the 14 metropolitan cities, Rome is the most populous, with over 4 million inhabitants, while Cagliari, with a population of approximately 422 thousand people, is placed last. Specifically and from an economic point of view, there is a greater foreign population residing in the most dynamic territories, as in the case of Milan, while with regards the old age index the Municipality of Cagliari presents the highest degree of aging amongst its population, with a value of 312.5 elderly people for every 100 young people.

From the point of view of wealth, with reference to the trend of GDP per capita and average income, the Municipalities of the South, with the exception of Cagliari, stand at lower values than those in the North and Centre. Also, with respect to the employment rate for the population aged between 25 and 64 years old, strong differences emerge: in the Southern Municipalities the rates in 2019 varied from a minimum of 49.4% in Catania to a maximum of 63.9% in Cagliari, while in the Centre-North, the capital with the lowest employment rate can be identified as Rome with 68.7%.

Furthermore, between 2014 and 2021, the percentage of families in absolute poverty grew most in the suburbs of the metropolitan areas of Northern Italy and the metropolitan cities of Southern Italy, remaining stable in the suburbs of Central Italy and decreasing in the metropolitan cities of the North.

In Italy the percentage of individuals in conditions of serious material and housing deprivation was equal to 5.6% and 5.9% respectively in 2021, with the regions of Southern Italy showing a higher incidence, especially in terms of the share of people experiencing conditions of serious material deprivation, equal to 10.8%. This data is in line with the presence throughout Italy of a total of approximately 96 thousand homeless, of which almost 50% are concentrated in the metropolitan cities of Rome, Milan, Naples and Turin.

Another indicator of housing conditions lies in the title of enjoyment of the home: in Italy in 2022, 80.4% of families owned their home, while 19.6% lived in rented properties, but this percentage grows every year due to an increase in the degree of poverty in the centre of metropolitan areas of Italy compared to the suburbs. Finally, a symptom of the worsening of housing conditions in Italy is given by the increase in eviction orders issued, which increased by 17.6% (equal to over 38 thousand) between 2020 and 2021, with a further increase by 9.4% (almost 42 thousand) between 2021 and 2022.

5. GOVERNANCE MODELS ADOPTED FOR THE MANAGEMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION OF AXIS 4 INTERVENTIONS

What governance model has been adopted for the management and implementation of Axis 4 interventions?

From the analyses conducted, two governance models implemented by IBs emerged:

- the creation of an ad hoc Office for the NOP Metro with centralisation of the coordination skills of the existing Directorates/Offices ("centralised" governance), mostly characterised by the presence of an Axis Manager;
- the assignment of the competences of the NOP Metro to pre-existing Offices, which, in some cases, subsequently evolved into the centralised model, with the creation of an ad hoc Office on the NOP Metro, which often also acquired competences from all European funds and the PNRR. In this case, the NOP Metro had the effect of encouraging the creation of Offices with fundamental skills not present in the relevant Administration at the start of the Programme.

The creation of new ad hoc Offices has favoured the coordination of Services/Departments/Offices, in order to successfully implement integrated interventions requiring a plurality of skills, both in the field of public and social works, and in the implementation and management of European funds. From the evidence collected it would seem that this collaboration worked better for Action 4.2.1, which is more connected to the provision of services.

In some cities, the model adopted from the beginning and/or which evolved during the 2014-20 programming, then became the basis on which more complex offices were built. This took charge not only of the NOP Metro but also of the entire match of European Funds and RRNP in the Post Covid-19 period. In some cases, this happened quickly, in other cases it was implemented as part of preparation for 2021-27 Programming.

6. INTERVENTION SELECTION PROCESS

6.1 LOGIC AND CRITERIA UNDERLYING THE SELECTION OF INTERVENTIONS

What are the strategic and governance structures underlying the selection of interventions? How were targets and interventions selected?

The identification of strategy and intervention priorities has always taken place on the basis of a mix of multiple factors. Among these, in the various situations examined one or more were found to be preponderant.

The social and territorial needs for most metropolitan cities were important in defining the strategy and identifying the projects. Furthermore, coherence with territorial and urban planning and with the strategic planning of reference were two relevant NOP eligibility criteria. In some cases, specific technical tools were used (for example, Poverty Map) to understand in which areas to intervene.

The feasibility of the intervention also played an important role in the selection process. Where this did not happen, there became difficulties and delays in implementation and in some cases the cancellation of projects.

Another important factor in terms of strategic choice was the presence of a consolidated project portfolio. In some cases, these projects were included at the start of the Programme; in others they were included subsequently in order to accelerate spending, thus overcoming the difficulties associated with specific programmatic-implementation delays found in projects born with the Programme.

In 8 out of 14 cities, a priority role was played by the political decision-maker, especially when he actively participated in the technical tables and meetings. This “political choice” was mostly associated with the feasibility of interventions.

To a lesser extent, the projects included in the Operational Plans were selected because they were synergistic or similar to other projects previously financed with other funding sources or due to the choices made within the participatory processes, especially in metropolitan cities where such participation practices are more consolidated.

6.2 CONSISTENCY OF OPERATIONAL PLANS WITH THE TERRITORIAL STRATEGY OF THE ADMINISTRATION AND THE SYNERGY AND COMPLEMENTARITY WITH OTHER AXES OR FINANCIAL RESOURCES

What is the consistency with the administration's territorial strategy and planning tools? What is the synergy with the interventions of axis 3 relating to the ESF or with other financial resources? Were there alternative and/or complementary financing lines considered in the selection? Which ones?

The strategies underlying the interventions carried out were, on the whole, consistent with sectoral plans and planning tools in the various cities (for example, ERP plans, social plans where relevant, urban and sustainable development agendas, etc.), this being, moreover, a requirement for the admissibility of interventions in the operational plans of the cities.

Some difficulties are highlighted when putting into practice the integration between the interventions of Axes 3 and 4 of the NOP Metro, so that the interventions carried out under the two Axes were in some cases complementary in the policies but not in the implementation of the individual interventions.

In relation to the synergy of the interventions financed by Axis 4 with ESF, the regional ERDF, rather than through the use of regional, municipal or national resources (CSF 2014-20, NOP Inclusion, Pacts for cities, etc.), there is overall a reduced application, although in the face of an intentionality repeatedly referred to by the IBs. Where this has materialised, the NOP has represented an element of additionality and synergy compared to other sources of financing:

- with respect to housing support interventions, the NOP Metro has allowed for consolidation and expansion to different targets of services started in an experimental or reduced way;
- with respect to services and structures for social innovation, the NOP has contributed to developing local strategies to combat degradation at an urban level, promoting the creation of spaces for experimentation and innovation in abandoned or unusable places;
- compared to other resources from municipal budgets, the PON Metro was decisive because it allowed us to broaden its field of action.

In the Administrations where alternative financing lines were available, the same were then also used to finance some of the projects that were revoked and/or de-financed by the NOP during implementation and which were placed with more compatible financing sources in terms of times and methods.

Have the selection criteria identified by the Managing Authority actively oriented the choices of interventions according to the objectives of the Axis/Programme? Are the tools for verifying the coherence and conformity of the selection and evaluation procedures considered suitable for the selection phase of the operations?

The criteria identified by the Managing Authority, referred to in the document "Operation Selection Criteria. Methodology and Criteria for Axis and Action, Version 5.0 of July 2021", were able to guide the choice of interventions by the IBs.

In particular, from the analysis of the documentation it emerged that the Municipalities, in addition to using the necessary eligibility criteria, also widely used the evaluation criteria, especially those connected to "the economic, financial sustainability and governance and control capacity of the intervention", "the level of design" and "redevelopment/recovery in a social, cultural, environmental key (...)". However, less use occurred with respect to the reward criteria, probably due to the need for a more binding direction for beneficiaries and the desire to simplify the selection procedures. Among the most used reward criteria are "the relevance of the property and/or space to be recovered with respect to its recognition as a collective good by the community" and "complementarity with other relevant community programmes".

Furthermore, the Administrations sometimes used other additional criteria, a factor that highlights the attention on the part of the IB regarding the use of "tailor made" selection procedures with respect to strategic objectives.

All Administrations, based on interviews addressed to the IB and surveys to the SPMs, expressed a positive opinion regarding the ability of the selection criteria to guide the choices of interventions according to the objectives of the Axis/Plan. In most cases, the criteria facilitated the selection or reprogramming of projects consistent with the NOP strategy.

Instead, with respect to the checklists for verifying the coherence and conformity of the selection and evaluation procedures of the operations, some of the IBs interviewed considered them redundant and complex, indicating the opportunity for greater simplification; in other cases, however, the Administrations reported that these tools were used in the working method, proving adequate to guarantee the homogeneity of administrative and management processes.

6.4 ACTIVATION AND OUTCOMES OF PARTICIPATORY PROCESSES

Have participatory processes been activated? With what outcome?

The involvement of the partnership was affected by factors such as the type of intervention, the synergies activated with the interventions of Axis 3 or with other national and regional programmes, as well as the propensity and previous experience of activating participation paths.

Generally speaking, the activation of participatory processes was found mostly in Action 4.2.1.; in fact, in the Municipalities where Action 4.1.1 interventions were mainly implemented (Turin, Florence, Genoa, Naples and the capital, Rome) no relevant participatory processes were reported, although in some cases there were broader partnership consultation processes that contributed to a better focus on needs

In some cities, stakeholder and partnership involvement processes were then created in Axis 3 interventions, from which Axis 4 also benefited, with involvement initiatives often carried out with the support of the social area, with the objective of identifying targets, target areas and services to be activated.

In some cases, however, the activation of participatory processes aimed at citizens and recipients specifically regarding Axis 4 projects, which also involved the related projects of Axis 3, were found. Specifically, these cases often refer to project proposals already defined or started in phases prior

to the NOP and to administrations already experienced in terms of co-planning and partnership involvement.

A final indication relates to NP Metro Plus 2021-2027 with respect to which, based on the indications provided by some IBs, greater involvement in the partnership is estimated for the future.

7. THE PROCESS OF IMPLEMENTING INTERVENTIONS

6.1 ACTIONS IMPLEMENTED

What actions have been implemented?

Based on the monitoring system, the Operational Plans of the Municipalities and the field investigations, interventions actually carried out amount to a total of 140, of which 59 refer to Action 4.1.1 and 81 to Action 4.2.1.

This value, lower than the 171 projects defined in the programming phase, is affected by the changes made in the reprogrammings connected to the Covid-19 pandemic as well as implementation difficulties encountered by the Municipalities. Furthermore, this number is partially different from what was recorded in the monitoring system thus presenting some updating problems.

Overall, the target recipients and the types of interventions are consistent with the objectives of the NOP Metro. The interventions of Action 4.1.1 are aimed at fragile individuals and families in difficult housing conditions or those residing in areas with conditions of marginality and widespread illegality (including homeless people, the elderly, migrants, female victims of violence, people with disabilities, Roma, Sinti and Caminanti populations, residents of slum areas, such as in Messina). Some interventions involved the recovery of properties for social use, such as night reception facilities and retirement homes for the elderly, while the majority of the projects involved the redevelopment of accommodation and apartments for residential purposes. These included ERP properties but also prefabricated buildings (aimed at welcoming migrants), cohousing structures and anti-violence centres aimed at female victims of violence, as in Rome.

The interventions of Action 4.2.1 are mainly aimed at disadvantaged people with a high risk of social exclusion, especially among the youngest, and are connected to the improvement of the urban fabric in areas of hardship or with a low level of legality.

Most of the interventions concerned the recovery of social and cultural spaces, with the involvement of local associations and the creation of services for social inclusion and innovation: this is the case, for example, of community centres, mafia spaces confiscated for the creation of social activities, functional spaces, libraries, theatres, etc. There are also numerous projects for the redevelopment of sports facilities, both outdoors (e.g. football, basketball, athletics) and indoors (swimming pools and gyms), and for the recovery of open public spaces (squares, parks, gardens and play areas). In some cases, the Administration carried out integrated interventions of a different nature aimed at the recovery and attractiveness of areas with a low level of legality, such as in Venice.

6.2 ANALYSIS OF THE "EFFICIENCY" OF PROGRAMMING: A COMPARISON BETWEEN THE INITIAL PLANNING OF INTERVENTIONS AND THEIR IMPLEMENTATION

How did the implementation of interventions differ from their planning?

Overall, there is a significant gap between the initial planning of the interventions and what was actually achieved, with respect to the number of interventions and financial resources.

Several factors influenced this evidence. First of all, the analyses reveal that only in some cases did the Operational Plans provide specific detail of the interventions, a factor influencing their level of implementation.

Furthermore, there is a significant gap between the initial planning and the implementation in most Municipalities. In fact, only in a few Municipalities - Florence and Genoa (for Action 4.1.1), Palermo (Action 4.2.1) and Venice (both Actions) - were the planned projects actually implemented.

The analysis suggests the existence of difficulties on the part of municipalities to properly plan interventions, with repercussions that carry over into the implementation phase as well.

This is confirmed by considering the relationship between the "planning capacity" and the implementation efficiency, given by the ratio of allowed payments to total planned expenditure: where administrations presented a better "planning capacity" there was also a better level in the advancement of expenditure. On the contrary, a lower level of "planning capacity" was matched by lower implementation efficiency, except for a few municipalities that still managed to achieve a good result from a financial point of view by activating new interventions during implementation or replacing them with interventions originally financed on other programs or other sources.

6.3 THE REASONS FOR ANY CANCELLATIONS BY ADMINISTRATIONS

What are the reasons for any IBs cancellations?

From the point of view of the representatives of the IOs, the main reasons for revising the initial planning of interventions lie in the complexity of the projects - not being compatible with the timing of the NOP - in critical issues of a technical nature, in delays in the implementation phase and in the absence of an adequate feasibility analysis at the start of the programme.

Furthermore, from the point of view of the functioning of the NOP, some problems can be related to the selection procedures of the properties to be redeveloped, the financial reprogramming carried out by the Municipalities - also in terms of the reuse of tender economies - and some changes carried out internally to the NOP. Impacts also occurred due to contextual elements: effects of the Covid 19 pandemic and the war in Ukraine, displacement due to the RRNP and construction bonuses. In some cases the change of different administrations at the political level had an influence.

These considerations are confirmed in interviews with the SPMS, who among the main reasons for the changes identified delays in starting the projects (especially for Action 4.1.1), changes in the reference legislation, the specific needs of the Administration, and difficulties in finding resources to guarantee the sustainability of the interventions. In particular, for Action 4.2.1, the complexity of the projects led Municipalities to review the programming, orienting it towards interventions that presented greater feasibility.

The consequences of these factors were: the cancellation of projects, their replacement with other more feasible projects, the shifting of operations to other sources of financing (MOP or Municipal resources), or the closure of interventions, instead relocating some activities to the new programming or using other sources of financing.

6.4 FACTORS INFLUENCING THE IMPLEMENTATION OF INTERVENTIONS

What are the delay factors in the implementation times? What are the causes that prevented/prevent the realisation of the projects and what factors seem to determine their success?

Among the main reasons for delays in implementing the interventions, as revealed in interviews with the OBs and the SPMS, are the absence of an adequate feasibility analysis of the project ideas and technical-administrative difficulties. In particular, the following factors had an influence: absence of eligibility requirements, difficulties in tender procedures, technical criticalities related to those properties or spaces to be redeveloped (especially for Action 4.1.1).

Furthermore, during implementation further factors emerged which caused obstacles in the implementation of the projects, such as unforeseen events during the construction phase (e.g. the discovery of archaeological finds in the Municipalities of Bari and Bologna), factors linked to the

reference context (especially for Action 4.2.1) and the emergence of some procedural criticalities related to the compilation of checklists, reporting and use of the Delfi information system which were considered inflexible (particularly for Action 4.1.1).

From the point of view of those factors that determined or represented elements of success for the interventions, on the basis of the analyses of the interviews with the OBs, positive experiences in the tender procedures can be highlighted (e.g. the Framework Agreement of the Municipality of Genoa or centralization mechanisms in Catania) as well as the inclusion of new interventions, as in the case of the purchase of new properties in the Municipality of Messina. Furthermore, despite some critical issues, the experimentation of the NOP was generally considered positive from an administrative, managerial and procedural point of view, as was the broad level of collaboration achieved between the IBs and the MA of the NOP Metro.

7. AN ANALYSIS OF THE INDICATOR SYSTEM

Are the interventions efficient (in terms of results achieved)? What do the indicators tell you? Which relevant aspects were not captured by the indicators?

For Action 4.1.1 the following indicators were considered:

- the CO40 output indicator (the number of restored homes intended for families experiencing housing hardship), which highlights an extension of the 2023 target in the capital Municipalities of the most developed regions; a value still stuck at 0 for the city of Cagliari (the only one falling into the category of regions in transition), however, based on the evidence collected, it should still reach the target at the conclusion of the interventions. Conversely, there is evidence of an implementation performance lower than the target on the part of the less developed regions.
- the IR19 result indicator (share of individuals in poor housing conditions, or who live in overcrowded conditions or in unserviced or unhealthy accommodation, out of the total population residing in the capital Municipalities of metropolitan cities), which highlights a good performance for the cities of the more developed and less developed regions. This indicator is worsening in the case of Cagliari.

With reference to Action 4.2.1, the following were considered:

- the output indicator IO17 (the recovered surface area, not only of properties but also of spaces to be used for services of social value), which, based on the analyses, denotes a good effectiveness of the financed projects, with a large extension of the targets set for the capital Municipalities of the metropolitan cities belonging to the more developed and less developed regional categories. For the Municipality of Cagliari the realised value is still below the target value.
- the IR20 result indicator looks at the number of businesses and non-profit institutions carrying out activities with a social content per thousand inhabitants of the capital Municipalities of metropolitan cities). Based on the data available in the 2021 Annual Implementation Report, it shows a result performance strongly influenced by the Covid-19 pandemic.

In any case, from the analyses carried out, it is clear that the indicators adopted present some limitations with respect to the ability to effectively grasp the implementation performance on the one hand and the ability to achieve results on the other: in the case of the output indicators, that is the need to have more exhaustive and detailed monitoring data for interventions that present specifications for the type of interventions expected and carried out and the type of structure or space. Instead, the limits of the result indicators depend on the fact that these indicators are mostly contextual, only indirectly taking into consideration the recipients of the interventions carried out.

In the Evaluation Service, 4 additional indicators were identified, reconstructed through field investigations and for some cities. For example, the results highlight that Venice is the city with the largest number of individuals hosted in accommodation/properties intended for social purposes (equal to 950), while Catania has the record with respect to the following indicators: number of recipients also involved in measures of 'Axis 3 - services for social inclusion (480), number of

interventions that involved energy and/or environmental requalification (14) and number of projects that included a functional mix (14). These additional indicators represent an evaluation exercise and should be studied in depth with respect to the specific type of interventions carried out.

8. SUSTAINABILITY OF INTERVENTIONS AND SOCIAL EFFECTS

Are the interventions effective and sustainable from a social and financial point of view?

Based on the current state of implementation of the Programme, given that many interventions are not yet completed, only initial indications can be made to the changes observed, in terms of size and permanence over time.

The Programme has certainly contributed to the improvement of the living conditions of some families experiencing housing and social hardship. In some cases, the contribution was minimal, in others, more significant, as in the case of Venice. Furthermore, the NOP Metro acted within a context in which, due to the end of large public housing programmes, there was a contraction of usable public assets and a reduction in the resources allocated to them, that is, in the face of an increase in people living in conditions of poverty and/or "new poverty".

Regarding effectiveness in general, it is noted that the interventions had a positive impact on improving the conditions of the target gSPMspis, despite managing to cover only a small number of potential recipients with the available funding.

Furthermore, in many cities there is still no clear planning of the sources and methods of retrieval and/or acquisition of resources to guarantee the sustainability of those resources in the medium term, although there is a widespread predisposition to support such costs; including those linked to management and maintenance directly (also through in-house agencies or bodies) or through public-private partnerships and assignments to third sector bodies.

In most cases the ordinary maintenance, and in some cases also management, of the financed interventions will be guaranteed with municipal funds using ordinary resources which for the interventions concerning accommodation/apartments for temporary use and multipurpose spaces will be integrated by community resources and managed in collaboration with third sector bodies.

In general, the insufficiency of structural or ordinary financing compared to needs is confirmed and the need to support interventions with different measures (European contributions, ministerial and regional funds, Municipal resources, private resources) managed by multiple actors from the public sector, the private or third sector (in-house agencies, third sector bodies, etc.) which do not ensure continuity and have precise target constraints of beneficiaries/recipients. In this context, the NOP METRO 2014-2020 has provided a contribution to the creation of infrastructures, although the concrete effects in terms of sustainability still seems to be uncertain.

The results of the analysis highlight that the issue of financial sustainability cannot be left to the programming of European funds alone. It is therefore necessary to strengthen the skills of the Administrations, to participate in alternative forms of financing, and above all to find stable resources based on regional resources that are capable of providing guarantees for the maintenance and management of infrastructures and continuity of related services.

What impact will the interventions implemented have on the reference areas?

The quantification of the impacts on the reference areas is not currently detectable since some interventions have not been completed and also because the passage of time is necessary to verify the impacts generated.

However, where the interventions have been concluded, the investigations highlight some positive effects on the reference areas both at a quantitative and qualitative level, that is, in relation to the reduction of housing hardship, the risk of social exclusion and greater safety/legality (also connected to the reduction of illegal occupations of vacant housing).

In particular, in various cases the interventions of 4.1.1 have concretely improved the quality of life of families in conditions of housing hardship and social exclusion. An effect that was detected in eight of the 14 metropolitan cities (for accommodation characterised by the temporary nature of residences and for accommodation for medium-long term residences). In relation to Action 4.2.1, the main effects/impacts concerned the reduction of the risk of social exclusion, the improvement of the attractiveness of the urban fabric of areas characterised by a low rate of legality and the improvement of the condition of the recipients receiving the interventions. The interventions had the effect of combating degradation (thanks to the disappearance of "abandoned places" without safeguards and controls) and of including the local community.

In any case, a strong fragmentation of the interventions can be highlighted, also attributable to the cancellation of some planned projects and subsequent modifications. In many cases this situation produced social consequences, in others it was a missed opportunity for the revitalisation of territories. In the planning phase, better knowledge of the territory and greater technical feasibility checks would have allowed a wider concentration of resources to specific areas of the city territory, favouring better social impact.

How has the condition of the target subjects changed? And that of the other subjects involved in the interventions?

Considering the current state of implementation of the Programme, in which many interventions have not yet been concluded, the detectable change is of a perceptive nature and not yet precisely definable, this is also due to some critical issues characterising the synergy between the interventions of Axis 4 and Axis 3.

Delays in completing the renovations and redevelopments of the infrastructure have produced delays in the provision of related services. The results of the field investigations returned a general appreciation of the changes in the contexts, even simply with respect to the "do nothing" option. Certainly, in light of what emerged from the analyses, the condition of people and families entitled to public residential housing who have been assigned accommodation has changed positively.

In this case, it is the type of infrastructure which, to a greater extent than the others, appears to be already used by the recipients and which has changed their condition of housing fragility. It should also be highlighted that some interventions (such as in Messina) have included projects in integration with Axis 3 of the Programme. These aimed at the activation of active inclusion paths (work, training, social and educational inclusion of those families assigned to the properties).

The results of the survey carried out among the officials of the social policy area of the Municipalities highlights that the type of recipients who have most benefited or will benefit most from the interventions carried out are represented by homeless people, families experiencing housing hardship and young people in uncomfortable conditions and who are at risk of social exclusion/poverty.

9. FINDINGS: THE POINT OF VIEW OF THE ACTORS INVOLVED

What are any elements of success in the selection, implementation and temporal planning phases of the interventions?

With respect to the planning and selection phase, a key role was determined by:

- already including in the start-up phase an in-depth knowledge and an updated mapping of the territory in relation to both the areas characterised by the phenomena of poverty and degradation;
- the ability to act in complement with other resources, in particular the RP ERDF, but also the RRNP and the NP Inclusion;
- the activation of participatory processes also involving citizens;

- having included projects with a positive feasibility outcome in terms of tools in the operational plans;
- the use of a framework agreement favouring speed of selection for those interventions relating to the redevelopment of ERP properties.

With respect to the implementation and temporal planning phases of the interventions, the decisive elements for the successful outcome of the interventions were:

- the preparation of a monitoring system to constantly check the implementation status of the interventions and correctness of times and procedures, reducing the risk of incurring unfeasible interventions or ineligible expenses;
- the activation of targeted capacity building actions shared between the various offices involved in the implementation of the interventions and aimed at filling knowledge gaps or critical issues;
- collaboration between the offices responsible for the management of public buildings and the offices responsible for the management of social activities.

Furthermore, in general, a further element of success concerned the construction of a synergistic relationship between IBs, those who govern programming, and the offices working on implementation.

What are the appreciable elements of discontinuity and innovation with respect to existing policies and practices?

Generally speaking, the Administrations analysed appreciated the allocation of resources and the areas of intervention. Generally, for the cities, the NOP metro has been a "training ground" for important learning, which can also be reused in the future. In some interventions, elements of discontinuity and innovation can be identified, compared to their previous experiences.

Among these we can mention some cities (for example, Catania, Bari, Messina, Venice) where the interventions of Axis 4 favoured the creation of synergies between different areas and the experimentation of effective organisational or implementation forms. On the other hand, other cities (for example Rome and Bologna), have chosen to continue with pre-existing lines of activity, taking advantage of consolidated relationships.

What is the continuity with 21-27 Programming and what learning should be emphasised?

The positive lessons learned by the actors involved, also useful for 2021-2017 Programming, are as follows:

- the importance of in-depth knowledge of the intervention territories through the construction of detailed maps of the areas integrated in the various aspects. These include the real estate assets available and/or recoverable and/or intended for uses other than the original ones, the quantitative dimensions and qualitative aspects of poverty, the actors who can represent the driving elements of the economic and social redevelopment of the territories;
- the need to pay great attention to a participatory partnership, since by improving synergies, information flows and increasing the sense of belonging to a common project, the successful outcome of the interventions is promoted, as demonstrated by some experiences;
- the adoption of governance models that allow collaboration between the different Services/Departments/Offices and the "pooling of skills";
- the implementation of specialist staff skills but also in relation to the ability to build multidisciplinary teams that support the constructive collaboration of technical, administrative and social services staff;
- the adoption of procedures for the selection and management of effective interventions in relation to their context of reference (for example, the Framework Agreements for the assignment of the design and works of the lots).

In all territorial areas, we will try to guarantee the continuation/implementation of the interventions carried out through the inclusion in the 2021-2027 operational plans of integrated projects financed under Urban Regeneration (Priority 7). Especially in the cities of the North, the South and the Islands, the objective will be to finance services to consolidate the positive experiences achieved, to improve the synergy with the other urban authorities and the comparison with the Supervisory Committee and thematic committees.

Concluding remarks and suggestions for Programming 2021-2027

- The analysis returns a fragmented picture from the point of view of housing and urban regeneration policies, from the point of view of the interventions implemented, the relevant actors, and the resources allocated, aggravated by the lack of long-term structural financing that would give continuity of action to the processes of planning and policy implementation.
- In light of these considerations, therefore, it seems clear that there is a need for a reversal of the current system of housing policies that starts with the reconstitution of planning of a strategic and, above all, operational nature that is also adequately resourced, enabling it to meet the challenges coming from the context through the expansion and differentiation of the range of policies serving housing.
- Within this context, the resources made available by the PON Metro can make, alongside other sources of funding, a substantial contribution in policy implementation. The structuring of a national steering structure could, in this sense, enhance the Program's contribution by orienting it - due to the limited resources available and programmatic characteristics - on well delineated/delimited interventions and forms of experimentation and social innovation that would allow the potential provided by the European Programming to be expressed in terms of housing and urban regeneration policies.
- Strengthen the ability to read contexts and integrated IBs analysis and design in order to foster the formation of the multifactorial "critical mass" necessary to produce structural change in the social sphere. Supporting tools include, for example, the preparation of detailed maps of the territories in which intervention takes place, integrated into the different aspects, including the quantitative and qualitative dimensions of poverty but also the elements and actors that can represent the driving forces - at different levels - for the economic and social redevelopment of the territories involved and/or the adoption of peer review methods for the verification of the technical feasibility of projects.
- Support IBs with operational tools and guidelines that enable verification of the actual potential of the intervention to be financed and that simplify administrative action in the hands of the Cities, providing for common procedures to be implemented in all the Administrations involved. In this sense, it will be useful to provide Guidelines, create mechanisms that can facilitate the exchange of information, documents, opinions between the Authorities involved and the IOs of the Cities. This is all the more so considering that the PN Metro+ will be aimed at a larger number of territorial contexts - the medium-sized cities - and the need for a more structured national direction will take on greater centrality, also in view of the specific and sectoral requirements to which the cities will have to respond (e.g. DNSH, Climate Proofing and New European Bauhaus). At the same time, it will be necessary to work on a simplification of the tools for verifying the coherence and compliance of the selection and evaluation procedures (checklists), which should not be perceived as a mere administrative fulfillment.
- Ensure the strengthening of activities for administrative strengthening from the first phase of implementation of the 2021 - 2027 programming, providing specific and targeted actions for the Administrations where the most critical issues have been highlighted. To this end, we highlight the usefulness of promoting greater coordination of the substantial resources available (including, the PN Capacity for Cohesion 2021-2027) for administrative capacitation in the

different territories, carrying out a preliminary mapping and reconnaissance of the opportunities offered.

- Strengthen the monitoring mechanisms and functions within the Information System, not only from the point of view of financial progress, but also for the verification of the progressive state of implementation of projects and the actual date of completion, as well as to consider the possibility of defining and introducing specific project indicators, which further declines the articulated system of output and result indicators already present in the Program and account for the results achieved "in itinere."
- Set up a device for interaction between the Administration and the stakeholders involved, capable of strengthening the mechanisms that consolidate implementation capacity. Reference is made to a guide to support IBs in monitoring the implementation process, strengthening the ability to anticipate possible critical issues and bottlenecks.
- Prepare specific methodologies and tools to foster the enhancement of those elements of innovativeness that have characterized some projects in relation to the management and organization of the process from the planning stage to implementation, in order to support the growth of skills both in the administrations involved and among the actors of the socio-economic partnership.
- Deepen the issue of the sustainability of interventions upstream of the selection procedures. In fact, it is difficult for entities to identify resources through which to maintain the services activated in the infrastructures built or restructured thanks to the measures put in place. Clearly, this requires identifying additional resources for the implementation of interventions that by their nature cannot be left to the programming of European funds alone.
- In relation to Programming 2021-2027, it is pointed out that a fundamental prerequisite for achieving positive and lasting social effects is to place projects within a systemic vision that includes the integration of housing and social policies with other development policies (including educational and health policies) that strongly impact the well-being and quality of life of people included in the target community. To this extent, modern on-going listening tools - not necessarily formally structured - should be activated, as decision-making spaces for relevant issues.