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0. Preface: central problem and structure of the thesis

This research focuses on the abandonment and underutilisation of property, including assets in urban environments. Buildings and lands are unused for a variety of different reasons, but such disuse has two direct and straightforward effects: (i) it leads to negative externalities in the surrounding areas, and (ii) it negatively affects individuals’ perception of an area.

This research considers only unused buildings\(^1\), particularly in Italy.

In Italy, the number of buildings that have fallen into disuse, in general terms, is vast\(^2\). Overall, all publicly owned buildings constitute approximately 1.2 million units (Ministero dell’Economia e delle Finanze, MEF, 2019). They belong to different ‘public domains’\(^3\), including territorial agencies (states, regions, provinces, and municipalities). The estimated

\(^1\) The discussion about land is deliberately not considered in this research because the issue of unused buildings might lead to different outcomes in terms of regulations, ethical implications and potential policy-guidelines.

\(^2\) Recent reports put the number of buildings (public and private) in this condition at around 2 million units. This data is an estimation based on three reports that have analysed privately owned buildings (ISTAT, 2014; Agenzia delle Entrate, 2017 and Centro Studi Casa Ambiente e Territorio of Assoedilizia, 2009) and one report that analyses publicly owned assets (MEF, 2019). This discussion about public and private buildings is extensively discussed in Moroni et al. (2020b).

\(^3\) There are, in fact, different agencies that are considered public. In some cases, ‘public property’ is an umbrella term. For example, MEF reports divide public properties into different categories: territorial agencies (State, Regions, Provinces, municipalities, and mountain communities), Chamber of Commerce, Health Services and Social Services, Universities, Social Housing, and Automobile Club Italia (acronym ACI). Furthermore, this research does not consider the mafia’s seized assets, as they are private properties that, once they are confiscated, become part of the public portfolio (see article n. 45 of the Legislative Decree no. 159, approved in 2011).
value of unused publicly owned buildings in Italy is around 12.2 billion euros, and they cover a total surface area of 20 million square meters (MEF, 2019) ⁴.

This research critically discusses unused buildings in Italy owned by the public sector. This is because they raise very specific questions and issues about management and regulations. The thesis also pays specific attention to some new initiatives of revitalisation, often raised from the bottom up.

Section 1 elucidates the issue of abandonment and disuse in general terms. It also presents the research question, the contemporary situation, and how to critically deal with this issue in political and urban debates. Also, it describes the approach and methodology of the research. Section 2 illustrates the Italian context, particularly the normative, the social-economic situation and the new tendency toward revitalisation processes. Section 3 provides a sample analysis to discuss these new ‘civic’ experiences to promote the revitalisation of unused buildings. The case studies provide a general overview of this phenomenon. Section 4 analyses the similarities and dissimilarities of the cases, with specific attention to the conditions fostering these practices. Section 5 discusses the policy guidelines, conditions, and limits for these experiences to occur.

⁴ Fondazione CRC (2019) highlights that 70% of this portfolio (both lands and buildings) is dismissed and abandoned and the share of these assets that are eventually in good state of maintenance and that might be appealing for the market is just 15% (p. 15).
1. Introduction: research gaps, research question, approach and methodology

Unused buildings and lands raise issues that are frequently discussed with alarmist tones. Through the years, the problems have become more urgent in political and urban agendas. That is clear from analysing how academics have dealt with the phenomenon, as they consider diverse causes and potential consequences (Caramaschi and Chiodelli, 2020). In the contemporary debate, this topic is associated with policies for renovation and re-use.

This section introduces the complex problem of disuse, with specific reference to buildings. It considers (i) definitory issues, (ii) causes and consequences, and (iii) property rights (see §1.1.1.). The last topic opens up to a challenging condition, specifically for Italy: the unused properties owned by the public sector.

This section also considers a new set of bottom-up and site-specific citizens activities with an exploratory description and analysis of these practices (§ 1.1.2.). On this background, this section will present the research question this thesis addresses (§ 1.2.); and, finally, it presents the research approach and the methodology applied in this investigation (§ 1.4. and § 1.5.).

---

5 See the Glossary in the Appendix. The term unused in this thesis is an umbrella term comprising different categories (e.g. abandoned, and empty).
1.1. Background issues

There have always been unused buildings and lands. What is different is how the issues they raise relate to different factors. Throughout the last century, many debates provided diverse perspectives either about the cause of other phenomenon or as a matter that needs an answer (Németh and Langhorst, 2014). The process of disuse, and in particular of abandonment, has often been seen as a ‘symptom’ rather than a cause of urban disinvestment (Accordino and Johnson, 2000; Cohen, 2001).

Although property abandonment is considered more urgent in political and urban agendas, the debate is not univocal. As highlighted by Pagano and Bowman (2000, p. 2), regulations and management of vacant and abandoned properties “has often resulted in short-term fixes rather than long-term solutions”.

This research considers unused buildings. Scholars have often considered unused public and private properties as pertaining to the same phenomenon. That is true if the discussion is about (i) consequences; however, there are some important divergencies considering (ii) the kind of property and (iii) policies (in this regard, see Moroni et al., 2020a; 2020b).

---

6 However, some scholars emphasise the fact that this disuse might (i) depend on urban reconstruction or (ii) result from urban growth (Kivell, 1993, p. 158). This phenomenon is argued and discussed by academics (i) as evidence of urban shrinkage (Hollander et al., 2009; Hollander, 2009), (ii) as an indicator of real-estate market boom and bust (Accordino and Johnson, 2000; Hollander et al., 2018) (iii) as an opportunity for smart growth and re-use (Schilling, 2002; Schilling and Logan, 2008; in regards to land, see Pagano and Bowman, 2000, p. 2).

7 Compare with Alexander and Powell (2011): they stress the lack of effective tools provided by local government, which leads to potentially serious consequences.

8 The term unused considers buildings that are ‘empty’ or, even, ‘abandoned’. The question that public buildings are unused is a problem per se (see § 1.1.1.).
1.1.1. The overlooked problem of unused public assets

With respect to consequences, the debate about unused assets is quite common and shared. Also, as mentioned before, the consequences are similar for both private and public properties. Some scholars consider this phenomenon as a kind of *nuisance* (Mallach, 2006, p. 2; compare with Ellickson, 1996, p. 1175)⁹. There are at least two distinctive elements that define *nuisances*. The first is the direct impact on *behaviour*; the second is the impact on the *urban and economic context*.

Some authors consider them part of the same phenomenon as, for example, described by Wilson and Kelling (1982) as the ‘broken window syndrome’¹⁰. This kind of behaviour might be a symptom of urban and social disorganisation and weakness, which “encourage other users of the same space to misbehave.” (Ellickson, 1996, p. 1177)¹¹. Nevertheless, there is no direct and deterministic connection between individuals’ behaviour and the condition of the built environment¹².

---

⁹ Compare with Ellickson (1993) who states that abandoned assets might create a certain type of negative externalities.

¹⁰ They explain that if a window in a building is broken and is left unrepaired, all the rest of the windows will soon be broken. Compare with Ellickson (1996, p. 1171) “Passerby, sensing this diminished control, become prone to committing additional, perhaps more serious, criminal acts. […] unchecked street misconduct thus has a multiplier effects”; compare with Hirokawa and Gonzalez (2010, p. 628): “[…] As explained by the ‘broken window’ syndrome, deterioration on vacant and abandoned properties is less likely to be repaired, essentially serving as an advertisement that there is neither local control nor consequences for bad acts. The theory also suggests that broken windows are associated with increased fear and weakened community confidence in affected neighbourhoods.”

¹¹ Ellickson (1996, p. 1177) defines ‘situation of disorders’ the one characterised by “unchecked street misconduct, like un-erased graffiti and unremoved litter, signals a lack of social control”.

¹² The ‘broken window syndrome’ can provoke a kind of disorder in residents’ perception of the built environment (Curtis, 2010, p. 146). Compare with Skogan (1986). He considers the ‘fear of crime’ as a potential cause of abandonment and as individuals’ influence that “stimulated a withdrawal from the community […] and stimulates further delinquency” (p. 204). Compare with Skogan (1989, p. 438) “crime also may erode the social bases for collective action” and Skogan (2015) who discussed disorganisation and misbehaviour arguing that these situations influence norms that “prescribe how people should behave in relation to their neighbours or while passing through a community” (p. 465) and he sets a list of ‘indicators of social disorder’ that might affect both environment and neighbours.
However, this phenomenon suggests that an unused asset might influence people’s behaviour: either to ‘fear’ those assets or misbehave. Schilling (2004) considers vacant and abandoned properties as costs for the community. Recent studies have highlighted how a higher rate of disused properties (i) might lead to individuals’ risk of assault or similar violence (Branas et al., 2012) and (ii) might directly affect social capital (Nassauer and Raskin, 2014).

The second set of externalities depend mainly on the ‘broken window syndrome’, and the tendency to misbehave. They include the social and economic context, particularly the neighbourhood and the real estate market. In general terms, abandonment and disuse affect the real estate market, and highlight government inefficiency (Alexander and Powell, 2011, pp. 1-2).

Some scholars argue that disuse might be considered as (i) a ‘structural’ problem (Cameron et al., 1988, pp. 119-120), derived from post-industrialisation processes (which could be carried out only with structural changes); or (ii) a symptom of market failure, considered as part of a cycle of decline in aggregate demand for goods and services (Couch, 1990, p. 69); or (iii) a frictional issue, related to time lags in redevelopment and slow decision-making procedures (Couch, 1990, p. 70).

---

13 See also Spelman (1993). In his paper he argues that abandoned buildings might lead to unwanted outcomes, such as events of criminality, in particular there is “evidence of illegal use by prostitutes, drug dealers, property criminals, and others” (p. 481). Compare with Kraut (1999 p. 1141) who considers vacant and abandoned buildings as (i) a problem of crime, that detracts cohesiveness of a residential or commercial environment, and as (ii) a problem for citizens’ health.

14 Nassauer and Raskin (2014) state that vacant areas might build social bonding to maintain and beautify their landscape but, on the other hand, individuals might consider themselves in isolation and they might perceive the area as dangerous.

15 According to Accordino and Johnson (2000, p. 303), abandoned and vacant properties might affect and lower the value of other nearby properties (compare with Kim et al., 2020). This influences individuals’ perception of the neighbourhood and affects their choices and the potential viability for building’s redevelopment (Goldstein et al. 2001, p. 13).

16 Compare with Kraut (1999, p. 1155) in which the market failure is expressed by the free-ride behaviour that might be adopted by individuals. In particular “each owner will delay investment for fear that nearby vacant properties will jeopardize any improvements or will attempt to free ride on improvements made by others. Either strategy, if adopted by
In contrast with this perspective, other scholars consider disuse (but not abandonment) a positive factor. They argue that a certain vacancy level is not an indicator of market failure but a necessity for a dynamic market (Kivell, 1993, p. 163)\(^\text{17}\). In general, this temporary condition might depend on two elements, explicitly related to individuals’ behaviour: either for speculative reasons (Couch, 1990 compare with Evans 2004)\(^\text{18}\), or because of owners’ irresponsibility\(^\text{19}\).

Although there are some dissimilarities, the debate considers this phenomenon of disuse a complex issue. There is a common assumption that the private sector and owners are the ones mainly responsible for disuse. Frequently, this judgment is made a priori depending upon (i) private owners’ misbehaviour or ‘other interests’, as discussed above (see also Kraut, 1999, p. 1152), and (ii) the range of measures governments might take to overcome this issue.

The fact that unused assets might belong to public agencies is often not considered, as they are discussed mainly concerning the private sphere\(^\text{20}\). This raises different issues about (i)

---

\(^\text{17}\) See also Evans and Hartwich (2005, p. 33): a ‘valid’ degree of vacancy is fundamental “to allow for movement between properties to occur and to allow the market to function”.

\(^\text{18}\) As highlighted by Couch (1990 p. 70), the property might remain temporarily vacant, and the owner would carry out the cost of vacancy for a potential upswing demand in the near future. Evans (2004, p. 77) stresses that “land owners will always try to ensure that their property is used to obtain the greatest possible current income”. For this reason, “an owner of land may deliberately choose to accept a lower income from the site than might be available” (p. 78).

\(^\text{19}\) In this regard, see Samsa (2008, p. 190), who consider responsibilities once the owner “fails to perform the basic responsibilities of property ownership” (compare with Mallach, 2006, p. 1: “An abandoned property is a property whose owner has stopped carrying out at least one of the significant responsibilities of property ownership, as a result of which property is vacant or likely to become vacant in the immediate future”. The kind of responsibilities are, for example (i) paying taxes and municipal charges, (ii) maintaining the property in conformity with relevant codes and ordinances, and (iii) keeping it from becoming a nuisance to the community). Two significant types of responsibility for an owner are (i) to keep the property in a condition that conforms to local building and house codes, and (ii) to minimal upkeep the property (Samsa, 2008, p. 194).

\(^\text{20}\) All the discussion about consequences refers to discussion about private properties. As already mentioned, consequences and externalities might be related also to public properties. For what concerns other kind of arguments, public properties lead to other debates.
ethical concerns and (ii) policies. Governments are the owners of specific portfolios, and parts of them might be underused, unused, or even abandoned. This situation has not received much attention (Tanzi and Prakash, 2000, p. 3).

This is crucial, because the responsibilities of governments for the disuse of assets are related both to private property and also to their assets, the publicly owned ones. In some cases, parts of this portfolio (managed by the public sector through taxes) might be unused: vacant (empty), or even abandoned.

There are different reasons publicly owned assets are left unused. Often this is ascribed to public inefficiency (Tanzi and Prakash, 2000, p. 1). That might be related to ‘external phenomena’ contributing to inefficiency such as difficulties implementing structural enhanced and broad policies and, more generally, and the lack of trust in and credibility of government bodies (Vermiglio, 2011, p. 426). Table 1 presents a general overview of the citizens’ trust in political bodies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Trust on the Italian Parliament</th>
<th>Trust on Italian political parties</th>
<th>Voter Turnout (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>3.8/10 (2018 datum)</td>
<td>2.7/10 (2018 datum)</td>
<td>56.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>3.4/10 (2017 datum)</td>
<td>2.4/10 (2017 datum)</td>
<td>58.7% (2014 datum)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>3.7/10 (2016 datum)</td>
<td>2.5/10 (2016 datum)</td>
<td>58.7% (2014 datum)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Analysis of indicators elaborated by BES (2017, 2018 and 2019). Rielaboration by the author.

21 In particular, the management of these assets is relatively new for public agencies (Kaganova and Amoils, 2020, pp. 239-240)
22 What is discussed is the role of governments in relation to vacant and abandoned buildings’ management. It is acknowledged that governments have the responsibility to ‘correct’ private owners from abandoning their assets, and to ‘prevent’ vacancy and disuse. Governments must intervene when abandonment and vacancy become a public nuisance or a public interest issue (Smith, 2014; Samsa, 2008). Hirokawa and Gonzalez (2010, p. 629) underscore that governments face a ‘Hobson's choice’: either to ignore the problem of vacancy or to allocate law enforcement. For Hirokawa and Gonzalez (2010, p. 628) the second option in some areas might be unaffordable, mainly because of the high price of the management (Schilling, 2008, pp. 110-111).
23 As highlighted by Ellickson (1993, p. 1358), “these ‘free spaces’ include services and facilities that governments provide to make people able to use them for spontaneous gathering”. Tanzi and Prakash (2000, p. 3) stress that governments “not only use tax or borrowed money to provide services to their citizens but also the assets they own”.

---
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In this view, the public sector has a lack of incentives so it either wastes its resources (with specific reference to Italy, see also Vermiglio, 2011, p. 426), or considers them as a property and not as a portfolio, able to serve public purposes better (Kaganova and Nayyar-Stone, 2000; p. 307).

Governments, in fact, might not consider their assets from the perspective of opportunity costs (Tanzi and Prakash, 2000, p. 4)\textsuperscript{24}. This is a symptom of public inefficiency and a waste of resources. One significant waste in the public sector is the misuse of assets\textsuperscript{25}. This might happen “either because some are not used at all or, if used, they are put to unproductive uses” (Tanzi and Prakash, 2000, p. 3)\textsuperscript{26}, or because they do not use the potential revenues derived from these assets (Kaganova and Nayyar-Stone, 2000; Kaganova, 1999). On the other hand, public buildings might be unused for speculative reasons, as it happens in the private sector (Evans, 2004, p. 83).

Unused public properties, either because of inefficiency or for speculative reasons, are a problem in themselves. The ethical issues are not the same as those for private buildings (Bellè, 2020; Moroni et al., 2020a; 2020b) precisely because the property is ‘public’. There are two key points here. First, unused public buildings are a waste of (public) capital that

\textsuperscript{24} One example is presented by Tanzi and Prakash (2000, p. 4) while discussing opportunity cost and waste of public resources, and it is the case of a public school facing the seaside in Brazil. The cost of the land is very high, and it has an extremely high market value. The school’s relocation might have a significant influence. On the one hand, because the land in question might be used for other purposes at a higher price. On the other hand, with the revenues, the school might be relocated in a place with less market value, but it would be better for students that will not be distracted by the beach and sea (compare with Kaganova and Nayyar-Stone, 2000, p. 325).

\textsuperscript{25} Compare with Alexander and Powell (2011) that stress the idea that local governments must provide an inventory of these assets, in the first place, and then define solutions and policies to prevent further consequences. This effort implies costs and public expertise.

\textsuperscript{26} Compare with Peterson and Kaganova (2010, p. 5): with specific reference to land, governments have a ‘surplus’ amount of assets that are ‘not required for public service delivery or other public use’ and, for this reason, it might be left empty.
might serve in alternative ways. Second, their condition affects the collective interest directly, threatening the idea of ‘publicness’ 27. As Vermiglio (2011) pointed out, the public sector is the main – but not the only28 – provider of services and facilities. As, underscored by Hayek (1982/2013) the state is a taxis: an organisation that do serve “a purpose of the maker” (p. 37). He discusses the importance of the state and governments in general, because they must use their power to raise funds “to provide a number of services which for various reasons cannot be provided, or cannot be provided adequately, by the market” (p. 383) 29.

This means that management resources must be related to enhancing the public or meeting its needs. Only in this way can performance be considered optimal (compare with Krumm et al., 2000).

27 This idea is frequently ambiguous and it leads to misinterpretations (Schmidt and Németh, 2010). Compare with Louкатou-Sideris and Ehrenfeutch (2009) underscoring the role of the sidewalks and their different functions; Talen (2000), concerning Jane Jacobs’ work, analyses the importance of the parks and their surroundings (see also Schmidt, 2008), giving a set of guidelines to improve proximity and community. Varna and Tiesdell (2010) try to define publicness as a term that is at the intersection of five main elements: property, control, civility, access, and animation. Compare with Németh (2012), who states that public space is ‘conditionally free’ but, on the other hand, the idea of “publicness is always subjected” (p. 3; compare with Smith and Low (2006, p. 3): “the dimension and extent of [a publicly accessible space’s] publicness are highly differentiated from instance to instance” (see also Mitchell, 2003; Németh, 2009).

28 As highlighted by Schmidt and Németh (2010) in the mid-late Twentieth-century public spaces, in general, are not only provided by the public sector. The provision and the management of public space are frequently privatised and the public sector might give incentives and bonuses to private developers in exchange for the provision and management of public spaces (pp. 454-456). See also Németh (2009) discussing privately owned public spaces.

29 In this perspective, the ethical concerns are mainly on taxation and free-ride behaviour. It might happen that most individuals “will reasonably believe that it will take no difference to the result [of the service that is provided] whether they themselves agree to contribute to the cost or not” (1982/2013: p. 383). The coercion of taxation is based on the fact that through an agreement upon the total volume of government’s services, citizens are voting for a particular expenditure and they know they will share the cost (1982/2013, p. 392). Although his perspective is not related to the general discussion about the welfare state, the importance of having a minimum granted by the State is highly important. This is also stressed by Dunleavy and Hood (1994) in discussing the role of the state and the need to its re-organisation. In particular, they highlight four different alternative futures for public sector management, analysing the importance of generalised rules, on the one hand, and of the separation of public and private sectors, on the other. The State here, as opposed to Hayek, is the ‘Minimal Purchasing State’, where the state is considered as an ‘intelligent consumer’ (p. 14). Compare with Hood (1995).
1.1.2. New trends in revitalisation processes

According to the general definition of the public sector’s obligations and duties, the contemporary situation presents some deficiencies in desired outcomes.

Unused public buildings present issues with regard to policies and management interventions. On the one hand, they highlight structural problems in their management; on the other hand, they raise questions about the very nature of being ‘public’. The economic crisis has revealed how traditional planning methods are no longer adequate, and how financial shortage influences private interventions, speculative and strategic intentions, and government policies. Concerning the misuse of public buildings, the lack of incentives (to promote the effective use of the public portfolio) directly affects the use of resources and the social benefits derived from them (Tanzi and Prakash, 2000, p. 3). What is crucial is the potential “income or welfare lost by leaving them unused, or by placing them in much less economically or socially useful activities” (p. 5).

The contemporary Italian context is facing a shift towards new economic, financial and social conditions. The economic crisis has highlighted many issues. First, there was a tendency by public agencies to withdraw themselves from responsibilities related to buildings management (Pacchi and Pirovano, 2013). Second, the private sector is no longer either able or willing to invest on these assets because of (i) the normative framework, and (ii) the very

---

30 As argued by Tajani and Morano (2017, p. 76), the privatisation and alienation of public properties (in general) “has been characterised by a deadlock”.

31 The reasons why the private sector is not well-prepared to invest in public buildings’ revitalisation might depend on the economic crisis. This situation has exacerbated some conditions that were not beneficial even in the first place. The maintenance and redevelopment costs were high and, on the other hand, the procedures were frequently ambiguous and uncertain (Tajani and Morano, 2017, p. 76; with specific reference to the Italian case, see Gaeta and Savoldi, 2013, p. 23; Bellè, 2017). Moreover, lots of auction were desert (Tajani and Morano, 2017) because of the tendency to foster supply-oriented policies without checking the real estate market trends (Micelli and Mangialardo, 2016; Bellè, 2020).
nature of buildings. Consequently, the public portfolio began being considered in a more strategic perspective, able to combine ‘heritage’ and ‘use’. Third, citizens might reclaim marginal, unused spaces and buildings. Here, the concept of citizenship and ‘right to the city’ emerge as elements that must be considered (Staeheli, 2008). What is important to underscore is the role of individuals in the management of unused public buildings. On this line, new ways to consider public portfolio (and buildings in particular) have been emerging in the European contexts.

From this perspective, the idea to consider a new trend of experiences about the renovating and revitalising unused public buildings is twofold. On the one hand, there is a general acknowledgement that some policies and regulations on the management of public buildings must be rethought. On the other, there is a progressive awareness that public spaces (in this case, public buildings) might be considered relevant places, as they are the expression of people’s claim, freedom and rights. After all, this mindset might “provoke particular political

---

32 In fact, the public portfolio is very heterogeneous in terms of: (i) size, (ii) location, (iii) condition of maintenance, and (iv) uses (Tajani and Morano, 2017 p. 75). As already underscored, the private sector prefers to use a ‘waiting attitude’ or invest in other foreign markets (ANCE, 2015).

33 See Tajani and Morano (2017, p. 76), “the enhancement of public buildings must be a synthesis of the traditional passive protection of these assets and their ‘productive’ uses, through modalities compatible with their nature and vocation”. Compare with Kaganova and Telgrasky (2018, p. 144): “Government capital assets came into sharp focus, both conceptually and in practice, as a result of the 2008 global financial crisis. The crisis hit many central and local governments hard, and force them to re-examine their capital assets as part of their search for new savings and revenues”.

34 In general, the idea that society creates the city is quite old (see Lefebvre, 1996; Schmidt and Németh, 2010) as well as the importance of the urban environment in shaping individuals’ behaviour (see Jacobs, 1961). Moreover, the importance of public spaces is related to the fact that people express themselves (Mitchell, 2005, p. 115); compare with Habermas (1989), who defines ‘public sphere’ and public spaces as normative ones, in which all manners of social formations find access. Habermas defines this sphere as ‘a-spatial’ because it is created by relationships and institutions.

35 In fact, the relationship between ‘citizenship’ and community is quite strong. As highlighted by Staeheli (2008), this nexus is very significant because the idea of having a community - that is changing over time – implies to have strong social, economic, and political ties, which means that this evolution is creating ‘citizenship’ in the first instance.
effects aligned with people’s individual or collective interests and demands” (Di Masso, 2012, p. 124)\textsuperscript{36}.

In some cases, as argued by Savini (2016), this new tendency could have two main aims. It might be (i) an excuse for decreasing and narrowing the role of the State\textsuperscript{37} or (ii) a tool for the public sector to give importance to these publicly owned spaces to reconfigure social practices, neighbourhoods and everyday life\textsuperscript{38}. Savini (2018, p. 59) goes on to say that this new attitude emphasises local and contextual solutions with a more direct and active engagement of the community, and, in some cases, the ‘unused space’ could be the trigger for these practices (Ostanel, 2016). As Rauws (2016) argues, the nature of these civic groups is related (i) to their spontaneous functioning which is relatively independent from the government and (ii) their bottom-up and place-based nature. What emerges is a variety of bottom-up and top-down activities that combine social needs with governmental purposes (Cottino and Zeppetella, 2009).

\textsuperscript{36} Di Masso (2010, p. 126) identifies some key-concepts to identify spatially and psychologically ‘public spaces’. First, the ‘place identity’ means people might recognise themselves with patterns of beliefs, feelings and expectations regarding public spaces. Second, the definition and the recognition of people derive from their social category, whose members belong to a specific area. Third, the pattern of behaviour and attitudes based on the perception, the occupation, and the personalisation of the space. Compare with Pennington (2004, p. 214) who argues that This phenomenon of “citizen-based form of urban land use planning” is linked with disillusion in the face of traditional models of urban planning management and governance.

\textsuperscript{37} It is essential to highlight that this kind of initiative is made by different stakeholders that in some ways are “occupying a space in economy and society that is separated from the public and the private sectors” (Chew and Lyon, 2012, p. 3; see also Alcock and Kendall, 2011). Furthermore, these actors position themselves in-between the public and private sectors (Macdonald, 2011).

\textsuperscript{38} These micro-practices put the emphasis both (i) on the relationships between active citizens and the State, and (ii) on the different modalities of urban activation (see Uitemark, 2015; Ostanel and Attili, 2018).
1.2. Research gaps and research questions

It is necessary to consider two elements. The first is the massive number of public buildings that are unused in Italy. This phenomenon has been at the centre of urban and political agenda for the last 30 years. The Italian governments have continuously attempted to organise and manage these estates with poor results. Second, this new trend in Italy and other European countries might be considered an alternative to alienation, disposals and long-term grants.

Some studies combine these two elements with specific reference to temporary uses and the conditions that might favour this kind of practice (Bishop and Williams, 2012; Andres, 2013). Combining temporary uses with creativity and, in particular, creative industries is one way to reconsider unused assets (Stevens, 2018)\(^{39}\). In particular, this idea of temporariness is related to adaptive re-use of unused buildings and lands (Abastante et al. 2021; for the Italian case, see Inti et al., 2014; Tricarico et al., 2020) “in a way that allows the use of spatial resources in a given place and time, or as a response to the current needs of users” (Szaton, 2018, p. 1), with no specific foreseeable demand for development (Blumner, 2006). This new tendency considers bottom-up experiences and temporary uses as a trigger for revitalisation\(^{40}\).

Italy has been selected as the focus of this research for several reasons. First, the after-crisis situation has highlighted how traditional planning models are no longer effective for renovating and regenerating buildings (Micelli and Mangialardo, 2016; Mangialardo and Micelli, 2018a). Second, there have been different attempts to define and promote temporary uses through many public policies (at both the regional and local levels, see Campagnoli and

---

\(^{39}\) Compare with Ferilli et al. (2016a) and Abastante et al. (2021).

\(^{40}\) See in particular Bartoletti and Faccioli (2016) and Ostanel (2016 and 2017).
Tognetti, 2016). Third, in Italy, there has been an exponential increase in associations from 2001 to 2016, with an increase of 46% (Istat, 2020a).

This increase led the Italian government to craft a specific law, Legislative Decree no. 117, for non-profit organisations (called Enti del Terzo Settore, ETS). This law includes their (i) definitions, (ii) obligations and responsibilities and (iii) relationships with public administrations. On this last concern, article 71 of the law is about the non-profit organisations’ support, which includes the free-grant of unused public buildings.

---

41 See, for example, TempoRiuso in Milano; with specific reference to military barracks, see Gastaldi and Camerin (2017) and Camerin and Gastaldi (2018); some other examples have been discussed in Abastante et al. (2021); Compare with § 3.2.

42 In 2016, Law no. 106 was approved aiming to delegate the government in charge, to adopt a new Law for the Third Sector. Article 1 defines ‘Third Sector’ as the category of private agencies that promote social and civic activities in line with the subsidiarity principle and the non-profit nature.

43 It is also expressed the duration of the free-grant depending on the public building’s nature. If it is an ordinary public building, the free-grant might last up to 30 years; on the other hand, if the public building is a heritage building, the free-grant might be extended up to 50 years (art. 71)
In line with this situation, Labsus\textsuperscript{44} has promoted a new code for the enhancement and protection of commons (Regolamento per la Cura dei Beni Comuni). In parallel with other tools, it aims to ‘take care’ of the commons, with particular attention to the urban ones (e.g. gardens, urban furniture, buildings)\textsuperscript{45}.

This research provides a critical overview of the phenomenon of unused public buildings in Italy, and the relationships between public administrations and this new set of stakeholders, defined as ‘civic actors’. Furthermore, it focuses on the normative context in which these experiences arise, and on the composition and attitude of these actors. In this way, it is possible to organise a set of guidelines for policymakers (as well as for the civic actors), and to understand the nature of these activities.

Therefore, the research question is this: could these new experiences be considered a potential process for renovating, re-using and revitalising public buildings in Italy, and if so, what are the conditions and the contextual situations that might favour their thrive?

1.3. Preliminary clarifications

This research focuses on two elements: (i) public buildings, as the object of the revitalisation and (ii) civic actors, as the activators of the revitalisation process. The first

\textsuperscript{44} Labsus, is the acronym for Laboratorio per la Sussidiarietà; it is an organization that promotes civic participation and activation in the light of subsidiary principle (art. 118 of the Italian Constitution). This principle acknowledges the fact that citizens might act for collective interest.

\textsuperscript{45} The idea of commons is defined as ‘goods that are acknowledged as functional to individual and collective’s welfare.’ (art. 1, Regolamento sulla Collaborazione Cittadini e Amministrazione per la Cure e la Rigenerazione dei Beni Comuni Urbani, Bologna, 2014). This category includes material, immaterial and digital assets.
clarification is related to ‘publicly owned buildings’. In Italy, the concept of ‘public’ frequently influences the debate (in general terms, see also § 1.1.2.). In some cases, it is misunderstood and misinterpreted in a way that lead to rhetorical⁴⁶ and unfertile discussions.

The second clarification aims to define these sets of ‘new’ stakeholders in the revitalisation processes, described here as ‘civic actors’. It must be clear that they are not the only actors taking part in those processes. The notion of ‘civic actors’ is not already much explored.

1.3.1. Publicly owned buildings

This research analyses unused buildings owned by Italian public agencies. To define this category in a way that avoids confusing it with similar ones⁴⁷, the research presents only buildings that are, strictly speaking, owned by the public sector. More specifically, the portfolio being considered is the one owned by territorial public agencies (i.e. states, regions, provinces, and municipalities). The assets might be used directly by territorial agencies (for offices, schools, or hospitals) or indirectly (for commercial or residential units). In both cases, the term ‘public’ defines the property. Considering the general economic framework based on excludability and rivalry, publicly owned buildings can be catalogued neither as public

⁴⁶ See for example Montanari (2015) and Maddalena (2014, p. 135), especially in relation to heritage buildings, and demanio assets. These assets are considered as common goods and the author argues that the privatization of such goods is tremendously damaging the entire Italian population.

⁴⁷ On public goods see Musgrave (1939); Samuelson (1954); Buchanan (1969/1999); Ver Eecke (1999); on common goods Hardin (1968) and Ostrom (1990). In particular, the differences between publicly owned buildings and public goods or common goods is twofold. While common goods and public goods are non-excludable as they are ‘free in access’, in some cases publicly owned buildings are not freely accessible (e.g. military barracks, institutional offices). Furthermore, they are rival, which means that the owner might define a certain degree of use and the amount of user-related benefits.
goods nor as common goods (Somaini, 2015, p. 32)\textsuperscript{48}. Nevertheless, it is essential to underscore that, differently from privately owned buildings, publicly owned ones should guarantee the collective interest\textsuperscript{49}.

1.3.2. Civic actors

Civic actors are different from the category of social movements\textsuperscript{50} and do not completely coincide with third sector organisations (Enti del Terzo Settore as defined by Legislative Decree no. 117, approved in 2017)\textsuperscript{51}. That is the reason why this research introduces another category of actors. Certainly, there are similarities with the categories mentioned above\textsuperscript{52}, but

\textsuperscript{48} A general discussion about goods and their ‘blurred’ categorisation was made by Adams and McCormick (1987), based on Cowen’s (1985) discussion.

\textsuperscript{49} Although private buildings – and properties in general – might respond to the owner’s interests, the Italian Constitution has regulated how also private properties might be subjected to ‘social function’ (art. 42), which is still under investigation.

\textsuperscript{50} Compare with Della Porta and Diani (2006), which state that social movements grounded themselves into a Marxian perspective, and they raise to contrast the intrusion of either the State or the market into social life, acting against the system (Melucci, 1996). Moreover, as Tarrow (1994) suggests, social movements might be defined as a group of people with common interests that collectively challenge “interaction with elites, opponents and authorities” (pp. 3-4; see also Hensmans and van Bommel, 2018). Compare with Moulaert et al. (2005), which underscore that social movements might arise within different spatial scales. They have a ‘philosophy’ which either influence or acquire peculiar features shaped based on the local political, social, and cultural contexts. Compare with Pacchi (2020, p. 1)

\textsuperscript{51} Different from Third Sector Organisation, which is considered a sector that occupies a space between public and private sectors (Alcock and Kendall, 2011) with hybrid organisational features (such as organisation of services, governance mechanism and networks) as a response to external environmental pressures from the market and the state (Chew and Lyon, 2012; Evers, 2005 and 2013). The Italian definition of Third Sector Organisation, is established as formal non-profit organisations that pursue collective and general interests. This condition also brings obligations related to organisational norms and transparency (Fici, 2019). The categories that are included in this norm are: voluntary associations and NGO’s, associations, philanthropic organisations, foundations, social enterprises.

\textsuperscript{52} Pacchi (2020) underscores that the so called ‘bottom-up’ experiences might be roughly divided into two categories: the ones considered more radicals (Castells, 1983; Melucci, 1985 and 1996; Mayer, 2003 and 2010); and that related to social innovation (Moulaert et al., 2007; Vicari Haddock and Moulaert, 2009; Moulaert et al., 2012; Barbera and Parisi, 2019).
there are also essential and peculiar features. The condition of being a civic actor is directly related to the idea of ‘citizenship’, as an individual attitude to be a productive and responsible caring member of society. It is related to the belief that citizens act as a part of the community. This situated is not fixed, but it is a field where individuals and groups might re-design rights and duties.

Different from the other categories noted above, they occupy a more definite space in this discussion. In particular, they have an ‘urban’ nature (punctual and local), which is related to the potential and transformative short-term interventions of collective actions as well as the bottom-up dimension (Pacchi, 2020, p. 1). In general terms, civic actors are individuals (or groups) rooted in local contexts that aim to transform their society and urban spaces, according to the principles of participation, social inclusion and civic engagement (Pacchi, 2020, p. 3). They might be very heterogeneous in composition, aim and organisation, but civic actors share three main features.

---

33 Very often, civic engagement and citizen activation are discussed in political terms, using voting as a proxy for understanding this trend (Gibson, 2006, p. 1). Compare with Staeheli and Thompson (1997, p. 30) “[…] public sphere can be equally open and accessible to all members of a polity; it assumes that once membership has been achieved, there are no structural barriers that limit the ability of individuals to participate in public affairs and to decide the fate of the community. Citizenship is the term that describe this membership.”

34 To “act as a citizen implies considering values and views about what is the better thing to do for the community one belongs to” (Soma and Vatn, 2014, p. 325). The civic activities are crucial for democracy because they feed policy-making; on the other hand, they are an important element for experiencing the idea of ‘gathering together’ (Pasqui, 2018).

35 As Mazza (2015, p. 1) argues citizenship “is a social process, a body of practices, an experience, and an activity carried out by citizens who act to reshape rights, duties, and forms of belonging. In this view, in addition to being a status, citizenship is a project and a way of life”.

36 Compare with Seyfang and Smith (2007, p. 591): “There are diverse organisational forms: cooperatives, voluntary associations, mutuals, informal community groups, social enterprises. Their resource base is similarly pluralistic, including grant funding, limited commercial activity, voluntary input and mutual exchanges. The spectrum of organisations exhibits varying degrees of professionalisation, funding and official recognition.”
First, they are *non-profits*; their main objective is not making profit through their activities\(^{57}\). Second, they are pursuing activities in line with the cultural and social spheres (Van Ham et al., 2017), which, in some cases, might lead to social innovation (Moulaert et al., 2013)\(^{58}\). Third, they provide ‘place-based services’ or contextual services\(^{59}\).

Once the civic actors’ features are defined in general, it is crucial to describe other aspects that distinguish them\(^{60}\). In particular, they are analysed here on the basis of their coordination, organisation and action (see also Eyerman and Jamison, 1991; Della Porta and Diani, 2006)\(^{61}\).

The major elements that emerge in analysing civic actors are (i) their nature, (ii) the nature of the trigger that activates them, and (iii) the nature of their action.

The nature of a civic actor might be *formal* or *informal*. *Formal* civic actors are formalised by Italian National Law. They are listed in the official classification of the *ETS*. *Informal* civic actors can decide to become formal\(^{62}\) or to remain informal.

\(^{57}\) This feature is also expressed by art. 4, “senza scopo di lucro, con finalità civiche” [no-profit driven and with civic aims].

\(^{58}\) In contrast, Vitale (2009) underscores that activities of this type are not always truly innovative and they do not have an impact on the community to go beyond the actors who are directly involved.

\(^{59}\) It might be interesting to refer to these practices like the ones presented by Tricarico and Pacchi (2018, p. 69) in which community concept in self-help and inclusion policy design and practices is related to public health, provision, social housing, and local welfare innovation. Compare with Macdonald (2011) who argues that they position themselves in-between the public sector and the private one. Moreover, their primary aim is to fulfil social services that are provided neither by the market nor by the public sector (Aiken et al., 2011; Paredo and Chrisman, 2006; Somerville and McElwee, 2011). Note that the kind of services that are ‘not provided’ does not necessarily mean that these facilities and services are not provided at all; instead, when provided by civic actors, they are more accessible and these ‘hybrid services’ are more in line with specific contexts community.

\(^{60}\) This analysis is made using a deductive method and observation of the different civic actors involved in revitalisation processes.

\(^{61}\) In § 3.2, there will also be analysed based on other information, that are more contextual (see the Appendix - *Questionnaire*).

\(^{62}\) In this case, the formal group have access to public calls and other local administration’s initiatives. That is not a condition *sine-qua-nos* as there is the possibility for informal group to work and act for the same purposes of the formal one through, for example, *Patti di Collaborazione*. Although, very frequently the formalisation is needed to compete in formal local calls and initiatives.
By the nature of the trigger that activate the civic actors is meant how these groups generate the revitalisation processes in unused buildings. There are many examples of *licit* actions, where revitalisation processes take place in the domain of law, and others that are *illicit*. In such cases, the civic actors behave ‘in light of the law’ (or ‘nomotropically’; see Chiodelli and Moroni, 2013), but they do act outside the legal domain.

As for the nature of their action, there are two possibilities. Either licit or illicit actions might trigger revitalisation processes, and the civic actors might function from the *bottom-up* or the *top-down*. Bottom-up actions mean that the civic actor engages with a building spontaneously and independent of the purposes of the local administration (e.g. civic actors might occupy a space to address an unmet need and claims or promote public interest in a building and use it for other activities). In the top-down model, the civic actors are ‘passive’: they could express themselves and their projects through a public announcement, promoted by the local administration (e.g. an open call for building recycle with specific guidelines, time-span, and budget).

To conclude, civic actors are different in composition and organisation. Throughout the case studies, it will be crucial to understand their patterns of interface (§ 3.2.).

---

63 Here, ‘illicit’ means a blurred and controversial dynamic such as occupying the building and squatting.
64 There is a twofold situation for civic actors. In particular, it is possible to consider ‘formally bounded’ and ‘unbounded’. This difference is related to the definition of top-down and bottom-up as the relationships civic actors have with public administrations might depends either on civic actors’ interests or public administrations ones. This difference is not considering the civic actor and its activity directly but, on the other hand, it defines the range of potential actions inside or outside a framework (the legal system).
1.4. Approach

This thesis adopts the framework of the new-institutional approach\textsuperscript{65}. The important thing about this method is the attention it gives to institutions. This framework is not frequently used in urban planning (Sorensen, 2017a, p. 250). This research adopts, in particular, the so-called ‘sociological institutionalism’ (Hall and Taylor, 1996, pp. 946-947), in which institutional forms and procedures “should be seen as culturally-specific practices” assimilated “as a result of the kind of processes associated with the transmission of cultural practices more generally”.

There are three main reasons to select this approach. First, the framework provides a different way to consider complex systems such as cities or governance processes (Ostrom, 2005)\textsuperscript{66}, as it explores contexts and activities that might be embedded in practices (Gonzalez and Healey, 2005). Second, this framework might reveal how institutions have contributed to creating and recreating a robust setting for successful cases (Sorensen, 2017b)\textsuperscript{67}. In particular,

\textsuperscript{65} It is called ‘new’ because it differs from the ‘institutional’ approach which take into consideration just formal organisations and institutions. The new institutionalism, on the other hand, focuses on both formal and informal institutions.

\textsuperscript{66} As Ostrom (2005, pp. 4-5) underscores, everyday life is based on complex situations and the individuals are implicitly acting normally. That depends on institutional and cultural aspects that affect our way of perceiving the world and influence our expectation of others’ behaviour and their expectations of our behaviour (see also Allen, 2005). Compare with Alston et al. (2018, pp. 44-45), which consider individuals as the ‘players’ with rationality (bounded rationality, as there are limits to humans’ ability to gather and process information), preferences (that are the individuals’ taste for consumption and personal affairs), values (that are the individuals’ taste for the ordering of society and social relations) and beliefs (that are the perception of how individuals’ thinks the world does work).

\textsuperscript{67} As highlighted by Sorensen (2017b) there is a co-evolution of institutions and they are interdependent one to another. “[...] the term co-evolution is intended here to indicate complex, interdependent, contingent, and branching processes of incremental change and mutual adaptation of multiple institutions over time”. Compare with Van Asche et al. (2015, p. 30) “the relations between the different institutions and between actors and institutions can be conceptualised as interdependencies. Each step on a governance path is conditioned, not only by the previous steps, but also by the pattern of actors and institutions that evolved over time”.
in sociological institutionalism, the focus is on the potential similarities in organisations and practices that might happen in diverse contexts, affected by a set of local conditions (Hall and Taylor, 1996). Moreover, this framework is related to the possibility of understanding “the nature of the ‘implementation processes’ and the relation between strategy and action” (Gonzalez and Healey, 2005, p. 2057). It is important for analysing the institutions and their interactions, that are shaped by institutional evolution; they mutually construct the generative process (Gonzalez and Healey, 2005; compare with Gualini, 2001). Third, “institutions and institutional design are central to the planning project of creating better, more just, more liveable, and more sustainable cities.” (Sorensen, 2017a, p. 250).

By **institution** is meant both formal rules and informal norms (North, 1992, p. 4) that are used by individuals “to organise all forms of repetitive and structured interactions” (Ostrom, 2005, p. 3).

Individuals themselves craft the rules that affect one situation or another. That leads to the diversity and complexity of the contemporary situation, which depends on the ability to (i) recognise a context, (ii) understand the structure, and (iii) select the appropriate assumptions about human behaviour (Ostrom, 2005, p. 7). Once it is acknowledged that this framework

---

68 Compare to Gonzalez and Healey (2005, p. 2057) that argues that sociological institutionalism has developed as a way to connect policies actions and practices with a specific local context, geographically specific. In addition, it connects micro-practices to wider structuring forces.

69 Compare with North (1990, p. 3) in which he states that institutions are ‘the rule of the game’; while individuals are ‘the players’ (Alston et al., 2018, p. 44) and they might organise themselves into ‘organisations’ in order to achieve a set of common objectives (p. 47)

70 Compare with North (1990, p. 3): institutions might be described as “the humanly devised constraints that shape human interaction”. Compare with Sorensen (2017b), who highlights that the definition of the term ‘institutions’ varies, he states that institutions are a set of formal and informal rules that shape behaviour developed in different societies through a specific historical process. Compare with Alston et al. (2018, p. 33): “institutions as a rule that recognized entities purposefully devise and have the recognized right to enforce”.
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might help understand the vast diversity of empirical settings\textsuperscript{71}, it is essential to stress that the context defines institutional constraints, incentives, and enforcement patterns\textsuperscript{72}. In this perspective, different contexts might influence – positively or negatively – institutions’ behaviour and efficiency (North, 1990) \textsuperscript{73}.

More specifically, the framework used in this research is the one presented by Elinor Ostrom in her book \textit{Governing the Commons} (1990). While discussing common pool resources, Ostrom examines different case studies to understand and derive common elements\textsuperscript{74}. In this way, she could ‘test’ her framework based on institutional design and consider which characteristics influence successful, unsuccessful, and fragile cases (Ostrom, 1990, pp. 178-179).

Another important work by Ostrom is \textit{Crossing the Great Divide: Co-production, Synergy, and Development} (1996). What is crucial is the importance that Ostrom gives to co-production and how institutions might pursue successful strategies (1996, p. 1080). Co-production means

\textsuperscript{71} The sociologist institutionalism might be referred to the “cultural sociology of space which deals with the dialectic relationship between material practices and the meanings that social agents attach to their environment. From this perspective, planning practices can also be understood as an unequal encounter between different spatial imaginations, geographical languages, urban narratives that different groups hold about the same place and which are all embedded in the political economy of a concrete time and space” (Gonzalez and Healey, 2005, p. 2058). Compare with Richardson and Jensen (2003); and Jensen and Richardson (2004).

\textsuperscript{72} These are kind of devices that can make the agents (in this case civic actors and governments) efficiently complement each other, although they have different interests (Ménard and Shirley, 2004).

\textsuperscript{73} North (1990, pp. 80-81) described how institutions do not have to be considered in allocative efficiency perspective, since the Pareto condition is not the case (allocative efficiency). On the other hand, adaptive efficiency is concerned with the kinds of rules that shape how the economy evolves through time. Compare with Crawford and Ostrom (1995, p. 583): institutions as equilibria might be considered as such because they rely on social order and the individuals are part of that. It means that this order does not depend on some external elements, such as ‘state’ or ‘third party enforcer’.

\textsuperscript{74} It must be clear that this research discusses \textit{publicly owned buildings}. The reference to Ostrom’s work is aimed at using her approach and her methodology to discuss the phenomenon of common pool resources. It is not related to the object of her research. In particular, her framework might be used also to understand other phenomena. Beside, the parallelism with Ostrom’s work is given by the organisation of the thesis, that is based on case studies observation.
combining the input of the government and individuals to create a synergy. In this way, it might be possible to achieve the same output level with different combinations of input.

Considering these two works written by Ostrom, the purpose of the framework is to underscore that “the application of empirical studies to the policy world leads one to stress the importance of fitting institutional rules to a specific social-ecological setting” (Ostrom, 2010, p. 642). This is because ‘one size fits all’ policies are not effective if the discussion is focused on institutions, incentives and patterns of enforcement.

As the primary purpose of this research is to understand conditions, incentives, and patterns of behaviour regarding the revitalisation of unused public buildings, this approach might be fruitful for collecting information with three aims: (i) to understand that different kinds of rules (operational, collective choices and constitutionals) might affect actions and achieve outcomes (Ostrom, 1990, p. 52), (ii) to understand which combination leads to synergy and co-production between governments (public administrations) and individuals (civic actors), and (iii) to recommend management policies for unused public buildings.

1.5. Methodology

The methodology for this research is based on desk review, and empirical analysis.

---

75 In this regard, Ostrom (1990, pp. 54-55) stressed the importance of formal collective arenas (e.g., legislature, regulatory agencies, and courts) and informal collective arenas (e.g. informal gatherings, appropriation teams, and private associations). This distinction defines how institutions work in the light of the law but that rules (formal ones) depends from institutions. Also, the physical, cultural, and institutional settings (e.g., formal institutions, such as governments) affect “who is to be involved in a situation, the action they can take and the costs of those actions, the outcomes that can be achieved, how actions are linked to outcomes, what information is to be available, how much control individuals can exercise, and what payoffs are to be assigned to particular combinations of actions and outcomes” (p. 55).
Desk review is mainly based on (i) an extensive review of the literature about the abandonment of buildings and the new bottom-up experiences in unused or abandoned buildings in general (see § 1.1.); (ii) a review of the Italian regulations on this matter since the 1980s. The empirical analysis is based on (i) first-hand information about case studies across Italy, (ii) second-hand information (e.g. papers) on them, and (iii) interviews with two practitioners, to understand the phenomenon and the factors that contribute to their rise, and two civic actors.

The selected cases respond to a twofold analysis. On the one hand, the list of the analysed cases was continuously updated, based on their connections with the research question (§ 1.2.).

On the other hand, the analysis of the cases is related to the description of the civic actors (§ 1.3.2.). This first selection of cases also included examples that afterwards have not been used. It was made to understand, in general terms, the phenomenon of unused public buildings and civic actors’ revitalisation.

The research sample selection is based on preliminary features that allow for heterogeneity and exhaustiveness in terms of the general overview (see § 3.2.). The first screening of the cases includes 45 cases. This analysis includes the QCA approach (QCA, Qualitative

---

76 Frequently some cases have been triggered by other similar projects used as a reference. For example, the case of military barracks is quite widespread, and one of the first cases was Factory Grisù at the beginning of 2000. The same is for industrial buildings: the case of Base in Milano (apart from the different dynamics) was one of the first cases in which the restoration of the building was based on culture and arts (similar to other cases analysed in this sample). See, in particular: Mangialardo (2017a); Micelli and Mangialardo (2016); Mangialardo and Miscelli (2017); Mangialardo and Miscelli (2018a); Mangialardo and Miscelli (2018b); Mangialardo and Miscelli (2018c).

77 The two practitioners are: Matteo Bartolomeo, Partner of Avanzi Sostenibilità per Azioni, and Annibale D’Elia, former promoter of Bollenti Spiriti, Regione Puglia, actually Head of Direzione di Progetto Innovazione Economica e Sostegno all’Impresa, Milano Municipality.

78 The civic actors interviewed are: Roberto Cirillo, Abitante of Ex Asilo Filangieri in Napoli; Marco Bonomi (Nutopia), Co-manager of Edonè in Bergamo.
Comparative Analysis, see § 3.2.) to compare them, and understand better the complexity of each case. The second screening includes 20 cases. These ones are analysed through a semi-structured questionnaire, to better understand the dynamics, and the potential variables. The questionnaire aims to understand the dynamic in a new-institutional framework, exploring the cases’ background conditions. The outcome, as also stressed by Ostrom, might be influenced by different causes.

The cases help to explain the phenomenon of civic actors’ experiences in unused public buildings.

Furthermore, understanding the level of uncertainty that these experiences face is essential. This condition might affect institutions’ robustness and how the initiative pursues revitalisation processes in unused buildings. Moreover, the normative and legal framework – at different scales – might influence outcomes, and it might influence the operational rules that civic actors pursue, based on their specific context.

79 This questionnaire was sent to the different civic actors that are (or were) working on one specific public building. Due to coronavirus, there was not the possibility to discuss with them and focus on some specific topics that might emerge during an ordinary discussion. Nevertheless, the questionnaire has faced some issues related to the civic actors’ misinterpretation, together with a lack of knowledge related to internal dynamics that emerges from an institutional perspective.

80 These variables might be defined in different ways, according to the perspective. For example, in the new-institutional framework, they are incentives; in a more general perspective, these variables are conditions and context.

81 Note that the cases are ongoing, but they do present key aspects of the revitalisation processes. For this reason, it is crucial to combine the cases with the general framework of the thesis.

82 Analysing the cases, in fact, she was able to derive important key features and elements for managing common-pool resources. In the case of revitalisation experiences in unused public buildings, some of the potential conditions have been already discussed by Micelli and Mangialardo (2016). This research wants to confirm an add the potential conditions that might influence (or not) revitalisation experiences to rise.

83 Moreover, as stressed by Ferilli et al (2016b, p. 97) the uncertainty is also related to the bottom-up initiatives, as civic actors might introduce uncertainty and indeterminacy because “such scenarios rely to a great extent on forces and factors of which most residents have no idea or little experience”.
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This methodology gives the possibility (i) to describe the case(s) under investigation and (ii) to shed light on a broader class of cases.
2. **Focus: the unsolved issue of abandoned and unused buildings in Italy**

It is crucial to narrow the issue of unused public buildings since the phenomenon presents challenges for three main reasons. First of all, the huge dimension of the phenomenon is clear, and it might be considered a problem, but the exact number of buildings (and land) that are owned by public agencies remains unknown. Second, there are difficulties in the management of these portfolios due to two main factors. On the one hand, there was a shift of perspectives and rationalities that influenced how governments administer public portfolios. On the other, ambiguities arose relating to the overproduction of regulations, affecting interventions and policy-making procedure. Third, the new civic experiences highlight that there are still several limitations in traditional planning. The strictness of Italian regulations is not consistent with the dynamicity and flexibility that these experiences promote.

These aspects make the issue of public buildings extremely complex from different points of view. This section presents the phenomenon with a twofold intention. First, the aim is to disentangle the complex issue of unused public buildings (§ 2.1.); second, a general framework will be examined to make the context of these practices more explicit. Moreover, there will be an *excursus* of the last thirty years of management policies, and finally a brief description of how civic experiences are emerging in Italy (§ 2.2.).
2.1. The magnitude of the phenomenon

In Italy, the actual number of publicly owned buildings is not known precisely and depends on different elements. First of all, there were different attempts to list these types of assets, through the introduction of laws and legislative decrees. Furthermore, reasons vary as to why different governments aim for a census of the public portfolio. Surveys, in fact, (i) would make public agencies aware of the magnitude of their portfolio and their condition; (ii) would give the possibility either to privatise, to securitise or to understand expenditures and cost in relation to revenues\(^84\); (iii) and they grant certain kind of public portfolio as an economic resource (Consiglio Nazionale del Notariato, 2017)\(^85\).

Throughout the last thirty years, different governments encouraged local administrations and other public agencies to keep a list of their portfolios to dismiss, alienate or eventually use\(^86\). As stated in Legislative Decree no. 269, approved in 2000, public agencies must have

---

\(^84\) In this case, public agencies might decide independently to privatise some assets to re-balance local budget (Kaganova and Nayyar-Stone, 2000, p. 308)

\(^85\) In this regard, see Law no. 1089 approved in 1939. In general, this law concerns assets that, independently from their property, have to be listed and considered ‘special’, and subjected to limitations for their public and general interest. This is similar to Musgrave’s (1959) idea of ‘merit goods’, which is independent of the property. They acquire their ‘merit’ for different reasons, and they have to be produced and provided publicly and consumed independently from individual preferences. Compare with Cavazzoni (2015) elucidating the potential relation between common goods and merit goods. In the category of merit goods, heritage buildings are also included. What is ‘heritage’ is established by Legislative Decree no. 42 approved in 2004. It concerns not only buildings with particular historic, artistic, or architectural value but also elements of the landscape, museums, archives, and so on. The heritage in question is frequently inalienable. This depends also on another category of assets that is labelled demanio culturale (Codice Civile, art. 822). In any cases, this constraint might be modified (so the asset might be alienated) for different reasons, such as financial budgeting or processes of valorisation.

\(^86\) One of the first law in this perspective was the Law no. 573 approved in 1993. It states that some of the public agencies (such as INAIL and INPS) must alienate their portfolio (art. 9). On this concern, one of the most recent tools that was approved was the Piano delle Alienazioni (Law no. 113 approved in 2008, art. 58). This device was introduced to give the chance to territorial administrations to list part of their portfolio that is no longer used for institutional purposes. That list categorises the estates into assets potentially sellable in the market (patrimonio disponibile, according to Codice Civile).
a list of their properties (i) for cognitive reasons, (ii) for management reasons, and (iii) for budgetary concerns (art. 151).

Nevertheless, as Benedikter (2004, p. 371) highlights in reference to Italy, “there is no complete list, as yet, containing state-owned objects [and] currently there is also no comprehensive inventory of all artistic, historical monuments”. Sometimes, lists regarding either state or local administration properties are not updated due to different reasons. First of all, public agencies might not know the specific nature of their portfolio (magnitude, conditions and property) due to a lack of financial resources and public sector inertia (Bellè, 2017)\(^87\). If they do know their portfolio, they do not often possess exhaustive information to define projects and policies (Gaeta and Savoldi, 2013, p. 7), or else the evaluation of these properties and their economic value are uncertain (Baiocco and Gastaldi, 2011, p. 13; Gastaldi and Camerin, 2015, p. 48). On these grounds, it is challenging to define management policies\(^88\). Second, the introduction of the so-called *federalismo demaniale*\(^89\) (Legislative Decree no. 85 approved in 2010, and Legislative Decree no. 69 approved in 2013) creates ambiguities and mismatches regarding policy management (Bellè, 2017). The *Ministero dell’Economia e delle Finanze* (MEF), which publishes the annual ‘state of the art’ about public properties, recently published a new report (MEF, 2019)\(^90\).

\(^87\) In this regard, the Financial Budget Law for 2010 (Legislative Decree no. 191 approved in 2009) highlights the urgency of having a complete list of all public properties, to understand the magnitude of this portfolio and to eventually consider privatisation and disposals. In that case, in 2011, only 53% of public administrations delivered the assets’ census. Compare with Vermiglio (2011, p. 426) who states that public agencies do not know their own portfolio, and that leads to different effects (lack of well-structured information, lack of skills from management’s responsible, absence of maintenance plans, inadequacy of the system, always focused on financial concerns).


\(^89\) This tool gives the possibility for different public agencies to transfer specific assets for management reasons. In particular, *federalismo demaniale* allows local public administrations to manage buildings and lands that were underused or abandoned by higher level of territorial agencies (e.g. State or Regions) for revitalisation and valorisation processes.

\(^90\) MEF uses the data sent by the different public agencies. The methodology used to evaluate this portfolio is based on mass appraisal method. This means that building units are not calculated as single units, but as ‘clusters’ (MEF, 2017b).
The report details the heterogeneity of public properties (with a variety of different ownerships)\textsuperscript{91}, and different uses of these properties. This fragmentation in terms of properties and institutions contributes to the difficulty in knowing the correct number of assets (Table 3).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administration type</th>
<th>Administration</th>
<th>Buildings</th>
<th>Surface</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Buildings (n.)</td>
<td>Buildings (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central government administrations</td>
<td>State and fiscal agencies</td>
<td>32,327</td>
<td>2.65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other central government administrations</td>
<td>6,219</td>
<td>0.51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local authorities</td>
<td>Regions</td>
<td>18,492</td>
<td>1.51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Metropolitan cities and provinces</td>
<td>12,912</td>
<td>1.06%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Municipalities</td>
<td>745,043</td>
<td>61.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unions of municipalities and Comunità Montane</td>
<td>1,516</td>
<td>0.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Universities</td>
<td>4,962</td>
<td>0.41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other local authorities</td>
<td>5,552</td>
<td>0.45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other local authorities (e.g. Health service; Camera di Commercio)</td>
<td>20,030</td>
<td>1.64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other authorities</td>
<td>National Social Security Institutions (INPS and INAIL)</td>
<td>33,895</td>
<td>2.78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>9,470</td>
<td>0.89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total public buildings</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,220,855</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Public portfolios: units and surface areas. Rielaboration by the author from MEF data (MEF, 2019).

In general, the MEF report counts (and analyses) one million two hundred thousand units\textsuperscript{92}. Municipalities own around 61% of these properties, accounting for approximately 58% of the whole public property surface. The entire portfolio estimated value is around 292.5 billion

\textsuperscript{91} Some of these properties are not reported in the thesis. They are labelled as ‘NON-S13’ (MEF, 2019), which means that they are still public properties but, differently from the others (S13), they do not perform and serve the public interests. Moreover, they are economically supported by individuals’ taxes (Istat, 2020b). This category includes: ACI (Automobile Club Italia), agencies and territorial organisations for social housing and ‘others’. Their magnitude is 28.5% of the total public portfolio and they cover 1.4% of the total surface in analysis.

\textsuperscript{92} In this report MEF (2019) analysed also ‘land’ that here are not counted, as they are not part of this research.
The buildings not directly used by public administration have an estimated value of 70.5 billion euros. The unused properties are valued at 12.2 billion euros (Figure 1).

![Figure 1. Public portfolio analysis of the uses and the estimated value. (The unused is a sub-category of the ‘not used directly’). Rielaboration by the author from MEF data (MEF, 2019).](image)

Although the list of these properties is not exhaustive, the listed unused buildings’ worth is relevant. Considering the last few years, the number of unused buildings (%) has remained quite stable (Table 4), although the higher census participation by public agencies during that period (Table 5).

---

93 In particular, this report divides public properties in two categories (i) residential and commercial, and (ii) institutional (public offices, hospital, schools …). The 73% of this portfolio are commercial and residential and only 20% is considered “institutional”. Nevertheless, the surface area of the institutional ones represents 80% of the total analysed surface.

94 In this analysis, MEF (2019) counted also (i) buildings that are used by the private sector (through leases); (ii) residential and commercial buildings used by the private sector; (iii) residential and commercial building used by individuals (free leases); (iv) residential and commercial buildings used by individuals for social and collective purposes (leases).

95 They cover around 19 thousand square meters (4% of the total).

96 This might be related to the number of building censed. The higher percentage of public agencies’ participation, the more possibilities to have unused buildings.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Report</th>
<th>Participation to the census</th>
<th>Total censed building units (n.)</th>
<th>Unused buildings (n.)</th>
<th>Unused buildings (%)</th>
<th>Unused b. surface area (sqm)</th>
<th>Unused b. surface area (%)</th>
<th>Total economic value (€)*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MEF, 2019</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>1,220,855</td>
<td>80,344</td>
<td>6.58%</td>
<td>16,448,490</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>12.2 billion €</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEF, 2018</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>1,056,404</td>
<td>70,610</td>
<td>6.68%</td>
<td>15,561,608</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>11.9 billion €</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEF, 2017 (a)</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>998,937</td>
<td>67,726</td>
<td>6.78%</td>
<td>15,021,639</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>~ 12 billion €</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEF, 2016</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>864,235</td>
<td>67,303</td>
<td>7.78%</td>
<td>14,985,395</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEF, 2015</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>803,873</td>
<td>50,258</td>
<td>6.25%</td>
<td>12,737,970</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4. Analysis of public portfolios in recent years based on MEF (2015, 2016, 2017a, 2018 and 2019) data. *Rielaboration by the author*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Unused public buildings (%)</th>
<th>Economic value (billion €)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>12.2 billion €</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>11.9 billion €</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>~ 12 billion €</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>~ 12 billion €</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>~ 12 billion €</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5. Percentage and the economic value of unused public buildings. *Rielaboration by the author from MEF data (2015; 2016; 2017a; 2018; 2019).*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Participation to the census</th>
<th>Total censed building units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>803,873</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>864,235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>998,937</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>1,056,404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>1,220,855</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6. Percentage of public agencies’ participation to the census. *Rielaboration by the author from MEF data (2015; 2016; 2017a; 2018; 2019).*
Moreover, this situation highlights how alienation is not as effective as expected (see § 2.2.). In general terms, the presence of different portfolios and fragmented public properties creates “suboptimal results” (Kaganova and Nayyar-Stone, 2000), as their management is not organised accordingly.

2.2. **Thirty years of management policies: the three main seasons**

Similar problems concern management policies. The types of portfolios (Table 2) are very heterogeneous and have specific peculiarities. Some of these characteristics depend on the very nature of a portfolio (e.g., heritage buildings, industrial buildings or military barracks), and the existence of constraints or limitation on interventions and alienation97.

For the last thirty years, there have been different attempts to “solve” and overcome public building disuse (Baiocco and Gastaldi, 2011). Moreover, the progressive increase of public debt (see Table 7) has forced public agencies to reconsider economic and financial policies in light of the high costs associated with these buildings.

---

97 See *Codice dei Beni Culturali*, Law no. 42 approved in 2004.
Some costs are related directly to the ordinary maintenance of those buildings. Nevertheless, due to the economic shortage of public administration, maintenance has progressively deteriorated, and some of the buildings that were not already used were gradually abandoned. This condition indicates both the difficulties encountered by a public administration in managing a considerable portfolio and the public inefficiency in portfolio management (see also § 1.1.1.).

Throughout the decades, the management of these estates was frequently at the centre of policies and interventions (IFEL, 2017)\textsuperscript{98}. Beginning with the 90s, it is possible to identify “three seasons” related to this issue. In fact, different perspectives and rationales (affected by different governments) have been adopted to discuss unused public buildings (Figure 2).

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{chart.png}
\caption{Public debt in Italy with some important events contributing to its increase/decrease. \textit{Rielaboration by the author from Ministero del Tesoro data. (Source: CPI- Serie Storiche, Osservatorio Conti Pubblici).}}
\end{figure}

\textsuperscript{98} In general terms, a strategic management of governments assets might contribute to: (i) better financial performances, (ii) a potential reduction on infrastructure investment needs, (iii) reduction of corruption and conflicts of interests, (iv) increased sustainability of the cities, (v) economic development, as a consequence of reusing, with a higher productivity (e.g. decommissioned military bases, underused railroad lands, ports, …) (Kaganova and Amois, 2020)
The starting point: public buildings as public goods. Before the 90s, these estates were considered very similar to public goods and related directly to the idea of publicness (Parlato and Vaciago, 2002) and the achievement of collective and general interests. In this period, public buildings did not receive much attention to their potential value in economic terms (see § 1.1.1.). The regulations focused more on public and social concerns, rather than on financial ones, and depended particularly on the asset’s nature, as some of them were part of the demanio pubblico.

First season: public buildings as capital. The first shift towards a new season began in the early 90s. These buildings (and their lands) started to be considered as assets “producing a mix of both measurable and difficult to measure returns (including social benefits), rather than a public good” (Kaganova and Nayyar-Stone, 2000, p. 309). The 1990 Italian Budget Law introduced the first attempt to ‘materialise’ these properties as assets (Law no. 407 was

---

99 See especially Codice Civile, Libro Terzo, Titolo I “Dei Beni”, Capo II “Dei Beni appartenenti allo Stato, agli enti pubblici”.

100 In the Italian legislation, with the term demanio pubblico are intended public buildings and lands that are unsellable on the market. It is the case of beaches, harbours, streets and infrastructures, and the “heritage buildings” (art. 822, Codice Civile).
approved in 1989). This law considers the public portfolio as a potential element in granting revenues to reduce public debt (Astrid, 2003)\textsuperscript{101}, and it was intended to manage public properties more successfully (Madeddu, 2019). However, the 1990 Budget Law was never implemented. Another attempt was made in 1991 (Legislative Decree no. 386 approved in 1991)\textsuperscript{102} with the creation of an agency – called Immobiliare Italia S.p.a. – that was in charge of the management and sale of the public portfolio\textsuperscript{103}. Subsequently, the 1994 Budget Law (Legislative Decree no. 537 approved in 1993) authorised different public agencies to alienate assets that were no longer used for general cultural or collective interests (art. 9)\textsuperscript{104}. This shift towards considering publicly owned estates as ‘capital’ arose because of a progressive increase of public debt\textsuperscript{105} (see Table 7).

\textsuperscript{101} The other reasons for privatising are related with other four elements: (i) the possibility to enlarge the stock market, (ii) favouring foreign investments, (iii) remove institutional constraints derived from the nature of the public property, and (iv) optimise resources in light of article no. 47 of the Italian Constitution (Cardia, 1994, p. 98).

\textsuperscript{102} Before this, there was the introduction of Legislative Decree no. 301 that never operates. This new Decree introduced some important norms and guidelines for the State concerning an effective management of public assets (Cardia, 1994, p. 109).

\textsuperscript{103} This decree is significant because it introduced a third actor in public assets’ management: the agencies and societies. That, on the one hand, gives the possibility for the public sector to dismiss part of their portfolio, using these societies. Moreover, it makes more ambiguous and difficult the mechanism of identification of the managing agents.

\textsuperscript{104} It stated also that Social Security Institutions (such as INPS and INAIL) have to organise disposals for their residential portfolio.

\textsuperscript{105} In the period between the Eighties and the early Nineties, in fact, the public debt increased, and it boosted to +124% of Italian GDP (1994). That is because of an unintentional ignorance of Italian governments about economic and financial balance and policies, and a progressive expenditure for facilities and services and social services in the previous years. That depended particularly on the incapacity of Italian governments to pursue welfare policy able to have a balance between costs and returns. In fact, what happened was that some benefits were targeted while costs are on the public debt. In particular, these policies were one-time short-term policies focused on consensus. What is crucial is that in 1992, after Maastricht Agreement, that defines a balance between public debt and GDP (fixed to 60%), and that agree on the Euro, poses Italy in a very critical situation. The ‘black Wednesday’ caused the collapse of the former currency (Lira), because of a speculative manoeuvre made by Soros (the Lira was devaluated of 7%), and starting from that moment, Italian public debt increased gradually year after year.
In that period, societal perspectives and rationales beyond public buildings changed radically, and throughout the years, Italian governments on an almost annual basis\textsuperscript{106}, introduced regulations aimed at privatisation – through public building disposals and alienation – with the expectation of relieving debt. The willingness to alienate part of this public portfolio no longer used by territorial agencies became increasingly urgent over the years.

Nevertheless, as Cottarelli (2016) argues, privatisation of public assets is a \textit{one-time} intervention compared to the debt progressive increase\textsuperscript{107}. Alienation might be considered a potential intervention in helping to smooth, re-balance and restore a small share of the public

\textsuperscript{106} Considering the Budget Law of the 1994, it is possible to identify some others regulations aiming to alienate public buildings. In particular, Law no. 335 approved in 1995 states that public buildings that are no longer used for ‘public interest’ might be alienated. Legislative Decree no. 104 approved in 1996 states the importance to have a census of the public portfolio, for organisational and economic reasons, and states the possibility to alienate part of this portfolio. Law no. 662 approved in 1996 (Budget Law 1997) introduces a new program for dismissions (in particular with reference to the properties owned by Ministero della Difesa) and privatisations for buildings that are no longer used by public agencies. This law was very important because it introduces the possibility to privatise also territorial public portfolios. The same was done with Budget Law 1999 (Law no. 448 approved in 1998) with a de-regulation and a simplification for direct privatisation and corporations’ privatisations. The kind of corporation’s portfolio might be heterogeneous in terms of properties and it includes both sellable and non-sellable assets. Moreover, it introduces the possibility for territorial public agencies to present a valorisation project for selected assets. In 1999, there was the re-organisation of Ministero dell’Economia e delle Finanze (MEF), and the creation of Agenzia del Demanio, in charge of public assets management (Legislative Decree no. 300 approved in 1999). In the same year, the Budget Law 2000 (Law no. 488 approved in 1999) introduces the possibility to privatise heritage buildings and allows the other territorial public agencies to privatise their portfolio. In 2000 the Ministero della Difesa alienates and dismiss part of its properties. The revenues will be re-invested for assets renovation (Law no. 388, approved in 2000). The Legislative Decree no. 351 approved in 2001 introduces a variety of interventions, especially in relation to Agenzia del Demanio’s obligations, and the relationships with the private sectors for privatisations, disposals and securisations. It introduces also the long-term grant (up to 50 years, see \textit{Second season: public assets as opportunity}). In 2002, the Legislative Decree no. 63 introduces a new agency (similar to Agenzia del Demanio) called Patrimonio dello Stato S.p.a. It must manage and alienate public portfolios, but its nature was highly debated as it was an agency working in parallel as Agenzia del Demanio. The alienations were also outlined in Legislative Decree no. 269 approved in 2003.

\textsuperscript{107} Also, the balance between active and passive public interventions and net expenditure remains the same. In fact, Cottarelli (2016, p. 109) argues that during financial and economic crisis, public assets have less degree of liquidity, and, as a consequence, to sell in such period might not be the right solution. In general, the activities of the public sectors have a low economic return.
debt (Parlato and Vaciago, 2002). In fact, privatisation does not have to be considered intrinsically as an undesirable tool for public building management. In some cases, it is legitimate and reasonable. In others, the situation is more controversial and leads to lively debates (Cottarelli, 2016, p. 110)\textsuperscript{108}.

\textit{Second season: public assets as financial and development opportunities.} On this concern, in 2001, Legislative Decree no. 351 changed how the public portfolio was managed, introducing new ‘innovations’. These included the possibility to secure and dismiss or alienate public buildings. Moreover, the decree recommends that public administrations have a census of their properties for cognitive purposes.

A second turning point towards the ‘second season’ of management was made in 2006 with the approval of the 2007 Budget Law (Legislative Decree no. 296), which combined alienation with more straightforward interventions. It introduced two new tools for the revitalisation: the PUV (\textit{Programmi Unitari di Valorizzazione})\textsuperscript{109} and long-term grants (up to 50 years\textsuperscript{110}) for public buildings\textsuperscript{111}. This idea stands in line with the expectation of more efficient bureaucracy and de-regulation. In this way, the public sector might sustain the possibility to maintain the property, but on the contrary, direct intervention by private

\textsuperscript{108} This long-standing tradition of alienation started to be highly criticised, and it was at the centre of animated debates, especially in relation with the ‘nature’ of the buildings that is intrinsically related to how publicly owned buildings are recognised (as a public good or as a common good). On this regard, the attitude towards privatisation is, in general terms, not desirable and inappropriate (see Gaeta and Savoldi, 2013; Montanari, 2015) because of (i) the risk to decrease the price and the value of the buildings (considering that some of them are part of the national heritage), (ii) the potentiality they would have once restored (Ponzini, 2015), (iii) ‘exploitation’ of the heritage for private interests (see Montanari, 2015, pp. 8-9).

\textsuperscript{109} PUV aims to consider a ‘critical mass’ of different public buildings that have to be enhanced in a homogeneous way (Ponzini, 2008).

\textsuperscript{110} With the Legislative Decree no. 95 approved in 2012 the grant was expanded.

\textsuperscript{111} Long-term grants give the possibility to a private investor to use (for free or paying an annual fee) those buildings, pursuing their interests but granting a share of services and facilities for the community.
investors is also possible. In accordance with this new regulation, in 2007, the Agenzia del Demanio (that is, the public agency in charge of the state’s portfolio) promoted a project called ‘Valore Paese’: different abandoned and unused public buildings were selected for a pilot project of revitalisation and valorisation\textsuperscript{112} through the use of long-term or short-term grants (Patruno, 2012).

The impending economic crisis (that would quickly exacerbate the Italian context) strongly influenced this situation, affecting the public debt, economy and, consequently, state governance\textsuperscript{113}. During this time, to cope with an economic and financial crisis (the public debt stood at +130% of the Italian GDP), governments implemented policies to smooth public debt through a massive intervention on disposals and alienation and reducing the field of leases. There were two types of interventions: one was related to the improvement of management obligations from public administrations\textsuperscript{114}, and the other promoted de-regulation and quick interventions in bureaucratic concerns\textsuperscript{115}.

\textsuperscript{112} There were two different projects. One was called Dimore, on which the selected buildings are considered ‘heritage’. In addition, these buildings have a very important characteristic, that is the high value. The idea was to promote tourism and commercial activities with this idea of diffused tourism and luxury accommodations. The other project was called Affidiamo Valore, which focused on more anonymous public buildings, that were less valued than the others. Nowadays, the projects promoted by Agenzia del Demanio are Valore Paese - Fari, started in 2015: similar to the Dimore project, the idea is to enhance public lighthouses. Another one is Cammini e Percorsi with a network of public buildings, often located close to natural and ecological corridors.

\textsuperscript{113} This was underscored also in the Legislative Decree no. 244 approved in 2007 (Budget Law 2008, art. 2, section no. 618). It states that public agencies have to reduce the ordinary and extraordinary costs for their portfolio. Astrid (2013, p. 23) affirms that from 2008 to 2013, the total public investments decreased by about 6 million euros.

\textsuperscript{114} Starting with the Legislative Decree no. 112 approved in 2008 (art. 58) which introduces the so-called Piano delle Alienazioni [Alienations’ Plan], to allow the different territorial agencies to sell quickly their assets to balance public costs. See also the Legislative Decree no. 201 approved in 2011 Salva Italia (art. 27), which states that public buildings have to be alienated if not used, to grant revenues and improve the public portfolio’s management. See, finally, the Legislative decree no. 1 (Cresci Italia) and Legislative Decree no. 95 approved in 2012.

\textsuperscript{115} Legislative Decree Semplifica Italia (no. 5 approved in 2012); Legislative Decree no. 69 approved in 2013; Legislative Decree no. 133, approved in 2014.
Third season: public buildings as ‘social experiments’. This crisis situation – including the post-crisis period – underlined that private investors are no longer interested in investing in public buildings. First of all, evidence demonstrated that the real estate market was overflowing (Ponzini and Vani, 2012; Ponzini, 2015)\(^{116}\). Second, the progressive interest and urgency of governments in solving the problem of public debt, by using public buildings as sources of capital, contributed to creating ambiguities among the different regulations, and considering only the supply-side of the market (Micelli and Mangialardo, 2016, p. 109). Some reports also describe how public auctions for building alienations were frequently deserted (ANCE, 2015; Fabrizi et al., 2015). This new context is one that might be defined as the ‘third season’ of management. In fact, it represents a new consideration of public buildings, not only as forms of economic capital but also as producers of other kinds of wealth.

2.3. The new ‘bottom-up’ approach

The “third season” of public building management is the more recent one and began in the after-crisis period of the early 2010s\(^{117}\). The economic crisis aggravated an already critical situation in the Italian real estate market (Nomisma, 2008, p. 6). The purchase stops is the direct consequence of a progressive stop on the demand side [...] the economic uncertainty is very high and its trust is at lowest terms”. See also Banca d’Italia (2013, p. 18) that underscores how public investments have faced a gradual downturn since 2005; moreover, in 2007 there was a harsh downturn that lasted until 2010, with a total loss of 25%.

\(^{116}\) Compare with Nomisma (2008, p. 6). This report underscores the critical Italian situation in 2007, with a specific focus on the real-estate market: “The purchase stops is the direct consequence of a progressive stop on the demand side [...] the economic uncertainty is very high and its trust is at lowest terms”. See also Banca d’Italia (2013, p. 18) that underscores how public investments have faced a gradual downturn since 2005; moreover, in 2007 there was a harsh downturn that lasted until 2010, with a total loss of 25%.

\(^{117}\) This statement is also underscored by the Libro Verde. Le industrie culturali e creative, un potenziale da sfruttare published by the European Commission in 2011. The crisis, in fact, highlights how the traditional way to consider territories and cities has been progressively changed throughout the last decades. In particular, the “immaterial” value of the digitalisation and technologies determines a shift towards different ways of production. In this sense, creative and cultural industries play a very important role and, according to EU, they have strong potentialities in terms of innovation and promotion of cultures (p. 2).
situation in Italy, especially concerning GDP and public debt, and further affected public portfolios and their cycles. In particular, Fondazione CRC (2019) underscored the critical conditions of local heritage buildings and their legacies, noting 70% disuse (p. 15)\(^{118}\). This tendency towards a new way of considering public buildings depends on the progressive national awareness of the high share of abandonment and disuse of those estates, and their relation to more recent international guidelines concerning ‘no net land take’ \(^{119}\) and ‘buildings’ re-use’ \(^{120}\).

What is crucial is the buildings’ context. In particular, the productive and economic situation shows (i) how difficult it is for private investors to spend their financial resources on these operations, and (ii) the inability of Italian policies and regulations to solve this issue (Bellè, 2017). In spite of these shortcomings, beginning in the early 2010s, temporary and pop-up experiences took place in unused buildings (Inti and Inguaggiato, 2011).

Besides, a new way to consider civic society and its role in light of public sector inefficiency\(^{121}\) has developed based on a phenomenon that progressively flourished in relation to self-government and collective management (Cacciari, 2010; Arena, 2016). The idea is to

\(^{118}\) According to the *Carta del rischio del patrimonio culturale* (2012), the unused heritage and abandoned buildings were around 60% (Fondazione CRC, 2019, p. 15).

\(^{119}\) The aim of ‘no net land take’ (zero soil consumption) is in line with the European policy guidelines (for the 2050) approved in 2013, concerning the liveability of the entire European territory. In general terms, the aim is to preserve ecosystems and biodiversity, that are influenced by the continuous un-regulated development. Compare with the annual report on the consumption of soil made by Ispra. The more recent one (2020) has highlighted an increase of 57,5 square kilometres (Ispra, 2020, p. 33). The ‘deteriorated’ area – as they are defined in the report – have increased to more than 20,000 square kilometres, that is the 6.6 % (Ispra, 2020, p. 183; in this analysis all kinds of deterioration is considered, but it is also including abandoned and dismissed areas and buildings).

\(^{120}\) On this regard, see the recent ESPON (2020) report. The aim is to reach the goal of ‘no net land take’ within 2050, thanks also to the reuse of vacant and abandoned buildings and spaces. The de-industrialisation has led to the creation of urban voids that might be reconsidered and developed in a more creative, sustainable and enhanced way.

\(^{121}\) This inefficiency is related, in particular, with the very limited focus on the market, on the one hand, and on the reduction of the public debt, on the other (Bombardelli, 2016, pp. 2-3)
promote a more efficient and effective method to manage resources with specific reference to social needs. In this case, experiences related to aspects of vacancy and the socio-cultural sphere are combined (Abastante et al., 2021).

Two main experiences present the idea of promoting the revitalisation of unused buildings by civic actors. The first one is the Culturability project, established in 2013, and promoted by Fondazione Unipolis (Table 8).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Culturability call</th>
<th>Aim of the call</th>
<th>Proposed projects</th>
<th>Funded projects</th>
<th>Total funds (for each project)</th>
<th>Case studies (§ 3.2.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013-2014 ‘Fare insieme in cooperativa’</td>
<td>Start-up and innovation</td>
<td>842</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20,000 €</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-2015 ‘Spazi dell’innovazione sociale’</td>
<td>Cultural, creative and innovative projects</td>
<td>996</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>60,000 € (40,000 €, and tutoring and mentoring for 20,000 €)</td>
<td>Mercato Sonato, Bologna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016 ‘Rigenerare spazi da condividere’</td>
<td>Cultural, creative and innovative projects that contribute to revitalisation and buildings reuse</td>
<td>522</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>50,000 €</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017 ‘Rigenerare spazi da condividere’</td>
<td>Cultural, creative and innovative projects that contribute to revitalisation and buildings reuse</td>
<td>429</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>50,000 €</td>
<td>FaRo, Rosarno</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018 ‘Rigenerare spazi da condividere’</td>
<td>Cultural, creative and innovative projects that contribute to revitalisation and buildings reuse</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>50,000 €</td>
<td>L’Imbarchino del Valentino, Torino</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-2022</td>
<td>Consolidate and enhance cultural and innovative projects, with a focus on urban regeneration.</td>
<td>481</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>90,000 € grant + 30,000 € voucher for tutoring, research and consulting + mentoring and tutoring for 25,000 €</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8. Summary of the different Culturability calls by Fondazione Unipolis (source: https://culturability.org/). Rielaboration by the author.

122 Article no. 118 of the Italian Constitution introduce the subsidiarity principle, that considers civic society as an active stakeholder in the policy process. This principle must be recognized and acknowledged by local public administrations. This does not mean that civic society might substitute the public sector, but, on the contrary, that it can operate to foster more integrated and effective policies (Iaione, 2012, pp. 123-124).

123 It is important to note that these temporary experiences involve the gradual engagement of civic actors. Many similar experiences exist, although they lack general and structured regulation to provide a homogeneous framework. All these activities are frequently based on ad hoc tools (Bombardelli, 2016, p. 14). Compare with Cottino and Zandonai (2012, p. 4). These experiences are related with two specific elements: one is the social aim, and the other is the local sphere. See also § 3.2.
The general aim of the *Culturability* initiative is to foster cultural and social activities in unused spaces, and to help different civic experiences to flourish, such as providing funds for their enhancement. With this project, different civic actors (in this case, the focus is on young actors, i.e. under 35 ones) compete and present their vision. *Fondazione Unipolis* acts as both the funder of these initiatives and the mediator with public administrations. There were more than 2,000 proposed projects (Fondazione CRC, 2019, p. 25).

The second experience in this direction is the so-called *Regolamento dei Beni Comuni*, mainly promoted by *Labsus* (an acronym for *Laboratorio per la Sussidiarietà*) and adopted by different municipalities (Bartoletti and Faccioli, 2016; Bombardelli, 2016)\(^\text{124}\). The most recent report underscores that this tool is present in more than 200 municipalities (Labsus, 2019)\(^\text{125}\). In this perspective, the municipality adopts the regulation, and civic actors can either present a project on some already listed ‘urban commons’ or propose others (see § 1.2.)\(^\text{126}\); according to the more recent report presented by Labsus (2019), the agreements – *Patti di Collaborazione* – number more than 1,000, but only 5% concern buildings.

The concept of considering civic actors as potential promoters of revitalisation processes of unused buildings is widely shared and relates to the introduction of the new Third Sector Law (2017), which established guidelines for civic actors (see § 1.3.2.).

\(^\text{124}\) See also Law no. 164 approved in 2014, article 190 which states that public administrations might conclude social partnership contracts based on different activities aiming to enhance and restore unused assets for collective interest (Composta, 2018)

\(^\text{125}\) See also https://www.labsus.org/; the enacted *Regolamenti* are 247 (accessed 18th May 2021).

\(^\text{126}\) The condition of being an ‘urban common’ stands behind the general discussion about ‘public’ (see § 1.1.1.); in particular, these assets were provided by the public sector to satisfy social and local needs (Mela, 2007). Compare with Cottino and Zandonai (2012, p. 3) who consider this tendency as experiments for ‘converting’ public buildings into “communitarian” assets. Moreover, these buildings might be functional in hosting new experiments for social experiences. They might be magnet for local social dynamism in pursuing collective interests (Cottino and Zandonai, 2012, p. 7).
It is essential to emphasise that these tools might vary\textsuperscript{127}, as they refer to a very fine-grained social and economic environment and may require different time-frames when employed in other contexts (Bellè, 2020). According to recent studies, these experiences are more likely to occur in specific situations, with precise conditions (Micelli and Mangialardo, 2016; Mangialardo and Micelli, 2018a).

\textsuperscript{127} There are also other regulations that are adopted by municipalities with a discretionary approach. These cases are discussed by Composta (2018). In certain municipalities there is the possibility for non-profit agents to require free leases (e.g. Ferrara, Bologna, Prato, Reggio Emilia and Vigevano) or the reduction of the rent fee (e.g. Pisa, Pescara, Mantova, Palermo and Torino).
3. Case studies: Examples of public building revitalisation

3.1. Overview

It is interesting to focus on the new trend of public building management because of the nature of the interventions enacted. In the Italian context, these practices are increasing due to a growing acknowledgement of the difficult socio-economic situation (Mangialardo and Micelli, 2018a; see also § 2.3.)\(^ {128}\). Furthermore, increasing discussion and debate have focused on communities and their potential to self-govern creative practices and self-provide services, facilities, and local welfare (Garcia et al., 2015; Tricarico and Pacchi, 2018)\(^ {129}\). The significance of these experiences from a general governance and management perspective is

\(^ {128}\) Compare with Cottino and Zeppetella (2009, p.10): they state that there is also a crisis of the urban public spaces. On the one hand, there is the presence of unsustainable and inadequate facilities and services, related with public sector’s incompetence; on the other hand, there is a progressive complexity in considering communities and society, especially in relation with their citizenship’s rights, their needs and public issues’ treatments.

\(^ {129}\) Compare with Cottino and Zandonai (2012, p. 2). Social innovation is a consequence of the crisis of the traditional model of planning. In particular, in some cases social innovation tackles public buildings, aiming to restore them and create new forms of communitarian uses; compare with Vani (2013) who underscores that importance of the community as a producer of ‘commons’. Compare with Gonzalez and Healey (2005) in relation to the discussion of social innovation and governance practices. Compare with Bragaglia (2021, p. 103) who argues that a wave of ‘radical social innovation’ “occurred between the 1980s and the 2000s, with a particular focus on neighbourhood and community development issues”.
related to the shift from a centralised governance structure to a more decentralised one (Ostrom, 2010). The new tendency towards more inclusive and participatory processes in public building revitalisation arose, initially, spontaneously, highlighting how culture, social inclusion, and local activities might trigger revitalisation processes. In Italy, these processes have grown in importance, and throughout the last five years, many cities have begun to adopt tools able to foster these experiences. This chapter presents Italy’s contemporary situation, with specific attention to processes activated by civic actors. It focuses on the analysis and the discussion of case studies. The chapter is divided into two main sections.

Section § 3.2. will focus on the methodology used to select and analyse the cases of revitalisation processes. The first analysis is based on an ‘extensive’ list of cases, the sample, that includes 45 different revitalisation processes. These cases are investigated in terms of general information. A second analysis includes more detailed information, examined in order to integrate the elements considered in the first phase (in the sample), and it is focused on a shortlist that includes 21 cases. The methodology is based on qualitative and comparative analysis (QCA). This approach will help to compare the different cases in the sample, according to shared elements; the investigation of the shortlist will enrich these key aspects.

---

130 Compare to Gonzalez and Healey (2005, p. 2055): “By social innovation, we mean changes in governance institutions and agency that intend to or have the effect of contributing to improving quality-of-life experiences in a socially inclusive and socially just way. We are interested in particular in transformations in urban governance which expand the understanding of the daily-life conditions of people who suffer from poverty and marginalisation in an urban context and which give voice and power to those who can both express this understanding and raise issues neglected in established governance discourses and practices”. Compare with Moulaert et al. (2019, pp. 62-63): “successful development can rarely be classified as either ‘bottom-up’ or ‘top-down’, but rather as both shaping and shaped by new, dynamic forms of conflicts and cooperation across scale”.

131 There are different ‘movements’ that started informally in the early 2000s. Some of these activities might be understood as a spin-off of the illegal occupations in the early Nineties. Those were more politically biased and targeted to housing’s rights and real estate market’s deprivation (interview with Annibale D’Elia, compare with Vattimo and Recano, 2019; Pecorelli, 2015)
as it includes a more detailed analysis on some specific issues (e.g. relationships with the public administrations; kind of dynamics and revitalisation process evolution).

Section § 3.3. will discuss in general what has emerged in analysing the sample and include some more in-depth discussion based on the shortlist. In particular, this analysis enables to group the cases in the sample into three main ‘interface clusters’ (§ 3.3.1.), in particular: (i) a traditional cluster; (ii) a collaborative cluster; and (iii) a non-traditional cluster. Moreover, this section focuses the attention on key elements of the revitalised buildings and the civic actors that are involved in these processes (§ 3.3.2.). Briefly, what emerges is that there are some important elements that have not been already investigated (e.g. uncertainty, civic actors composition, interface with public administrations), and there is a considerable legal and normative ‘gap’ that, in some cases do not respond effectively both to public administrations and civic actors’ needs.

3.2. Case study selection and method of analysis

The analysis of these revitalisation processes is based on case study analysis. More specifically, this research will present a sample of revitalisation processes in formerly unused public buildings. The approach is based on qualitative and comparative analysis (QCA), which is a case-based method. It compares and investigates similar experiences based on a variety of indicators (Ragin, 1987; Rihoux and Lobe, 2009). The use of a sample to present the phenomenon might be helpful for various reasons. First, the case selection is explicit and replicable. Second, the reasoning behind the selection can strengthen the identification of the cases. Third, the use of sample analysis provides a certain degree of generalisation and
representativeness for the phenomenon. Fourth, it allows separation between theory and testing (Gerring, 2017, p. 125).\footnote{Compare with Rihoux (2013, p. 234) who considers QCA as a potential research approach and a technique, able to grasp both the dissimilarities among the cases and, on the other hand, it “enables forms of ‘modest’ or ‘limited historical’ generalization”. Compare with Rihoux (2006, p. 680) who considers QCA as an approach able to give an in-depth insight about the different examined cases, and to capture their complexity.}

Having a sample of different experiences is crucial to “establish similarities and differences across comparable cases [and] it allows for the assessment of multiple conjunctural causations” (Rihoux, 2013, p. 234).

*Research process.* The investigation and analysis of these revitalisation experiences includes three different processes. First is the *selection of the cases* for the sample\footnote{It includes (i) personal knowledge, (ii) former research on this regard and (iii) official documents and reports. On this concern, see Mangialardo (2017a); Micelli and Mangialardo, 2018a, 2018b, 2018c.}, second is the *analysis of the sample* itself, and third is the analysis of the *specificity of the cases*. Each process includes several steps.

The *selection of the cases* includes three steps. The first step entails screening for cases in which (i) the building is publicly owned, and (ii) there is at least one civic actor involved in the revitalisation process. The second step seeks to understand the kinds of dynamics and processes that happened in each case by roughly researching the case, based on official documents along with news and other reports, to determine if it might contribute to the research question (§ 1.2.)\footnote{On this concern, there will be analysed (i) the phenomenon of revitalisation process, and (ii) the elements that might influence the successfullness of the case. The success does not depend on the physical outcome (the re-use of the buildings). In fact, it is related with different aspect, such as (i) the impact on the physical and social context, and (ii) the evolution of the institutions in facing revitalisation processes.}. This rough analysis relates to a series of different examples of revitalisation processes in unused public buildings. Although some of them have not been selected for the final sample, this analysis was helpful for two main reasons. On the one hand,
it was helpful to better understand the complexity of the phenomenon of revitalisation processes in unused public buildings; on the other, there was the need to focus the research on one specific kind of process in which the civic actors are present and active, and the property is wholly public.\footnote{There were cases that either (i) presents actors that cannot be considered ‘civic actors’ as they do not completely conform (e.g. Bagni Misteriosi or BASE in Milano, or ex Mattatoio di Testaccio in Roma). Others referred to hybrid properties, private properties, or they were temporarily used by public administrations (e.g. Caserma Leopolda in Firenze, ex Colorificio in Pisa or Nuovo Cinema Palazzo in Roma).}

The third step is the actual selection of the cases. The final \textit{sample} includes 45 cases. These cases are heterogeneous for certain respects (e.g. in terms of processes and civic actors), with different period of activity\footnote{The shortlist includes cases that are still ongoing and others that are concluded. This element is important to figure out the precariousness of these experiences either (i) for their novelty or (ii) for the lack of systemic organisations. The aim of this research, in fact, is also to understand which kind of conditions and elements have influenced the outcome in the first place. It could also give a critical perspective on these experiences in relation with their effectiveness and impact.} (Figure 3). Figure 3 presents a general overview of the \textit{sample}, based on the processes. Some of them are still ongoing (62%); others might be considered as ‘pending’ (24.4%) (see also § 3.3.2.); and some others are ‘concluded’ (13.3%). What is crucial is to understand that revitalisation processes in unused public buildings are experiences that might encounter some difficulties. These difficulties will be better explained in § 3.3.2., and the discussion will include also some impressions that emerges from the \textit{shortlist} analysis (that is based on 21 cases).

![Figure 3. Analysis of the sample of the cases, based on their duration and dynamics.](image-url)
The second process is the *analysis of the sample* (i.e. the 45 cases) itself, using the QCA approach. The analysis involves a twofold focus. On the one hand, there is an analysis based on the regional scale; on the other, there is an analysis at the local scale. The two investigations include different indicators\(^{137}\) and focuses (Table 9).

\(^{137}\) Some indicators have been discussed also by Abastante et al. (2021).
Table 9. List of the cases in the sample.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Municipality where the case study is located</th>
<th>Name of the project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Piemonte</td>
<td>Torino</td>
<td>1. Becozanam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. L’Ambarchino del Valentino</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Cavallerizza Reali</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. Mufant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Novara</td>
<td>5. Casa Bossi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lombardia</td>
<td>Milano</td>
<td>6. Cencina Montelu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7. Fabbrica del Vapone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8. Tempio del Futuro Perduto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9. Macso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bergamo</td>
<td>10. Edone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11. Composto del Carro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12. EXSA (ex Carceri di Sant’Agata)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cremona</td>
<td>13. CRAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veneto</td>
<td>Livorno</td>
<td>14. Ex Caserma Occupata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Venezia</td>
<td>15. Sale Docks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16. Caserma Pepe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Belluno</td>
<td>17. Hangar 11 (Caserma Piave)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Treviso</td>
<td>18. Caserma Pave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emilia Romagna</td>
<td>Parma</td>
<td>19. On/Off Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ferrara</td>
<td>20. Factory Gressi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bologna</td>
<td>21. Dymaro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22. Mercato Sonato</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23. Instabile Portazza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24. XM24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Forli</td>
<td>25. ExATR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lazio</td>
<td>Roma</td>
<td>26. Teatro Valle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>27. Rampa Prenestina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>28. Palestre Popolare San Lorenzo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Umbria</td>
<td>Termini</td>
<td>29. CAOS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campania</td>
<td>Napoli</td>
<td>30. Ex Asilo Filangieri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>31. Esa OIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>32. Lo Scugnizzo Liberato</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>33. Domus Ars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>34. Il Giardino Liberato dei Martedì</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puglia</td>
<td>Lecce</td>
<td>35. Manifatture KNOS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bari</td>
<td>36. Young Market Lab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>San Vito dei Normanni (Brindisi)</td>
<td>37. Ex Fadda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Taranto</td>
<td>38. Officine Tarantina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basilicata</td>
<td>Potenza</td>
<td>39. Moon – La luna al Granaglio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calabria</td>
<td>Lamezia Terme (Catanzaro)</td>
<td>40. CRAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rosarno (Reggio Calabria)</td>
<td>41. Civico Train</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sicilia</td>
<td>Palermo</td>
<td>42. FiRo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Catania</td>
<td>43. Carceri Culturali della Voca</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sardegna</td>
<td>Cagliari</td>
<td>45. Sia Manifatture</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The cases of the sample are divided according to their location in the different regions and cities. Table 8 provides a list of the cases in the sample. They will be discussed extensively in § 3.3.2. (see also Appendix – Regional Analysis, and Appendix – Case studies Analysis).
Although regions may be large, some elements might provide a general overview of the normative economic and social Italian background relevant for the case studies (see the Appendix – Regional Analysis)\(^ {138}\). The second investigation moves to the local level to strengthen the analysis of the sample. At this level, two elements are examined: (i) the external environment (related to the contextual conditions)\(^ {139}\) and (ii) the internal features (related to the case itself)\(^ {140}\). This analysis is grounded on ‘direct’ information (e.g. evidence and official documents). Thus, it is possible to understand the elements that frequently influence the outcome (see also the discussion in Micelli and Mangialardo, 2016).

However, since the objective analysis does not provide information about the development and the internal dynamics of the revitalisation process (crucial in understanding the conditions and institutional principles involved), the analysis uses also a semi-structured questionnaire\(^ {141}\). This device was sent to a list of 22 civic actors involved in 21 different revitalisation examples\(^ {142}\) (the shortlist cases). This selection is made looking at the sample, and selecting those cases that might help to deepen a certain discussion (e.g. civic actors, kind of agreement and uncertainty, see § 3.3.2). Moreover, the shortlist helps the reader to understand the

\(^{138}\) Also, the comparison among the different regions might refute the long-standing tradition and discussions about the dichotomy North-South.

\(^{139}\) The analysis of the external features is related to the contextual conditions of each case, for example the scale of the city, the population, the kind of local tools provided by public administrations for revitalising unused public buildings.

\(^{140}\) The internal features are related to the ‘sufficient numbers of features’ that operate in similar situations (Rihoux, 2006, p. 687; Ragin et al., 1996). In this way, the sample describes situations in which there are elements of similarities (but also dissimilarities) among the different examples.

\(^{141}\) The questionnaire aims to provide issues not investigated in terms of internal and external features. It is structured in 17 different questions (14 questions concern the case study; the other three are related to the general impression they have about their experience and the socio-political and economic environment where they practice), and it was sent to the civic actors (the second shortlist), to grasp elements that are not provided by general observation. The general framework (Ostrom) of this research is also the assumption of this questionnaire (§ 1.4.).

\(^{142}\) These cases include different experiences in terms of features, outcome, and dynamics.
aggregation and the combination of the *internal* and *external* elements, as revitalisation processes are a complex system of *key elements* and *conditions* (Table 10).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Shortlisted cases</th>
<th>Civic actors involved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lombardia</td>
<td>Milano</td>
<td>Fabbriera del Vapore</td>
<td>Via Farini</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tempsio del Futuro Perduto,</td>
<td>The Art Land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Milano</td>
<td>Collettivo Tempsio del</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Futuro Perduto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bergamo</td>
<td>Edonè</td>
<td>Nutopia, former Mellow Yellow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cremona</td>
<td>CRAC – Cremona</td>
<td>CRAC APS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veneto</td>
<td>Venezia</td>
<td>Sale Docks</td>
<td>Collettivo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Casarina Pepe</td>
<td>Biennale Urbana (Burb)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emilia Romagna</td>
<td>Parma</td>
<td>On/Off Office</td>
<td>Group of different associations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ferrara</td>
<td>Factory Grisù</td>
<td>Consorte Grisù</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bologna</td>
<td>Dynamo</td>
<td>Associazione Salvaciclisti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Instabile Portazza</td>
<td>Iniistabile Portazza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>XM24</td>
<td>Collettivo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Forli</td>
<td>Ex ATR</td>
<td>Spazi Indecisi, Città di Elba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lazio</td>
<td>Latina</td>
<td>Teatro Valle</td>
<td>Spazi Indecisi, Città di Elba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rampa Principeina</td>
<td>Cenca Onlus, ABCittù</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Palestra Popolare San Lorenzo</td>
<td>Spazi Indecisi, Città di Elba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campania</td>
<td>Napoli</td>
<td>Ex Asilo Filangieri</td>
<td>Asio’s Aabitanti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ex Giardino Liberato dei</td>
<td>Collettivo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mariadei</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puglia</td>
<td>Lecce</td>
<td>Manifacture KNOS</td>
<td>Associazione Sud Est</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bari</td>
<td>Young Market Lab</td>
<td>Kreativa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sun Vito dei Normanni</td>
<td>Ex Fadda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Brindisi)</td>
<td>Sandei</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calabria</td>
<td>Rosarno</td>
<td>FaRo</td>
<td>Associazione Kiwi</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10. List of the cases in the shortlist.

Table 10 presents the *shortlisted* cases that have been selected for the in-depth analysis on some specific elements. They are, similarly to the *sample*, very heterogeneous, also in terms of ‘period of activity’ (Figure 4). The importance of having a comparison between the *sample* and the *shortlist* might help to understand which are the conditions and the *internal dynamics* that have contribute to the enhancement (or not) of the revitalisation processes.
This provides other elements useful to understand the kind of revitalisation processes that emerge in very different contexts and with a variety of patterns of dynamics. The role of the questionnaire (and in some cases, also, of interviews), and the shortlist in general, is very important because the civic actors involved in the revitalisation processes have to face different situations and, in some cases, they face complex issues, that are not easily understandable from a general and objective analysis. In this way, the thesis addresses some ‘other’ features that influence and directly affect the outcome of the processes.

As Figure 5 and 6 shows, the sample and the shortlisted cases are quite well-spread across the Italian territory.
Figure 5. Localisation of the cases in the sample and in the shortlist.

Figure 6. Analysis of the shortlisted cases in comparison with the sample.
Table 11 roughly presents the research process, focusing on the methodology and the outcome expected from each kind of analysis. As already discussed, the *sample* (45 cases), and the *shortlist* (21 cases, related to 22 civic actors) are analysed jointly.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research process</th>
<th>Steps</th>
<th>Rielaboration of the data and methodology</th>
<th>Outcome expected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Research on revitalisation processes in Italy</strong></td>
<td>Selection of case studies based on first and second-hand information. Specific focus to (i) public buildings and (ii) revitalisation processes enacted by civic actors</td>
<td>General overview of the phenomenon in Italy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Selection of the sample</strong></td>
<td>Analysis of different elements that are common for all the cases. This research is based on QCA approach, which leads also to have a comparison among a variety of revitalisation processes. QCA approach also helps to derive the common element that will be discussed (see also Appendix – Case studies Analysis)</td>
<td>General information about revitalisation processes in different Italian regions, with specific attention to common trends and patterns of development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Selection of the shortlist</strong></td>
<td>Preparation of a semi-structured questionnaire. The questionnaire includes questions related to aspects that have to be further investigated, as the <em>sample</em> does not provide a wholly understandable context (e.g. what civic actors consider to be important in a revitalisation process; which are the limitations of the revitalisations; how do they work). QCA approach is used also in this section to provide data that might be comparable among the different cases.</td>
<td>Integration of these information in the general <em>sample</em> overview to enrich the discussion about revitalisation processes. Aggregation of data (e.g. civic actors and public administrations; public administration and planning tools; dynamics)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11. Research process and the steps adopted for the analysis of the case studies.
Limitations of the method. Although the sample is based on similar indicators, the cases peculiarities lie in their different political, social, and economic contexts\textsuperscript{143}. Nevertheless, some crucial issues might remain outside this analysis. This is why the research both consults official data and incorporates qualitative data (using the QCA approach). Both of these steps have encountered some limitations. On the one hand, the consultation of official data might be either outdated or incomplete (as in the case of public properties), or they could be aggregated (as in the case of non-profit organisations at the regional level), in which case it is not possible to derive the sub-data. On the other hand, this research also faces two qualitative limitations: the first is the impossibility of verifying the qualitative data through fieldwork\textsuperscript{144}, and the second is the limited—and sometimes biased—information provided by civic actors\textsuperscript{145}. Despite these limitations, the study is still data-based, which allows us to discuss and underscore a variety of issues.

3.3. Case studies: A variety of experiences

According to the methodology, 45 cases were selected to be initially included in the sample. As already mentioned, the analysis is twofold. The first-level analysis is devoted to the general comprehension of the sample. It highlights regional and local features that are re-
assembled based on (i) personal knowledge, (ii) official data and (iii) direct observation (see Appendix – Regional Analysis, and Appendix – Case studies Analysis). The QCA approach is employed for the sample, and also for the shortlist.

What becomes apparent at the regional scale is that there is not a specific relation between the civic actors’ experiences and the regional context\(^{146}\). In particular, the social capital analysis (which includes five indicators\(^{147}\)) underscores that there might be other conditions influencing these activities in very heterogeneous contexts (Figure 7).

![Figure 7. Social capital and location (cities) of the cases in the sample. Rielaboration by the author from BES data (2019).](image)

\(^{146}\) There are anyway some dissimilarities that emerge between north and south (some indicators, in fact, are lower in southern regions, a more detailed analysis of the regional scale is provided in the Appendix – Regional Analysis). In brief, the analysis includes the following elements: (i) regional regulation on buildings and civic actors, (ii) urban renovation policies and specific regional programmes, (iii) public heritage (MEF, 2019), and (iv) density of non-profit organisations (Istat, 2020). Other elements have been analysed to provide an overview of the regional context and to support the local analysis (BES, 2019). In particular, the regional analysis provides an outline of different elements: (i) social capital, (ii) level of education, (iii) welfare and (iv) general condition of the environment. These more specific analyses are provided only for the regions where the cases are located.

\(^{147}\) The indicators are: (i) social participation, (ii) civic and political participation, (iii) voluntary work, (iv) associations’ financing, and (v) employees in creative companies (BES, 2019).
As Putnam (1993) emphasises, social capital is defined as the inclination of individuals to cooperate\textsuperscript{148}. Moreover, it is a potential collective resource able to mobilise and engage society in innovative and collective actions (Mangialardo, 2017b). According to the definition by Putnam (1993), social capital is more related to individuals. This motivates the potential mismatch of social capital and the sample in Figure 8: regions, in fact, include widely varying contexts. This is why the local sphere and the questionnaire are necessary for an accurate analysis and a more fine-grained investigation of specific elements\textsuperscript{149}.

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{social_capital_map.png}
\caption{Analysis of the social capital in the regions where case studies are located.}
\end{figure}

\textsuperscript{148} Compare to Putnam (2002, pp. 6-7) who stressed the idea of social capital as twofold: internal, that is connected with ‘returns’, and external, that is related to the idea that social capital is also a ‘public good’. On this last point, social capital has also public effects, especially within the neighbourhood. Dense networks and social interaction might contribute to solve the dilemma of collective actions. Compare to Putnam (2001, p. 41): “The central idea of social capital, in my view, is that networks and the associated norms of reciprocity have value. They have value for the people who are in them, and they have, at least in some instances, demonstrable externalities, so that there are both public and private faces of social capital.” Compare to Putnam (1994, pp. 6-7): “[…] ‘social capital’ refers to features of social organization, such as networks, norms, and trust, that facilitate coordination and cooperation for mutual benefit. Social capital enhances the benefits of investment in physical and human capital”.

\textsuperscript{149} The regional scale is a first step for the analysis at the local scale. In general, some indicators discussed in the paragraph above will be used to combine better local information.
The combination of the two levels of scale is important for understanding both the general overview of the phenomenon and the specific context (see Appendix – Regional Analysis and Appendix – Case studies Analysis).

The sample is studied based on essential elements. These elements are related to the internal features (specifically related to the case in question); others concern the external features, which are more connected with the administrative sphere (e.g. planning policies and public policies regarding revitalisation or similar issues), and the municipal context (e.g. population and density)\textsuperscript{150}.

The external features (i.e. the context) might depend on regional planning laws (concerning buildings and their re-use). Moreover, the majority of the municipalities have adopted planning tools for enabling revitalisation processes (e.g. Regolamento Usi Civici, Regolamento dei Beni Comuni, or other crafted policies). Table 12 presents the use of Regolamento dei Beni Comuni in the different cities where the revitalisation experiences are enacted. The majority of the municipality (54%) have adopted this tool, and some of them have already amended it (e.g. Torino, Bologna and Livorno). Others (11%) have started the process of adoption (e.g. Novara, Taranto and Palermo). Still others (35%) do not have any specific tool for these initiatives – except from Napoli\textsuperscript{151} – but they do have the ordinary ones.

\textsuperscript{150} Regarding the former, the contexts analysed are the cities. In general, the cities that are taken into consideration are different in size. Roughly, they are divided into: (i) ‘very small cities’, with less than 20,000 inhabitants; (ii) ‘small cities’, cities that have between 20,000 and 50,000 inhabitants; (iii) ‘medium size cities’ includes municipalities with 50,000 – 200,000 inhabitants; (iv) ‘large cities are the one with more than 200,000 inhabitants, and (v) ‘very large cities’ have more than 600,000 inhabitants.

\textsuperscript{151} Napoli adopted the ‘Laboratori’ and organises workshop and an Assembly for the Urban Common, based on Rodotà (1990) and his ‘Commissione Rodotà’ (2007). The case of the Asilo was the pilot project for similar projects with similar dynamics (e.g. Lo Scugnizzo Liberato, Ex OPG).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>Regolamento Beni Comuni Urbani (Labsus)</th>
<th>Approval</th>
<th>Other information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Piemonte</td>
<td>Torino</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>The tool was reviewed in 2019 with some innovations (e.g. from ‘active citizens’ to ‘civic actors’, the re-introduction of the public administration as ‘active’ stakeholder in the processes).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Novara</td>
<td>(Y)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Not an official document yet, but they are working with Labsus on a workshop (2021) to awaken citizens to this opportunity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lombardia</td>
<td>Milano (Metropolitan City of Milano)</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bergamo</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cremona</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veneto</td>
<td>Venezia</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Belluno</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Treviso</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emilia-Romagna</td>
<td>Bologna</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>It was the first Regolamento to be approved and a reference for the others. In 2020 it started a process of ‘review’, focusing on citizens’ participation and ‘imagination’. Workshops with ETS, and others organised by the neighbourhood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ferrara</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Differently from the others, the Regolamento includes: ‘Carta dei beni comuni’ (manifesto of principles and civic actions), ‘from Carta to Regolamento’ (structured and very similar to Regolamento), and conclusions. In parallel, there is a tool for assisting the first two years of sperimentation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parma</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Review in 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Forlì</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>The process started in 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toscana</td>
<td>Livorno</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Review in 2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The process is in stand-by. There were different attempts: one in 2015; the second in 2017; the third one in 2018 and now (2021) the public administration is still discussing it.

They have a different *Regolamento*, that was approved in 2012 after the dynamics in ex Asilo Filangieri (Municipal Resolution no. 17 approved on the 18th January 2013; and Municipal Resolution no. 521 approved on the 11th July 2013)

Public Administration is evaluating to adopt it

Table 12. Analysis of the planning tools concerning public buildings revitalisation by civic actors. *Rielaboration by the author.*

As Micelli and Mangialardo (2016) underscore, one primary condition for these examples’ success is directly related to social capital and the derived density of networks in larger cities (Table 13 and Figure 9).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>Population (1st Jan 2021)</th>
<th>Density (inhab./km²)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Piemonte</td>
<td>Torino</td>
<td>848,196</td>
<td>6,515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Novara</td>
<td>101,916</td>
<td>274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lombardia</td>
<td>Milano</td>
<td>1,397,715</td>
<td>7,695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bergamo</td>
<td>119,684</td>
<td>2,981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cremona</td>
<td>71,523</td>
<td>1,015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veneto</td>
<td>Venezia</td>
<td>255,609</td>
<td>344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Belluno</td>
<td>35,505</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Treviso</td>
<td>84,930</td>
<td>358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emilia-Romagna</td>
<td>Bologna</td>
<td>394,463</td>
<td>2,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ferrara</td>
<td>132,288</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parma</td>
<td>200,218</td>
<td>760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Forli</td>
<td>117,479</td>
<td>517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toscana</td>
<td>Livorno</td>
<td>156,031</td>
<td>1,490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Umbria</td>
<td>Terni</td>
<td>109,255</td>
<td>518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lazio</td>
<td>Roma</td>
<td>2,783,809</td>
<td>808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campania</td>
<td>Napoli</td>
<td>940,940</td>
<td>2,652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puglia</td>
<td>Bari</td>
<td>313,003</td>
<td>323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>San Vito dei Normanni (Brindisi)</td>
<td>18,331</td>
<td>273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lecce</td>
<td>93,673</td>
<td>282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Taranto</td>
<td>189,366</td>
<td>758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basilicata</td>
<td>Potenza</td>
<td>65,988</td>
<td>378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calabria</td>
<td>Lamezia Terme (Catanzaro)</td>
<td>67,713</td>
<td>432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rosarno (Reggio Calabria)</td>
<td>14,170</td>
<td>373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sicilia</td>
<td>Palermo</td>
<td>640,720</td>
<td>3,986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Catania</td>
<td>294,298</td>
<td>312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sardegna</td>
<td>Cagliari</td>
<td>149,474</td>
<td>1,767</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 13. Analysis of the population of the municipalities where the cases are located. Rielaboration by the author from ISTAT data (source: http://dati.istat.it/)
Cities such as Torino, Milano, Roma, and Napoli have the densest clusters of cases (see Figure 7: the 35% of the total experiences is located in ‘very large’ cities. There are also ‘large cities’ (e.g. Bologna), and ‘medium size’ cities (e.g. Bergamo) where the density of cases is relatively high. Around 9% of the sample is located in Bologna\textsuperscript{152}; the 6.7% is located in Bergamo.

To fully understand the cases, the thesis provides a scheme where the sample is analysed according to the internal features (Appendix – Case studies Analysis), together with an investigation on some others peculiarities that might not emerge from QCA approach (this information is derived from the shortlist).

To better understand the cases and the Italian context, the analysis of the sample provides a brief presentation of the dynamics of the revitalisation processes. On this concern, the

\textsuperscript{152} In this case, Bologna on the one hand, a strong attitude among citizens towards civic participation and, on the other, a long-standing tradition in the Bologna municipality of cooperation and participation.
sample is divided into (i) ‘policy-driven’ cases and (ii) ‘context-driven’ ones. This categorisation is strictly connected with the analysis and the definition of the civic actors (§ 1.3.2.).

‘Policy-driven’ cases in this research are the cases following the ordinary process of revitalisation, usually starting from top-down. The ‘context-driven’ cases are the ones with a bottom-up approach. It has to be clear that this distinction is based on the usual bias that urban planning processes and practices are traditionally ‘planned’ in a certain way. The ‘context-driven’ emerged from the contexts and social practices and, for this reason they cannot be defined a priori. The analysed sample is quite balanced: 52.3% of the cases are ‘policy-driven’ and the other share (47.7%) refers to ‘context-driven’ cases.

It is important to highlight, on the one hand, that revitalisation processes are continuously evolving, but this preliminary distinction might be employed in analysing on-going cases. On the other hand, these two categories coexist in contemporary urban planning practices.

Revitalisation, in fact, does not directly depend on the formalisation of the process: actually, around 21% of the ‘context-driven’ cases have been policy-directed throughout the time. As also stressed by Cellamare (2019), urban revitalisation public policies are frequently inadequate and do not satisfy social needs, whilst bottom-up experiences are more tailored to urban contexts.

153 The two features are discussed in the thesis as theoretical guidelines to generalise and distinguish among revitalisation processes.
3.3.1. The three clusters: traditional, collaborative and non-traditional interface

To understand the different cases, they are combined into ‘clusters’. The clusters are based on the revitalisation process applied to unused public buildings, and the dynamics that affect the stakeholders. The analysis is carried out for the *sample* of cases (45 experiences). All the processes present different combinations of actions that might be described according to this distinction.

The ‘interface clusters’ might be divided into three main categories: (i) traditional, (ii) cooperative, and (iii) non-traditional.

This division is important because regeneration processes might occur in different ways and, also, they might lead to expected or unexpected outcomes. This aspect concerns uncertainty and it is important to recognize the clusters (not only in theory but also in practice) to possibly activate forms of cooperation or organisation, or to prevent their interruption. Figure 10 provides general information on the sample, based on the three different clusters that will be described.

![Cluster distribution](image)

*Figure 10. Percentage of the different clusters in the sample.*
Moreover, Table 14 presents six different examples that have been used to define the clusters. They are located in different regions but they present similar dynamics. In general, the selection of the cases is based on the willingness to present similar dynamics in completely different contexts, and on the opportunity to disentangle this complex issue of revitalisation processes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cluster: ‘Traditional’</th>
<th>Cluster: ‘Cooperative’</th>
<th>Cluster: ‘Non-Traditional’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fabbrica del Vapore, Milano (Lombardia)</td>
<td>Edonè, Bergamo (Lombardia)</td>
<td>Palestra Popolare San Lorenzo, Roma (Lazio)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAOS, Terni (Umbria)</td>
<td>Ex Asilo Filangieri, Napoli (Campania)</td>
<td>XM24, Bologna (Emilia Romagna)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mercato Sonato and Dynamo, Bologna (Emilia Romagna)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 14. Cases discussed for each cluster.

First Cluster: traditional interface. The first cluster includes the ‘traditional’ interface. This category presents ordinary and streamlined processes of regeneration. It involves, in particular, the cases where the public administrations decided to entrust public buildings to civic actors for social and cultural purposes. In the second instance, civic actors were asked to present proposals to a public call. This process is shared by about 51% of cases.

The two cases chosen to exemplify this cluster are: Fabbrica del Vapore in Milano, and CAOS in Terni.

In the case of Fabbrica del Vapore in Milano, the public administration decided to renovate a former industrial building close to the city centre. From 2002 Fabbrica del Vapore has been hosting different kind of activities. The idea of the municipality was to have a common space where a variety of socio-cultural experiences could meet (e.g. ViaFarini, or The Art Land[^154]).

[^154]: These two projects are part of the Fabbrica del Vapore. The civic actors were also involved in the shortlist.
The contract award criteria are based on a public call. The call involved some guidelines that civic actors needed to follow and the agreement was free of charge (three years, extendable to other three years).

This case is similar to CAOS in Terni. In this case, the municipality invested money to transform a former industrial building into a cultural hub (1997-2002). Some of the spaces host a museum and others are ‘vacant’ and free to use. The municipality of Terni decided to entrust the building through a public call. For one period Indisciplinarte was the social entrepreneur of the space (2009-2014), then this civic actor expected the extension of the
leases but the municipality preferred to give the space to another civic actor (Cooperativa Le Macchine Celibi, from 2020).

Other similar cases have been analysed in Bologna (in the period 2015-2019), the Dynamo or Mercato Sonato projects\footnote{These projects started and finished in the same period as they are two experiences that won a Bologna municipal call, Incredibol! . This public call is promoted every year since 2015. In 2020 was approved the ninth edition (https://www.incredibol.net/).}. The difference here is that public administration did not intervene on the buildings. The revitalisation process in the Bologna cases is both physical and social. These projects are ‘pending’, as the civic actors do not know how to deal with the expiration of their free grant.

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{image3.jpg}
\caption{CAOS in Terni (Source: BellaUmbria.net)}
\end{figure}

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{image4.jpg}
\caption{Mercato Sonato in Bologna. The building was not restored by the municipality therefore the association decided to cover the walls with graffiti. (Source: Cooperative City Magazine)}
\end{figure}

\footnote{These projects started and finished in the same period as they are two experiences that won a Bologna municipal call, Incredibol! . This public call is promoted every year since 2015. In 2020 was approved the ninth edition (https://www.incredibol.net/).}
Figure 11 present the cases that have been analysed and focuses on two main important elements for this cluster: the public intervention on the building\textsuperscript{156}, and the civic actors’ settlement in the building. These are important also for the other clusters, but it is important to underscore the different \textit{steps} of the process.

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{fig11.png}
\caption{First interface cluster and two of the main elements defining this cluster.}
\end{figure}

\textbf{Second cluster: cooperative interface.} The second cluster (cooperative) consists of cases where ‘cooperation’ and ‘coproduction’ are the key element of regeneration processes. It is called “cooperative” because in these cases public administrations and civic actors cooperated to build a common language on revitalisation, and also on the formal agreement that would best suit civic actors’ proposals and objectives. This cluster includes around 30 of the sample.

\textsuperscript{156} Whenever public administration is intervening on a building, especially in this case, is because the general aim is to create ‘cultural and innovative hub’. Similar cases are: Manifatture KNOS in Lecce; Factory Grisù in Ferrara; Zo- Centro Culture Contemporane in Catania; Sa Manifattura in Cagliari.
The two selected cases to exemplify this ‘cooperative interface’ are: Edonè in Bergamo, and Ex Asilo Filangieri in Napoli.

Edonè started in the early 2000 and, similarly to other cases in Italy, it had the opportunity to cooperate with the public administration to create new tools for the emerging phenomenon of bottom-up experiences: something that was un-planned and ‘context-driven’\textsuperscript{157}. Edonè in Bergamo had a bottom-up approach, to address specific and contextual need that young people expressed. The civic actors Mellow Mood (2005) started to organise music festivals and gatherings. This situation affected positively the community, especially the one living in the neighbourhood, and it echoed up to the public administration. The municipality recognised the importance of the civic actor for their role in the neighbourhood, and the socio-cultural importance of the space, subsequently called Edonè. This opened up to a co-production of a call for tenders for the management of the space. In this way, the public call was tailored based on civic actors’ know-how and knowledge about the context using public administration tools.

In general terms, the co-production model is a new trend of bottom-up experiences that has emerged without the involvement of public administrations’ in expectations and training. This means that the conditions and the arrangements are ‘tailored’ case-by-case, with different outcomes. The examples of collaborative clusters are: Edonè in Bergamo and the Ex Asilo Filangieri in Napoli.

\textsuperscript{157} Another example is BASE in Milano, that was one of the other pioneer cases started in the early 2000s. Edonè and also BASE were two pioneer examples on which future devices and tools have been crafted and used for revitalisation processes. (interview with Matteo Bartolomeo, 2020)
Another similar case that might be considered as a pioneer is the Ex Asilo Filangieri in Napoli. This case started as an occupation of an abandoned historical building in the city centre (2012) by a group of artists. Thereafter, the three-day event (promoted by the artists) generated an interest in the building that started to be considered part of the neighbourhood. The Asilo became a landmark for the neighbourhood and for Napoli. The civic actors started occupying the building illicitly; they organised events, and provided social and cultural services for the community. In 2012, the municipality of Napoli opened up a round-table meeting, together with the abitanti (the civic actors in the Asilo) to consider the historical building as an urban common (Municipal Resolution no. 17 approved on the 18th of January 2013; Municipal Resolution no. 521 approved on the 11th July 2013). This was the first case in this perspective, and it triggered the emergence of other ‘urban commons’ (such as Lo Scugnizzo Liberato and Ex OPG in Napoli; La Cavallerizza Reale in Torino).
Figure 12 summarises the two case studies analysed for presenting the collaborative interface. The elements that emerge are two, and they are precisely related to the ‘timing’ of the actions: the civic actors’ settlement in the building, and the cooperation with the public administration. In both cases, but this is valid for all the cases in this cluster, there is no intervention from the public administration’s side.
Third cluster: non-traditional interface. The third cluster is called ‘non-traditional’ as it might be considered opposite to the traditional one. It has a bottom-up approach, differently from the ‘traditional’ one (that is top-down): civic actors raise interests and start the revitalisation without initially interacting with the public administrations. This cluster includes around 18% of the sample. There are two subcategories in this cluster, differently from the other two. In fact, the ‘non-traditional’ starts as such but, the dynamics might lead to two different outcomes: (i) the progressive coproduction of civic actors and public administrations (also included into the second category of the ‘cooperative’), (ii) conflictual processes or disregard from one of the parties involved. These cases started with a bottom-up approach but, differently from the ‘cooperative’ ones, they did not follow a ‘legal framework’, either because public administration did not take into consideration these experiences or because civic actors were in conflict with the government (see also § 1.3.2.).

158 These dynamics are also linked to the description of civic actors (§ 1.3.2.).
This was the case, for example, of Palestra Popolare di San Lorenzo in Roma, and XM24 in Bologna. These two cases of occupation started earlier than the other examples presented in this section (respectively, in 1998 and 2002). In that period, bottom-up experiences were not as present as they are in the contemporary context. Also, the kind of knowledge we have on bottom-up experience, in the contemporary debate, is different from the one at that time. Bottom-up experiences of this kind were more related to political and antagonistic movements (see also Pecorelli, 2015). For this reason, both Palestra Popolare San Lorenzo and XM24 faced different administrations and made temporary and occasional agreements. In the case of Palestra Popolare di San Lorenzo, they reached an agreement with the public administration after 10 years of occupation (in 2008) and from 2018 to 2020, and now (2020) they are getting evicted; XM24 reached some occasional agreements with the public administration (like the one in 2015-2016), but they were permanently evicted in 2019.

Image 8. The entrance of Palestra Popolare San Lorenzo. The banner said “We won’t go away!” because the public administration wanted to evict them from the building. (Source: La Repubblica, 2020)
Figure 13 presents the third cluster of interfaces with specific attention to the different elements that are included in this kind of processes: the public intervention ‘on’ the civic actors and, possibly, the temporary agreement. These two elements are important as the temporary agreement derives from the collaboration but, if there is not collaboration, the public intervene against the civic actors.

Figure 13. Third interface cluster and three of the main elements defining this cluster.

These clusters of interfaces have to be considered as ‘fluid’ categories. In particular, in relation to the cases, the patterns of dynamics are very heterogeneous, but they share four
common elements, in relation to ‘timing’. Two of them are linear: public intervention (either on the building, or on the civic actors), and communication. The other two are punctual: the civic actors’ settlement in the building, and the temporary (or more stable) agreement. Combining together these elements, taking into account the time-related steps, this cluster distinction might be useful to understand revitalisation processes. Also, it will be helpful in understanding the complexity of the cases in the first place, and allows for further investigations.

In general, the sample helps in having an important outlook in relation to revitalisation processes. If the ‘traditional cluster’ is compared with the other two (‘cooperative’ and ‘non-traditional’), the percentage are quite similar (51.2 % vs 48.8%). However, on the ‘traditional’ side the process is clear and direct; in the other cases, the processes might be more complex. In these cases, there is not a general guideline or a process that have to be followed, each case is based on ad hoc arrangements, that are not repeatable – and effective – in different contexts (see also § 4.).

3.3.2. First findings on type of buildings and civic actors involved

This section presents the elements emerged (based on the QCA approach). It considers both the sample (45 cases) and the shortlist (21 cases, related to 22 different civic actors)\textsuperscript{159}, and provides a recognition of different internal and external elements. The shortlist is used

---

\textsuperscript{159} The case studies are associated to the buildings, but in the case of Fabbrica del Vapore (Milano), the civic actors involved are more than one. This distinction emerges once the questionnaire was sent, as the building does not always correspond to one single actor. In cases where the building correspond to a civic actor, is because there is the presence of a social entrepreneur, managing the general environment of the building and the revitalisation process (e.g. Factory Grisù, Ferrara).
to better define specific *internal-external* elements, or to aggregate them for specific situations and dynamics. The cases are heterogeneous both in terms of localisation (Figure 5 and 6), and in terms of cluster of interfaces (50% of them are ‘traditional’, 27.3% are ‘collaborative’ and 22.7% are ‘non-traditional’).

The use of the questionnaire was helpful in understanding some kinds of correlation among the different elements. In both cases, the analysis uses the QCA approach. The further discussion on the cases provides both a general overview of the *sample*, and some insight taken from the *shortlisted* cases.

**Buildings.** The sample shows a balance in the locations of the buildings. Some are located in central or semi-central areas, while others are in suburban or peripheral areas (Figure 14).
The kinds of activities are similar, but the kinds of services provided in the latter locations concern social services and answer more local needs. In general, the buildings in city centres are more likely to be ‘cultural hubs’ (e.g. Fabbrica del Vapore in Milano; CAOS in Terni).

According to what Micelli and Mangialardo suggested (2016) about the centrality of the activities, it is interesting to notice that the central areas of the cities, whether they are small or large, are a preferable location for revitalisation processes. Also, the possibility to have ‘unused’ buildings in the central area might influence the reputation of the city, and it might be less attractive for further investments.

This usage is linked with the economy of scale, derived from networks and the provision of public buildings. Public buildings that function this way are large and flexible enough to enable civic actors’ experiences inside.

In most cases, the former condition of the public buildings was either abandoned (around 58%), which means that it was left empty, it had structural and functional problems, and it is no more maintained; another large part is ‘dismissed’, but not abandoned, which means that the building is no more performative for specific functions (35.5%)\(^\text{160}\). There are a few examples in which the public building (or the space in question) might be considered ‘empty’ (it is the case of 6.7% of the buildings; e.g. Casa BeeOzanam, Torino; or Acropolis—Tempio del Futuro Perduto, Milano)\(^\text{161}\). However, the restoration of public buildings does not have a direct connection with full use. The sample highlights that some of these buildings were still

\(^{160}\) With specific reference to Moroni et al. (2020a; 2020b); see also the Glossary in the Appendix. The condition of being ‘abandoned’ is because some of the public buildings that are taken into account were either (i) dismissed and left in a bad state of maintenance (e.g. military barracks or former industrial buildings), or (ii) they were not ordinarily maintained by the in-charge public agencies. That condition influence also the possible intervention on the public building by the public agency (e.g. Manifatture KNOS in Lecce; CAOS in Terni; Fabbrica del Vapore in Milano). However, part of these abandoned buildings has been restored by the civic actors (e.g. Instabile Portazza in Bologna; L’imbarchino del Valentino and Mufant in Torino) with other forms of funds (e.g. Culturability calls, Regional and local funds and crowdfunding).

\(^{161}\) For this distinction see § 1.1. and the Glossary in the Appendix.
partially unused. The decision to revitalise them depended either (i) on the division of the public buildings into sub-spaces able to accommodate diverse civic actors to create the ‘cultural hub’ (e.g. Factory Grisù in Ferrara; Caserma Piave in Belluno; Fabbrica del Vapore in Milano) or (ii) on the impossibility for a single civic actor to manage the maintenance cost for the whole building (e.g. Carcere di Sant’ Agata in Bergamo; the cases in Napoli; Cavallerizza IrReale in Torino). Civic actors find innovative ways to raise revenue for revitalisation. In particular, since they are non-profit, they might (i) use their activities to raise the money\(^\text{162}\) needed to maintain the activities, or (ii) to present proposals to public calls\(^\text{163}\), (iii) or rely on the tool of civic crowdfunding\(^\text{164}\). In this case, these examples are considered self-financed.

**Civic Actors.** The civic actors are the second element under investigation. They form one of the two main preliminary components—together with public buildings—that structure this thesis’s discussion. Based on the previous discussion in § 1.3.2., the sample describes the civic actors (47 civic actors have been analysed)\(^\text{165}\), with specific attention to their main

\(^{162}\) In particular, they promote a vast schedule of cultural activities, events and cultural performances. Moreover, during the events they provide drinks and food.

\(^{163}\) The civic actors might participate to public calls (national, regional or local). With respect to the national and the regional, see Appendix – *Regional Analysis* and § 3.2. (in particular POR-FESR, Youth policies or Fondazione Con il Sud); with reference to local calls, they vary according to the different municipalities (e.g. CO-City for the case of BeeOzanam in Torino; *Incredibol!* for the cases Dynamo and Mercato Sonato in Bologna).

\(^{164}\) The tool of crowdfunding is used and promoted by civic actors with social media. It is a device that allows civic actors to raise a certain amount of money for a specific purpose. The crowdfunding is based on free donation and it is strictly based on the willingness to participate and to be engaged, according to individuals’ value and interests. In general, civic crowdfunding is strictly related to ‘civic project’ which means that they are associated to projects related to the duties of people in their own city or local area (Charbit and Desmoulins, 2017, p.5). Compare to Pacchi and Pais (2017) and Pais Pacchi (2020).

\(^{165}\) The cases in the sample are 45 but the civic actors analysed are 47. In Fabbrica del Vapore (Milano) they work in parallel in different spaces of the buildings; in CAOS (Terni) the former civic actor that was in charge of the management was substituted with another one while this research was on going.
features, and it investigates the presence of social entrepreneurs (Mangialardo, 2017b), the composition of the group, and the use of social media. In most of the cases, there is a linear relation among (i) their nature, (ii) their actions, and (iii) the trigger. Many cases present a situation in which a formal civic actor (68%) revitalises the public building through a specific public call (competing with other civic actors) organised by the public sector. This might be related to the ‘traditional cluster’ of interface, that have been discussed in § 3.2.1.

However, other cases present a more controversial combination of these three features. With the introduction of Regolamento dei Beni Comuni, formal civic actors are placed side by side with informal groups or individuals who might promote revitalisation projects (the informal groups are 32%). It also introduces the possibility for civic actors to present a revitalisation project in the first place. This means that the process might be from the bottom up (e.g. Instabile Portazza in Bologna; Edonè in Bergamo; Caserma Pepe in Venezia). Nevertheless, they are still cases that might be considered licit, as the process happens in the legal domain. There is also a ‘third’ combination in these examples, related to illicit action by civic actors. In those cases, the action is more related to the practice of occupation. However, the sample highlights two potential directions related to the degree of cooperation between civic actors and public administrations (see also ‘cooperative cluster’ in § 3.2.1.). The first is the case in which an informal civic actor acts illicitly (from the bottom up), and they do find an agreement with the public administration. It is a complex process, but these are cases in which the public sector realises the importance of civic actors’ activities (e.g. the cases in Napoli; Sale Docks in Venezia; XM24 in Bologna). The second is the case in which the

---

166 In this situation, the nature of the action is licit and the nature of the trigger starts from the top-down.
167 The main motivations rely, on the one hand, (i) on the public administrations’ foresight and acknowledgement of these experiences as opportunities, rather than disadvantages; and (ii) the high level of co-production and cooperation between the different stakeholders.
dynamics are very similar, but the civic actors and the public administrations do not cooperate (see the ‘non-traditional cluster’ in § 3.2.1.). In these examples, the conflict is quite high, and the different stakeholders do not find formal agreement (e.g. Teatro Valle in Roma; Macao in Milano; Cavallerizza IrReale in Torino)\textsuperscript{168} (Figure 15).

![Figure 15. Licit and illicit actions by civic actors and share of the ‘non-traditional’ interface cluster related to illicit actions.](image)

Analysing the different patterns of interfaces, and the general information about civic actors, this category might be further discussed concerning the civic actors’ behaviour in revitalisation processes. For this reason, there might be another subdivision of civic actors: (i) the \textit{moderate} and the (ii) \textit{extreme}. The main difference is how they express themselves and their beliefs. \textit{Moderate} civic actors are willing to cooperate for the collective interest; \textit{extreme} civic actors possess a strong tendency towards an unconventional, politically oriented approach\textsuperscript{169}.

As presented in Figure 15, the civic actors in most of the cases act \textit{licitly} (74.5\%), but the 25.5\% of the sample in analysis starts with an \textit{illicit} action. Nevertheless, according to the pattern of interface, the analysis underscores that not each case that is considered \textit{illicit} is still

\textsuperscript{168} In this regard, see Melucci (1996). Compare with Della Porta and Diani (2006) concerning the discussion about collective actions.

\textsuperscript{169} In those cases, there are two main alternatives. Either the group do not want to be recognised in any case by ‘formal’ agreement or, that is the most frequent, the public administration do not recognise the collective impact of civic actors’ activities in the context. Frequently this is related also to strong clashes between political beliefs.
acting ‘outside the legal domain’, as some of them choose to collaborate. Some of them (41.6%) did not reach any agreements with public administrations; this might depend either from the nature of the group or from ‘other’ motivations on the public administrations’ side. The other share is collaborating, but their future is still uncertain.

Concerning the so-called social entrepreneur’s role (Micelli and Mangialardo, 2016; Mangialardo, 2017b), the sample presents a situation in which some of the examples involve a social entrepreneur (e.g. Ex Fadda in San Vito dei Normanni; Factory Grisù in Ferrara; BeeOzanam in Torino; Cantieri Culturali della Zisa in Palermo; Zo-Centro Culture Contemporanee, in Catania); others do not. It seems that, they might also work without the presence of this personality. However, what is crucial is the composition of the group, which might positively or negatively influence the revitalisation process for a variety of reasons (e.g. know-how, professional skills, professional or practical experience). This element is also stressed by the civic actors, involved in the shortlisted cases. One crucial factor for the ‘success’ of the case is the ‘group expertise’. In particular, this element is highlighted by more than 54% (12) of civic actors throughout the shortlisted cases (e.g. Sale Docks in Venezia; On/Off Officine in Parma; Instabile Portazza in Bologna; the two cases in Fabbrica del Vapore in Milano; ExATR in Forlì).

The civic actors’ networks are another crucial element. In particular, civic actors have very dense relationships both within their groups and with other civic actors. Sharing these

---

170 The social entrepreneur is considered as a figure that enables the development of the bottom-up process and that foster the vitality of the space.

171 This is also stressed by the civic actors that have answered to the questionnaire. In particular, they stressed two main elements. First, the different expertise of the civic actors in the group (some of them have other works, so they do this because of their own interest; e.g. Sale Docks in Venezia). Second, they share a similar local background, which means that the civic actors are ‘locals’ who know the territory and their needs (one exception is CAOS in Terni, where the social entrepreneur is not a local civic actor).
experiences, characterised by a strong mutual and civic engagement, might strengthen them, both in terms of new triggers and from the outside. There are two kinds of actions that civic actors do in this perspective: (i) offline and (ii) online. In the first case, cooperation among different civic actors (locally or nationally) contributes to having a sort of *do-ut-des* approach, in which civic actors promote activities in partnership with others. It is based on face-to-face relationships and discussions. It means that civic actors, public administrations and the other stakeholders involved in the revitalisation process are cooperating and negotiating together based on dialogues (in this regard, see Forester, 1980 and 1982). These ‘offline’ activities are happening *in loco* and they depend on the different environment where revitalisation processes take place. These activities might emphasise the importance and the reputation of the project\(^{172}\) and, also contribute to enrich and enhance social relations, and more in general the social capital.

The pre-existing network, or the one created by the civic actors is underscored as a positive factor for the success of the revitalisation process. In fact, an exemplary network has been discussed as a fundamental element for the project by 77% (17) of the civic actors in the shortlist (e.g. Caserma Pepe in Venezia; FaRo in Rosarno; Dynamo in Bologna; Factory Grisù in Ferrara; Edonè in Bergamo; Manifatture Knos in Lecce). This also depends on the kinds of activities located in the building, the population, and the building’s location.

In the case of online activities, civic actors promote themselves and reach a broad community. They frequently use social media (e.g. Instagram, Facebook, Twitter)\(^{173}\) to

---

\(^{172}\) This element was also stressed by civic actors in the questionnaire. The building up of a reputation is not simple, but it is essential also for the kind of activities they provide. If the community perception of the project is understood, this is an incentive for civic actors; on the other hand, if the community do not understand the kind of project is implemented in their context, the risk is to spend ‘energy’ without positive feedbacks.

\(^{173}\) They are listed according to the use they have of the different social media. Instagram is the most used platform.
enhance their projects, to present their ideas and activities, and to promote events. The use of social media is connected to both the kinds of activities promoted and the kinds of targets civic actors want to address (often young people, but not exclusively). Although they recognise the importance of having ‘online’ initiatives it is helpful to enlarge their catchment areas. Nevertheless, their primary aim is to gain trust both from the public administration and from the community.

**Kind of agreement.** As already mentioned, the role of civic actors and their ability to develop a revitalisation process is related to the role performed by the public sector. The role of the public administration depends on its attitude towards revitalisation processes. Thanks to the shortlist analysis, five different attitudes throughout the processes have been identified: (i) *promoter*, which means that the public sector is the one that initiates a process of revitalisation (e.g. Fabbrica del Vapore in Milano; Sa Manifattura in Cagliari; Factory Grisù in Ferrara; Cantieri Culturali alla Zisa in Palermo) (ii) *collaborator*, that is the tendency of the public administration to collaborate with the civic actors either to reach an agreement or to enrich the process (e.g. Edonè in Bergamo; BeeOzanam in Torino; Sale Docks in Venezia; ex Asilo Filangieri in Napoli); (iii) *conflictual*, which means that civic actors and public administrations do not agree on different aspects of the revitalisation process (e.g. Teatro Valle in Roma; Macao in Milano); (iv) *neutral*, which means that the public

---

174 The social media is an innovative tool that allows civic actors to be recognised in a specific building or project. Moreover, the network that is created by the social media is huge and everyone that have direct access to them could potentially being aware of that specific place.  
175 This issue was also discussed in the questionnaire. The question asks how they consider the relationships with public administrations. The alternatives are: (i) no relationships at all, (ii) conflictual and critical, (iii) collaborative and negotiating, (iv) completely aligned.  
176 There are also cases in which public administration does not directly intervene in the public building, but it gives its sponsorship (e.g. Young Market Lab in Bari; Factory Grisù in Ferrara; On/Off Officine in Parma; Crac-Cremona).
administration does not interfere with civic actors and revitalisation process (e.g. Dynamo or Mercato Sonato in Bologna; Manifatture KNOS in Lecce; FaRo in Rosarno); (v) discontinued, which means that throughout the period of the revitalisation different public administrations might not converge on the process (e.g. Rampa Prenestina in Roma; XM24 in Bologna, Cavallerizza IrReale in Torino) (Figure 16).

In general, the sample is for the majority (42 cases, 89%) formalised through formal agreements. These might depend on (i) youth policies (e.g. Edonè in Bergamo or Crac in Cremona); (ii) ordinary grant (e.g. Factory Grisù in Ferrara; Manifatture KNOS in Lecce, CAOS in Terni); (iii) Patti di Collaborazione (e.g. ExSa in Bergamo; Beeozanam in Torino; Instabile Portazza in Bologna); (iv) ad hoc agreement (e.g. Ex Asilo Filangieri in Napoli; TTB in Complesso del Carmine in Bergamo)\(^\text{177}\). Figure 17 presents the variety of agreements in the sample in analysis. Patti di Collaborazione: although public administrations have started

\(^{177}\) This category includes ‘temporary agreements’ (e.g. Caserma Pepe in Venezia, Rampa Prenestina in Roma; and ‘Municipal Resolutions’ (e.g. Palestra Popolare Sanl Lorenzo in Roma; Ex Giardino dei Martedei in Napoli)
to adopt them\textsuperscript{178}, they are not very used for enhancing revitalisation processes in unused public buildings (8.5%).

The cases might be summarised with the distinction that has been extensively discussed in § 3.3.1. about ‘interface clusters’. Nevertheless, the side of the public sector is important as also stressed by the civic actors interviewed for the shortlist: the majority of them consider the relationships with public administrations as one of the main element of uncertainty (e.g. Ex Fadda in San Vito dei Normanni and Tempio del Futuro Perduto in Milano), and the major point for the revitalisation process.

Figure 17 presents the general overview of the civic actors’ approach and reliance on public administrations. For the conflictual, natural and discontinued relationships, civic actors consider that a change in public administrations might contribute to improving the quality of the revitalisation process; on the other hand, who are collaborative or more ‘in line’ (as the public administration was the promoter) think that a change in public administration might worsen their condition and the revitalisation.

![Figure 17](image)

Figure 17. Analysis of the answers that civic actors gave in the questionnaire. The question is “Could a change in public administration affect your projects? In which way?”

\textsuperscript{178} The 53.8% of the municipalities have adopted this tool. In particular, the shortlisted cases include Instabile Portazza (Bologna).
Overall, the majority of the examples demonstrated more collaborative and cooperative dynamics\textsuperscript{179}. This is important in relation to the idea of co-production and the potentially enhanced performance that might arise from a synergistic relationship (Ostrom, 1996, p. 1080). This incremental approach to setting up the basis for a durable revitalisation process is very important, but, on the other hand, civic actors are aware that they act in an uncertain arena, as some political conditions might change (e.g. XM24 in Bologna; Rampa Prenestina in Roma).

The \textit{sample} reveals the recurrence of two specific orientations of the kind of agreement that formalises the deal. There is also another category in which the agreement is not contemplated. In the first case, there are two kinds of agreement: (i) the free grant, which means that the civic actors do not have to pay any rent to the public administration for the occupation of the public space\textsuperscript{180}; and (ii) the rental fee grant, which is a kind of rent civic actors have to pay to the local authority (e.g. Fabbrica del Vapore in Milano; Young Market Lab in Bari). Frequently, in the cases in which the public intervention was also \textit{on} the building, the agreement is a rental fee grant, while in the other cases, where the projects are likely based on self-financing, there is a free grant\textsuperscript{181}. This is also related to the duration of the agreement. In this concern, the sample does not present a standard period for the grant,

\footnotesize
\textsuperscript{179} Either they are conflictual or more collaborative, if a sort of confrontation is happening, the revitalisation might be enforced and enhanced by the negotiation and the incremental process. In fact, in this way, both civic actors and public administrations might converge to some range of opportunities that might be discussed, argued and bargained case to case.

\textsuperscript{180} They do not pay any rent for the occupation. They frequently have to pay for the households and for building’ renovation and structural interventions (if needed). The responsibilities of the renovation are on behalf of the civic actors, which means that they have to invest a certain amount of money (that depends on the condition of the building) to ‘secure’ the building. This is the case of ordinary contracts, that might be also approved following the Legislative Decree no. 117 of 2017 (Third Sector Organisation Law).

\textsuperscript{181} Some of them are ordinary contracts, some others are the so-called \textit{Patti di Collaborazione} [Collaboration Agreement], that is the tool promoted by the \textit{Regolamento dei Beni Comuni}.
but there are (i) temporary grants (which vary from a few months to five years; e.g. Edonè in Bergamo, that is for five years; Instabile Portazza in Bologna, for one year; Sale Docks in Venezia, one year; Caserma Pepe in Venezia, temporary grant)\textsuperscript{182}, and (ii) more long-term grants (e.g. Factory Grisù in Ferrara, 11 years; Napoli’s cases, subjected to Municipal Resolution no. 521 approved in 2013). This is also evident in the \textit{shortlist} analysis, as the civic actors stressed that the kind of agreement might influence the revitalisation process. In fact, it directly affects the level of uncertainty that civic actors have to face. As they are non-profit, some civic actors might not consider a project with a rental fee grant. Micelli and Mangialardo (2016) also make this point, underscoring this element as one condition encouraging a project’s success.

Regarding the absence of an agreement, there are two main options. These are related to the public administrations’ attitude. If it is conflictual, neutral or discontinued, the revitalisation processes might remain without agreement or, even, stop. On the one hand, it might be related to the conflictual relationships between public administrations and civic actors. On the other hand, political and administrative changes might influence the possibility of having (or not having) a formal agreement (e.g. XM24 in Bologna, and Macao in Milano, temporary agreement; or Tempio del Futuro Perduto in Milano, waiting for a formalised contract) (neutral or discontinued attitude).

\textit{Uncertainty}. The condition of dependency that civic actors have from both their temporary nature and their reliance on public administrations is crucial. Ostrom (1990) discusses this situation of uncertainty as an element that institutions have to challenge in order to evolve

\textsuperscript{182} In some new regulation, the maximum period for Collaboration Agreement is 15 years (e.g. Torino), or 9 years (e.g. Bologna). In general, the ordinary Agreement have one year set-off, and from 3 to 5 years grant.
and strengthen themselves. She underscores the importance of having a problem-solving attitude, which contributes to cases’ success (Ostrom, 1990, p. 180)\(^{183}\).

Two levels of uncertainty make these processes more challenging: (i) the temporary nature of civic actors’ participation and (ii) reliance on public administrations.

Concerning the first level of uncertainty, civic actors do not have the incentive to invest too much money, as they do not know if the space they occupy will be re-assigned to them. This might slow down certain kinds of investments because public administrations will not refund these investments and because the risk of having greater costs than revenues is too high (the duration of the contract sometimes is too short to cover initial costs and ‘personal costs’)\(^{184}\). Regarding the second level of uncertainty, civic actors rely on public administrations both because the buildings they are managing and occupying are publicly owned, and because they depend on public councils’ changes and, eventually, different perspectives\(^ {185}\).

Figure 17 presents also how civic actors consider their relationships with the public administrations and, independently from their ‘original condition’, the majority of them (41%) considers a change in public administrations as a positive factor. This depend particularly on the fact that many of them are in a ‘conflictual’ or ‘neutral’ situation, which means that they expect more from future administrations. On the other hand, civic actors that

\(^{183}\) Compare with North (1989, p. 1320) “The evolution of more complex social frameworks will not occur if such institutional structures cannot reduce the uncertainties associated with such situations. So, institutional reliability is essential, because it means that even as the network of interdependence caused by the growth of specialization widens we can have confidence in outcomes that are necessarily increasingly remote from our personal knowledge.”

\(^{184}\) What is important is that free grant is not always the right solution to these processes that sometimes are more complicated and challenging, depending also on the condition of the building. Frequently the economic investments made by civic actors are not sufficient to provide a good place to stay but, on the other hand, public administrations do not have money to invest in restoration.

\(^{185}\) That is challenging, in particular, because these experiences are affected by political beliefs and rhetoric (especially in the case of illicit actions).
have positive relationships with the public administrations might fear its change (36%). These kinds of expectations are related to the precariousness of these activities, that are not well framed into policy design contexts. This is also evident while discussing about the kind of agreement as there is space for *ad hoc* ones.

Some former cases already analysed\(^{186}\) present a situation of this kind (Mangialardo, 2017a). This analysis is important to highlight that some of these cases continuously face the condition of uncertainty. On the one hand, such uncertainty is an incentive for civic actors to perform at their best, but on the other, it limits their actions.

The analysis of the sample regarding *internal* and *external* features presents a variety of different combinations, highlighting the heterogeneity of the examples. The analysis of the context and the other features of the specific cases provides a general overview of the phenomenon. The comparative method is very important and helpful, as it gives the possibility to derive some trends. The questionnaire, on the other hand, combines different information, which are beneficial for understanding the complex phenomenon of unused public buildings revitalisation.

These processes are very different in terms of dynamics as well as *internal* and *external* features. What is crucial is to understand the common elements shared by the sample to better define the key aspects that constitute the whole phenomenon. This might also help both (i) in rediscussing categories and (ii) in directing the study of public policy.

\(^{186}\) Mangialardo (2017a) analyses 50 different case studies. Some of them have been selected also in the sample of this research (in particular, they are the 20%). For what concerns the ‘still ongoing’ analysed in her research, they are the 86%. In some of the ones that are no longer “active” there are other projects being implemented (14%).
4. Discussion: background conditions of revitalisation processes

This section presents a discussion of what emerged from the sample of case studies, with a specific attention to the shortlisted ones. The aim is to critically discuss the outcome and the conditions of revitalisation processes by civic actors in unused public buildings. The findings are based on the sample analysis (regional and local scale) and on the shortlisted cases, able to provide an in-depth analysis of some specific issues. The elements emerging from the analysis in § 3., together with the results of the questionnaire and informal interviews, are useful materials for the discussion.

What is important – as also stressed in § 3. – is the dimension of temporariness for two main reasons. The precariousness of the activities considered is also reflected in the difficulties related to establishing the sample of revitalisation processes. Moreover, some of these cases encounter difficulties throughout time, and the outcome was different from the one expected (see in particular Figures 3 and 4). This is crucial to identify conditions and causations (i) to understand the different issues that might emerge, and to (ii) face the level of complexity of these experiences.

In particular, this section is divided into two main parts.

The first part concerns what Ostrom calls the ‘principles’: here redefined as ‘background conditions’ (§ 4.1.). The background conditions concern the major elements that establish the basis for revitalisation processes, and the conditions, in general terms, that support the success
of these activities. Section § 4.1. is devoted to the analysis of the elements that emerges from
the sample, and also it presents some other important aspects that result from the questionnaire
(of the shortlisted cases). Combining these elements is critical to defining the policy
guidelines and deriving general discussion about the phenomenon (§ 4.2.).

4.1. **Background conditions**

In line with Ostrom’s framework, it is crucial to identify some principles according to
which the different case studies might be considered *successful or not successful*. To consider
a process as a successful case, the research provides an analysis based on the outcome of the
revitalisation processes. This is connected with (i) the restoration of the building (either in
terms of interventions by the public administrations or by the civic actors), (ii) the creation of
cultural and social activities inside the space, and (iii) the community participation in this
process. This is important because revitalisation, as intended in this research, is not only
related to physical aspects, but also to social and participatory practices.

By contrast, considering a case as not successful, means that the process has faced different
issues that led to a negative outcome. This is for instance the case of experiences that have
been interrupted or are only temporary.

The research refers to Ostrom’s principles, redefining them as ‘background conditions’,
since they are related to the contextual and institutional domain\(^{187}\).

\(^{187}\) The term ‘principle’ relates to a more scientific-positivistic approach, which is not the one that is used in this research.
The background conditions have been identified mainly through (i) the combination of sample and shortlist analysis made in § 3.; (ii) the rielaboration of the questionnaire (that is more specific on some topics), and (iii) the interviews\textsuperscript{188}. In particular, a specific section (§ 4.1.) is devoted to defining five factors that contribute (or not) to the positive outcome of the revitalisation process. Then, the information extracted from the questionnaire helps in discussing other elements that the civic actors considered important for the process. It is based on the observation of the trends that have been analysed for the sample. Moreover, the interviews delineate a broader situation of the phenomenon of revitalisation processes in unused public buildings\textsuperscript{189}.

In terms of the framework institutional aspects, this research identifies a list of specific elements that are quite different from the one already discussed by Micelli and Mangialardo (2016), Foster and Iaione (2018)\textsuperscript{190}, and Abastante et al. (2021)\textsuperscript{191} (Table 15).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Topic of the research</th>
<th>Kind of principles/conditions identified</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Micelli and Mangialardo (2016)| Bottom up experiences and revitalisation processes. The kind of buildings that have been taken into account are publicly owned, and the kind of activities raises from the bottom-up (initially). | 1. Kind of population and presence of a ‘creative class’  
2. Localization of the building  
3. Architectural structure of the building  
4. Social entrepreneur  
5. Kind of agreement (free-grant) |

\textsuperscript{188} Structured interviews with some practitioners (Annibale D’Elia, former promoter of Bollenti Spiriti; and Matteo Bartolomeo, Avanzi), and with civic actors.

\textsuperscript{189} The interviews are two: to Marco Bonomi from Edonè (Bergamo); and Roberto Cirillo from ex Asilo Filangieri (Napoli).

\textsuperscript{190} Foster and Iaione (2018) are specifically interested in urban commons, but some of the principles might be applied also to publicly owned buildings.

\textsuperscript{191} Abastante et al. (2021) are specifically interested in cultural regeneration cases performed by public or private sector. The kind of projects that they discuss are more similar to the one that this research considers ‘cultural hubs’.
Notwithstanding the specificity of the cases, the QCA approach and the ri-elaboration of the questionnaire allows for comparison among the answers. In general, the background conditions might be distinguished between case-based conditions (internal to the process and the stakeholders) and framework conditions (derived from the environment).

These elements interact in complex ways that influence the dynamics and the potential ‘trajectories of transformation’ of governance, which are highly diverse and contingent (Gonzalez and Healey, 2005, pp. 2056-2057). Moreover, as also underscored by Gonzalez and Hayley (2005, p. 2065), the different case-based and framework conditions are not separated, but rather they interact and influence each other reciprocally.

---

192 The questionnaire is based on two main section: one is devoted to the analysis of the case itself (Q1-Q14); the second part is directed to more general question about the revitalisation process and a posteriori impressions (Q15-Q17). The first section investigates different elements such as: (i) positive and negative factors that affect the process, (ii) relationships with public administrations, (iii) incentives and economic sustainability, (iv) trigger and process references, (v) collective participation. The second section of the questionnaire asks for governance suggestions and highlights potential risks or opportunities related to the revitalisation processes.
The *case-based conditions* are: (i) the localisation of the building, (ii) the community-building, and (iii) coproduction.

The *framework conditions* are related to the local situation where the revitalisation process takes place. These are related to (i) political continuity, (ii) legal and administrative frameworks, and to (iii) the general social and economic environment.

*Case-based conditions.* The different case-based conditions influence the revitalisation processes either in positive or negative ways. In particular, one important element is the *localisation of the building.* Being in the city center, in contrast with being in a peripheral area, is a potentiality, because more people might be in contact with this new venue, and they might hang around more frequently. Civic actors involved in revitalising a public building in the central city area (for large cities) may also contribute to creating a scale economy, not only in terms of limitation of transaction costs, but also because they would operate in a more active context. The flow is different, which means that more people might have the chance to get acquainted with the project and participate actively in it.

This element is related to the second *case-based* condition, which is the civic actors’ ability and capacity to build a reputation. The *community-building* condition relates to the actors’ capacity to be considered as civic agents, and also being considered as such from the community (see § 1.3.2.; this is also underlined in § 3.3.2. in discussing civic actors’ activities for enhance their engagement). It involves the creation of a solid network within and outside the community. On the one hand, reputation building is connected with the restoration of the building and, more importantly, with its use for community practices and social inclusion. In this way, civic actors have to build a sense of trust in the community: this involves time, and
also the integration of different activities able to convey more people. This element might be more difficult, but not impractical, when the social capital is low (Figure 18)\textsuperscript{193}. On the other hand, the kind of population might influence both the activities and the willingness to participate in the revitalisation practices and processes.

Figure 18 shows the different composition of the \textit{shortlisted} cases, based on the community building capacity. In general, all the cases where there is a higher social capital (59\%) have built a sense of community, both internal and external. The other cases, where the social capital is lower, have a lesser sense of community. This is evident in Figure 18, where the regions with high social capital have a higher proportion of community building.

\textsuperscript{193} In this regard, see also Ferilli et al (2016b, p. 95): “as a matter of fact, most of the socially sustainable experiences [urban renewal and regeneration] have taken place in relatively wealthy and un-deprived contexts”. Compare with Raco (2003).
capital is lower (9%), found difficulties in building a community. This might depend also on the localisation of the building. In general, the **community building** is shared by around 90% of the civic actors taken into account in the shortlist.

Although the social capital is expressed at regional level, some cases in the regions Puglia (e.g. Manifatture KNOS in Lecce) or Lazio (e.g. Rampa Prenestina in Roma) show that there might be a correlation between social capital and reputation building. This factor, at a local level, depends also on the positioning of the buildings and the kind of population that gravitate around the area\(^\text{194}\) (see also § 4.2.). Actually, reputation building is more likely to be successful when considering a favourable positioning; while in peripheral and suburban areas revitalisation processes might face some difficulties (Figure 19).

The capacity to be recognized from the public administration and from citizens is crucial to pursuing revitalisation processes. As these activities are non-profit, they need to have other kinds of revenues and need a certain kind of demand. If the demand is not reciprocated with

---

\(^{194}\) See also the Appendix – Regional Analysis.
a specific supply, these experiences are more likely to be unsuccessful throughout time. Moreover, the denser the network of civic actors’, the greater the share of information.195

Another important case-based condition is the *coproduction*. This element might be considered a consequence of civic actors’ expertise and capacities to work with other subjects (comprising the public administration). The main feature of this aspect is that co-production might occur in varying degrees (Ostrom, 1996)196, but this condition is essential to grant revitalisation processes more possibilities. This might contribute to lowering uncertainty. Co-production and uncertainty are strictly connected in revitalisation processes. Uncertainty is one element that has emerged frequently across the different shortlisted cases. It might be summarised into two kinds of uncertainty: ‘policy ambiguity’, and ‘polity ambiguity’. The ‘policy ambiguity’ is related to the concerns about the legal framework and kind of tools; whilst the ‘polity ambiguity’ is more related to the precariousness of these experiences, and the possibility that they will be interrupted because of public administration actions and decisions. Figure 20 illustrates how these two elements are interconnected and might affect the revitalisation processes in different ways. In particular, for the 83% of the shortlisted cases, the policy ambiguities and related to the uncertainty of the planning tools and devices. Also, ‘polity ambiguities’ are shared across the shortlist (54.5%), and this is related to the first kind of uncertainty.

---

195 Many civic actors are connected with other realities in the same city, or in others. This fact allows them to have access to different kind of information. They are either organisational (e.g. the specific organisation of the group, the kind of activities, etc.) or relational (e.g. level of coproduction, kind of arrangement with public administrations, potential tools, etc.).

196 In this concern, see also Foster and Iaione (2018) which refers to commons, and the practice of ‘commoning’, that “involves a collaborative process of bringing together a wide spectrum of actors that work together to co-design and co-produce shared, common goods and services at different scales.”
Figure 20. Analysis of the shortlisted cases, related to the level of uncertainty derived from different elements.

Framework conditions. The framework conditions might influence the outcome of the revitalisation. They depend largely on normative frameworks and planning policies (see § 2.2.), on public administrations interface (see also § 3.3.1.), and, in general, on the socio-economic environment.

In terms of the legal and normative framework, it is important to highlight that there is a need for specific tools and a transparent legal background. This allows civic actors – but also public administrations – to recognise these experiences as a potentiality. Moreover, there is no shared national framework wrapping up all the different local tools and public devices. This element emerges also throughout the analysis of the ‘kind of agreement’ (see § 3.3.2.), that might vary case to case. The bureaucracy and the legal framework concerning these experiences is still blurred, and the kind of contracts sometimes are not flexible enough to allow civic actors to be forward-looking\(^{197}\). In this concern, some progress has been made by the Legislative Decree no. 117, approved in 2017 (Third Sector Law), but some improvements still need more attention (see Figure 20). Moreover, since the norm is binding, some civic actors do not really accomplish the specific features recalled in the law, and they are

\(^{197}\) In general terms, the free-grant is the most commonly used tool (see also § 3.2.). In particular, it is an incentive for civic actors to present projects to revitalise unused public buildings (on this issue, see also Micelli and Mangialardo, 2016).
considered ‘hybrid’. Furthermore, since the phenomenon is quite recent, some civic actors were exploring new potentialities (e.g., Edonè in Bergamo; ex Asilo Filangieri in Napoli).\footnote{The novelty of these activities is still under discussion and investigation. Moreover, they do not follow specific legislation and procedural steps (this was also underscored by the interviews with Annibale D’Elia and Matteo Bartolomeo).}

Political continuity is also an important background condition that might influence the success of these experiences. This is a crucial element because its absence could lead to uncertainty. Political continuity is essential not only because certain revitalisation processes have to be considered a potential alternative to privatisation and long-term grants, but also because these processes allow re-using unused buildings. Apart from rhetoric and political beliefs, which may differ by left or right wing affiliation, continuity is important to encourage these activities (Foster and Iaione, 2018; Abastante et al., 2021). Political continuity is also important because different public administrations might decide to ‘replace’ these experiences, after testing them, either for (i) speculative reasons or for (ii) renovating buildings with other purposes (e.g. Mercato Sonato or Dynamo in Bologna).

The last framework condition is the socio-economic environment, which might be favourable for entrepreneurship, also for the social ones. If we consider the state of the art, around 13% of the analysed processes of the sample are no longer active. The situation changes if the shortlisted cases are investigated: 36% of these experiences, in fact, are pending or interrupted. This is because there is a lack of conditions that positively influence the process and the revitalisation.

The incentive that is derived from the market is the first factor that stimulates civic actors to promote cultural activities, innovative and hybrid services that are not present in the context (and also to overcome the supply-oriented policies that have been promoted since the 1990s).
In this concern, the analysis made at the regional scale provides some key elements that contribute to understand the socio and economic environment. Moreover, it is also an opportunity for public administrations to test new activities without costs or save time on further investments. The opportunity for the public administrations with these activities, in fact, is related also to the possibility to re-activate an abandoned or unused space in a public and collective perspective, without any costs. Furthermore, having this space renovated might enlighten public administrations to change land use policies deliberatively.

To understand revitalisation processes and the institutional performances, these background conditions have been ‘evaluated’ accordingly to what have emerged throughout the analysis of the sample and the shortlist. All the background conditions have been assessed with criteria that allows the comparison and the presentation of the institutional performance. Roughly, considering the Ostrom’s framework, the cases might be considered from their institutional performance as: (i) robust, (ii) fragile, and (iii) failure. The ‘robust’ are the ones that have three or more background conditions (with a positive absolute value) that are occurring at the same time (45%, 10 cases). The ‘fragile’ cases are the ones that present less than three conditions, or that present medium level of the absolute value, given to the background conditions (32%, 7 cases). The ‘failure’ are the ones that do not have a positive degree based on the conditions (23%, 5 cases). The assessment is presented in Table 16. It shows the different shortlisted cases, with specific attention to the background conditions.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case study</th>
<th>Background conditions</th>
<th>Revitalisation process</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name of the project</td>
<td>Civic actor that answered to the questionnaire</td>
<td>Community-building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fabbrica del Vapore, Milano</td>
<td>The Art Land</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Via Farini</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tempio del Futuro Perduto, Milano</td>
<td>Acropolis</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edonè, Bergamo</td>
<td>Nutopia s.r.l</td>
<td>SB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crac, Cremona</td>
<td>CRAC Associazione</td>
<td>SB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caserma Pepe, Venezia</td>
<td>Burb</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sale Docks, Venezia</td>
<td>Marco Baravalle, co-founder of the artists community</td>
<td>SC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On/Off Officine, Parma</td>
<td>Cooperativa Sociale Onlus Doposcuola</td>
<td>SC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factory Grisi, Ferrara</td>
<td>Consorzio Grisi</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ExATR, Forli</td>
<td>Città di Elba and Spazi Indecisi</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dynamo Velostazione, Bologna</td>
<td>Associazione Salvaciclisti</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instabile Portaiazza, Bologna</td>
<td>Leonardo Benvenuti, founder of the project</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XM24, Bologna</td>
<td>Collettivo</td>
<td>SC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teatro Valle, Roma</td>
<td>Collettivo</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Palestra Popolare San Lorenzo, Roma</td>
<td>Collettivo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Rampa Prenestina, Roma</td>
<td>Sebastiano the co-founder of the activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Ex Asilo Filangieri, Napoli</td>
<td>Abitanti dell’Asilo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Il Giardino Liberato dei Martedei, Napoli</td>
<td>Collettivo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Manifatture KNOS, Lecce</td>
<td>Associazione Culturale Sud Est</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Young Market Lab, Bari</td>
<td>Kreattiva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Ex Fadda, San Vito dei Normanni (Brindisi)</td>
<td>Sandei s.r.l.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Faro, Rosarno (RC)</td>
<td>Associazione Kiwi</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 16. Analysis of the combination among the different background conditions and evaluation of the institutional performances based on revitalisation processes.

4.2. **Major remarks**

These two sets of background conditions are crucial. Considering them is important to define policy guidelines and derive general discussion about the phenomenon. One element that is at the basis of this research is the evolution of the institutions in general. As Ostrom (2005, pp. 66-67) underscores, the outcome might also be understood through alternative institutional arrangements using ‘evaluation criteria’. All the different criteria described might be a proxy to discuss the outcome and the institutional arrangements. Moreover, *background*...
conditions are derived from specific cases and, although they cover a heterogeneous range of experiences, this research aims to provide a structured framework for further investigations.

Two elements are crucial to discuss this phenomenon. First, there is the discussion that emerges from the sample and the findings (§ 4.1.). This first set of conclusions are specific. Second, there are more general concerns about this phenomenon and its implications in urban planning issues.

The findings demonstrate that this phenomenon of ‘hybrid’ experiences (considering the sample) is an alternative to privatisation. In general, these processes are happening because of a shift in socio-economic and political contexts. The background conditions highlight that those elements are important in principle, to allow civic actors to ‘see the opportunity’. Also, especially in the bottom-up processes, there is a strong tendency by the civic actors towards ‘enterprising spirit’ and perseverance. Nevertheless, in situations where some of these background conditions are not contemplated (or they were just temporary), the institutions’ evolution becomes very challenging and, sometimes, fails. However, experiences of this kind are highly urban and strictly influenced by the context.

In general terms, the findings provide a general discussion about revitalisation processes in unused public buildings by civic actors.

The general framework used for this research is important, as it provides principles (the background conditions) that seem to be significant to ground this phenomenon to the actual situation. First, it helps to define some key elements that are important to understand the very nature of these experiences. Second, they highlight urban planning issues that are rarely discussed.

In general terms, there is a need to reflect upon the normative framework provided for two main reasons. First of all, the Italian regulative structure is highly fragmented (see § 3.3.2.;
and the Appendix – *Regional Analysis*). That means uncertainty, on the one hand, and
difficulties in understanding clearly the processes and the potentiality of revitalisation, on the
other. Second, the overproduction of similar regulations, with inadequate categories of actors
and unclear definitions of the objects, creates ambiguities both in terms of operations and in
terms of management (see § 2.3.).

That is true for two aspects: the processes and tools for revitalisation, the civic actors’
organisations. In the first case, the processes that have been implemented and the tools
adopted are very heterogeneous. In fact, the sample presents many normative contexts, where
the different municipalities variously face this phenomenon (e.g., the cases in Napoli;
compare with the ones in Milano or Torino). Secondly, this ambiguity is also related to the
condition of being part of the Third Sector Organisations (*ETS*). Actually, civic actors face
different concerns from the bureaucratic side, the organisation, and the limitations determined
by the law. The regulation is based on organised groups with a long-standing tradition (e.g.
associations, cooperatives, foundations, etc.); however, recent experiences underscore that
civic actors’ nature is more hybrid and, sometimes, difficult to classify in those pre-arranged
categories. This ‘gap’ might contribute, on the one hand, to increase the level of uncertainty
and, on the other, it highlights the need to clarify and update some regulation (see also Table
12).
5. Conclusions: a desirable but not resolutive option

This section provides some general conclusions about the phenomenon of unused public buildings and civic actors’ activities in regard to them. The conclusion suggests that we need a critical discussion on the nature of these experiences; in particular, because they are frequently considered as good per se (Pacchi, 2020).

In the after-crisis situation, the social and economic conditions have changed radically. As already discussed, there is a new demand that is not related to the traditional private sector. Furthermore, a new category of stakeholders, the so-called civic actors, push revitalisation processes into an unexplored direction.

This section summarises the information emerging from the sample and the shortlisted cases (with a specific focus on those in § 4.), to determine policy guidelines in general, and to discuss – without rhetoric – these experiences.

This research investigated the role of the civic actors in the revitalisation of unused public buildings. What emerges from the sample analysis is that these experiences are more likely to occur in specific situations (§ 4.1.). In general, the Ostrom’s framework, combined with the QCA approach, helps in understanding the common background and, at the same time, the peculiarities of the single cases.
However, there are still some crucial elements that need to be acknowledged. It is important to refer to these practices as a potential alternative to the long-standing tradition of privatisation. This does not mean that the phenomenon is the solution to unused public buildings. This relates, in particular to two main situations. First of all, the impact was not the one expected. In fact, considering the latest report presented by Labsus (2019) on civic actors’ revitalisation activities, only 5% relate to buildings. The percentage is low, and it might depend on background aspects and on the market conditions. Also, if we consider the sample, the 37% of the experiences are still ‘pending’ or ‘interrupted/concluded’. This means that, apart from the rhetoric, these experiences have a certain degree of successfulness, but there are still cases, in which the revitalisation processes might face some unexpected, or partially expected negative impacts. It is essential to underscore here the strong importance of the social sphere. The condition of being a civic actor is rooted in civic activation and participation. Secondly, the analysis of the shortlist showed that some of these cases are interrupted, fragile or a failure199.

This research has discussed the potentiality of these activities, taking into account that the revitalisation processes might occur in ‘keener’ or participated contexts. Civic actors’ activation in revitalisation processes involving unused public buildings have to be considered as an alternative, compared to privatisations and long-term leases. As discussed in § 2., the contemporary socio-economic context is more in favour of this latter alternative, rather than the other two. This does not mean that the public sector has to rely only on the ability of the

199 This means that a more inclusive and participatory process does not always address the expectations, although participation “emphasizes some of the most important characteristics of [entrepreneurial] citizen: self-regulation; responsibility for individual problems, and non-conflicative partnership with the state” (Ganuza et al., 2016, p. 330). This aspect is also stressed by Ferilli et al. (2016b) and by Ganuza et al. (2014 and 2016) who state that participation and civic engagements are unanimously regarded as a good thing, in the belief that more inclusive processes lead to more justice, equality and to better life.
civic actors but (as already discussed in § 4.1.) it has to be ‘active’, operative, and collaborative with them.

As the property of these buildings is public, it is crucial to review, on the one hand, the ethical issues concerning this topic (§ 1.) and, on the other, to repeat that the discussion relates only to buildings that are publicly owned. That point is essential to define the boundaries of debates and political discussion. The risk of considering those properties as something ‘different’ from what they really are, leads to misunderstandings and potentially to improper consideration about the public portfolios in general. The thesis identifies background conditions that might be useful both for the public administrations (that are the owners of those buildings) and the civic actors.

To enhance these experiences, without assuming that they will address the whole demand, it is crucial and essential to define specific policies, flexible enough to allow civic actors to activate those spaces with less limitations (e.g. planning regulations and tools or bureaucracy). This means, for instance, creating codes able to foster these experiences. A code of this kind must provide general, but fundamental, rules that can support different kinds of experiences (as the one presented here). It has to work on background conditions. This code has to work in relation to two different spheres: civic actors and public administrations. In general terms, the code will be framed at the national level, with more specific local regulations, based on the different contexts. The willingness to have a code at the national level is based on the acknowledgement that there is not a flexible, horizontal and inclusive framework. This suggestion is based on the analysis. Revitalisation processes in unused public buildings have

---

200 In this concern, see Montanari (2015) and the recent bill to adopt a law concerning urban commons (Proposta di legge d’iniziativa popolare: Disegno legge delega Commissione Rodotà beni comuni, sociali e sovrani, no. 2237).
to be considered as an urgency, also in the political agenda\textsuperscript{201}. Moreover, to have local regulations that might vary case-by-case, will (i) enhance the specificity of the locality, (ii) commit both civic actors and public administrations on revitalisation processes in unused public buildings, and (iii) avoid the cut-pasting of laws (especially in relation to \textit{Regolamento dei Beni Comuni}) without any kind of real tie and relationships with the context (Foster and Iaione, 2018).

The suggestion to implement a code is based on the ambiguities and, sometimes, inadequacies generated by the different regulations at local, regional and national levels. This code would be based on revitalisation \textit{processes} that might be enhanced and supported. In this regard, the code would rely on the background conditions (§ 4.1.) as elements that contribute (i) to successful revitalisation processes, and (ii) to minimize the level of uncertainty.

To conclude, revitalisation processes brought about by civic actors might not solve completely the phenomenon of unused public buildings in Italy. The phenomenon will still remain, considering its magnitude. Nevertheless, these practices might be positively considered as a manifesto for social inclusion and public participation in a more general sense.

\textsuperscript{201} The urban agenda have already identified the problem of unused building (§ 1.)
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Appendixes

1. Glossary
2. Regional Analysis
3. Case studies Analysis
4. Questionnaire
The importance of the terminology for this research is crucial. The Italian legislation and the different reports discuss this phenomenon with vague and different terms. The risk of misunderstanding is also derived from the translation from the Italian language to the English one. This research provides a glossary to avoid misunderstandings. This tool aims to help the reader throughout the research. Furthermore, it aims to define better the meaning of the different terms, according to the research and the Italian translation.

In general terms, the glossary underscores a crucial issue in the Italian legislation, which is related to the ambiguity of the terminology and the overproduction of words to describe same or similar things.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Keywords (in this research)</th>
<th>Meaning in this research</th>
<th>Italian translation and synonyms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abandoned, adj.</td>
<td>The condition of being left in particular condition (see Moroni et al., 2020a; Moroni et al. 2020b). it is a kind of unused asset which is not fully functional operational.</td>
<td><em>Abbandonato</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alienation, noun</td>
<td>The alienation is one of the process through which privatisation might be accomplished. The alienation means to transfer property rights from one agent to another.</td>
<td><em>Alienazione, vendita</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asset, noun</td>
<td>In economics, anything that might be considered as as “value” in the economic balance. Anything that can be used for the payment of debt.</td>
<td><em>Attività, beni immobili</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building</td>
<td>The estates that are built-up. Some of the analysis are made according to ‘building-units’,</td>
<td><em>Edificio, immobile, unità immobiliare, compendio,</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Civic actors</strong></td>
<td>Actors with a strong civic and urban essence. They are non-profit, and they are considered actors able to support local and urban contexts, civic participation and, often, social innovation.</td>
<td><strong>Attori civici, cittadinanza attiva, cittadini attivi</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dismissed, adj // Disposal, noun</strong></td>
<td>The asset’s condition considering them no more important or worth of consideration. In particular, the research refers to military assets that have been no longer used by the Defense Ministry. The disposal is another process that accomplishes privatisation.</td>
<td><strong>Dismesso // Dismettere</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Empty, adj.</strong></td>
<td>The assets’ condition of being not-used but well maintained (Moroni et al., 2020a; Moroni et al., 2020b)</td>
<td><strong>Vuoto</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Estate, noun</strong></td>
<td>Assets owned by an individual or an organisation.</td>
<td><strong>Proprietà, portafolio immobiliare</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Privatisation, noun</strong></td>
<td>The privatisation, in general, is meant as the transfer of rights from the public sphere to the private one (see also § Alienation)</td>
<td><strong>Privatizzazione, liberalizzazione, de-regulation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public domain, noun</strong></td>
<td>An area of interest in which the public sector has the control</td>
<td><strong>Dominio pubblico</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Real estate, noun</strong></td>
<td>Lands or buildings</td>
<td><strong>Beni immobili. Settore delle proprietà immobiliari</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Re-use, noun</strong></td>
<td>To use again an asset that was no longer used.</td>
<td><strong>Riuso</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Renovation, noun</strong></td>
<td>To rehabilitate or restore an asset, that lacks maintenance and needs to be refurbished and cleaned-up.</td>
<td><strong>Rinnovo, ristrutturazione</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Revitalisation, noun</strong></td>
<td>To revitalise means to renovate an asset. It is related to the idea of ‘giving another chance’ to the asset in question. Moreover, the idea of revitalisation includes also civic practices, neighbourhood impacts and individual’s perceptions.</td>
<td><strong>Rivitalizzazione</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Securisation, noun</strong></td>
<td>The process of transforming an asset into marketable securities.</td>
<td><strong>Cartolarizzazione</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Underused, adj.</strong></td>
<td>The condition of something that is not used as much as it could be</td>
<td><strong>Sottoutilizzato</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Unused, adj. // Disuse, noun** | This definition considers assets that are no longer used. They might be either ‘empty’ or even ‘abandoned’.
| **Non utilizzato, inutilizzato (adj); inutilizzo (noun)** |
| **Vacant, adj // Vacancy, noun** | A place or space that is available to be used. |
| **Vuoto, vacante** |
Appendix - Regional Analysis\textsuperscript{202}

The elements investigated at the regional scale are: (i) urban regulation on buildings renovation with specific reference to 	extit{civic actors} initiatives\textsuperscript{203}, (ii) public policies and specific programs (e.g. \textit{ad hoc} public policies, not directly related to buildings’ renovation), (iii) public heritage (MEF, 2019) and (iv) density of non-profit organisations (Istat, 2020a). Also, the regional analysis takes into consideration other elements that might be useful to understand better the context from a general point of view. In particular: (i) education, (ii) welfare, (iii) social relationships, (iv) safety and perception of the environment, (v) research and development. These other indicators have been aggregated to the main indicators presented for the analysis and, also, for the analysis of the social capital in general (see § 3.2.).

For what concerns the first element in analysis, the normative framework in relation to building regulation (especially for public buildings, but in regards also for private ones), regions that adopted these policies are 35\%\textsuperscript{204} (Figure A). In general, if it is considered the

\textsuperscript{202} This chapter is based on:
- ISTAT (2020a), Struttura e profili del settore non profit. \url{https://www.istat.it/}

\textsuperscript{203} It is not taken into account that ‘urban regeneration’ \textit{per se}.

\textsuperscript{204} To give some examples, see Regional Law in Emilia Romagna no. 24 approved in 2017, art. 16 or Regional Law in Veneto no. 56 approved in 2017, art. 8 that define, in different ways, the Temporary Uses (the articles are called \textit{Usi Temporanei}). Other examples are Regional Law in Lazio no. 7 approved in 2017 (art. 2) or Regional Law in Umbria no. 10 approved in 2018 (art. 21) which promote the idea of urban revitalization and buildings’ reuse through civic
sample, the regions that have adopted this kind of regulation are 54%. It means that at regional level, this trend to consider public buildings as a potential in relation to civic actors’ activities is not so widespread. Figure A presents the situation of the Italian regions in this concern. Different regions have adopted similar tools to enhance the public buildings, giving the priority and the possibility to civic actors to intervene there.

![Figure A. Regional analysis of urban renewal policies concerning buildings and civic actors. Rielaboration by the author from Regional Regulation.](image)

Each region considers the importance of having specific planning regulation for building renewal, but only few of them consider civic actors’ activities as an opportunity. On the contrary, if we consider the local level, and the localization of the sample in analysis, the participation and Third Sector Organisations. Another interesting case is the Regional Law in Campania no. 3 approved in 2018 (art. 4), which considers the confiscated assets as a potential element for social participation, civic engagement and innovative practices (such as start-ups). Another example is Toscana Region (Regional Law no. 65 approved in 2014, artt. 5 and 60) but it is related with the reuse and revitalization of the so-called aree interne.
situation is quite different. If we consider Table 8 (§ 3.2.) lots of municipalities have adopted the *Regolamento dei beni comuni*, which is a tool that goes in this direction. In fact, the 50% of the municipalities have adopted this tool, in general, and only 69% of them are located in regions that have ‘urban regeneration policies related to civic actors’ activities’ (Table I).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Regional policy</th>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>Local policies (Regolamento dei Beni Comuni)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Piemonte</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Torino</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Novara</td>
<td>(Y)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lombardia</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Milano</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bergamo</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cremona</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veneto</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Venezia</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Belluno</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Treviso</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emilia Romagna</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Bologna</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ferrara</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Parma</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Forli</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toscana</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Livorno</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Umbria</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Terni</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lazio</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Roma</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campania</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Napoli</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puglia</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Bari</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lecce</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Taranto</td>
<td>(Y)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>San Vito dei Normanni</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basilicata</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Potenza</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calabria</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Lamezia Terme</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rosarno</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sicilia</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Palermo</td>
<td>(Y)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Catania</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sardegna</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Cagliari</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table I. Analysis of regional regulation in comparison with local regulation of urban revitalisation, with specific reference to civic actors’ interventions.

There is not a direct correlation between public buildings and civic engagement; on the other hand, regions prefer to combine youth policies with building renovation and
revitalisation\textsuperscript{205}. The average, in this case is higher than the previous one, and regions adopting this perspective are 50\% (Figure B).

In general, the youth policies at regional level are more present in southern regions. This might be related to the kind of economic and social environment, that is quite different from the one in northern ones. In particular, south Italy presents a higher level of urban deprivation, economic difficulties as well as a lower density of employed people, tendency to research and development (Figures K). It is crucial to underscore that, considering the sample, the average of regions that adopt planning regulation or youth policies concerning public buildings is the same (around 54\%). Nevertheless, if it is considered the general overview of the Italian

\textsuperscript{205} To give some examples: Emilia Romagna promotes this project called “GpT. Giovani per il Territorio: la cultura che cura” (Agenda 2030, Emilia Romagna). Toscana region has promoted a project denominated “Giovanisì” and a portion of this project is dedicated to urban regeneration; similarly, this happened also in Puglia, with the project of “Bollenti Spiriti” (from 2005 to 2015). In most of the instances, there is the tendency towards innovation and culture, especially for young generations.
In the territory the 72% adopts policies that include urban regeneration with a certain category of actors (either civic actors or young people, in general). If we consider the sample, around 85% is ‘covered’ with a certain regulation concerning unused public buildings. The only two regions that do not present neither of the two regional regulations are Piemonte and Sardegna. Nevertheless, as already discussed, at the local level the municipalities of Torino and Novara (located in Piemonte) have *Regolamento dei Beni Comuni*. On the contrary, Emilia Romagna, Toscana and Sicilia have adopted both of them.

While there is no strict correlation between the regional regulation on buildings and civic actors (some regions that do not contemplate the two elements together), the combination of public buildings *and* youth policies is powerful. Most of the cases, in fact, have been promoted through civic and youth policies (Figure C).

![Sample analysis](image)

**Figure C.** Comparison between different public policies for building revitalisation and urban regeneration.

Analysing the sample, it emerges that around 62% of the regions have adopted either one of the two regulations, whilst 23% have adopted both. In the case of Piemonte and Sardegna...
regions, there is not a direct correlation between civic actors or young citizens and unused public buildings (Figure D).

The third element investigated is the density of public heritage (MEF, 2019). Figure E shows the value of the public portfolio in each region. According to the combination on the sample and the public portfolio value, there is a smooth correlation between the two factors. That might be motivated by the fact that the higher density of buildings, the more possibilities to have unused buildings and, eventually, revitalisation process policies and processes.

In this case, the assets (buildings and land) are valued based on their profit.
There are, in fact, eight cases located in Lombardia, six cases in Emilia-Romagna and three cases in Veneto. On the other hand, this situation presents a link, but not a natural condition.

The fourth analysis at regional level concerns the density of non-profit organisations (Istat, 2020). Also, Figure F considers a potential association between cases and the density of non-profit organisation but, on the other hand, it is crucial to remark that the different experiences in the sample consider a broader kind of civic actors. The Istat census (2020a) examines non-profit organisations that are formal, while the other groups are not considered. According to the selected sample, this specific analysis is provided to give an overall situation of the regions. Lombardia is the densest but, as Figure F shows, there are also experiences located in regions like Puglia or Campania, where non-profit organisations’ density is lower than others (e.g. Campania, Puglia).

What is important to underscore is that these regional analyses are provided to give a general glimpse of the Italian situation, based on different discussed topics.
The other indicators that are considered involve (i) education (Figure G), (ii) welfare (Figure H), (iii) social relationships (Figure I), (iv) safety and perception of the environment (Figure J), (v) research and development (Figure K). These other indicators are important to understand the social capital (§ 3.2) and to understand the context in which some activities flourish.

1. Education

![Figure G. Level of education expressed by different indicators. Rielaboration by the author from BES data (2019).](image)

207 The indicators are selected based on the latest BES report, published in 2019. The indicators are described in that report and they are just presented by the author as they are.
2. Welfare

Figure H. Level of welfare. 
Rielaboration by the author from BES data (2019).
Figure I. Level of social relationships. *Rielaboration by the author from BES data (2019).*
4. Safety and perception of the environment

Figure J. Level of safety and the environment perception. *Rielaboration by the author from BES data (2019).*
5. Research and development

Figure K. Level of research and development. *Rielaboration by the author from BES data (2019).*
## Appendix – Case studies Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Name of the project</th>
<th>Public building</th>
<th>Agreement</th>
<th>Economic sustainability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Property</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Typology</td>
<td>Nature of the group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piemonte</td>
<td>BeeOzanam</td>
<td>municipality of Torino</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>Former industrial building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L’Imbarchino del Valentre</td>
<td>municipality of Torino</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Former farmhouse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>La Cavallerizza IrReale</td>
<td>municipality of Torino</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Historical building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mufant</td>
<td>municipality of Torino</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Former school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Casa Bossi</td>
<td>municipality of Novara</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Historical building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cascina Monlù</td>
<td>municipality of Milano</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Cascina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fabbri del Vapore</td>
<td>municipality of Milano</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Former industrial building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lombardia</td>
<td>Tempio del Futuro Perduto</td>
<td>municipality of Milano</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Part of the Fabbrica del Vapore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Macao</td>
<td>municipality of Milano</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Former greengrocers market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Edonè</td>
<td>municipality of Bergamo</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>Public building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Municipality</td>
<td>Former Use</td>
<td>Current Use</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complesso del Carmine</td>
<td>Bergamo</td>
<td>Church</td>
<td>Unused</td>
<td>Teatro Tascabile Bergamo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex Carceri Sant’Agata (EXSA)</td>
<td>Bergamo</td>
<td>Military Barrack</td>
<td>Abandoned</td>
<td>Maïtê</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crac</td>
<td>Cremona</td>
<td>School</td>
<td>Unused spaces of the school</td>
<td>APS, Associazione Culturale no-profit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toscana</td>
<td>Occupati</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Military Barrack</td>
<td>Autonomous Comitati</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sale Docks</td>
<td>Venaria</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>Warehouse</td>
<td>Assemblea del Sale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caserm Pepe</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Military Barrack</td>
<td>BURB (Associazione Culturale Biennale Urbana)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caserma Piave, Treviso</td>
<td>Treviso</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>Military Barrack</td>
<td>Open Piave (consortium)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On/Off Officine</td>
<td>Parma</td>
<td>Public Building</td>
<td>Unused</td>
<td>Associazione On/Off, Cooperativa Sociale Ohlas Gruppo Scuola</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emilia Romagna</td>
<td>Province of Ferrara</td>
<td>Fire Station</td>
<td>Abandoned</td>
<td>Consorzio Grisù</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dynamo, Velostazione</td>
<td>Bologna</td>
<td>Garage</td>
<td>Unused</td>
<td>Associazione SalvaCiclisti</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Art Bonus, Comune di Bergamo’s funds (from 2017, 3y=3y), MIUR, Public local funds (for two years) / Provincial funds / crowdfunding, Self-funding, Creative ANCI’s call / crowdfunding.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>Municipality of</th>
<th>Concerned</th>
<th>Concerned</th>
<th>Concerned</th>
<th>Concerned</th>
<th>Concerned</th>
<th>Concerned</th>
<th>Concerned</th>
<th>Concerned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instabile Portuza</td>
<td>Province of Bologna</td>
<td>Public building</td>
<td>Abandoned</td>
<td>Associazione Pro.Muovo</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>BU</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Young active citizen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXATR Municipality of Forlì</td>
<td>Province of Bologna</td>
<td>Former base warehouse</td>
<td>Unused</td>
<td>Spazi Indecis, Città di Elba</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>BU</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Artists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teatro Valle</td>
<td>Municipality of Roma</td>
<td>Theatre</td>
<td>Unused</td>
<td>Collettivo</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>IL</td>
<td>BU</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Activists and artists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palestra Popolare San Lorenzo</td>
<td>Municipality of Roma</td>
<td>Public space</td>
<td>Unused</td>
<td>PalPop Associazione</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>IL</td>
<td>BU</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Active citizens and activists / external personal trainer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Umbria CAOS</td>
<td>Municipality of Terni</td>
<td>Former industrial building</td>
<td>Abandoned</td>
<td>Associazione Indisciplinare</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>TD</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Professionals (culture)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex Asilo Filangieri</td>
<td>Municipality of Napoli</td>
<td>Historical building</td>
<td>Abandoned</td>
<td>Abitanti dell’Asilo</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>IL</td>
<td>BU</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Young active citizens, artists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex OPG</td>
<td>Municipality of Napoli</td>
<td>Former sanatorium</td>
<td>Abandoned</td>
<td>Group “Je so’ pazzo”</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>IL</td>
<td>BU</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Young citizens, artists, workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domus Ars</td>
<td>Municipality of Napoli</td>
<td>Former church</td>
<td>Abandoned</td>
<td>Il Canto di Virgilio Associazione</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>TD</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Artists and professionals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Il Giardino Liberato di Martedei</td>
<td>Municipality of Napoli</td>
<td>Former monastery</td>
<td>Abandoned</td>
<td>Active citizens</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>IL</td>
<td>BU</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Young active citizens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacture KNOIS</td>
<td>Province of Bologna</td>
<td>Former industrial building</td>
<td>Abandoned</td>
<td>Associazione Sud Est</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>BU</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Active citizens (urban regeneration and culture)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young Market Lab</td>
<td>Municipality of Bari</td>
<td>Former greengrocer hangar</td>
<td>Unused</td>
<td>Kreativa, Aton Aid International, Pop hub, BAM, Ouishare</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>TD</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Young active citizen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex Fadda</td>
<td>Municipality of San Vito dei Normanni</td>
<td>Public building</td>
<td>Unused</td>
<td>Sanderi s.r.l</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>TD</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Young active citizen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td>Municipality</td>
<td>Former Use</td>
<td>Unused/Abandoned</td>
<td>Current Use</td>
<td>Formal Agreement</td>
<td>Funding Source</td>
<td>Form of Agreement</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basilicata</td>
<td>Moon, La Luna al Guinzaglio</td>
<td>Former toy warehouse</td>
<td>Unused</td>
<td>Associazione La Luna al Guinzaglio</td>
<td>Active citizens</td>
<td>Self-funding</td>
<td>From 2018</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calabria</td>
<td>Crac municipality of Lamezia Terme</td>
<td>Former school</td>
<td>Abandoned</td>
<td>Associazione Antiterror Lamezia Othas, Fondazione Trame, Trame volunteers</td>
<td>Active citizens, artists</td>
<td>Self-funding</td>
<td>From 2015, now it is closed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Civico Trame municipality of Lamezia Terme</td>
<td>Former elderly centre</td>
<td>Abandoned</td>
<td>Associazione Kiwi, Argomen APs</td>
<td>Young active citizens</td>
<td>Mibact funds,</td>
<td>From 2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FaRo municipality of Rosarno</td>
<td>Public building</td>
<td>Unused</td>
<td>Associazione Kiwi, Argomen APs</td>
<td>Active citizens, professionals</td>
<td>Self-funding</td>
<td>From 2017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sicilia</td>
<td>Cantiere Culturali della Zia municipality of Palermo</td>
<td>Former industrial area</td>
<td>Abandoned</td>
<td>12 different associations, 4 foreign agencies</td>
<td>Professionals</td>
<td>Inovitalia funds</td>
<td>From 2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Zo-Centro Cultura Contemporanea municipality of Catania</td>
<td>Former industrial building</td>
<td>Abandoned</td>
<td>Associazione Culturale Zo' Zo Centro Culture Contemporane</td>
<td>Professionals</td>
<td>Self-funding</td>
<td>From 1997</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sardegna</td>
<td>Sa Manifatture municipality of Cagliari</td>
<td>Former industrial building</td>
<td>Abandoned</td>
<td>Sardegna Ricerche</td>
<td>Active citizens</td>
<td>Regional funds</td>
<td>From 2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Nome del progetto [Name of the project]:

Edificio e proprietà [Name of the building and property]:

Altre realtà nell’immobile [Other civic actors in the buildings]:

Domande generali

1. Elenca cinque (5) fattori positivi che hanno contribuito alla buona riuscita del vostro progetto (facoltativo: spiegare brevemente perché).

   [List five positive factors that contribute to the successfullness of the project]

2. Elenca cinque (5) fattori negativi che avete riscontrato nella gestione o nell’organizzazione di questo progetto (facoltativo: spiegare brevemente il perché).

   [List five negative factors that you face in pursuing your project]

[List five different stakeholders / actors that have contributed to this project in an actively way]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>..</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>…</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Com’è nata l’idea del progetto? Vi siete ispirati a qualche altro progetto già attivo in Italia (o estero)?

[How does this project raise? Have you used other active projects as a reference for yours?]

a. La scelta di questo progetto è dovuta ad una ricognizione di “mancanze” all’interno del vostro quartiere, oppure si tratta di un progetto “indipendente”? 

[la domanda vuole capire quali siano le motivazioni dietro l’avvio del progetto, se siano legate al contesto o se, invece, si tratta di un progetto del tutto casuale che poteva essere inserito all’interno di altri contesti]
Have you seen some neighbourhood needs that were lacking? Or is a kind of ‘independent’ project?

b. Sulla base del vostro progetto principale, come siete riusciti a coniugare la necessità del quartiere o della città?

How you combine local and aim of your project?

5. É la vostra prima esperienza in questo campo o ne avete già fatte altre?

Is it your first experience or you have others?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prima esperienza [First Experience]</th>
<th>Altre esperienze [indicare: luogo, periodo, tipo di attività] [other experiences]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

6. Il progetto che avete avviato:

The project that you develop:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opzioni</th>
<th>Risposta</th>
<th>Breve descrizione</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>È partito in risposta ad un bando? [you answer to a public call]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>È stato modificato per poter rispondere ad un bando [it was modified in order to present it to a public call]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
È partito in maniera indipendente e senza bando?
[It was independent from any public calls]
È stato successivamente approvato e/o legittimato?
[It was lately legitimised or approved]

[Segnare con una X la risposta corretta e spiegare brevemente come questa cosa è avvenuta]

7. Come sono stati i rapporti con l’amministrazione locale?

[How you consider your relationships with the public administration?]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grado</th>
<th>Risposta [x]</th>
<th>Breve descrizione [riferimento eventuale a domanda 7 e 8]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nessun rapporto con l’amministrazione [No relationships]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Molto / poco conflittuali [Conflictual]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Di cooperazione (negoziazione e accordi) [Cooperation (negotiation and agreements)]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Del tutto in linea (accordi) [Completely ‘in line’ (agreements)]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. Ci sono stati degli aiuti da parte dell’amministrazione? Se sì, di che genere?

[Spiegare in breve se l’amministrazione locale per favorire il progetto abbia attuato qualche misura straordinaria. Ad esempio: attivazione di un bando, promozione pubblicitaria, patrocinio, lavori di manutenzione, lavori di riqualificazione, aiuti economici per la sostenibilità del progetto, altro...]
[Does the public administration help and support you in developing your project? If yes, which kind of help does it give to you?]

9. Che tipo di limiti avete dovuto affrontare?

[Problemi legati alle normative vigenti – problemi normativi, problemi strutturali ed architettonici – legati all’edificio, problemi politici – prospettive differenti, problemi economici, problemi di conflitto d’interessi con altre associazioni o gruppi, altro...]

[Which kind of limitations have you encounter in developing your project?]

10. Ci sono stati incentivi o fondi (es. art bonus o simili) che vi hanno permesso di avviare la vostra attività?

[Did you have any incentives or funds that helped you in the development?]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Si</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[si] Quali? [Which one?]</td>
<td>[no] Che altre forme di finanziamento o raccolta fondi avete utilizzato (se ne avete utilizzata qualcuna)? [Which form of economic resources or other things have you used?]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. Quali sono i costi che un progetto della vostra portata deve sostenere? Le entrate sono sufficienti a sostenere i costi?

[Which kind of costs does a project like yours have?] 

12. Come organizzate le vostre attività? Che tipo di piattaforme utilizzate? [Social, giornali, promozione diretta, promozione per vie ufficiali, altro...]

162
13. Quante persone partecipano al vostro servizio (più o meno)?

[How many people do participate to your services and your space in general?]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Periodo</th>
<th>Partecipanti [numero indicativo]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Giornalmente [Daily]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eventi promossi [Supported events]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Note [segnare eventuali progetti, eventi o attività che hanno più influenza sulla cittadinanza]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. Come siete organizzati all’interno del vostro gruppo? Gestite tutto in completa autonomia o avete aiuti esterni? Chi gestisce i rapporti con la pubblica amministrazione?

[How are you organised your group? Do you manage the project and all the activities independently or do you have any external support? Who interface with public administration?]

Domande di indirizzo

15. Un eventuale cambiamento di amministrazione, potrebbe contribuire a qualche cambiamento per la vostra attività?

[Could a change in public administration affect your projects? In which way?]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risposta</th>
<th>Tipo di cambiamento [segnare P per positivo, N per negativo]</th>
<th>Che tipo di cambiamento?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
16. Gli strumenti che ci sono a disposizione a livello normativo, riescono a rispondere in maniera efficace alle vostre richieste? Avete qualche suggerimento?

[Do you think that the planning tools and the other regulations approved are sufficient and effective to foster your projects?]

17. Il tipo di contratto che è stato stipulato cosa prevede?

[Which kind of contract do you have?]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tipo di contratto [Type of contract]</th>
<th>Eventuale canone di locazione [Free or fee grant]</th>
<th>Periodo di concessione [Leases period]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

a. È la forma corretta, secondo voi? [Is this tool the right one, in your opinion and for your project?]

b. Avete qualche altro suggerimento? [Do you have any other suggestion in this concern?]