

A. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY STAGE II

This evaluation study was created as part of the public contract *Kvalitativní šetření inovačních projektů PO 3 OPZ (Qualitative survey of innovation projects PO 3 OPZ) - 2nd wave* and offers the second series of evaluations concerning nine selected social innovation projects supported in OPZ (Operational programme Employment) based on findings from the previous part and on interviews with representatives of the project teams, project evaluators and stakeholders conducted after a longer period of time since the end of the projects.

project number	project name	project implementer
1	SOCIÁLNÍ KLINIKA (Social clinic)	Český institut biosyntézy, z.ú.
2	R-ITAREPS - KOMPLEXNÍ PROGRAM PREVENCE RELAPSU SCHIZOFRENIE (Complex schizophrenia relaps prevention program)	Fokus České Budějovice, z.ú.
3	ZVYŠOVÁNÍ INTERKULTURNÍ PROSTUPNOSTI VEŘEJNÝCH INSTITUCÍ VE MĚSTĚ BRNĚ (Increasing the intercultural permeability of institutions in the city of Brno)	Statutární město Brno
4	SYSTÉM SOCIÁLNĚ-ZDRAVOTNÍ PÉČE O OSOBY 50+ S VYUŽITÍM INOVATIVNÍHO MODELU (The system of socio-health care for people aged 50+ using the innovative model)	Česká asociace pečovatelské služby z.s.
5	COCHEMSKÝ MODEL V ČR (Cochem model in the Czech Republic)	Mosty - sociálně psychologické centrum, z.s.
6	INOVOJEME S TELEKOMUNIKAČNÍMI DATY! (Innovating with telecommunication data!)	SVI AJAK z.s.
7	EDISON	RegioHub s.r.o.
8	IMPACT ACADEMY	Institut aktivního občanství, z.s.
9	INOVACE V SPOD PRO OHROŽENÉ DĚTI (Innovation in SPOD for endangered children)	STŘEP – České centrum pro sanaci rodiny, z.ú.

Social innovation projects usually develop completely new approaches to solving problems in the social field, which largely predetermines that before the start of the project and often even during its (albeit completely successful) implementation it is often not clear what the circumstances and "final conditions" after the end of the financial support will look like. Thus, even if the whole innovation shows the right and inspiring path for subsequent replications during the project and has the potential for systemic change, there are still many aspects that can fundamentally affect and/or condition the continuation of key activities after the end of the financial support.

If we wanted to strictly evaluate the social innovation projects and assess their sustainability based on their continuity under all (or at least most) of the conditions, basic parameters or at least on the continuity of key activities (KA), **no project would be sustainable (replicable) except for the project Inovace v SPOD pro ohrožené děti (Innovation in SPOD for endangered children; project no. 9).**

If we also considered the topics of evaluated social innovations, securing of the individual projects and "involvement" of the implementer, it can be said with relatively high certainty that **KA of projects no. 3, 4, 7 and 8 would not be possible without the European project / ESF support.** The position of intercultural workers (project no. 3), the Center for Home Carers with a Counselor (project no. 4), the complex acceleration program Edison (project no. 7) and the *Ukaž změnu* Impact Academy program (project no. 8) probably would not have been created in their given parameters without the European ESF support. At the same time, however, it turns out that **these activities are not sustainable in the set basic project parameters without the continuation of the ESF support or similar other European projects.**

Projects no. 1, 5 and 9 would probably, or could easily, be implemented without the ESF support. Sociální klinika (Social Clinic) project (would have) worked and currently still works regardless of the implementation of the European Social Innovation project Sociální klinika (no. 1). The Cochem practice would have been practiced in Most and continues to be practiced even without the project Cochemský model v ČR (no. 5). SAS Střep (project no. 9) would have probably also begun testing and using the OS-Hvězda even without the ESF grant project as they keep using it now. During these projects, some procedures, tools and key activities were tested and some weaknesses and strengths of the solutions were identified, etc. but the SI project was not necessarily the **"key moment - trigger"** of these activities, resp. the emergence of these activities was not dependent on ESF support. **This is the aspect that strongly determines the "above-average" probability of sustainability of these projects.** Therefore, even this view through "theoretical assumptions" is useful for the sustainability analysis.

In the case of project no. 2, the cooperation between NUDZ (National Institute of Mental Health) and the non-profit organization (Fokus) would still be possible, however, the absence of a contractual definition of relationships (incl. license) is one of the main reasons why some conflicts and the failure to fulfill the main goals and ambitions during the implementation of the project would have been inevitable anyway. Specific demand for the project no. 6 *Inovujeme s telekomunikačními daty!* (Innovating with telecommunication data!) could theoretically arise from the public or state administration sector, even if its real need and urgency is significantly questioned even by the respondents themselves (both the implementer and stakeholders). For this project it is even more important to consider the extent, focus and financial needs of the project - in general, the question regarding the need for such a significant investment. In these two cases, (un)success of the project is not associated with the implementation of the project itself but it is rather a result of the input conditions setting. However, we can see a problem in the fact that if the risks had been identified in time during the preparatory phase, funds would not have been (and should not have been) drawn (or at least not in such an amount). **In the light of the above arguments, both projects have zero sustainability potential.**

According to the current situation described about one and a half years after the end of the ESF support, it seems that projects no. 2, 3, 4, 5, 9 can work **with a "fraction" of the cost (budget)**

compared to the situation from the European project. On the contrary, projects no. 1, 6, 7, 8 were so "ambitious" (both financially and in terms of time) precisely because of the ESF money provided, but it seems that in reality there is no entity that would finance such generously designed projects for the next period.

Another sustainability problem is that the viability of the implementer (non-profit organization) may sometimes depend on only two people (not necessarily working full-time) who carry out project-related activities and financial coverage (wages) of this activity is often secured only for a few months ahead. In the real situation, projects no. 1, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8 had to deal with the project implementer's existential (financial and personnel) problems after the end of the project, rather than its sustainability. In some cases, we then talk rather **about "implementer's sustainability" than "project's sustainability"**.

It seems extremely difficult to assess sustainability options and, in particular, KA financing after the end of the project in cases when the implementers are not forced to deal with these topics during the project implementation and it is generally not clear who is responsible for them, or whose role it is to be interested in financing, in assessing the feasibility and justification of creating corresponding jobs and in the whole economy, profitability and costs of the project after the end of the financial support.

The interviews have shown the need for a fundamental definition of the following facts, which the implementer should accept as his own in order to realistically evaluate the topic of project sustainability:

- the project (SI) is perceived as a step change
- project financing is not financing the operation of an organization
- before the start of the project, it must be clear what will "follow" after the end of the ESF support drawdown, specifically:
 - ❖ who should look for options that would allow the continuation of the project after the end of the European project – to seek the sustainability of the project (responsibility of the implementer?)
 - ❖ how and by whom will the continuation of KA be financed after the end of the project (in its original extent)
 - ❖ who and how will initiate and finance the project replication
 - ❖ how the project positions (jobs) will be settled after the end of the project if the replication or simple sustainability of the project itself is not possible.

Therefore, following points concerning the assessment (of the relevance) of sustainability should be clear (both for the implementer and for the Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs):

- if we can talk about sustainability of the project or key activities when positions and project staff move under another European project or another project with a similar or remotely similar focus. In some cases, the "continuity" of another ESF grant project or another grant (at least to some extent with a similar focus, with the same target group, similar objectives) is proving necessary for the sustainability of positions and KA because there is no other possible source of funding (concerns fully, partially or potentially projects no. 1, 3, 4, 7, 8, 9)

- what is the importance of sustainability when the possibility of replication and/or future systemic change is currently (completely) excluded or very limited within the horizon of the next 1-3, 5 years, in

particular due to the lack of legislative and systemic preparation (concerns fully, partially or potentially projects no. 1, 2, 4).