INTERGENERATIONAL FAIRNESS TOOLKIT

DESIGNING POLICIES AND PRACTICES FOR CURRENT AND FUTURE GENERATIONS
The California 100 Initiative envisions a future that is innovative, sustainable, and equitable for all. Our mission is to strengthen California’s ability to collectively solve problems and shape our long-term future over the next 100 years.

California 100 is organized around 15 policy domains and driven by interrelated stages of work: research, policy innovation and engagement with Californians. California 100’s work is guided by an expert and intergenerational Commission. Through various projects and activities, California 100 seeks to move California towards an aspirational vision—changing policies and practices, attitudes and mindsets, to inspire a more vibrant future. california100.org

School of International Futures (SOIF) is a global non-profit collective of practitioners in strategy and policy for current and future generations. Our vision is a better, fairer and more sustainable world for current and future generations. We achieve this by empowering people to use participatory futures and foresight to drive societal transformation through their organizations, communities and countries.

SOIF’s Intergenerational Fairness Observatory helps decision-makers to act in ways that are more intergenerationally fair within communities, countries, regions and across global systems. Activities include driving awareness of intergenerational issues, building coalitions for change, and development of the Intergenerational Fairness Framework and policy assessment methodology. soif.org.uk
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The need for intergenerational dialogue and intergenerational commitment is now more important than ever. In a very short space of time—less than a century—we have gone from having 2.5 generations alive to 4 or more. It will be increasingly important for our governing institutions and communities to more explicitly consider the interests of current and future generations, and the multi-generational impacts of our current-day decisions.

On various matters—ranging from government debt and public pensions, to climate change and environmental stewardship, to the future of work and of homeownership—it is essential for people of various generations to come together and to engage in deep, meaningful, and consequential conversations that can chart a better future for people and the planet alike.

At California 100 and SOIF, we have had the privilege of taking intergenerational dialogue and intergenerational fairness to deeper levels. California 100 drew on the talent and expertise of an intergenerational commission, with half of the Commissioners below age 35, coming together and producing visions and strategies to guide the state’s long-term success in over a dozen issue areas.

Building solidarity between people of different generations alive now and in the future is at the heart of SOIF’s work. We weave intergenerational coalitions for change to connect expertise, energy, experience so that regardless of age, we can all be good ancestors. As part of this endeavour, SOIF has been supporting new cohorts of futurists, including especially those working in the global South, through its Next Generation Foresight Practitioners (NGFP) program. The NGFP has helped to strengthen connections across countries, and has provided important venues for inspiration and support for new leaders as they seek to enact change within their societies.

SOIF has also advanced the theory and practice of intergenerational fairness through public policy, working with various governments around the world to convene community dialogues, to develop intergenerational assessments, and to commit to embedding the intergenerational fairness framework into multiple institutions within government and society.

We are pleased to advance the work of intergenerational fairness by introducing it to the North American context through this toolkit and through the work of California 100. We are also excited about the prospect of adapting and integrating the work of intergenerational fairness with important policy discussions in California and elsewhere surrounding historical justice and reparations.

The prospects for advancing the science, art, and practice of intergenerational fairness look very promising. The United Nations is organizing a Summit For the Future in September 2024, where member states have committed to adopting a Pact for the Future “to cement collective agreements and to showcase global solidarity for current and future generations.” As we note in this toolkit, many countries have already established ministries of the future with intergenerational fairness as an important priority. We hope that many governments, community organizations, and corporations will do the same in California and the rest of North America.

There is a lot of exciting and important work ahead. We are honored to be on this journey with you.
This toolkit is designed as a primer and introduction to intergenerational fairness and how it can be applied to create better decisions.

It builds on a multi-year collaboration between the Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation and the School of International Futures to define a framework for the systematic evaluation of public policies according to what is fair and unfair for all generations.

This framework seeks to generate constructive dialogues around intergenerational fairness. We hope to inspire leaders to stress-test that their plans work for all generations: in order to avoid mortgaging our children’s future and in order to harness the wisdom and legacy of elders in our communities. We aim to make it easy for communities to hold decision-makers accountable for the long-term consequences of their plans. And we seek to inspire collaborative exchanges where human creativity and energy can address problems of temporal distributional problems before they balloon, and perhaps even before they arise.

This assessment framework is only one part of the solution. Other supporting reforms and changes are needed—from ensuring data availability, to building new institutions and rights for the long-term, to curricular reform that supports civic education and awareness about the future as well as our past.

We hope that you will enjoy exploring the topic and framework, and that this toolkit can act as a catalyst to drive long-term change.
Intergenerational thinking and planning are not new. These concepts and practices have been critical to the governance of Native and indigenous societies for centuries, and have gained currency and frequency in more recent decades among Western thinkers and practitioners alike.

More recently, American economist James Tobin put forward a theory of intergenerational justice in 1974.² The Brundtland Report, ‘Our Common Future’, some thirteen years later, made the needs of future generations core to the sustainable development debate.³ But there have been discernible shifts in the debate over the past 15 years. Intergenerational fairness is increasingly discussed not just as part of sustainable development and planetary boundaries, but also as an issue in its own right.

Today, intergenerational fairness is also about navigating a wide range of complex societal challenges, many of which require decisions to be made today that will affect both current and future generations, with significant distributional costs and benefits. For example:

- Multi-generational debts are being incurred as governments make big investments in physical and social infrastructure in the aftermath of the COVID-19 pandemic. How do intergenerational benefits compare to the costs being incurred, and can we find ways to better align the two?

- Existing environmental policy commitments and visions (including the EU Green Deal⁴ and COP28 targets)⁵ are faltering in the implementation phase. They suffer from a lack of specificity and are under attack by populists from around the world. How can institutions build intergenerational consensus and support for policies enabling environmental transitions?

Intergenerational fairness is also about fair and sustainable pensions, as many worry that such systems may disappear for younger and future generations. It is about student debt and the inaccessibility of homeownership for young families. And it is about the gig economy and threats from artificial intelligence that disparately affect workers of different generations.

**WHY CARE ABOUT FUTURE GENERATIONS**

When considering fairness for future generations, the most obvious and basic question is: why would anyone care? Especially when we are struggling to navigate today’s pressures. What do we owe to future generations?

Krushil Watene, a philosophy professor at Massey University in Aotearoa New Zealand and a member of various Māori tribal communities, wrote a paper for the United Nations Environmental Programme entitled “Indigenous Philosophy and Intergenerational Justice” that focuses on empowering local communities, rethinking responsibilities, and enabling innovation.⁶

As Roman Krznaric notes,⁷ “We are in the midst of a historic political shift. It is clear that a movement for the rights and interests of future generations is beginning to emerge on a global scale.” As author of *The Good Ancestor*, he shows that all human lives are...
far outweighed by all those yet to come. This calculation has been done by looking 50,000 years into the past and 50,000 into the future and assuming that the twenty-first century’s birth rate remains constant.

Being a good ancestor means ensuring that our decisions in the present are informed by long-term thinking and aligned with the needs and values of our descendants who own the future. Judicial and policy developments globally demonstrate a growing precedence in protecting the rights of future communities.

EXAMPLES OF INTERGENERATIONAL FAIRNESS IN PRACTICE

Intergenerational fairness is emerging as a defining theme of our time. Although most leaders and the general public value fairness, society does not yet have a systematic way to assess the impacts of current policies and practices on future generations.

We are seeing increased demands for fairness from people and communities—the debate has become more vocal. For example, we have become accustomed to seeing thousands of youth protesters demanding climate action, as exemplified by Greta Thunberg and Extinction Rebellion. We are also seeing increased action through legislatures and courts. In August 2023, a district court in Montana ruled in favor of 16 youth plaintiffs who maintained that recent state laws violated Article IX of the state constitution which reads, in part, that “the state and each person shall maintain and improve a clean and healthful environment in Montana for present and future generations.”

There is growing demand for intergenerational assessments as a means to adequately plan for futures that are sustainable and equitable. Across the world, leaders are taking responsibility as stewards of future generations more seriously. We are seeing movements at varying levels, including:

At an intergovernmental level: The United Nations Secretary General announced a focus on future generations and fairness in Our Common Agenda with four commitments that include:

- A global envoy for future generations
- Better use of foresight, science and data
- A declaration to define and make concrete our duties of future generations, and
- A dedicated intergovernmental forum to advance implementation of the declaration and share best practices.

The United Nations ambitions include establishing a Special Envoy for Future Generations. Together with its member states, the UN is developing innovations leading up to its Summit of the Future in September 2024, which it bills as a “once-in-a-generation opportunity” that aims to “mend eroded trust and demonstrate that international cooperation can effectively tackle current challenges as well as those that have emerged in recent years or may yet be over the horizon.”

INTERGENERATIONAL FAIRNESS AS A LENS ON REPARATIONS AND HISTORICAL JUSTICE

The definition and approach that we use in the Framework for Assessing Intergenerational Fairness (set out in Section 2) focuses on two key principles: allowing people of all ages to meet their needs; and helping meet the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs. It is focused on navigating decisions being made today for current and future generations. It does not explicitly factor in historical injustices, but the framework can be adapted to include such considerations.

Communities and countries will have different approaches to reparations for historical injustices. At a global level, the Bridgetown Initiative is seeking climate reparations to support countries facing debt distress and liquidity challenges. At a national level, New Zealand established a settlement system in 1975 to allow Māori and other indigenous populations to seek reparations. At a regional level, the 2022 California Reparations Taskforce proposed reparations for the “ongoing and compounding harms experienced by African Americans as a result of slavery.” The recommendations include a formal apology and admission of wrongdoing for a variety of policies and practices, as well as cash transfers and the creation of a new state agency to serve the descendants of enslaved people.
In Europe, the EU President Ursula von der Leyen, in her 2022 State of the Union address said: “A simple principle should inspire every action that our (European) Union takes. That we should do no harm to our children’s future.” The European Commission under the leadership of Maroš Šefčovic has also convened 27 Ministers for the Future from across Europe.

At a national level: The Wellbeing of Future Generations Act in Wales requires public bodies in Wales to think about the long-term impact of their decisions. Wales now has its second Future Generations Commissioner who is required to monitor and assess the extent to which well-being objectives set by public bodies are being met. Other countries are talking about similar appointments.

The German Constitutional Court declared in 2022 that current climate protection measures were insufficient and revised its targets to become greenhouse gas neutral by 2045 rather than 2050 – and effectively established a duty on current German actors to ensure they don’t limit the freedoms of future generations.

Portuguese President Marcelo Rebelo de Sousa has made a public statement championing intergenerational solidarity. SOIF has developed an intergenerational fairness assessment for the Portuguese government and civil society.

The Premier of Cayman Islands has announced an ambition to ensure that all policy is for the benefit of current and future generations of Caymanians, committing to a future national dialogue.

The Australian Government produces intergenerational reports which project outlooks for the economy and budget over 40 years. The reports explore long-term sustainability of policies in the light of changing trends.

Finland’s latest Government Report on the Future (Jan 2023) set out measures to ensure that they can “secure opportunities of future generations to lead socially, economically and environmentally sustainable lives.”

In New Zealand the Wellbeing Budget has put a focus on ensuring people’s well-being and the environment are at the center of policy-making. It takes advantage of Well-being Economics principles with a core focus on “outcomes that meet the needs of present generations at the same time as thinking about the long-term impacts for future generations,” while meeting the needs of all people including Māori and Pacific Islanders.

In civil society and private sector: In 2012, The Sustainable Democracy Centre (SDC) a small NGO in Lebanon became the first NGO to establish a Child and Youth Board. Today, we are seeing a growth in the number of Youth Councils, boards and other governance structures that seek to give young voices representation and voice through formal governance.

Meanwhile organizations such as CoGenerate in the United States and Generations Working Together in Scotland are seeking new ways to bridge intergenerational divides, connecting across generations to solve problems and create better futures.

In the private sector, there is a growing trend for new mechanisms of scrutiny, compliance, assessment and monitoring government and business decisions for sustainability and longer-term impacts. These include innovations around ESG reporting for businesses or BRE mechanisms for governments. How can an explicitly intergenerational and future generations lens contribute to the effectiveness of these measures?

The 2022 CEO Purpose Report, published by Brandpie, surveyed 1,000 CEOs across seven markets. They found that a quarter of CEOs identify future generations as key stakeholders for creating and capturing value in the long run.

Other companies are reflecting the views of future generations through their governance structure. Riversimple – producers of sustainable cars – have developed a Future Guardian model of governance. “The seventh generation principle has been central to our thinking...The six custodians governance structure ensures a collaborative and healthy balance between short and long term interests.”
INTERGENERATIONAL FAIRNESS IN POLICY-MAKING

WHAT GETS MEASURED, GETS MANAGED.
- PETER DRUCKER

There is strong societal support for increased intergenerational fairness. Despite this interest, leaders often describe needing further incentives to build intergenerational fairness into their decision-making in the face of short-term pressures. After all, there is no constituency for the unborn, people too young to vote, or people otherwise excluded from the existing system.

Additionally, leaders often report a lack of information on the long-term impacts of specific policies and decisions. There is also a lack of data about intergenerational decisions—it can be hard to measure the impact of decisions and how they might play out over time, especially in highly complex environments. Values are also central to decision-making — how do we navigate various desires and needs, especially when we are speaking for unborn generations?

To overcome these barriers, there is a need for approaches that will incentivize long-term thinking, to provide an understanding of how the future may evolve and what different communities might want from their future, and to ensure that fairness can be measured over time—providing accountability and transparency.

Our Intergenerational Policy Assessment Tool set out in the next chapter builds on the principles of Well-being Economics, however this is not the only approach that can be used to make intergenerational decisions. We examined many tools, frameworks and indices when designing the content for the policy assessment tool, including:

- **Cost-benefit analysis** Standard economics frameworks recommend the use of cost-benefit analysis as a guide to policy making. It does not simply provide a list of costs and benefits of different policy options, but also offers a means of comparing them and arriving at conclusions about whether total costs exceed total benefits or vice-versa. Too often, however, these models use discounting formulas that are heavily weighted to the present, biasing decision-making away from the needs of future generations.

- **Doughnut economics** Doughnut economics combines the natural science analysis of ecological ‘planetary boundaries’ provided by Johan Rockström and colleagues with a set of social indicators based on the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals.

---

**Figure: The Doughnut of social and planetary boundaries.** The Doughnut consists of a social foundation, to ensure that no one is left falling short on life's essentials, and an ecological ceiling, to ensure that humanity does not collectively overshoot the planetary boundaries that protect Earth's life-supporting systems. Image adapted from Doughnut Economics Action Lab.
• Generational accounting\(^{32}\) is a method used in fiscal policy analysis to assess the long-term sustainability of current fiscal policies by evaluating their impact on different generations. It involves calculating the present value of the net taxes and benefits that each generation is expected to receive over its lifetime, taking into account factors such as projected demographic changes and economic growth.

• Natural capital accounting\(^{33}\), which applies cost-benefit analysis to the natural world, estimating the current value of natural wealth and what it could provide for future generations.

• Sustainable development goals\(^{34}\) The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development acknowledges the needs of future generations (with UN commitments to future generations going back to 1961). The 17 SDGs provide a vision and commitments to creating a better future while tackling needs of today. Intriguingly in Japan, in recent times, the SDGs have also become a mobilizing force across society.

• Targeted universalism\(^{35}\) is a policy approach that aims to achieve universal goals by focusing specifically on the needs and barriers faced by marginalized or disadvantaged groups in order to get to universality. This approach aims to reduce disparities and ensure that everyone can benefit from public policies, ultimately promoting greater equity and social inclusion.

• Well-being economics\(^{36}\) is an approach to economic policy that prioritizes the well-being and quality of life of individuals and communities, rather than focusing solely on traditional measures of economic success such as GDP growth. This approach seeks to create a more holistic understanding of prosperity that includes factors such as health, education, social relationships, and environmental quality.

PUTTING PEOPLE AND COMMUNITIES AT THE CENTER OF INTERNATIONAL FAIRNESS
The tools and frameworks above provide a useful starting point for thinking about what matters and how to measure the impact of intergenerational fairness over time. However they do not factor in what individuals or communities actually want for the future and for future generations.

The Intergenerational Fairness (IGF) framework supports community engagement in two key ways: supporting assessment through participatory engagement to ensure that policies are designed to meet the needs of different communities over time; and grounding the work through intergenerational dialogue.

THE FUTURE IS INHERENTLY COMPLEX AND UNKNOWABLE
The IGF framework builds on the principles of strategic foresight—providing an understanding of what might change and the ability to explore policy decisions and their intergenerational impacts under alternative futures. For more on strategic foresight see the California 100 Strategic Foresight Toolkit for Decision-makers.\(^{37}\)

Embracing foresight as a principle of design helps to ensure that any decisions are applying systemic assessment principles such as systems mapping and understanding, and exploring the impacts and tradeoffs across different generations, age groups or other sub-populations in different scenarios.

INNOVATIVE APPROACHES TO NAVIGATING INTERGENERATIONAL DILEMMAS
SOIF’s Intergenerational Fairness (IGF) Hub is a community of practice and impact collective that brings together individuals and organizations who are committed to creating a just and sustainable future for present and future generations. As part of the Next Generation Foresight Practitioner (NGFP) network,\(^{38}\) the aim of the hub is to foster intergenerational equity and fairness in decision-making by providing a collaborative space where members can explore, learn, share knowledge and collaborate around IGF. It is a place for youth futures practice, stories and community - working together to collaborate with others in the field as well.

Adam Sharpe and Siddhi Patil—two of the NGFP fellows in the hub—have developed a novel participatory People Power game\(^{39}\) designed to help people navigate, anticipate and explore future challenges around demographics. In just 3 hours—participants learn about the megatrends of population decline and aging, experience the playful exploration of wide-ranging perspectives, anticipate future challenges and opportunities, and mobilize for action with an eye towards intergenerational fairness. Find out more about People Power and the IGF Hub.
THE IGF FRAMEWORK: PUTTING THEORY INTO PRACTICE
A FRAMEWORK FOR ASSESSING INTERGENERATIONAL FAIRNESS

WHY AN IGF FRAMEWORK?

There are common human desires that span cultures and generations—health, meaningful work, security, community, freedom and opportunity, in a flourishing natural environment. We want our governments to work towards these goals over the long term, but the information is not always available to enable governments to make decisions that are fair to both current and future populations. Furthermore, incentives for policy-makers are often skewed to the short-term with few mechanisms for driving behavior for the long-term good.

The Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation commissioned SOIF to develop a framework for intergenerational fairness. The framework closes the information gap highlighted by politicians by providing a mechanism to answer the question of whether any specific policy is fair to all generations. It also creates a constituency for generations who aren’t yet represented in the democratic system by providing a mechanism for advocating for them.

The question underlying the framework is simple yet deep. How do we give future generations—and other under-represented people the opportunity to identify the long-term consequences of today’s policy decisions?

This assessment framework is clearly only one part of the solution, but we hope it can act as a catalyst to drive long-overdue change. Other reforms needed include ensuring availability of data that can shed light on long-term consequences, building new institutions with a mandate to focus on the long-term, and establishing rights for unborn generations.

The framework may be used in very different scenarios to understand how intergenerationally fair a policy is, or is likely to be, including by:

- Leaders creating legislative agendas, and parties and campaigns creating policy platforms,
- Civil servants formulating better policy practices,
- External and internal evaluators assessing policy design or assessing results,
- Citizens and interest groups concerned about the potential or actual impacts of policies, and
- News organizations reporting about policies.

INTRODUCING THE THREE ELEMENTS

The framework consists of three inter-linked elements: A policy assessment toolkit, anchored by community dialogue and institutional stewardship.

- The Policy Assessment Tool applies the latest best practice to provide useful clarity on the impact of a specific policy on intergenerational fairness.
- Intergenerational Dialogue collectively considers a community’s or society’s vision for the future. The output informs the assessment criteria for the toolkit to ensure that deciding what is fair is not a technocratic judgment call to be made by politicians and experts.
- Institutional Stewardship provides legitimacy within the political system and accountability to the community, and ensures that the work towards intergenerational fairness maintains momentum.

All three elements must work together in order to effectively create change.
The resulting Framework for Intergenerational Fairness provides a mechanism both to systematically assess the impact we’re having on future generations, and to advocate for those generations. It is applicable to any local, national, or international context. It can be applied by governments, civil society, media, investment communities and interest groups.

While the framework can’t solve the problem of intergenerational fairness, it can expose unfairness where it exists. It can also provide clarity on potential unintended consequences and complex tradeoffs by highlighting who is paying and who is benefiting—allowing advocacy for mitigations where hard choices need to be made.

A DEFINITION OF INTERGENERATIONAL FAIRNESS

To decide whether a decision, strategy or policy is intergenerationally fair, we need to know what we mean by fair.

We use a simple definition of intergenerational fairness that builds on the work of the Brundtland Commission Report on Sustainable Development (1987)42. Policies that are fair from an intergenerational standpoint if they:

- Allow people of all ages to meet their needs
- Meet the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs.”

This is a simple definition, but it is not simplistic. It encapsulates an intuitive understanding of fairness, steeped in principles of solidarity, responsibility, care and transparency.

It is broad enough to encompass intersectionalities of fairness such as equality of gender, race, socioeconomic status, or sexuality. Whilst being precise enough to be meaningfully auditable and assessable.

Building on the widely accepted definition of sustainability from Brundtland brings international recognition and legitimacy to the terms.

Underneath this definition, there are many different ways in which a decision can be intergenerationally unfair. The relative importance of the different components of IGF may differ by context.

THREE KEY ELEMENTS

| Figure: The three elements of the IGF Framework |
What’s critical in the conversation about IGF is that we are able to get clear on which aspects of fairness we’re talking about at any given time.

Based on our definition, a policy is unfair when it:

- Disadvantages people at any particular life stage;
- Disadvantages people at any period in time, present or future;
- Increases the chances of inequality being passed on through time;
- Restricts the choices of people in the future; or
- Moves society further away from its vision for the future.

**THEORY OF CHANGE**

Change can be effected from three key leverage points within a system or organization to increase intergenerational fairness:

**Inside the system or organization**: where manifestos and visions are forged; agendas and strategic goals set; and legislation or projects proposed, debated, implemented and assessed;

**Outside the system or organization**, using public debate, media, civil society and industry; and

**Within wider networks of systems or organizations**: e.g. internationally, through global standards and agreements (for example, EU and OECD).

In the context of a political system (see figure X), politicians and civil servants can and will be welcome allies in this process, however change may not originate within the political system. Interest amongst citizens, media and public debate, or external requirements that originate at a supra or intra-governmental level can exert pressure on the political system.

**Figure**: In any political system there are three key pressure points for increased intergenerational fairness: inside the political system, where manifestos are forged, agendas set, and legislation proposed, debated, implemented and assessed (1); outside, from public debate, media, civil society and industry (2); and internationally, through global standards and agreements (3, for example, from EU and OECD).
However the framework is applied, people, communities and civil society need to be deeply involved in establishing the framework—in particular through the National Dialogue. Interested citizens must also be informed of assessment conclusions and mobilized to influence the political system. The policy assessment tool can also be adapted to be applied by informed citizens themselves.

Once the political system is taking sufficient notice of concepts of intergenerational fairness, there are three key influence points within the political system:

1. Better regulation and support of the policy design process—providing policy teams the tools they need to identity and mitigate for long-term consequences from the early stages of policy design;

2. Bringing intergenerational fairness squarely into parliament and public scrutiny processes as proposed legislation is debated; and

3. Monitoring and evaluation of the emerging long term consequences of existing policies once in place, including by national audit bodies and other watchdogs.

**GETTING STARTED**

All three elements of the framework are essential for an effective and sustainable approach to intergenerational fairness, but they can’t be implemented at the same pace.

A policy assessment can be organized rapidly and takes hours or days to complete;

Planning and executing an Intergenerational Dialogue in a community can span weeks, months or years; and

Stable and embedded institutional stewardship may take years to formally establish and will continue to evolve over decades.

Right now The policy assessment tool is available under a creative commons license from SOIF and Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation.

It can be used as-is, or adapted to your specific needs. The toolkit includes the tool itself and a pragmatic How To Guide to support rapid deployment.

Find out more The IGF Specialist Report provides a blueprint for the Community Dialogue and Institutional Stewardship, including informal and transitional arrangements.
EXAMPLES OF HOW THE TOOLKIT HAS BEEN USED AND ADAPTED

Piloting the intergenerational fairness assessment tool in Portugal

Pilots of the original intergenerational assessment tool in Portugal helped to refine the parameters and the process. The Court of Auditors saw the value that an intergenerational fairness lens brought to their risk assessments, and expressed interest in including a question about intergenerational fairness in their check list templates. On applying the tool using quantitative data, an established policy that changed future pension provisions was found to be more fair than the team had expected, even as the assessment found one group of people who were disadvantaged above others.

Social Mobility Commission, UK

SOIF adapted the intergenerational fairness framework to create a policy assessment tool that identifies the impact of a specific policy on social mobility in the UK. A goal of increasing social mobility is closely related to a wider goal of intergenerational fairness. A key finding from the pilots held with policy teams across the UK government was the structure provided to flag potential negative unintended consequences. We found that policy team members found it easy to identify such consequences, but due to their intangible nature, had not always felt comfortable raising them.

Future Check: All Party Parliamentary Group (APPG) for Future Generations, UK

The APPG for Future Generations’ goal is to raise awareness of long-term issues and create space for considering the long-term in UK policy-making. Intergenerational fairness provides a vital lens for considering what is desirable over the long-term.

The policy assessment tool was adapted as Future Check45 in collaboration with the APPG for use by groups of interested civilians to complete a simplified assessment process. A short report is created that flags any long-term issues identified with the policy. The APPG’s position in the UK government means that those reports can be sent directly to MPs and members of the House of Lords. They include suggested questions that can be raised to bring issues of intergenerational fairness into the debate on proposed legislation.
FUTURE CHECK: ASSESSING LEGISLATION IN THE UK

Future Check\textsuperscript{[6]}, which makes use of the School of International Futures’ sophisticated Intergenerational Fairness Assessment tool, is a citizen-led service. It is designed to help parliamentarians, policymakers and the public to consider the long-term impact of proposed government legislation.

It uses a structured methodology across 40 impact areas which is then reviewed by at least one other volunteer before being reported by the APPG to parliamentarians and the public.

The assessments are conducted by volunteers on live pieces of legislation which are passing through Parliament and identified by APPG as a top priority for future generations. The intention is to pioneer discussions about the potential long-term consequences of legislation.

The APPG has conducted assessments on five pieces of legislation, including the controversial Police, Crime, Sentencing and Courts Bill, the Environmental Bill and the Telecommunications Bill.

### IMPACTS ON FUTURE GENERATIONS

- Provides clear and actionable information on the long-term implications of policies for future generations.
- Helps policymakers understand the potential consequences of legislation for future populations and their needs.

### POLICY GAPS IN THE LONG TERM

- Identifies areas where current policies are insufficient for addressing future needs.
- Highlights potential gaps in long-term planning and resource allocation.

### AMENDMENTS FOR FUTURE GENERATIONS

- Proposes changes to legislation that better align with intergenerational fairness principles.
- Seeks to ensure policies are sustainable and adaptable for future populations.

### SUGGESTED QUESTIONS AND INTERVENTIONS

For Future Check assessment teams: Ministry of Justice

#### about Department

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Suggested Intervention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To ask the Secretary of State to provide evidence that provision for new offences and the modification of existing offences maintain consistent proportionality between crimes and their respective punishments?</td>
<td>The proposed changes (including public order) place a higher sentence on inflicting under £5,000 damage to statues and monuments than they do for inflicting grievous bodily harm, violent disorder and causing grievous bodily harm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To ask the Secretary of State to clarify the scope of the provision which increases the sentence for acts of criminal damage under £5,000 to statues or monuments?</td>
<td>This bill gives police additional powers to crack down on protests. Protests are critical for future generations since they typically address long-term issues which governments aren’t addressing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To ask the Secretary of State to clarify the scope of the provision which increases the severity of sentences for acts of criminal damage under £5,000 to statues or monuments?</td>
<td>Does this apply to perpetration of racist/sexist/offensive damage or intent?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### About Future Check

Future Check is a citizen-led service supported by the APPG for Future Generations and the School of International Futures. It’s designed to help parliamentarians, policymakers and the public consider the long-term impact of proposed legislation.

Each Future Check uses a structured methodology across 40 impact areas and is reviewed by at least one other volunteer before being reported by the APPG to parliamentarians and the public.

Future Check cannot guarantee to find all of the potential consequences of a policy or make a final judgement of whether the policy is fair or unfair to people now and in the future. It can highlight issues that might not be visible at first glance and raise conversations about the future we want to shape through our actions today.

### To Learn More and Get Involved

- Learn about Future Check: Futures Generations Events at www.appgfuturegenerations.com
- Read about the Framework for Intergenerational Fairness at www.futurecheck.org
- Volunteer to help with Future Check assessments at secretariat@appgfuturesgenerations.com

Future Check is adopted under Creative Commons license for non-commercial use from the Framework for Intergenerational Fairness, created by the Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation and School of International Futures. The framework – which allows for the systematic evaluation of public policies for intergenerational fairness – can be applied by national and local government, international organisations, foundations, businesses and other interested groups. Policies that are fair from an intergenerational standpoint allow people of all ages to meet their needs in the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs in the future.
The assessment tool is used to examine whether a specific policy, strategy or decision is intergenerationally fair. It can be applied flexibly to any type of decision in advance (ex ante) or retrospectively (ex post).

The tool assesses whether a specific policy is intergenerationally fair by answering:

- Does it disadvantage people at any particular stage of life?
- Does it disadvantage people at any period in time, present or future?
- Does it Increase the chances of inequality being passed on through time?
- Does it restrict the choices of people in the future?
- Does it move the community further away from its vision for the future?

It then considers all aspects of unfairness together with the benefits of the policy and assesses whether, on balance, the policy is fair or unfair. We have found that the relative importance of each of these aspects of intergenerational fairness can change based on context. One way to adapt the assessment tool is to get clarity on which aspects of intergenerational fairness are critical in your context.

Figure: Outputs from each stage of the dialogue inform the structure and content of the policy assessment tool. Overall findings from the dialogue guide the institutional owners.
The assessment report shines a light on any instances of intergenerational unfairness that may be caused by the policy. It provides an overall judgment of whether, on balance, the policy is clearly fair or unfair, probably fair or unfair, or “too close to call”.

Crucially, it sets out the reasoning underlying the overall assessment, allowing the reader to make their own political judgments based on the likely consequences of the policy. The assessment process recognizes that difficult decisions need to be made, and tradeoffs are sometimes needed where some negative consequences are inevitable. The aim is to ensure informed decisions can be made, and mitigation can be put in place to support any groups who are particularly disadvantaged by a policy.

### ASSESSMENT OUTPUT

The assessment tool is designed to apply to a wide variety of policy types and policy areas and cannot anticipate everything that it may need to deal with. These principles should be used to guide decisions about how the tool is applied in practice.

**Target resources to maximize impact** There will be limited resources available to carry out assessments, so target the policies that will have the biggest impact, and decide upfront how many resources to devote to each assessment. The institutional arrangements put in place will be responsible for making these decisions.

**Take a participative approach whenever possible** Varied perspectives are required to identify consequences and build a full picture of their impact. Participation from all groups affected by the policy is a key part of achieving a fair outcome.

**Get clear on the counterfactual and timeline** It is not possible to reliably assess the impact of a policy without getting very clear on the alternative scenario that is being compared to. E.g. is it business as usual or are alternative consequences expected if the policy is not implemented? Everyone involved should be clear on what is meant by short, medium and long term for the purposes of the assessment. Ensure long term is looking far enough into the future to stretch thinking.

**Take a “snag-hunting” approach** The assessment is concerned with identifying potential negative consequences, so that they can be addressed early on. Positive policy consequences are brought out by the assessment, but there is a deliberate focus on the negative.

**Avoid the “fallacy of misplaced concreteness”** While qualitative data and approaches can be used within the assessment, we deliberately avoid a quantitative approach to determining where a policy is fair or unfair.
The future is uncertain—the context within which policy consequences will play out cannot be known, nor can the consequences themselves. There are no concrete answers here.

**Utilize peer review** An independent peer reviewer considers the rigor and judgment applied to the policy in question. Has the assessment been conducted properly? Does the outcome contribute meaningfully to the societal conversation about the policy? Where possible, the final assessment should be a co-creation where both the assessor and reviewer are comfortable with the outcome.

**Report reasoning and assumptions alongside assessment outcomes** There is an unavoidable level of uncertainty and subjectivity inherent within any assessment of fairness. Allow an appropriate level of challenge by including information sources, logic and reasoning behind the analysis, and any assumptions.

**Communicate engagingly** Design policy assessment outputs with a clear call to action to exert pressure on levers within the political system. Communications may include:
- Technical output from the policy assessment
- A report or briefing designed for use within the political system
- Communications designed to engage the public

**HOW DOES THE ASSESSMENT WORK?**

There are five stages to the assessment process.

1. **Diagnostics stage** captures key information about the policy, scans for ways the policy may be unfair and builds a timeline of short, medium and long-term issues, identifying those which require further analysis. In some cases, the assessment can stop here.

2. **Impacts stage** dives deep into the toughest questions, using available qualitative and quantitative data, expert modeling and participative sessions to explore chains of intended and unintended impacts on generations over time.

3. **Scenarios stage** stress-tests the assessment against different alternative futures scenarios, making recommendations to ensure the policy is robust in an uncertain environment.

4. **Process stage** examines how the policy was designed and/or enacted. Were intergenerational issues considered? Diverse perspectives actively sought? Did the process itself create unfairness?

5. **Conclusions stage** summarizes the findings and recommendations for further communication.

Figure: Assessment pathways should vary depending on findings at the diagnostic stage.
WHY INTERGENERATIONAL DIALOGUE?

Intergenerational Dialogue enables citizens to form a collective desired vision for the future society they want. It informs the policy assessment tool and ensures that deciding what is fair or unfair is based on citizens’ views of what is fair and desirable, not a technocratic judgment.

Outside the context of this framework, the dialogue can inform policy strategy, future risk management and visioning for policy-makers and communities. It furthers the conversation and generates mainstream engagement with issues of intergenerational fairness.

WHAT IS THE COMMUNITY DIALOGUE?

The dialogue is a five-stage participative foresight process that collaboratively explores potential futures of a society or system, including a collective ideal vision for the future. Leaders, experts and citizens work together to explore:

**Context** defines the issues and drivers of change that shape the future of this specific society and its place in the wider world.

**Systems Mapping** analyzes how these factors interrelate to each other in this society, including ways in which inequality is transferred across generations.

**Scenarios** describe a set of distinctly different, possible alternative futures. They stimulate deliberation around these futures to inform the collective vision.

**Vision** creates a desirable vision for this society informed from the previous stages.

**Indicators** identify the means to track progress against the vision.

---

![Figure: Outputs from each stage of the dialogue inform the structure and content of the policy assessment tool. Overall findings from the dialogue guide the institutional owners.](image)

**DIALOGUE PRINCIPLES**

To be effective and generate usable outputs, the dialogue must be informed by rigorous foresight practices and conducted using best practice for deliberative dialogue. These principles ensure that the dialogue brings to light issues specific to intergenerational fairness and works effectively within the framework.

**Diverse participation** Collaboration with stakeholders across society is vital in both the design and execution of the dialogue. Working with non-traditional partners such as local businesses or well-known individuals such as artists, sports figures and scholars can encourage citizen participation.
Inclusivity and accessibility Inclusion can be thought of in multiple ways: different generations, including a proxy for the unborn; digital accessibility; diverse geographical locations; and different levels of economic participation and ability, alongside more familiar lenses of gender, ethnicity and religious communities.

Independence and impartiality Genuine, recognized impartiality is the only way to guarantee public ownership and success. The outputs must be communicated openly and transparently.

Institutional ownership Although the dialogue includes multiple foresight tools, it is an integrated methodology that should be designed and stewarded by a single coalition, with inputs from others. For each new dialogue, ensure that the majority of team members are new.

Timeliness The dialogue should occur at least twice per decade to keep the framework relevant and the public engaged in its work. Each dialogue should consider a time frame of at least one generation out. For example, a dialogue held in 2030 should consider the future to at least 2060.

OUTPUTS OF THE DIALOGUE

The dialogue can be used for different purposes, both within and outside of this framework. These include:

- Populating the Policy Assessment Tool with specific information necessary to judge whether a policy is intergenerationally fair or unfair for this society.
- Generating broad-based, mainstream engagement and conversation on the topic of intergenerational fairness.
- Informing decision-making, policy, strategy, future risk management and visioning at a community, local and national level.
- Guiding the institutional owners, as they decide where to focus resources and how to communicate their work.

INTEGRATING TOP DOWN AND BOTTOM UP PRINCIPLES

The dialogue should not presume what society values and believes to be fair today, nor expect the public to have a comprehensive understanding of the needs and desires of future generations. No single view, data set, or methodology can adequately represent this complex and dynamic system. Therefore, each stage of the process complements more top-down and expert-led
perspectives with bottom-up and participatory inputs. The systems mapping methodology creates unifying links between participative inputs and strategic outputs that can be used within the policy assessment tool.

In particular, the dialogue must manage the tension between existing national and cultural concerns and newer or emerging ways of defining the context of a society, its culture and concerns for fairness. For example, future generations may define their society by planetary boundaries, not national borders, or include the needs and desires of non-human citizens such as robots, artificial intelligence, animals, or environmental and ecological features. As populations age, new life stages will emerge and new technologies and data models will extend human capabilities and decision making. As the climate continues to change, needs for food, housing and security will evolve. These possibilities must be brought into dialogue and conversation with the needs of today’s population in order to negotiate the complexity, rather than deny it.

APPLYING BEST PRACTICES TO PARTICIPATION

If the dialogue is not informed by rigorous foresight or conducted using best practices for deliberative dialogue, the results will be generic and difficult to put into action. The dialogue design draws on input from leading experts in law, philosophy, economics, sustainability, design, foresight and public deliberation, and is based on extensive testing and implementation across many countries including Japan, Singapore, Wales, and France.

Considerations include:

- **Ensuring diverse participation** Diversity can be supported by collaborating with stakeholders across society in the design and execution of citizen participation, including non-traditional partners. For example, the “Wales We Want” dialogue relied on local business entities acting as project champions, while the City of Mexico’s constitution project included well-known individuals such as artists, sports figures and scholars.

- **Importance of inclusivity** Inclusion can be thought of in multiple ways, including different generations and the unborn, digital accessibility, diverse geographical locations, and different levels of economic participation and ability, alongside more familiar lenses of gender, ethnicity and religious communities.

- **Considering a human-centered design approach** The framework is culturally embedded and needs to take into account context-specific ethnography and primary research. Citizens should be involved in the design of the dialogue, as well as participate in it.

- **Avoid generational capture** For every new dialogue, ensure that the majority of team members are new to avoid it being captured by a previous generation.

- **Importance of independence** From the examples, it is evident that the design of the dialogue and its execution must be seen to be independent and impartial. Genuine, recognized independence is the only way to guarantee public ownership and success.
INTERGENERATIONAL FAIRNESS IN URBAN PLANNING (JAPAN)

The Research Institute for Humanity and Nature in Japan used a “Future Design” method to host conversations about the future with unborn generations in Japan. This participative process brings community residents together as a group of current generations and another group of imaginary, future generations. Both groups discuss community policies, with the difference that the future residents discuss them from within the context of the future (2060).

The change in perspective that results, gives rise to very different outcomes around policy discussions, and flows into very concrete changes that already have positive impact in the present. Participants also indicate attitude changes towards future generations and a lasting integration of a futures perspective in their personal lives.

- The process brought to light the conflict of interest between current and unborn generations.
- Participants developed a lasting empathy for future generations.
- The process not only represented future generations in the present, but also managed to change the perspectives of the present generation.
- The process increased the active, civic participation of participants after the workshop.

Find out more about Future Design.

WALES WE WANT 2030: IN SUPPORT OF THE WELL-BEING OF FUTURE GENERATIONS ACT (WALES)

The Wales we want public dialogue was central to the development of the Well-being of Future Generations Act.

- The National Conversation has engaged nearly 7000 people across Wales through their communities and groups (in addition to contributions via social media, postcards and online) and tested different approaches to engage people.
- A key feature has been the recruitment of 200 Futures Champions whose role has been to take the Conversation forward, becoming advocates for future generations and raising the issues affecting their groups, communities, and organizations.
- The process culminated in an IGF Act with 6 well-being goals as well as stipulating 7 foundations for the IGF commissioner.
- The process increased the active, civic participation of participants after the workshop.

It is a good example of a nationwide attempt to engage with citizens on the well-being of future generations. It had a direct influence on policy by being connected to the Well-being of Future Generations Act (Wales) of 2015. Civil society was also consulted in identifying the indicators used to track progress against the Well-being Act.

Find out more about The Wales We Want Process.
Cascais, a medium-sized city in Portugal, has citizen participation as a central policy goal. Its participatory budget initiative enables residents to more deeply inform public projects and local governance and allows them to select particular projects for funding through direct public voting.49

There are continuous open communication channels between residents and the municipality, supported by a strong digital infrastructure that allows residents to report problems through a phone app, and a website that allows anyone to submit a project proposal. It has won numerous national and international awards.

Still, Cascais is not resting on its laurels. It has made several advancements in intergenerational dialogue and fairness. According to URBACT, a European Union-funded program promoting sustainable urban development, the city’s outreach has “extended to people in residential care homes, as well as to the long-term unemployed, who are often socially isolated. They have also lowered the participation age to twelve, and have ensured that these children vote separately from their parents, to ensure their independence.”50 Importantly, young people have the ability to control part of their school budget, as well as to propose solutions for the entire city. City residents approved three such solutions in recent years.

Find out more about the process and results.

Mexico City had to overcome skepticism within a context of low public trust and participation in order to create their new city constitution.51 They appointed a set of gender-balanced local representatives from a cross-section of the city’s life to support engagement, which included historians, artists, human rights organizations, sports figures, activists and scholars.

They used multiple channels for direct public input, such as an “Imagine Your City” visioning survey exploring residents’ dreams, fears and future ideas (31,000 respondents); an independent petition and proposal platform that received about 400,000 petitions with 4 projects acquiring more than 50,000 signatures. They encouraged spontaneous deliberation across the city after which an independent working group created the draft of the relevant constitution inputs.

The consultation process was anchored in a broadly representative, independent commission of residents which provided agency and avoided partisanship.

Talking about the future and dreams resulted in surprisingly high participation within a context of low public trust and civic participation.

Find out more about the process.

Find out more about the process.

Find out more about the process.
INSTITUTIONAL STEWARDSHIP

THE IMPORTANCE OF INSTITUTIONAL STEWARDSHIP

Institutional stewardship is core to the framework, providing a vital anchor for the policy assessment tool alongside the community dialogue. It provides an essential link between political legitimacy and public accountability. Institutions exist across all layers of society—we use this term loosely to refer to any entity that might have a role in driving accountability and transparency in a system or community.

Embedding the framework in multiple institutions within government and society helps achieve political legitimacy and administrative commitment. It also helps to ensure resilience and long-term viability of the framework and a continued focus on intergenerational fairness.

While emphasizing the importance of institutional stewardship, we recognize that it may not be possible to implement full institutional stewardship at the same rate that policy assessments can be rolled out. In the—ideally temporary—absence of formal ownership it is worth exploring establishing informal governance and stewardship structures.

Without formal ownership or stewardship intergenerational dialogue and policy assessments may not be taken seriously or translate into clear policy impact, and the focus on intergenerational fairness may disappear over time.

STRUCTURAL CONSIDERATIONS

Stewardship can be held by a single institution or shared across a network of multiple organizations brought together by an overseeing steering group. It might include independent bodies with links to the government and members from civil society and academia.

Figure: Taking our theory of change into account, stewardship must span both the political system and the public at large, with active links into the global and international context.

The framework was designed to be adaptable. We encourage principled application within:

- Government institutions including across parliamentary, legislative, the executive and audit bodies;
- Ombudsmen or watchdogs representing current or future generations;
- Interest groups who want to organize around specific instances of intergenerational unfairness. For example, youth, older people, teachers, or environmental activists;
- Communities looking to develop shared visions and priorities;
• International organizations setting standards and regulations around sustainable development or innovating new forms of governance;

• Researchers focused on topics of sustainable development, distributional justice, policy making and decision systems;

• Business and investment groups needing to understand the long-term impacts of their funding decisions, product designs, land-use and urban planning; and

• Foundations working to ensure the long-term future of people, the planet, and democratic systems.

ROLE OF THE INSTITUTIONAL STEWARDS

In this IGF framework institutional stewards oversee resourcing, commissioning, reporting, monitoring and evaluation of both the policy assessments and community dialogue. This includes engaging with the media, citizens, politicians, civil service and other assessment bodies. Institutional stewards hold the design of all elements of the intergenerational fairness framework as they shift and adapt over time.

Responsibilities include:

• Building a governance culture that takes intergenerational fairness seriously

• Commissioning and overseeing Intergenerational Dialogues

• Leading the Policy Assessment processes—taking strategic decisions on resourcing, focus, and communication of outputs

• Refining the theory of change to fit the unique context, and embedding intergenerational fairness processes in the leverage points identified

• Implementing a robust monitoring and evaluation process to assess the performance of the framework and overseeing improvements over time

• Setting up a watchdog function where complaints and concerns about assessment processes and outputs can be brought

• Producing an annual report to identify patterns in intergenerational concerns and future areas for focus.

INSTITUTIONAL STEWARDSHIP PRINCIPLES

Experience from various efforts around the world suggest the following principles for effective stewardship:

An ecosystem approach will help ensure the framework is resilient and effective over time, rather than relying on a single institution to deliver all elements. Different parts of the system have a role to play in supporting the framework and can help ensure a smooth transition from one leading institution to another as the system adapts.

Independence from government is important where the framework is being used as a scrutiny tool, although there is a place for policy teams to utilize the tools to inform policy design stages. Checks and balances, including peer review, help avoid real and perceived conflicts of interest.

Balance of security and impartiality In order to ensure sustainability and popular legitimacy, institutional solutions need to be democratically embedded with a significant amount of fiscal protection from the vagaries of yearly budgets.

Not a technocratic exercise The community dialogue brings legitimacy by guiding institutional stewards on where to focus their available resources and how to communicate their work.
TAKING THIS FURTHER: APPROACHES, TOOLS AND RESOURCES
CONTINUING ON THE IGF JOURNEY

As people interested in intergenerational fairness we are part of a wider community of interest. One that is growing and continually changing.

We have developed this toolkit as an initial resource that we hope will help you to take the first steps towards harnessing intergenerational fairness.

Whether you adopt the framework or not, we hope that you will become an ambassador and advocate for future generations.

You can start by taking the time to stop, think and ask whether your decisions, policies and plans are intergenerationally fair.

You may decide to go further:

- Creating space for a Future Generations representative on your board;
- Stress testing and assessing your decisions for intergenerational fairness;
- Becoming an advocate for your community or organization—drawing on its rich history through the present, and into an aspirational future that is envisioned by your community.

The resources we share here can help you dig deeper. You’ll find some background reading on intergenerational fairness—what it is and how to think differently about the future. You’ll also find some further examples, as well as communities that you can connect with and learn from.

These resources are not comprehensive, but we hope they will serve as a starting point and inspiration.

WHAT IS INTERGENERATIONAL FAIRNESS?

Krushil Watene (2022). *Reimagining the Human-Environment Relationship. Indigenous Philosophy and Intergenerational Justice*. This paper highlights key principles from different indigenous perspectives to “recast our relationship with the environment and inform future policy-making.”


john a. powell (2022) *Equity 2.0: What is Targeted Universalism and How Does It Address Inequality?* Nonprofit Quarterly, 08 June 2022.


Catherine Moury (2021) *Perceptions of the Portuguese political class on intergenerational justice*. Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation. A study in Portugal that sets out the case for intergenerational fairness.
POLICY AND PRACTICES FOR FUTURE GENERATIONS


Doughnut Economics Action Lab A website with resources to help you make use of the Doughnut Economics model.

Barbert, G. (2023) The Trillion-Dollar Auction to Save the World Wired. An article exploring how natural capital valuation can support decision-making around climate change.


Wellbeing Economy Alliance What is a Wellbeing Economy. This website provides an overview of what is meant by a well-being economy supported by additional resources.


THE INTERGENERATIONAL FAIRNESS ASSESSMENT FRAMEWORK


SOIF (2021) Framework for Intergenerational Fairness. Specialist Report. An introduction to the framework, how it was designed, and how to use it.


SOIF (2023) Intergenerational Fairness Observatory: Putting intergenerational fairness into practice. Find out more about the framework and access training and support.


INTERGENERATIONAL FAIRNESS IN PRACTICE


Catarina Zuzarte Tully and Elisa Cecilli (2022) CEOs as Stewards of Future Generations Business Fights Poverty. Discussion of how businesses can start to adopt intergenerational fairness.


International Institute for Sustainable Development SDG Knowledge Hub (2023) UNGA Decides on Elements for “A Pact for the Future” A short article setting out how the UN is preparing for the Summit of the Future.

UNESCO and UN Global Pulse (2023) Futures Tools for Intergenerational Equity. A toolkit exploring how to use foresight tools to think differently about intergenerational equity.
Future Generations Commissioner for Wales (2023) \textit{Well-being of Future Generations (Wales) Act 2015}. This website sets out the principles and approach that Wales has adopted to ensure representation for future generations.

Neubauer et al. versus Germany: \textit{Planetary Climate Litigation for the Anthropocene?} This landmark case in Germany showcases how courts can play a role in protecting intergenerational rights.

Mina Whorms (2023) \textit{Premier Panton Looks to the Future, Cayman Islands Government}. This press statement announces the Cayman Islands Premier’s commitment to ensure policies meet the needs of both current and future generations.


Airos et al (2022) \textit{Strengthening foresight and the role of future generations in Finnish lawmaking}. This policy brief explores the role of foresight and future generations in legislative processes, institutions, and practices.


\section*{Organizations and Networks}

- \textit{School of International Futures} supports policy-makers, politicians and practitioners to develop and adopt intergenerational fairness.

- \textit{The Foundation for the Rights of Future Generations (FRFG)} is a think tank and activist group founded in 1997 by a non-partisan alliance of five young people between the ages of 18 and 27.

- \textit{Cogenerate}. A US-based social-impact organization dedicated to making the most of increasingly multigenerational societies.

- \textit{Intergenerational Foundation}. A non-profit that promotes intergenerational fairness and protect the interests of younger and future generations across all areas of policy

- \textit{Foundation for the Rights of Future Generations (FRFG)}. A think tank and activist group founded in 1997 by a non-partisan alliance of five young people between the ages of 18 and 27.

Find out about the \textit{Ministers of the Future network} run by the European Commission.

\section*{A Framework for Assessing Intergenerational Fairness.}

School of International Futures and the Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation have created a methodology to assess whether a decision is fair to different generations, now and in the future. For resources, training and support please visit \textit{soif.org.uk/igf}

- Read about the launch of the assessment framework in Portugal.

- Read the specialist report to learn the details of the design and development framework.

- Download the IGF toolkit which contains everything you need to get started including the assessment tool, how to guide and example assessment reports.

- Register for a one-hour introductory class on intergenerational fairness; or join a three-hour training on how to conduct the assessment.
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