

Co-City Evaluation Framework



Deliverable No.	2.3.2
Work Package	WP2
Status	Final - May 2020
Version	2.0

Summary

1) <i>Introduction</i>	2
2) <i>The methodological approach</i>	2
a. The Theory of Change Tool	2
b. The level and the purposes of the analysis	3
3) <i>The situation in Turin – urban poverty and the urban commons</i>	3
4) <i>The intervention model</i>	4
a. The hypothesis underlying the Theory of Change	4
b. The areas of interventions of the Theory of Change and the outcome chain	5
c. The action plan	7
5) <i>Determining what needs to be evaluated</i>	7
6) <i>Indicators</i>	9
7) <i>Data collection: monitoring and evaluation</i>	13
8) <i>The stakeholders of Co-City</i>	13
Public officers	14
Active citizens	14
Subjects of active citizenship (informal groups, associations, committees, third sector organizations)	15
Neighborhood houses.....	15
The change in the related policy domain: indirect stakeholders	16
9) <i>Conclusions</i>	17
<i>Annex I: The Outcome chain</i>	18
<i>Annex II: The Theory of Action</i>	19

1) Introduction

The Co-City evaluation activity has been developed halfway through the implementation period of the project. This gives, on one hand, the opportunity to examine in a critical light the entire project structure and see the possible deviation that occurred so far. On the other hand, it will be possible to set a reasoned evaluation framework that will be developed during the second half of the project implementation. This report is preliminary to the collection of data for the actual evaluation and is intended to set the guiding framework for the empirical test of the hypothesis of change produced by the Co-City project.

A first general remark is that, considering the actions that have been implemented so far, the results that the project aims to accomplish will be observed mainly during 2019, when the collaborations between the City of Turin and the citizens will be fully formalized and functional thanks to the signature of the Pacts of Collaboration.

A second very necessary remark is that the Co-City project application has been translated in an intervention model as foreseen in the Theory of Change evaluation framework, therefore the first step was to reconstruct the logic underlying the intervention. This will by no means replace the project document that was approved by the funding agency but it will constitute the first tool for proper monitoring and evaluation. The new intervention logic is introduced as an instrument but never as an improved project formulation.

2) The methodological approach

a. The Theory of Change Tool

The Theory of Change (ToC) is a methodological approach that describes how interventions can bring about long-term changes through a logical sequence of intermediate outcomes, outcomes, outputs and activities. This method, through the description of the sequence of events necessary to achieve the long-term change, allows to understand, develop and describe the model of social intervention and to provide a framework for monitoring and evaluation.

First of all, it is necessary to get back to the situation analysis that informed the project strategies and activities. Reviewing the background discussion on the project at the moment of the application makes explicit which aspect of the general problem is addressed by the action.

The second step is to reconstruct the implicit change process with the development of the outcome chain which shows the assumed cause and effect between immediate, intermediate and ultimate outcomes or impact. This will be the basis to identify the evaluation questions.

The third step is the identification of the plan of action that associates to the map of outcomes the necessary outputs and actions for the implementation of the change.

The fourth step is to determine what can/should be evaluated by making explicit the evaluation questions that are necessary to construct indicators.

The indicators and the sources of verification will be the starting point for the actual evaluation of the project, which will be fully developed in the final report.

In order to have a full picture of the intervention, we developed a parallel focus on the profiles of stakeholders that are directly and indirectly involved within each dimension area of the project, isolating the elements of the expected change that the project will have on them.

b. The level and the purposes of the analysis

As a starting point, is necessary to clarify and limit the scope of this analysis.

The ToC is used for thinking about change at different levels, ranging from world views to project level, from broad to circumscribed scenarios. For this report, we will use the project level, zooming on specific objectives and strategies designed and implemented by the Co-City project over the period of its implementation.

Therefore, the area of analysis of the evaluation of the Co-City projects will be:

- (1) The current context, stakeholders and opportunities;
- (2) The intervention logic of the project to achieve a specific change objective,
- (3) Its assumed contribution to the longer-term social change in the related policy domains.

The second element that has to be identified is the purpose of the analysis. This definition is critical as it also influences who needs to be involved in the process.

The ToC is used in this report for three different purposes:

- (1) Mid-term review: quality audit the project making explicit what the initiative aims to achieve, why and how it is supposed to work, and clarify underlying assumptions;
- (2) Providing basis for final ex-post evaluation that will substantiate the validity of the ToC: identification of what findings (indicators) and how (sources of verification) will be collected during the second phase of implementation of the project;
- (2) Support the communication of the project and its results.

3) The situation in Turin – urban poverty and the urban commons

Turin is coping with the consequences of a financial crisis that has contributed to the spread of poverty in old inner-city neighborhoods and peripheral areas. Between 2008 and 2013 the population of the city living in absolute poverty increased by 80% and is now 7%. 14.1% of the population live under the relative poverty line, while the grey area of people on the edge of poverty is enlarging. The unemployment rate is 13% and is rising more than in other Italian cities.

This situation and the constraints to the budget for social sector has forced the city to rethink the way to deliver the public services, the dialogue and exchange with the citizens within the framework of the urban regeneration.

A process of local dialogue and community engagement started almost 20 years ago culminated in the formalization of eight neighborhood houses that are located in the eight

districts of the cities and constantly evolving to better respond to the communities in which they are located.

In parallel, a national debate on the urban public goods regulation that started in Bologna and soon spread in all the major Italian cities. In 2016 the Torino City Council issued the public “Regulation on collaboration between citizen and the City for the care, shared management and regeneration of urban commons”. The aim is to encourage and sustain new collaborative forms of dialogue with civil society related to the management of public goods/services and provision of collective public services.

The municipality of Turin has started a project on the peripheral areas of the city (AxTO) that is implementing an integrated set of public interventions addressing the fragility of the Turin suburbs linked to the economic crisis and the lack of resources in the recent years. The AxTO project has been selected in the framework of the call for urban periphery regeneration and safety, issued by the Presidency of the Italian Council of Ministers. AxTO has planned 44 actions (material and not-material), which are now being carried out through 235 widespread interventions on peripheries.

Turin ecosystem for social innovation is represented in the Torino Social Impact platform, that was activated within the European project Boostino (URBACT). It is an open structure of stakeholder aggregation and convergence to promote social impact while tackling in a diversified way the most compelling urban challenges. The long-term objective is to make Turin one of the best ecosystems for entrepreneurship and investments with social impact and high technological level. aims to support the growth of companies able to respond to emerging social needs in different fields and transform innovative ideas in services, products, solutions able to create both economic and social value. Among its objectives there is the development of a more collaborative, inclusive and sustainable economy.

Finally, the Social services of the city are currently undergoing a substantial reorganization which implies the creation of new “Poli di inclusione sociale”. In these new structures, various services from the third sector and the city will be integrated to better intercept needs and support and integrated intervention for social inclusion. Through this integration between the project (Co-City social workers) and reorganization of social services, the pacts of collaboration will become part of the range of tools put in place by the city of Turin to promote social inclusion.

The Co-City experimentation builds from this ecosystem of policies, projects and actors that developed for more than 20 years in the field of urban regeneration

4) The intervention model

a. The hypothesis underlying the Theory of Change

The reflections that brought to the formulation of the Co-City project and its model of intervention affect how the problem and the change path was operationalized.

Starting from the concept of urban poverty and its manifestation in the urban context, the project identified in the self-reinforcing cycle of socio-spatial polarization (i.e. segregation, marginalization, and exclusion of citizens from citizenship and participation, both physically and socially) the feature that had to be addressed by its actions.

The urban socio-spatial polarization has several interconnected dimensions that reciprocally and cyclically affect and reinforce each other:

- 1) Local institutions: the reduction of public expenditure leads to the deterioration of living conditions. This feeds mistrust in local institutions that are decreasingly responding to the needs of local communities through welfare services provision.

The first dimension of the challenge is how to reinforce the social bonds between the community and institutions

- 2) Spatial polarization: poverty produces deprived neighborhoods, which in turn exacerbate poverty. One visible sign is the presence of many derelict buildings. 6.5% of about 1,600 buildings and about 1M sqm of land owned by the City are unused or underused and have no prospect of economic exploitation.

The second dimension of the challenge is to use public assets as a resource for a polycentric urban welfare policy

- 3) Social polarization: poverty is linked to citizen's indifference, lack of participation in civic life, engagement, sense of empowerment. Lack of interest and attention for urban public spaces.

The third dimension of the challenge is to reinforce the social bonds within urban communities to unlock their social capital for urban regeneration

- 4) Citizens in need: social and spatial peripheries do not always coincide and poverty is exacerbated by situation of social fragility and degradation.

The fourth dimension of the challenge is to stimulate social inclusion of the people at risk of exclusion

It is useful to underline that poverty is intended in the definition of *lack of capacity* which is not strictly related to the lack of income. The quality of the urban space does not depend only on the number of infrastructures and services but on the relationships established between the material city and people who live in it and on concrete opportunities that the city offers to the people about "living" the city.

As a general remark, it is necessary to underline that the Co-City project aims to contribute to alleviate, but does not aspire to structurally solve, the above-mentioned urban issues considering its time and resources limitations.

b. The areas of interventions of the Theory of Change and the outcome chain

The outcome chain aims to articulate the different results necessary to achieve the project's desired impact.

The long-term impact identified is to experiment tools that can help the city to find solution to the self-reinforcing circle of poverty, social segregation in deprived neighborhoods and lack of participation.

In order to achieve this expected result, the project encourages the generation of different changes both in technical/administrative and relational/participative sphere. In this paragraph they are kept separate for schematic purposes but they have to be considered as mutually reinforcing and interrelated, as it will be shown in the graph of the outcome chain.

Four outcomes have been identified that reflect the previously identified four challenges of the project:

- 1) Legal – administrative dimension: The first intermediate benefit that the project is aiming to produce is related to the *production of a new paradigm of collaborative administration based on increased mutual trust between citizens and the urban authority*. Starting from the adoption of the Regulation on Urban commons, a new normative basis is developed that affects the functions and the attitudes of the public officials in relations to the urban commons and the active citizens requests/instances. This will, in turn, have an impact on the exchange, cooperation and the definition of the roles of the participants in the shared care of urban spaces.
- 2) Polycentric urban welfare: The spatial and physical polarization is addressed with the investments for the requalification of urban assets and resources that will generate polycentric and collaborative ecosystems for enabling collective action. This will be obtained thanks to the development and start-up of co-management projects in urban commons so as to test collaborative and innovative forms of *polycentric Commons based urban welfare*. This outcome is strictly intertwined with the following one: the tangible urban goods, through a participative and collaborative procedure, are acknowledged to be *functional to the individual and collective wellbeing* by the citizens and the public administration. This assumes that the spatial dimension inevitably influences the quality of citizens daily life and their forms of interaction and sharing.
- 3) Generative communities: Citizens will be identified, activated and enabled to develop ideas into sustainable social innovation practices, pilot projects and services to be developed in urban commons. Their knowledge, relations, resources, energies and skills will be channeled for the creation of *"generative communities" for the co-production of urban welfare services*. The result is strictly linked to the previous one as they share the complementary objective to create a collaborative ecosystem based on the urban commons. The citizens activation towards a common is necessary to the existence of the common as such.
- 4) Social inclusion: The last outcome of the project has a specific focus on the inclusion of the citizens in needs as *agents of change* within the different actions of the project. They will be integrated and involved in the projects activated in urban commons. This will be strictly related to the City structured Social Services in a view of complementarity with the urban regeneration policies: the protection and preservation of public spaces and local services seen as urban common goods has direct positive implication for social inclusion.

In *Annex 1* we illustrate hierarchically the logical causal relationship of the outcomes and the intermediate outcomes (Outcome chain) that bring the ultimate goal of the Co-City project. It is constructed by working backwards from the four project outcomes asking what needs to change for them to occur and constructing the dependencies between them. Each arrow represents a causal (*if-then*) relation between two outcomes and an assumption about the change process.

c. The action plan

The following step is to reconstruct the what the project “does” and how it is supposed to work in theory by identifying the connections between the outcomes, outputs and activities. This will be compared with how it actually works to determine the extent to which the project is implemented consistently with its theory. In *Annex 2* is illustrated the theory underlying the Theory of action of the project

5) Determining what needs to be evaluated

The project’s ToC represents the theoretical-conceptual framework on which the measurement system of the results of the project is based. Providing a full picture of the project underlying change theory is the basis to identify the information that we need to track and analyze to monitor and evaluate the change process as it evolves, and to learn about assumptions for improvement.

From the action plan we identify critical areas of inquiries for each level of the project (activities, outputs, outcomes and impact) that are relevant to understanding key aspects of the change pathway. An area of inquiry is a part of the project’s change map that (1)concerns a specific outcome/output or activity that we need to learn more about because they are critical to the change process; (2)we need to understand in order to know how, why and for whom a situation is actually changing; (3)we know least about the dynamics and actors involved; (4)concerns assumptions with a high risk of being invalid.

The table below illustrates the areas of inquiry of the Co-City evaluation.

ACTIVITIES	OUTPUTS	INTERMEDIATE OUTCOMES / RESULTS	OUTCOMES
Did the public officers and the active citizens participate to the training on the legal framework?	Did the public officers and the active citizens acquire the skills for using the new legal framework?	Are the public officers having a collaborative and flexible attitude in the communication with citizens? Are the citizens perceiving the collaborative and flexible attitude of the public officers in the communication with them?	Has a new collaborative paradigm been generated in the public administration? Is the trust increased towards the public administration?
Were ideas collected from citizens?	Could the ideas collected be presented to the urban authority via the public call?	Are the public officers considering themselves as enabler and partners with the citizens?	Do citizens’ feel that they are part of a generative community?

		Are the citizens considering the Urban authority a partner / enabler?	Are the urban welfare services co-produced?
Were the scope of the projects and the party's responsibilities identified?	Were the pacts of collaboration underwritten?	Were the urban welfare services collaboratively designed?	Are commons becoming centers of urban welfare? Is a polycentric system of commons implemented?
Did the coaching for active citizens take place?	Were the projects / project proposals fine-tuned with other technical aspects?	Is the collaborative dialogue between the active citizens and the public administration institutionalized?	Did citizens in need become agents of change?
Was the system for sustainable collaborative management identified?	Was the distributed ledger based social market and the georeferenced social network tested on urban commons?	Are the project activated in the commons sustainable?	
Were the online tools developed?	Were the investments successfully implemented?	Do the citizens feel that their actions are actively contributing to the urban welfare?	
Are the call for tenders for investment and purchase of equipment launched?	Did the citizens in need reinforce their life skills?	Are citizens in need perceived to be contributing to the community change?	
Did the active citizens participate to the self-maintenance and self-building workshops?			
Were citizens in need intercepted by the co-city social workers and integrated in activities addressing their social exclusion?			

At this stage of the analysis, and in order not to highly complicate this initial phase of the evaluation, it is not useful to include the long-term impact within the inquiry areas.

6) Indicators

In line with the evaluation questions described below, we have identified two different types of indicators: output and outcome.

The first are quantitative indicators inquiring the process (first two columns in the evaluation questions' table). They are easier to recognize and to measure as they indicate whether activities have taken place by considering the outputs (products and services) produced as a result of activities. Below the list output indicators for the Co-City project.

OUTPUT	ACTIVITIES	INDICATOR	SOURCE OF VERIFICATION
O1. The public officers and the active citizens have the skills for using the new legal framework	A.4.2 Legal framework experimentation (Legal Toolkit) and training for active citizens and public officers	Number of public officers to the training on the legal framework Number / variety of functions of participants to the training on the legal framework	Training attendance lists
O2. Active citizens' ideas are operationalized into project proposals and are presented to the urban authority via a public call	A.5.1, A.5.2 Community building: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Engagement of active citizens Collection of ideas Collaborative project teams 	Number of citizens participating to the presentation events Number of proposals received from active citizens	Proposals presented Neighborhood houses databases Email archives
O3. The urban authority and the active citizens underwrite and sign the contracts (pacts of collaboration)	A.6.1 Underwriting preliminary texts of the contracts (pacts of collaboration) outlining: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the scope of the projects the party's responsibilities 	Number of pacts of collaborations signed Number of local subjects (associations, groups, etc.) supported in the definition of collaboration proposals Number of citizens involved	Co-design meetings reports Pacts of collaborations texts

		<p>Number of municipality sectors involved in the signature of the pacts of collaborations</p> <p>Number of co-design meetings</p>	
<p>O4. Implementation plan of projects fine-tuned with the technical and economic resources, the expertise and the needs of the territory, the possible synergies</p>	<p>A.6.4 Coaching for active citizens on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strategy and organization • Attracting finance • Social innovative sustainable models design • Legal issues <p>A.4.3 Definition of a coherent system of sustainable collaborative management</p>	<p>Number of coaching sessions activated for the fine-tuning of projects proposals</p> <p>Number of citizens involved in the coaching sessions</p> <p>Number of sustainability plans identified</p>	<p>Coaching attendance lists</p> <p>Coaching topics</p> <p>Coaching results</p>
<p>O5. Distributed ledger based social market and georeferenced social network tested on urban commons</p>	<p>A.4.1, A.6.5 Development of participative online tools:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FirstLife georeferenced social network • Distributed ledger based social market design and experimentation 	<p>Number of subscriptions to the platform</p> <p>Number of urban commons mapped</p> <p>Number of interactions</p>	<p>Social networks (FirstLife and Blockchain) statistics</p>
<p>O6. The urban authority implements investments and purchases for urban commons</p>	<p>A.7.1, A.7.2 Preparation and production of the documentation for public investments for Pilot projects and purchase of equipment</p> <p>A.6.3 Self-maintenance and self-building workshops for active citizens</p>	<p>Number of investments done on public buildings</p> <p>Number of pieces of equipment purchased for the active citizens</p> <p>Number of people participating in the self-maintenance and self-building workshop activity</p>	<p>Investments tenders</p> <p>Investments completed</p> <p>Equipment tenders</p> <p>Equipment purchased list</p> <p>Workshop's attendance list</p>
<p>O7. Citizens in need are reinforcing their life skills</p>	<p>A.6.2 Citizens in need are intercepted by social workers and specific</p>	<p>Number of citizens in need intercepted</p>	<p>Social workers reports</p>

	activities for their integration are designed organized and managed	Number of citizens in need involved in the activities, city collaborative welfare services and pacts of collaborations	
--	---	--	--

The second are qualitative indicators and are inquiring the outcomes (last two columns of the evaluation questions' table). They are focusing mainly on the changes affecting the stakeholders' judgements and perceptions in a subjective perspective and need more than one source of verification (i.e. point of view) to be correctly compared between them (see paragraph 8 – The Stakeholders of Co-City).

These indicators have been agreed with UJA in

INTERMEDIATE OUTCOME / RESULT	INDICATOR	SOURCE OF VERIFICATION
R1. Public officers are able to communicate with citizens in a collaborative, flexible and non-formalist way	Indicator 1: Percentage of public officers' that feel they moved to a collaborative and flexible attitude in the communication	- Observation of co-design meetings - analysis of co-design meetings report - interviews / questionnaires with public officers involved in the project
	Indicator 2: Percentage of citizens and associations that feel the change to a collaborative and flexible attitude of the public officers in the communication with them	- Observation of co-design meetings - analysis of co-design meetings reports - interviews / questionnaires with citizens involved in the project - interviews / questionnaires with associations involved in the project
R2. The urban authority becomes an ENABLER and a PARTNER	Indicator 3: Percentage of public officers' feeling that the public authority is a partner and an enabler for citizens and associations	- Observation of co-design meetings - analysis of co-design meetings reports - interviews / questionnaires with public officers involved in the project
	Indicator 4: Percentage of citizens and associations feeling the public	- Observation of co-design meetings - analysis of co-design meetings reports

	authority as a partner and an enabler	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - interviews / questionnaires with citizens involved in the project - interviews / questionnaires with associations involved in the project
R3. Active citizens and the urban authority CO-DESIGN the urban welfare services	Indicator 5: Percentage of citizens and associations feeling that the projects proposals presented have been positively discussed and changed in collaboration with the public administration	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Observation of co-design meetings - analysis of the change in the project proposals during the co-design phase - analysis of co-design meetings reports - interviews / questionnaires with citizens involved in the project - interviews / questionnaires with associations involved in the project - interviews / questionnaires with neighborhood houses operators
R4. Active citizens and the urban authority CO-MANAGE the urban commons	Indicator 6: Percentage of citizens and associations feeling the collective fruition of urban commons to be with increasing characteristics of inclusiveness and integration	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - analysis of the project proposals - analysis of the pacts of collaboration - interviews / questionnaires with citizens involved in the project - interviews / questionnaires with associations involved in the project - interviews / questionnaires with neighborhood houses operators
R5. Sustainable urban welfare services co-production in urban commons	Indicator 7: Percentage of citizens and associations feeling to have enough resources, competences and skills to make the project sustainable	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - analysis of the project proposals - analysis of the pacts of collaboration - interviews / questionnaires with citizens involved in the project - interviews / questionnaires with associations involved in the project
R6. Citizens that feel that their actions are actively contributing to the urban welfare	Indicator 8: Percentage of citizens and associations feeling that their actions are actively contributing to the urban welfare	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - interviews / questionnaires with citizens involved in the project - interviews / questionnaires with associations involved in the project
R7. Citizens in need are recognized as part of the community change	Indicator 9: Percentage of citizens in need involved in the project that are integrated in the city collaborative welfare services and pacts of collaborations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - analysis of social workers reports - social workers periodic coordination and reporting meetings - interviews / questionnaires with social workers

Quantitative indicators alone cannot return a full picture of the intervention of the project. Co-City has an articulated intervention that involves multiple stakeholders and needs the development of indicators that will investigate deeply the stakeholders' point of view. Qualitative indicators are more research questions: The type of questions being answered are different and allow for a deeper understanding of the situation with greater insight into why and how something is the way it is.

7) Data collection: monitoring and evaluation

The collection and measurement of the data will take place according to the two principles and processes of monitoring and evaluation.

Monitoring is a continuous process that uses systematic collections of data on specified indicators to provide information on the extent of progress and achievements that have been reached by an intervention.

The monitoring activity that focuses on the collection of data on the progress of activities and outputs, is based on:

- Periodic planning based on a monitoring plan referring to activities and outputs that are planned to be delivered in a certain reference period
- Milestone review: intermediate checks on states of progress that are instrumental in completing the planned activity and relative to a certain point of time
- Periodic collection of data for output indicators (quantitative)

The data collection for outcome (qualitative) indicators foresees three types of engagements with the stakeholders identified:

- Collection of simple qualitative data: surveys providing information on what happened as a result of interventions
- Interviews and focus groups with representatives of the stakeholders that can inform on experiences and perceptions
- Storytelling, case studies and anecdotal evidence that can provide additional context information to be used to assess and illustrate the real contribution of the intervention and possible best practices

The data collected during this process will be collected and used for the final evaluation of the Co-City project that will assess the efficiency, the effectiveness, the impact, the sustainability and relevance of a project in the context of the intervention logic and outcomes identified in the present report.

8) The stakeholders of Co-City

With his paragraph, we are zooming in on the changes of behaviors and relationships of the stakeholders that the Co-City project wants to achieve during its implementation period. For each stakeholder we will identify:

- Who they are and the numbers involved in the project

- How each stakeholder is involved
- A description of the area where the change is expected and the project outcome that is affected

Stakeholders are central elements of the analysis because (1) they determine the focus of the qualitative evaluation and locate the project activities; (2) The monitoring and evaluation priorities formulated are largely affected by the changes that the project is having on different stakeholders.

Here stakeholders are defined as people, organizations or entities that experience change, whether positive or negative, as a result of the activity that is being analyzed. Such change will be explored for each of them from their perspective and will be measured, valued and recorded to assess the outcomes of the general project outcomes.

This assessment has identified and isolated direct and indirect stakeholders affected by the Co-City project. It is worth distinguishing direct and indirect stakeholders. The first are those directly associated and interact with the Co-City project and its impacts and the latter are not involved in the steps of the project implementation but have a relation with it.

Public officers

Who are they: Turin Municipality employees. In particular:

- 1) The Working group involved in the selection of proposals
- 2) Officers in the decentralized levels (8 districts)
- 3) Municipality technicians working in the co-design phase and in the formal definition of the Pacts of Collaboration

Reason for their involvement: The City's staff is involved in the Co-City project in different implementation moments and at different levels. They are actively engaged during the co-design phase and the preparation and signature of the pacts of collaboration. In this analysis, we included the elected leaders only at district level as they are more locally involved in the implementation of the project.

Area of Change: Public officers are assumed to have an interest in strengthening trust and legitimacy in the public sector and to become more responsive towards the citizens' engagement process. During the implementation of the project they are experiencing direct involvement in the co-design of services with citizens. This will lead them to understand that citizens can become a source of ideas for city solutions and that the new legal framework can be the enabling structure for the new relationship of collaboration and for a collaborative, flexible and non-formalist communication.

Related outcome: Generation of a new paradigm of collaborative administration between citizens and the urban authority.

Active citizens

Who are they: Active citizens are considered as individuals capable of taking initiatives in areas of public concerns according to their beliefs and ideas. Those included in the analysis are all the citizens involved in the presentation of the proposals, also those that have not been admitted in the co-design phase.

Reason for their involvement: active citizens are at the core of Co-City implementation with their firsthand and differentiated knowledge and perception of the socio-spatial polarization in the urban context. With the response to the Co-City call they express the need of involvement (with different degrees) for the solution of collective problems. A reflection on single citizens separated from group actions is necessary to isolate the change of the Co-City project on individual activation dynamics.

Area of Change: The change that will be taken into consideration is referring to the characteristics of single citizens' engagement and how this has been affected by the project. They will gradually pass from a condition of suffering from the obligations imposed by the public administration to becoming aware of their individual social responsibility. From claiming resources and solutions to realizing that they can offer knowledge, skills, resources to the public administration. Citizens will feel invested with power and this will provide answers to collective problems with individual behavior in everyday life.

Related outcome: Generation of a new paradigm of collaborative administration between citizens and the urban authority; Generative communities for the co-production of urban welfare services.

Subjects of active citizenship (informal groups, associations, committees, third sector organizations)

Who are they: Group of citizens (also informal) linked by a common interest and an organized collective activity. Those included in the analysis are all the subjects of active citizenship involved in the presentation of the proposals, also those that have not been admitted in the co-design phase.

Reason for their involvement: Like active citizens, the subjects of active citizenship are at the core of the implementation of the Co-City project. As citizens' groups with defined objectives, interests and ties, their role in the project as aggregators of single instances has a separate meaning from the individual activation.

Area of Change: The change to be investigated here is referring to the strengthening of (1) their role of mediation in the interaction between the active citizens and the urban authority; (2) the leadership, coordination and orientation function of single citizens' interests; (3) the planning and management capacity that they are able to express through both stable and organized action and daily practice and (4) their capacity of cross-fertilization of different actions to construct partnerships between projects.

Related outcome: Generative communities for the co-production of urban welfare services; polycentric commons based urban welfare.

Neighborhood houses

Who are they: The 8 neighborhood houses located in each Turin district and the network of the neighborhood houses as the cooperation framework between them. For this analysis, it will be considered specifically the impact of the Co-City 8 local contact points.

Reason for their involvement: The neighborhood houses are both a partner and a stakeholder of the Co-City project due their multifaceted and polyhedral nature. Each house

has different characteristics, services and audiences. The Co-City project is implemented in a crucial moment for the houses and their network development.

Area of Change: neighborhood houses are expected to be impacted by the Co-City project in three different ways:

- (1) definition of a collaborative relationship with the public administration (both at district and municipality level)
- (2) enhancement of interactions with other different actors in the area, both public (eg. schools, universities, services and departments of the Municipality) and private (eg. local associations and foundations, cooperatives, religious bodies, chambers of commerce)
- (3) enhancement of the relation and the exchanges between the different neighborhood houses within the network.
- (4) costituire una rete policentrica di comunità generative e di spazi di co-progettazione riferiti alle “Case del Quartiere” in grado di dare continuità al progetto e di diventare un nuovo modello di fiducia reciproca tra cittadini e amministrazione locale.

Related outcome: Generative communities for the co-production of urban welfare services; polycentric commons based urban welfare.

Social workers

Who are they: social workers and educators working closely with the social workers hired by the Co-City project (n.4 cultural mediators and n.3 socio-educational instructors) working on the inclusion of citizens in need.

Reason for their involvement: during the implementation the project underwent a content major change that allowed for the redefinition of the Activity 6.2 which addressed citizens in need. It has therefore been necessary to identify the social workers and educators as a new stakeholder that will assess indirectly the change of the project on vulnerable individuals.

Area of Change: the citizens in need are expected to be integrated in the city collaborative social services and pacts of collaboration

Related outcome: citizens in need become agents of change

The change in the related policy domain: indirect stakeholders

Special attention during the evaluation will be kept on the possible and indirect impact of Co-City on the urban policies and actions that are taking place during and after the implementation of the project.

It will be considered as a general reflection on the role and contribution of the project to the larger change process on other urban initiatives that have a longer implementation timeline. Considering the highly unpredictable impact that the Co-City project, a qualitative analysis will be conducted with interviews with representatives of the main urban initiatives that are intercepted by the priorities of the Co-City project.

9) Conclusions

The framework presented in this report will be applied to the evaluation of the Co-City project. The analysis will be conducted during 2019 with the collection of the data and the involvement of the stakeholders.

The final report is expected to be a full assessment of the impact of the Co-City project with recommendations on the continuation of the activities within the framework initiated by Co-City.

Annex II: The Theory of Action

