



1. Introduction

Artificial intelligence (AI) is rapidly reshaping how societies make decisions, deliver services and support people's everyday lives. For older persons, these changes present both significant opportunities and emerging human rights challenges. AI has the potential to improve healthcare, enhance accessibility, strengthen communication, expand participation and enable greater independence throughout longer lives. At the same time, it raises important questions about equality, autonomy, privacy, participation, dignity, self-determination and the role of human judgement in decisions increasingly informed by AI.

Much of the current discussion on AI and older persons has focused on specific applications or risks, including age discrimination, privacy, digital exclusion and automated decision-making. These issues are important. However, they do not fully capture the broader transformation that AI is bringing to the experience of older age. As AI becomes increasingly integrated into the environments in which people live, work, learn, receive support and participate in society, it is reshaping the contexts in which existing human rights are experienced, exercised and realised throughout longer lives.

It raises new questions about how existing human rights should be interpreted and applied in response to changing realities. AI therefore raises not only questions about technology, its development, implementation, and governance, but questions about what the interpretation and application of human rights require as the contexts of older persons' lives change.

This paper examines that challenge through two complementary steps. First, it identifies four human and societal realities of older age—diversity in older age; longer lives and evolving trajectories; living with support; and living with possibilities—and considers how AI is reshaping the contexts in which human rights are experienced, exercised and realised across each. These realities provide the analytical lens for the paper. Second, it examines five international and regional AI instruments to identify the normative foundations they provide and consider the extent to which those foundations respond to the human-rights questions raised by the four realities.

The analysis examines five international and regional AI instruments selected to reflect different governance approaches: the *UNESCO Recommendation on the Ethics of Artificial Intelligence*; the *OECD Recommendation on Artificial Intelligence*; the *Council of Europe Framework Convention on Artificial Intelligence and Human Rights, Democracy and the Rule of Law*; the *African Union Continental Artificial Intelligence Strategy*; and the *ASEAN Guide on AI Governance and Ethics*.

These instruments differ in purpose, legal status, geographic reach and approach to AI governance. The analysis does not seek to rank them or expect each instrument to perform the same function. Rather, it examines the normative foundations each provides and the questions that arise when those foundations are considered against the four realities of older age.

The comparative analysis leads to five findings concerning the extent to which the instruments respond to the human-rights questions raised by the four realities. The paper concludes by considering what these

findings mean for the interpretation and application of human rights and for the development, implementation and governance of AI in relation to older persons.

2. Realities of AI and Older Persons

Artificial intelligence is changing more than individual technologies or services. It is reshaping the contexts in which older persons experience, exercise and realise their human rights throughout longer lives. Understanding these changes requires looking beyond specific AI applications to the broader human and societal realities they influence.

This section identifies four realities that together provide a lens through which to examine this changing context. They do not create new human rights. Rather, they highlight contexts in which existing human rights must be interpreted and applied. Each reality begins with the human and societal context, considers what AI is changing, and identifies the corresponding human-rights question that emerges.

Taken together, these realities provide the analytical lens for the comparative analysis that follows.

2.1 Reality 1 – Diversity in Older Age

Human and Societal Reality

Older persons are not a homogeneous group. Older age encompasses extraordinary diversity in health, abilities, culture, gender, income, education, geography, language, digital confidence, family circumstances, life experiences and personal aspirations. It also reflects diversity across age itself. The experiences and priorities of someone in their sixties may differ considerably from those of someone in their eighties or hundreds, just as the experiences of two people of the same age may be entirely different.

This diversity is also intersectional. Different characteristics, circumstances and accumulated life experiences interact over time, shaping how each person experiences older age.

These differences influence how older persons live, the opportunities available to them, the barriers they encounter and the choices they make. Human rights therefore require recognising diversity rather than assuming that age alone defines needs, preferences or capabilities.

What AI is Changing

Artificial intelligence is increasingly influencing decisions and services across many aspects of life, including healthcare, financial services, employment, public administration, communication and everyday technologies. AI has significant potential to improve accessibility, personalise services and strengthen the realisation of human rights for older persons.

At the same time, AI often relies on patterns, categories and assumptions derived from data. If these systems fail to recognise the diversity of older persons, they may unintentionally reinforce stereotypes, overlook individual circumstances or reduce complex lives to simplified assumptions based on age or other characteristics.

The challenge is therefore not whether AI supports older persons, but whether it recognises the diversity through which older persons experience, exercise and realise their human rights.

Illustrative Example

Imagine one hundred people, all aged eighty, using the same AI-enabled public service.

They share a chronological age, but little else can be assumed. They may differ in health, abilities, gender, culture, language, education, income, geography, digital confidence, family circumstances, relationships and aspirations.

Their experiences of older age are also shaped by intersectionality: these characteristics and circumstances interact in different ways, creating different opportunities, barriers and experiences of discrimination across their lives.

And by eighty, each person brings decades of accumulated life experience—different careers, relationships, opportunities, disadvantages, choices and experiences that have shaped who they are and how they live.

The AI system uses data to identify patterns and categories that help determine how information, assistance or services are provided. Those patterns may improve accessibility and enable more personalised responses.

But patterns can also obscure difference. If the system treats chronological age, or other characteristics associated with older age, as sufficient to infer people's needs, capabilities or preferences, it may fail to recognise the diversity of the individuals to whom it is being applied.

One hundred people may all be eighty years old. But they have arrived at eighty through one hundred different lives.

The human-rights challenge is therefore whether AI can recognise this diversity rather than reduce older persons to categories that fail to reflect the complexity of their lives.

Human Rights Objective

Recognise and respect the diversity of older persons in the realisation of human rights.

Human Rights Implications

AI has significant potential to strengthen the realisation of human rights by enabling more personalised services, improving accessibility and responding to individual circumstances. These capabilities should be encouraged and further developed.

However, the diversity of older persons means that the same AI system, service or approach may have very different implications for different individuals. Differences in health, abilities, culture, gender, income, education, geography, language, digital confidence, family circumstances, relationships, accumulated life experiences and aspirations may interact in ways that shape both how AI is experienced and whether it supports the realisation of human rights.

A human rights approach therefore requires attention not only to age, but also to diversity within older age and the intersection of different characteristics and circumstances. AI systems that rely on broad categories or assumptions may fail to recognise these differences, overlook individual circumstances or reproduce existing inequalities.

Accordingly, AI should be developed, implemented and used in ways that recognise the diversity of older persons, avoid assumptions that age or other characteristics alone determine needs, preferences or capabilities, and support meaningful choice about how technology is integrated into people's lives.

Interpretive Question: *How should equality and non-discrimination be interpreted and applied so that AI recognises the diversity of older persons?*

Reflection

The diversity of older persons demonstrates that AI cannot be assessed solely by whether it functions effectively. It must also be assessed by whether it recognises the different circumstances, experiences and ways in which older persons live, participate and exercise their human rights.

2.2 Reality 2 – Longer Lives, Evolving Trajectories

Human and Societal Reality

People are living longer than ever before. Longer lives create opportunities for continued learning, work, participation, contribution and personal fulfilment. They also mean that older persons experience multiple transitions throughout later life. These transitions extend well beyond changing physical, sensory or cognitive capacities. They include evolving family roles, relationships, aspirations, priorities, support needs, living arrangements and participation in community life.

These evolving trajectories are neither linear nor predictable. Some arise through personal choice, while others result from illness, disability, bereavement, economic circumstances or broader social and environmental factors beyond an individual's control. Throughout these transitions, however, older persons remain the same rights-holder. The challenge is therefore to ensure the continued realisation of human rights as trajectories evolve over longer lives.

What AI is Changing

Artificial intelligence is increasingly developed, implemented and used to identify patterns, monitor change and support decision-making over time. Much of this work has developed through longitudinal data, particularly in healthcare, where AI analyses evolving clinical information to support diagnosis, anticipate changing support needs and personalise interventions. Similar approaches are increasingly being adopted in education, employment, financial services, public administration and assistive technologies.

These developments create significant opportunities to support older persons throughout longer lives.

However, the longitudinal data informing AI are often domain-specific. Healthcare data, for example, provide valuable insights into changing health and functional capacity, while other datasets capture particular aspects of work, learning or service use. Collectively, these data improve AI's ability to identify patterns and changes within specific dimensions of a person's life, but they provide only a partial understanding of the broader trajectories through which older persons experience, exercise and realise their human rights.

Understanding the evolving trajectories of longer lives therefore requires more than longitudinal data. It also requires recognising the lived experiences, aspirations, concerns and goals that shape those trajectories.

Illustrative Example

Imagine a woman who retires from a long career at the age of seventy.

Retirement marks one of several transitions across her longer life. She begins studying a subject she has long wanted to pursue, using AI-enabled learning and translation tools to support her studies.

In her early eighties, her circumstances change unexpectedly when her partner dies. Her priorities, relationships and daily life change. AI-enabled services help her navigate practical matters and remain connected with family and community.

At eighty-five, she completes the university degree she began years earlier.

In her nineties, arthritis increasingly affects her ability to write and travel. AI-enabled accessibility and communication tools enable her to adapt how she works, communicates and participates.

By 101, her circumstances have changed again. She requires greater support in some areas of her life while continuing to mentor younger people and participate in her community in others.

Across these decades, AI encounters different dimensions of her life through health information, educational records, service use and other forms of longitudinal data. These data may become increasingly detailed over time. Yet they cannot, on their own, explain the meaning of these transitions to her, how she understands her changing circumstances, or what she wants for the next stage of her life.

Her circumstances change. Her aspirations change. Her roles change. Her capacities and support needs change. Her rights do not.

This is why understanding longer lives requires more than longitudinal data. It also requires *longitudinal human experience*: the lived experiences, concerns, preferences, aspirations and goals that only the person herself can contribute.

Human Rights Objective

Ensure the continued realisation of human rights as trajectories evolve over longer lives.

Human Rights Implications

AI can contribute to the realisation of human rights by identifying changes in capacities and helping anticipate evolving support needs. These are important advances and should continue to be strengthened.

However, human rights are experienced through the broader trajectories of older persons' lives. Longitudinal data describing health, function or service use provide valuable knowledge, but they cannot fully represent evolving aspirations, relationships, participation, personal goals or the meanings older persons attach to different stages of later life.

A human rights approach therefore requires broadening the knowledge that informs AI. This is not simply a question of collecting more data. It is a question of recognising that longitudinal human experience is itself an essential source of knowledge. Older persons should participate in AI development and governance, bringing their lived experiences, concerns, aspirations and goals to help ensure that AI development, implementation and governance are better informed by the evolving trajectories through which human rights are experienced and exercised.

Accordingly, AI should be developed, implemented and used in ways that recognise the limits of what data alone can represent and enable the meaningful participation of older persons in informing how AI supports the realisation of human rights throughout longer lives.

Interpretive Question: *How should human rights be interpreted and applied so that AI enables older persons to continue to realise their rights as trajectories evolve over longer lives?*

Reflection

Longer lives are not simply characterised by changing capacities. They are characterised by evolving trajectories shaped by changing circumstances, relationships, aspirations, roles and support needs.

AI can play an important role in supporting these trajectories, but longitudinal data alone cannot capture their full human meaning. Human rights interpretation therefore requires recognising not only patterns of

change, but also the evolving lived experiences through which older persons exercise and realise their rights throughout longer lives.

2.3 Reality 3 – Living with Support

Human and Societal Reality

Support is a normal part of the human experience. Throughout life, people both give and receive support from family members, friends, communities, professionals and increasingly from technology. As people age, the type and intensity of support may change, but the need for support should never diminish personhood or reduce an older person's role in directing their own life.

Older persons may receive support in communication, mobility, healthcare, decision-making, daily living and community participation. Human rights therefore require more than ensuring support is available. They require ensuring that support respects dignity and autonomy, enables older persons to make informed decisions, and respects their will and preferences, while recognising the older person as the primary rights-holder.

What AI is Changing

Artificial intelligence is increasingly developed, implemented and used as part of how support is provided. AI can assist with communication, improve accessibility, support memory, personalise learning, identify changing support needs, facilitate access to services and help older persons remain connected to their families and communities.

These developments create significant opportunities to strengthen the realisation of human rights by enabling older persons to exercise greater independence, participation and self-determination throughout longer lives.

At the same time, AI is increasingly capable of monitoring behaviour, making recommendations, automating responses and initiating actions on behalf of individuals. As AI becomes more embedded within systems of support, an important human rights question emerges:

Does AI strengthen the older person's ability to make informed decisions and exercise their will and preferences, or does it gradually begin to substitute for them?

Illustrative Example

Imagine an older person experiencing early cognitive changes.

An AI assistant helps prepare for medical appointments by explaining treatment options in plain language, reminding the individual of questions they wish to ask and recording their preferences before meeting with their healthcare team. During family discussions, AI supports communication by helping clarify the older person's wishes and ensuring their views remain central to decisions affecting their life.

Here, AI supports autonomy by helping the older person understand relevant information, make informed decisions and communicate their will and preferences.

Now imagine the same technology evolving differently.

The AI automatically notifies family members before speaking with the older person, adjusts routines based on predicted risks without consultation and increasingly communicates recommendations directly to

caregivers rather than the individual. Family members begin relying on AI recommendations instead of asking the older person about their wishes.

The technology continues to provide support. But the older person is becoming less involved in decisions about their own life.

Support has begun to become substitution.

The human rights question is therefore not simply whether AI provides support, but whether that support enables the older person to remain the rights-holder at the centre of decisions affecting their life—able to understand relevant information, make informed decisions and have their will and preferences respected.

Human Rights Objective

Ensure that AI-enabled support strengthens autonomy and enables older persons to make informed decisions and have their will and preferences respected.

Human Rights Implications

AI has significant potential to strengthen the realisation of human rights by enhancing communication, accessibility, decision support and participation throughout longer lives. These capabilities should be encouraged and further developed.

However, support should never become a justification for replacing the older person's own voice or participation in decisions affecting their life. Human rights require support that enables older persons to understand relevant information, make informed decisions and express their will and preferences.

The presence of another person in a decision-making process does not by itself ensure this. A family member, professional or caregiver may be involved while the older person has little influence over the decision. The relevant human rights question is whether AI and the surrounding support enable the older person to remain the rights-holder at the centre of decisions affecting their life.

Accordingly, AI should be developed, implemented and used in ways that support informed decision-making, respect will and preferences, preserve meaningful participation and ensure that support strengthens rather than substitutes for the older person's role in directing their own life.

Interpretive Question

How should autonomy and support be interpreted and applied so that older persons can make informed decisions and have their will and preferences respected when AI is used?

Reflection

AI has enormous potential to transform how support is provided throughout longer lives. The challenge is not whether AI should provide support, but how that support is understood. Human rights require support that strengthens the older person's ability to understand, decide and participate, with their will and preferences respected, rather than support that gradually substitutes for them.

2.4 Reality 4 – Living with Possibilities

Human and Societal Reality

Longer lives create opportunities as well as challenges. Older persons continue to learn, create, work, volunteer, mentor, innovate, care for others, participate in civic life and redefine personal goals throughout later life. Their aspirations and contributions continue to evolve, bringing knowledge, experience and perspectives that become increasingly valuable in a rapidly changing world.

Human rights are therefore realised not only by protecting older persons from harm or ensuring access to support. They are also realised by expanding opportunities for older persons to continue becoming who they wish to become, contributing in the ways they choose and shaping the future of their families, communities and societies.

What AI is Changing

Artificial intelligence is increasingly developed, implemented and used to expand human capability. It can remove barriers to communication, increase access to education, support creativity, strengthen entrepreneurship, accelerate scientific discovery, facilitate civic participation and connect older persons with opportunities that transcend geography, language and physical limitations.

These developments create opportunities not simply for older persons to continue participating in society, but to contribute in new ways that were previously difficult or impossible.

At the same time, AI can also narrow possibilities. Algorithmic bias, inaccessible design, automated decision-making and age-based assumptions may unintentionally limit opportunities for employment, education, leadership, innovation and participation.

The human rights challenge is therefore not simply whether AI creates opportunities. It is whether AI expands the possibilities for older persons to participate, pursue their aspirations and shape their own futures.

Illustrative Example

Imagine a marine scientist in her early seventies who has spent a lifetime observing coastal ecosystems.

Using generative AI, satellite imagery and environmental modelling, she analyses decades of personal observations alongside global environmental data to help develop climate adaptation strategies adopted by governments and coastal communities around the world. AI rapidly identifies patterns across vast datasets, models future scenarios and translates scientific findings into practical policy options.

Without AI, analysing her lifetime of observations alongside vast global datasets and modelling their implications at this scale might have been difficult or impossible.

With AI, her decades of knowledge and experience can be combined with new analytical capabilities, extending the reach and potential impact of her contribution.

AI does not simply enable older persons to continue what they have done before. It can expand the possibilities for what they may choose to do next and how they contribute.

Human Rights Objective

Enable older persons to realise their human rights by expanding opportunities to participate, pursue their aspirations and shape their own futures throughout longer lives.

Human Rights Implications

Artificial intelligence has the potential to transform how older persons learn, create, innovate, work, mentor, volunteer and contribute to society. By reducing barriers and amplifying human capability, AI can create opportunities that extend well beyond traditional assumptions about later life.

These possibilities, however, will not be realised automatically. They depend on whether AI is developed, implemented and used in ways that recognise older persons as innovators, creators, leaders, mentors and contributors—not merely as recipients of care or support.

A human rights approach therefore requires moving beyond narratives that frame older persons primarily through vulnerability or dependency. AI should be developed, implemented and used in ways that expand opportunities, foster continued human development and enable older persons to pursue new aspirations, contribute their knowledge and experience, and continue shaping their own futures throughout longer lives.

Interpretive Question: *How should participation and self-determination be interpreted and applied to enable older persons to shape the futures they want in an AI-enabled world?*

Reflection

AI presents an opportunity to rethink not only how societies support older persons, but how they value and enable continuing human development throughout longer lives. Human rights are realised not simply by protecting older persons from exclusion or harm, but by expanding opportunities for them to continue learning, creating, leading and contributing in ways that reflect their aspirations and potential.

2.5 Reflection – Emerging Human Rights Questions for AI Development and Implementation

The four realities presented above do not create new human rights. Rather, they illustrate how AI is reshaping the contexts in which older persons experience, exercise and realise their human rights throughout longer lives.

Collectively, they demonstrate that AI must respond to:

- **the diversity of older persons**, recognising diversity within older age, including intersectional differences and accumulated life experiences;
- **the evolving trajectories of longer lives**, supporting the continued realisation of human rights while recognising that longitudinal data provide only a partial understanding of those trajectories and must be complemented by longitudinal human experience;
- **living with support**, ensuring that AI-enabled support strengthens autonomy, enables informed decision-making and respects the will and preferences of older persons rather than substituting for their role in directing their own lives; and
- **living with possibilities**, expanding opportunities for older persons to participate, pursue their aspirations and shape their own futures throughout longer lives.

3. Comparative Analysis of AI Instruments

3.1 Approach to the Comparative Analysis

Five international and regional AI instruments were examined to consider the extent to which emerging approaches to AI provide foundations relevant to the realisation of human rights in older age:

- the UNESCO Recommendation on the Ethics of Artificial Intelligence;
- the OECD Recommendation on Artificial Intelligence;
- the Council of Europe Framework Convention on Artificial Intelligence and Human Rights, Democracy and the Rule of Law;
- the African Union Continental Artificial Intelligence Strategy; and
- the ASEAN Guide on AI Governance and Ethics.

The instruments differ significantly in purpose, legal status, geographic reach and approach. They include an ethical recommendation, intergovernmental principles, a legally binding convention, a continental development strategy and a practical governance guide. The comparison is therefore not intended to rank the instruments or assess them against a single model. Rather, it examines the normative foundations each provides within its own purpose and character.

The comparative analysis considers six dimensions:

1. purpose;
2. participating States;
3. human rights coverage;
4. recognition of older persons and older age;
5. normative readiness across the four realities identified in Section 2; and
6. unresolved questions.

Normative readiness is assessed using the four realities—Diversity in Older Age; Longer Lives, Evolving Trajectories; Living with Support; and Living with Possibilities—as analytical lenses through which to examine the foundations provided by each instrument and the extent to which their implications for older persons are developed.

Detailed evidence, instrument-level analysis and evidence-based observations supporting the comparison are set out in [Appendix A](#).

3.2 Purpose, Reach and Character of the Instruments

The five instruments approach AI from different institutional and normative starting points.

The UNESCO Recommendation establishes a global ethical framework grounded in human dignity, human rights and fundamental freedoms, supported by policy guidance across multiple sectors.

The OECD Recommendation establishes intergovernmental principles for innovative and trustworthy AI together with recommendations for national policy and international cooperation.

The Council of Europe Framework Convention establishes a legally binding framework requiring activities involving AI systems to be consistent with existing human rights, democracy and the rule of law.

The African Union Continental Artificial Intelligence Strategy places AI within a broader people-centred agenda of inclusive socio-economic development, capability-building and innovation while incorporating human-rights and ethical safeguards.

The ASEAN Guide has a more operational orientation, translating responsible-AI principles into practical organisational governance concerning areas such as risk management, accountability, data governance and human involvement in AI-augmented decision-making.

Their geographic reach and legal effect also differ. UNESCO has global reach through its Member States; the OECD Recommendation extends across OECD members and adhering jurisdictions; the Council of Europe Convention is a treaty framework with potential participation beyond Council of Europe membership; and the African Union and ASEAN instruments provide continental and regional frameworks respectively. With the exception of the Council of Europe Convention, the instruments are non-binding.

These differences provide important context for the comparison. The analysis considers the normative foundations each instrument provides within its particular purpose, scope and form of authority. Detailed

evidence concerning the purpose, participating States and legal character of each instrument is provided in [Appendix A](#).

3.3 Human Rights Foundations and Recognition of Older Persons

All five instruments contain foundations relevant to human rights, although those foundations differ in their framing, scope and authority.

UNESCO provides an extensive and explicit human-rights foundation encompassing dignity, autonomy, equality and non-discrimination, privacy, participation, diversity, inclusion, accessibility, transparency and accountability, alongside policy commitments concerning education, research, work, culture and human development. The OECD similarly combines human rights and democratic values with commitments concerning human capability, creativity, inclusive growth, skills, employment and broadly shared benefits.

In the Council of Europe Convention, existing human-rights obligations provide the legal benchmark against which activities involving AI systems are assessed. Its legally binding framework includes dignity and individual autonomy, equality and non-discrimination, privacy, transparency, oversight and accountability, supported by risk and impact assessment, procedural safeguards and remedies.

The African Union Strategy embeds human rights and human dignity within a broader people-centred development framework, combining non-discrimination, autonomy, privacy and inclusion with lifelong learning, participation, innovation and socio-economic development. ASEAN does not establish an international human-rights framework as such, but incorporates rights-relevant protections through human-centricity, fairness and equity, privacy, transparency, accountability, safety and human involvement.

Recognition of older persons and older age, however, is uneven.

UNESCO expressly recognises age and older persons, although older persons are most visible in contexts of care, assistance and vulnerability and less visible across its wider developmental provisions. The African Union Strategy expressly identifies age in relation to non-discrimination and refers to AI-enabled technologies supporting the autonomy and quality of life of “the elderly and/or dependents,” but older persons are less visible across its broader commitments concerning lifelong learning, skills, work, innovation and development.

The OECD Recommendation, Council of Europe Convention and ASEAN Guide do not expressly identify older persons or older age. Older persons are encompassed through universal protections or broader categories such as individuals, workers, affected stakeholders, underrepresented populations, demographics and vulnerable persons. The Council of Europe Convention is notable in expressly requiring attention to the rights, needs and vulnerabilities of children and persons with disabilities while containing no comparable provision concerning older persons.

The detailed human-rights provisions and forms of recognition identified within each instrument are set out in [Appendix A](#).

3.4 Normative Readiness Across the Four Realities

The four realities identified in Section 2 were used to examine how the normative foundations identified across the five instruments relate to the human-rights questions arising in older age.

The comparison is summarised below. Detailed evidence and instrument-level analysis supporting each assessment are provided in [Appendix A](#).

Reality	UNESCO	OECD	Council of Europe	African Union	ASEAN
Diversity in Older Age	Equality, non-discrimination and diversity foundations; further interpretation needed for diversity within older age, including intersectionality and accumulated life experiences.	Universal equality, non-discrimination and diversity foundations; application to diversity within older age remains implicit.	Legal foundations for equality, differentiated impacts and intersecting characteristics; application to diversity within older age remains undeveloped.	Inclusion and diversity foundations with explicit age non-discrimination; diversity within older age remains underdeveloped.	Relevant fairness, representative-data and human-centric foundations; application to diversity within older age remains undeveloped.
Longer Lives, Evolving Trajectories	Broad cross-sectoral foundations; continued rights realisation across evolving trajectories and longitudinal human experience are not substantively developed.	Relevant data, traceability, stakeholder and interdisciplinary foundations; evolving trajectories and longitudinal human experience remain largely undeveloped.	Iterative risk and impact assessment can respond to changing AI impacts, but evolving human trajectories and longitudinal human experience are not substantively addressed.	Broad cross-sectoral, user-centred and lifelong-learning foundations; evolving trajectories and longitudinal human experience are not substantively developed.	Data governance, monitoring and risk assessment address changing AI effects, but evolving human trajectories and longitudinal human experience are largely outside the Guide's focus.
Living with Support	Strong autonomy and safeguard foundations; further interpretation needed to ensure informed decision-making and respect for older persons' will and preferences.	Strong human-agency, oversight, transparency and contestability foundations; application to older persons' informed decisions, will and preferences requires further interpretation.	Strong legal foundations for autonomy, transparency, challenge and procedural safeguards; further interpretation needed to keep older persons' informed decisions, will and preferences central.	Explicit older-age foundation through autonomy and quality of life; informed decision-making, will and preferences, and the boundary between support and substitution remain underdeveloped.	Strong practical mechanisms for human involvement; further interpretation needed to ensure they support older persons' autonomy, informed decisions, and will and preferences.
Living with Possibilities	Strong participation and human-development foundations; application to older persons' continuing aspirations, contribution and ability to shape their futures remains limited.	Strong foundations for human capability, creativity and inclusive growth; application to older persons' continuing aspirations, contribution and future possibilities remains implicit.	Legal foundations for rights-compatible innovation and participation, but comparatively limited guidance on continuing aspirations, contribution and self-determined futures in older age.	Very strong foundations for lifelong learning, participation, innovation and human development; broader developmental opportunities are not systematically extended to older persons.	General foundation for beneficial and human-centred AI, but comparatively limited guidance on older persons' continuing aspirations, participation, contribution and ability to shape their futures.

4. Findings

The comparative analysis demonstrates that current international and regional AI instruments contain substantial foundations relevant to the realisation of human rights in older age. The central issue is therefore not simply the absence of human rights principles. Rather, it is whether those principles are sufficiently interpreted and applied to the realities of older age.

Five findings emerge.

4.1 Human Rights Principles and Standards Are Not Yet Sufficiently Interpreted and Applied to the Realities of Older Age

The instruments examined contain foundations relevant to the realisation of human rights. Dignity, autonomy, equality and non-discrimination, privacy, participation, human agency, transparency and accountability appear in different forms across the instruments. Several also extend beyond protection from harm to include human capability, creativity, learning, work, innovation, development and well-being.

This provides a substantial normative foundation. It does not, however, establish that those principles have been sufficiently interpreted and applied to the realities of older age.

The distinction is important. A principle may apply universally while providing limited guidance on what its realisation requires in particular circumstances. Equality and non-discrimination may be recognised without addressing what their application requires across the diversity of older age, including intersectionality and accumulated life experiences. Human-rights protections may apply across time without addressing their continued realisation as an older person's circumstances, aspirations and trajectory evolve over a longer life. Autonomy may be recognised without determining what is required to enable an older person to make informed decisions and have their will and preferences respected when AI is used. Participation and human development may be supported without considering how older persons can continue to pursue their aspirations, contribute and shape their own futures.

Normative readiness therefore requires more than the presence of relevant principles or standards. It requires sufficient interpretation and application of those principles to enable human rights to be realised across the diverse and evolving circumstances of older persons' lives.

4.2 Older Persons Are Not Fully Recognised and Accounted For Across the Five AI Instruments

Older persons do not need to be expressly named in every provision for human rights to apply to them. Universal human rights remain universal. The comparative analysis nevertheless shows that the extent to which older persons and older age are expressly recognised varies considerably across the five instruments.

UNESCO and the African Union expressly recognise age or older persons, while the OECD Recommendation, Council of Europe Convention and ASEAN Guide rely principally on universal protections or broader categories of persons, populations and stakeholders. Where older persons are not expressly recognised, their particular circumstances must therefore be addressed through the interpretation and implementation of more general principles and standards.

Express recognition, however, does not by itself mean that the full realities of older age are accounted for. In the instruments that expressly recognise older persons, references are particularly evident in contexts associated with care, assistance, health, autonomy, quality of life or vulnerability. These are important dimensions of older age, but they are not its entirety.

At the same time, some of the instruments contain broader provisions concerning areas such as education, lifelong learning, work, creativity, innovation, participation, entrepreneurship, culture and development. These provisions are not generally articulated specifically in relation to older persons.

The comparative finding is therefore twofold: older persons are not consistently recognised across the five instruments and, where they are expressly recognised, that recognition does not necessarily account for the full range of circumstances, aspirations and possibilities through which they experience, exercise and realise their human rights.

4.3 The Five AI Instruments Do Not Yet Substantively Address Evolving Human Trajectories in Older Age

The comparative analysis identifies foundations across the five instruments that are relevant to change over time.

These include cross-sectoral approaches, data governance, stakeholder engagement, user-centred research, lifelong learning, and mechanisms for assessing changing impacts of AI systems. These foundations are important, but they do not substantially address the continued realisation of human rights as an older person's own circumstances, relationships, aspirations, roles and support needs evolve over a longer life.

This distinction is important. Provisions concerning the lifecycle of an AI system or the changing impacts of AI are not the same as attention to the evolving trajectory of a human life. Similarly, increasingly detailed or longitudinal data about health, employment, service use or other domains may provide valuable knowledge about particular aspects of a person's life, but they do not necessarily provide a fuller understanding of the life as a whole.

Life trajectories are neither linear nor predictable. They are shaped by relationships, opportunities, environments, social and economic circumstances, unexpected events and personal choices. As these trajectories evolve, older persons themselves contribute knowledge that data alone cannot provide: how they understand their circumstances, what matters to them, and how their concerns, preferences, aspirations and goals may be changing.

The comparison therefore reinforces an important distinction between longitudinal data and longitudinal human experience. The instruments contain relevant foundations for data governance, consultation and participation, but they do not substantially develop how older persons' evolving lived experience should inform AI alongside longitudinal and other domain-specific data.

The comparative finding is therefore that normative readiness for longer lives requires more than mechanisms capable of tracking data or AI impacts over time. It also requires ways of accounting for the evolving human experience through which older persons continue to exercise and realise their rights.

4.4 The Five AI Instruments Do Not Yet Fully Address Autonomy and Self-Determination in AI-Enabled Support in Older Age

The five instruments contain important foundations relevant to autonomy and self-determination when AI is used as part of support. Across the instruments, these include dignity and autonomy, consent, human agency, transparency and explainability, opportunities to challenge decisions or outputs, procedural safeguards, accessibility and user empowerment. The African Union Strategy provides a particularly direct connection to older age by recognising the potential for AI-enabled technologies to support the autonomy and quality of life of older persons.

These foundations are significant. However, the comparative analysis shows that the instruments provide less developed guidance on what autonomy and self-determination require from the perspective of the older person receiving AI-enabled support.

AI-enabled support may strengthen an older person's ability to access and understand information, communicate their preferences, make informed decisions and participate in decisions affecting their life. But as AI takes a greater role in identifying needs, assessing risks, making recommendations or initiating actions, support may also begin to influence or replace decisions that would otherwise be made by the older person.

The distinction is therefore not simply between AI decision-making and human decision-making. It is between support that strengthens the older person's own decision-making and support that begins to substitute for it. The safeguards and governance mechanisms identified across the instruments do not yet fully articulate where that boundary lies or what is required to ensure that the older person's will and preferences remain central as AI becomes part of support.

The comparative finding is therefore that existing foundations for autonomy and self-determination require further interpretation and application to ensure that AI-enabled support strengthens older persons' ability to make informed decisions and have their will and preferences respected, rather than gradually substituting for their own decision-making.

4.5 The Five AI Instruments Do Not Yet Fully Address Continuing Aspirations, Participation and Contribution in Older Age

The five instruments contain foundations that extend beyond protection from harm and the management of AI-related risks. Across the instruments, these include commitments concerning human capability, education and lifelong learning, creativity, work, innovation, entrepreneurship, participation, inclusion, development and well-being. The nature and extent of these foundations vary according to the purpose and character of each instrument, with particularly substantial developmental foundations in the African Union Strategy and important enabling foundations in the UNESCO and OECD Recommendations.

These provisions demonstrate that the normative foundations relevant to AI are not concerned solely with protection. They also encompass ways in which AI may support human development, participation and the exercise of capabilities.

The comparative analysis, however, shows that these broader enabling and developmental foundations are not generally articulated specifically in relation to older persons. Even where older persons or age are expressly recognised elsewhere in an instrument, that recognition is not systematically carried through to provisions concerning learning, work, creativity, innovation, participation and development.

This gap is significant in the context of longer lives. Older persons may continue to develop new aspirations, learn, work, create, innovate, participate and contribute in ways that change over time. The question raised by the comparison is therefore not only whether older persons are protected from the risks associated with AI, but whether the broader opportunities contemplated within these instruments are understood as extending throughout older age.

The comparative finding is therefore that the five instruments provide important foundations for human development and participation, but do not yet fully develop what those foundations require to enable older persons to pursue their aspirations, participate and contribute in the ways they choose, and shape their own futures throughout longer lives.

4.6 Overall Finding

Taken together, the findings point to a gap between normative coverage and normative readiness.

Relevant normative foundations are identifiable across all five instruments, although their nature, strength, specificity and application vary. The comparative analysis shows that the presence of relevant human rights principles, standards and governance mechanisms does not by itself establish that they are sufficiently interpreted and applied to the realities of older age.

Across the five instruments, older persons are not fully recognised and accounted for; evolving trajectories in older age are not yet substantively addressed; autonomy and self-determination in AI-enabled support in older age are not yet fully addressed; and continuing aspirations, participation and contribution in older age are not yet fully addressed.

The overall finding is therefore that the gap lies not simply in whether relevant normative foundations exist, but in whether they are sufficiently interpreted and applied to enable human rights to be realised across the diverse and evolving realities of older age.

The question arising from these findings is therefore not simply whether current AI instruments contain principles, standards and governance mechanisms relevant to human rights. It is what is required for these normative foundations to enable the realisation of human rights for older persons in the development, implementation and use of AI.

5. Recommendations

The findings suggest that improving normative readiness for older age does not necessarily require a separate set of AI principles for older persons. Rather, greater attention is needed to how human rights are interpreted and applied to the realities of older age, who participates in that process, and how that interpretation is translated into the development, implementation and governance of AI.

Three recommendations follow.

5.1 Interpret and Apply Human Rights to the Diverse and Evolving Realities of Older Age in an AI World

Human rights principles and standards should be interpreted and applied in ways that respond to the realities of older age rather than relying on general principles or assumptions about older persons alone.

This requires attention to diversity within older age; to circumstances, aspirations and goals that may evolve across longer lives; to autonomy and self-determination where AI forms part of support; and to older persons' continuing opportunities to learn, create, participate, contribute and pursue new possibilities.

Such interpretation can provide greater clarity about what the realisation of existing human rights requires as AI becomes increasingly embedded in the contexts of older persons' lives.

5.2 Ensure Older Persons Participate Meaningfully in Shaping Interpretation and Application of Human Rights in an AI World

Older persons should participate meaningfully in determining what the realisation of human rights requires as AI intersects with the realities of older age.

Their participation should extend beyond being sources of data or being consulted after AI systems, policies or governance approaches have already been developed. Older persons bring diverse and accumulated life experiences, as well as changing concerns, preferences, aspirations and goals that cannot necessarily be inferred from data or determined by others.

Meaningful participation is therefore not only a matter of inclusion. It is necessary to understanding how human rights should be interpreted and applied across the diverse and evolving circumstances of longer lives.

5.3 Translate Human-Rights Interpretation into AI Development, Implementation and Governance

Greater normative clarity will have limited effect unless it shapes how AI is developed, implemented and governed.

Human-rights interpretation informed by the realities and participation of older persons should therefore be reflected in relevant AI processes, including design and data practices, impact and risk assessment, deployment, monitoring and review, and governance and decision-making. These processes should consider not only risks of harm or exclusion, but also whether AI supports autonomy and self-determination, responds to changing circumstances, and enables participation and possibilities across longer lives.

This translation from human-rights interpretation into AI practice is necessary if human rights are to remain capable of realisation as AI continues to evolve.

Together, these three recommendations offer a way forward—so that as AI evolves, older persons can continue to exercise and realise their human rights across longer lives.

6. Conclusion

AI is changing the contexts in which older persons experience, exercise and realise their human rights. The comparative analysis demonstrates that relevant normative foundations exist, but that further interpretation and application are needed to respond to the diversity of older age, evolving trajectories over longer lives, AI-enabled support, and continuing aspirations, participation and contribution.

The task ahead is therefore not simply to ensure that older persons are protected as AI develops. It is to ensure that human rights continue to enable older persons to shape how they live, who they become and the futures they choose throughout longer lives in an AI-enabled world.

Appendix A. Comparative Analysis of International and Regional AI Instruments

A.1 Analytical Framework

Each instrument is examined across six dimensions: *Purpose*; *Participating States*; *Human Rights Coverage*; *Recognition of Older Persons and Older Age*; *Normative Readiness for Human Rights in Older Age*; and *Unresolved Questions*.

For each dimension, the appendix preserves the evidence identified, the analysis of that evidence, and an evidence-based observation that can subsequently be used in the cross-instrument comparison

A.2 UNESCO Recommendation on the Ethics of Artificial Intelligence (<https://www.unesco.org/en/artificial-intelligence/recommendation-ethics>)

Dimension	Evidence identified / analysis	Evidence-based observation
1. Purpose	Evidence: Global ethical framework grounded in human dignity, human rights and fundamental freedoms. Values and principles are translated into policy action across multiple sectors and the AI lifecycle. Analysis: Combines a normative ethical framework with relatively detailed policy guidance rather than operating only as a statement of high-level principles.	Establishes a global ethical framework for AI grounded in human dignity, human rights and fundamental freedoms, with values and principles translated into cross-sectoral policy action.
2. Participating States	Evidence: Adopted by UNESCO Member States as a Recommendation rather than a treaty. Analysis: Has global reach but does not create treaty obligations; implementation occurs through national legislative, policy and institutional measures.	Global, non-binding instrument intended for implementation across UNESCO Member States through national measures.
3. Human Rights Coverage	Evidence: Human dignity; human rights and fundamental freedoms; autonomy; equality and non-discrimination; fairness; privacy and data protection; human oversight and determination; transparency and explainability; accountability; diversity and inclusion; accessibility; participation; safety and security; sustainability; quality of life. Policy areas include education, research, health and social well-being, culture, communication, economy and labour.	Explicit human-rights foundation centred on dignity and fundamental freedoms, combining protective rights with enabling commitments concerning participation, inclusion, development and quality of life across multiple areas.

Dimension	Evidence identified / analysis	Evidence-based observation
	Analysis: Human rights are explicit rather than inferred. The framework combines protective rights with enabling dimensions such as participation, inclusion, education, development and quality of life and links these to policy action.	
4. Recognition of Older Persons and Older Age	Evidence: Age is expressly included within the dignity/equality framework. Older persons are expressly identified in relation to AI assistance and care and alongside persons potentially in vulnerable situations. Broader provisions address diversity, accessibility and different relationships with technology. Analysis: Recognition is explicit rather than solely implicit. However, older persons become most visible in care, assistance and vulnerability contexts and are less expressly visible across education, work, culture, research, innovation and contribution.	Recognises age and older persons, but older persons are substantially more visible in care, assistance and vulnerability contexts than across the instrument's wider developmental domains.
5A. Normative Readiness — Diversity in Older Age	Evidence: Dignity; autonomy; equality and non-discrimination; diversity; inclusion; accessibility; participation; differing relationships with technology. Analysis: Provides normative foundations for recognising diversity among older persons through equality and non-discrimination, diversity, inclusion, accessibility and participation. These foundations are relevant to differences in circumstances, characteristics, values, experiences and choices. However, the Recommendation does not systematically interpret equality and non-discrimination in relation to diversity within older age, including intersectional differences and the accumulated life experiences that shape how older persons experience and exercise their rights.	Normative foundations exist for recognising diversity, but further interpretation is needed to apply equality and non-discrimination across the diversity within older age, including intersectional differences and accumulated life experiences.
5B. Normative Readiness — Longer Lives, Evolving Trajectories	Evidence: Health; education; work; research; culture; participation; diversity of knowledge; stakeholder engagement. Analysis: Provides broad cross-sectoral foundations relevant to the continued realisation of human rights as circumstances and trajectories change over longer lives. Its recognition of diverse forms of knowledge and stakeholder engagement also provides a basis for incorporating perspectives beyond domain-specific data. However, the Recommendation does not substantively address evolving trajectories throughout longer lives or how older	Relevant cross-sectoral foundations exist for the continued realisation of human rights across changing circumstances, but evolving trajectories over longer lives and the role of longitudinal human experience are not substantively developed.

Dimension	Evidence identified / analysis	Evidence-based observation
	persons' lived experiences, concerns, aspirations and goals should inform AI alongside longitudinal and other domain-specific data.	
5C. Normative Readiness — Living with Support	Evidence: Autonomy; human oversight and determination; proportionality; privacy; accessibility; health safeguards; protection against undue influence; informed consent in health contexts. Analysis: Provides normative foundations relevant to autonomy and the provision of AI-enabled support, including human determination, accessibility, proportionality, protection against undue influence and informed consent in health contexts. These foundations can support older persons in understanding information and participating in decisions affecting their lives. However, the Recommendation provides less explicit guidance on how AI-enabled support should enable informed decision-making and ensure that the older person's will and preferences remain central, particularly where AI increasingly monitors, recommends or initiates actions as part of support.	Normative foundations exist for autonomy and safeguards in AI-enabled support, but further interpretation is needed to ensure that support enables informed decision-making and respects the will and preferences of the older person rather than substituting for their role in directing their own life.
5D. Normative Readiness — Living with Possibilities	Evidence: Policy commitments and guidance concerning education and learning, scientific research, culture, employment and work, together with broader principles concerning participation, inclusion, human development and quality of life. These provisions recognise the potential for AI to support access to education and knowledge, scientific and creative activity, participation in cultural and economic life, and opportunities for human development. Analysis: Provides normative foundations for participation, inclusion and continued human development across education, research, culture and work. These foundations are relevant to enabling older persons to pursue aspirations, contribute their knowledge and experience and shape their own futures. However, these developmental and participatory commitments are not systematically applied to older persons as continuing learners, creators, innovators, leaders and contributors throughout longer lives.	Normative foundations exist for participation and continued human development, but further interpretation is needed to apply them to older persons' continuing aspirations, contributions and ability to shape their own futures.

Dimension	Evidence identified / analysis	Evidence-based observation
5. Overall Summation	Analysis across the four realities: Relevant normative foundations are identifiable across all four realities. UNESCO provides substantial foundations concerning equality and non-discrimination, diversity and inclusion; cross-sectoral human rights realisation and participation; autonomy and safeguards in AI-enabled support; and participation and continued human development. Application to older persons remains strongest in care, assistance and vulnerability contexts. Applying the broader normative foundations to diversity within older age, evolving trajectories over longer lives, autonomy and support, and continuing aspirations and contribution requires further interpretation.	UNESCO provides normative foundations relevant to all four realities, but normative readiness is uneven. Its strongest explicit application to older persons remains in care, assistance and vulnerability contexts, while further interpretation is needed to apply its broader human-rights foundations across the diversity, evolving trajectories, support needs and possibilities of older age.
6. Unresolved Questions	Analysis: The UNESCO Recommendation on the Ethics of Artificial Intelligence provides substantial human-rights foundations across all four realities and expressly recognises older persons. However, its explicit treatment of older persons is concentrated primarily in care, assistance and vulnerability contexts. It does not substantially develop how its broader commitments concerning equality and non-discrimination, participation, education, work, research, culture and human development should be interpreted and applied to older persons across diverse circumstances, evolving trajectories and continuing aspirations. Similarly, while autonomy, human oversight, accessibility, protection against undue influence and informed consent provide important foundations for AI-enabled support, the Recommendation does not fully address how these safeguards operate to keep the older person's will and preferences central when AI is involved in support and decision-making.	The principal unresolved issue is how UNESCO's broad human-rights foundations should be interpreted and applied to older persons as AI increasingly affects the ways they exercise and realise their rights across longer lives.

A.3 OECD Recommendation on Artificial Intelligence (<https://legalinstruments.oecd.org/en/instruments/oecd-legal-0449>)

Dimension	Evidence identified / analysis	Evidence-based observation
1. Purpose	Evidence: Intergovernmental principles for innovative and trustworthy AI, accompanied by policy recommendations for governments. Analysis: Combines values-based principles for AI actors with recommendations concerning national policy and international cooperation.	Establishes an intergovernmental principles-and-policy framework for innovative and trustworthy AI that respects human rights and democratic values.
2. Participating States	Evidence: OECD members and adhering partner jurisdictions; non-binding Recommendation. Analysis: Broad international reach, with implementation undertaken through national policies, regulation and international cooperation rather than treaty obligations.	Broad international reach through OECD members and adhering jurisdictions; politically authoritative but not legally binding.
3. Human Rights Coverage	Evidence: Human rights and democratic values; dignity; freedom and autonomy; equality and non-discrimination; diversity; fairness; privacy and data protection; social justice; labour rights; human agency and oversight; transparency and explainability; safety, security and robustness; accountability and traceability; inclusive growth; human capability and creativity; underrepresented populations; skills, employment, entrepreneurship and broadly shared benefits. Analysis: Provides explicit protective and enabling foundations. Its principle-based architecture is more concise than UNESCO's and leaves greater contextual interpretation to adherents and AI actors.	Broad and explicit human-rights and human-centred foundation combining dignity, autonomy, equality, privacy, agency, transparency and accountability with developmental commitments concerning human capability, creativity, inclusion and broadly shared benefits.
4. Recognition of Older Persons and Older Age	Evidence: Older persons and older age are not expressly identified. Age is not specifically enumerated in the substantive human-rights provision. Broader categories include individuals, workers, affected stakeholders and underrepresented populations. Analysis: Older persons are covered by universal principles but are not made visible as a distinct rights-holder group or older age as a particular context for interpreting those principles.	Older persons and older age are not expressly identified. They are encompassed by universal protections and broader inclusive categories, but older age is not made visible as a distinct context for interpreting or applying the Principles.
5A. Normative Readiness — Diversity in Older Age	Evidence: The OECD Principles require AI actors to respect human rights and democratic values, including dignity, autonomy, privacy and data protection, non-discrimination and equality. They also call for fairness and social justice, recognition	Universal foundations exist for equality, non-discrimination and diversity, but their application to diversity within older age, including intersectional differences and accumulated life experiences, remains implicit.

Dimension	Evidence identified / analysis	Evidence-based observation
	of diversity, safeguards to address risks arising from bias and the use of datasets appropriate to their intended context, and attention to populations that may be underrepresented or otherwise affected by inequalities. Analysis: These provisions provide universal foundations for recognising diversity. However, older persons are not expressly identified, and the Principles do not develop how equality, non-discrimination and related commitments should apply to diversity within older age, including intersectional differences and accumulated life experiences.	
5B. Normative Readiness — Longer Lives, Evolving Trajectories	Evidence: The OECD Principles take a lifecycle approach to AI and emphasise data quality and representativeness, traceability of datasets and processes, interdisciplinary research, investment in skills and training, and dialogue with relevant stakeholders. Together, these provisions support attention to changing circumstances, the knowledge informing AI systems and the participation of affected groups in their development and use. Analysis: These provide relevant foundations for responsible AI as circumstances change. However, the Principles do not address the continued realisation of human rights as individual trajectories evolve over longer lives, nor how older persons' lived experiences, concerns, aspirations and goals should inform AI alongside longitudinal and other domain-specific data.	Relevant foundations exist, but their application to the continued realisation of human rights across evolving trajectories over longer lives, including the role of longitudinal human experience, remains largely undeveloped.
5C. Normative Readiness — Living with Support	Evidence: The OECD Principles emphasise human agency and oversight and require transparency and responsible disclosure so that people can understand when they are interacting with AI and, where appropriate, understand and challenge AI-enabled outcomes. They also envisage mechanisms through which harmful or inappropriate AI systems can be overridden, repaired or decommissioned. Analysis: These provisions provide important foundations for enabling affected persons to understand and challenge AI-enabled decisions. However, the Principles do not clearly distinguish between oversight exercised by another human and	Important foundations exist for human agency, oversight and contestability, but further interpretation is needed to determine how they apply when AI is used to support an older person's decision-making, particularly in ensuring that the person's own will and preferences remain central.

Dimension	Evidence identified / analysis	Evidence-based observation
	the autonomy of the person affected by the decision, nor do they substantially address how AI-enabled support should enable informed decision-making and respect the older person's will and preferences.	
5D. Normative Readiness — Living with Possibilities	Evidence: The OECD Principles frame trustworthy AI as contributing to inclusive growth, sustainable development and well-being. They recognise AI's potential to augment human capabilities and enhance creativity and call for policies that support skills development, employment and entrepreneurship, reduce inequalities and promote broadly shared benefits from AI. Analysis: These provisions provide a strong developmental foundation for expanding human capability, creativity and opportunities for economic and social participation. However, older persons are not expressly identified, and the Principles do not develop how these opportunities should extend across longer lives or enable older persons to pursue continuing aspirations, contribute and shape their own futures.	Strong foundations exist for human capability, creativity, inclusive growth and participation in economic and social life, but their application to older persons' continuing aspirations, contributions and ability to shape their own futures remains implicit.
5. Overall Summation	Analysis across the four realities: The OECD Recommendation provides substantial normative foundations relevant across all four realities. Equality, non-discrimination, diversity and fairness provide foundations relevant to diversity in older age; lifecycle approaches, representative data, traceability and stakeholder dialogue are relevant to evolving trajectories; human agency, oversight, transparency and contestability provide foundations relevant to AI-enabled support; and commitments to human capability, creativity, inclusive growth, skills, employment and entrepreneurship provide particularly strong foundations for living with possibilities. However, older persons and older age are not expressly identified, so the application of these universal provisions to the realities of older persons' lives remains largely implicit.	The OECD Recommendation provides substantial universal normative foundations relevant to all four realities, including particularly strong commitments to human capability, creativity and inclusive growth. Its normative readiness for older persons remains largely implicit, however, because neither older persons nor older age are expressly recognised and the application of its universal principles across the diverse and evolving realities of longer lives is not developed.
6. Unresolved Questions	Analysis: The OECD Recommendation establishes universal principles concerning human rights, equality, human agency, oversight, transparency, inclusive growth and human capability,	The principal unresolved issue is how the OECD's universal principles should be interpreted and applied to older persons

Dimension	Evidence identified / analysis	Evidence-based observation
	but does not expressly consider what their application requires for older persons. This leaves unresolved how protections against discrimination and bias account for diversity within older age; how lifecycle, data and stakeholder provisions respond to evolving trajectories and incorporate older persons' lived experience; whether human agency and oversight ensure that the older person's own will and preferences remain central when AI is used in support; and whether commitments to skills, employment, entrepreneurship, creativity and broadly shared benefits extend meaningfully across longer lives.	as AI increasingly affects the ways they exercise and realise their rights across longer lives.

A.4 Council of Europe Framework Convention on Artificial Intelligence and Human Rights, Democracy and the Rule of Law

(<https://www.coe.int/en/web/artificial-intelligence/the-framework-convention-on-artificial-intelligence>)

Dimension	Evidence identified / analysis	Evidence-based observation
1. Purpose	Evidence: First international legally binding treaty specifically addressing AI. It aims to ensure that activities within the lifecycle of AI systems are fully consistent with human rights, democracy and the rule of law, while remaining conducive to technological progress and innovation. The Convention is technology-neutral and complements existing international human-rights standards rather than creating new human rights. Analysis: Unlike UNESCO and OECD, its distinctive contribution is the establishment of legally binding obligations. Its purpose is not to reinterpret the substantive content of existing human rights but to ensure that activities involving AI systems comply with the existing human-rights obligations applicable to each Party.	Establishes the first legally binding international framework requiring activities involving AI systems to be consistent with existing human rights, democracy and the rule of law, while remaining technology-neutral and compatible with innovation.
2. Participating States	Evidence: Opened for signature on 5 September 2024. The Convention is open to Council of Europe member States, non-member States that participated in its elaboration and the European Union, with provision for accession by other non-member States following entry into force.	Legally binding treaty designed with potential reach beyond Council of Europe membership, including participation by the European Union and eligible non-member States.

Dimension	Evidence identified / analysis	Evidence-based observation
	Analysis: Its architecture therefore gives it potential geographic reach beyond Europe. Entry into force requires five ratifications, including at least three Council of Europe member States.	
3. Human Rights Coverage	Evidence: Human rights form the legal foundation of the Convention. Its substantive principles include human dignity and individual autonomy; equality and non-discrimination; privacy and personal-data protection; transparency and oversight; accountability and responsibility; reliability; and safe innovation. It establishes remedies and procedural safeguards, including access to relevant information, opportunities to challenge decisions made or substantially informed by AI, complaints mechanisms and notice when interacting with AI. It also requires iterative risk and impact assessment of actual and potential impacts of AI activities on human rights, democracy and the rule of law, together with prevention and mitigation measures. Analysis: Human rights are not simply ethical reference points but the legal benchmark against which activities involving AI systems must be assessed. The Convention combines substantive principles with implementation mechanisms while preserving the content of existing international human-rights obligations rather than creating or redefining those rights.	Provides a legally binding human-rights framework encompassing dignity, autonomy, equality and non-discrimination, privacy, transparency, oversight, accountability, remedies and procedural safeguards, supported by risk- and impact-management obligations. It applies existing human-rights law to AI without creating or redefining substantive human rights.
4. Recognition of Older Persons and Older Age	Evidence: The Convention does not expressly identify older persons or older age. It does, however, contain an express population-specific provision for persons with disabilities and children. Article 18 requires Parties to take due account of their specific needs and vulnerabilities in relation to respect for their rights, with reference to the CRPD, CRC and relevant domestic law. Equality provisions more generally recognise differentiated impacts associated with personal characteristics, circumstances or group membership. Analysis: The Convention is therefore not wholly population-neutral: it demonstrates that population-specific obligations can be included. Older persons receive no comparable express provision, although they remain protected through applicable	Older persons and older age are not expressly recognised. The Convention relies on universal human-rights protections for older persons while expressly requiring consideration of the specific rights, needs and vulnerabilities of persons with disabilities and children.

Dimension	Evidence identified / analysis	Evidence-based observation
	universal human-rights obligations, including equality and non-discrimination.	
5A. Normative Readiness — Diversity in Older Age	Evidence: The Convention requires respect for human dignity and individual autonomy and for equality and non-discrimination in activities involving AI systems. Its equality framework recognises differentiated impacts associated with personal characteristics, circumstances or group membership. The Explanatory Report recognises the relevance of intersecting personal characteristics and structural and historical inequalities. Affected perspectives may inform measures addressing equality, while public consultation provides a mechanism for incorporating diverse views. Analysis: These provisions provide substantial legal foundations for recognising diversity and differentiated impacts rather than treating affected populations as homogeneous. However, older persons are not expressly identified, and the Convention does not develop how equality and non-discrimination should apply to diversity within older age, including intersectional differences and accumulated life experiences.	Substantial legal foundations exist for equality, non-discrimination and differentiated impacts, including recognition of intersecting characteristics and structural inequalities, but their application to diversity within older age and accumulated life experiences remains undeveloped.
5B. Normative Readiness — Longer Lives, Evolving Trajectories	Evidence: The Convention requires risk and impact assessments of actual and potential impacts of AI activities on human rights, democracy and the rule of law to be undertaken iteratively, together with prevention and mitigation measures. It also provides for public discussion and multi-stakeholder consultation on relevant social, economic, legal, ethical and environmental implications of AI activities. These mechanisms allow impacts and affected perspectives to be considered as AI systems are developed and used. The Convention's references to the “lifecycle” concern the lifecycle of the AI system—from design through deployment, operation and retirement—not the life course of an individual. Analysis: Iterative assessment and consultation provide mechanisms for responding to changing impacts of AI, but they do not substantively address the continued realisation of human rights as an individual's circumstances, aspirations and	Iterative risk and impact assessment and consultation provide mechanisms for responding to changing impacts of AI, but the continued realisation of human rights across evolving trajectories over longer lives, including the role of longitudinal human experience, is not substantively addressed.

Dimension	Evidence identified / analysis	Evidence-based observation
	trajectory evolve over a longer life. Nor does the Convention address how older persons' lived experiences, concerns, aspirations and goals should inform AI alongside longitudinal or other domain-specific data.	
5C. Normative Readiness — Living with Support	Evidence: The Convention protects individual autonomy and establishes requirements concerning transparency and oversight. It requires relevant information about AI systems and their use to be documented and made available to affected persons, including information sufficient to enable them to challenge decisions made or substantially informed by AI. It also establishes complaint mechanisms, procedural guarantees and notice when a person is interacting with AI. Analysis: These provisions provide significant legal safeguards where AI supports or influences decisions affecting an older person and can help affected persons understand and challenge AI-enabled decisions. However, the Convention does not clearly distinguish between oversight exercised by another human and the autonomy of the person affected by the decision. Nor does it substantially address how AI-enabled support should enable informed decision-making and ensure that the older person's will and preferences remain central when AI forms part of support.	Strong legal foundations exist for autonomy, transparency, challenge and procedural safeguards, but further interpretation is needed to determine how they apply when AI is used as part of support, particularly in ensuring that the older person's informed decisions, will and preferences remain central.
5D. Normative Readiness — Living with Possibilities	Evidence: The Convention seeks to ensure that human-rights protection remains compatible with technological progress and innovation. Its safe-innovation provisions permit controlled environments for the development, experimentation and testing of AI systems under appropriate safeguards. Public consultation and digital-literacy measures provide additional foundations for participation and engagement with AI. Analysis: These provisions provide foundations for rights-compatible innovation and participation. However, unlike UNESCO and OECD, the Convention contains comparatively limited explicit developmental content concerning education, work, creativity, entrepreneurship, human capability or continued contribution. This is consistent with its treaty purpose, but means that its foundations for enabling older persons to pursue	Provides legal foundations for rights-compatible innovation and participation, but comparatively limited guidance on how AI might enable older persons' continuing aspirations, contributions and ability to shape their own futures.

Dimension	Evidence identified / analysis	Evidence-based observation
	aspirations, contribute and shape their own futures are comparatively indirect.	
5. Overall Summation	Analysis across the four realities: The Convention provides strong legally binding normative foundations relevant across the four realities, particularly through dignity and individual autonomy, equality and non-discrimination, transparency, procedural safeguards, remedies, risk and impact assessment and accountability. Its recognition of differentiated and intersecting impacts provides particularly relevant foundations for diversity. Iterative risk and impact assessment and consultation provide mechanisms for responding to changing impacts of AI, but do not address evolving human trajectories over longer lives. Older persons and older age are not expressly recognised. The Convention does not fully develop what autonomy requires when AI forms part of support, while its treaty orientation provides comparatively less explicit emphasis on continued human development and possibilities.	The Convention provides strong legally binding normative foundations relevant to all four realities, particularly through dignity, autonomy, equality and non-discrimination, safeguards, risk and impact assessment, remedies and accountability. Its normative readiness for older persons remains largely dependent on interpretation, however, because older persons are not expressly recognised, its universal obligations are not specifically developed in relation to evolving trajectories over longer lives, AI-enabled support and continuing possibilities.
6. Unresolved Questions	Analysis: The Convention's distinctive approach is to require consistency with existing human-rights obligations while leaving the substantive content of those rights to applicable international and domestic human-rights law. This makes interpretation particularly important where the Convention itself does not expressly address a population or circumstance. Older persons receive no population-specific treatment comparable to persons with disabilities and children under Article 18. Its equality provisions provide substantial foundations for addressing differentiated and intersecting impacts, but do not apply them specifically to diversity within older age. Its iterative risk and impact assessment requirements concern changing impacts arising from AI activities, rather than how human rights should continue to be realised as an older person's own trajectory evolves. Its autonomy, transparency, oversight and procedural safeguards do not fully determine how an older person's informed decisions, will and preferences remain central when AI forms part of support. Its provisions concerning safe	The principal unresolved issue arises from the Convention's reliance on existing human-rights law for substantive interpretation: where older persons are not expressly recognised, further interpretation is needed to determine what its legally binding obligations concerning AI require for older persons as their circumstances, aspirations, support needs and possibilities evolve across longer lives.

Dimension	Evidence identified / analysis	Evidence-based observation
	innovation, participation and digital literacy provide comparatively limited guidance concerning continuing aspirations, contribution and human development in later life.	

A.5 African Union Continental Artificial Intelligence Strategy (<https://au.int/en/documents/20240809/continental-artificial-intelligence-strategy>)

Dimension	Evidence identified / analysis	Evidence-based observation
1. Purpose	Evidence: The Strategy is Africa-centred, development-oriented and people-centred. It aims to harness AI to advance Agenda 2063 and the Sustainable Development Goals while managing associated risks and harms. Its five focus areas concern harnessing AI benefits, building capabilities, addressing risks, stimulating investment and fostering cooperation. Fifteen action areas cover governance, public-sector and sectoral adoption, datasets, skills, research and innovation, ethics, safety, investment and cooperation. Analysis: Unlike an instrument principally oriented toward risk management or legal compliance, the Strategy expressly positions AI as an instrument of socio-economic transformation, cultural renaissance and inclusive development while embedding ethical and human-rights safeguards.	Establishes an Africa-centred, development-oriented strategy for harnessing AI to advance inclusive socio-economic development, cultural renaissance and Agenda 2063 while building capabilities and addressing human-rights, ethical, safety and governance risks.
2. Participating States	Evidence: The Strategy was endorsed by the AU Executive Council in July 2024 and calls on AU Member States to develop and implement national AI strategies and governance mechanisms based on its direction. The African Union has 55 Member States. Analysis: It is a continental strategic framework rather than a legally binding treaty. Implementation depends substantially on national AI strategies, policies, regulation, institutional arrangements and capacity-building across countries with differing levels of AI readiness.	Continental strategy for the African Union's 55 Member States. It is non-binding and intended to guide national AI strategies, policies, regulation and capacity-building across diverse national contexts.

Dimension	Evidence identified / analysis	Evidence-based observation
3. Human Rights Coverage	Evidence: One of the Strategy's guiding principles is Human Rights and Human Dignity, requiring AI production, development, use and assessment to uphold human dignity, gender equality and rights under the African Charter and international human-rights law. Other principles include people-centred AI, inclusion and diversity, non-discrimination, peace and prosperity, ethics and transparency, skills and public awareness. The Strategy also addresses privacy and personal-data protection, bias and discrimination, information integrity, freedom and autonomy, accessibility, impact assessment, lifelong learning, participation, innovation and inclusive development. Analysis: Human rights are explicit and embedded within a wider development framework. The Strategy combines protection from harm with affirmative commitments to well-being, inclusive growth, skills, innovation, participation and socio-economic opportunity. Its framing is particularly notable for linking human rights to African values, Agenda 2063 and development rather than treating human rights as a separate compliance layer.	Provides an human-rights and human-dignity foundation embedded within a broader people-centred development strategy, combining non-discrimination, privacy, autonomy, inclusion and protection from harm with well-being, lifelong learning, participation, innovation and socio-economic development.
4. Recognition of Older Persons and Older Age	Evidence: Age is expressly identified as a prohibited ground of discrimination within the Inclusion and Diversity principle. In the health-sector section, the Strategy states that AI-enabled robots can support the autonomy and quality of life of “the elderly and/or dependents” and persons with disabilities. Older persons are not similarly identified in broader provisions concerning education, labour, skills, innovation, entrepreneurship, public participation or research. The Strategy gives considerably more population-specific attention to women, youth, children and persons with disabilities. Analysis: Older age is therefore expressly visible in two important ways: as a protected characteristic and through an example concerning autonomy and quality of life. However, explicit recognition is limited and concentrated principally in health and support rather than across the Strategy's much broader developmental vision.	Expressly recognises age as a ground of non-discrimination and refers to AI supporting the autonomy and quality of life of “the elderly and/or dependents.” However, older persons are otherwise largely absent from the Strategy's broader provisions on education, skills, work, innovation, participation and development.

Dimension	Evidence identified / analysis	Evidence-based observation
5A. Normative Readiness — Diversity in Older Age	Evidence: The Strategy's Inclusion and Diversity principle expressly prohibits discrimination on the basis of age and calls for AI that respects the diversity of African peoples, cultures, languages and circumstances. Its people-centred approach, emphasis on high-quality and diverse datasets, measures against marginalisation and widening inequalities, impact assessment for affected groups and user-centred research provide additional foundations for recognising differentiated circumstances and impacts. Analysis: These provisions provide substantial foundations for equality, non-discrimination and recognition of diversity and go further than population-neutral approaches by expressly naming age. However, the Strategy does not develop how these commitments should apply to diversity within older age, including intersectional differences and accumulated life experiences that shape how older persons experience and exercise their rights.	Substantial normative foundations exist through express age non-discrimination, inclusion, diversity and people-centred AI, but their application to diversity within older age, including intersectional differences and accumulated life experiences, remains underdeveloped.
5B. Normative Readiness — Longer Lives, Evolving Trajectories	Evidence: The Strategy has a broad cross-sectoral scope spanning healthcare, education, labour, public services, skills, research, culture and economic development. It promotes diverse datasets, user-centred research, multi-stakeholder dialogue and lifelong learning. It also calls for short-, medium- and long-term assessment of the impacts of AI on African people, societies, labour markets, values and futures. Analysis: The cross-sectoral and user-centred orientation provides relevant foundations for considering different dimensions of people's lives, while lifelong learning recognises continuing development over time. However, the Strategy's short-, medium- and long-term assessment concerns the changing impacts of AI rather than the evolving trajectory of an individual's life. The Strategy does not substantively address the continued realisation of human rights as older persons' circumstances, relationships, aspirations and support needs evolve, nor how their lived experiences, concerns, aspirations and goals should inform AI alongside longitudinal and other domain-specific data.	Broad cross-sectoral, user-centred and lifelong-learning foundations exist, but the continued realisation of human rights across evolving trajectories over longer lives, including the role of longitudinal human experience, is not substantively developed.

Dimension	Evidence identified / analysis	Evidence-based observation
5C. Normative Readiness — Living with Support	Evidence: The Strategy expressly recognises the potential for AI-enabled robots to support the autonomy and quality of life of “the elderly and/or dependents.” More broadly, it addresses freedom and autonomy, accessibility, privacy, responsible AI, user empowerment and concerns about reliance on algorithms in patient care. These provisions provide foundations for considering how AI may assist individuals while preserving human control and participation. Analysis: This is meaningful older-age-specific evidence and gives the Strategy a comparatively direct foundation for AI-enabled support. However, it does not substantially develop what autonomy and rights-based support require when AI is used. In particular, it provides limited guidance on enabling older persons to understand relevant information and make informed decisions, ensuring that their will and preferences remain central, or distinguishing support that enables the person from AI or human intermediaries that begin substituting for their role in directing their own life.	Provides an explicit older-age-specific foundation through autonomy and quality of life in AI-enabled support, but further interpretation is needed to determine how support should enable informed decision-making and respect the older person's will and preferences rather than becoming substitution.
5D. Normative Readiness — Living with Possibilities	Evidence: The Strategy places inclusive growth, socio-economic transformation, innovation, employment, entrepreneurship, research, skills, lifelong learning, creativity, public participation and cultural renaissance at the centre of its developmental agenda. It promotes user-centred research, capability-building and opportunities to harness AI for development rather than focusing only on preventing harm. Analysis: These provisions provide a particularly strong foundation for participation, continuing human development and the expansion of human capability. However, this positive developmental vision is more explicitly associated with youth, women, the future workforce, start-ups and general populations. Older persons are not expressly positioned as continuing learners, entrepreneurs, researchers, innovators, leaders or contributors, despite the Strategy's commitment to lifelong learning.	Very strong normative foundations exist for participation, lifelong learning, innovation, entrepreneurship and human development, but their application to older persons' continuing aspirations, contributions and ability to shape their own futures remains limited.

Dimension	Evidence identified / analysis	Evidence-based observation
5. Overall Summation	Analysis across the four realities: The Strategy provides substantial normative foundations relevant across all four realities through explicit human-rights commitments, express age non-discrimination, people-centred development, inclusion and diversity, user-centred research, lifelong learning, innovation and participation. Its direct recognition of older persons in relation to autonomy and quality of life provides a comparatively strong starting point for Living with Support, while its broad developmental orientation provides particularly strong foundations for Living with Possibilities. However, explicit application to older persons remains uneven. Diversity within older age is not substantially developed; its cross-sectoral and long-term approaches do not address evolving human trajectories or longitudinal human experience; its older-age support provisions do not establish how informed decisions and will and preferences remain central; and its broader developmental commitments are not systematically extended to older persons.	The African Union Strategy provides substantial normative foundations relevant to all four realities, with particular strengths in express age non-discrimination, people-centred development, lifelong learning, innovation and participation. Its normative readiness for older persons is nevertheless uneven: explicit older-person recognition is concentrated principally in health and support, while its broader human-rights and developmental commitments are not systematically applied across diversity within older age, evolving trajectories and continuing aspirations and contribution throughout longer lives.
6. Unresolved Questions	Analysis: The Strategy is distinctive in combining an explicit human-rights foundation, express prohibition of age discrimination and a strong developmental vision, while also expressly recognising older persons in relation to autonomy and quality of life. The remaining questions therefore arise less from an absence of relevant normative foundations than from the limited extent to which those foundations are applied to older persons beyond health and support. Its diversity and inclusion commitments do not substantially develop intersectional diversity within older age; its cross-sectoral, user-centred and long-term approaches do not establish how human rights should continue to be realised as an older person's own trajectory evolves or how longitudinal human experience should inform AI; its autonomy provisions do not fully address informed decision-making and respect for will and preferences where AI is used as part of support; and its extensive commitments to lifelong learning, skills, entrepreneurship, innovation and development are not systematically extended to older persons.	The principal unresolved issue is how the Strategy's strong human-rights and developmental foundations—including express age non-discrimination and older-person recognition in support—should be interpreted and applied more systematically to older persons as AI increasingly affects their participation, rights realisation and opportunities across longer lives.

Dimension	Evidence identified / analysis	Evidence-based observation
	The Strategy's stronger population-specific emphasis on youth, women, children and persons with disabilities also leaves unresolved how older persons should participate in AI research, implementation and policy processes.	

A.6 ASEAN Guide on AI Governance and Ethics https://asean.org/wp-content/uploads/2024/03/ASEAN-for-Business-Bulletin-March-2024.pdf?utm_source=chatgpt.com

Dimension	Evidence identified / analysis	Evidence-based observation
1. Purpose	Evidence: The Guide is a practical, non-binding resource for organisations in ASEAN designing, developing and deploying traditional AI in commercial and non-military or dual-use contexts. It seeks regional alignment and interoperability and also makes national- and regional-level recommendations to governments. Its practical framework covers internal governance, levels of human involvement in AI-augmented decision-making, operations management and stakeholder interaction. Analysis: ASEAN's distinctive contribution is operational rather than legal or broadly normative: it translates responsible-AI principles into organisational governance practices.	Provides practical, non-binding governance guidance for organisations designing, developing and deploying AI, while promoting regional alignment and responsible AI adoption across ASEAN.
2. Participating States	Evidence: The Guide was developed as a regional ASEAN instrument. ASEAN currently comprises 11 Member States following Timor-Leste's admission in October 2025. The Guide is non-binding and is intended to support organisations and governments across the region rather than create treaty obligations.	Regional, non-binding guidance applicable across ASEAN's 11 Member States, intended to support organisational practice and regional policy alignment rather than create legal obligations.
3. Human Rights Coverage	Evidence: Seven guiding principles: human-centricity; fairness and equity; privacy and data governance; transparency and explainability; accountability and integrity; robustness and reliability; security and safety. Human-centricity requires respect for human-centred values and pursuit of human well-being. Fairness requires avoiding amplification of discriminatory or unjust impacts across demographics and using diverse and	Embeds important human-rights-related protections through human-centricity, fairness and equity, privacy, transparency, accountability, safety and human involvement, but does not establish an explicit international human-rights framework or systematically interpret particular rights.

Dimension	Evidence identified / analysis	Evidence-based observation
	representative datasets. Privacy, accountability, transparency, human involvement and risk assessment are operationalised through governance measures. Analysis: Human rights are not framed as the Guide's formal legal foundation in the same way as UNESCO or the Council of Europe. Instead, rights-relevant protections are embedded through human-centricity, fairness, privacy, accountability, transparency, safety and human involvement. The Guide is principally operational and governance oriented.	
4. Recognition of Older Persons and Older Age	Evidence: The 2024 Guide does not expressly identify older persons or older age as a population group in its guiding principles or governance framework. It refers more generally to vulnerable individuals, different demographics, users and affected stakeholders. Fairness provisions seek to prevent discriminatory impacts across demographics and encourage diverse and representative datasets. Analysis: Older persons can fall within these universal and demographic categories, but older age is not made visible as a specific context for AI design, deployment or human-rights interpretation. This differs from UNESCO and the AU, which contain explicit references to older persons or age.	Older persons and older age are not expressly identified. They may be encompassed by references to vulnerable individuals, demographics, users and affected stakeholders, but older age is not made visible as a distinct context for applying the Guide.
5A. Normative Readiness — Diversity in Older Age	Evidence: Human-centricity; fairness and equity; diverse and representative datasets; avoidance of discriminatory impacts across demographics; stakeholder interaction; risk assessment. Analysis: These provide relevant practical foundations for recognising differentiated effects and avoiding demographic bias. However, the Guide does not explore heterogeneity within older age, differing values or technological preferences, or meaningful alternatives for older persons who make different choices about AI.	Relevant practical foundations exist through fairness, representative data and human-centricity, but diversity within older age and differing circumstances, values and choices are not specifically interpreted.
5B. Normative Readiness — Longer Lives, Evolving Trajectories	Evidence: AI lifecycle governance; data quality and integrity; risk assessment; stakeholder communication; ongoing organisational governance. Analysis: The Guide is designed around responsible operation of AI systems over their lifecycle, but it provides little substantive foundation concerning human life trajectories over	AI-lifecycle and data-governance foundations exist, but evolving later-life trajectories and longitudinal human experience are largely outside the Guide's substantive focus.

Dimension	Evidence identified / analysis	Evidence-based observation
	time. It does not address longitudinal human experience or how evolving aspirations, concerns and goals of older persons should complement data-driven assessments.	
5C. Normative Readiness — Living with Support	Evidence: A major component of the Guide concerns determining appropriate levels of human involvement in AI-augmented decision-making, including human-in-the-loop, human-over-the-loop and human-out-of-the-loop approaches based on risk. Human-centricity also cautions against exploiting vulnerable individuals. Analysis: This is highly relevant to AI-enabled support, but the framework focuses primarily on the <i>amount and form of human involvement</i> needed to manage AI risk. It does not distinguish the agency of the older person receiving support from oversight exercised by professionals, organisations or other humans. Nor does it develop support versus substitution or supported self-determination.	Provides strong practical guidance on human involvement in AI-augmented decisions, but further normative interpretation is needed to ensure that “human involvement” protects the older person’s agency rather than merely inserting another human decision-maker.
5D. Normative Readiness — Living with Possibilities	Evidence: Human-centricity seeks benefits for human society and well-being, and the Guide aims to build trust and enable greater responsible use of AI. Its focus, however, is largely on responsible organisational deployment, risk mitigation and governance. Analysis: Compared with UNESCO, OECD and the AU Strategy, it contains less substantive guidance concerning education, lifelong learning, creativity, employment, entrepreneurship, contribution or continuing human development. The possibilities dimension is therefore mainly implicit in responsible adoption rather than expressly articulated. (ASEAN Main Portal)	Provides a general foundation for beneficial and human-centred AI, but comparatively limited normative guidance on AI as an enabler of continued learning, creativity, contribution and human development in older age.
5. Overall Summation	Analysis across the four realities: ASEAN offers useful practical mechanisms relevant especially to fairness, representative datasets, risk assessment and human involvement. These can operationally support aspects of diversity and AI-enabled support. However, because the Guide is primarily an organisational governance instrument and contains no express recognition of older persons, evolving trajectories and living with possibilities receive comparatively little normative development.	The ASEAN Guide provides practical governance foundations relevant to the four realities, particularly through fairness, representative data, risk assessment, human-centricity and structured human involvement. Its normative readiness for older age is comparatively limited: older persons are not expressly recognised, evolving life trajectories receive little attention, human involvement is not interpreted from the

Dimension	Evidence identified / analysis	Evidence-based observation
		standpoint of the older rights-holder's agency, and continued human development and contribution remain largely implicit.
6. Unresolved Questions	Analysis: How should fairness and representative-data requirements account for diversity within older age? How can AI lifecycle governance incorporate older persons' evolving lived experiences rather than relying primarily on available data? Whose agency is protected when the Guide prescribes human involvement in AI-augmented decisions? How should human-centricity encompass older persons' continued learning, creativity, contribution and self-determination? How should older persons participate in organisational governance and stakeholder-engagement processes? Analysis: The Guide is strongest on practical governance processes; its unresolved issues arise principally from the limited normative interpretation of what those processes should mean for particular rights-holders and contexts.	The central unresolved issue is how the Guide's practical governance mechanisms should be interpreted and applied so that human-centricity, fairness and human involvement translate into substantive human-rights outcomes for older persons across the changing realities of older age.

A.7 Cross-Instrument Comparative Matrix

Dimension	UNESCO	OECD	Council of Europe	African Union	ASEAN
1. Purpose	Global ethical framework combining human-rights principles with cross-sectoral policy guidance.	Intergovernmental principles-and-policy framework for trustworthy and innovative AI.	Legally binding international framework requiring AI lifecycle activities to comply with human rights, democracy and rule of law.	Africa-centred development strategy combining AI-enabled transformation with human-rights, ethical and governance safeguards.	Practical organisational governance guidance for responsible AI development and deployment.
2. Participating States	Global, non-binding UNESCO Recommendation.	Non-binding Recommendation with OECD members and adhering jurisdictions.	Binding treaty framework with wider-than-European participation possible; not yet in force.	Continental non-binding strategy for AU Member States, implemented primarily	Regional non-binding guidance across ASEAN Member States.

Dimension	UNESCO	OECD	Council of Europe	African Union	ASEAN
				through national measures.	
3. Human Rights Coverage	Extensive and explicit. Combines protective rights with enabling commitments concerning participation, inclusion, development and quality of life.	Broad and explicit. Combines dignity, autonomy, equality, privacy and agency with capability, creativity, inclusion and shared benefits.	Legally grounded and explicit. Existing human rights provide the legal benchmark, supported by safeguards, remedies, risk assessment and accountability.	Explicit and development-oriented. Human rights and dignity are embedded within people-centred development, inclusion, well-being and innovation.	Rights-relevant rather than explicitly rights-based. Human-centricity, fairness, privacy, transparency, accountability, safety and human involvement provide important protections.
4. Recognition of Older Persons and Older Age	Explicit. Age and older persons are recognised, but older-person visibility is concentrated particularly in care, assistance and vulnerability.	Not explicit. Older persons are encompassed by universal protections but older age is not made visible as a distinct context.	Not explicit. Universal rights apply to older persons; specific recognition is provided to children and persons with disabilities but not older persons.	Explicit but limited. Age is identified in non-discrimination and “the elderly” in relation to autonomy and quality of life, primarily in health/support.	Not explicit. Older persons may fall within broader demographic, vulnerable-person and stakeholder categories.
5. Normative Readiness for Human Rights in Older Age	Substantial but uneven. Relevant foundations exist across all four realities; strongest explicit older-person application is in care/support, with further interpretation needed for diversity, evolving trajectories and possibilities.	Substantial but largely implicit. Strong universal foundations apply across the realities, but older-person visibility and older-age-specific interpretation are limited.	Strong legally binding foundations but interpretation-dependent. Particularly strong on rights protection, safeguards and accountability; less developed on evolving trajectories, support versus substitution and positive human-	Substantial and strongly developmental but uneven. Express age non-discrimination and older-person recognition coexist with limited application of the Strategy's wider learning, innovation and development	Useful practical foundations but comparatively limited normative interpretation. Stronger on governance processes, fairness and human involvement than on evolving trajectories, older-person agency

Dimension	UNESCO	OECD	Council of Europe	African Union	ASEAN
			development possibilities.	agenda to older persons.	and continued human development.
6. Unresolved Questions	How should substantial universal principles be interpreted and operationalised across the changing realities of older age?	How should strong universal principles be translated into older-age-specific interpretation and implementation?	How should binding but largely population-neutral obligations be interpreted and applied to older age?	How should strong human-rights and development commitments be systematically extended across older persons' evolving trajectories, agency and contribution?	How should practical governance mechanisms translate into substantive human-rights outcomes for older persons?

A.7.1 Normative Readiness Across the Four Realities

Reality	UNESCO	OECD	Council of Europe	African Union	ASEAN
Diversity in Older Age	Substantial equality, non-discrimination and diversity foundations; further interpretation needed for diversity within older age, including intersectionality and accumulated life experiences.	Strong universal equality, non-discrimination and diversity foundations; application to diversity within older age remains implicit.	Strong legal foundations for equality, differentiated impacts and intersecting characteristics; application to diversity within older age remains undeveloped.	Strong inclusion and diversity foundations with explicit age non-discrimination; diversity within older age remains underdeveloped.	Relevant fairness, representative-data and human-centric foundations; application to diversity within older age remains undeveloped.
Longer Lives, Evolving Trajectories	Broad cross-sectoral foundations; continued rights realisation across evolving trajectories and longitudinal human	Relevant data, traceability, stakeholder and interdisciplinary foundations; evolving trajectories and	Iterative risk and impact assessment can respond to changing AI impacts, but evolving human trajectories and	Broad cross-sectoral, user-centred and lifelong-learning foundations; evolving trajectories and longitudinal human	Data governance, monitoring and risk assessment address changing AI effects, but evolving human trajectories and

Reality	UNESCO	OECD	Council of Europe	African Union	ASEAN
	experience are not substantively developed.	longitudinal human experience remain largely undeveloped.	longitudinal human experience are not substantively addressed.	experience are not substantively developed.	longitudinal human experience are largely outside the Guide's focus.
Living with Support	Strong autonomy and safeguard foundations; further interpretation needed to ensure informed decision-making and respect for older persons' will and preferences.	Strong human-agency, oversight, transparency and contestability foundations; application to older persons' informed decisions, will and preferences requires further interpretation.	Strong legal foundations for autonomy, transparency, challenge and procedural safeguards; further interpretation needed to keep older persons' informed decisions, will and preferences central.	Explicit older-age foundation through autonomy and quality of life; informed decision-making, will and preferences, and the boundary between support and substitution remain underdeveloped.	Strong practical mechanisms for human involvement; further interpretation needed to ensure they support older persons' autonomy, informed decisions, and will and preferences.
Living with Possibilities	Strong participation and human-development foundations; application to older persons' continuing aspirations, contribution and ability to shape their futures remains limited.	Strong foundations for human capability, creativity and inclusive growth; application to older persons' continuing aspirations, contribution and future possibilities remains implicit.	Legal foundations for rights-compatible innovation and participation, but comparatively limited guidance on continuing aspirations, contribution and self-determined futures in older age.	Very strong foundations for lifelong learning, participation, innovation and human development; broader developmental opportunities are not systematically extended to older persons.	General foundation for beneficial and human-centred AI, but comparatively limited guidance on older persons' continuing aspirations, participation, contribution and ability to shape their futures.