AAL
PROGRAMME

FINAL
PROJECT REPORT

GtG - AAL-2018-5-117-SCP

Please send this report ELECTRONICALLY to the Central Management Unit (CMU) as well as a copy to the National Contact Persons (NCPs) of the coordinator and project partners

The coordinator of the project must submit this report within 60 calendar days after the final date of the project, on behalf of the consortium.

If you have any additional question,
please contact the AAL CMU at CMU@aal-europe.eu,
or your NCP (see details on www.aal-europe.eu/aal-ncp)

Report date	30/08/2019

PUBLISHABLE PROJECT INFORMATION (TO BE USED BY AALJP)

<table>
<tr><td colspan="2">1A. PROJECT</td></tr>
<tr><td>Project full title</td><td>A senior to senior model for boosting the collaborative economy and active aging</td></tr>
<tr><td>Project acronym</td><td>Gift to Gift (GtG)</td></tr>
<tr><td>Project No.</td><td><i>AAL-2018-5-117-SCP</i></td></tr>
<tr><td>Project Website</td><td>aal.civics.eu</td></tr>
<tr><td>Project duration</td><td>●   Starting date: <i>01/02/2019</i>
●   Termination date: <i>31/07/2019</i></td></tr>
<tr><td>Coordinator's name and details</td><td>Full name: Michael Holbech
E-mail address: michael@civics.eu
Telephone number: +45 30 600 814*

* Both e-mail address and tel. number must be provided.</td></tr>
</table>

1B. PROJECT PARTNERS

No.	Partner organisation name	Partner org. acronym	Type*	Project costs: Public grant in Euro	Project costs: Partner own contribution in euro	Total person-month spent
1 (coord.)	Civics ApS	Civics	SME	90.726	59.274	10
2	GezondheidFabriek	SGWIA	RTD	28.092	12.039	4,3
3	Stichting HierTV	Senior-Live	END	32.317	17.483	7,4
4	Hidepixel, Lda.	siosLIFE	SME	40.442	40.442	24
Please select one of these options: SMEs, Large, END USER, RTD, other						

2

Report date	30/08/2019

1C. PUBLISHABLE PROJECT RESULTS SUMMARY *(1 PAGE)*

As the population of elderly people in our society grows, so does the burden on our welfare system. At the same time, the group of elderly with skills and resources is also growing. We want to make this resource-pool available to the group of 'elderly in need'.

The Gift-to-Gift project has leveraged from this emerging 'two-generation retirement generation' and has co-created a novel collaborative economy initiative, which both assists and activates the elderly population living at home.

The initiative mimics the situations where a friend or neighbour does you a favour – but extends this function beyond friends and neighbours, as Gift-to-Gift gives elderly without a local support network the chance to receive help from other seniors. The activation of resources starts with the purchase of one of the GtG services, which has been co-created in the AAL project.

To make the platform economically sustainable, we build our business model on a novel business concept, a gift-card relaying model. We use the concept of passing on a baton in a relay race: In the end, the helping citizen gets a gift card in return, which can then be redeemed in a number of GtG partner shops. Thus, the helping senior gets a token of appreciation and at the same time we leverage the growing market for gift cards as a means to generate the revenue needed to run the service.

In most cases, we expect the payer of the GtG service to be an acquaintance of the elderly. However, the payer could also be the municipality occasionally offering the service to a group of elderly, or an organisation giving donations for a bulk of services.

In WP2 in the AAL project, the GtG concept has been tested and specific services have been co-created in 28 activities (workshops, pilots focus groups, app-tests and interviews) involving 72 elderly end-users and senior helpers. The creation was also informed by insights retrieved through 27 contacts (meetings and interviews) with officials/stakeholders/gatekeepers; i.e. professionals in elderly care, municipal officials, organizations a.o.).

As an illustration of a GtG service, one example is "Companionship to a local museum", where a group of resourceful seniors have signed up to the GtG platform to deliver this specific service to an elderly co-citizen. In WP3, we built ICT prototypes which illustrate the concept and its basic work-flow from the request of a service, it's delivery and settlement by transferring the token of appreciation. We have tested the prototypes in workshops in 3 geographical regions.

The core results of WPs 2 and 3 are the identification of specific activities, where, within the conditions of the model, the need of the senior users is met whilst, at the same time, the motivation(s) of the helping seniors are satisfied. In WP1 these activities have been further packaged into a set of specific GtG services and a commercialisation plan for the concept has been drafted. The next step toward market introduction is to test the GtG services in a commercial pilot and to complete the development of the ICT platform supporting the offering of GtG services and processes for signing up and engaging the corps of resourceful seniors.

3

| Report date | 30/08/2019 |

CONFIDENTIAL PART OF THE REPORT

2. DELIVERABLES SUBMITTED AND MILESTONES ACHIEVED DURING THE PROJECT

In this section, please provide details in case your project deviated from the Description of Work (work plan) with respect to delivery dates, achievement of milestones or changes in planned outputs; please indicate whether and to whom (AAL NFA/NCP) the changes have been communicated.

……

Has the project been finalised in line with the Description of Work?	YES x	NO ▢	PARTLY ▢
IN CASE OF DEVIATION, *PLEASE EXPLAIN:*			
Has the project achieved its expected results as described in the Description of Work?	YES x	NO ▢	PARTLY ▢
IN CASE OF DEVIATION, *PLEASE EXPLAIN:*			

3 A. PROJECT RESULTS - SCIENTIFIC/TECHNICAL PROJECT RESULTS

Provide a summary of the confidential results, including:

● The progress per work-package

● The performance of the project consortium (added value of cooperation, added value and performance of each partner etc.)

● Scientific/technical achievements during the course of the project
● End-user services developed during the course of the project
● Other confidential information

The work in the project has been organized in 3 work packages:

● WP1 was dedicated to the business aspect of the GtG service (and to the coordination of the project).
● WP2 was focused on the co-creation with Users and Helpers through workshops and pilots in Denmark, The Netherlands and Portugal.
● WP3 was dedicated to design and development of the critical parts of the ICT platform with feedback loops from WP2.

The core activities of the 3 WPs – particularly business development, co-creation of services and ICT prototyping - was interwoven in two 3-months co-creation sprints.

Report date	30/08/2019

While co-creation of the GtG-services were performed in all 3 counties, the natural focus in DK for Civics (GtG business owner) was toward business aspects, in NL for SeniorLive (non-profit end-user) and GezondheidFabriek (service innovation organization) was towards end-user needs and in PT the focus for siosLife (ICT company) was technology. This triad of both common and complementary foci brought added value to the consortium and was especially valuable in discussions in the initial "planning", halfway "consolidation" and final "evaluation" seminar.

In WP1, we started by laying out our framework for how to capture the results from the subsequent workshops in two specific well known models. Our main stakeholders - the different types of User and Helpers – was to be captured using personas and identified types of tasks to be described using value maps.

We carried some preparatory research and we gained further insight about volunteers, which we used when we engaged with possible Helpers - especially insights about how widespread loneliness is, which we will take into account when engaging with possible Users, but also with Helpers, and also how that may impact the quality of life of elderly.

Additionally, we further surveyed the available solutions, which aim at solving the same or similar problems as our model. Our preparations did not reveal anything which made us change our initial hypotheses on GtG's potential value propositions or its novelty.

Lastly, as a preparation for the co-creation (WP2), we used the preparatory research and the developed framework to map the (generalized) value propositions and generic personas. This work was documented in D1.1

In WP2 we aimed to fill in the value propositions and personas for the GtG User and Helper based on co-creation activities with elderly end users in PT, DK and NL. Each sprint had a design, testing and learning phase, the first and the latter coinciding with the project seminars. In the first sprint we carried out co-creation activities with a total of 41 elderly in 6 sessions (11 in PT, 14 in DK, 16 in NL). This resulted in a wealth of information and insights, including 'jobs', 'pains' and 'gains'. E.g. we identified a long list of potential GtG tasks of interest to elderly, to be divided into roughly four categories: handyman tasks, mind work, companionship and hobbies. And we learned a lot about elderly. Elderly like to help (each other) as much as they can, but don't wish to be perceived as someone who needs help. The results of an ICT questionnaire taught us that not all elderly (know how to) use smartphones and computers. For this reason we decided to not involve the (oldest elderly) GtG User in any online interaction on the GtG platform.

For sprint 2 we thus developed (WP3) and tested a GtG Helper only app with end users. This provided further insights in the GtG Helper and the service design: keep it simple. The app successfully matched Helpers with tasks and their associated Users/Givers.

Though not part of the co-creation sessions, we did some additional, small (online, Facebook, interviews) studies into the GtG Giver and potential partners, as we realised the importance of these roles. Here we found, for instance, that potential Givers are enthusiastic about the GtG service and prepared (70% of 30 respondents) to pay up to €50.

All in all we established an interest in the GtG service, with many recommendations on the future design as well as 'framing' of the service related to e.g. Helper/ User/ Giver recruitment, ICT literacy, trust, security, privacy, partners and channels. The main results of the co-creation can be found in D2.1 and D2.2.

| **Report date** | 30/08/2019 |

In WP3, we initially worked on the ICT architecture for the GtG services (described in D3.1) and subsequently delivered the ICT prototypes, following a localization process where the local variants of the GtG Services were included, and the user interfaces implemented in 3 languages. Subsequently, updates were delivered throughout the second sprint in WP2 as results of the co-creation process. At the final evaluation meeting recommendations were discussed as reported in D3.1 for future updates of the GtG app and platform.

3 B. PROJECT RESULTS – BUSINESS MODELS & INDICATORS

In WP1, we described generic personas and value map for the GtG Services, and these were further researched and co-created in WP2. Towards the end of the project, the GtG co-creation results were further 'productized' into specific services, in order to resemble sellable products as much as possible for subsequent testing in a planned commercial pilot. Further on in WP1, we worked on complementing business aspects surrounding the services. Here we have used the business canvas model to structure our findings in the project.

As for the business model, the revenue flow and the economical fuelling of the GtG business model starts with a GtG Giver purchasing a GtG Service. Then the relay and profit model work as follows:

- The GtG Helper is offered a Voucher of the same face value as the GtG Service purchased. The GtG Voucher will be redeemable for offerings of the same face value by our GtG partners, who will be a combination of local stores, retail chains and larger brands.
- Following the open loop gift card business model, the profit in the GtG profit model will follow from the discounts we get from our partners. Typical discounts from the supplier of the gift cards range at 15-30%.

We have detailed the GtG business model and based on this developed forecasts and potential scale-up scenarios, which show how a possible sustainable roll-out could be achieved under certain assumptions and prerequisites. Similarly, we show how further expansions can return the further investments needed to launch the service. As for our next step for the GtG services, we have developed a rough plan for a commercial pilot.

Finally, we investigated further future perspectives for the model. We have identified a new ICT approach, which has the potential to strengthen the GtG value propositions even further. Moreover, we have investigated opportunities in extending the model from seniors-to-seniors to citizens-to-citizens

The results of the business strategy development can be found in deliverable D1.2

Please answer the questions below, if possible:	
What is the **targeted range of manufacturing/service costs** per product/service unit (€, € per month etc.)?	€25-€100

6

Report date	30/08/2019

What is the **estimated size of the targeted market** in Europe for your product/service (in €)?	> €100M

In your business model, **who will pay** for the product/service (you can tick more than one box):

☐ End user (older person)   X Informal carers   ☐ Formal care providers   ☐ Public subsidies

☐ Insurance   ☐ Other (add if necessary)   ☐ not yet decided

In your business model, **who will take the decision about purchase** of the product/service (you can tick more than one box):

☐ End user (older person)   X Informal carers/family   ☐ Formal care providers   ☐ Public subsidies

☐ Insurance   ☐ Other (add if necessary)   ☐ not yet decided

At what **stage of development** are you with your product/service (e.g. research, pilot, real life trial etc.)?	research
When will your product/service be **ready for market**?	**12 month**
What type of **further research/development** is necessary to finalize the product (technical, adoption, market research etc.)?	MVP development
What **further investments** are necessary to launch product on the market?	€0,5M

---

3 C. PROJECT RESULTS – END USER INDICATORS

In the section below, please provide the information you have gathered during your project on primary, secondary and tertiary end-users[1] **of your product/service.** Note that secondary end-users can be formal and informal carers (see footnote). For the indicators cited below, please provide information if available; any other qualitative or quantitative information on beneficiaries can be provided instead.

---

[1] *Definition of end-users in AAL Joint Programme:*

● *Primary end-user is the person who is actually using an AAL product or service, a single individual, "the well-being person". This group directly benefits from AAL by increased quality of life.*

● *Secondary end-users are persons or organisations directly being in contact with a primary end-user, such as formal and informal care persons, family members, friends, neighbours, care organisations and their representatives. This group benefits from AAL directly when using AAL products and services (at a primary end-user's home or remote) and indirectly when the care needs of primary end-users are reduced.*

● *Tertiary end-users are such institutions and private or public organisations that are not directly in contact with AAL products and services, but who somehow contribute in organizing, paying or enabling them. This group includes the public sector service organizers, social security systems, insurance companies. Common to these is that their benefit from AAL comes from increased efficiency and effectiveness which result in saving expenses or by not having to increase expenses in the mid and long term.*

Report date	30/08/2019

This 6 month project focused primarily on primary end users as the potential Users and Helpers of the GtG service. Following project plan we recruited end users in rural Vig, Denmark (DK), urban Almere, The Netherlands (NL) and urban Braga, Portugal (PT), to take part in WP2 Co-creation:

- 6 co-creation workshops in the first sprint with in total 41 participants (12 Male/ 29 Female) between 59 and 91 years old (11 end users in PT (average age 71 yrs, 3M/8F) , 14 in DK (72,5 yrs, 4M/ 10F), 16 in NL (75 yrs, 5M/11F)
- 3 end to end GtG User-Helper pilots with 5 participants (elderly Users and senior Helpers)
- 14 workshops or app test events with 18 participants (senior Helpers) in second sprint

In addition we carried out studies to gain further insights in our primary end users, as well as the secondary end users, the GtG Giver and potential partners and channels, as part of the overall project objective:
- 2 focus groups with 6 participants (elderly end-users and senior helpers)
- 8 interviews with 8 participants (elderly end-users and senior helpers)
- 3 local events (GF i Vig Familieby, Tarteletaften, Torsdagstræf i Vig Kirke) with +150 participants (elderly end-users and senior helpers)
- 8 meetings with local stakeholders and organisations (including the elderly council in Odsherred, DanAge's 'Helping hand', the 2 local priests in Vig and Egebjerg, Vig Community, Vig association of commerce, local politicians, a o)
- 6 meetings with organisations under Odsherred Municipality (rep. for eldercare, elderly homes, preventive health care, a o)
- contact with 12 potential GtG partners (DGI, ODA, COOP i Vig, 60+, REMA, Del din Passion, VMCA, De Schoor, Woonzorg Flevoland, Gouden Dagen, Municipality of Almere, Zonnebloem o.a.)
- 1 online survey into GtG service (via Senior-Live NL) with 30 respondents
- 1 online probe into framings (DK) with a total of 615 interactions with the campaign (likes etc.)

From the wealth of information gathered on the various users of the foreseen GtG service, we drew the following (major) conclusions as reported in D2.1 and D2.2.

On primary end users, the potential GtG Users and GtG Helpers
We considered several aspects in the light of the GtG service:
- Family situation – presence of partner, kids?
- Local network – neighbours, friends, other family members?
- Work situation – still working, volunteering or retired?
- Geographical situation – urban or rural setting, distance to services?
- Health and care situation – vital or vulnerable older adults?

On GtG User
- Typical User is living alone (or has a vulnerable partner at home) and is often an older elderly, no longer able to perform certain tasks or join certain activities. Older elderly often have a smaller local network than younger elderly.
- (Almost) nobody wants to be a User (importance of GtG Giver to reach User, right framing needed)

| **Report date** | 30/08/2019 |

- However, in the actual experience (i.e. visiting a museum) we had a very happy User (importance of experiencing GtG benefits)!
- Users are not typically used to using technology/ ICT (refrain from online interaction)
- Helpers can very well be Users and vice versa (they may well share similar gains and pains)

On GtG Helper
- Most respondents like to see themselves as 'Helpers'.
- A Helper can be single or in a relationship.
- Helper typically does not wish to receive anything (tangible) in return - apart from recognition (competition with volunteering, reason to not promote 'earning GtG points', look for partner as it is a challenge to recruit GtG Helpers)
- Helper can be very technology savvy, but can also be not used to using technology at all (need for helpdesk, tutorial, simple app)

One thing our research seems to have failed, is testing whether certain types of helpers could be attracted through GtG points. We think our recruitment through existing volunteer networks (in Denmark and The Netherlands) might have skewed the response /respondents.

On secondary end users, the GtG Giver and partner organisations
Though not the focus of the project, we did some extra studies into the interest in the market in (helping) 'buying/ giving' a GtG gift card as a present to an older GtG User.

On GtG Giver (based on FB campaigns in NL and DK)
- Respondents liked the GtG concept (we got a good amount of likes and interactions) and would make use of it
- 75% of the respondents were prepared to pay for a GtG gift card with 23% willing to pay an amount between € 25 and € 50.
- Givers were responding better on a campaign framing the service as a way to "make someone happy" as compared to "help someone without lifting a finger"

The co-creation activities have helped us to both determine that the GtG service idea is worthwhile pursuing further and to design it in line with end users needs.
We can think of involving various partners as the role of GtG Giver can be taken on by different entities depending on the 'gift' e.g. social/practical help can also come from charitable organisations, municipalities, retirement homes, or foundations sponsoring gift cards for more vulnerable citizens, etc.

9

| **Report date** | 30/08/2019 |

3 D. PROJECT RESULTS – OTHER INDICATORS	
Patents, which are the direct result of the project work	N/A
Contribution to **standards**, which are the direct result from the project work	N/A
Publications (scientific or other), which are the direct result from the project work (please provide details)	N/A
Other **dissemination activities**	See 3.C
Type and size of audience reached by dissemination activities	See 3.C

4. FINANCIAL INFORMATION - OTHER COMMENTS
Please check appropriate box: *The financial part of the project* **X** *is in line with (or)* ☐ *deviates from the partner's Grant Agreements & Work Packages plans* (personal efforts, other costs, etc.)**?**   *In case of deviation, please give a short explanation:*   ……
Other comments related to financial part of the project: ……

5. AAL JP PROGRAMME

10

Report date	30/08/2019

Please comment, using your AAL project experience, on the main advantages and disadvantages of AALJP projects.

6. UPDATED PROJECT PARTNERS' CONTACT DETAILS[2]

No.	Partner organisation name	Contact person		Email address	Telephone number
		Name	Last name		
1 (coord.)	Civics ApS	Michael	Holbech	michael@civics.eu	+45 30 600 814
2	GezondheidFabriek	Sandra	Migchielsen	sandra@gezondheidfabriek.nl	+31 06 29199794
3	Stichting HierTV	Gijs	Roelofsen	gijs@senior-live.nl	+31 06 18115626
4	Hidepixel, Lda.	Fabio	Macedo	fabiomacedo@sioslife.com	+351 917 432 201

---

[2] Please insert here, for every partner organization participating in your consortium, the updated email address and telephone number of the main contact person. These persons might be contacted after the closure of the project for statistical enquiries related to impact assessment.

Report date	30/08/2019