Ten composite indices for policy-making
Evidence and data are key to policy-making, in particular when it comes to setting priorities, mitigating negative impacts and finding the best possible trade-offs. The information in this publication is geared towards supporting policy-makers by providing sources of data and identifying the possible biases built into them. EPRS has picked 10 composite indices from a range of policy areas. The selected indices have been taken from reliable sources, already used as references by policy-makers. Dedicated chapters present the producers of each index and describe their objectives, outlining the data compiled and their actual and possible use by policy-makers. The chapters also highlight the limitations inherent in using the indices.
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Introduction

Policy-making is a difficult art. In a globalised world, decisions that do not take account of the bigger picture can have far-reaching unintended consequences. The current global debate on measures to tackle Covid-19 and vaccinate entire populations offers ample examples of just how intertwined are the social, economic, technological and other impacts of any policy. Policy-makers need to be able to trust data to help them make the best decisions.

Rough data are sometimes difficult to get hold of. Various non-governmental organisations (NGOs), academics and think-tanks meanwhile produce tools aimed at interpreting data. These include composite indices that gather data from different sources in order to visualise the multiple dimensions of a specific concept more clearly. A composite index often proposes a ranking of countries. Such indices help to capture a comprehensive overview of a given situation and grasp its constitutive elements more easily – they provide for comparisons between countries or regions on a standard basis, and, when they are updated on a regular basis, give a good overview of the evolution of a situation over time. This can help with designing policies to prevent or mitigate risks and to encourage positive development. Indices can also – up to a certain point – help monitor the impact of policies and support forecasting exercises.

Fulfilling its core mission of ‘empowering through knowledge’, in this analysis EPRS proposes a non-exclusive selection – which is in no way to be perceived as a ranking – of 10 composite indices in a range of policy areas. The indices selected are from reliable sources, already used as references by policy-makers. The majority have a good geographical coverage. With one exception – retained on account of its quality and uniqueness – they cover all EU Member States and/or most UN member states. The selection is also designed to cover some key EU policies, and most of the UN 2030 Agenda sustainable development goals (SDGs).

Each index is presented in a dedicated chapter that presents its producers and describes their objectives in publishing the index, the data compiled, and their actual and potential use by policy-makers. The chapters also highlight the potential limitations in using the indices. All composite indices of course are inevitably biased, as they select some indicators and reject others. They also standardise data that originated in heterogeneous units; therefore, the more indicators a composite index encompasses, the more bias it may carry. According to experts, this does not challenge the value of indicators, provided the authors’ vision and biases are acknowledged.

The information provided in this publication is geared towards supporting policy-makers by providing sources of data and by identifying possible biases in using them. Evidence and data are key to policy-making, particularly when it comes to making foresight reports, setting priorities, mitigating negative impacts and finding optimum trade-offs. In this context, when used properly, indicators can underpin better regulation.

---

1 Words followed by an asterisk (*) are defined in the glossary, page 25 et seq.
Icon legend

Click on the map for interactive content

- EU coverage
- World coverage
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- Updates
- Dataset accessible online
- Dataset accessible upon request

Sustainable development goals (SDGs):

1. No poverty
2. Zero hunger
3. Good health and well-being
4. Quality education
5. Gender equality
6. Clean water and sanitation
7. Affordable and clean energy
8. Decent work and economic growth
9. Industry, innovation and infrastructure
10. Reduced inequalities
11. Sustainable cities and communities
12. Responsible consumption and production
13. Climate action
14. Life below water
15. Life on land
16. Peace, justice, strong institutions
17. Partnerships for the goals

The 17 SDGs
1. Climate Change Performance Index

**CCPI**, by Germanwatch, NewClimate Institute and CAN – Climate Action Network International

90% GHG* 19.75 to 74.42 Yearly: 2005→** Data on request Main SDGs covered

* 57 countries and the EU, covering 90% of greenhouse gas emissions. ** Methodology updated in 2017.

1.1. What it measures

Figure 1 – CCPI scores 2021 (2018 data)

Source: [CCPI.org](https://ccpi.org), accessed July 2021.

The CCPI measures and compares countries' climate protection performance through their climate policies and greenhouse gas (GHG) reduction achievements. The CCPI also evaluates countries' compatibility with the Paris Agreement goals.

1.2. Methodology and limitations

As shown in the table below, the CCPI calculates an overall climate protection performance ranking for each country, based on four categories, using 14 indicators. Countries' performance in each individual category is included in an annual report, accompanied by a background and methodology paper. The CCPI places most weight* on the GHG emissions category, owing to their warming effect. In calculating that particular score, the index uses production-based emissions excluding international trade. To ensure equity in assessments, the current level of GHG emissions per capita indicator considers development status. Assessment in each category is made per country/indicator as very high, high, medium, low or very low, depending either on the level of the indicator or its development over the past five-year period. Each indicator has its own step-scale for performance attribution, converted into a 0-100 scale for overall ranking. On policy, over 350 climate and energy experts rate national and international climate policy from weak (1) to strong (5) in an annual survey. Recent policy developments can therefore allow countries to improve positions quickly, whereas quantitative data sources have a two-year time lag. The CCPI excludes certain data
to avoid putting specific countries at a disadvantage owing to their developmental status or economic make-up. Some data are excluded because of overall sustainability concerns. The methodology paper provides details.

**Limitations.** When it comes to certain EU 2030 energy targets, the index uses the overall EU target, rather than representing the differentiated target contributions committed to by Member States. This potentially skews an individual country’s performance positively or negatively. The choice of production-based versus consumption-based emissions impacts outcomes, and it is worth being aware of countries’ consumption-driven GHG impacts. The CCPI is 80 % quantitative data, however the climate policy category is qualitative, using experts’ subjective opinion. Retroactive revisions in underlying datasets can limit replicability and the methodology change of 2017, to allow for compatibility with the climate policy framework of the Paris Agreement, means that the earlier versions cannot be compared to the new ones. For the well-below 2°C compatible pathway assessments, the authors have to extrapolate certain values, as UNFCCC allows countries to freely choose baseline year and allows relative rather than absolute GHG emission reduction targets.

**Table 1 – CCPI rankings; categories, indicators and sources**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Indicators and their weighting*</th>
<th>Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **GHG emissions** | • Current level of GHG emissions per capita  
• Past trend of GHG emissions per capita  
• Current level of GHG emissions per capita  
• 2030 GHG emissions reduction target  
*Overall weight 40 % (10 % for each indicator)* | PRIMAP  
FAO  
National inventory submissions to the UNFCCC – 2018  
UNFCCC – biennial country reports |
| **Renewable energy** | • Current share of renewables per total primary energy supply  
• Development of energy supply from renewable energy sources  
• Current share of renewables per TPES  
• Renewable energy 2030 target  
*Overall weight 20 % (5 % for each indicator)* | IEA |
| **Energy used** | • Current level of energy use (TPES/capita)  
• Past trend of TPES/capita  
• Current level of TPES per capita  
• 2030 TPES/capita target  
*Overall weight 20 % (5 % for each indicator)* | IEA |
| **Climate policy** | • National climate policy  
• International climate policy  
*Overall weight 20 % (10 % for each indicator)* | Experts’ evaluation Publisher’s annual survey |

TPES: total primary energy supply; *a* compared to a well-below 2°C compatible pathway

1.3. How it can be used by policy-makers

The CCPI can help policy-makers understand how their country performs overall and on specific categories, compared with other countries. Currently the index leaves the top three ranks empty, as no country is on a well-below 2°C compatible pathway and the authors wish to encourage improvement in climate performance. Each year, the CCPI presents the rankings at the Conference of Parties (COP) to the UNFCCC in an effort to improve transparency and understanding of current climate policies. The CCPI is often used to indicate climate performance.
2. Commitment to Development Index

**CDI**, by the Center for Global Development (CGD)

40 countries *  0 to 100  Yearly: 2003* →  Data on request  Main SDGs covered

* Currently covering 18 EU Member States and 22 other countries.
** Updated yearly since 2003 (no update in 2019 owing to a in-depth review of the methodology)

2.1. What it measures

Commitment to development goes beyond development assistance; other policies may have positive or negative impact or spill-over effects on third countries' development. For example, financial flows can foster developing countries' growth but also hamper social development if not managed transparently. The Commitment to Development Index (CDI) measures 40 countries' effective contribution to global development, primarily assessing their efforts to improve their 'footprint' on developing economies.

2.2. Methodology and limitations

The Center for Global Development has identified seven policy areas ('components') that matter for development: development finance, investment, migration, trade, environment, security, and technology. Each country assessed receives a score for each of the seven components, as well as an overall 'commitment to development score'. The score for each component is determined by the country's performance on a number of subcomponents (in turn based on a set of indicators). Each component is weighted* equally for the overall score. However within each component, subcomponents and indicators have different weights*, according to their estimated contribution to development (see table below). Scores are standardised, i.e. adjusted to have a mean* of 0 and standard deviation* of 1.
CGD reviewed its methodology for the 2020 index, following independent reviews by academics from the Global Development Network, Columbia University and Cornell University. The review resulted in the following main changes:

- broader country coverage: the CDI now examines 40 countries – it now encompasses all G20 countries, most OECD countries and new development actors such as China and United Arab Emirates (UAE);
- new measures on gender, climate, health, research and trade;
- a simplified presentation with three overarching themes (Development finance, Policies on exchange, Global public goods);
- different weighting* according to the income of beneficiary countries in order to trace commitments that benefit poorer countries more effectively; and income-adjusted scores to make the commitments of the 40 countries assessed comparable.

Limitations. For EU policy-makers, the first limitation is the fact that nine EU Member States are not covered (see Figure 2). While OECD countries generally have sound reporting systems, the addition of non-OECD countries in the latest edition of the CDI has created more data gaps than in past editions. The main CDI strategy to mitigate data gaps is to give any country that has failed to report its data to an international organisation to which it belongs (such as the OECD or the UN) the worst score, and to give the average score – in some cases interpolated* based on gross national income (GNI) per capita – to any country that is under no obligation to report data. The EU countries covered do not have data gaps.

Table 2 – CDI components and sub-components

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Components</th>
<th>Sub-components (relative weight* for the component)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Development finance</td>
<td>Quantity (50%); Quality (50%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment</td>
<td>Anti-corruption (20%); Business and human rights (10%); Natural resource governance (10%); Financial secrecy (35%); International investment agreements (25%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migration</td>
<td>Immigrant inflow (30%); Female immigrants (10%); Refugee hosting (30%); Integration policies (20%); International conventions (10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade</td>
<td>Lower-income weighted tariffs (30%); Tariff peaks (10%); Agricultural subsidies (20%); Services trade restrictions (20%); Logistics performance (20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>Greenhouse gas emissions (40%); Fossil fuel production (10%); Fossil fuel support (10%); Carbon pricing (10%); Fishing subsidies (10%); Environment treaties and participation in organisations (20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security</td>
<td>Contributions to peacekeeping efforts (20%); Female peacekeepers (10%); Sea lanes protection (10%); Arms trade volume (15%); Conflict potential of arms exports (10%); Ratified security treaties (10%); Global health security (10%); Antimicrobial resistance (10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>Government technology expenditure (25%); Tax incentives (10%); Foreign students (25%); Female foreign students (10%); Research collaborations (10%); Intellectual property (20%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


2.3. How it can be used by policy-makers

Providing policy-makers with comparable information is a clear aim of the CDI. Measuring the impacts of EU policies on third countries’ development is of prime importance as ‘policy coherence for development’ is enshrined in the EU Treaties. The CDI provides an online tool that allows for comparison, and can help define strategies that have a better positive impact.
3. Ease of Doing Business Index

*Doing Business*, by the World Bank

190 economies  20.0 to 86.8  Yearly: 2003 →  Online dataset  Main SDGs covered

3.1. What it measures

Figure 3 – Ease of Doing Business ranking, 2020


The Ease of Doing Business Index evaluates how the regulatory and institutional environment of a given country affects entrepreneurial activities. Countries are ranked from 1 (top ranking) to 190 (lowest ease of doing business) based on their Ease of Doing Business score, which aggregates several data, assessing the impact of legal provisions, procedures, costs and time taken, throughout the business life cycle.

3.2. Methodology and limitations

Currently, 41 indicators measure this impact on major steps in the business life-cycle; they are grouped in 10 topics: all topics are weighted equally and within each topic all indicators are weighted equally. For most indicators, the score is calculated based on the country's position compared to the worst possible (0) and best possible (100) performances – worst and best performances are re-set every five years. Countries are ranked according to overall performance.

Limitations. For the data collected to be comparable, for each country examined data are based on a hypothetical case: a 100% domestically owned, private, limited-liability company with at least 60 employees, located in the country's largest business city (or, for 11 countries, two largest business cities), not in an export-processing zone or an industrial estate with special export or import
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privileges. Exports constitute more than 10% of its sales. The performance assessment for each topic is based on additional hypotheses (see links in the table below). These hypotheses mean that outlying* businesses can face very different conditions. For several indicators the scoring is based on an assumption that fewer, quicker and less costly procedures are better. This can be detrimental to the country’s overall development (for example lighter procedures for construction may not take a sufficient account of environmental impacts). The Ease of Doing Business Index faces strong criticism for it not taking the social and human rights situation in the countries it ranks into consideration. Over the years, the team responsible for the index have addressed some of the criticisms – including those made by an independent panel report commissioned by the World Bank. They have notably dropped controversial indicators on the cost and flexibility of hiring workers and making them redundant. Reported irregularities and alleged manipulation of data led the World Bank to suspend the 2021 edition and conduct an internal audit in 2020 in order to correct the flawed data and to review data collection and interpretation.

Table 3 – Ease of Doing Business topics and indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Starting a business</td>
<td>Procedures (number) – Time (days) – Cost (% of income per capita) Minimum capital (% of income per capita)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealing with construction permits</td>
<td>Procedures (number) – Time (days) – Cost (% of warehouse value) Building quality control index (based on 6 components)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting electricity</td>
<td>Procedures (number) – Time (days) – Cost (% of income per capita) Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (based on 6 components)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registering property</td>
<td>Procedures (number) – Time (days) – Cost (% of property value) Quality of land administration index (based on 10 components)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting credit</td>
<td>Strength of legal rights index (based on 10 components) Depth of credit information index (based on 8 components)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protecting minority investors</td>
<td>'The data come from a questionnaire administered to corporate and securities lawyers and are based on securities regulations, company laws, civil procedure codes and court rules of evidence.'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paying taxes</td>
<td>Payments (number per year) – Time (hours per year) Post-filing index (based on 4 components) Time to comply with VAT refund (hours) – Time to obtain VAT refund (weeks) Time to comply with corporate income tax correction (hours) Time to complete a corporate income tax correction (weeks)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trading across borders</td>
<td>Time and cost to export and time and cost to import: Documentary compliance (hours – USS) – Border compliance (hours – USS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enforcing contracts</td>
<td>Time (days) – Cost (% of claim) Quality of judicial processes index (based on 4 components)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolving insolvency</td>
<td>Recovery rate (cents on the dollar) Strength of insolvency framework index (based on 4 components)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


3.3. How it can be used by policy-makers

Since its inception, the Ease of Doing Business Index and its companion report have been widely discussed and its ranking plays a key role in foreign investors' decisions. The index has triggered changes in the business regulatory environment in many countries, and some high-level politicians – including Narendra Modi and Vladimir Putin – have been keen to improve their country's ranking. Conversely, its influence and controversial nature make it subject to intense scrutiny and alleged pressure from governments.
4. Ecological Footprint

**EF**, by the Global Footprint Network

- 200+ countries
- global ha/cap.*
- Yearly**: 2003
- Online dataset
- Main SDGs covered

* Scores are expressed in global hectares per capita above or below zero (a deficit is a negative score, while a reserve is a positive score).
** Some data have been available since 1961.

4.1. What it measures

Figure 4 – Ecological Footprint scores 2020


The Ecological Footprint measures ecological resource use and resource capacity. According to the glossary provided by the index producers, it is ‘a measure of how much area of biologically productive land and water an individual, population or activity requires to produce all the resources it consumes and to absorb the waste it generates, using prevailing technology and resource management practices’. More specifically, the Ecological Footprint tracks how much biologically productive area it takes to meet the demands of people (such as food growing, fibre production, timber regeneration, absorption of CO₂ from fossil fuels and accommodating built infrastructure). International trade flows (imports and exports) are also embedded in the index.
4.2. Methodology and limitations

The methodology is based on calculating the difference between 'national footprint' and 'biocapacity accounts', counted in global hectares. The ecological deficit shows a difference between the biocapacity and footprint of a region or country, i.e. when the footprint of a population exceeds the biocapacity of the area available to that population. Conversely, an ecological reserve exists when the biocapacity of a region exceeds its population's footprint. The specific terms used for this calculation are:

- **Ecological footprint**: a measure of how much area of biologically productive land and water an individual, population or activity requires to produce all the resources it consumes and to absorb the waste it generates.

- **Biocapacity**: the capacity of ecosystems to regenerate what people demand from those surfaces. It is the ecosystems' capacity to produce biological materials used by people and to absorb waste material generated by humans.

- **Global hectare**: a biologically productive hectare with world average biological productivity for a given year. It is an accounting unit used for the EF and biocapacity accounts.

**Limitations.** Some criticisms of the EF point out that it provides only a partial metric of sustainability and does not capture all dimensions of environmental quality. It is also noted that basing EF accounts strictly on available UN statistics means that not all consumption items are included. Moreover, some criticisms highlight an over-focus on forests (without distinguishing their quality) as a way to absorb emissions.

**Table 4 – EF sources of data and calculation method**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Calculation method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The data in the index come from the following sources:</td>
<td>EF tracks the supply (biocapacity) and demand (ecological footprint) of renewable resources and ecosystem services. Both components express biological flows as global hectares, which allows for direct comparisons between them. The Ecological Footprint has six subcomponents (cropland, grazing land, fishing grounds, forest for forest products, built-up land, and carbon footprint), while biocapacity has five components (cropland, grazing land, fishing grounds, forests, and built-up land).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- United Nations or UN affiliated datasets, including Food and Agriculture Organisation (FAO), UN commodity trade statistics database, UN Statistics Division</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- International Energy Agency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Studies in peer-reviewed science journals and thematic collections.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


4.3. How it can be used by policy-makers

According to the creators of EF, the index can support governments in managing their natural resources and making policy decisions. Ecological Footprint policy applications include reviews of national footprint and biocapacity accounts, identifying risks, tracking sustainability over the long term and monitoring trends. The index can also help raise awareness of sustainability challenges. The European Environment Agency analyses the Ecological Footprint for all EU countries, while [EU Overshoot Day](https://www.overshootday.org) (part of the annual Earth Overshoot Day campaign) in 2019 was accompanied by a report analysing EU trends.
5. EU Regional Competitiveness Index

**RCI**, by the European Commission’s Directorate General for Regional and Urban Policy (DG REGIO)

EU regions * -1.60 to +1.08

Every 3 years: 2010 → Online dataset

Main SDGs covered

* EU regional coverage (268 Eurostat NUTS2 level regions in 27 Member States and the UK)

5.1. What it measures

The EU Regional Competitiveness Index (RCI) measures the major factors of competitiveness in EU regions. The index is based on the following definition: ‘Regional competitiveness is the ability of a region to offer an attractive and sustainable environment for firms and residents to live and work in’. The index includes 74 indicators to track aspects such as governance, infrastructure, health, human capital, labour market and innovation. The EU regional version of the index is based on the global GCI, which monitors competitiveness at national level in 141 countries, including all EU Member States.

![Figure 5 – EU-27 RCI scores 2019](image)


Each edition of the RCI is accompanied by a ‘methodological paper’ from DG REGIO. The paper explains the methodology and presents key findings. The RCI builds on the approach of the Global Competitiveness Index of the World Economic Forum (GCI-WEF). The main aspects of competitiveness are classified into three groups:

- **Basic sub-index** (the Basic group covers key drivers for all types of economies): institutions, macroeconomic stability, infrastructure, health, basic education
- **Efficiency sub-index** (as a regional economy develops and improves its competitiveness, factors such as skilled labour force and efficient labour market come into play as part of the
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**Efficiency** group: higher education and life-long learning, labour market efficiency, market size

**Innovation sub-index** (The most advanced stage of development requires drivers from the **Innovation** group): technological readiness, business sophistication, innovation.

**Limitations.** Eurostat NUTS categories change over time (see NUTS revisions) and in some cases – though very rare – they are artificial statistical units, which do not always correspond to regional administrative boundaries in Member States. Moreover, as each composite index measures a multi-dimensional phenomenon, it necessarily includes a subjective selection of components (though it is consistent with the WEF Global Competitiveness Index framework).

### Table 5 – RCI sources and weighting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Weighting*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Data in the index come from the following sources:</td>
<td>The weighting assigned to the groups depends on the development stage of a region. The regional score is a measurement of the relationship of the regional <strong>RCI</strong> value to the EU <strong>RCI</strong> mean* (average), measured in terms of standard deviations* from the mean.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU: Eurostat, DG REGIO, Regional Innovation Scoreboard by DG GROW, Eurobarometer</td>
<td>If a score is 1, it indicates that the data point's score is one standard deviation above the EU average. Positive values show higher than EU-mean score; negative values are lower than the EU-mean score. (see Figure 5 – EU-27 RCI scores 2019).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Bank: Worldwide Governance Indicators, Ease of Doing Business Index</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Economic Forum: Global Competitiveness Index</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Government Index by the Quality of Government Institute at the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Gothenburg</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centre for Science and Technology Studies (CWTS) at Leiden University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National statistical institutes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


### 5.2. How it can be used by policy-makers

The **RCI** is included in the report on economic, social and territorial cohesion ('cohesion report*), published by the European Commission every three years to report on progress towards cohesion (required by Article 175 TFEU). The latest [cohesion report](https://ec.europa.eu/) dates back to 2017 and a new one is expected in the autumn of 2021.

The **RCI** enables competitiveness to be monitored at a disaggregated* spatial level, which provides valuable information on within-country inequalities. It helps identify the strengths and weaknesses of each region and compare its performance to the EU average and that of its peers. Thanks to its robust methodology and credible sources, it can support regional development strategies and cohesion policy implementation. Regular updates of the index allow changes to be tracked over time and trends identified.
6. EU Social Progress Index

**EU-SPI**, by the European Commission and the Social Progress Imperative

* EU regional coverage (Eurostat **NUTS2** level regions in 27 Member States)

6.1. What it measures

The EU Social Progress Index (EU-SPI) measures a variety of components of social progress. Social progress is defined as: 'the capacity of a society to meet the basic human needs of its citizens, establish the building blocks that allow peoples and communities to enhance and sustain the quality of their lives, and create the conditions for all individuals to reach their full potential.' The index includes 55 indicators tracking health, education, safety, environmental quality and personal rights at regional level. The index uses the **NUTS2** classification of EU regions created by Eurostat. The EU's regional version of the index is based on the global SPI, which monitors social progress at national level in 163 countries, including all EU Member States.

![Figure 6 – EU-SPI scores 2020](image)

Data source: European Commission, **EU-SPI**, 2020.

6.2. Methodology and limitations

The EU-SPI methodology is explained in a [methodological paper](#) published by the European Commission’s Directorate-General for Regional and Urban policy (DG REGIO). The paper also presents key findings and information on usage. The EU-SPI builds on the approach taken by the global Social Progress Index of the non-profit organisation Social Progress Imperative. Social progress is divided into three dimensions:

- **Basic human needs**: nutrition and basic medical care, water and sanitation, shelter and personal security
- **Foundations of well-being**: access to basic knowledge, access to information and communication, health and wellness, and environmental quality
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**Opportunity**: personal rights, personal freedom and choice, tolerance and inclusion, access to advanced education.

This framework of three dimensions assumes that the basic components are necessary, but not sufficient to achieve social progress. The foundations and opportunity components go a step further and measure more advanced factors. Economic indicators are excluded on purpose to avoid economic proxies of social progress and focus on direct metrics.

**Limitations.** Occasional Eurostat NUTS revisions may change the boundaries of regions and thus impede the tracking of change over time for some regions, but this happens rarely. Moreover in a small number of cases, the NUTS regions are artificial statistical units, which do not correspond to regional administrative boundaries in Member States. Within the three components some indicators are adjusted in new index versions (removed or added), but the methodological set-up ensures that even if some individual indicators cannot be tracked over time, each of the three dimensions can.

Table 6 – EU-SPI sources and weighting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Weighting*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Data in the index come from the following sources:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• EU: Eurostat, DG REGIO, EU-SILC, European Environmental Agency (EEA)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Gallup World Poll survey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Quality of Government Index by the Quality of Government Institute at the University of Gothenburg</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• European Institute for Gender Equality (EIGE)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The index uses a hybrid aggregation method that includes the simple, unweighted arithmetic mean* within each component and the generalised unweighted mean across components and across dimensions. The selection of indicators through PCA (principal component analysis, i.e. a dimensionality reduction technique designed to capture all relevant information in a small number of transformed dimensions) guarantees that the arithmetic mean is the correct way to aggregate.* Component scores are simultaneously computed at regional level from regional-level indicators, and at national level from national-level indicators. Then, regional component scores are anchored to purely national ones.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


6.3. How it can be used by policy-makers

The EU-SPI is featured in the cohesion report published by the European Commission every three years to report on progress towards economic, social and territorial cohesion (as required by Article 175 TFEU). The latest cohesion report was issued in 2017; a new one is expected in the autumn of 2021.

The EU-SPI helps track social disparities at regional level, which reveals trends within countries. It helps to identify the strengths and weaknesses of each region and compare the region to the EU average and its peers via scorecards. It can support regional development strategies and cohesion-related policies. In fact, an EU-SPI pilot project in 10 regions has been carried out by the European Commission to test how the index can be used to improve policy-making.
7. Human Development Index

HDI, by the United Nations Development Programme

189 countries 0.394 to 0.957 Yearly: 1990 → Online dataset Main SDGs covered

7.1. What it measures

The HDI is designed to measure countries' development beyond economic growth. It measures well-being improvements in three dimensions: a long and healthy life, knowledge, and a decent standard of living.

Figure 7 – HDI scores 2020 (2019 data)


7.2. Methodology and limitations

The Human Development Index is the geometric mean* of the indices corresponding to these three dimensions. Based on their HDI, countries are grouped into four categories (HDI 2020):

- HDI 0.800 and above: very high human development (66 countries in 2019)
- HDI 0.700 up to 0.799: high human development (53 countries in 2019)
- HDI 0.550 up 0.699 medium human development (37 countries in 2019)
- HDI below 0.550 low human development (33 countries in 2019)
The three dimensions are measured according to the following primary indices:

Table 7 – HDI primary indices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Index</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Weighting*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 'Long and healthy life' – Health Index (Ih) | $Ih = \frac{(LEB-20)}{65}$

$Ih = 1$ for a LEB of 85 years (as $85-20 = 65$), and 0 for a LEB of 20 years

Source: **UNDESA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Index</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Weighting*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 'Knowledge' - Education Index (Ie)        | $MYSI = \frac{\text{Adults}(25+)\text{ Mean YS/15}}{2}$

$MYSI$ is $< 1$ when adults have spent less than 15 years at school or university on average.

$EYSI = \frac{\text{Expected years of schooling/18}}{2}$

$EYSI$ is $< 1$ when children are expected to spend less than 18 years at school or university.

Source: **UNESCO, UNICEF, ICF**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Index</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Weighting*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>'Decent standard of living' – Income Index (Ii)</td>
<td>$Ii$ is $0$ when GNIpc is $$100$ and $1$ when GNIpc is $$75,000$.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: **World Bank, IMF, UNSD**


**Limitations and corrections.** The HDI is a simplified view of human development as it is based on data aggregated* at country level and does not reflect inequalities within the same country. Over the years, the UN has developed other composite indices derived from the HDI that capture specific aspects of human development:

- **GDI:** the gender development index, which disaggregates* HDI dimensions by gender (GDI= female HDI / male HDI);
- **IHDI:** the inequality-adjusted HDI which measures the inequality in the distribution of each dimension across the population (increased inequalities result in IHDI < HDI);
- **PHDI:** a new index since the 2020 edition, the planetary-pressure-adjusted HDI incorporates per capita carbon dioxide emissions and material footprint (increased pressures result in PHDI < HDI).

### 7.3. How it can be used by policy-makers

**Human Development Report.** The HDI, GDI, IHDI and PHDI are the basis for the analysis of the yearly **Human Development Report**, together with other composite indices (the **Gender Inequality Index** and the **Multidimensional Poverty Index**). Eurostat notably uses the HDI to classify countries by development level. In a **resolution of June 2011**, the European Parliament welcomed the Commission's initiative to develop indicators for measuring economic and social progress beyond **GDP** and recommended that such indicators be consistent with the HDI in particular.
8. Media Pluralism Monitor

MPM, by the Centre for Media Pluralism and Media Freedom at the European University Institute

30 countries*  Risk: 97% to 3% **  Yearly: 2014 →  Data on request  Main SDGs covered

* Coverage: EU Member States (all-EU coverage since 2018 edition) + Albania, Turkey and the UK
** Countries get a risk score in four areas (the lower the score, the better the situation).

8.1. What it measures

The Media Pluralism Monitor (MPM) is a scientific and holistic index documenting the health of media ecosystems, detailing threats to media pluralism and freedom. It monitors four major areas: Basic protection, Market plurality, Political independence and Social inclusiveness.

Figure 8 – Media Pluralism Monitor 2021: Risk assessment

Data Source: Monitoring media pluralism in the digital era, European University Institute, July 2021.

8.2. Methodology and limitations

The MPM is calculated on the basis of a questionnaire of 200 questions filled in by national teams. Data drawn from the questionnaire is supplemented with various sources, including:

- national legislation and reports,
- case law,
- interviews with stakeholders,
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- reports of non-governmental organisations (NGOs) and international organisations:
  - Index on censorship, Council of Europe,
  - European Court of Human Rights,
  - International Federation of Journalists,
  - European Regulators Group for Audiovisual Media Services,
- indicators for independence and efficient functioning of audiovisual media services regulatory bodies (INDIREG).

For each area, countries receive a score calculated by means of various indicators included in the table below. Risk scores range from low (0-33 %), to medium (34-66 %), to high (67-100 %). There is no overall score.

Limitations and corrections. Some variables are more difficult to measure, because of their qualitative aspect or a lack of verifiable data. These limitations are corrected by way of a group of experts’ evaluation; the absence of data or reliable data are considered to be indicative of risk in relevant cases.

Table 8 – MPM2020: Areas and indicators covered

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Basic protection</td>
<td>Protection of freedom of expression; Protection of the right to information; Journalistic profession, standards and protection; Independence and effectiveness of the media authority; Universal reach of traditional media and access to the internet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market plurality</td>
<td>Transparency of media ownership; News media concentration; Online platforms and competition enforcement; Media viability; Commercial and owner influence over editorial content</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political independence</td>
<td>Political independence of the media; Editorial autonomy; Audiovisual media, online platforms and elections; State regulation of resources and support to the media sector; Independence of public service media governance and funding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social inclusiveness</td>
<td>Access to media for minorities; Access to media for local/regional communities and community media; Access to media for people with disabilities; Access to media for women; Media literacy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Monitoring media pluralism in the digital era, European University Institute, 2020.

8.3. How it can be used by policy-makers

The MPM is an important source for the European Commission’s annual rule of law report and as such is the main source for one of the four main pillars of the report (national justice systems, anti-corruption frameworks, media pluralism and freedom, and other institutional issues related to the checks and balances essential to an effective system of democratic governance). In 2020, the report stated that broadly speaking EU citizens enjoy high standards of media freedom and pluralism. Nevertheless, there are concerns about effectiveness and adequate resources, as well as risks of politicisation of media authorities in some Member States. Some country assessments have further identified cases where serious concerns have been raised regarding political pressure on media. Lastly, journalists and other media actors face threats and attacks in relation to their work in a number of Member States, although some countries have also developed practices and set up structures and measures to support and protect journalists.
9. Normandy Index

NI, by the EPRS and the Institute for Economics and Peace (IEP)

137 countries*  
2.82 to 9.19  
Yearly: 2019 →  
Data on request  
Main SDGs covered

*EU-27 counted as one country

9.1. What it measures

Figure 9 – Normandy Index: Resilience to threats to peace, 2021

Data source: EPRS and IEP, 2021 – The greater the score, the lesser the risks.

The Normandy Index (NI) measures threats to peace and security identified by the EU in its global strategy (EUGS) in order to combat or mitigate them. The NI takes into account the interconnectedness of threats in 137 countries (the EU-27 being counted as one). By measuring the linkages between threats, the NI can help policy-makers assess the likelihood or graveness of a conflict in a particular country.

9.2. Methodology and limitations

The EUGS identifies 11 threats to peace and security: terrorism, hybrid threats, economic crises, climate change, energy insecurity, violent conflicts, cybersecurity, disinformation, fragile states, transborder crime, weapons of mass destruction. In addition to the threats identified in the EUGS, the NI measures the quality of the democratic process. Complexity in the collection of transborder crime data has led to adaptations in that indicator; hybrid threats are excluded to avoid duplication as they are considered a component of several other indicators in the NI. Transborder crime has been replaced with a measurement of the number of homicides and of perceptions of criminality; hybrid threats are interpreted as the accumulation of other threats in a given country. The authors
also recognise that each threat has 'interconnecting dimensions that are hard to quantify'. The NI therefore selects a unique indicator, deemed the most representative, to measure each threat (except for 'crime' and 'economic crises', see table below).

The index is constructed in such a way that higher scores denote better security situations. Therefore a 'reverse' standardisation is applied to indicators that associate a higher value with a higher threat. For a given country the value of each indicator ranges from 0 (below a defined minimum) to 1 (above a defined maximum). The NI aims to mitigate the limitations of composite indices – heterogeneous data, strong disparity in data collection and updates between countries – notably by replacing data that is missing or too old with equivalent data from more recent sources (for instance from national statistics) or by a regional average As the Normandy Index draws on the EUGS for its 'threats basket', it is limited in the number of threats the EUGS acknowledges.

### Table 9 – Normandy Index domains and indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Latest data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Climate change</td>
<td>INFORM Global Risk Index</td>
<td>UN</td>
<td>2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cybersecurity</td>
<td>Global Cybersecurity Index</td>
<td>ITU</td>
<td>2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic processes</td>
<td>Participatory Democracy Index</td>
<td>VDEM</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic crises</td>
<td>Non-performing loans as a % of total loans'</td>
<td>World Bank, Trading</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Annual inflation rate</td>
<td>economics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy insecurity</td>
<td>Energy imports, net (% of energy use)</td>
<td>World Bank, Enerdata</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fragile states</td>
<td>Fragile States Index</td>
<td>Fund For Peace</td>
<td>2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime</td>
<td>Homicide rate per 100 000</td>
<td>UNODC</td>
<td>2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Perceptions of criminality banded</td>
<td>EIU</td>
<td>2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disinformation</td>
<td>Disinformation</td>
<td>VDEM</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terrorism</td>
<td>Global Terrorism Index</td>
<td>IEP</td>
<td>2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violent conflict</td>
<td>Global Peace Index</td>
<td>IEP</td>
<td>2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WMD Nuclear and heavy weapons</td>
<td>Global Peace Index</td>
<td>IEP</td>
<td>2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>capabilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: EPRS and IEP, Normandy Index, 2021.

### 9.3. How it can be used by policy-makers

As the Normandy Index is based on the EU strategic approach on peace and security, it is primarily aimed at helping EU policy-makers identify the countries where EU action is most needed. More than an annual snapshot, its objective is to monitor progress regarding identified threats in specific countries, regions or globally, and the EU contribution to them. Future releases of the NI will take into account new threats identified by future EU security strategies, which could, for example, place greater emphasis on the impact of epidemics or pandemics on security. The Normandy Index was originally designed at the request of the French regional authority of Normandy, to be presented yearly during the Normandy World Peace Forum. Each update of the Normandy Index is accompanied by an in-depth analysis (Peace and Security: Overview of EU action and outlook for the future) and a thematic analysis of the EU's role in peace and security in a specific country or region (in 2019, Colombia; in 2020, the Sahel; and in 2021, Turkey). Data from the NI are also used in several EPRS country or regional briefings. The interactive version can be used by policy-makers and researchers for their own needs.
10. Sustainable Development Report's SDG Index

SDG Index and Dashboards, by the Sustainable Development Solutions Network (SDSN) – a scientific network set up under the auspices of the UN Secretary-General – and Bertelsmann Stiftung.

UN states * 38.5 to 84.7** Yearly***: 2016 → Online dataset All SDGs are covered

* All 193 UN member states are monitored, however not all are included in the index, owing to insufficient data for some SDGs.

10.1. What it measures

Figure 10 - SDG Index scores (2020)


The 17 UN sustainable development goals (SDGs) are linked to a series of targets to be reached by 2030, with a number of quantified indicators to monitor progress with reliable and comparable datasets. These data feed national reports prepared by the UN member states. However, these reports are voluntary, not updated on a regular basis, and may not cover every SDG. To fill the gaps, the Sustainable Development Report (SDR) team, made up of independent experts, monitors SDG implementation progress in all UN member states. At the core of the SDR, the SDG Index is aimed at showing each country's progress towards achieving the SDGs.

10.2. Methodology and limitations

The SDG Index is based on 85 indicators – and 30 additional indicators for OECD countries – distributed between the 17 SDGs (unevenly, see table below). The indicators are less numerous and some differ from the UN's official SDG indicators – to the preparation of which SDSN also
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contributed. The SDR team selected indicators based on their relevance for the widest range of countries, adequacy (valid and reliable measures), timeliness, and data quality. Within each goal, all indicators are given the same weight,* and for calculating the overall SDG score, all 17 goals are given the same weight. A country achieving the best possible outcome on a specific goal or on all SDGs would be given a score of 100.

The main limitation for a global assessment of SDG progress lies in the availability of data for certain countries, either because it is not collected or because it has not been updated. Countries with less than 80 % of all indicators covered are not included in the ranking. When countries included in the SDG Index however miss data for a specific goal, the missing values are replaced by the regional average score. Another limitation is the equal weighting* for each SDG, no matter the number of indicators it is based on (see Table 10). The European Commission's Joint Research Centre audited the SDG Index in 2019 and found it 'a noteworthy effort of synthesizing the 17 adopted SDGs into a single figure'. Overall, it found the SDG Index rankings to be 'fairly robust'.

Table 10 – SDG Index: number of indicators per SDG

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SDG</th>
<th>Number of indicators</th>
<th>SDG</th>
<th>Number of indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SDG1 No poverty</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>SDG10 Reduced inequality</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDG2 Zero hunger</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>SDG11 Sustainable cities</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDG3 Good health and well-being</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>SDG12 Consumption and production</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDG4 Quality education</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>SDG13 Climate action</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDG5 Gender equality</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>SDG14 Life below water</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDG6 Clean water and sanitation</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>SDG15 Life on land</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDG7 Affordable and clean energy</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>SDG16 Peace, justice, strong institutions</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDG8 Decent work and economic growth</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>SDG17 Partnerships to achieve the goal</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDG9 Industry, innovation and infrastructures</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Rescaling to %: actual score – worst possible score optimum score – worst possible score * 100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


10.3. How it can be used by policy-makers

The SDG Index was clearly designed to help policy-makers track SDG progress and implement the policies needed in their country. The 'SDG dashboards' have been analysing trends since the first index. They highlight each country's progress towards each SDG, and extrapolate its chances of achieving the SDGs by 2030. A system of arrows is used to describe the trends. This visualisation of trends can help policy-makers to concentrate on the SDGs on which their country is lagging behind, or at least to make appropriate trade-offs to improve their SDG score as well as SDG progress at global level. Each year, the report concentrates on a specific issue, and gives policy advice on achieving SDGs in that context. For instance, in 2021 the report examines ways to increase low-income developing countries’ fiscal space, in order to help them achieve the SDGs. In addition to the global report, the SDR team also publishes reports dedicated to regions (e.g. Europe), cities (e.g. Italian cities), or specific themes (e.g. racial inequality) in delivering the SDGs in the United States).
Short glossary of statistical terms

Except when otherwise stated, definitions are quoted from or inspired by Eurostat’s Statistics explained glossary.

**Aggregate or aggregated data**: Statistics for related categories can be grouped together [or aggregated] to provide a broader picture. Thus, an aggregate is the combination of related categories (...) to provide information at a broader level to that at which detailed observations are taken. (...) The aggregating is usually not done by simple addition, but taking account of the relative importance of the different categories, using weights*. See also: Disaggregation.*

**Arithmetic mean**: See average.*

**Average, Mean**: The average is the statistical summary, in one value, of a group of numbers. There are three main types of averages: the mean (the sum or product of the values of a group of numbers divided by how many numbers there are in the group); the median (the middle value of a group of numbers); the mode or modus (the most common value of a group of numbers). The most common of these three types is the mean, which can itself be further subdivided into the arithmetic mean, the geometric mean and the harmonic mean. However, in common daily usage, the term 'average' often refers to the mean ... and even more specifically to the arithmetic mean rather than to the geometric mean, harmonic mean, median or mode. The arithmetic mean, also known as the arithmetic average, is the sum of all the values in a list of numerical values divided by the number of items in the list. For example, if we have the two values, eight and six, then their arithmetic average is: \((8 + 6) ÷ 2 = 7\). The geometric mean, sometimes also called the geometric average, is an average calculated by multiplying a set of positive values and taking the \(n^{th}\) root, where \(n\) is the number of values. The geometric mean is used to minimise the effects of extreme values; for instance, when averaging growth rates.

**Benchmark**: A recognised standard that forms the basis for comparison. In the quality improvement lexicon, a benchmark is a best in class achievement. This achievement then becomes the reference point or recognised standard of excellence against which similar processes are measured. Benchmark data are recognised standard data set against which other data sets are compared.

**Bias**: An effect that deprives a statistical result of representativeness by systematically distorting it, as distinct from a random error, which may distort on any one occasion but balances out on average (OECD).

**Disaggregation, disaggregated data**: Disaggregation is the breakdown of observations, usually within a common branch of a hierarchy, to a more detailed level to that at which detailed observations are taken. [Examples: the unemployment rate may be by gender, age, ethnicity, migratory status, etc.]. See also: Aggregated data*, Granularity* (OECD).

**Geometric mean**: see Average.*

**Granularity**: Granularity is the level of detail at which observed values are stored in a database. The number of observations or granularity for a specific dimension in a given domain will vary according to the purpose of the data collection and to the database storage capacities. For instance, in a geographical database, data referring to localities has a finer granularity than data referring to regions or states. See also: Disaggregation.*

**Inlier**: see Outlier.*
**Interpolation**: A procedure to estimate an intermediate data value by means of a formula. An interpolation may be derived: from previous survey data or from proxy variables (e.g. data from comparable countries in the same region).

**Median**: The median is the value in a list of values, that divides the list into two halves.

**Mode**: The most frequent value in a list of values.

**Outlier, inlier**: A data value that lies in the tail of the statistical distribution of a set of data values. In the distribution of raw data, outliers are often regarded as more likely to be incorrect. In contrast, an inlier is an erroneous data value, which actually lies in the interior of a statistical distribution, making it difficult to distinguish it from good data values.

**Percentile**: The set of partition values that divide the total frequency into one hundred equal parts (OECD).

**Purchasing power parities (PPPs)**: PPPs are the rates of currency conversion that equalise the purchasing power of different currencies by eliminating the differences in price levels between countries (OECD).

**Standard deviation**: A summary measure of the differences of each observation from the mean [expressed as the differences of each observation from the mean]. If the differences themselves were added up, the positive would exactly balance the negative and so their sum would be zero (The BMJ). [Consequently the standard deviation is obtained by calculating the square root of the aggregated squares of the differences (known as the variance of the values)].

**Unit value**: When the expenditures or value of production of an item is divided by the quantity, the result is known as a unit value (OECD).

**Weight, weighting**: A weight in statistical terms is defined as a coefficient assigned to a number in a computation, for example when determining an average, to make the number’s effect on the computation reflect its importance. A weighted average* or mean is one where each item being averaged is multiplied by a number (weight) based on the item’s relative importance, rather than treating each item equally.
Further reading

The European Commission’s Joint Research Centre (JRC) proposes a series of composite indicators, mostly designed to monitor the implementation of EU policies and strategies:

- EU multidimensional inequality monitoring framework (EU MIMF)
- Gender equality strategy monitoring portal
- Cultural and creative cities monitor
- European pillar of social rights social scoreboard
- ASEM [Asia-Europe Meeting] sustainable connectivity portal
- Active Ageing Index (AAI)

The JRC has also prepared a handbook (with the OECD) and a tool to help design and analyse composite indicators. The JRC’s Competence Centre on Composite Indicators and Scoreboards (COIN) also independently audited other indices, such as the SDG Index (2019, see above), the Gender Equality Index (2020), the Commitment to Reducing Inequality Index (2020), and the Environmental Performance Index (2020).


Evidence and data are key to good policy-making, in particular when it comes to setting priorities, mitigating negative impacts and finding optimum trade-offs. The information provided in this publication is designed to help policy-makers by providing sources of data and identifying possible bias in their use.

EPRS has selected 10 composite indices in a range of policy areas from reliable sources; indices already used as references by policy-makers. For each index, a chapter presents the producers and describes their objectives in publishing the index, the data compiled, and how that data is or could be used by policy-makers. The chapters also highlight each index’s limitations.