

### **WG 3: Policies related to Green care**

Chair: Thomas van Elsen; Vice vice chair: Bas Pedroli; Minutes: Francesco Di Iacovo

The main aim of this Working Group is to discuss how Green care fits into current and future national health and social care systems. This includes

- the organisation of the Green Care System and
- the building up of the network behind the health and social care systems.

A further aim is to discuss how rural development is affected; creation of new jobs and strengthening of the economic viability of rural communities, those of less-favoured and remote rural areas in particular.

#### **WG3 Milestones**

##### **The chair of the group refreshes the main aims of the WG3 as defined in the Cost Action 866**

1. Definition of terms and concepts for the different services of Green care. Mutual concepts and their proper terms for various types of services offered within Green care, which could be adopted across Europe to ease international cooperation, will be defined. A proposal will then be discussed in a plenary session of the Action.
2. Evaluate the contribution of Green care to rural and agricultural policies, but also policies in health care and social care. This involves discussions on the evaluation of social aspects of urban areas like social cohesion, safety, feelings of annoyance due to e.g. people with drug problems etc. Different regions should be compared with each other. Social entrepreneurship, social cohesion, quality of life, landscape and environment, social services, agriculture, citizens and governance, and education and research are important policy domains we have to deal with, mainly on regional and national levels. There appears to occur a change of paradigm from the traditional monodisciplinary protocol-oriented medical approach of long-term care issues, to a more social, integrated approach. Green care fits into this main trend, as well in the trend towards more and more informal family care. Innovations in long term care generally means a shift from focus on target groups to functions; this implicates a need for cooperation of organisations focussed on different functions. Green care should therefore develop alliances with other sectors. A challenge is to include people with other cultural backgrounds in green care projects. A shift from national approaches in long-term care towards a more local orientation can be observed in many countries. This has advantages of more client-oriented responsibilities, more attention to individual wishes and the needs of clients, but also a strong risk of ad-hoc financial cuts. Depending on the country, government (tax based health system) or insurance companies have more influence on the financial structure of health care, and therefore also on the market for Green care services.
3. Development of a research program – policies of Green care. Suggestions of the policies part of a research program on Green care will be developed, based on discussions and conclusions of Milestone

#### **The activities**

During the meeting the following activities were planned:

1. Presenting national situations and specific cases
2. Introducing EU policies for green care
3. Debating

#### **Presenting national situations and cases**

About 8 papers were presented during the meeting according with the programme. The idea was to share and to better socialize inside the group common views and diversity in green care in different countries. The summary of each presentation was distributed among participants. In short the main points addressed during the presentations were the followings:

**Common situations**

- Quite different -individual/un-formal- experiences
- Lack in definitions
- Difficulties in monitoring so broad activities
- Low inter-sectors dialogue (agriculture, rural, education, health)
- Aim for new policies
- Changing situation for social services and agriculture as well

**Differences**

- Growing number of interesting practices but no established methods
- Social demand about nature and farm life (Norway-Greece)
- Accent on different aspects and rural resources (forest, horticulture, farm activities)

**The driving forces for changes**

	<i>Urban areas</i>	<i>Rural areas</i>
<b>Fiscal crisis of the state</b>	Searching for new resources Decentralisation and municipal welfare	Agriculture as a local source
<b>Low efficacy of institutional services</b> (from school to social services)	Institutional vs tailor made services Agriculture as a new tool	Scale vs scope
<b>Change in economic patterns of development</b>		Knowledge economy and human /relational resources

**Introducing EU policies**

The regulatory system can be differently organised place by place. It is based on voluntary actions as well as following specific agreements among farmers and local institutions. At the same time is quite evident a lack in the legal framework in about all Nations. The actors involved are quite different also. The main actors are Public services, Private enterprises, NGOs, Voluntaries and associations. All of them provide services for a wide range of target groups.

Initiative are mainly organised at ground level with a bottom up approach. But, at the main time, there are still difficulties in defining interactions and a clear framework with different institutional subjects there could be related to green care (Agriculture, Rural, Educational, Social, Health institutions).

In the scenario described a better understanding about the policies role has to be achieved. From this point of view policies can be seen at different levels:

- For funding
- To improve new alternatives for farmers
- For mainstreaming social farming
- To build a different environment for local/ European society

### **Debating**

In the afternoon the discussion work around the main topics that should be focused during the WG3 activities. A large debate starts within the group as shortly described:

- Georg: let us **collect information** from different countries because many developments are parallel
- Georg / Francesco: **systematic comparison on organisations**, concepts and schemes of Green Care Farming (quantitative table + qualitative description per country)
- Roberto: **3 levels of policy** overview needed
  - EU level,
  - national level: especially also medical care aspects
  - spontaneous developments in funding
- Eva: **survey existing initiatives** for developing educational **courses and curricula**
- Charlotte: need for **basic definitions** of what we are talking about: what is health? What is green care?
- Helena: overview needed of what **types of initiatives are being practiced for which target groups** in the various countries
- Linda: be aware that care is not understood as something to be imposed; it should be seen as an opportunity, also as a prevention of societal health problems (from salutogenetic side, instead of the pathogenetic approach of health care systems)
- Georg:
  - innovative potential of green care farming? Or is it just conventional, presented in a new way?
  - rural amenities, local assets, coast, private family based household, archeological sites, etc.
  - link with other social welfare aspects, don't isolate green care! Green care is para-agricultural activity.
  - interest of clients should be taken into due consideration
- Katriina: let us keep focus on agriculture
- Roberto: rural development as an opportunity to exploit local assets!
- Francesco:
  - multifunctionality is crucial, but let us concentrate on agriculture and related services
  - let us investigate in detail the policies in green care farming, i.e. shifting attention a bit from practice and survey to contemplation on policy aspects
  - what are the processes, the arena, the actors involved? local level of experiences against the framework of policies. How are local initiatives expressed and presented in relation to the existing policies?
- Bas: paradox between the **lacking results** of care farming available and the need to present these to the policy makers

- Eva: **communicate** between the countries about which different kinds of working in Green Care exist
- Linda: what can I **contribute as a grassroots worker**

**From the debate 5 main topics are defined as follows:**

1. inventory of policies
2. inventory of educational provision
3. collect evidence (both at grass root level and research level) for ourselves and for policy makers
4. design process of change
5. new research proposal

**For each of them a work proposal was written down.**

### **Inventory of policies**

- **why:** to better communicate between ourselves and better convince policy makers with examples from other countries
- SoFar (<http://sofar.unipi.it>) already produced overview of practice in social farming of 7 countries
- **which policies** (regulations, obstacles, opportunities to enhance green care farming):
  - agricultural and rural policies
  - regional and cohesion policies (in some countries also social policies as far as related to inclusion)
  - educational policies (related to nature education)
  - health care policies as far as related to green care
- just adopt a **proper definition of Green Care** in Agriculture to safeguard that all respondents are using the same (MC!)
- here **systematic overview of policies** needed (sectoral and cross-cutting policies, actors, main institutions, organisations involved), e.g. systematic table with for each country 1 or 2 pages of explanatory text
- no final definitive overview possible, rather a starting point for further research
- **good framework for the inventory** to be circulated by **1 January 2007**,
- including reference to places where further information can be found (process owner: **Francesco**)
- deadline: first presentation at Vienna June 2007

### **Inventory of educational provision**

- **why** to provide dedicated education for Care Farmers, to be acknowledged as qualified Care Farm workers (Norway: 'teacher in use of nature'), or horticultural therapists etc.
- to provide training for health care workers in agricultural practice for Care Farming
- **make an inventory of courses** for staff engaged in Green Care farming over Europe
- **exchange experiences** (formal and non-formal), curricula of courses
- make a **list with predefined entries**, plus explanatory text of 1 or 2 pages per country
- process owner: **Bas to ask Wiebe Cool**

- circulate form by **1 January 2007**
- result to be presented Vienna June 2007

### **collect evidence**

(SoFar is collecting 4 pages for two cases per country and short description of 10 other cases; ready by February 2007) <http://sofar.unipi.it>

- **why**: to demonstrate the diversity in care farm initiatives across Europe and inspire ourselves and policy makers
- present **inspiring examples** of green care in a very appealing way; beautiful book publication; later eventually on public website
- adopt **criteria of SoFar**
- Process-owner (take care to include missing European countries; make a good budget plan): **Roberto**
- distribute form by January 1<sup>st</sup> 2007
- adopt the SoFar result as an example (**Francesco** to check with SoFar participants), with additional cases from missing countries in Vienna, June 2007
- **working title**: 100 ideas for development of green care

### **design process of change**

(SoFar is developing methodology)

- to present a high level high quality **policy document** policy makers
- bottlenecks, actors involved, ways to overcome gaps, integration of national and regional policies
- organize a **dedicated discussion group** on this topic in Vienna June 2007 (taking into consideration the results of SoFar sofar)
- process owner: **Thomas**
- Vienna

### **new research proposal**

- **Why**: self evident
- revise and resubmit the Farming for Health proposal as soon as there is an opportunity in FP7; or any other good project idea (e.g. under PEOPLE, or CULTURE)
- develop **joint project ideas** with especially WG2
- be open for **project ideas** from outside this COST action
- prepare an **overview of opportunities** for jointly developing project proposals
- Process owner: **Bas**
- to be presented in Vienna June 2007

At the end of the meeting Georg and Francesco are asked to present the main results of the wg3 during the MC.