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Part 1

The European Context
1.1 The European Context
Challenges, Solutions and Outcomes

- Longer term consequences of population ageing;
- Shorter term lack of growth, while austerity is also required!

- Greater activity during older age in diverse forms;
- Healthy, self-reliant and secure living, especially during older age

- Higher quality of life and well-being outcomes for people of all ages
- Financial Sustainability of public welfare systems

1.3 Emphasis at the European level

I. Designation of 2012 as the European Year for Active Ageing and Solidarity between Generations
   http://ec.europa.eu/archives/ey2012/

II. European Innovation Partnership on Active and Healthy Ageing (EIP-AHA) – also setting out the target to increase the average healthy lifespan of Europeans by 2 years by 2020
   http://ec.europa.eu/research/innovation-union/index_en.cfm?section=active-healthy-ageing

III. Vienna Ministerial Declaration for the 2\textsuperscript{nd} 5-year review of MIPAA: ‘Ensuring a society for all ages: Promoting quality of life and active ageing’ (September 2012)
   www.unece.org/pau/ageing/ministerial_conference_2012.html

* MIPAA: Madrid International Plan of Action on Ageing

Source: Drawn from the analysis included in Zaidi et al. (2013)
Part 2

Introducing Active Ageing Index
Building knowledge using numbers

“When you cannot express it in numbers, your knowledge is of a meagre and unsatisfactory kind”

Lord Kelvin in 1883
Mathematician, physicist and engineer, 1824-1907
Drawing from the latest report, released during the AAI International Seminar, April, 2015

Data points covered:
2008
2010
2012
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2.1 Objectives of the AAI project

I. To produce high-quality, independent, multi-perspective evidence on active ageing;

II. To highlight the contributions of older people in different dimensions of their lives; and in the process identify the potential of older people;

III. To offer policy makers comparative and integrated evidence to develop strategies for active and healthy ageing.
2.2 Key features of the AAI project

I. Initiated during 2012, to contribute to activities of EY2012 and to MIPAA’s 10th anniversary;

II. The project carried out at Southampton University, UK; 3rd phase getting started now.

III. Advised by the AAI Expert Group, comprising a diverse group of international experts and stakeholders (including OECD, WHO, EUROSTAT, and AGE Platform Europe as a representative of older people)
2.3 Analytical framework
22 indicators, 4 domains

Active Ageing Index

The Active Ageing Index (AAI) is a tool to measure the untapped potential of older people for active and healthy ageing across countries. It measures the level to which older people live independent lives, participate in paid employment and social activities as well as their capacity to actively age.

Domains

- Employment
- Participation in society
- Independent, healthy and secure living
- Capacity and enabling environment for active ageing

Indicators

- Employment rate 55-59
- Employment rate 60-64
- Employment rate 65-69
- Employment rate 70-74
- Voluntary activities
- Care to children and grandchildren
- Care to older adults
- Political participation
- Physical exercise
- Access to health services
- Independent living
- Financial security (three indicators)
- Physical safety
- Lifelong learning
- Remaining life expectancy at age 55
- Share of healthy life expectancy at age 55
- Mental well-being
- Use of ICT
- Social connectedness
- Educational attainment

Actual experience of active ageing
Capacity to active age
Critical observations about the AAI

AAI indicators focus on outcomes rather than processes:

Legal instruments → Implementation → Outcomes

• AAI not intending to measure the well-being of older people, but the contributions of older people.

→ see also Global AgeWatch Index which measures the QOL / well-being of older people, by HelpAge International (and also the new Age UK’s Wellbeing In Later Life “WILL” Index)
Part 3

Five Key findings

Active Ageing Index 2014
Analytical Report
April 2015
Key message 1: Affluent EU States in the Northern and Western Europe have had greater success.

Also, stability observed in the relative position of EU countries over the period 2008-2012.
Key message 2: Top-ranked countries not at top of each domain and indicator, falling short of goalposts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Country 1</th>
<th>Score 1</th>
<th>Country 2</th>
<th>Score 2</th>
<th>Country 3</th>
<th>Score 3</th>
<th>Goalpost 1</th>
<th>Goalpost 2</th>
<th>Goalpost 3</th>
<th>Goalpost 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>44.9</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>43.4</td>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>79.0</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>69.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>40.3</td>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td>39.7</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>79.0</td>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>65.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>35.8</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>78.9</td>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td>63.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>39.7</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>35.8</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>78.6</td>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>61.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>39.0</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>34.4</td>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td>76.7</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>61.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>38.6</td>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>33.9</td>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>75.9</td>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>60.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>35.8</td>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>33.7</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>74.9</td>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>60.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>74.4</td>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>35.4</td>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>74.2</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>59.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td>34.6</td>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>73.8</td>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>58.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## An anatomy of AAI results for Poland

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>AAI Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>31.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>22.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Malta</td>
<td>31.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Slovakia</td>
<td>21.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>29.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td>21.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>29.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>21.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>29.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>21.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Slovakia</td>
<td>28.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>20.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>28.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Malta</td>
<td>20.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>28.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>19.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>28.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>19.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td>58.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>40.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**EU28 avg.**

- **The goalpost**: 56.4
- **50%**
- **41%**
- **32%**
- **74%**
- **62%**
Key message 3: AAI scores for men are higher than women, especially where employment and incomes are involved.
Key message 4: Active ageing has been increasing in the EU, despite economic crisis and austerity measures.

On average, an increase of nearly 2 points in the EU, while an increase of nearly 3 points or more in nine EU countries (during 2008-2012).
Key message 5: A push towards active ageing does not imply a worsening of older people’s quality of life, and it brings real benefits to the economy. No cause-and-effect direction implied!
Part 4

Conclusions
4.1 Strengths and limitations

1. The AAI framework identify specific priorities for each country regarding where the potential of older people is not realised, and by how much?

2. The AAI framework point to successful / innovative policy instruments to promote active and healthy ageing.

3. The AAI evidence is only as good as the underlying data and its comparability – the best possible is not free from limitations;

4. Comparative research must also capture diversity of contexts across countries; and different visions and goals with respect to active and healthy ageing.
4.2 Why political rhetoric has failed to deliver a comprehensive policy response?

A joined-up approach is missing for a strategy towards Active Ageing At All Ages (AAAAA):

.... by forming partnership between individuals, organisations and policymakers in which the state level initiatives and removal of barriers/disincentives meet with reinforcing positive behavioural responses from the individuals and their families and communities;

.... by joined-up initiatives in different areas of policymaking (labour market; social protection; health and social care; etc) at local/regional/state level – not to operate in silos and thus miss out on synergies and desired outcomes.
4.3 Streams of future work required

1. How can the benefits of the AA strategy are made available to all on equal basis?
   .... How the benefits of the AA strategy can be shared, and not meant just for the elites (better educated and more resourceful)?
   .... **For example**, what AA policies required for those who have physical and mental limitations?

2. What policies and strategies can be identified by comparing policy regimes and their outcomes?
   .... What innovative social policies can be identified from the comparative and integrated analysis offering mutual learning? e.g. within Nordic countries, using pairwise comparisons (MOPACT’s work)
**Key AAI references**
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