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Comparison among the size of health inequalities and policies aimed at tackling them

% of mortality explained by educational inequalities

Background

- Persisting health inequalities (between and within countries)
- New challenges (recession and migration…)
- Available evidence on (distal and proximal) mechanisms and their avoidability
- Wide gap in Europe in terms of political response
Background

- The new Joint Action: joint effort of EC and MSs (resources, tool, expertise) (existing alliances and partnerships: global work, SDG, EU pillar of social rights…)
- Bringing together the available knowledge on what works and what does not to address both the distal (socio-economic) and proximal (lifestyle) determinants (even knowledge gaps)
- MS need to make an analysis of their capacity in tackling health inequalities, which the gaps are and what further action can be taken
- JA flexibly designed to enable MS with strong expertise in a specific area to support weaker MS that have chosen to work on that same topic
Aims

• help halting or moderating the rise of health inequalities in Europe (relative everywhere and absolute in the Eastern regions)
• encouraging decision makers to make the issue of health inequalities a priority in the public agenda
• implementing concrete local/national actions through practical guidance/examples for more experienced MSs
Needs for assistance (and how substantive WP will contribute)

- **It’s not our concern** (evidence, description)
- **We don’t know what to do** (evidence, links)
- **We don’t know how to do it** (delivery, networks)
- **We don’t want to** (levers, incentives, regulations)
- **We really don’t want to** (ideology, no pressure)
- **We can’t afford to** (cost efficacy, cross sectoral, prevention and other things matter more)
Target groups

- improving the health of those that are worse or worst off at a faster rate than those who already have better health
- a combination of universal and targeted measures (proportionate universalism)
- that meets proportionally with greater intensity the growing needs of vulnerable groups (children in poverty, rural areas, phys/mental disabled, unemployed, in-work poor, older, victim of violence, homeless, prisoners)
- a specific focus on migrants
Deliverables and desired outcomes

- **Policy framework for Action** on reducing Health Inequalities in EU and Member States.
- **Country assessments** and country specific recommendations to reduce health inequalities in the participating Member States
- Report with learning from **case studies on actions** to tackle health inequalities and on actions overcoming challenges for health equity – reports per WP and one final summary report
- **Material useful to policy makers and politicians and stakeholders**, such as effective policy briefs, info-graphics, video’s and communication of evidence from EU to local levels, in all EU languages
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Title and WP leader (Co-leaders to be decided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Coordination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>ITALY (National Inst. Health)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Dissemination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>EUROHEALTHNET (TBC)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>WP LEADER TO BE DECIDED</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Integration and sustainability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>ITALY (TBC)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Health and Equity in All Policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>– Governance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>FINLAND (National Inst Health)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Monitoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>SWEDEN (Public Health Ag.)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Healthy Living Environments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>GERMANY (Health promotion)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Migration and health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>NORWAY (Centre for Migrat)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Improving equality in access to health services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>SPAIN (TBC)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Clustering actions/countries for substantive WPs

WP1-4
General country assessment
Policy framework for actions

WP4-8
Specific policy framework
Specific menu of EB actions
Specific country assessment
Choice of actions to prioritize
Implementation: feasible/complex

Lessons learned and recommendations
A preliminary country assessment: actions and WP

Comprehensive cross-government
Public health and Isolated cross-government
Health sector direct
Health sector indirect
A preliminary country assessment: challenges and WP

Needs

Governance  Monitoring  Living  Migrants  Health care  Health access

Countries A  Countries B  Countries C  Countries D
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>28 Countries</th>
<th>Organisation's Full Name (red: ministerial body; grey: public health institute, green: regions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>Federal Public Service Health, Food Chain Safety and Environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bosnia and Herzegovina</td>
<td>Ministry of Civil Affairs of Bosnia and Herzegovina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>National Center of Public Health and Analyses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>Croatian Institute of Public Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td>Ministry of health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>The National Institute of Public Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>Bridge to Better Health - Region Zealand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td>The National Institute for Health Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>National Institute for Health and Welfare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>Santé Publique France</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>Bundeszentrale für gesundheitliche Aufklärung / Federal Centre for Health Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>6th health region of Peloponnese, Ionian Islands, Epirus and Western Greece</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>The National Health Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 Countries</td>
<td>Organisation's Full Name (red: ministerial body; grey: public health institute, green: regions)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td>The National Health Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>Sveikatos apsaugos ministerija</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malta</td>
<td>Department Health Information and Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moldova</td>
<td>Institute of Mother and Child</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>Dutch Ministry of Health, Welfare and Sport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>The Norwegian Centre for Migration and Minority Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>Ministry of Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>Directorate-General of Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>National school of public health, management and professional development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serbia</td>
<td>Institute of Public Health of Republic of Serbia &quot;Dr Milan Jovanović Batut&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovakia</td>
<td>Ministry of Health of the Slovak republic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>National Institute of Public Health of the Republic of Slovenia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>Escuela Andaluza de Salud Pública</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>Folkhälsomyndighet, The Public Health Agency of Sweden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>Welsh Government</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Preliminary exercise of country assessment for helping WP leaders in clustering actions issues and countries for priority setting

COUNTRIES ACCORDING TO THEIR ADVANCEMENT IN TACKLING HEALTH INEQUALITIES AS REPORTED IN SOME COUNTRY ASSESSMENTS AVAILABLE IN THE EU EXPERT GROUP WORK (2015-16)

7 June, 2017
Action/country clusters for WP4 governance

• Cooperation and participation enabling HI to be raised in public agenda (stakeholder, supportive culture, comunication, leadership):
  – bottom up (Italy, Finland),
  – top down (Croatia),
  – advocacy (Cyprus), from health professional (Italy, UK)
  – policy framework: creating and sharing (Croatia, Cyprus, Slovakia)
  – intervention networks and communities of practice (Austria, Germany, Italy)

• How to keep HI in the agenda (accountability…):
  – Role of health targeting and evaluation (Austria)
  – Role of legal duty for ensuring equity in essential level of care in NHS (Italy)
  – structural funds at regional level (Bulgaria)

• Decentralization to local authorities and communities (Finland, Estonia, Sweeden, Italy, Netherlands)

• Capacity building
  – availability and dissemination of best practices (Hungary)
  – how to put HiAP in practice (Estonia)
  – Governance processes (Cyprus)
Action/country clusters for WP5 monitoring

- Preliminary essential equity monitoring (Bulgaria, Cyprus, Poland, Slovakia)
- Profiling health inequalities (Croatia, Poland)

- Integrating social and health data in health information systems for equity audit at any level (Austria, Italy, Estonia)
- Best indicators: evaluation (Germany, Italy), unexplored health determinants (Ireland, Italy), material deprivation (Netherlands)
- Developing longitudinal studies for impact evaluation (Austria, Italy)
- HEIA tools: quality criteria for project funding (Austria), in practice (Cyprus, France)

- Knowledge gaps: a) evidence for effectiveness of actions and policies in the area of health systems and welfare (Norway, Finland, Sweedish commission?), b) assessing impact of actions on HI (relative, absolute…) (Belgium, Italy)
Action/country clusters for WP6 living conditions

• Health equity audit in
  – Housing for vulnerable: housing first (Belgium) (Norway)
  – School setting: whole of school (Hungary, Italy), school meals (Czech)
  – Workplace: workability and HP (Estonia, Italy), role of occupational safety (Italy)
  – GP setting HP (Italy)
  – Early life HP (Italy)
  – Environmental justice (Italy)
  – Obesity (Italy, UK, Ireland)
  – Mental health HP (Hungary, Italy, Denmark)

• HP among vulnerables
  – Excluded areas HP (Czech)
  – Hard to reach: men violence, HIV, sexual health (Sweeden)
  – Disabled HP (Czech, Estonia)

• Capacity building
  – Evidence on good practices: HP in general (Estonia), care, work, housing, living conditions (Norway, Finland, Ireland)
  – Training health equity audit in HP (Spain)

• Knowledge gaps: a) lone parenthood and children (Czech), b) southern resilience to inequalities in nutrition, alcool.. (Italy), c) interaction of income education and work with proximal risk factors and implication for actions (Sweeden) d) good practice in EU facilitating collaboration on structural funds and social policies
Action/country clusters for WP7 immigration

- Health literacy in front of health care access and health promotion (Austria, Norway, Italy, Portugal)
- Health mediators (Belgium, Bulgaria, Romania, Italy)
- Health examination guidelines for refugees, and training for professionals and frontline workers (Croatia, Greece, Sweden)
Action/country clusters for WP8 universal access to care for vulnerables

- Targeting vulnerable groups
  - tailor made in: dementia, cancer, nutrition, early life (Austria), rare diseases (Croatia), pregnancy (Belgium), diabetes, cancer screening, mental health, occupational injuries (Italy)
  - Affordability and inclusion in: sex workers, prisoners ... (Belgium, Croatia, Cyprus), ethnic minorities (Bulgaria), disabled, victim of violence, Roma, (Croatia) (Denmark)
  - Health literacy in health care access (Austria)

- Targeting remote areas (Italy)

- NHS reform:
  - coverage (Estonia) (France, Portugal)
  - capitation in allocation formula (Italy)
  - Equal access to GP (Denmark)
  - Use of structural funds (Slovenia)

- Knowledge gaps: a) cost effectiveness of actions on health literacy (Austria), b) EB actions on unemployment and precarious jobs (Belgium) and on income and education and work and interaction with proximal factors (Sweden)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agenda</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Evaluation</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Deaths attributable to education</th>
<th>Countries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Comprehensive cross-government strategies</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Social gradient</td>
<td>Finland ● Ireland ● Norway ● Sweden ● Austria ● Germany ● (UK)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Medium/High</td>
<td>Public health and isolated Cross-government</td>
<td>Medium/High</td>
<td>Mostly vulnerable</td>
<td>Belgium ● Denmark ● Spain ● Netherlands ● Italy ● France ● Estonia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Health sector</td>
<td>Low/medium</td>
<td>Vulnerable Regional</td>
<td>Croatia ● Cyprus ● Czech ● Hungary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Health sector direct/indirect</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Society as whole</td>
<td>Poland ● Romania ● Slovakia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Missing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Latvia ● Greece ● Portugal ● UK</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Graph 16
Health inequalities actions (2003–13) presented in three clusters
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Table 7
Differences of emphasis between the two main clusters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>‘Vulnerable groups’ cluster</th>
<th>‘Health gradients and gaps’ cluster</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inequalities targeted</td>
<td>Health problems of migrants, ethnic groups and ‘at-risk’ groups</td>
<td>Socio-economic differences and effects of sex, age and country of residence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health problems addressed</td>
<td>Infectious diseases, Addictions, Non-communicable diseases (for ethnic groups)</td>
<td>Life expectancy, Healthy life years, Non-communicable diseases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interventions undertaken or proposed</td>
<td>Improving health care (access, quality, training), Health promotion, harm reduction and prevention via health services</td>
<td>Collecting and analysing data, Intersectoral action on social determinants of health</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Wideing of policy response on HI between member states since EC Communication on solidarity

- Do some
  - Greece: little (crisis)
  - Eastern and Baltic countries plus Turkey: prevention programs on lifestyles, and vulnerable groups (roma)
  - Slovenia: structural funds
  - Slovachia: NHS reform
Widening of policy response between member states since EC Communication on solidarity

- **Do more**
  - Germany: new prevention law
  - Italy: equity focus in national prevention plan and legal duty in health protection
  - Sweden: whole of government, municipalities
  - Austria: whole of government
  - France: national strategy, regional responsibilities
  - Spain: systematic training program
  - Belgium: health in all policies, inclusion
  - Portugal: NHS reform, lifestyles, migrants
Widening of policy response on HI between member states since EC Communication on solidarity

• Do better
  – Denmark: less visible
  – Netherlands: municipalities
  – Norvay: new strategy
  – Sweeden: new strategy, whole of government, municipalities
  – Finland: health in all policies
  – UK: strategy still in place, targeting obesity and child poverty
  – Ireland: strategy still in place, targeting tobacco, nutrition and crisis
Needs for assistance and how

- It's not our concern (evidence, description)
- We don’t know what to do (evidence, links)
- We don’t know how to do it (delivery, networks)
- We don’t want to – (levers, incentives, regulations)
- We really don’t want to - ideology, no pressure
  – so public pressure
- We can’t afford to – (cost efficacy, cross sectoral, prevention and other things matter more)
1. Putting (health) Equity ‘on’ the Agenda

How are other countries doing it....?

• as a matter of fairness and social justice
• as a human right
• for achieving Social Cohesion
• as an approach for managing / reducing social and economic costs
• as an approach to social and economic sustainability
• as an *enabler* of inclusive growth & development
Current European agendas supporting joint investment in health equity

- Inclusive Growth agendas
  EU Targets
  - Poverty Reduction
  - Participation of Older People in the Workforce
  - CAP Inclusive growth through education & employment
  - EU Social Investment Package
- Costs associated with preventable disease and Inequities
- Well being & Resilience
- Social Sustainability
- WHO Health 2020 Policy Framework

Chris Brown, 2016
2. Keeping (health) Equity ‘in’ Policies

A Question of Governance . . . .

How do we make joint investments for equity in Health work in practice?
Co Production

ACCOUNTABILITY

PARTICIPATION

Joint Responsibility

COOPERATION

Shared Benefits

Chris Brown, 2016
Incentivizing cooperation across sectors and stakeholders

**Partnership Platforms** Formal Intersectoral & Inter-ministerial Working Groups & Task Forces  *Slovenia, Estonia, Denmark, Finland,*

**Financial & reward systems linked to team results** Shared/ Pooled Budgets, common Performance Indicators. *England, Spain, Norway,*

**Joint Review of policies and interventions** ensure shared understanding of problems & solutions e.g. Impact Assessments, Cross Sectoral Spending Reviews  *Slovakia, Lithuania, Latvia, Scotland, EU OMC;*
Hold decision makers to account for health & equity results

**Laws, MoUs, Contracts** make responsibilities explicit & hold decision makers to account for results.

**Guidance, Audit and Regulation** support systematic action & remedy poor performance

**Rewards & Incentives** make pro health action the easy option.

**Common Targets** Health & Equity as key indicators

Systematic & Transparent Monitoring

use a mix of *hard* and *soft* instruments
Diversity of voices in decision making and implementation

Bottom Up Planning

Capacity Building for Communities to Participate

Public Reporting of actions and engagement in review of progress e.g. citizens juries, community panels, social networks and media)
Warnings for Lifepath
(Exworthy, Health Policy&Planning, 2008)

• Features of SDHs making it resistant to policy translation
  – Multiple causes ~ coordination barrier
  – Life-course perspective ~ misfit policy timetables
  – Inter-sectoral collaboration ~ misfit “modus operandi”
  – Complex causality ~ attribution problems
  – Conflicting priority
  – Globalization ~ multi-level stakeholders hampers governance
  – Data availability
Warning to Lifepath: attribution matters in agenda setting
(Causal stories and the formation of policy agendas. Stone PSQ, 1989)

“Complex causal explanations are not very useful in politics, precisely because they do not offer a single locus of control” (ibid pp289)

“Complex cause is sometimes used as a strategy to avoid blames and the burden of reform” (ibid pp 292)

Attribution “to push a problem into the realm of human purpose” = scientific presentation of risk and causality?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agenda</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Evaluation</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Countries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Comprehensive cross-government strategies</td>
<td>High Social gradient</td>
<td>Finland ● Ireland ● Norway ● Sweden ● Austria ● Germany ● (UK)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Medium/High</td>
<td>Public health and Isolated Cross-government</td>
<td>Medium/High Mostly vulnerable</td>
<td>Belgium ● Denmark Spain ● Netherlands ● Italy ● France ● Estonia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Health sector</td>
<td>Low/medium Vulnerable Regional</td>
<td>Croatia ● Cyprus ● Czech ● Hungary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Health sector direct/indirect</td>
<td>Low Society as whole</td>
<td>Poland ● Romania ● Slovakia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Missing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Latvia● Greece ● Portugal ● UK</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>