

**Data report: Second draft**

**A Comparative Study on Generation Policies in Denmark, Italy,  
France, Germany and in the UK**

Rahel Strohmeier Navarro Smith  
3 April 2009

## Content

1. The project.....	3
2. The research question.....	4
3. Definitions.....	5
3.1. Generation policy.....	5
3.2. Policies and policy.....	5
3.3. Institutionalisation.....	5
4. Methods.....	6
4.1. Selection of the countries.....	6
4.2. Data collection.....	6
4.3. Evaluation of the data.....	7
4.4. Data analysis.....	7
5. Presentation of the results.....	9
5.1. Generation policies.....	9
5.1.1. <i>Overview over the generation policies found in the investigated countries</i> .....	9
5.1.2. <i>Examples of best practise</i> .....	12
5.1.3. <i>The understanding of social policy expressed by the investigated intergenerational policies and projects</i> .....	22
5.1.4. <i>Existence or non-existence of an overall, explicit generation policy?</i> .....	22
5.1.5. <i>Explanations for the existence or non-existence of an overall, explicit generation policy</i> ...	25
5.1.6. <i>What is the novelty in comparison to other policy areas with similar topics?</i> .....	26
5.1.7. <i>Perspectives for generation policies</i> .....	27
5.2. The institutionalisation of generation policies.....	28
5.2.1 <i>The role of the state in organising generation policies</i> .....	30
5.2.2. <i>Most important state level for organising generation policies</i> .....	32
5.2.3. <i>The representation of generation policies in public administration</i> .....	33
5.2.4. <i>The kind of actors involved in the designing and implementation of generation policies (public/non-public)</i> .....	34
5.2.5. <i>Regulation of the cooperation/cooperation between the different actors involved in organising generation policies</i> .....	35
5.2.6 <i>The role of the EU</i> .....	35
5.3. Comment: A first step towards an interpretation of the results.....	36
5.3.1. <i>Different starting points for the comparison: different welfare models</i> .....	36
5.3.2. <i>New famialism or more de-familisation?</i> .....	37
5.3.3: <i>Associated risks and chances for generation policies</i> .....	38
6. Conclusion.....	39
7. References.....	41
8. Appendix.....	43

## 1. The project

In various policy areas intergenerational relationships play a part, for instance in family, age or youth policies. Many political measures influence intergenerational relationships. Intergenerational relationships can, however, also become a direct subject of policy. In Switzerland generation policies have been given an institutional footing, by creating a business area called Family, Generations and Society at national level in the Federal Office for Social Insurance.

The same authority assigned a research team of the Lucerne University of Applied Sciences and Arts – Social Work Department to examine and compare generation policies and their institutionalisation in five European countries (Denmark, Italy France, Germany and the UK). The main point of interest focuses on specific projects and measures (*policies*) and the question whether and how generation policies are developing in the five countries (*institutionalisation of generation policies*).

The results of the research presented in this first draft will be used for teaching lessons in the Master of Science in Social Work and for scientific and specialist articles.

## 2. The research question

- What projects and measures can be assigned to generation policies in the investigated country?
- Does an independent policy area develop which focuses on the direct political design of intergenerational relationships?
- How does the institutionalisation of the generation policies manifest itself in the individual countries?

### **3. Definitions**

#### **3.1. Generation policy**

In this project, generation policy is understood to be the active design of intergenerational relationships by the state in cooperation with other players. Matters regarding the design of economic transfers between intergenerational relationships (e.g. funding and services within old age insurance) are not included. We are more interested in the support of exchange relationships of a non-economic type, such as intergenerational living, learning and playing, etc.. Hence, for the data collection in our five investigated countries, we have chosen a broader concept of generation policies than it has been chosen for the literature study presented in a further document.

#### **3.2. Policies and policy**

We understand *policies* to be initiatives, projects, programmes, measures, etc. for the active design of intergenerational relationships *at any state level*. The term *policy* (singular) is used instead when referring to a possibly existing explicit, overall programme or concrete measure promoted by the Central/Federal States *at the national level* through plans and reports, laws or conferences etc..

#### **3.3. Institutionalisation**

We understand the institutionalisation of generation policy to be the role and participation of public players in the active design of intergenerational relationships.

## 4. Methods

### 4.1. Selection of the countries

For the organisation of generation policies, cooperation between public and private actors is of special importance. The involvement of public and private actor in the welfare production is also referred to as welfare-mix in the literature (Parson 1995). Therefore, we selected five countries for our study, which all represent different welfare models with different welfare-mixes (Esping-Andersen 1993, 1999; Ferrera 1998); that are: the Nordic/social-democratic/Scandinavian welfare model (Denmark); the conservative-corporatist welfare model (France and Germany); the Southern welfare model (Italy) and the liberal welfare model (UK). A short overview over the different welfare models and its characteristic welfare mix is summarised in the following table:

*Table 1: Overview over welfare models and welfare mixes*

	<b>Denmark</b>	<b>France</b>	<b>Germany</b>	<b>Italy</b>	<b>UK</b>
<b>5.2.1. Welfare model</b>	Socio-democratic model	Conservative-corporatist model		Southern model	Liberal model
<b>5.2.2. Welfare-mix</b>	Strong welfare state; with growing importance of the families and civil society for the welfare production.	A real welfare-mix: The State, the family and the civil society all play an – explicit – important role in the welfare production.		The state is subsidiary. The market, civil society – and implicitly also family – play an important role for the welfare production.	

Source: Based on literature (Esping-Andersen 1993, 1999; Ferrera 1998; Parson 1995)

In addition to the different welfare systems and traditions in the production of social welfare, also socio-economic and political contexts in which potential generation policies are implemented vary among the selected countries. For instance, family pattern are changing “faster” and demographic ageing is “stronger” in Italy than in the other countries. Therefore, in near future, more volunteer and professional care giver will be needed in order to care for the older people. Furthermore, people get even retired at an earlier age than in the other countries, but are as in the other countries, possibly still able and willing to work, maybe in a different sector than during their professional life. How to organise and deal with these new social resources? All these aspects are to be taken into account when the importance and effects of generation policies are assessed.

Further, we included France, German and Italy in our studies as neighbouring countries of Switzerland, with a strong cultural influence and social exchange which might also affect the social systems despite of the specific and different welfare traditions.

The selection of the countries was coordinated with the European Centre for Social Welfare Policy and Research which had been charged with a similar, but larger study commissioned by the Federal Office of Social Insurance in Berne.

### 4.2. Data collection

The research is executed and documented by scientific specialists in the investigated countries.<sup>1</sup> The data has been collected between June 2008 and December 2008, mainly

<sup>1</sup> Denmark: Tine Rostgaard, Researcher at the Danish National Centre for Social Research, Denmark; France: Annegret Bieri, Research Associate, Lucerne University of Applied Sciences and Arts,

through document studies and internet research. If necessary, data has been accomplished with expert interviews.

Ten generation policies have been analysed in each country (except for Italy: nine generation policies). Criteria for the selection of the policies were: 1. typical, the most significant and innovative examples; 2. where possible: both private and state intervention; 3. where possible: policies at various state levels (national, regional, local).

All data has been documented on pre-designed excel sheets, including a description of ten policies in every country (policy sheet), a sheet on the institutionalisation of those policies (institutionalisation sheet) and a short summary with a more general evaluation on the generation policy studied in the investigated country (summary sheet). All sheets will be sent in a separate document.

#### **4.3. Evaluation of the data**

The collected data contains a lot of information and is rather complete. Only data on exact budgets, public and private shares on the policy financing such as exact description of the regulation of the cooperation between different actors at different state levels and from different societal sectors (public/ private non-profit) were hard to receive. The exact description of the institutionalisation of generation policies and a first summary and evaluation of the countries experts on additional sheets have been very useful in order to gain a first impression on the different approaches used in the investigated countries.

#### **4.4. Data analysis**

For the analyses of the data, most of the indicators used in the questionnaires for the scientific specialists have been reused for the comparison of the policies and their institutionalisation.

Generation policies were analysed according to:

- Overview over single policies, initiatives, measures...
- Examples of best practise
- The understanding of social policy expressed by the generation policies
- The existence or non-existence of an explicit generation policy
- Possible explanations for the existence or non-existence
- The novelty of generation policies
- The perspectives for generation policies

The institutionalisation of generation policies was analysed with reference to the following indicators (see *table 8* in the Appendix):

- Role of the State in organising generation policies
- Most important state level for generation policy

---

Switzerland; Germany: Rahel Strohmeier Navarro Smith, Research Associate, Lucerne University of Applied Sciences and Arts, Switzerland; Italy: Marco Dossena, free lance political scientist and Stefania Sabatinelli, Research Associate, Facoltà di Sociologia, Università degli studi di Milano – Bicocca, Italy. United Kingdom: Sharon M. Holder, Scientific Associate at the Centre for Research on Ageing, School of Social Sciences, University of Southampton, United Kingdom.

- Representation of generation policies in the public administration
- The kind of actors involved in the designing and implementation of generation policies (public/non-public)
- Regulation of the cooperation/cooperation between the different actors
- The role of the EU

## **5. Presentation of the results**

The following presentation of the results consists of three parts.

In the first part, the analyses of the type of generation policy found in the single countries will be presented and characterised in a comparative perspective. For every country, generation policies of best practice will be presented by an example if possible. In the second part, the analysis of the institutionalisation of these policies will be deepened in a comparative perspective. In the last part of this chapter, the results will be shortly commented and interpreted in a larger context of theories of welfare state development.

### **5.1. Generation policies**

Even though the collected data on different generation policies in Denmark, France, Germany, Italy and the UK does often not provide us with definitive answers on our research question, the data allows us to compare different and similar approaches in this new, not always explicit policy area. An overview of the data provided for single generation policies and their institutionalisation in the investigated countries are presented in two tables in the Appendix at the end of this report. In the following, the most interesting findings are summarised and a first short interpretation is presented.

#### *5.1.1. Overview over the generation policies found in the investigated countries*

The following table gives an overview on the different topics covered within the single generation policies found in the investigated countries.

Table 2: List of the policies described in the investigated countries

Denmark	France	Germany	Italy	UK
<p>Project Food like in the old days</p> <p><a href="http://www.os-samraad.dk">www.os-samraad.dk</a> (closed down now)</p>	<p>Memories</p> <p><a href="http://www.accordages.com">www.accordages.com</a></p>	<p><b>Generation houses*</b></p> <p><a href="http://www.mehrgenerationenhaeuser.de/">http://www.mehrgenerationenhaeuser.de/</a>; <a href="http://www.bmfsfj.de/bmfsfj/generator/Politikbereiche/Familie/mehrgenerationenhaeuser.html">http://www.bmfsfj.de/bmfsfj/generator/Politikbereiche/Familie/mehrgenerationenhaeuser.html</a></p>	<p>Senior Citizens' voluntary civil service</p> <p><a href="http://www.comune.candelo.bi.it/flex/cm/pages/ServeBL/0B.php/L/IT/ID/Pagina/1">http://www.comune.candelo.bi.it/flex/cm/pages/ServeBL/0B.php/L/IT/ID/Pagina/1</a></p>	<p><b>Active Ageing Programme*</b></p> <p><a href="http://www.centraliverpoolpct.nhs.uk/Provider/Services/Ageing.asp">http://www.centraliverpoolpct.nhs.uk/Provider/Services/Ageing.asp</a></p>
<p>Bonus grandparent scheme</p> <p><a href="http://www.kk.dk/reservebedste.aspx">http://www.kk.dk/reservebedste.aspx</a></p>	<p><b>Chronos literature prize*</b></p> <p><a href="http://prix-chronos.org">http://prix-chronos.org</a></p>	<p>Volunteer services of and for all generations</p> <p><a href="http://www.bmfsfj.de/bmfsfj/generator/BMFSFJ/Freiwilliges-Engagement/freiwilligendienst-fuer-jedes-alter.html">http://www.bmfsfj.de/bmfsfj/generator/BMFSFJ/Freiwilliges-Engagement/freiwilligendienst-fuer-jedes-alter.html</a></p>	<p>Civic grandparents</p> <p><a href="http://www.comune.torino.it/tempieorari/web/index.php?pag=sezioni&amp;idSottoarea=54&amp;idNews=180&amp;idArea=1023">http://www.comune.torino.it/tempieorari/web/index.php?pag=sezioni&amp;idSottoarea=54&amp;idNews=180&amp;idArea=1023</a></p>	<p><b>Age Concern Kingston's Age and Youth-School Based Project (ACKuT)*</b></p> <p><a href="http://www.ageconcernkingston.org/Intergenerational.htm">http://www.ageconcernkingston.org/Intergenerational.htm</a> or <a href="http://www.ageconcernkingston.org/documents/IntergenRpt2005.pdf">http://www.ageconcernkingston.org/documents/IntergenRpt2005.pdf</a></p>
<p>Best friend of vulnerable children</p> <p><a href="http://www.social.dk/global/nyheder/Nyhedsarkivgammelt/Nyheder%202006/SM/index.aspx?id=fe2bfdce-7cea-4947-8ed9">www.social.dk/global/nyheder/Nyhedsarkivgammelt/Nyheder%202006/SM/index.aspx?id=fe2bfdce-7cea-4947-8ed9</a></p>	<p><b>Solidary Paris*</b></p> <p><a href="http://www.leparisolidaire.com">www.leparisolidaire.com</a></p>	<p><b>Dialogue between the generations - generationendialog.de*</b></p> <p><a href="http://www.generationendialog.de/projektebuero.php">http://www.generationendialog.de/projektebuero.php</a></p>	<p>Living together</p> <p><a href="http://www.comune.bologna.it/quartieresantostefano/archivio_progetti/abitare_insieme/index.php">http://www.comune.bologna.it/quartieresantostefano/archivio_progetti/abitare_insieme/index.php</a></p>	<p>The Bigger Picture Project (Tower Hoamlets) Ocean Estate</p> <p><a href="http://www.magicme.co.uk/templates/template_summary.php?storyno=153">http://www.magicme.co.uk/templates/template_summary.php?storyno=153</a> or <a href="http://www.cafonline.org/pdf/MagicMe.pdf">http://www.cafonline.org/pdf/MagicMe.pdf</a></p>
<p>Memory workshop</p> <p><a href="http://198.64.136.117/informationpage.asp?id=417F1D61-64AE-4419-A568-64CD7A9EB12B">http://198.64.136.117/informationpage.asp?id=417F1D61-64AE-4419-A568-64CD7A9EB12B</a></p>	<p><b>Intergenerational cohabitation*</b></p> <p>(no website available)</p>	<p><b>Reading connects*</b></p> <p><a href="http://www.stiftunglesen.de/lesen_verbindet_generationen/default.aspx">http://www.stiftunglesen.de/lesen_verbindet_generationen/default.aspx</a>; <a href="http://www.mgffi.nrw.de/generationen/stiftung-lesen/index.php">http://www.mgffi.nrw.de/generationen/stiftung-lesen/index.php</a></p>	<p>Young and Senior citizens at the Centre</p> <p><a href="http://www.comune.pontcanavese.to.it/FileDownload.asp?T=2&amp;l=2584">www.comune.pontcanavese.to.it/FileDownload.asp?T=2&amp;l=2584</a></p>	<p>Shoebox Theatre</p> <p><a href="http://www.shoeboxtheatre.co.uk">http://www.shoeboxtheatre.co.uk</a></p>
<p>Grandparents' day off for sick grandchildren</p> <p><a href="http://ida.dk/presse/presseklip/Januar2008/Sider/17januar2008.aspx">ida.dk/presse/presseklip/Januar2008/Sider/17januar2008.aspx</a></p>	<p>Circle "Vermeil"</p> <p><a href="http://www.cercle-vermeil.fr">www.cercle-vermeil.fr</a></p>	<p>Senior-mentoring for the entrance in work life</p> <p><a href="http://www.awopides-euskirchen.de/index1024.php?auf=1&amp;lang=;engagement/index.php">http://www.awopides-euskirchen.de/index1024.php?auf=1&amp;lang=;engagement/index.php</a>; <a href="http://www.mgffi.nrw.de/generationen/index.php">http://www.mgffi.nrw.de/generationen/index.php</a></p>	<p>Solidarity agreement between generations (not implemented!)</p> <p>(no website)</p>	<p>Burbank Court &amp; Brierton Scholl Intergenerational Craft Project</p> <p>(no website)</p>
<p><b>Foster care with relatives*</b></p> <p><a href="http://www.social.dk/boern_unge_og_familie/index.aspx?id=8c9bc576-ca6a-46de-88b9-bf14fba58996">http://www.social.dk/boern_unge_og_familie/index.aspx?id=8c9bc576-ca6a-46de-88b9-bf14fba58996</a></p>	<p>Intergenerational restaurant</p> <p>(no website available)</p>	<p>Competition: "Projects for generations"</p> <p><a href="http://www.mgffi.nrw.de/generationen/wettbewerb/index.php">http://www.mgffi.nrw.de/generationen/wettbewerb/index.php</a></p>	<p>Young and senior citizens: a solid bridge between generations</p> <p><a href="http://www.vssp.it/pag/k/bando07/sea.pdf">www.vssp.it/pag/k/bando07/sea.pdf</a></p>	<p><b>Age Exchange Youth theatre Group: Case study of reminiscence drama work between African elders and ten-year olds*</b></p> <p><a href="http://www.age-exchange.org.uk/our_work/intergenerational.html">http://www.age-exchange.org.uk/our_work/intergenerational.html</a></p>
<p>Councelling involving grandparents</p> <p><a href="http://www.social.dk/boern_unge_og_familie/">http://www.social.dk/boern_unge_og_familie/</a></p>	<p>Reading and enable to read</p>	<p>Expert conference The Future on Ageing – Dialogue between the generations</p>	<p>Three Ages University</p> <p><a href="http://www.unitre.net/nazionale/nazionale.html">http://www.unitre.net/nazionale/nazionale.html</a></p>	<p><b>Sixty Plus</b></p> <p><a href="http://www.nya.org.uk/information/111738/sixty">http://www.nya.org.uk/information/111738/sixty</a></p>

index.aspx?id=8c9bc576-ca6a-46de-88b9-bf14fba58996	www.lireetfairelire.org	http://www.schleswig-holstein.de/MSGF/DE/BuergergesellschaftEhrenamt/BuergergesellschaftEhrenamt___node.html#doc134130bodyText6		plusintergenerationalproject/
Visiting friend  <a href="http://www.aeldresagen.dk/Medlemmer/detgoervifordig/sochum/besoegsven/Sider/default.aspx">http://www.aeldresagen.dk/Medlemmer/detgoervifordig/sochum/besoegsven/Sider/default.aspx</a>	Good ageing  (www.travail-solidarite.gouv.fr)	<b>Video of the generations*</b>  <a href="http://www.video-der-generationen.de/index.htm">http://www.video-der-generationen.de/index.htm</a>	Laboratorio della Memoria  <a href="http://www.comune.isoladovarese.cr.it/comune_laboratorio.asp">http://www.comune.isoladovarese.cr.it/comune_laboratorio.asp</a>	Deryshire Integenerational Strategy (DIGS) Gardening project  <a href="http://www.seah.org.uk/index.php?option=com_content&amp;task=view&amp;id=93&amp;Itemid=66">http://www.seah.org.uk/index.php?option=com_content&amp;task=view&amp;id=93&amp;Itemid=66</a> & <a href="http://www.fallingwide.com/triptych.htm">http://www.fallingwide.com/triptych.htm</a>
Grandma' in the kindergarten  <a href="http://www.aeldresagen.dk/Frivillige/blivfrivillig/fordele/aktiv/Sider/Bedsteib%C3%B8rnehave.aspx">http://www.aeldresagen.dk/Frivillige/blivfrivillig/fordele/aktiv/Sider/Bedsteib%C3%B8rnehave.aspx</a>	<b>Intergenerational charter*</b>  www.colombes.fr Service intergénérationnelle	<b>Intergenerational volunteering in sports*</b>  <a href="http://www.freiwilligendienste-im-sport.de/index.php?id=7562">http://www.freiwilligendienste-im-sport.de/index.php?id=7562</a> ; <a href="http://www.bmfsfj.de/bmfsfj/generator/BMFSFJ/Freiwilliges-Engagement/freiwilligendienste-fuer-jedes-alter.html">http://www.bmfsfj.de/bmfsfj/generator/BMFSFJ/Freiwilliges-Engagement/freiwilligendienste-fuer-jedes-alter.html</a>	<b>Friendly houses for girls and boys*</b>  <a href="http://www.coriantoline.it/">http://www.coriantoline.it/</a>	<b>The Beth Johnson Centre for Intergenerational Practice*</b>  <a href="http://www.centreforip.org.uk">http://www.centreforip.org.uk</a>
Cooperation between local society and the school  <a href="https://www.retsinformation.dk/Foms/R0710.aspx?id=25528">https://www.retsinformation.dk/Foms/R0710.aspx?id=25528</a>	Se canto  www.se-canto.com	Generation learning  <a href="http://www.generationenlernen-hamm.de/">http://www.generationenlernen-hamm.de/</a> ; <a href="http://www.mgffi.nrw.de/generationen/index.php">http://www.mgffi.nrw.de/generationen/index.php</a>		Intergenerational Dance Company  <a href="http://www.seah.org.uk/index.php?option=com_content&amp;task=view&amp;id=93&amp;Itemid=66">http://www.seah.org.uk/index.php?option=com_content&amp;task=view&amp;id=93&amp;Itemid=66</a> & <a href="http://www.fallingwide.com/triptych.htm">http://www.fallingwide.com/triptych.htm</a>

Source: Policy sheets.

**Best practise policies: \***

For a more detailed description of the policies see websites, for best practise policies see also tables below on the following pages.

In general terms, two main objectives can be distinguished: First, the promotion of intergenerational public-private projects on the one hand and second, the coordination, professionalisation and networking for existing providers of such policies on the other hand. Most of the listed generation policies can be grouped to the one of the following societal dimension: education, social relationships, cultural heritage, care and support, living together, participation in the labour market (here: mentoring for young people), community development, nutrition, arts and leisure.

As the chosen generation policies in the investigated countries are not necessarily representative, we have to be cautious with generalising and identifying trends with reference to the different contents we find in the single policies. However, some trends seem to be rather obvious: In **Denmark**, policies refer stronger to care related topics (child care, family care and care for older people) than in the other investigated countries. In **Germany**, a strong intent in order to coordinate and stabilise the existing generation policies can be noticed. The promotion of new and traditional forms of volunteering is an important aim in many policies. The same applies for the **UK**, where a scientific centre for intergenerational practices and research has been established in 2001. However, in the presented policies of the UK, a strong focus on education and arts is to be observed in comparison to the other countries. The policies are generally located around the topic of community development. In **France**, the main motivation seems to be to prevent older people from social isolation as several organisations of older people are involved in the organisation and implementation of the policies. And in **Italy**, generation policies seem to be lowest developed despite some very interesting, but very punctual local projects and initiatives, most dealing with the promotion of intergenerational relationships in the cultural and social sector.

Generally speaking, the following three main approaches can be distinguished. The aim of some projects is to open certain social institutions to a larger public, for instance universities with special lectures for children and for retired persons. In other projects, the approach is to address all citizens and not only a specific age group dealing with community development, for instance. Another approach found in some projects is to enhance contacts between different age groups in order to mobilise (new) social resources – especially given by the healthy retired persons. New forms of volunteering through exchange of social services, for instance in the cohabitation project “Mehrgenerationenhäuser” in Germany, shall be enhanced. On this way, not only institutionalised, but also informal and spontaneous volunteering is promoted. And a third approach is to prevent from age segregation and social isolation, especially of older people, which is a topic in many projects presented in France.

#### *5.1.2. Examples of best practise*

For all five investigated countries, examples of best practise could be identified. These are policies which are recognised as good examples through public awards or prizes or whose success has been shown by scientific evaluation. Or they are of national importance and lived an expansion due to a successful first time period. Furthermore, generation policies of best practise may have served as a model for the implementation of a similar policy in another region of the country or abroad.

In *table 3* below, all best practise policies found in the five investigated countries are presented

*Table 3: Overview on best practise policies in the five investigated countries*

<b>Denmark</b>	<b>France</b>	<b>Germany</b>	<b>Italy</b>	<b>UK</b>
<b>Foster care with relatives*</b>  <a href="http://www.social.dk/b_oern_unge__og_familie/index.aspx?id=8c9bc576-ca6a-46de-88b9-bf14fba58996">http://www.social.dk/b_oern_unge__og_familie/index.aspx?id=8c9bc576-ca6a-46de-88b9-bf14fba58996</a>	<b>Chronos literature prize*</b>  <a href="http://prix-chronos.org">http://prix-chronos.org</a>	<b>Generation houses*</b>  <a href="http://www.mehrgenerationenhaeuser.de/">http://www.mehrgenerationenhaeuser.de/</a> ; <a href="http://www.bmfsfj.de/bmfsfj/generator/Politikbereiche/Familie/mehrgenerationenhaeuser.html">http://www.bmfsfj.de/bmfsfj/generator/Politikbereiche/Familie/mehrgenerationenhaeuser.html</a>	<b>Friendly houses for girls and boys*</b>  <a href="http://www.corian-doline.it/">http://www.corian-doline.it/</a>	<b>Active Ageing Programme*</b>  <a href="http://www.centalliverpoolpct.nhs.uk/Provider/Services/Ageing.asp">http://www.centalliverpoolpct.nhs.uk/Provider/Services/Ageing.asp</a>
	<b>Solidary Paris*</b>  <a href="http://www.leparisolidaire.com">www.leparisolidaire.com</a>	<b>Dialogue between the generations - generationendialog.de*</b>  <a href="http://www.generationendialog.de/projektbuero.php">http://www.generationendialog.de/projektbuero.php</a>		<b>Age Concern Kingston's Age and Youth-School Based Project (ACKuT)*</b>  <a href="http://www.ageconcernkingston.org/Intergenerational.htm">http://www.ageconcernkingston.org/Intergenerational.htm</a> or <a href="http://www.ageconcernkingston.org/documents/IntergenRpt2005.pdf">http://www.ageconcernkingston.org/documents/IntergenRpt2005.pdf</a>
	<b>Intergenerational cohabitation</b>  (no website available)	<b>Reading connects*</b>  <a href="http://www.stiftunglesen.de/lesen_erbindet_generationen/default.aspx">http://www.stiftunglesen.de/lesen_erbindet_generationen/default.aspx</a> ; <a href="http://www.mgffi.nrw.de/generationen/stiftung-lesen/index.php">http://www.mgffi.nrw.de/generationen/stiftung-lesen/index.php</a>		<b>Age Exchange Youth theatre Group: Case study of reminiscence drama work between African elders and ten-year olds*</b>  <a href="http://www.age-exchange.org.uk/our_work/intergenerational.html">http://www.age-exchange.org.uk/our_work/intergenerational.html</a>
	<b>Intergenerational charter*</b>  <a href="http://www.colombes.fr/Service/intergenerationnelle">www.colombes.fr/Service/intergenerationnelle</a>	<b>Video of the generations*</b>  <a href="http://www.video-der-generationen.de/index.htm">http://www.video-der-generationen.de/index.htm</a>		<b>Sixty Plus Intergenerational Dance Company*</b>  <a href="http://www.nya.org.uk/information/111738/sixtyplusintergenerationalproject/">http://www.nya.org.uk/information/111738/sixtyplusintergenerationalproject/</a>
		<b>Intergenerational volunteering in sports*</b>  <a href="http://www.freiwilligendienste-im-sport.de/index.php?id=7562">http://www.freiwilligendienste-im-sport.de/index.php?id=7562</a> ; <a href="http://www.bmfsfj.de/bmfsfj/generator/BMFSFJ/Freiwilliges-Engagement/freiwilligendienste-fuer-jedes-alter.html">http://www.bmfsfj.de/bmfsfj/generator/BMFSFJ/Freiwilliges-Engagement/freiwilligendienste-fuer-jedes-alter.html</a>		<b>Deryshire Integenerational Strategy (DIGS) Gardening project</b>  <a href="http://www.seah.org.uk/index.php?option=com_content&amp;task=view&amp;id=93&amp;Itemid=66">http://www.seah.org.uk/index.php?option=com_content&amp;task=view&amp;id=93&amp;Itemid=66</a> & <a href="http://www.fallingwide.com/triptych.htm">http://www.fallingwide.com/triptych.htm</a>
				<b>The Beth Johnson Centre for Intergenerational Practice*</b>  <a href="http://www.centreforip.org.uk">http://www.centreforip.org.uk</a>

Source: Policy sheets.

In the following tables, a short description of the best practise policies found in the five investigated countries is given. Information provided in the single tables is mainly based on the Policy sheets.

<b>Denmark</b>	
<b>Foster care with relatives (Slægtsanbringelse)</b>	
<b>Kind of policy</b>	Public, reform of the foster care legislation. Support policy for vulnerable children.
<b>Aim and Content of the policy</b>	Care and support: To strengthen the sense of continuity for children who are unable to live with their parents and to use the resources available in the family, i.e. with grandparents, by placing children in foster care with these relatives.  The reform has focussed on the benefits of placing children in relative foster care instead of foster care with others. Relatives are reimbursed for expenditure for clothes, food, pocket money and shelter. Relatives are only authorized to care for their own family members, not children outside the family also.
<b>Target population</b>	Vulnerable children, their relatives
<b>Financing</b>	The overall budget of this policy is unknown. However, the policy is publicly funded, mainly at the local level.
<b>Role of the State</b>	The local authority must evaluate relatives to see if they are fit to take care of the child, and must offer courses for these relatives.
<b>Place</b>	National
<b>Time</b>	2006
<b>Justification for best practise</b>	A literature review suggests that fostering care by relatives results in better continuity and that children remain in contact with their biological parents and have fewer problems than other children in foster care.
<b>Similar policies</b>	"Counseling involving relatives" (see Policy Sheet 7).
<b>Comments</b>	The Danish National Centre for Social Research (SFI) in 2007 started up an evaluation of relative foster care, which is still ongoing.
<b>Sources</b>	A similar policy is counseling involving relatives described in policy sheet 7. Policy sheet 6; <a href="https://www.retsinformation.dk/Forms/R0710.aspx?id=25528">https://www.retsinformation.dk/Forms/R0710.aspx?id=25528</a>

<b>France</b>	
<b>Intergenerational Charter (Charte Intergénérationnelle)</b>	
<b>Kind of policy</b>	A local public-private project
<b>Aim and Content of the policy</b>	Content: to coordinate the different existing intergenerational projects and to build up a network of actors. Aim: to develop a natural alliance between generations, to develop alliance between children and retired people, develop enriching exchanges, to transmit knowledge.
<b>Target population</b>	All inhabitants of the city of Colombes: children, retired and professional institutions, organisations
<b>Financing</b>	City of Colombes at the local level finances all the cost of different projects. The retired people participate as volunteers.
<b>Role of the State</b>	The state approves this Charter in Colombes and co-finances the project.
<b>Place</b>	Local: city of Colombes (Region: Ile de France)
<b>Time</b>	Charter of intergeneration: existing since 1992 in the city of Colombes (Region: Ile de France).
<b>Justification for best practise</b>	Colombes is the first city to have a "charte intergénérationnelle". It stands therefore as an example for other cities. At national level one of the proposition formulated (after the conference of family 2006) to enhance the intergenerational exchange was to establish intergenerational charters.
<b>Similar policies</b>	There are intergenerational charters following the example of "Colombe" all over the country.

<b>Sources</b>	Policy sheet 9; www.colombes.fr/fileadmin/Documents/Mag_senior/charte.pdf Service intergénérationnelle; Documentation: Charte intergénérationnelle.
----------------	--

<b>France</b>	
<b>Solidary Paris (Le Parisolidaire)</b>	
<b>Kind of policy</b>	Local private non-profit project.
<b>Aim and Content of the policy</b>	Content: The private association (Association loi de 1901) "Parisolidaire" is a centre that organises the cohabitation between young and old through a charter of intergenerational cohabitation.  Aims: On the one hand to give young students the chance to find a room in the big cities and on the other let lonely seniors have company and help in their daily life by creating cohabitation.  The members of the association as main cooperation partners can chose to get a flat for a short period (some weeks, 1 month) or for more months, years (restriction is in the age of the students: they must be between 18 and 30 years old).
<b>Target population</b>	Students and elderly people. Young students are ready to share an apartment with retired people and give them company and help them in their every day life with little errands. Both individuals have to follow the rules of the charter of cohabitation (charte de convivialité).
<b>Financing</b>	"Le Parisolidaire" is a private association (at the local level) based on the law "association de loi 1991" in France. The association depends mainly on the contribution of its members (a non recurring charge of 10 EUR for students and 30 EUR for seniors for the registration and a yearly charge for students between 150 - 350 EUR, for seniors 150 EUR) and also on partner fundings. European commission: Fonds social européen en France Public financers are: Région ile de France, le Conseil Général, office public d'aménagement et de construction de Paris (OPAC), Ministère du travail, des relations sociales, de la famille et de solidarité Private financers: Credit Coopératif, Société de gérance d'immeubles municipaux (SGIM), Fondation de France, Toit et joie, Droit de cité habitat
<b>Role of the State</b>	Co-financing.
<b>Place</b>	Local: city of Paris. However, cohabitation projects are found also in other places.
<b>Time</b>	2004 ongoing.
<b>Justification for best practise</b>	The charter of intergenerational cohabitation serves as base for all other French associations promoting the cohabitation between young and old and belonging to the network of all associations promoting "cohabitation solidaire intergénérationnelle" (COSI). Since the project has been going on well for the last few years' long term cooperation with the other partners has been agreed.
<b>Similar policies</b>	For an overview on cohabitation projects between young and old people: www.reseau-cosi.com.
<b>Sources</b>	Policy sheet 3; www.leparisolidaire.com www.reseau-cosi.com: website with all associations in France promoting the "Cohabitation Solidaire Intergénérationnelle".

<b>France</b>	
<b>The Chronos Literatur Prize (Le prix Chronos de littérature)</b>	
<b>Kind of policy</b>	Yearly national award for literature concerning the subject of intergenerational exchange implemented by the public "Fondation nationale de Gérontologie" (FNG).
<b>Aim and Content of the policy</b>	The Chronos Prize is aimed at encouraging reading. Its purpose is to change the way society looks at senior citizens and aging by raising awareness, starting in childhood, of what it means to go through life and grow older. This will thus promote better relations among different generations as children discover that: "Growing up means growing older - growing older means growing up". The jury is composed of children, from nursery schools, primary schools and middle schools and seniors. This jury choose a publication from among a selection of illustrated books and novels, all of which focus on subjects like grandparents, aging, life pathways, the handing down of knowledge, and the end of life.  A committee, composed of researchers, specialists in children's literature, gerontologists, teachers' representatives, booksellers, senior citizens, and colleagues from the public and private sectors selects the books on the theme "Growing Up, Growing Older". Five categories of books are considered: illustrated books for nursery school children, and novels for primary and middle school children. In 2001, 13 and 14-year-old schoolchildren (7th and 8th grades) will take part in the Chronos

	Prize.
<b>Target population</b>	Children of different ages and seniors
<b>Financing</b>	Public financing through contributions of six ministries at the national level.
<b>Role of the State</b>	The main actor is the public "Fondation nationale de Gérontologie" (FNG) at the national level that organises the "Prix de Chronos" since 1996. The Foundation is publicly financed. Thus, the State also acts as a financier and as an implementer in this policy.
<b>Place</b>	National. But also other countries participate in the yearly literature award.
<b>Time</b>	Yearly since 1996. The Foundation was created in 1967 by the public authorities and the main basic or supplementary social security systems in France. Also national research centres working in the field of health contributed to its creation. The FNG was recognized to be of public interest on 21 September 1967. In 1996 the National Gerontology Foundation broke new ground by setting up a literary prize: the Chronos Prize for Youth Literature. This action is targeted at what for gerontologists is a new public - children. Its purpose is to change the way society looks at senior citizens and aging by raising awareness, starting in childhood, of what it means to go through life and grow older. This will thus promote better relations among different generations as children discover that: "Growing up means growing older - growing older means growing up".
<b>Justification for best practise</b>	Has been declared by the national level as a good initiative and other similar projects should be promoted. Thus, the Chronos Prize is officially awarded in a prestigious cultural setting: Every spring at the Paris Book Fair (Salon du Livre) the results are announced in the presence of well-known figures from the world of culture, teaching and gerontology, as well as various financial sponsors The Prize is continually expanding to include more countries. The media, including the daily national and regional press, has shown steadily growing interest. The private sector partners of Chronos Prize have remained loyal and have fully integrated Chronos into their communications plans and everyday activities. An increasing number of children have taken part in the Chronos Prize over the last five years. These children have come from throughout France as well as from several foreign countries, including Germany, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Spain, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Portugal, Romania, the United States... They are extremely enthusiastic, and grow more so every year. They are hardly frightened by the theme "Growing Up, Growing Older".
<b>Similar projects</b>	"Le prix intergeneration": organised by the ministry delegated to elderly people. Awarding different intergenerational projects in France. "La semaine bleue": initiative by ministry of health - every year one week in the month of October is devoted to elderly people and all the projects involved.
<b>Sources</b>	Policy sheet 2; <a href="http://prix-chronos.org">http://prix-chronos.org</a>

<b>Germany</b>	
<b>Generation houses (Mehrgenerationenhäuser)</b>	
<b>Kind of Policy</b>	A national public programme promoted by the Federal Ministry of Family, Seniors, Women and Young People (BMFSFJ)
<b>Aim and Content of the policy</b>	Aim: to enhance and enforce volunteers engagement, intergenerational relationships, services close to home and networking among different local providers Content: Generation houses are mostly based on other institutions. There are six prototypes: 1. centre for parents and their children + plus; 2. family/mother centres + plus; 3. family education and counselling + plus; 4. school/sports/culture + plus; 5. senior education and meeting + plus; 6. church and citizen's community + plus. These prototypes have to fulfil certain criteria in order to be chosen for the generation house programme and to be financed through federal funding. These criteria are: Integration of the four life-ages: 1. children and young people; adults; young olds (more than 50) and old people. 2. cross-generational offers; 3. child care services, 4. cooperation between professionals and volunteers at the same level; 5. strong integration of volunteering; 6. development of an information and service exchange point on site; 7. involvement of the local economy; 8. open meeting point with cafeteria/bistro.  However, not only new contents, but also new methods are promoted: strong cooperation between

	volunteers and professionals at the same level, enhancing cooperation and networking between existing local institutions etc.
<b>Target population</b>	Different, but no specific and therefore all age groups: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Parents who need help and support</li> <li>• Children learning with other people and enjoying their attention</li> <li>• Older people: sharing their competences and experiences, finding new meaningful duties</li> <li>• You people who can meet each other beyond family borders in a reliable space</li> <li>• Professionals who participate in the community and find support in the community</li> <li>• Volunteers and professionals working together and learning from each other</li> </ul>
<b>Financing</b>	The federal government/ministry for families, seniors, women and young people (40'000 EUR per year per generation house); the European Social Fund (which is financing 200 of the total 300 generation houses).
<b>Role of the State</b>	Initiating, coordinating, funding. And with the help of project partners at the national level also offering support services like: operational support, communication, scientific evaluation and specific capacity building in workshops.
<b>Place</b>	National: There are 500 generation houses in all 16 "Bundesländer" (regional level in Germany) since the beginning of 2008
<b>Time</b>	2006-2011
<b>Justification for best practise</b>	The policy represents the first national public programme which explicitly promotes intergenerational relationships. The European Social Fund agreed for co-financing, so the project could be extended. Regularly scientific evaluations state that the project has been successful so far, even though there is still room for improvement. A second programme has been started by the BMFSFJ in 2009 for intergenerational volunteering which can be seen as a continuation of this project. But again, interested organisations have to apply in a competition for participating and funding in and through the programme. The first generation houses were funded in the region (Bundesland) of Niedersachsen in 2003, where Miss von der Leyen has been regional family minister in Niedersachsen until 2005. After that, the successful programme introduce at the national scale, when Miss von der Leyen became national family minister.
<b>Sources</b>	Policy sheet 1; <a href="http://www.mehrgenerationenhaeuser.de/">http://www.mehrgenerationenhaeuser.de/</a> ; <a href="http://www.bmfsfj.de/bmfsfj/generator/Politikbereiche/Familie/mehrgenerationenhaeuser.html">http://www.bmfsfj.de/bmfsfj/generator/Politikbereiche/Familie/mehrgenerationenhaeuser.html</a>

<b>Germany</b>	
<b>Dialogue between the generations (generationendialog.de)</b>	
<b>Kind of Policy</b>	A (national) public-private internet platform for generation policies with links to other European and International homepages
<b>Aim and Content of the policy</b>	Aim: To distribute of the idea of a intergenerational dialog; to promote networking for generation projects in Germany, Europe and international; to offer counselling and training, Content: Services offered by the project office (Projektbüro): maintaining the data collection, information material, newsletter, project counselling, training, building and support of regional groups, participation at congresses, contributions in journals, competitions
<b>Target population</b>	-old and young people who are looking for information on intergenerational projects -staff members of intergenerational projects and measures -local institutions and organisations, Schools and Universities, Foundations and Sponsors -cities and governments at regional level (Länder), civil parish, volunteer organisations -media -European and international partners.
<b>Financing</b>	The Federal Ministry for Family, Seniors, Women and Young People is co-financing.
<b>Role of the State</b>	Initiating and co-financing.
<b>Place</b>	It is a national Internet Platform which promotes generation policies at different state levels and which includes links to other national, European and international homepages
<b>Time</b>	1994/1997
<b>Justification for best practise</b>	The policy enhances networking on a long-term among different partners at local, regional, national, European and international level and is therefore also to be seen a policy for best practise.
<b>Sources</b>	Policy sheet 3; <a href="http://www.generationendialog.de">http://www.generationendialog.de</a>

<b>Germany</b>	
<b>Video of the generations (Video der Generationen)</b>	
<b>Kind of Policy</b>	A national public-private project
<b>Aim and Content of the policy</b>	Aim: To bring together film fans from different generations in order to make a video which is not longer than 60 minutes and which presents new perspectives on special topics, also sensibilising for prejudices. Content: Making a film together which is be shown at a film festival. There are three options for film topics: 1. free selection, 2. a special topic "don't panic" (Keine Panik), 3. a documentary of an intergenerational project. The price to win: 9'500 EUR (cash 6'000; 3'500 for film material).
<b>Target population</b>	Filmmakers younger than 25 and older than 50 years
<b>Financing</b>	The Federal Ministry for Families, Seniors, Women and Young People (BMFSFJ) is co-financing the project. and the German Film Centre for Children and Young People (Kinder- und Jugendfilmzentrum in Deutschland (KJF)). The BMFSFJ is a co-financer, the KJF is organising the event.
<b>Role of the State</b>	Financing. And the German Film Centre for Children and Young People (Kinder- und Jugendfilmzentrum in Deutschland (KJF) is organising the event.
<b>Place</b>	National
<b>Time</b>	1996 ongoing; yearly
<b>Justification for best practise</b>	The policy can be seen as best practise policy due to its twelf years of existence. No end is planned for the successful cooperation between the BMFSFJ and the KJF. The partners have published a handbook on intergenerational filming in 2008.
<b>Sources</b>	Policy sheet 9; <a href="http://www.video-der-generationen.de/index.htm">http://www.video-der-generationen.de/index.htm</a>

<b>Germany</b>	
<b>Intergenerational volunteering in sports (Generationenübergreifender Freiwilligendienst im Sport – das Plus an Engagement)</b>	
<b>Kind of Policy</b>	A national public-private project
<b>Aim and Content of the policy</b>	Aim: The aim of the policy is the implementation of the new volunteering model into the structures of sports. Content: The volunteers are working in the sport area with children and young people, for and with migrants, disabled people and seniors. They further give mentoring for younger people who would like to start a new project, for instance establishing a new sport section.
<b>Target population</b>	Volunteers of all age groupes.
<b>Financing</b>	The project is financed through Federal funding (Modell Programme of the BMFSFJ (Bundesministerium für Familie, Senioren, Frauen und Jugend), volunteering of individuals (older people) and within sport clubs. The financing of the Federal Ministry goes per occupied place: 250.00 EUR in the first year, 200.00 EUR in the second year, 150.00 EUR in the third year. Without rooms and the resources of the volunteers and sport clubs, Federal financing covered between 80 and 100% of the total costs.
<b>Role of the State</b>	Initiating and financing.
<b>Place</b>	National
<b>Time</b>	2005-2008; 2009 ongoing
<b>Justification for best practise</b>	After the national programme on intergenerational volunteering had finished in 2008, the project „Generationenübergreinder Freiwilligendienst im Sport – das Plus am Engagement“ is again at the homepage of the new programme of the Federal Ministry for BMFSFJ (Bundesministerium für Familie, Senioren, Fauen und Jugend) for "Volunteering for all generations" (2009-2012).
<b>Sources</b>	Policy sheet 10; <a href="http://www.freiwilligendienste-im-sport.de/index.php?id=7562">http://www.freiwilligendienste-im-sport.de/index.php?id=7562</a> ; <a href="http://www.bmfsfj.de/bmfsfj/generator/BMFSFJ/Freiwilliges-Engagement/freiwilligendienste-fuer-jedes-alter.html">http://www.bmfsfj.de/bmfsfj/generator/BMFSFJ/Freiwilliges-Engagement/freiwilligendienste-fuer-jedes-alter.html</a>

<b>Italy</b>	
<b>House of Friends for children: Coriandoline (Coriandoline: le case amiche dei bambini e delle bambine)</b>	
<b>Kind of Policy</b>	A local public-private project developed by the inhabitants' cooperative (a third sector organisation), the municipality, public day-care centres, university and artists of the civil society

<b>Aim and Content of the policy</b>	The main objective was to take into account the point of view, the vision and the needs of children in the projecting and building of a new neighbourhood, in order to have a children friendly city. Involving Children in projecting the houses their families would live in, or that would be built close to their home. The policy was executed through workshops, exhibitions, conferences, intergenerational and interdisciplinary group working.
<b>Target population</b>	Children aged 3-5 and adults looking for a dwelling.
<b>Financing</b>	Private funding through the local Andria inhabitants' cooperative (private financing, no public funding). The overall budget of this policy is unknown.
<b>Role of the State</b>	The municipality among other partners (University, day-care centres, the civil society) is involved.
<b>Place</b>	Local: municipalities of Correggio and Rio Saliceto, Emilia Romagna Region (centre of Italy).
<b>Time</b>	1999-2008 (the project began in 1999, the building process started in 2003 and the project ended in 2008).
<b>Justification for best practise</b>	In 2001, the project won the Peggy Guggenheim award for innovative enterprise and culture projects, and participates in 2008 to the Innovation and Urban Quality Award EuroP.A. (Salone della autonomia Locali). The project is being exported to Osaka, Japan.
<b>Sources</b>	Policy sheet 9; <a href="http://www.coriandoline.it/">http://www.coriandoline.it/</a> , <a href="http://www.andria.it/">http://www.andria.it/</a> , <a href="http://www.lacittadeicittadini.org/uploads/File/Libro%20p1_15_02.pdf">http://www.lacittadeicittadini.org/uploads/File/Libro%20p1_15_02.pdf</a>

<b>United Kingdom</b>	
<b>The Beth Johnson Centre for Intergenerational Practice</b>	
<b>Kind of Policy</b>	The Beth Johnson Centre for Intergenerational Practice (CFIP) is a registered charity that operates throughout the UK which supports the development and promotion of intergenerational practice as a catalyst for social change. The Centre is part of the Beth Johnson Foundation.
<b>Object and Content of the policy</b>	The Beth Johnson Centre for Intergenerational practice aims to bring people together in purposeful, mutually beneficial activities which promote greater understanding and respect between generations and contributes to building more cohesive communities. Intergenerational practice is inclusive, building on the positive resources that the young and old have to offer each other and those around them. Improving the understanding and relationships between people of different generations and cultures. Developing evidence base on research and understanding of intergenerational practice at national, regional and local levels are the ethos of the centre. However, the centre provides a host of other services and activities includes consultancy, information and advice, websites, e-bulletins, newsletters, training, publications and research.
<b>Target population</b>	-For intergenerational projects hosted by the CFIP: Younger (under 25) and older (50+) people: the two groups most affected by ageist attitudes and when we talk about abuse, poverty, lack of political voice and marginalisation these two groups are the most affected. They are doubly disadvantaged if they are also members of other socially excluded groups. -For the CFIP in more general terms: Organisations and individuals with a commitment to intergenerational practice. It especially seeks to connect those who share a common interest but who may not often come into contact - linking people from youth work and older people's organisations, for example, or connecting those in academia and the voluntary sector. Also, developing relationships with policy-makers and influencing them to create an environment where best practice can flourish is an essential element of the Centre's work within Beth Johnson Foundation.
<b>Financing</b>	The initial funding came from the Community Fund and Lloyds TSB Foundation for England and Wales. However, starting in April 2007, the centre received funding support from the Big Lottery Reaching Communities Fund for the next three years. In 2007, the Intergenerational Fund had £124,887.00 (= 156,697 EUR).
<b>Role of the State</b>	(unclear)
<b>Place</b>	A nationwide network of members. Currently the CFIP is in the four regions of the UK.
<b>Time</b>	April 2001: the Beth Johnson Foundation established the Centre for Intergenerational Practice (CFIP).
<b>Justification for best practise</b>	Increasing networking across national boarder: In October 2007, the CFIP was invited to present at an intergenerational forum on elder education by the National Chung Cheng University in Taipei, Taiwan. Furthermore, the Beth Johnson Foundation is one of the national partners for EAGLE (i.e. a two year programme funded by Socrates exploring European models on inter and trans generational learning). Generation United is the United States national membership organisation focused on improving lives through intergenerational strategies, programmes and policies. The Foundation is also linked with Spanish Intergenerational Network (SIN) have resulted in one of our publications being translated into Spanish, "How do you know IP works?"
<b>Sources</b>	Policy Sheet 10; <a href="http://www.centreforip.org.uk">http://www.centreforip.org.uk</a> ; Publications, documentations, internet websites and newsletters.

<b>UK</b>	
<b>Active Ageing Programme</b>	
<b>Kind of Policy</b>	National-regional public programme
<b>Aim and Content of the policy</b>	<p><b>Aim:</b> The programme encourages old and young people to engage in discussions related to health, healthy foods and services, and helps to identify older people with skills who wish to pass them on to young people. The programmes' objectives also includes improving the health and quality of life of older people by promoting health, physical activity levels, independence and reducing social isolation.</p> <p><b>Content:</b> A referral service from anywhere (i.e. Relevant Health Professionals, Social Services, Housing, Pension Service etc.) to help the older person gain increase awareness of their health and other services available to them including the older people and young people engaging in discussions related to health, healthy food and services.</p>
<b>Target population</b>	The target audience of the programme are both the older people and the sixth form students. The programme encourages both generations to be more aware of the issues that both older and younger people faces, and in turn creates a better understanding between the generations.
<b>Financing</b>	At the local level, through different public institutions.
<b>Role of the State</b>	Initiating and implementing.
<b>Place</b>	South Liverpool, identified as one of the most deprived areas in the country, with very high rates of teenage pregnancy, crime and anti-social behaviour problems and unemployment. The older people in the area had little or no access to health services and reported trepidation of anti-social behaviour youth activities.
<b>Time</b>	2004 on-going
<b>Justification for best practise</b>	<p>The programme resulted in a request from Mount Primary School in 2005 to establish the Learning Mentor Project. The Learning Mentor Project was funded from 'Excellence in Cities'(i.e. part of a National Government initiative). The project's success was recognised at the highest level and was awarded The Golden Jubilee Award for Voluntary Services from the Queen in 2007. The programme has since received accreditation status as an 'Approved Provider of Intergenerational Projects and Programmes' in June 2008. The Approved Provider Standard (APS) has been designed and developed by the Beth Johnson Foundation Centre for Intergenerational Practice (CIP) and is a UK benchmark for organisations providing intergenerational projects or programmes. It has been designed to be used by organisations of any size and to take account of the rich diversity of intergenerational programmes (IP). Due to the success of the 'Active Ageing Programme' the South Liverpool Primary Care Trust has funded another two programmes across Liverpool. Once establish they will be developed into Intergenerational programmes.</p> <p>Because of the success of the programme the British Broadcasting Corporation (BBC) did a documentary on older people on poverty featuring the programme.</p>
<b>Sources</b>	<p>Policy sheet 1; Stories in nursing journals and local newspapers, BBC and flyers. <a href="http://www.centralliverpoolpct.nhs.uk/Provider/Services/Ageing.asp">http://www.centralliverpoolpct.nhs.uk/Provider/Services/Ageing.asp</a></p>

<b>UK</b>	
<b>Age Concern Kingston's Age and Youth – School Based Project</b>	
<b>Kind of Policy</b>	Local public-private programme
<b>Aim and Content of the policy</b>	<p><b>Aim:</b> To enable older people to volunteer their skills, talents, and share their knowledge and experiences with children from local schools. The children benefit from the expertise and positive role models provided by the older people.</p> <p><b>Content</b> A Learning Mentor Project including Age &amp; Youth Craft Partnerships, Intergenerational Discussions Forums, The Intergenerational Art Project and the Healthy Eating Workshops.</p>
<b>Target population</b>	Older people and sixth-formers from four schools in the Borough.
<b>Financing</b>	Unrestricted Fund of the local authority - 488,577; but also private funding. No co-financing through the national umbrella of Age Concern.
<b>Role of the State</b>	Co-financing at the local level. The project is governed under the umbrellas of Age Concern at the national level and the participating partners guidelines.
<b>Place</b>	Local: Kingston Upon-Thames.
<b>Time</b>	2001 on-going
<b>Justification for best practise</b>	<p>Both generations acknowledge that their link with the project has made them feel 'more a part of the community than before'.</p> <p>The initiative for the intergenerational project started in June 2001 and the Pilot project was set up in May 2005. Phase II of the project started in December 2005. However, because of its success the project is on-going.</p>

<b>Sources</b>	Policy sheet 2; Initial meetings with Head Teachers at the schools, advertisements via flyers to other organisations, libraries, church notice boards, local newspaper articles and preparation of informational packets for perspective volunteers including personal meetings. <a href="http://www.ageconcernkingston.org/Intergenerational.htm">http://www.ageconcernkingston.org/Intergenerational.htm</a> or <a href="http://www.ageconcernkingston.org/documents/IntergenRpt2005.pdf">http://www.ageconcernkingston.org/documents/IntergenRpt2005.pdf</a>
----------------	--

<b>UK</b>	
<b>Sitxty Plus Intergenerational Project</b>	
<b>Kind of Policy</b>	Local private-public project
<b>Aim and Content of the policy</b>	<p><b>Aim:</b> To break down barriers and prejudice between the generations by building partnerships of mutual benefit and promoting both groups' self-confidence and contributions to the community.</p> <p><b>Content:</b> Activities fall under two categories: the core scheme and arts-based, short or one-off projects. The core scheme provides weekly individual support to older people, mainly in their homes. This includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Reading Project – young volunteers are trained as readers and matched with visually impaired older people. Tasks include reading for pleasure, sorting mail and everyday administrative help.</li> <li>• Computer Project – young volunteers coach older people in using ICT, including accessing the internet and using digital cameras or DVDs.</li> <li>• English Language Support – English speaking young volunteers are matched with older people to provide extra support to improve their everyday spoken English. Sixty Plus is an example of an older people's organisation that uses Millennium Volunteers (MV) working on intergenerational projects. MV is one of the two government schemes that were launched as part of the UK government's 'Active Communities Strategy', to promote volunteering in 1999.</li> </ul>
<b>Target population</b>	Older people 50 and over but most of the Sixty Plus members are aged 70 to 80. Approximately two-thirds are female and around half are non-British, with some language project participants unable to read and write in their mother tongue. Most are on means tested benefits. The young volunteers are aged between 16 and 24 years, with most aged 16 to 18 and in full-time education.
<b>Financing</b>	Sixty Plus is an independent charity (NGO) that received support through its collaboration with different agencies (i.e. Task Force Trust, the Community Safety Team, Crime Prevention Panel, the schools and the RBKC. Received an annual grant of 25,597.0 EUR from Task Force Trust. Tapered over the last 5 years and a final grant of 6,399.25 EUR will be made for 2003-2008. The local authority contributes 7,679.10 EUR; however the direct cost for the scheme is 51,194.0 EUR. The Royal Borough of Kensington & Chelsea - 192,825 EUR. The remainder of operating budget comes mostly from other community organisations, donations and one off funding.
<b>Role of the State</b>	Co-financing and Implementing: The involvement of the different representatives from the local authority (i.e. Community Safety Team, Crime Prevention Panel and Police Community Support Officers )support the work as a way of contributing towards community cohesion in enhancing the policy.
<b>Place</b>	Local: London
<b>Time</b>	1996 on-going
<b>Justification for best practise</b>	<p>The programme plans to expand the arts work and create further partnerships with other youth services. It is a member of Age Concern's Intergenerational Network, as well as the Centre for Intergenerational Practice's networks, and its work has featured in these organisations' publications. The Project fulfils the 'The Approved Provider Standard (APS) from the Beth Johnson Centre for Intergenerational Practice (CFIP).</p> <p>During the past 18 months, presentations have been made to the National Council on Ageing, the Mentoring and Befriending National Conference and a joint All Parliamentary group on older people and children.</p> <p>Several awards: -2005 Philip Lawrence Award for community contribution -2006 Lady Goodman Award for Excellence in Volunteer Management</p>
<b>Sources</b>	Policy Sheet 7; <a href="http://www.nya.org.uk/information/111738/sixtyplusintergenerationalproject/">http://www.nya.org.uk/information/111738/sixtyplusintergenerationalproject/</a>

There are different numbers of best practise policies found in the investigated countries: In Denmark and Italy: 1; in France and in the UK: 3; in Germany: 4. This finding, however, might have more to do with the "best practice culture" found in a country than with the real existence of such policies. In the UK, for instance, there is a culture of award that pushes best practice generation policies. In Germany, it is the acceptance in a national public programme that stands for a certain recognition (and funding!) given to an intergenerational

project. And in France, generation policies are presented and promoted mainly through public conferences (for instance the Family Conference in 2006). Another thing is that not necessarily best practice policies have to be to most interesting projects documented in a country. The data collection shows that new interventions take place also at the local or regional level and then are promoted through larger programmes at higher state levels.

#### *5.1.3. The understanding of social policy expressed by the investigated intergenerational policies and projects*

In most countries, both the classical understanding of social policy which reacts on new social risks and the communitaristic justification of promoting communities and values are expressed by generation policies according to the statements of the country experts. On the one hand, changing family patterns, demographic change, societal ageing and its new forms of risks like social exclusion and isolation are mentioned in order to justify intergenerational policies or projects. On the other hand, also values like new forms of solidarity and community development are mentioned. There are only small differences between the investigated countries regarding how the generation policies are legitimated and often it is a mix of the two understandings of social policy mentioned above.

In **France**, the starting point and focus of the intergenerational projects seem to be in the first place on the family and the ageing society. This also applies for **Germany**, even though there is a stronger stress and link to promote volunteering through the allocation of new resources and forms of solidarities also outside of the classical family. There are two opposite public main discourses referring to intergenerational relationships in Germany: A) a populist discourse on the war between the generations which highlights intergenerational conflicts – also referring to economic transfers; B) a governmental discourse which highlights new forms of solidarities, resources and potentials for intergenerational exchange and relationships. All in all, in Germany, generation policies can be seen as a positive and constructive answer to the challenges of social change (societal ageing and new family patterns).

In **Italy**, the growing social exclusion of the older people seems to be in the centre of attention. However, it is stated by the country experts that Italy has not a real social policy at the national level. The Government does not play a role and delegates every action to the local level, in which municipalities and non profit associations play the main role in intergenerational projects. The absence of a national intergenerational policy is a consequence of this approach.

In the **UK**, intergenerational policies are integrated into community development which is seen as an answer to deal with demographical change and changing family patterns. And in **Denmark**, in addition to the promotion of social cohesion, welfare state crisis, moving away from welfare state dependency, de-professionalisation and giving the user more say (i.e. counselling) are mentioned as understanding of social policies expressed by the studied intergenerational policies.

#### *5.1.4. Existence or non-existence of an overall, explicit generation policy?*

In order to ask this question, valuable indicators have to be defined. Reading through the policy sheets, we have come up with the following indicators (see *table 4* below): First, we checked the data with reference to possible national *generation programmes* or national institutions for intergenerational practices. A policy was considered a programme, when it is initiated and co-financed by the national State, lasting for a longer time period, including a large number of large and similar project partners. Second, we looked for national *generation*

*policies* – where the national State plays generally a more modest role, with a limited number of project partners and for possibly a shorter time period.

In the following the question is tackled, whether an explicit, overall generation policy exists in the investigated countries or not. A strong indicator for such a policy is the existence of national programmes or a high number of policies at the national level. In case local (public-) private initiatives predominate, this is interpreted as a lower probability for an explicit, overall generation policy.

As it is shown in *table 4* below, according to these indicators, only in **Germany** and the **UK** an explicit, overall generation policy with national programmes and national policies can be identified. **France** and **Denmark** are cases in-between: Here, there are some national policies reported. However, these policies are often local initiatives in **Denmark**, which are co-funded by the resources from the national level. In **France**, generation programmes or policies are often part of a more general programme on ageing, family policy etc. and therefore not explicit. In **Italy** we find neither national programmes nor national policies, therefore it can be concluded that a general, overall explicit generation policy does not exist.

Nevertheless, examples of local projects and initiatives which promote the exchange between generations and which enhance the relationships between persons of different age groups are found in all five investigated countries. In all investigated countries, generation policies are often pushed and executed by private non-profit actors. Therefore, also in Germany and England, the engagement of civil society in this policy area is significant. Thus, the simple fact of the existence of generation programme at the national level does not necessarily mean that generation policy is not also to be seen a cross-sectional task which is shared between the State and private non-for profit actors and organisations.

*Table 4: Explicit, overall generational policy or a local, cross-sectional/private task?*

	Denmark	France	Germany	Italy	UK
<b>Indicators</b>					
<b>Number of national generation programmes or national institutions for intergenerational practices</b>	0	2, not explicit	2	0	1
<b>Number of national generation policies</b>	1 national; 2 national-local cooperation	1, not explicit	3	0	2
<b>Description of the policy trend: Is there an overall national programme or do generation policies mainly consist of local public-private initiatives?</b>	No overall national programme, but public co-financing is traditionally shared between national and local level and the involved private non-profit initiatives.	No overall national programme, but some national policies and strong promotion of the intergenerational aspect of family policy and its positive effect against social isolation of older people. Mostly local private non-profit initiatives which become more and more coordinated at higher state levels.	Two national programmes and within these programmes, mid-term and longer-term co-financing of regional and local, private non-profit projects.	Local, private non-profit projects with almost no co-financing of other state levels.	National plans for community development – intergenerational relationships are an important aspect of it. National centres (Centre for Intergenerational Practice). Local, private non profit projects are co-financed by different state levels.

Source: Policy sheets, Summary sheets.

Nevertheless, examples of local projects and initiatives which promote the exchange between generations and which enhance the relationships between persons of different age groups are found in all five investigated countries. In all investigated countries, generation policies are often pushed and executed by private non-profit actors. Therefore, also in Germany and England, the engagement of civil society in this policy area is significant. Thus, the simple fact of the existence of generation programme at the national level does not necessarily mean that generation policy is not also to be seen a cross-sectional task which is shared between the State and private non-for profit actors and organisations.

Both in **Germany** and in the **UK**, generation policies are promoted as an answer to ongoing social change and the re-allocation of social resources. In the **UK**, however, these policies seem to be more linked with community development (see the Beth Johnson Foundation) whereas in **Germany**, the discourse refers more to the demographical change and new forms of cooperation between professionals and volunteers (see the action programmes and the numerous volunteer organisations involved).

A very important role in the designing and implementation of intergenerational policies in the **UK** plays The Centre for intergenerational Practice (CFIP) established in April 2001 by the Beth Johnson Foundation (see also description of best practise). In 2003, for instance, John Griffiths, Deputy Minister for Health and Social Services, Welsh Assembly Government stated: 'The Welsh Assembly published a Strategy for Older People in Wales and one of the priorities in the Strategy is to develop and promote intergenerational practice across Wales'. As a consequence the Beth Johnson Foundation was commissioned to develop an Intergenerational Strategy for Wales. Also in **Wales** and **Scotland**, the governments have finally made funding available to establish national centres of intergenerational practice to partner the centre in England.

The CFIP is supported and guided by an Advisory Group which is composed of leading members from a cross-section of organisations involved in intergenerational work. It works to promote evaluation of intergenerational programmes and research into the impact of intergenerational approaches. Furthermore, it developed the 'Approved Provider Standards' (APS) which provides both a framework for the development of projects and an indicator to measure the quality of work that the young and old are engaged in together.

Although there is a strong framework to support practitioners and an increasing understanding by policy makers, the evidence based for the impact of intergenerational policy in England still needs to be significantly reinforced as stated by the country expert. For example, the government initiatives stressed their committed to 'Intergenerational Practices' (IP), but funding for said programmes over long periods for the activities reviewed was allocated only for short periods or in stages. Compared to other policies such as health care, poverty, childhood poverty/obesity IP seems to be less prioritised. Thus, even though there are structures in place to support practitioners and an increased level of interest by policy makers, intergenerational policies/programmes appear to be still somewhat a novelty.

In **Germany**, the action programme for generation houses initiated in 2006 by the new family minister Ursula von der Leyen (CDU, family minister since 2005) is a national initiative. The aims of the project are defined in the coalition contract between CDU, CSU and the SPD (11.11.2005). The generation houses has first been introduced at the regional level (Land) in Niedersachsen (when Ms von der Leyen was family minister of Niedersachsen) before it was introduced at the national level in 2006. The action programme is followed up by a new programme in the volunteer sector ("Freiwilligendienste aller Generationen" (2009-2011) which is also initiated and co-financed by the Federal Ministry for Families, Seniors, Women and Young People (for further information on the generation houses, see examples for best practice below).

Also in the other countries **France**, **Italy** and **Denmark**, where no explicit overall generation policy is found, there is growing awareness to be identified for the need of promoting intergenerational relationships.

In **France**, the debate about generation takes place in the policies regarding mostly family and older people. Therefore, generation policies are more seen as a cross-sectional task and less as a specialised policy area within public administration. However, since the last four years, the importance of linking generations together is becoming more and more important at the national level. The government has realised the importance of the generation. There are two public programmes (Reading and enable to read (“Lire et faire lire”) and Good ageing (“Bien vieillir”)) and one national policy (Chronos literature prize (“Le prix Chronos de littérature”), Reading and enable to read (“Lire et faire lire”)). However, in particular Good ageing (“Bien vieillir”) focuses on the integration of older people into society and prevention of old age, and less on the explicit exchange between generations. It had an overall yearly budget of 3 million EUR (2.5 Million EUR for the regional level and 500'000 for the national level) during 2005 and 2006. Since 2006 the national state is aiming to coordinate all these projects on the national level and to assure more financial support. 2007 the national government has made a call for programmes in favour of intergenerational exchange (for example cohabitation). Nevertheless, there is neither an explicit public programme nor a specialised institution for generation policies like in Germany or the UK. Thus, the mentioned national generation policies represent single policies which seem to be little coordinated by the Central State and, therefore, are more of implicit than of explicit nature.

In **Italy**, it is local municipalities that invested in this sector – which is proof that a new awareness is growing around this issue. However, the (national) State as a player in this kind of projects is absent. Therefore, there is no explicit policy in Italy.

Also in **Denmark**, there is no explicit generation policy, but a growing awareness of the many resources which are present in society. Central and local government often divide the roles. It is also seen as a cross-sectional task within public administration in the sense that benefits for both children and elderly are acknowledged and labour market, family policy, integration policies etc are often at same time considered.

#### *5.1.5. Explanations for the existence or non-existence of an overall, explicit generation policy*

It is interesting to see that country specialists had difficulties in giving reasons for the existence or non-existence of generation policies in a country. Nevertheless, country experts still could have a rough guess on possible reasons.

In **France**, a reason for the low institutionalisation of generation policies might be the stronger focus on family policies and more general on policies against social exclusion, less than on the exchange between age groups.

In **Germany**, for instance, generation policies are propagated to be a positive way to be dealing with demographical change, ageing societies and new resources for volunteering. There is a strong anti-discourse in contrast to this positive interpretation on how to deal with social change, referring to the “wars between the generations”.

In **Italy**, the country expert state that the low development of generation policies might have to do with the general weak establishment of social policies at the national state level. Thus, the national government does not play a role and delegates every action at the local level, in which municipalities and non profit associations play the main role, trying to give answers to

social problems and – also to generation challenges. The dominant absence of an overall generation policy is a consequence of this approach.

In **Denmark**, country expert note that relying on state provisions is a widely spread tradition and mixed forms of welfare production – as they are in use in all other investigated countries – are rare. Furthermore, social policies are strongly targeted towards individuals, based on individual social rights and less on general transfers towards families or other selected population groups (a strong individualisation of social policies).

In **UK**, the need for a generation policy is seen in general social trends. For example, older people used to form a smaller proportion of the population in the past and the need to tell them apart then as a separate age group was not noticeable. In 1950, just over one in ten people in the population was 65 year or older. Now, it is one in five. In another 20 plus years, over 36% of the population will be 50 years and over as the baby boom generations (those born in the 1950s to late 1960s) reach older ages. Life expectancy is expected to increase to 79.5 years for men and 82.6 years for women (ONS, 2001; Tomassini, 2005). Additionally, family structures have been broken down and children have an increased likelihood of being born into single parent families with an increased chance of experiencing poverty (Granville 2002).

#### *5.1.6. What is the novelty in comparison to other policy areas with similar topics?*

In **Denmark** and in **Italy**, it is too early for an assessment, as an overall, national generation policy does not exist.

In **France**, there is no separate generation policy. The subject of generations has been enforced in the family policy, youth policy and in the age policy. More importance has been giving to intergenerational exchange in the policy areas mentioned. The novelty is that in these policy areas more attention is given to intergeneration relationships. This enforces in general the inclusion of the elderly people in the society (who are becoming as the demographic development show an important age group), the support new family structures (mono-parental family), enforces new structures of living (intergeneration cohabitation) and animates communities to think about modern/new community organisation.

In **Germany**, the novelty of the national public generation programmes is that existing national, regional and local generation policies and initiatives become more coordinated and professionalized. Furthermore, new forms of cooperation between professionals and volunteers are exercised. The policies are promoted as a positive response to demographical change and to the ageing society, mobilising new resource of the healthy, older generation groups.

In the **UK**, our country expert states that even though there are structures in place to support practitioners and an increased level of interest by policy makers, intergenerational policies/programmes appear to be still somewhat a novelty. For example, the government initiatives stressed their committed to IP, but funding for said programmes over long periods for the activities reviewed was allocated only for short periods or in stages. Furthermore, intergenerational projects/programmes need to be recognised for their contribution to social cohesion, individual health (i.e. Active Ageing Programme) and be a part of the health promotion schemes. Thus, based on the evidence, there is still need for stronger commitment in sustaining intergenerational policy. Compared to other polices such as health care, poverty, childhood poverty/obesity IP seems to be less prioritised.

### 5.1.7. Perspectives for generation policies

In **France** the intergeneration debate has become more and more important on national level (see for instance article of the Neue Zürcher Zeitung, 18.02.2009, p. 11: Family holiday for palliative care (“Familienurlaub zur Sterbebegleitung”). The ministry for labour, family and solidarity has declared its assistance for intergenerational projects and wants to enhance this area. The state has realized that a lot of initiatives are already taken place at the local level. Their perspective is now coordinate these projects and also to assure an evaluation work to assure a learning output and enduring implementation. The last year’s investment of the state shows that the intergenerational debate is important and will be continuously supported. Thus, generation policies are seen as a chance, not as a risk, and as being part of family policy.

In **Germany**, generation policies have been established at the national level through mid-term public programmes. After the first big programme running from 2006-2008 has finished, a new national programme was built (2009-2012). However, there will be election during 2009 and it cannot be taken for granted that the Big Coalition will continue. The first national public generation programme is part of the current coalition contract between the CDU/CSU and SPD.

For the providers, new steering at the national level through the mentioned action programmes have become a challenging chance. Some of them had to reschedule their service offer to fulfil the given criteria for intergenerational project given by the Federal Ministry, in order to receive the attractive Federal funding. Last but not least the voluntary sector can also learn and experience new forms of cooperation with professionals. Thus, generation policies are seen as a chance with new opportunities for volunteering with and for all generations. As there is an intensive debate about the challenges of the ageing society, the German government’s intention is to show constructive ways to deal with social and demographic change.

In the **UK**, generation policies are seen both as a chance, however with it risks. On one hand, generation policies are seen as a possibility for both intergenerational learning within families but also for community development (see the Governments’ “Modernisation Agenda’ with its priorities on active communities, citizenship and social exclusion’. On the other hand, no long-run state funding for intergenerational initiatives has been evaluated as a risk a thread for local generation policies and initiatives.

In **Denmark** and in **Italy**, our country specialists are less optimistic with reference to the future development of generation policies in their countries. For **Italy**, our experts state that in a short term consideration, a real perspective for this policy area, especially at statal level, is not visible. “The State seems to be a spectator, more then a protagonist of this kind of policy.” Intergenerational policies – consisting of local and private non-profit initiatives – might even prevent the State to be more active in this field or in the field of social policies in more general terms.

In **Denmark** it is mentioned that there is some reservation among citizens in participating in intergenerational projects (i.e. Grandma in Kindergarten). Furthermore, it is stated, that it is most often resourceful older people who participate. It is seen as a risk as new generation policies could be misused as alternatives or even substitutes of welfare services.

Table 5: Summing up generation policies in the five investigated countries

	<b>Denmark</b>	<b>France</b>	<b>Germany</b>	<b>Italy</b>	<b>UK</b>
<b>Existence</b>	Implicit generation policy	Implicit generation policy	Explicit generation policy	No existence	Explicit generation policy
<b>Explanations</b>	The State’s	Part of other policy	Following the	Generally weak	Following the

	predominary position in welfare provision	sectors like "good ageing", "family policies"...	conservative-coorporatist welfare tradition	welfare provision; other preferences (pension and health policies).	charity tradition of the liberal welfare tradition
<b>Novelty</b>	Substitution of existing public provision of social services?	Generation policies as a cross-sectional task of public administration?	New forms of volunteering.	No novelty	New forms of community development.
<b>Perspective</b>	No perspective	Seems to be becoming a perspective, which is, however, not fully developed yet.	Establishing new networks and forms of corporation between volunteers and professionals. Enhancing positive aspect of the demographical change and allocating new social resources.	No perspective	Sustainable financing is still to be found for longer-term projects. National frame of generation policies is still weak due to limited co-funding.

Source: Policy sheets and Summary sheets.

## 5.2. The institutionalisation of generation policies

In general terms, it can be stated that most generation policies found represent a rather complex organisational structure with various actors involved at different state levels from different societal sectors such as public administration and organisations, private non-profit institutions and organisations, and families. One example for such a complex structure is the public Foundation for Gerontology in France which is sponsored by several ministries<sup>2</sup> at the national level und which cooperates with different partners, these are: local and regional institutions at the city, department and regional level for the policy "Chronos literature price" (see best practices policies). It is partly due to its success, as it has been stated a "positive approach that has systematically resulted in immediate support of six Ministries as well as of the UN and UNESCO" as stated by the country expert. However, also in other French, local generation projects like the association "Le Parisolidaire", a "simple" project of cohabitation of students and older people, the list of cooperation partners is not short.<sup>3</sup> However, as stated before, it is the objective of many generation policies, in particular in Germany and in the UK – and also in France – to bring together existing providers of the public and the private sector and to enhance public-private corporations.

Having a short look on the organisation of such policies in the five investigated countries, one can observe both similarities and dissimilarities.

In **Denmark**, generation policies consist of public-private projects or initiatives, mostly organised at the local level but co-financed both by the national and the local level. However, the Central State's role is limited to law-making and co-financing. The municipalities are responsible for the implementation and also co-financing of the policies. Many of the described generation policies are of younger date and one gains the general impression that intergenerational relationships are mainly enhanced through small projects. The Central

<sup>2</sup> The Ministry of Culture and Communications; the Ministry of National Education, Research and Teaching; the Ministry of Employment and Social Solidarity; the Ministry for Children and the Family; the Ministry for Youth and Sports; the Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

<sup>3</sup> Public partners of the association "Le Parisolidaire" are: Région ile de France (regional level), le Conseil Général (regional level – départements), office public d'aménagement et de construction de Paris (OPAC) (local level), Ministère du travail, des relations sociales, de la famille et de solidarité (national level). Private partners at the local and national level are: Credit Coopératif, Société de gérance d'immeubles municipaux (SGIM), Fondation de France, Toit et joie, Droit de cité habitat.

State does not act as a special promoter of generation policies like for instance in Germany. Thus, generation policies are not represented in public administration at the national level. There is also no alternative national private organisation promoting generation policies explicitly like in the UK.

In **France**, there are two large public programmes in order to enhance intergenerational relationships mentioned in the policy sheets: Reading and enable to read (“Lire et faire lire”) and Good ageing (“Bien vieillir”). Projects at the national level are often of longer timelines. Thus, some of the older generation projects are run by well established charities or associations. In particular the associations have a long tradition and a special status in France according to the “loi d’ associations 1901”. Solidary Paris “Parisolidaire”, a cohabitation project between students and old people in Paris, is an example for an intergenerational project organised through a private non-profit “associations de loi”. These are rather independent private non-profit organisations, which are however dependent on the support of their members and bound to charity (the obligation to not enrich its members) to be of public utility. Donators can ask for declaration of their part of contribution. Another important actor for intergenerational policies is the national public “Foundation for Gerontology”. At the national level, generation policies are represented in the secretary of State for Older People of the Ministry for Labour, Labour Relations, the Family and Solidarity. Nevertheless, the organisational structure of generation policies is complex in France, as policies are not only organised across levels and societal sectors as mentioned above. Moreover, different national authorities at the single state level might be involved and the complexity of French administration seems to be reflected in the organisational structure of certain generation projects.

In **Germany** there are three national programmes run by the Federal Ministry for Family, Seniors, Women and Young People (BMFSFJ) which include private non-profit project partners at the national, regional and local state level. At the regional level, three ministries promote an explicit generation policy. Most projects are public-private contract based mid-term cooperation including more or less stable public funding (between 4 and 5 years within the national programmes). Some national programmes are co-financed by the European Social Funds. However, first national funding was assured and then, the programme could be extended thanks to the financing through the EU Social Fund. Since 2006, intergenerational policies are initiated, promoted, coordinated and financed through those public programmes at the national level. A clear focus on volunteering is to be noticed which itself has become a more organised and “professionalized” sector and which also seems to represent a more standardised sector than for instance in Italy. The most important partners involved are private non-profit organisation of different activity areas like reading, filming, living together, sports, supporting etc.

In **Italy**, only local, mostly short term private projects and initiatives exist with little public funding. The only national planned policy mentioned in the policy sheets, a governmental law project in 2008 including trade unions, firms and single workers has never been implemented. Local governments and private non-profit organisations like associations and “cooperativi” are involved in the implementation of the very punctual generation policies. However, these kinds of cooperation seem to be little regulated (different kind and forms of agreements can appear in the same policy with the different partners) and not coordinated at any (sub-local) state level. The only important actor mentioned at the national level is the National Civil Service which is involved in several local projects with civil servants acting as volunteers.

In the **UK** a mix of national and local approach is to be found. Community development programmes and voluntary programmes are initiated and promoted nationally through planning and lawmaking, for instance through the Modernisation Agenda in 2002. At the national level, there exists a scientific centre for intergenerational practice and research, the Centre for Intergenerational Practice (CFIP) of the Beth Johnson Foundation which is financed through the Community Fund and the Big Lottery (£124,887.00 = 156,697 EUR in 2007). However, when it comes to financing of generation policies, the local level is very important despite of some co-financing at the national level. The policies generally are not of a short term timeline; however, long-term financing is not assured. Therefore continuity of local projects and initiatives is often a problem.

Generation policies are not institutionalised in a specific authority at the national level, but appear within different units of public administration as a specific area at different state levels. Furthermore, the mentioned Centre CFIP coordinates intergenerational policies at the national level and developed quality standards (APS) which are acknowledged as general guidelines for intergenerational policies with public funding.

A more detailed view on the most important findings regarding the institutionalisation of generation policies is given in *table 8* in the Appendix. In the following, we will elaborate more on the single indicators mentioned in chapter 4.4 of this report in order to describe similarities and dissimilarities and assess *the degree of institutionalisation of generation policies* in the investigated countries. The mentioned indicators for the degree of institutionalisation of generation policies are:

- Role of the State in organising generation policies
- Most important state level for generation policy
- Representation of generation policies in the public administration
- The kind of actors involved in the designing and implementation of generation policies (public/non-public)
- Regulation of the cooperation/cooperation between the different actors
- The role of the EU

### *5.2.1 The role of the state in organising generation policies*

The question to be answered here is whether the state plays a role organising intergenerational policies or not or, in other words, is the national level involved in organising such kind of policies or not. Three main roles can be distinguished: 1. the State as an “initiator/promoter” of generation policies, 2. the State as a “(co-)financer” of generation policies and 3. the State as an implementer of generation policies.

With reference of these roles, there are considerable differences to be identified between the investigated countries.

In **Italy**, for instance, the State does not play a role in organising generation policies. The only project found at the national level (“Solidarity between generations”), has not been settled because of the change of the Government in 2008.

In all other countries, the central Governments play some kind of role in initiating and financing intergenerational policies. However, contexts in which those policies are implemented vary significantly and therefore, the function of generation policies in the country-specific welfare-systems also looks very different.

In **France**, the Central State has been enhancing intergenerational project since 2006. The main promoter was the Family Conference in 2006 which approved different proposition to

enhance intergenerational projects. There are no specific plans for a generation policy. But there are suggestions to establish a national "charte de l'intergénération" inspired by the charters of Quebec in Canada. An example of such a charter is available for the city of Colombes ([http://www.colombes.fr/fileadmin/Documents/Mag\\_senior/charte.pdf](http://www.colombes.fr/fileadmin/Documents/Mag_senior/charte.pdf); see also description of best practise policies).

In the report of the Family Conference in 2006, seven conclusions are defined:

- 1: Create an intergenerational portal and develop numerous national calls for programme
- 2: Create a local network of information centres and different develop socials actions
- 3: Value the intergenerational relations
- 4: Develop research work about the transfer between generations
- 5: Implement an intergenerational charter
- 6: Encourage the volunteer work and support the different private associations
- 7: Encourage the intergenerational habitation und urbanisation
- 8: Develop a social civic service open to all the youngster"

(Source: Bas, Philippe: La société intergénérationnelle au service de la famille. Conférence de la famille 2006. Rapport de propositions).

There are two national public programmes and one national policy in France (see also *table 2* on page 10-11). However, civil society plays an important role through associations. A lot intergenerational projects are initiated and implemented by non-profit associations. However, despite this strong focus on civil society, family generally plays an important role in the national politics in France. Thus, the State in this field acts as an implementer, but only partly as an initiator an co-financer of (explicit) generation policies.

In **Germany**, the Federal Ministry BMFSFJ (Bundesministerium für Familie, Senioren, Frauen und Jugend) has initiated two national programmes in order to enhance intergenerational exchange and relationships. It is also generously funding these programmes. The programmes are based on national concepts<sup>4</sup> and are evaluated regularly by a scientific team<sup>5</sup>. Coordination of intergenerational policies takes place through information exchange by an internet platform<sup>6</sup>, enhancing networking among different regional and local providers and between professionals and volunteers. The implementation is usually done through public-private cooperation with national, regional and local partner organisations. The controlling is executed through scientific evaluations and reporting of the national programmes such as a system of self-monitoring of the providing institutions. Furthermore, there are two more national projects that are promoted and co-financed by the Federal State in one case and by the regional Ministry for Generation policy in Nordrhein-Westfalen in the other case. All in all, the State and also some regions execute all three suggested roles as a implementor, initiator and a co-financer of generation policies.

In the **UK** intergenerational policies are now becoming recognised and intergenerational programmes are more accepted as part communities. For examples, in the 'Modernisation Agenda' the Government identified several priorities including 'active communities, citizenship and social exclusion'. These priorities seem to help in supporting the individual and groups in communities both at the national and local levels. However, more importantly, they seem to link the role of intergenerational learning within the family and its potential benefit to civil society with the generations working together. There is no overall concept or

---

<sup>4</sup> The concept for the activation programme on generation houses at the national level:

[http://www.bmfsfj.de/bmfsfj/generator/RedaktionBMFSFJ/Abteilung5/Pdf-Anlagen/konzept\\_\\_mgh,property=pdf,bereich=,sprache=de,rwb=true.pdf](http://www.bmfsfj.de/bmfsfj/generator/RedaktionBMFSFJ/Abteilung5/Pdf-Anlagen/konzept__mgh,property=pdf,bereich=,sprache=de,rwb=true.pdf)

<sup>5</sup> Evaluation on generation houses (2008):

[http://www.bmfsfj.de/bmfsfj/generator/RedaktionBMFSFJ/Broschuerenstelle/Pdf-Anlagen/Starke-Leistung-f\\_C3\\_BCr-jedes-Alter,property=pdf,bereich=,sprache=de,rwb=true.pdf](http://www.bmfsfj.de/bmfsfj/generator/RedaktionBMFSFJ/Broschuerenstelle/Pdf-Anlagen/Starke-Leistung-f_C3_BCr-jedes-Alter,property=pdf,bereich=,sprache=de,rwb=true.pdf)

<sup>6</sup> The German internet platform on generation policies: <http://www.generationendialog.de>

national plan for generation policies. However, in March 2008, an Intergenerational Practice Ministerial Round Table was held in the House of Commons. There is regular reporting on ongoing intergenerational projects by the Beth Johnson "Centre for Intergenerational Practice (CFIP)". There are two more generation policies mentioned in the sheets. However, usually, mixed financing including public financing on different state levels is at stake. Therefore, the State's role in the UK is that of an initiator and promoter, but less the role of a co-financer and an implementer.

In **Denmark** the central state acts as an initiator for intergenerational projects through lawmaking, which are then financed by local authority, and implemented by local authority or NGO. Thus, one such lawmaking project is mentioned in the policy sheet. Two more generation policies are described as being national-local forms of cooperation. However, there is no national plan or concept for generation policies. The coordination of these local policies takes place at the local level, by local authority or NGO. Controlling might take place through regulation but most often today through project evaluation. Most projects are private non-profit initiatives. Thus, the Danish State is partly an implementer and co-financer, but not so much an initiator or promoter of generation policies.

To sum up, generation policies as overall national programmes and a strong involvement of the State has only been found in **Germany**. In the **UK**, the national Government has delegated this task to specialised centres for intergenerational practice (CFIPs) which is part of the registered charity of the Beth Johnson foundation. Thus, the government has recognised the potential of intergenerational projects. However, financing of the concrete projects often depends on local government. A similar situation is found in **France** where the Central States also promoting such policies through national conferences and calls for projects. However, the existing initiatives are punctually and partly co-financed by the Central State and most often depend further financial funding. Also in **Denmark**, the local generation policies are partly co-financed by the State and the municipalities, dependent on the project. However, in Denmark, the State does not act as an active promoter of generation policies like in Germany, the UK and in France through a national programme or funding a foundation or association which is responsible for the implementation of generation policies. And in **Italy**, finally, promotion of such kind of policies has not been put into practise so far.

#### *5.2.2. Most important state level for organising generation policies*

A national programme run by a Central or Federal state instead of regional or local programmes is as such a sign for a certain recognition and appreciation of the topic as being of importance and national interest. However, the majority of generation policies consist of local projects based on local initiatives promoted by private non-profit organisations. This "basic" form of generation policy seems to be most spread in **Italy**, where most intergenerational projects are financed through resources of private non-profit organisations and by local governments (municipalities). Punctually and depending on the project, there is only rarely co-financing by provinces or regions. The national level is not at all involved in the planning, organising and implementation of generation policies, except for people doing their civil service whose salary is paid by the State.

Also in **France**, local private associations with a long tradition (founded on the law "association loi de 1901 en France") are the most important promoters of generation policies. With the approval of the local or national authorities, they initiate and coordinate different projects. They depend on the contributions of their members who sign an affiliation. In the last few years (since 2006) the national Government has organised calls for projects regarding the intergenerational exchange (cohabitation between old and young, other projects favouring the intergenerational exchange) and assuring a financial support.

However, the projects usually receive the main financial support from the local government. There are further actors, for instance the public (!) "Fondation nationale de Gérontologie" (FNG), which implement generation policies at the national level.

In **Denmark**, the **UK** and in **Germany**, financing of generation policy is also mainly based on private resources (donations, memberships of private non-profit organisation and "free labour" by volunteers). However, there seems to be a stronger contribution of other state levels for the financing of generation policies.

In **Denmark**, the local initiatives are sometimes co-financed by the central state which has in recent years in particular supported the use of family resources across the generations in the support for vulnerable families. Also the reform of the educational law in 1994 supported the use of the resources from local society, and in i.e. the 'Best friend for vulnerable children' the resources of older people are especially focuses. Local authority take part in implementation of general laws but also in establishing or coordinating local projects like the 'Grandma' in the kindergarten' project.

In the **UK** the local, mostly private non-profit intergenerational initiatives and projects are often co-financed by different state levels, depending on the project. However, in comparison to Denmark, generation policies that enhance intergenerational relationships are more strongly promoted explicitly in the UK. Co-financing with different state level involved is very common for the funding of intergenerational projects, even though it is generally no long-term financing which causes a serious problem to the providers of such policies.

And in **Germany**, local and private non-profit initiatives and projects also still predominate. However, since 2006, intergenerational relationship and exchange is promoted as a topic at the Federal level in different Federal programmes. Private non-profit institutions can participate in the programme and apply for national funding. So this is more than a punctual co-financing how it was observed in the other countries where the sustainability and mid-term planning seems to be more difficult due to missing binding financial commitment by the Government.

To sum up the importance of specific state levels, most generation policies are located at the local level. These local initiatives and projects might be more or less supported by the State funding. However this funding is always related to the individual project and generally limited for a defined timeline. In **Denmark**, **France**, **Germany** and the **UK** the financing and organisation of generation policies is partly seen as a shared task among different state levels. However, only at the Federal level in **Germany**, generation policies seem to be promoted and implemented in a coordinated way within national programmes.

### *5.2.3. The representation of generation policies in public administration*

This indicator deals with the representation of generation policies in public administration. Generally speaking, two forms can be distinguished: First a specialised unit that main tasks is dealing with generation policies. Second generation policies as a topic in different units of public administration and therefore as a cross-sectional task. The first is associated with a stronger institutionalisation of generation policy, the second with a weaker institutionalisation of generation policy.

In **Denmark** and **Italy**, generation seems not to be represented as a specialised area within public administration, whereas in **Germany**, **France** and the **UK** different authorities of the public administration are in charge to implement generation policies. In **France**, for instance, public administration implements different projects and programmes which aim to prevent the isolation of older people and which therefore enhance the cohabitation of old and young people. However, there are no specialised units which are responsible for generation policies

at the national or regional level. In the **UK**, different parts of the public sectors are involved in generation programmes and policies. For example, the Active Community Unit (ACU), the Older Volunteers are specialities areas. The Local Authority Older People's Project and area based-initiatives such as New Deal for Communities are examples of local authorities strategic programmes/projects that are helping to facilitate better understanding between younger and older persons. So in both countries, no specialised unit is in charge for generation policies. Only in **Germany**, generation as a specific and explicit policy area is represented in public administration at regional level, in the Ministry for Generation, Families, Women and Integration of the regional administration Nordrhein-Westfalen. At the federal level and in some public administration at regional levels, intergenerational projects are mentioned, but do not appear explicitly as a label of a specialised area in public administration.

As stated above, the weak representation of specialised units for generation policies as a sign that generation policies are seen as one aspect of social policy which represents a new approach, but not a new policy field which asks for specialised units within public administration of the investigated countries. Therefore, generational policies are more to be seen as cross-sectional tasks than as specialised units within public administration.

#### *5.2.4. The kind of actors involved in the designing and implementation of generation policies (public/non-public)*

In most investigated countries, the main actors involved in organising and implementing the policies are at the local level, most of them private non-profit organisations which are financed through more or less public funding, private donations and which work with volunteers. The State and the public administration are partly and punctually involved in Denmark, France and in the UK. Only in Germany, there is a more constant and regulated involvement of the Federal level in organising such policies through national intergenerational programmes.

In **France**, **Germany** and the **UK**, there are important private non-profit actors involved at the national level that promote and finance generation policies.

In France, "associations" and "chartes" are important when it comes to the organisation and implementation of generation policies. The associations are defined by a national act from 1901 and have therefore a long tradition in France, whereas the charters ("chartes") seem to be of a newer date (i.e. "Charte Intégenerationelle de Colombe" 1992).

An example for an association is the generation policy Solidary Paris ("Le Parisolidaire") which is run by an association based on the Association de loi 1901. In France, conventional associations are regulated by the Waldeck-Rousseau law of July 1, 1901 and are thus called Association loi 1901. According to this law, it is a quite independent organisation. The main obligation is that the association does not enrich directly or indirectly its members. The association has to have a non-profit objective. They are subject of the private law which leaves an organisational freedom. The contract obligates the members to the association and is subject of the French civil law system. As soon as the activities of the association are recognized as a public utility, donators can ask to for declaration of their part of contribution. The members adhering to the association Parisolidaire have to respect the charter of cohabitation. By signing the charter they agree on contractual basis to respect it. Most of these associations, however, mainly depend on the contribution fees of its members (i.e. also the association "Le Parisolidaire").

In **France**, there is furthermore a public foundation, the "Fondation nationale de Gérontologie". The Foundation was created in 1967 by the public authorities and the main basic or supplementary social security systems in France National research centres working

in the field of health contributed to its creation. The FNG was recognized to be of public interest on 21 September 1967. In **Germany**, the partners in the national public programmes are generally private non-profit organisations, some of them organised at the national level. In the **UK**, the Beth Johnson Foundation which created the Centre for Intergenerational Practice (CIFP) in 2001 is a private non-profit organisation. In contrast of France, generation policies represent more clearly a topic on their own which is promoted as such in the UK, whereas in France, generation policies seem more to be a sub-topic of general family policy and policy against social isolation of older people. Also national umbrella private non-profit organisations of smaller local private non-profit organisations exist. However, such a membership in a national umbrella does not necessarily include further funding (see for example the generation policy "Age Concern Kingston's Age and Youth – School Based Project (ACKuT)).

#### *5.2.5. Regulation of the cooperation/cooperation between the different actors involved in organising generation policies*

National regulation of public-private cooperation hardly exist for generation policies. An exception are the mentioned national programmes in Germany which are regulated within the Coalition Contract. Where the national State does not coordinate the existing intergenerational policies, local governments and local public administration might have to jump in. Or "coordination" might just be left to the private non-profit organiser and/or not be executed at all through formal agreements with partner organisation or the local government / local public administration, which is most often the case in **Italy**, but also in **Denmark** – despite of the fact that in the latter, the Central State might be slightly "coordinating" the local generation policies through law making and co-financing.

In the **UK** and in **France**, cooperation between different actors involved in organising generation policies are rather complicated and can go across state-levels, across different areas of public administration and include both public and private non-profit actors when it comes to the implementation of those policies. In the **UK**, cooperation is organised under the label of public-private partnerships. Another important function has the CFIP's accreditation system based on formulated indicators. It is a quality sign for generation policies. In **France**, cooperation can be organised through private non-profit associations, through public foundations (i.e. the "Fondation nationale de Gérontologie (FNG)") and charters (i.e. "Charte intergénérationnelle").

#### *5.2.6 The role of the EU*

The role of the EU or more precisely of the European Social Fund is mentioned as a financial resource in certain generations policies in **France**, in **Germany** and in the **UK**. In **Denmark** and in **Italy**, the European Social Fund seems not to be involved in financing generation policies at all.

In **France** and in **Germany**, there is co-financing mentioned through the European Social Fund. In the **UK**, the intergenerational programmes have been recognised by the European Approach to Inter-Generational Lifelong Learning (EAGLE) with prospects of future funding. In general terms, it can be mentioned that "generations" has become a topic on the agenda of the EU and projects that enhance intergenerational exchange are financially supported, for instance through funding by the European Social Fund.

(For international networks see: International Consortium for Intergenerational Programmes (ICIP) <http://www.icip.info/>).

Summing up *the degree of institutionalisation of the generation policies* in the investigated countries, as can be seen in *table 6* below, generation policies are most institutionalised in **Germany** and the **UK**, partly institutionalised in **France**, and less institutionalised in **Denmark** and the least institutionalised in **Italy**.

*Table 6: The degree of institutionalisation of the generation policies in*

	<b>Denmark</b>	<b>France</b>	<b>Germany</b>	<b>Italy</b>	<b>UK</b>
Role of the State	- partly implementation and partly co-financing - not initiating or promoting	- implementing (implicit) - partly initiating and promoting, partly co-financing,	-initiating, promoting, co-financing, implementing	No role	-initiating, promoting - partly co-financing, partly implementing
Most important State levels	Local-national	local, national; local-national	national; national-regional-local; regional; regional-local	local	Local, national, regional
Representation in public administration	No	Yes: not really an explicit policy area, but a cross-sectional task	Yes: explicit policy area; a specialised unit in one region (Nordrhein-Westfalen)	No	Yes: not an explicit policy area, more a cross-sectional task
Main actor for the policy design	Municipalities	Municipalities, Regions and Central State	Federal state, NGOs	Municipalities, NGOs	Municipalities, Central State, Charities
Regulation of the cooperation					
Role of the EU					
<i>Degree of institutionalisation of the generation policies</i>	low	middle	high	lowest	high

### 5.3. Comment: A first step towards an interpretation of the results

When it comes to the role of the State and the kind of actors involved in generation policies, different constellations are to be found in the investigated countries. The question here is whether the actors involved in the organisation of generation policies are in line with the traditional welfare mix associated with the specific welfare model or not. In order to discuss this question, the welfare model and the welfare-mix are shortly referred to in the following section, in order to allow a more differentiated evaluation of the generation policies in the investigated countries. By these means, we also will be able to better analyse generation policies with reference to their function in the welfare production in which they are embedded and report on their associated risks and chances.

#### 5.3.1. Different starting points for the comparison: different welfare models

The welfare contexts in which generation policies are embedded vary significantly in the investigated countries. Thus the reasons, why generation policies are only little established in some country might differ from country to country due to different driving forces. For instance in **Italy** (representing the Southern welfare model of the countries in the South of Europe), the initiation of generation policies often depends on the person in charge in local authorities or in non-profit organisation whereas in **Denmark** (representing the social-democratic welfare model of the Scandinavian countries) generation policies are not promoted at the national level as the State is clearly responsible for the provision of basic (social) security and the promotion of individual welfare. In the Danish welfare system, families should take

responsibility for their own life and care for each other, but there are individual entitlements to welfare. Civil society is considered a resourceful actor - NGOs act as alternatives to state providers, but have a more limited role compared to other countries. Civil society in the sense of local community resources are considered and tried involved, but there is no tradition for reliance on civil society. Denmark does, however, have a tradition for having local organisations and associations, run on a non-profit basis and from the help of volunteers. Therefore the assumption is that generation policies take place in Denmark, but in a more implicit way and hidden within existing public welfare services which are possibly among the most developed and generous within our investigated country group. Even though **Germany** and the **UK** are representing different welfare traditions – Germany stands for the conservative-corporatist welfare tradition whereas the UK's welfare tradition is commonly classified as liberal – similar trends and degrees of institutionalisation of generation policies have been identified. Both countries have public programmes and national policies which enhance and promote the relationships between generations. This result is not at all surprising, as in both welfare systems – not only the state or market sector – but also the civil sector is of importance for welfare production and probably is even given more importance through such generation programmes. However, the crucial question here is to what extent can these “new social services” provided by volunteers of different generation groups cover needs and where is professional help and support needed? Another question is whether all generations are equally addressed by such new initiatives or whether they are mainly addressed to the “healthy retired people/women” willing to constantly contribute to the wellbeing of society in order to be accepted as a full member of these societies. In **France**, another country representing the conservative-corporative welfare system, an explicit overall generation policy is not established despite of some national projects. The reason might be on the traditional focus on family policies and policies against social exclusion within which generation policies might be one of many aspects and way for new solutions. Nevertheless, generation policies are in most of the cases implicit and not promoted through a public programme on intergenerational exchange, but more enhanced within given frames of the traditional and existing social policies.

### 5.3.2. *New familialism or more de-familisation?*

With reference of the welfare-mixes, we observe that the State is more or less involved or more or less active when it comes to the organisation of generation policies in the investigated countries. **Germany** is the only country in our sample with an explicit generation policy promoted through funded national programmes at the Federal level. In **Denmark**, the **UK** and in **France**, generation policy do not seem to be a sign board like in Germany, even though the State promotes and partly also co-finances generation policies which are organised and implemented at the local level.

Generation policies are usually linked with family policies and related with local projects run by private non-profit organisations.

However, it is our overall impression, that generation policies are more located in the context of family policies in **Italy** (*implicit familialism*), **France** (part of the traditional policy representing *explicit familialism*) and in **Denmark** (new kind of policy representing *new/optional familialism*) whereas in **Germany** and in the **UK**, there is a stronger focus on new forms of cooperation between the State and civil society and volunteering (*de-familialism?*) (Leitner 2003: 358-359). Thus, in the latter, generation policies could represent a new form of measures which could go beyond the traditional models of *traditional familialism* with a stronger role of private non-profit organisations in the provision or promotion of such policies, also enhancing intergenerational relationships outside the traditional family (see also the results of our literature study).

This trend is similar to developments in other policy areas in some countries, where the provision of social services has become a more and more important topic, for instance for labour market integration or in the sector of long-term care for older people. The importance of such individual social services for all age groups is more and more acknowledged by the official represents of social policy. However, these personal and time-intensive services would be much more costly if welfare states would have to come up for them entirely and could not rely on family members or volunteers. Nevertheless, this also raises new questions dealing with gender and migration issues within the current care economies (Lyon and Glucksmann 2008; Saraceno 2008; Da Roit and Naldini 2008).

Thus, on one hand, the implementation and outcomes of generation policies vary significantly between the investigated welfare states and there is no real “converging trend” with reference to generation policies to be observed. On the other hand, it can be seen that in **Denmark**, in **France**, in **Germany** and in the **UK** generation policies are promoted as a way to mobilise new societal resources for the welfare state, which imply new forms of governance and a new role of the welfare state as a initiator and promoter of policies and existing networks, more than as a direct provider of financial help or social services.

Nevertheless, that also means that when public funding is totally absent or really insufficient and not – at least – valuable for a symbolic compensation, generation policies include (back to) *passive familism* with an increasing reliance on private households instead of on public households .

### *5.3.3: Associated risks and chances for generation policies*

Policies that enhance intergenerational relationships and the exchange between the different generations are evaluated differently with reference to their risks and chances.

In **Denmark**, the country experts are the most sceptical towards generation policies and state that new generation policies could be seen as alternatives or even substitutes for welfare services. Generally, there is only little public debate about generation policies, but if, the increasing emphasis on using the resources in the family is debated.

Also in **Italy**, the chances for generation policies are evaluated to be limited.

Intergenerational policies – consisting of local and private non-profit initiatives – might prevent the State to be more active in this field or in the field of social policies in more general terms. The political debate at the national level is concerned about the financial sustainability of the impact of the ageing population process (pensions and health costs), and not so much about the consequences in terms of social exclusion and social risks, which are more perceived at the local level, where generally projects about these issues are developed.

In the other countries, the chances of generation policies are evaluated more positively. In **France**, for instance, generation policies are seen as a part of the (public) family policy. The political debate refers to the social and demographic change: the rising life expectance, prevention of exclusion of older people from society and the change of the traditional family structure – and therefore, new, publicly funded solidarity in the society should be enhanced and the existing policies should be more coordinated. In **Germany** and the **UK**, similar attitudes are at stake. However, the new social resources are even more highlighted, especially in Germany, where generation policies are seen as a new way of volunteering with and for all generations, partly supported by public funding. And in the UK generation policies are seen as a possibility for both intergenerational learning within families but also for community development. However, in particular the latter, are still in need of a longer-term and sustainable funding.

## 6. Conclusion

Even though it might be rather early to draw a final conclusion on our three research questions asked at the beginning of this report, some interesting findings and trends can be identified in this young field of public intervention which is more or less developed in the investigated countries.

For the provisory conclusion, our research questions are shortly recalled:

- What projects and measures can be assigned to generation policies in the investigated country?
- Does an independent policy area develop which focuses on the direct political design of intergenerational relationships?
- How does the institutionalisation of the generation policies manifest itself in the individual countries?

With reference to the first question, it can be stated that generation policies that country experts in all countries have been able to identify generation policies (for an short overview see *table 2* on page 10-11 of this report; for a more detailed overview see *table 7* on page 44-49 in the Appendix). These policies represent a wide range of the societal dimensions: education, socialisation, arts, care, labour market integration, sports etc.. The reported generation policies lead to the tentative assumption, that in some countries, there is a stronger focus on certain societal dimension than in other countries (for instance in Denmark, many reported generation policies can be located in the care sector or for instance in the UK, a big number of the described policies can be located in the art sector). Especially in France, Germany and in the UK, where programmes which enhance intergenerational exchange and relationships are also propagated at the national level, certain initiatives also try to “coordinate” the existing offer of such policies through public Conferences (France), public programmes (Germany), specialised Centres for intergenerational practice (UK), national websites with lists and description of single generation policies (Germany, UK) or through scientific investigation on intergenerational relationships (France).

The answer for the second research question is more difficult. It is our overall impression that there is evidence for an explicit, overall generation policy in Germany and in the UK, and partly also in France even though the policies found in these countries are still rather young and have not yet established completely. However, there is a strong connotation with other policy areas: in France with family policy and policy for older people; in Germany with volunteering; in the UK towards community development. Therefore, it might be the case that not all activities labelled as “generation policies” are necessarily new and only dedicated to the promotion of intergenerational exchange and relationships. Thus generation policies could in some cases also stand for old wine served in new bottles, making use of the current discourses over new social challenges, social change, an ageing society, new family patterns and social isolation of separation of certain age groups which are building the argumentative ground for such policies. Strong indicators for independent policy area for the direct political design of intergenerational relationships are (long-term) public financing at the national level through public programmes explicitly dedicated to generation policies (i.e. Germany; partly also in France, and in the UK) and established institutions and partners which develop and

promote the knowledge about generation policy and policies (i.e. UK; partly also in France, and in Germany).

With reference to the last question regarding the institutionalisation of generation policies, larger differences have been found between the five investigated countries. Even though local public-private initiatives also exist in Denmark and in Italy, it is still a longer way to go for an explicit, overall policy in these countries whereas in Germany, France and in the UK these policies have been gaining profile during the last ten years. However, also in these latter countries, generation policies still seem to be a young and small field of public action whose future depends very much on the stability of public co-funding and the on-going willingness and motivation of the volunteers who make a big part of the collaborators in such projects.

Another finding is that single generation policies might change over time. For instance, former (private) local initiative can become (part of) a public programme. Or former publicly funded projects can end up as private non-profit initiatives due to timely limited or missing public financing. Looking at the “histories” of generation policies one gets the impression that actors of the private sector and voluntary organisations are of special importance (and interest) in this policy area. It is therefore sometimes hard to evaluate where the state really plays an active role in promoting generation policies or where new social challenges are simply delegated to local voluntary organisations of civil society in the name of “generation policies”.

What can be learnt from the investigated countries?

Comparing generation policies in Switzerland with those in the investigated countries, the following differences can be identified:

- There is no co-financing by the Federal level for public-private projects and initiatives at the regional or local level (see Denmark, Germany)
- There is no national public programme initiating and promoting such policies at the national level, for instance through a competition (see Germany)
- There is no competence centre for intergenerational practices and research (see the CFIP in the UK)
- There is no National Conference organised in order to promote this kind of policies (see France)

(For a more detailed description of generation policies in Switzerland see our literature study.)

## 7. References

### **Books and articles**

Beth Johnson Foundation: Intergenerational Programmes and Practice. Available at:  
<http://www.centreforip.org.uk/Libraries/Local/67/Docs/BJF%20Briefing%20Paper%20IG%20Ministerial%20Round%20Table%20Mar%202008.pdf> [Access: 06 August, 2008]

Derbyshire County Council IP Strategy  
<https://www.derbyshire.gov.uk/Images/content/DemocraticServices/Reports/Bridging%20the%20gap.pdf>

Esping-Andersen, G. (1990) *The Three Worlds of Welfare Capitalism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Esping-Andersen, G. (1999) *Social Foundations of Postindustrial Economies*, New York: Oxford University Press.

Evaluation Report of Speke IP (Active Ageing)  
<http://www.centreforip.org.uk/Libraries/Local/67/Docs/Speke%20Report%20Final%20Version.pdf>

Da Roit, B. and Naldini, M. (2008) 'Migrant Care Workers as means to reconcile work and family. A shift in the Italian family-based care model?' Paper presented at the International Conference at the Danish National Centre for Social Research (SFI) "Transforming elderly care at local, national and transnational levels", Copenhagen, 26-28 June 2008

Ferrara, M. (1998) 'The Four "Social Europes": Between Universalism and Selectivism', pp. 79-96 in Rhodes, M. and Mény, Y. (eds.), *Future of European Welfare: A New Social Contract?* London: MacMillan.

Granville, G. (2002), A Review of Intergenerational Practice in the UK. The Beth Johnson Foundation.

Hatton-Yeo, A. (2006) *Intergenerational Programmes: an Introduction and Examples of Practice*. Stoke-on-Trent: The Beth Johnson Foundation.

Leitner, S. (2003) 'Varieties of Familialism – The Caring Function of the Family in Comparative Perspective' *European Societies*, 5, 4: 353-375.

Lyon, D. and Glucksmann, M. (2009) 'Comparative Configurations of Care Work across Europe' *Sociology* 42, 1: 101-118

Office for National Statistic (ONS) (2001) Focus on older people & ethnic minorities. Available at:  
<http://www.statistics.gov.uk/focuson/ethnicity>

Parsons, W. (1995) *Public Policy*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.

Population Trends, (PT 126) 126, Winter 2006, National Statistics  
[www.statistics.gov.uk/downloads/theme\\_population/PopTrends126.pdf](http://www.statistics.gov.uk/downloads/theme_population/PopTrends126.pdf)

Saraceno, C. (2008) '„Care“ leisten und „Care“ erhalten zwischen Individualisierung und Refamiliarisierung' *Berliner Journal für Soziologie* 18, 2: 244-256

Schlimbach, T. (2007). Funding Intergenerational Practice: Report of the Findings of a Survey. The Beth Johnson Foundation

Tomassini, C. (2005). Focus on Older People: Demographic profile. Office for National Statistic. Available at: [http://www.statistics.gov.uk/downloads/theme\\_compendia/foop05/Foop\\_Demographic\\_Profile.pdf](http://www.statistics.gov.uk/downloads/theme_compendia/foop05/Foop_Demographic_Profile.pdf) [Access: 18 August, 2008]

**Newspapers**

"Familienurlaub zur Sterbebegleitung". In: Neue Zürcher Zeitung, 18.02.2009, p. 11.

## 8. Appendix

Table 7: Overview over the generation policies found in the investigated countries

	Denmark	France	Germany	Italy	UK
<b>Number of policies</b>	10 policies	10 policies	10 policies	9 (one of them is not implemented yet and therefore marked with *)	10 policies
<b>Names of the policies</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Project Food like in the old days</li> <li>-Bonus grandparent scheme</li> <li>-Best friend of vulnerable children</li> <li>-Memory workshop</li> <li>-Grandparents' day off for sick grandchildren</li> <li>-foster care with relatives</li> <li>-counselling involving grandparents</li> <li>-visiting friend</li> <li>-Grandma' in the kindergarten</li> <li>-cooperation between local society and the school</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Memories</li> <li>-Chronos literature price</li> <li>-Solidary Paris</li> <li>- intergenerational housing</li> <li>-circle "Vermeil" (?)</li> <li>-intergenerational restaurant</li> <li>-Reading and enable to read</li> <li>-Good ageing</li> <li>-intergenerational charter?</li> <li>-Se canto – With Benjamin Giroud</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Generation houses</li> <li>-Volunteer services of and for all generations -generationendialog.de (Internetplattform)</li> <li>-Reading connects</li> <li>-Senior-mentoring for the entrance in work life</li> <li>-Projects for generations</li> <li>-Expert conference The Future on Ageing – Dialogue between the generations</li> <li>-Video of the generations</li> <li>-Intergenerational volunteering in sports</li> <li>-Generation learning</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Senior Citizens' voluntary civil service</li> <li>-Civic grandparents</li> <li>-Living together</li> <li>-Young and Senior citizens at the Center</li> <li>-Solidarity agreement between generations*</li> <li>-Yong and senior citizens: a solid bridge between generations</li> <li>-Three Ages University</li> <li>-Laboratorio della Memoria</li> <li>-Friendly houses for girls and boys</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Active Ageing Programme</li> <li>-Age Concern Kingston's Age and Youth-School Based Project (ACKuT)</li> <li>-The Bigger Picture Project (Tower Hoamlets) Ocean Estate</li> <li>-Shoebox Theatre</li> <li>-Burbank Court &amp; Brierton Scholl Intergenerational Craft Project</li> <li>-Age Exchange Youth theatre Group: Case study of reminiscence drama work between African elders and ten-year olds.</li> <li>-Sixty Plus</li> <li>-Deryshire Integenerational Strategy (DIgS)</li> <li>Gardening project</li> <li>-The Beth Johnson Centre for Intergenerational Practice</li> <li>-Intergenerational Dance Company</li> </ul>
<b>Type of policy</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- local private project</li> <li>-private initiative, later a public programme</li> <li>-public programme</li> <li>-private project (2)</li> <li>-labour market agreement in private sector</li> <li>-public reform (foster care legislation; primary and secondary schooling reform 1994) (2)</li> <li>-public initiative, privately organised</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-national private initiative and long-term project (2)</li> <li>-national public long-term project</li> <li>-local private project</li> <li>-public local initiative</li> <li>-public-private local project</li> <li>-national programme</li> <li>-public national/local project</li> <li>-private regional/local project</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-National action programme of the Federal Ministry for Family, Seniors, Women and Young People with private non-profit project partners (3)</li> <li>-National public-private project (2)</li> <li>-regional public project (2)</li> <li>-regional-local public-private project</li> <li>-public-private local project (1)</li> <li>-regional public-private model project (1)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Public intervention, - Public-private initiative (2)</li> <li>-Public project (2)</li> <li>-Governative law project with trade unions, firms and single workers*</li> <li>-public initiative</li> <li>-public-private programme</li> <li>-third sector-public-private (non-profit) project</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-community programme (2)</li> <li>-voluntary programme (2)</li> <li>-community project (2)</li> <li>-public-private initiative</li> <li>-charity project (1)</li> <li>-company with a special offer</li> <li>-specialised Centre for Intergenerational Practice (CFIP)</li> </ul>
<b>Dimension of exchange (some policies cover at the same time)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Education and socialisation (5)</li> <li>-direct contacts between older people and children (2)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-coordination and general support for intergenerational projects (2)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Housing combined with several social services</li> <li>-volunteering</li> <li>-networking and</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-culture, socialisation, environment and care</li> <li>-social and care</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-education and socialisation (8)</li> <li>-health</li> <li>-art (4)</li> <li>-community</li> </ul>

<b>different dimensions)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Remembering the past (1)</li> <li>-Care and support (5)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Education and socialisation (3)</li> <li>-direct contacts between young and old people (2)</li> <li>-exchange between young families and older persons</li> <li>-prevention form social isolation of older people (3)</li> <li>-care and support for older persons</li> <li>-Art</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>promoting existing intergenerational policies (2)</li> <li>-Education and knowledge exchange (3)</li> <li>-Education and socialisation (2)</li> <li>-participation in the labour market</li> <li>-competition for intergenerational projects</li> <li>-conference on intergenerational dialogue</li> <li>-arts: video</li> <li>-sports</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-socialisation, care and support, housing</li> <li>-socialisation cultural education</li> <li>-Labour market Socialisation, care support and cultural exchange*</li> <li>-cultural, social/educational</li> <li>-cultural and educational</li> <li>-education, participation, social inclusion, housing, quality of life</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>development</li> <li>-research on intergenerational relationships</li> </ul>
<b>Objective and content of the policy</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-establish relations between older people and children through cooking, ensuring that recipies from the generation of the older are not forgotten in these days of fast food culture.</li> <li>-to help single parents when their children are ill by establishing contact to older people who can offer take care so that the parent can go to work.</li> <li>-to vulnerable children to establish contact with resourceful older people for stable and reliable grown-up relations</li> <li>-to help older people remembering their past and to teach young children about history</li> <li>-reconciliation work for families</li> <li>-to help vulnerable children who cannot live with their parents through fostering care by relatives</li> <li>-to offer counselling sessions for vulnerable families</li> <li>-to make sure that lonely elderly are in contact with other people preventing them from loneliness</li> <li>-to pass knowledge from older people to kindergarden children</li> <li>-to encourage better cooperation and involvement of local society in the school education for young children</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-to create networking between different actors (2)</li> <li>-encouraging reading among children, prevention form illiteracy</li> <li>-to give affordable room of living to student, prevention from social isolation of older people (3)</li> <li>-to promote exchange between young families and older people</li> <li>-young people teach older people the use of modern communication technology</li> <li>-healthy nutrition for older people</li> <li>-labour activation for seniors and young retired people</li> <li>-detection of sings of ageing</li> <li>-to establish relations between young and old people (2)</li> <li>-to transmit knowledge</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-to enhance and enforce volunteers engagement (3)</li> <li>-to promote intergenerational relations and dialogue between the generations (2)</li> <li>-to offer "social services" (2)</li> <li>-to enhance networking among different providers of intergenerational policies and promot existing projects (3)</li> <li>-to teach older people in internet knowledge, to train didactical skills of students</li> <li>-mentoring for entering in to the labour market</li> <li>-to bring together film fans of different age groups</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-use senior citizens experiences, improve their social dignity and their self-esteem, exploiting their skills</li> <li>-creation of a more friendly town for all age groups/inhabitants</li> <li>-cohabitation between students and senior citizens</li> <li>-avoiding social exclusion of seniors and creating relationships between the young and the seniors (2)</li> <li>-combat youth unemployment*</li> <li>-education programme for seniors, enhancing communication with other generations, discovering the value of building something together</li> <li>-oral history project: intergenerational exchange of experiences</li> <li>-building a children friendly city</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-intergenerational discussions (3)</li> <li>-health maintaining for the older and younger people</li> <li>-mentoring, workshops, theatre, dancing</li> <li>-older people share their skills and experiences with younger people, social inclusion of the older people</li> <li>-to open one's horizon through representatives of other age groups</li> <li>-to promote better understanding and tolerance</li> <li>-to break down barriers and prejudice between generations</li> <li>-promoting self-confidence of different age groups and enhancing their contribution to community development (2)</li> <li>-people of different generations find a common language through dance</li> <li>-support the development and promotion of intergenerational practice and research of such practise</li> </ul>
<b>Addressees</b>	-Institutions like nursing	-Individuals,	-Parents needing	-seniors	-older people and

	<p>homes, day centres for older people, pensioners organisation, primary schools, day centres for children and children preparing for religious confirmation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Single parents and their children, older people</li> <li>-vulnerable children and older people</li> <li>-older people and children</li> <li>-employees who are grand-parents</li> <li>-vulnerable children, their relatives</li> <li>-vulnerable families</li> <li>-elderly and their visiting friend</li> <li>-kindergarden children and older people</li> <li>-school children and youngsters, local society</li> </ul>	<p>associations, students, university, deputy (local, regional or national), communities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-children and seniors (2)</li> <li>-students and older people (living in their homes (1), in hospitals and residences (1))</li> <li>-young couples with children and older people</li> <li>-older people (2)</li> <li>-older people needing care</li> <li>-different associations</li> <li>-all inhabitants of a city</li> </ul>	<p>support; children, older people; professionals and volunteers;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-volunteer-organisations and more indirectly volunteers</li> <li>-old and young people; staff of intergenerational projects and measures; local institutions and organisations (schools, universities, foundations, sponsors, volunteers...)</li> <li>-Children, young people, adults, seniors</li> <li>-Older people and students</li> <li>-retired persons with a lot of professional and personal experience and a good network; young people at the age of leaving school and entering in the labour market</li> <li>-regional and local organisations and institutions of intergenerational projects</li> <li>-all members of society, volunteers for intergenerational projects</li> <li>-filmmakers younger than 25 and older than 50</li> <li>-volunteers of all age groups</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-seniors and university students</li> <li>-seniors and school students</li> <li>-worker 55+ and young people 25+*</li> <li>-civil servants (young people) and seniors (2)</li> <li>-seniors, retired and young</li> <li>-children and adults</li> </ul>	<p>children at school (2)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-young people of different ages and older relatives, neighbours and friends</li> <li>-older and/or disabled people and primary age children and their parents</li> <li>-50+ of a shelter housing scheme and young people of a community school</li> <li>-young (African) people and older African people which are organised in the AJoda group</li> <li>-50+ and 70- to 80-years-old</li> <li>And young people 16- to 18-years-old</li> <li>-children and older people of different communities</li> <li>-older and younger people</li> <li>- up to 25 and 50+ who are most confronted with ageism</li> </ul>
<b>Budget</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Not known (6)</li> <li>-Not known, but presumable very low (1)</li> <li>-32.000 EUR in 2005 from Ministry of Families for establishing need and setting up the scheme. In 2007 the scheme was funded with 16.500 EUR from Copenhagen local authority in order to carry on.</li> <li>-2.425.00 EUR set of in 2008-11. To be applied for by a NGO or any other interested party that fulfil the applicaiton criteria.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-No information (8)</li> <li>- living together, a local project: 10'000 EUR by the public Fondation National de Gérontologie (FNG), at the beginning of the project</li> <li>- "Bien vieillir": overall budget of 168 millions; 3.5 Millions are given for projects (intergenerational habitation, semaine bleue - see policy sheet 2) regarding the exchange between generations on the local level.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-No information (5)</li> <li>-40'000 EUR per year for each of the 500 generation houses for 5 years (2006-2011); 200 generation houses receive further funding through the European Fund; all in all funding of 100 Mio. EUR</li> <li>-22.5 Mio EUR for the 30 chosen lighthouses: 50'000.00 per year for 2009-20011</li> <li>-The project is financed through Federal funding (Modell Programme of the BMFSFJ (Bundesministerium für Familie, Senioren, Frauen und Jugend), volunteering of individuals (older people) and within sport clubs. The financing of the Federal Ministry goes per occupied place: 250.00 EUR in the first year, 200.00 EUR in the</li> </ul>	<p>No information</p>	<p>Little information</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Age Concern Kingston's Age and Youth – School Based Project (ACKuT): local authority (488.577 EUR)</li> <li>-Sixty Plus Intergenerational Project: annual grant: 25.597.0 EUR and a final grant of 6,399.25 EUR over the last 5 years</li> <li>-The Beth Johnson Centre for Intergenerational Practice: 2007 the intergenerational Fund had £124,887.00 = 156,697 EUR in 2007.</li> </ul>

			second year, 150.00 EUR in the third year.		
<b>Main actors and level of financing</b>	National/local and private; -No info (1) -no funding necessary:1 -mainly or only public funding: 6 -mainly or only private: 2	Mixed financing predominates: -different local, regional, national; and different offices; and different private offices; -national public foundation: Foundation of Gerontology; -national private association: Parisolidaire -by members of the association according to the "association de loi 1901 (3) -mainly local actors (3)	Mostly mixed (public-private) financing, often including volunteering -National and European level (1) -National/regional and local level -National(3) -Regional level(4 – but always Nordrhein-Westfalen) -local (1)	Local; -municipality (4) -municipality and province (1) -district council (1) -State and regions (1)* -associations, trade unions and non profit organisations (1) -cooperative	National and local; -National (different offices) and counties -promoted nationally, but financed locally -national and local (3) -local (4) -Financing of the CFIP: Community Fund and the Big Lottery for - charities: Age Concern England; Sixty Plus -the Art Council of England -The South Liverpool Primary Care Trust (PCT) -
<b>Organisation of cooperation with authorities at other state levels</b>	-no State involvement (4) -national level: law-making; sometimes co-financing; -local level: authorities implementing the policies with project partners.	In most policies many partners at the same time, at different state levels, of different social sectors are involved (the typical French complexity...)	-national and regional level act independently -local initiatives and projects can be part of national or regional programmes – however, there are not so many regional programmes -common design of public-private (non profit) cooperation	-no: (4) -agreement between the municipality and the National Civil Service -different forms of agreements (formal general agreements or specific contributions...) within the same policy -formal agreement between the municipality and the province -specific agreements at the local level	-public-private partnerships (3) -public programmes (4) -not regulated (3 -> 2 = "relationships") -agreements
<b>Cooperation partners</b>	-no State involvement (4) -NGO at the national level: "Omsorgsorganisasione mes Samråd og Ældremobilisering"); Red Cross; "Dan Age" -local authorities (3) -different institutions at the local level: like nursing homes, day centres for older people, pensioners organisation, primary schools, day centres for children and children preparing for religious confirmation -CSC (Computer Science Corporation)	In most policies many partners at the same time, at different state levels, of different social sectors are involved (the typical French complexity...)	-The Federal Ministry for Families, Seniors, Women and Young People (BMFSFJ) with municipalities, local private for profit and non-profit (volunteer organisations, social enterprises) organisations at the basis of cooperation contracts (3). -the Foundation Reading at the national level and the Ministry of Generation, Family, Women and Integration in Nordrhein-Westfalen at the regional level (3). -cooperation between educational institutions -local worker welfare association with educational institutions -cooperation between	-municipality and non-profit and voluntaristic partners -municipality with senior citizens or family associations /and council of neighbourhood -municipalities and National Civil Service (2) -the State, the Regions, the Trade Unions, firms* -trade unions, retired people associations, social/cultural organizations -municipality, province and University	Public-private partnerships in all projects; -National (public) Health Service -National (public) Art council -the Safer School Partnership -Schools in general -local private non-profit charity Magic me (a specialist provider for intergenerational projects, -local public services -county council -local government (3) -local Theatre -local Dance company -central and local

			regional and national forums and volunteer organisations -The German Film Centre for Children and Young People -European network for culture in the age -The German Youth's Sport	-inhabitants cooperative, University, municipality, day-care centres, civil society	government -national Foundation: The Beth Johnson Foundation -> Centre for Intergenerational Practice
<b>Regulation of the cooperation</b>	-No regulation (1) -Not known (9)	-by the law "association loi de 1901" (3) -More punctual forms of regulation: 1. treaty (1) 2. convention and agreement of partnership (1) 3. charters (2) 4. guidelines of a public programme (1-2)	-Public programme with competition for participating institutions, guidelines given by the Federal Government, cooperation with the selected partners is based on contracts (3) -A similar design is found in some regions; here, two ministries were found that push forward generation policies (Nordrhein-Westfalen and Niedersachsen).	-formal regulated through agreements (6)* -formal regulated and informal (3)	-governing guidelines established by educational authority -Approved Provider Standard (APS) -contractual guidelines established by the partnerships -contractual agreements (2) -guiding principles of a volunteer organisation (Age Exchange's volunteers -charity constitution -institutional guidelines of a dancing company -through the discussion of the participants -supported and guided by a Advisory Group
<b>Timeline</b>	-short term (1) -in many cases not known (9)	-long-term (7) -February 2008 - end of 2009 (1) -2003 ongoing (1) -2007-2009 (1)	Not stated (3) -mid-term (4-5 years) (4) -long-term (2)	-year by year (3) -medium term (1-3years) (3) -long term (1:9 years)*	Not stated (1) -several years -2001-2005, still ongoing -2003-2004, -2005, still ongoing -more than a year, ongoing -1983- -1996- -2005-2007, ongoing -long-term
<b>Role of the state</b>	-No role (4) -Coordination, funding, implementation (local authority) (1) -Initiation, coordination, funding (national level) (1) -Implementation: Evaluation and Controlling (local authority) (2) -Initiating lawmaking (Central State) (2)	-No information (0) -No role (1) -Co-financing: at the national and at other levels (3); -Initiation and funding at the national levels; implementation and coordination at the local level; - at the local level: initiator, coordination, funding, controlling and implementation (2)	Initiator, coordinator and funding (national level) (5) -Funding, promoting (regional level) (3) -Promoting (at the regional level) (1) -Initiating, Implementing (Organisation of a Conference) (at the regional level) (1) -Funding (at the national level) (1)	-no role (6) -through the National Civil Service(2) -Initiator of the project (but not implemented so far)*	-presence of uniformed police officers in schools (?!) -Funding (national and local) (3) and implementing (local) (3) -Co-financing (local) (2) and implementing (1) -National

		-Implementation at the national level; coordination and organisation of the policy at the local level -Approving at the national level (1)			
<b>Political justification</b>	-Change in food culture, generational relations; -Family and labour market policy; -Support policy for vulnerable children -Education and remembrance -Family policy (reconciliation work, use of familial resources and prevention for vulnerable families -Support policy for vulnerable children -Support policy for the older people, sustainability -demographic change -sustainability of local solidarity and coherence	-ageing population (3) -need for coordination of intergenerational offers (2) -new views on ageing -need for apartment for students in the cities -creating a dynamic intergenerational approach -prevention from isolation of older people (5) -prevention from social segregation -prevention of older people from geographical isolation (1) -fight against illiteracy	-new family patterns -demographic change (3) -enhancing intergenerational relations also outside the family -follow-ups of earlier intergenerational programmes in the volunteer sector -increasing individualisation and mobility, technical development and a changing workforce; disolutionation of neighbourhood relationships -fight against desolidarisation and against "the war between the generations" -making use of chances resulting from demographic change -support of unprivileged young people entering into the working market -activation of the resources of all members of the society enhancing volunteering (3) -creation of solidarity	-social integration of senior citizens (4) -insecurity in cities and society (3) -youth employment and cooperation among the generation* -promote relationship between generations (2) -improvement of the elderly's quality of life -strengthening communitarian roots and share and value old citizens experiences -social housing	-contact and positive experiences between different age groups -social change and community development (3) -maintaining and enhancing social cohesion (2) -knowledge exchange -increasing volunteering among younger and older people -support for older people -confronting ageism
<b>Year of introduction</b>	-Not known (2) -1994 (reform) (1) -1998- (1) -2005 (2) -2006 (2) -2008 (1) -2008-2011 (1)	-1985 at the local level; since 1999 at the national level (1); -1992 (1) -1996 (1) -1999 (2) -2000 (1) -2003 (1) -2004 (1) -2007-2009 (1)	-2006-(2011) -2009-2012 -1994/1997 -2007 -2003- -2008 -February 2008 -1998: yearly -2005	-1975(1) -1995(1) -1997(1) -2003 (1) -2006 (4)	-1983 -1996 -2001 -2003 -2004 -2004-2007 -2007
<b>Number of best practise policy</b>	1	3	4	1	4
<b>Main sources used</b>	Internet	Internet and Documentation (1)	Internet, Mails, Interviews	Internet	Internet, publications, journals, newspaper, BBC, workshops, interviews.

Table 8: The institutionalisation of generation policies

	Denmark	France	Germany	Italy	UK
<b>5.2.1. Role of the State in organising generation policies</b>	Initiating through lawmaking and punctual co-financing of the local-private non-profit projects.	Promoting of generation policies through conferences and call for projects at the national level. Punctual co-financing of local-private non-profit projects.	Initiation and financing of two (three) national programmes. Co-financing of national, regional and local private non-profit projects.	No role. The only national initiative at the national level has not been settled because of the change of the government in 2008 (Solidarity between generations).	Promotion and co-financing of intergenerational programmes, projects and initiatives at different state level.
<b>5.2.2. Most important state level for generation policy</b>	Local (and national).	Local (and national).	Local, national and in some parts also regional level (Niedersachsen, Nordrhein-Westfalen)	Only local.	Local, (regional) and national.
<b>5.2.3. Representation of generation policies in the public administration</b>	(no answer)	Implementation of different project/programmes which aim to prevent the isolation of elderly people (cohabitation between old and young).	Generations as a specific and explicit policy area is only represented at regional level, in the ministry for generation, families, women and integration of the Länder authority Nordrhein-Westfalen. At the federal level and in some public administration at regional levels, implementation of intergenerational programmes and projects.	Generation policies do not appear in the public administration as a policy area. However, public administration is involved in the implementation of generation policies, even though not within specialised areas.	Different parts of the public sector including private, community and voluntary sectors are involved in the implementation of generation policies. There are speciality areas such as the Active Community Unit (ACU), the Older Volunteers are specialities areas.
<b>5.2.4. The kind of actors involved in the designing and implementation of generation policies (public/non-public)</b>	Local governments, local private non-profit organisations.	Local private non-profit "associations". The public authorities at the local and at the national level.	Local, regional and Federal private non-profit organisations; public authorities (and government) at the Federal and Regional level (Länder).	Local private non-profit organisations.	Local private non-profit organisations and local governments, local public administration; national government and national public administration.
<b>5.2.5. Regulation of the cooperation/cooperation between the different actors</b>	Not known	Association. The coordination of the project takes mostly place at the local level (municipalities and private non-profit organisations).	There are formalised forms of cooperation between different partners within the national programmes.	Dependent on the project: formal and informal agreements between municipalities and the private (non-profit) actors	Public-private partnerships.
<b>5.2.6. The role of the EU</b>	No role.	Co-financing	Co-financing	No role.	No co-financing so far,

		through the European Social Fund (in 1 investigated project)	through the European Social Fund: Thank to this extra funding, the number of generation houses could be increased from 440 to 500 in 2008.		but recognition of the UK intergenerational programmes by the European Approach to Inter-Generational Lifelong Learning (EAGLE). Thus, with anticipation for the future such funding will be secured for UK IP.
--	--	--	--	--	---