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Introduction

• This presentation aims to:
  – Give an overview of the state of long term care in Turkey.
  – Highlights the likely future economic cost.
• It builds on field work and visits.
• It uses data from (WHO, WB, OECD and US Census Bureau).
• All graphs, maps, calculations are authors’ own.
Aging index
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State of LTC system in Turkey

• Two main (parallel) systems of long-term care
  – informal care providers, such as unpaid family members
  – formal care providers,
    • Range of state, private & NGOs provision with various extent and quality
    • Social assistance programme- mixture of service and cash benefits
    • Improved generalised provision of palliative care (from capacity building in 2006; WHO 2104))

➢ Family-based with majority of LTC provided by women
  – High financial, emotional and physical burden on the family
  – Implications on women’s labour participation, physical health and emotional wellbeing (26% female labour participation vs. 71% for men)
Where do we stand?

• A focus on institutional care with lack of home-based LTC provision
• Variability in provision across municipalities
• Strong norms & cultural beliefs of duty of care to the elderly
• Gender imbalance of expectations of LTC with high informal care reliance
• Emerging mixed-market: regulations and standards are in need of updating
Moving Forward

• Build on what is available and address gaps and shortfalls
• Prepare for projected increased demands
• Adapt from the European experiences to the specific Turkish context
• Move towards ‘system approach’ rather than isolated interventions
• Italy:
  – LTC expenditures accounts for 1.12% of GDP
  – 80% of budget devoted to care in the community (cash and service in kind)
  – Only 3% of older people use care homes
  – Funded through general taxation system
  – Funding, governance and management responsibilities spread over municipalities
  – Family plays an important role supported by various cash allowances ‘cash-for-care’ (family based model)
  – Significant regional variations
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• The Netherlands:
  
  – Highest public expenditures on LTC in OECD countries at 3.7% of GDP
  
  – The philosophy that the state bears the responsibility of LTC not the individual or the family
  
  – Funded by national insurance scheme covering all citizens- covering both home and residential care; with some contribution based on income (Corporatist model)
  
  – Introduced some forms of cash-for-care but this was stopped in 2010
• Norway:
  – LTC expenditures accounts for 2.2% of GDP + 2% of GDP spent for health related LTC
  – Universal coverage with little contribution from individuals (Universal model)
  – Moved steadily from institutional to home care
  – All LTC services traditionally provided in kind with recent introduction of cash for care option (only 2 to 3%)
  – No assumptions about family responsibility
  – Funded through national & local taxations
  – Care organisations affiliated with municipalities
  – Strong policies of extending working lives
• The United Kingdom:
  – Public spending on LTC has fallen significantly over the past 10 years – currently around 1% of GDP
    • declining from a budget of around £8.3 billion in 2005 to £6.3 billion in real terms in 2015 – budget projections show further reductions over the coming year
  – The Care Act 2014 made Personal Budgets to be offered to 100% of eligible users
  – Financed by central and local government, the National Health Service (some nursing homes), charities and individuals
  – The model is based on mixed-market economy and is means-tested to protect the most vulnerable (residual model)
Market Shaping

• Setting necessary standards and regulations for a responsive, diverse and sustainable LTC market
• Commissioning and approval processes
• Recognise, and integrate LTC services with other services
• Incentives for businesses to provide varied, high quality and affordable services
• Estimate the cost and plan for funding
Model-Based Clustering According to Current Health Expenditure Per Capita and Life Expectancy
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A would be an alternative approach.
See Ismail M., 2014
Probability of starting age (60, 70, 80) as healthy then:

remain healthy  
become unhealthy  
death

See Ismail M., 2014
Conclusion

• Different demographic transition stages and health expenditure
• Various ideologies of care and responsibilities
• All moving steadily towards ‘ageing in place’ with a focus on home and community care
• Funding, regulations and workforce issues are key challenges and receive considerable debate
• Thinking about the Turkish context and formulating a context-specific LTC model
• Personal budgets are likely to emerge as one of the favorite options.
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