

YOUR FRIENDS FEEDBACK

Alessandro Maurizio Polo
Salvatore Monaco
Simone Sannino
Matteo Saracino
Luca De Ruggiero
Rocco Tofalo

WHAT WE LIKE

- **You keep seniors' autonomy at the centre of your ideas**

In all your concepts, older people are treated as individuals who still want to move around, make their own choices and live the city. The solutions are designed to support their independence, rather than framing them as patients who need to be “managed”.

- **You use technology in a functional, not decorative, way**

Digital tools are always connected to something concrete: accessing the service, organising movements, finding safer options, simplifying coordination between people. Technology clearly has a purpose in the system and is never there just as a “cool feature”.

- **You explore mobility in a more flexible and contemporary way**

Your ideas don't rely on a single, traditional model of transport. Instead, you experiment with different ways of moving, sharing and organising trips. This opens up several scenarios and makes the overall direction feel more modern and potentially closer to how mobility services already work in everyday life.

WHAT YOU CAN IMPROVE

- **Safety and reliability of the people who provide help**
 - There needs to be a clear guarantee about who is accompanying older adults.
 - The people providing support could be: university students, who access the service using their student ID number (so they are identified and can be verified); volunteers from associations for older people, who are already used to working with this age group. This increases trust both for older adults and for their family members.
- **Continuous human care, not just “transport”**
 - The brief explicitly asks for human care, trust and familiarity.
 - The concepts focus a lot on the vehicle or the app and much less on an ongoing relationship (seeing the same faces again, feeling “accompanied by a friend”).
- **Ease of access for people who don’t use apps**
 - Right now, the ideas are all very app-centric. They should also include: a phone call option, a physical touchpoint in the neighbourhood, and the possibility for a family member to manage the request.
- **Real hyper-locality**
 - They should be designed as true neighbourhood services, not generic ones: a few key routes, a few reference people, real knowledge of the local area.
- **Strong fit with the morphology of Naples**
 - Hills, narrow alleys, broken or non-existent sidewalks, out-of-service elevators...
 - The concepts should show more clearly how they work in this specific context, not in a “flat and perfect” city.

OUR REFERENCE CONCEPT: GIROGIRO

After analysing the three concepts we consider GiroGiro to be the strongest idea and the one that best fits the brief.

For this reason, we use it as our reference concept: in the matrix, GiroGiro is set to 0 on all criteria, and the other concepts are scored as better (+), similar (0) or worse (–) when compared to it.

This allows us to make explicit not only why GiroGiro works so well, but also where the other concepts fall short.

Criterion	Concept 1 – Mappella	Concept 3 – SeniVeloce	Concept 2 – GiroGiro (reference)
Support for daily micro-routines	–	–	0
Reduction of physical effort in critical spots	–	–	0
Frequency and spontaneity of outings	0	0	0
Perceived autonomy and dignity	+	+	0
Accessibility for people with low or no digital literacy	–	+	0
Number of steps needed to activate the service	+	–	0
Speed of response and handling of last-minute requests	+	+	0
Clarity of information and wayfinding	+	0	0
Economic accessibility for everyday use	+	–	0
Intensity of perceived care	–	–	0
Quality and continuity of the human relationship	–	–	0
Perceived safety for older adults and family members	0	–	0
Impact on reduction of social isolation	–	–	0
Fit with Naples’ morphology and constraints	–	–	0
Alignment with “Your Friends” positioning (a friend who accompanies)	–	–	0

RESULTS OF THE CONCEPT SCREENING

This matrix shows that GiroGiro aligns best with the brief because it offers the most balanced mix of daily mobility support, human care and local feasibility. Mappella performs slightly worse, as it focuses more on information and technology than on care and physical effort, while SeniVeloce is penalised mainly for safety issues, weak social impact and low coherence with the real conditions of Naples.

Concept	Number of “+”	Number of “0”	Number of “–”	Total score (+1 / 0 / –1)
Concept 1 – Mappella	5	2	8	–3
Concept 3 – SeniVeloce	3	2	10	–7
Concept 2 – GiroGiro (reference)	0	15	0	0
Concept	Number of “+”	Number of “0”	Number of “–”	Total score (+1 / 0 / –1)

WHAT WE RECOMMEND

As a possible evolution of the project, we suggest combining the strengths of GiroGiro and Mappella.

GiroGiro provides the human, intergenerational ride-sharing experience, while a “Mappella layer” could add smarter, more accessible routes and better information about the city.

This hybrid concept would be even more consistent with our brief, as it connects human care, everyday mobility and a deeper understanding of the urban context.