SOCIAL PROGRESS INDEX **2017**

BY MICHAEL E. PORTER AND SCOTT STERN
WITH MICHAEL GREEN

SOCIAL PROGRESS IMPERATIVE

CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2017 SOCIAL PROGRESS INDEX

Social progress has become an increasingly critical agenda for leaders in government, business, and civil society. Citizens' demands for better lives are evident in uprisings such as the Arab Spring and the emergence of new political movements in even the most prosperous countries, such as the United States and France. Since the financial crisis of 2008, citizens are increasingly expecting that business play its role in delivering improvements in the lives of customers and employees, and protecting the environment for us all. This is the social progress imperative.

Progress on social issues does not automatically accompany economic development. Rising income usually brings major improvements in access to clean water, sanitation, literacy, and basic education. But on average, personal security is no better in middle-income countries than low-income ones, and is often worse. Too many people — regardless of income — live without full rights and experience discrimination or even violence based on gender, religion, ethnicity, or sexual orientation.

Traditional measures of national income, such as GDP per capita, fail to capture the overall progress of societies.

The Social Progress Index rigorously measures country performance on a wide range of aspects of social and environmental performance, which are relevant for countries at all levels of economic development. It enables an assessment of not just absolute country

performance but relative performance compared to a country's economic peers. Governments and businesses have the tools to track social and environmental performance rigorously, and make better public policy and investment choices. The Social Progress Index also assesses a country's success in turning economic progress into improved social outcomes; it helps translate economic gains into better social and environmental performance in ways that are critical to enabling even greater economic success. The Social Progress Index provides a concrete framework for understanding and then prioritizing an action agenda, advancing both social and economic performance.

THE SOCIAL PROGRESS INDEX METHODOLOGY

The Social Progress Index follows four key design principles:

1. **Exclusively social and environmental indicators:** Our aim is to measure social progress directly, rather than utilize economic proxies or outcomes. By excluding economic indicators, we can, for the first time, rigorously and systematically analyze the relationship between economic development (measured for example by GDP per capita) and social development. Prior efforts to move "beyond GDP" have comingled social and economic indicators, making it difficult to disentangle cause and effect.
2. **Outcomes not inputs:** Our purpose is to measure the outcomes that matter to the lives of real people, not the inputs. For example, we want to measure a country's health and wellness achieved, not how much effort is expended nor how much the country spends on healthcare.
3. **Holistic and relevant to all countries:** We strive to create a holistic measure of social progress that encompasses the many aspects of the health of societies. Most previous efforts have focused on the poorest countries, for understandable reasons. But even prosperous countries face social challenges, and knowing what constitutes a successful society, including at higher income levels, is indispensable for charting a course for every country.
4. **Actionable:** The Social Progress Index aims to be a practical tool that will help leaders and practitioners in government, business, and civil society to implement policies and programs that will drive faster social progress. To achieve that goal, we measure outcomes in a granular way that focuses on specific areas that can be implemented directly. The 2017 Social Progress Index is structured around 12 components and 50 distinct indicators. The framework not only provides an aggregate country score and ranking, but also allows benchmarking on specific areas of strength and weakness. Transparency of measurement based on a comprehensive framework allows change-makers to set strategic priorities, acting upon the most pressing issues in their societies.

The design principles are the foundation for Social Progress Imperative's conceptual framework and formulate our definition of social progress. The Social Progress Index uses the following working definition:

Social progress is the capacity of a society to meet the basic human needs of its citizens, establish the building blocks that allow citizens and communities to enhance and sustain the quality of their lives, and create the conditions for all individuals to reach their full potential.

Figure 0.1 / **Social Progress Index component-level framework**

Basic Human Needs	Foundations of Wellbeing	Opportunity
Nutrition and Basic Medical Care	Access to Basic Knowledge	Personal Rights
Water and Sanitation	Access to Information and Communications	Personal Freedom and Choice
Shelter	Health and Wellness	Tolerance and Inclusion
Personal Safety	Environmental Quality	Access to Advanced Education

Each of the 12 components of the framework comprises between three and five specific outcome indicators. Indicators are selected because they are measured appropriately with a consistent methodology by the same organization across all (or essentially all) of the countries in our sample. Taken together, this framework aims to capture a broad range of interrelated factors revealed by the scholarly literature and practitioner experience as underpinning social progress. The high-level structure of the 2017 Social Progress Index remains unchanged from 2016. To improve the measurement of component-level concepts and accommodate changes in data availability, we made some modifications to individual indicators and to the composition of several components.

A key advantage of the Social Progress Index's exclusion of economic variables is that results can be evaluated relative to a country's level of economic development. In many cases, it is more useful and interesting to compare a country's performance to countries at a similar level of GDP per capita than to all countries in the world. For example, a lower-income country may have a low score on a certain component, but may greatly exceed typical scores for countries with similar per capita incomes. Conversely, a high-income country may have a high absolute score on a component, but still fall short of what is typical for comparably wealthy countries. For this reason, we present a country's strengths and weaknesses on a relative rather than absolute basis, comparing a country's performance to that of its economic peers.

For a full explanation of how the Social Progress Index and country scorecards are calculated, see our separate 2017 Methodology Report. All the underlying data is downloadable from our website at www.socialprogressimperative.org. The methodology has been refined and improved through the generous feedback of many individuals and organizations around the world. We will continue to refine and improve the methodology and welcome feedback at feedback@social-progress.org.

2017 SOCIAL PROGRESS INDEX RESULTS

The 2017 Social Progress Index (see Figure 0.2 ranks 128 countries that have sufficient data for all 12 components. We group countries from highest to lowest social progress into six tiers from 'Very High Social Progress' to 'Very Low Social Progress.'

Figure 0.2 / **Full 2017 Social Progress Index Rankings**

2017 SOCIAL PROGRESS INDEX RESULTS

Very High Social Progress

Rank	Country	Score
1	Denmark	90.57
2	Finland	90.53
3	Iceland	90.27
3	Norway	90.27
5	Switzerland	90.10
6	Canada	89.84
7	Netherlands	89.82
8	Sweden	89.66
9	Australia	89.30
9	New Zealand	89.30
11	Ireland	88.91
12	United Kingdom	88.73
13	Germany	88.50
14	Austria	87.98

High Social Progress

Rank	Country	Score
15	Belgium	87.15
16	Spain	86.96
17	Japan	86.44
18	United States	86.43
19	France	85.92
20	Portugal	85.44
21	Slovenia	84.32
22	Czech Republic	84.22
23	Estonia	82.96
24	Italy	82.62
25	Chile	82.54
26	Korea, Republic of	82.08
27	Cyprus	81.15
28	Costa Rica	81.03
29	Israel	80.61
30	Slovakia	80.22
31	Uruguay	80.09
32	Poland	79.65
33	Greece	78.92
34	Latvia	78.61
35	Lithuania	78.09
36	Croatia	78.04
37	Hungary	77.32
38	Argentina	75.90

Upper Middle Social Progress

Rank	Country	Score
39	Mauritius	75.18
40	Panama	74.61
41	Bulgaria	74.42
42	Kuwait	74.12
43	Brazil	73.97
44	Romania	73.53
45	Serbia	73.41
46	Jamaica	72.42
47	Peru	72.15
48	Mexico	71.93
49	Colombia	71.72
50	Malaysia	71.14
51	Tunisia	71.09
52	Albania	70.97
53	Georgia	70.80
54	Montenegro	70.01
55	Ecuador	69.97
56	Jordan	69.85
57	Saudi Arabia	69.45
58	Macedonia	69.35
59	Armenia	69.01
60	Paraguay	68.73
61	Turkey	68.68
62	Thailand	68.51
63	Dominican Republic	68.42
64	Ukraine	68.35
65	Belarus	67.80
66	South Africa	67.25
67	Russia	67.17

continued on page 5

Figure 0.2 / **Full 2017 Social Progress Index Rankings** *(continued)*

Rank	Country	Score
68	Philippines	67.10
69	Bolivia	66.93

Lower Middle Social Progress

Rank	Country	Score
70	El Salvador	66.43
71	Lebanon	66.31
71	Moldova	66.31
73	Sri Lanka	66.16
74	Kazakhstan	66.01
75	Algeria	65.41
76	Azerbaijan	65.33
76	Kyrgyzstan	65.33
78	Morocco	65.25
79	Indonesia	65.10
80	Botswana	64.44
81	Nicaragua	64.17
82	Egypt	63.76
83	China	63.72
84	Guatemala	62.62
85	Uzbekistan	62.02
86	Mongolia	62.00
87	Namibia	61.98
88	Iran	61.93
89	Honduras	61.76
90	Ghana	61.44
91	Nepal	60.08
92	Tajikistan	58.87
93	India	58.39
94	Senegal	58.31

Low Social Progress

Rank	Country	Score
95	Kenya	56.17
96	Myanmar	55.69
97	Bangladesh	54.84
98	Cambodia	54.54
99	Laos	54.17
100	Malawi	53.09
101	Rwanda	52.78
102	Swaziland	52.64
103	Lesotho	51.74
104	Benin	51.69
105	Pakistan	51.54
106	Côte d'Ivoire	50.65
107	Tanzania	50.21
108	Zimbabwe	50.10
109	Nigeria	50.01
110	Burkina Faso	49.75
111	Uganda	49.59
112	Liberia	49.34
113	Mauritania	48.44
114	Congo, Republic of	48.24
115	Togo	48.21
116	Mozambique	47.90
117	Cameroon	47.83
118	Mali	47.75
119	Madagascar	47.40
120	Sierra Leone	47.10
121	Ethiopia	45.29

Very Low Social Progress

Rank	Country	Score
122	Yemen	43.46
123	Guinea	43.40
124	Niger	42.97
125	Angola	40.73
126	Chad	35.69
127	Afghanistan	35.66
128	Central African Republic	28.38

SOCIAL PROGRESS INDEX VS. GDP PER CAPITA

The 2017 Social Progress Index findings reveal that countries achieve widely divergent levels of social progress, even at similar levels of GDP per capita. For example, a country with high GDP per capita may do well on absolute social progress, reflecting high income, yet under-perform relative to countries of similar income. Conversely, a country with low GDP per capita may achieve only modest levels of social progress, yet substantially outperform countries at similar economic levels.

Figure 0.3 shows the relationship between GDP per capita and overall social progress. The data reveal several key findings:

- First, there is a positive and strong relationship between the 2017 Social Progress Index and GDP per capita.
- Second, the relationship between economic development and social progress is not linear. At lower income levels, small differences in GDP per capita are associated with large improvements in social progress. As countries reach high levels of income, however, the rate of change slows.

Figure 0.3 / **Social Progress Index vs. GDP per capita**



SOCIAL PROGRESS OVER TIME

As we enter a fourth year of the Social Progress Index, we are able to introduce a new dimension to our analysis, the evaluation of social progress over time. We are therefore able to evaluate both the evolution of social progress, and also identify the relative movement of each component and dimension of the Social Progress Index.

To summarize our findings, we find that overall social progress is improving but that there are components of social progress that have experienced deeply worrying erosion. Disaggregated by component, we find that Access to Information and Communications and Access to Advanced Education improve markedly in a short period of time. This improvement is in sharp contrast to declines or stagnation in Personal Rights, Personal Safety, and Tolerance and Inclusion. In other components, progress is slow and/or uneven. The findings suggest that improved social progress in the aggregate should not mask the erosion in personal rights and challenges to tolerance and safety that threaten to undermine hard-earned social progress achievements.

Figure 0.4 / **Population-weighted world scores in 2014 and 2017**



Relative to 2014, 113 out of 128 countries have improved their Social Progress Index score. The improvement of social progress is largely concentrated in South Asian and Western African nations, whose original scores were in the Lower Middle or Low Social Progress Tiers of the Index. This improvement suggests that countries at a relatively low level of social progress may be able to improve more rapidly since they both have more opportunities for improvement and can draw on lessons and approaches that have been implemented elsewhere.

While global social progress is improving, a small group of 15 countries register a marked decline in their overall score, with an average decline in this group of 0.64 points. The biggest decliners are mainly in Central America or Sub-Saharan Africa, but Hungary stands out with the largest decline by far among European countries, driven largely by change in Tolerance and Inclusion.

PUTTING SOCIAL PROGRESS INTO ACTION

The Social Progress Imperative publishes the annual Social Progress Index in order to build a common language and data platform that supports benchmarking, collaboration, and change. Throughout the world, the Social Progress Imperative has catalyzed the formation of local action networks that bring together government, businesses, and civil society organizations committed to using the Social Progress Index as a tool to assess strengths and weaknesses, spur constructive dialogue, catalyze change, and improve people's lives.

The Social Progress Index Amazonia, led by regional partner Fundación Avina and local nonprofit Imazon, represents the most detailed social and environmental diagnosis of the Amazon's 772 municipalities across nine states.[1] Alarmed by the low levels of social progress in the municipality of Carauari, an important region for their supply chain, Coca-Cola and Natura partnered with Ipsos to create a community needs survey based on the Index framework. This community-level Social Progress Index has been the foundation for a new development program developed in collaboration between citizens, government, business and civil society.

1.. www.ipsamazonia.org.br

Figure 0.5 / **Top Improvers and Decliners on Social Progress Index 2014 to 2017**



Guided by the social progress data, this program has improved water and sanitation infrastructure, providing 500 households with consistent sources of clean water for the first time. They also constructed new river piers to improve transportation during seasonal flooding and increase connectivity with neighboring communities. These improvements have already changed lives in Carauari, where business has taken responsibility for acting on the insights of the Index and taking the necessary actions to mobilize partners to generate impact.

In Europe, the Social Progress Imperative has supported the European Commission, in a partnership including the Orkestra Basque Institute for Competitiveness, for the creation of a Social Progress Index for 272 regions of the European Union. This index is being used to monitor the Commission's 2014–2020 action program and identify best practices within regions that can be scaled and applied elsewhere. We are also working with countries and regions of the EU — including some of the highest performing regions in Scandinavia, as well as in lower performing regions in Southern and Eastern Europe — to use the Index to help tackle challenges such as environmental quality, social inclusion, disaffected youth, and other needs.

In India, policymakers will be able to act on new insights about priority areas for investment and development thanks to a multi-year endeavor to assess progress in 28 states and one territory, 50 cities, and 562 districts, launched in 2016 by the Institute for Competitiveness India in association with government think tank NITI Aayog. Beyond its utility for India's state governments and national leaders, the India Social Progress Index will also equip the corporate sector with a comprehensive outline of the thematic areas where their legally-mandated CSR funds can be directed. By sparking cross-learning and competitive opportunities across the states, the India Index has the potential to improve quality of life for more than 1.3 billion people.

These are just a few examples of how the social progress partner network is making social progress a central component of policy planning and a leading concern for businesses (see the Supplemental Section for a full discussion of social progress measurement efforts at the regional and country level). As the Social Progress Network continues to grow, new agents of change will use our existing indexes and create new ones to target their actions and generate impact. It has never been enough simply to measure progress – together with our partners, we are driving it.

CHAPTER 1

WHY WE MEASURE SOCIAL PROGRESS

THE CASE FOR SOCIAL PROGRESS

We created the Social Progress Index to broaden how country success is measured, beyond economic indicators like GDP per capita. Social progress is about meeting everyone's basic needs for food, clean water, shelter, and security. It is about living healthy, long lives, and protecting the environment. It is about education, freedom, and opportunity.

Social progress has become an increasingly critical agenda for leaders in government, business, and civil society. Citizens' demands for better lives are evident in uprisings such as the Arab Spring and the emergence of new political movements in even the most prosperous countries, such as the United States and France. Since the financial crisis of 2008, citizens are increasingly expecting business to play its role in delivering improvements in the lives of customers and employees, and protecting the environment for us all. This is the social progress imperative.

Advancing social progress requires a new model of development, because economic development alone has been found wanting.

ECONOMIC GROWTH IS NOT ENOUGH

Economic growth has had an extraordinary impact on our world. Not only has global Gross Domestic Product (GDP) per capita more than doubled since 1970 but, according to World Bank estimates, the percentage of the world's population now living in extreme poverty has fallen from nearly 40% to less than 10%. However, the gains from this growth have been uneven. Most of the world's extremely poor now live in countries considered "middle income."

Progress on social issues does not automatically accompany economic development. Rising income usually brings major improvements in access to clean water, sanitation, literacy, and basic education. But on average, personal security is no better in middle-income countries than low-income ones, and is often worse. Too many people – regardless of income – live without full rights and experience discrimination or even violence based on gender, religion, ethnicity, or sexual orientation.

Traditional measures of national income, such as GDP per capita, fail to capture the overall progress of societies. This limitation has been well documented in reports such as *Mismeasuring Our Lives*,[1] but solutions have been slow to emerge. The question of when and how economic development advances social progress (and when it does not) has become central due to concerns about inequality and environmental limits to growth, but the answers have been absent.

The Social Progress Index is the first comprehensive framework for measuring social progress independently of GDP, and gives us the ability to undertand the relationship between economic and social progress. Our vision is a world in which social progress sits alongside GDP as a core benchmark for national performance. The Social Progress Index provides a systematic, empirical foundation for this benchmark and a guide for inclusive growth strategies.

THE IMPERATIVE OF MEASUREMENT

The Social Progress Index rigorously measures country performance on a wide range of aspects of social and environmental performance, which are relevant for countries at all levels of economic development. It enables an assessment of not just absolute country performance, but also relative performance compared to a country's economic peers. Government and businesses now have the tools to track social and environmental performance rigorously, and make better public policy and investment choices. The Social Progress Index also allows us to assess a country's success in turning economic progress into improved social outcomes; it helps translate economic gains into better social and environmental performance in ways that are critical to enabling even greater economic success. The Social Progress Index provides a concrete framework for understanding and then prioritizing an action agenda, improving both social and economic performance.

Our data suggest that countries may face important development strategy choices. For example, a development path that may temper economic growth in the short term may be preferable if it accelerates social progress that supports greater economic growth in the longer term. The Index allows a deeper analysis of how individual aspects of social progress relate to particular aspects of economic development such as income inequality. Understanding these relationships, and the strategic choices that will most rapidly advance societies, is a major priority for Social Progress Imperative's ongoing research.

1. Stiglitz, Joseph E, Amartya Sen, and Jean-Paul Fitoussi. *Mismeasuring Our Lives: Why GDP Doesn't Add Up*. New York: New Press, 2010.

PUTTING SOCIAL PROGRESS INTO ACTION

The Social Progress Imperative publishes the annual Social Progress Index in order to build a common language and data platform that supports benchmarking, collaboration, and change. Throughout the world, the Social Progress Imperative has catalyzed the formation of local action networks that bring together government, businesses, and civil society organizations committed to using the Social Progress Index as a tool to assess strengths and weaknesses, spur constructive dialogue, catalyze change, and improve people's lives.

Increasingly, the overall Social Progress Index is being used as a starting point for more in-depth country analysis. Subnational indexes are increasingly being created in a wide range of contexts from the regions of the European Union to the neighborhoods of Rio de Janeiro. (See the Supplemental Section for the growth of social progress measurement efforts at the regional and country level).

SUPPORTING IMPLEMENTATION OF THE SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT GOALS

The Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) are an ambitious global commitment to improve the wellbeing of the world's citizens and ensure environmental sustainability by 2030. The SDGs are a commitment to the social progress agenda.

We are actively supporting efforts to deliver on the promise of the SDGs. The Social Progress Index is a proven tool to measure social progress performance, and drive action. It can enable a rapid assessment to measure many of the SDGs, playing a complementary role to the United Nations (UN) monitoring systems that are being put in place.

The Social Progress Index addresses three critical challenges facing SDG implementation:

1. **The Measurement Challenge:** According to the latest communication by the Expert Group on SDG Indicators, barely a third of the 200+ indicators can currently be measured in a rigorous manner for a majority of countries. The 2017 Social Progress Index, using 50 indicators drawn from official UN data as well as from globally respected research institutions and polling organizations, takes measurement further. Its flexibility on data sources allows the Social Progress Index to provide a comprehensive estimate of SDG performance even where the formal indicators do not yet exist.
2. **The Aggregation Challenge:** Unlike the SDGs, which are by definition a list of goals rather than an overarching model, the Social Progress Index has been designed and tested over time to provide a rigorous overall framework for broad assessment of country performance. The Social Progress Index conceptual model has been designed to allow aggregation, using econometric techniques to select and weight indicators. Since the Social Progress Index is strongly aligned with the concepts underlying the SDGs, it can serve as a powerful tool for carrying the measurement effort forward.
3. **The Localization Challenge:** Much of the effort on SDG implementation will take place at the sub-national level, and will require local data to track performance. The Social Progress Index is already being deployed extensively by state, city, and district governments in Latin America, Europe, Asia and soon the United States. The Social Progress Index will provide a practical tool for SDG localization.

FIGURE 1.1 / **Social Progress Index Complements the Sustainable Development Goals**

OUTLINE OF THIS REPORT

- Chapter 2 provides details on how the Social Progress Index and country scorecards are calculated.
- Chapter 3 presents the 2017 Social Progress Index results.
- Chapter 4 examines the global trends in social progress over the first four years of results since 2014.
- The Supplemental Section describes the work of the Imperative's Partner Network in driving implementation globally.
- Appendixes and Acknowledgements.

CHAPTER 2

HOW WE MEASURE SOCIAL PROGRESS

The Social Progress Index is a robust and holistic measurement framework for social and environmental performance that can be used by leaders in government, business, and civil society to benchmark success and accelerate progress. In this chapter, we discuss the principles underlying our measurement approach, and how we define social progress as well as operationalize it through a rigorous, multi-layered framework. We conclude with a summary of our calculation methodology and discussion of interpreting results on an absolute and relative basis.

PRINCIPLES OF THE SOCIAL PROGRESS INDEX

The Social Progress Index, first released in beta form in 2013 and officially in 2014, measures a comprehensive set of components of social and environmental performance and aggregates them into an overall framework. The Index was developed based on extensive discussions with experts and stakeholders around the world including policymakers, social advocates, and scholars. Our work was also influenced by prior contributions to the field by Amartya Sen and members of the Commission on the Measurement of Economic Performance and Social Progress.[1]

1. The Commission on the Measurement of Economic Performance and Social Progress was created in 2008 to identify the limits of GDP, consider additional information relevant to indicators of social progress, and assess alternative measurement tools. The Commission was chaired by Professor Joseph E. Stiglitz, Columbia University. Professor Amartya Sen, Harvard University, was Chair Adviser. Professor Jean-Paul Fitoussi, Institut d'Etudes Politiques de Paris, President of the Observatoire Français des Conjonctures Economiques (OFCE), was Coordinator of the Commission.

The Social Progress Index follows four key design principles:

1. **Exclusively social and environmental indicators:** Our aim is to measure social progress directly, rather than utilize economic proxies or outcomes. By excluding economic indicators, we can, for the first time, rigorously and systematically analyze the relationship between economic development (measured for example by GDP per capita) and social development. Prior efforts to move "beyond GDP" have comingled social and economic indicators, making it difficult to disentangle cause and effect.
2. **Outcomes not inputs:** Our purpose is to measure the outcomes that matter to the lives of real people, not the inputs. For example, we want to measure the health and wellness achieved by a country's people, not how much a country spends on healthcare or the effort expended.
3. **Holistic and relevant to all countries:** We strive to create a holistic measure of social progress that encompasses a comprehensive view of the health of societies. Most previous efforts have focused on the poorest countries, for understandable reasons. But even prosperous countries face social challenges, and knowing what constitutes a successful society, including at higher income levels, is indispensable for charting a course for every country.
4. **Actionable:** The Social Progress Index aims to be a practical tool that will help leaders and practitioners in government, business, and civil society to implement policies and programs that will drive faster social progress. To do so, we measure outcomes in a granular way that focuses on specific areas that can be acted on directly. The 2017 Social Progress Index is structured around 12 components and 50 distinct indicators of social progress. The framework not only provides an aggregate country score and ranking, but also allows benchmarking on specific areas of strength and weakness. Transparency of measurement, based on a comprehensive framework, allows change-makers to set strategic priorities, acting upon the most pressing issues in their societies.

THE SOCIAL PROGRESS FRAMEWORK

The design principles are the foundation for our conceptual framework and formulate our definition of social progress. The Social Progress Index uses the following working definition:

Social progress is the capacity of a society to meet the basic human needs of its citizens, establish the building blocks that allow citizens and communities to enhance and sustain the quality of their lives, and create the conditions for all individuals to reach their full potential.

This definition reflects an extensive and critical review and synthesis of both the academic literature and practitioner experience across a wide range of development topics. The Social Progress Index framework focuses on three distinct (though related) questions:

BASIC HUMAN NEEDS	Does a country provide for its people's most essential needs?
FOUNDATIONS OF WELLBEING	Are the building blocks in place for individuals and communities to enhance and sustain wellbeing?
OPPORTUNITY	Is there opportunity for all individuals to reach their full potential?

These three questions reflect the three broad dimensions of the Social Progress Index framework. Each dimension is broken down further to elucidate the key elements that make up social progress in that area, forming the 12 components of the model. The concepts underlying these components have remained unchanged since the first publication of the Social Progress Index in 2013.

Figure 2.1 / **Social Progress Index Component Descriptions**

BASIC HUMAN NEEDS	Nutrition and Basic Medical Care	Social progress begins early in life, with access to reliable medical care, as well as adequate nutrition. The two factors are not only prerequisites for survival, but prevent early-life damage that may lead to permanent impairment. The result of not having access to care or not having enough to eat range from suffering from undernourishment to dying as a child, in childbirth, or as an adult with a preventable or treatable infectious disease.
	Water and Sanitation	Recognized as basic human rights by the United Nations, clean water and sanitation are essential to survival and can drastically improve life expectancy. Essential for drinking, cooking, and keeping oneself clean, water must be free of pathogens to prevent the spread of disease. Likewise, sanitation not only prevents the spread of disease, it is an aspect of human dignity that can affect multiple facets of a person's life.
	Shelter	Adequate living conditions are essential to safety, health and human dignity. To be considered adequate, housing goes beyond merely four walls and a roof. It must be safe, provide protection from the elements, include basic facilities, and be accessible and affordable.
	Personal Safety	Safety is essential for the attainment of health, peace, justice, and well-being. It affects people's freedom to leave their homes, walk alone, and provide for themselves and their families without fear.
FOUNDATIONS OF WELLBEING	Access to Basic Knowledge	Education is fundamental to individual freedom and empowerment. With basic knowledge in reading, writing, and math, an individual can improve his or her social and economic circumstances, as well as more fully participate in society. Education is essential to creating a society that is more equitable.
	Access to Information and Communication	Freedom to access and exchange information is essential for an efficient, open, and accountable society. The ability of one individual to connect with others via phone or internet facilitates learning, an exchange of ideas, social fabric, and exposure to different views and cultures. Freedom of the press ensures that access to information is not suppressed by the government, and citizens can educate themselves about their community, their country and the world, promoting broader cooperation and understanding.
	Health and Wellness	The Health and Wellness component measures the extent to which a country's population achieves healthy, long lives. In contrast with Nutrition and Basic Medical Care, this component includes the capacity to minimize deaths from non-communicable diseases that typically affect individuals later in life and can be prevented or managed for many decades. Mental health, an aspect measured in the Social Progress Index using suicide rate as a proxy, is integral to the ability of people to live happy and fulfilled lives.
	Environmental Quality	A safe and protected natural environment is a precondition for living a healthy and satisfying life and an enabler for longer-term community resilience. It is tied to both health and survival: outdoor pollution can affect a person's capacity to breathe freely and function, while greenhouse gas emissions and loss of biodiversity and habitat threaten the world's collective climate, food chain, and containment of disease. Likewise, toxic waste in water and elsewhere impedes the realization of other human needs such as clean water, sanitation, and adequate shelter.

continued on page 4

Figure 2.1 / **Social Progress Index Component Descriptions** *(continued)*

OPPORTUNITY	Personal Rights	Personal rights enable an individual to participate freely in society without the intrusion of government, social organizations, or private power over personal freedom. These rights include political rights, rights of association and expression, as well as the right to own property. All contribute to dignity and worth and facilitate the participation of individuals in building a free and democratic society where the people's voices are valued in determining state and community affairs.
	Personal Freedom and Choice	Personal Freedom and Choice focuses on individual freedom over life decisions, rather than the rights of society at large. An individual should be able to choose what religion to follow, when and whom to marry, and when to start a family. This component also includes corruption, which restricts individual freedoms and distorts individuals' choices.
	Tolerance and Inclusion	A tolerant society is an inclusive society, where every individual can pursue his or her human right to a life of dignity and worth. Discrimination based on ethnicity, gender, country of birth, religion or sexual orientation prevents individuals from fully participating in society, creating a pretext for violence and conflict. In contrast, a supportive community can work together for the advancement of all individuals and a better society.
	Access to Advanced Education	Though not every individual will choose to pursue advanced education, the choice in itself is fundamental to advancing society and individual opportunity. World-class educational and research institutions provide benefits beyond simply educating individuals. They are conveners and contribute to solving global and local problems through innovation and by acting as a conduit for cutting edge knowledge. It is also important to measure equity within higher education – ensuring that access is available to women and people of all socioeconomic levels.

FROM FRAMEWORK TO MEASUREMENT

Each component of the Social Progress Index comprises of a set of outcome indicators that are measured appropriately with a consistent methodology by the same organization across all (or essentially all) of the countries in our sample. These indicators are reevaluated annually in order to improve to quality of the scores calculated, and we seek to actively improve the quality of the data available.

The Social Progress Index score and its corresponding rank define a country's overall level of social progress and how it compares to all countries in the world. The overall Social Progress Index score is a simple average of the three dimensions: Basic Human Needs, Foundations of Wellbeing, and Opportunity. Each dimension, in turn, is the simple average of its four components.[2] Each component of the framework comprises between three and five specific outcome indicators. Figure 2.2 lists each indicator, by component. Definitions and sources for all indicators are presented in Appendix A.

2. We discuss the reasons to weight each component equally, and the alternatives considered, in the 2017 Methodology Report.

Figure 2.2 / Social Progress Index indicator-level framework

Basic Human Needs

Nutrition and Basic Medical Care

- Undernourishment
- Depth of food deficit
- Maternal mortality rate
- Child mortality rate
- Deaths from infectious diseases

Water and Sanitation

- Access to piped water
- Rural access to improved water source
- Access to improved sanitation facilities

Shelter

- Availability of affordable housing
- Access to electricity
- Quality of electricity supply
- Household air pollution attributable deaths

Personal Safety

- Homicide rate
- Level of violent crime
- Perceived criminality
- Political terror
- Traffic deaths

Foundations of Wellbeing

Access to Basic Knowledge

- Adult literacy rate
- Primary school enrollment
- Secondary school enrollment
- Gender parity in secondary enrollment

Access to Information and Communications

- Mobile telephone subscriptions
- Internet users
- Press Freedom Index

Health and Wellness

- Life expectancy at 60
- Premature deaths from non-communicable diseases
- Suicide rate

Environmental Quality

- Outdoor air pollution attributable deaths
- Wastewater treatment
- Biodiversity and habitat
- Greenhouse gas emissions

Opportunity

Personal Rights

- Political rights
- Freedom of expression
- Freedom of assembly
- Private property rights

Personal Freedom and Choice

- Freedom over life choices
- Freedom of religion
- Early marriage
- Satisfied demand for contraception
- Corruption

Tolerance and Inclusion

- Tolerance for immigrants
- Tolerance for homosexuals
- Discrimination and violence against minorities
- Religious tolerance
- Community safety net

Access to Advanced Education

- Years of tertiary schooling
- Women's average years in school
- Inequality in the attainment of education
- Globally ranked universities
- Percentage of tertiary students enrolled in globally ranked universities

CHANGES FROM 2016

The overall structure of the 2017 Social Progress Index remains unchanged from 2016. To improve the measurement of some component-level concepts, and accommodate changes in data availability, we modified some individual indicators as well as the overall composition of the Nutrition and Basic Medical Care, Access to Basic Knowledge, Health and Wellness, and Personal Rights components. For comparison purposes, restated 2014-2016 Social Progress Indexes incorporating these methodological enhancements and retroactive data changes are available at www.socialprogressimperative.org.

Changes to indicators and components

1. **Nutrition and Basic Medical Care:** Deaths from infectious diseases now uses data from the Institute for Health Metrics and Evaluation rather than the World Health Organization because data are more recent and updated more frequently.
2. **Access to Basic Knowledge:** Primary school enrollment now uses total net enrollment rather than net enrollment. The new measure captures enrollment of all primary school-aged children regardless of the level of school in which they are enrolled (such as pre-primary). One measure of overall secondary school enrollment replaces the two previous measures, lower secondary school enrollment and upper secondary school enrollment. The new indicator provides a better comparison of enrollment at the secondary level across different educational systems.
3. **Health and Wellness:** Premature deaths from non-communicable diseases now uses data from the Institute for Health Metrics and Evaluation rather than the World Health Organization, because the new source is more recent and updated more frequently. The outcome measure is deaths per 100,000 population, rather than probability of dying. We removed the obesity rate indicator because it has conceptual problems and does not correlate with the other measures in the component.
4. **Personal Rights:** Previous data provided by the Cingranelli-Richards Human Rights Data Project were discontinued, so that the indicators using this source (freedom of speech, freedom of assembly/association, and freedom of movement) were removed from the component. In their place, we added freedom of expression drawing on data from Freedom House, and freedom of assembly from the World Justice Project's Rule of Law Index.

Changes to the country sample

Due to data gaps, we removed three countries from the overall 2017 Social Progress Index ranking: Bosnia and Herzegovina (Access to Basic Knowledge gaps), Djibouti (Shelter gaps), and Iraq (Personal Rights gaps). We also removed Syria and Venezuela due to rapidly deteriorating conditions that are not reflected in less recent data. In 2017, then, 128 countries are ranked with full Social Progress Index data. In addition to these countries, we provide at least nine out of 12 component scores for an additional 33 countries. In addition, for the first time in 2017 we also provide component scores for an additional 49 countries and territories that have sufficient data for at least one component, bringing total country coverage to 210 countries and territories. With the expanded data points, the 2017 Social Progress Index represents 98% of the world's population.

Retroactive data changes

Fifteen of the 50 indicators included in the Index have been retroactively revised by the source institution since publication of the 2016 Social Progress Index.[3] While these revised changes are typically minor, they can affect countries' relative performance at

3. These 15 indicators are: household air pollution attributable deaths, homicide rate, level of violent crime, perceived criminality, political terror, adult literacy rate, gender parity in secondary enrollment, mobile telephone subscriptions, internet users, life expectancy at 60, suicide rate, outdoor air pollution attributable deaths, political rights, satisfied demand for contraception, and the percentage of tertiary students enrolled in globally ranked universities.

the indicator, component, and dimension levels. This means that we cannot compare one Index year to the year prior without recalculation. Retroactive data changes are common and pose a challenge to any index that wishes to measure change over time.

Each year, in addition to presenting the most up-to-date results, we recalculate the prior year's Social Progress Index to reflect any changes in country performance due solely to retroactive changes in data by source organizations. This year, we have retroactively revised Social Progress Index scores going back to 2014. Such an approach assures that comparing one year's Index to the next reflects actual changes to social progress, versus source data methodology.

CALCULATING SOCIAL PROGRESS INDEX SCORES

To build up the Social Progress Index, we use principal component analysis to help select the most relevant indicators and to determine the weights of the indicators making up each component. Principal component analysis corrects for overlapping measurement between two or more indicators. It also highlights indicators that may not fit well with others within a component. We have found that principal component analysis weights for many indicators within components are very near to equal, which signals a successful selection of indicators to measure the concept of the component. Appendix D of the 2017 Methodology Report shows the 2017 weights within each component.

The actual Social Progress Index scores at the overall, dimension, and component levels are all based on a 0–100 scale. For most indicators, this scale is determined by identifying the best and worst absolute global performance on each indicator recorded by any country since 2004, and using these actual performance levels to set the maximum (100) and minimum (0) bounds. For a few indicators, we use theoretical boundaries (e.g., zero maternal mortality deaths would be the equivalent of a score of 100 on the indicator). Thus, Social Progress Index scores reflect absolute performance from good to bad. It allows us to track absolute, not just relative, performance of countries over time on each component of the model.

ASSESSING RELATIVE SOCIAL PROGRESS INDEX PERFORMANCE

Social Progress Index results, because we exclude economic components, allow us to compare them relative to a country's level of economic development for the first time. In many cases, it is more illuminating and relevant to compare a country's performance to countries at a similar level of GDP per capita than to all countries in the world. For example, a lower-income country may have a low score on a certain component, but may greatly exceed typical scores for countries with similar per capita incomes. Conversely, a high-income country may have a high absolute score on a component, but still fall short of what is typical for comparably wealthy countries. For this reason, we compare a country's performance to that of its economic peers and present a country's strengths and weaknesses on a relative rather than absolute basis. This information is presented in the country scorecards.

To determine a country's relative social progress performance and identify its strengths and weaknesses, the first step is to identify a relevant peer group. Standard groupings of countries, such as the income classifications done by the World Bank, are not appropriate for such relative comparison of countries for two reasons. First, the groupings are too large, encompassing excessively wide ranges of social performance and therefore few relative strengths and weaknesses. Second, using standard groups leads to a situation where countries at the top or bottom of a group may appear to have a large number of strengths or weaknesses, but this is misleading because the country is being compared to a group including countries at a much lower or higher level of economic development.

We define a country's economic peers as the 15 countries closest in GDP per capita, above or below.[4] Benchmarking is country-specific, so each country is compared to a unique set of peers. We then calculate median social progress scores for the peer group (overall, and by dimension, component, and indicator). A country's performance is then compared to its peer group's median social progress scores to identify its relative strengths and weaknesses. A strength is performance significantly greater than the median score, while a weakness is performance significantly lower than the median score.[5] Neutral performance is neither strong nor weak, but within the same range as economic peers. Significance is determined by a score that is greater than or less than the average absolute deviation from the median of the comparator group.

4. To reduce the effects of yearly GDP fluctuations and maintain stability in country groupings, we use average GDP PPP per capita between 2013 and 2016 to determine country peer groups. After significant testing, we found that groupings larger than 15 resulted in a wider range of typical scores and therefore too few relative strengths and weaknesses. Smaller groupings become too sensitive to outliers. A full description of how strengths and weaknesses relative to GDP per capita are calculated is in the Methodology Report.

5. See the 2017 Methodology Report for a more detailed description of the calculations.

CHAPTER 3

2017 SOCIAL PROGRESS INDEX RESULTS

HIGHLIGHTS

- The world's top performer on the Social Progress Index is Denmark. All five Nordic countries are in the Very High Social Progress Tier, but the top performers on social progress also include non-Nordic countries that have much larger and more diverse populations such as Canada, Netherlands, Australia, the United Kingdom, and Germany. Canada is the best performing G7 country.
- Four G7 countries with significant wealth (the United States, Japan, France, Italy) achieve only the second tier of High Social Progress; two middle-income countries achieve the same level of social progress (Argentina and Costa Rica).
- Among the five BRICS countries with emerging economies, Brazil performs the best, but India is showing marked improvement. India has moved into the Lower Middle Social Progress tier, ahead of Bangladesh and Pakistan, and nearing China.
- Many Lower Middle Social Progress Tier countries are performing strongly compared to countries with similar income, including Nepal and Senegal, which have made great strides in governance and health.
- All countries show areas in need of improvement. Some countries may perform well on an absolute basis, but show relative weaknesses when compared to countries at a similar level of GDP per capita.

Figure 3.1 / **Map of 2017 Social Progress Index results**



The 2017 Social Progress Index (see Figure 2.2) ranks 128 countries that have sufficient data for all 12 components. We group countries from highest to lowest social progress into six tiers from 'Very High Social Progress,' to 'Very Low Social Progress.' Tiers are based on *k*-means cluster analysis to determine break points across groups of countries based on their Social Progress Index scores.[1] In this chapter, we first present results across all countries and discuss the relationship of the Social Progress Index with GDP per capita. We then present more detailed results for each tier of Social Progress Index performance, and conclude with reflections on unranked countries.

1. To determine tiers, we ran a number of iterations of clusters and decided upon the common breaks, with six different tiers being the best fit for the Index. We note that although these tiers show similarities among countries in terms of aggregate performance, there is significant variation in each country's performance across components.

SOCIAL PROGRESS INDEX VS. GDP PER CAPITA

The Social Progress Index findings reveal that countries achieve widely divergent levels of social progress, even at similar levels of GDP per capita. For example, a country with high GDP per capita may do well on absolute social progress, reflecting the resources that come with high income, yet underperform relative to countries of similar income. Conversely, a country with low GDP per capita may achieve only modest levels of social progress, yet substantially outperform countries at similar economic levels. For example:

- The Netherlands achieves a significantly higher level of social progress (89.82) than Saudi Arabia (69.45) with a GDP per capita ($46,354 vs. $50,284).
- Chile achieves a much higher level of social progress (82.54) than Kazakhstan (66.01) with a slightly lower GDP per capita ($22,197 vs. $23,522).
- The Philippines achieves a far higher level of social progress (67.10) than Angola (40.73) with the same GDP per capita ($6,938).

There are good reasons to expect the correlation between economic development and social progress is partly or heavily due to the fact that economic growth provides more resources to invest in social issues, through private consumption, private investment, and public spending and investment. However, we noted a clear causal relationship in the other direction: better social outcomes in terms of health, education, personal safety, opportunity, and others are essential to productivity and better economic performance. The relationship between economic development and social progress is therefore complex, and causation may go in both directions.

Figure 3.2 shows the overall relationship between GDP per capita and composite social progress. The data reveal several key findings:

- First, there is a positive and strong relationship between the 2017 Social Progress Index and GDP per capita. On average, countries with higher income tend to have higher social progress: for example, Denmark ($44,042 GDP per capita) ranks highest on social progress while the Central African Republic ($581 GDP per capita) ranks lowest. At the aggregate level of the Social Progress Index and without controlling for additional factors, a 1% increase in GDP per capita is associated with a 0.11-point increase in Social Progress Index score. However, there are countries such as Kuwait and Saudi Arabia that have high GDP per capita, but relatively low social progress, and vice versa.
- Second, the relationship between economic development and social progress is not linear. At lower income levels, small differences in GDP per capita are associated with large improvements in social progress. As countries reach high levels of income, however, the rate of change slows. Our findings suggest that the easy gains in social progress arising from economic development become exhausted as countries approach lower middle income, and economic growth brings on new headwinds in terms of social and environmental challenges.

Figure 3.2 / **Social Progress Index vs. GDP per capita**

SOCIAL PROGRESS INDEX TIERS

Very High Social Progress

The top performers on social progress reveal multiple paths to world-class social progress. The Very High Social Progress Tier comprises 14 countries that register generally strong performance across all 12 components, with tightly clustered overall Social Progress Index scores between 87.98 and 90.57. The Nordics frequently top the list on most indices that measure wellbeing, confirming that their model of development delivers social progress. Not surprisingly, all five Nordic countries are in the Very High Social Progress Tier, but the top performers on social progress also include non-Nordic countries that have much larger and more diverse populations, such as Canada, Netherlands, Australia, the United Kingdom, and Germany. Their success highlights the different ways countries can achieve higher social progress.

Figure 3.3 / **Very High Social Progress**

Very High Social Progress		
Rank	Country	Score
1	**Denmark**	90.57
2	**Finland**	90.53
3	**Iceland**	90.27
3	**Norway**	90.27
5	**Switzerland**	90.10
6	**Canada**	89.84
7	**Netherlands**	89.82
8	**Sweden**	89.66
9	**Australia**	89.30
9	**New Zealand**	89.30
11	**Ireland**	88.91
12	**United Kingdom**	88.73
13	**Germany**	88.50
14	**Austria**	87.98

Denmark takes the top spot on the 2017 global ranking with strong performance across all the components of the Index. It leads the world in Shelter (94.27) and Personal Rights (97.89). It ranks second on Access to Information and Communications (98.49) and Personal Rights (97.89), and ranks third on Personal Safety (93.75). These results are not surprising: Denmark has long been admired for its successful social welfare policies and quality of life. It is known for its celebration of *hygge* or the "quality of coziness and comfortable conviviality that engenders a feeling of contentment or well-being." Denmark was also named world's happiest country in 2016.

Finland ranks second overall (90.53). Like Denmark, Finland is known for its social welfare policies. Finland has strong performance generally, ranking in the top five countries in six out of the Index's 12 components. It is first in Nutrition and Basic Medical Care and Personal Freedom and Choice; third in Shelter, Personal Rights, and Tolerance and Inclusion; and fourth in Access to Information and Communications. Iceland and Norway tie for third (90.27). Both countries rank in the top 10 on half the components in the Index. Iceland ranks first on Tolerance and Inclusion and Norway takes the top spot on Access to Information and Communications.

Canada (score of 89.84, ranked 6th in the world), Australia and New Zealand (tied for 9th with a score of 89.30), Ireland (88.91, 11th), and the United Kingdom (UK) (88.73, 12th) achieve the top tier largely due to very strong performance in components of the challenging Opportunity dimension on the Index. Canada is the top-performing G7 country. Canada, Australia, Ireland, and the UK outperform countries at a similar level of GDP per capita on Access to Advanced Education. These countries provide relatively high access to world-class universities. Compared to its income peers, New Zealand outperforms on the overall Social Progress Index, led by its strong performance on Personal Rights, Personal Freedom and Choice, and Tolerance and Inclusion. This is a significant achievement given that

it is harder for countries with higher GDP per capita to over-perform (See Box 3.1, Overperforming on the Social Progress Index: A High Bar).

Switzerland (90.10, 5th) and the Netherlands (89.82, 7th) have strong performance across all components of the 2017 Social Progress Index. Notably, they are the only countries in the Very High Social Progress tier to have no component-level weaknesses relative to countries at the same level of GDP per capita. Sweden (89.66, 8th) ranks first in Personal Safety and second in Environmental Quality.

Germany and Austria round out the top tier, with generally very high levels of social progress that are on par with other countries of similar GDP per capita. Germany performs especially well on Environmental Quality; Austria shows strong performance on Personal Safety and Personal Rights. Both exhibit few strengths or weaknesses relative to their economic peers. Germany performs within expected range on all components except Health and Wellness, where it slightly underperforms because of relatively lower life expectancy (at 60). Similarly, Austria underperforms on only one component, Access to Advanced Education, because of fewer average years of tertiary schooling and lower women's mean years in school. Austria is also not home to as many globally ranked universities as its economic peers.

Overall, the findings from the Very High Social Progress Tier countries reveal that there are strong examples in the world of advanced social progress that represent more than one model of development from which we can draw best practices. However, even the strongest countries have unfinished agendas and areas for improvement. For example, on Health and Wellness top-ranked Denmark and Finland perform below the level that is typical for countries at their level of income. Throughout the world, countries struggle with Tolerance and Inclusion and the most socially progressive countries are no exception. Scores range from 69.49 for the UK to 93.04 for Iceland with an average for the group of only 79.63.

BOX 3.1 / OVERPERFORMING ON THE SOCIAL PROGRESS INDEX: A HIGH BAR

Overperformance on the Social Progress Index (or any of its components relative to income) is remarkable for any country, but is particularly so for higher-income countries, such as New Zealand. Underperformance, on the other hand, is mathematically possible at all income levels. In fact, it is sometimes rather dramatic for high-income countries with high-performing peers. There are many more under-performing countries than over-performing ones. Only 17 countries overperform on relative social progress relative to peers, whereas 29 underperform.

This reflects two factors that make it harder for higher-income countries to show relative strength. First, some aspects of social progress — such as basic medical care and education — show major improvements at relatively low levels of income but reach near maximum 100 scores for many high-income countries. At that point, a strong relative performance becomes nearly impossible because even a score of 100 lies within the "expected" or neutral performance band.[†] The ceiling of 100 means that it is mathematically impossible for some countries to overperform on such components of the model, making it more difficult to overperform on the overall Social Progress Index.

Second, some high-income countries score worse than middle-income countries (e.g. Kuwait, the country on the 2017 Social Progress Index with the highest GDP per capita, scores lower than Costa Rica, the 55th richest). This leads us to apply a rule that a country of higher income cannot be held to a lower standard of performance than a country of lower income. This rule is applied to eliminate any anomalies that occur when poor performing high-income countries pull down the median score for their peer groups. For example, Kuwait scores only 40.33 on Personal Rights, far below the level that is typical for countries at a similar level of income. When a country with a similar GDP per capita, such as Norway, is evaluated based on the median of its income peer group and that peer group includes Kuwait, the median score for the peer group may be below that of peer groups comprising lower-income countries without poor-performing outliers such as Kuwait. Without setting a floor, high-income Norway might appear to over-perform even though a lower-income country with the same score is not considered an overperformer.

[†]Calculated as + 1 average absolute deviation from the median of the scores for the 15 countries closest in GDP per capita.

Figure 3.4 / **Over- and underperformers by income group**



High Social Progress

A group of 24 countries, ranging from Belgium (score of 87.15) to Argentina (score of 75.90), represents the next tier of social progress. This tier comprises four members of the G7 (Japan, the United States, France, and Italy), four Latin American countries (Chile, Costa Rica, Uruguay, and Argentina), Israel, South Korea, and 14 other countries across Europe. This tier of countries on average performs as well as the top tier of countries on Nutrition and Basic Medical Care, Water and Sanitation, and Access to Basic Knowledge, but lags significantly behind Very High Social Progress Tier countries on Personal Freedom and Choice and Tolerance and Inclusion. As would be expected, this tier of countries includes mainly high-income countries with Costa Rica (81.03) and Argentina (75.90) as the only upper middle-income countries in the group.

The four G7 countries perform well on Shelter and Access to Advanced Education. They uniformly perform worse on Tolerance and Inclusion than other components, with all but Italy achieving scores well below their economic peers. On some components, though, they greatly diverge on performance.

Figure 3.5 / **High Social Progress**

High Social Progress

Rank	Country	Score
15	**Belgium**	87.15
16	**Spain**	86.96
17	**Japan**	86.44
18	**United States**	86.43
19	**France**	85.92
20	**Portugal**	85.44
21	**Slovenia**	84.32
22	**Czech Republic**	84.22
23	**Estonia**	82.96
24	**Italy**	82.62
25	**Chile**	82.54
26	**Korea, Republic of**	82.08
27	**Cyprus**	81.15
28	**Costa Rica**	81.03
29	**Israel**	80.61
30	**Slovakia**	80.22
31	**Uruguay**	80.09
32	**Poland**	79.65
33	**Greece**	78.92
34	**Latvia**	78.61
35	**Lithuania**	78.09
36	**Croatia**	78.04
37	**Hungary**	77.32
38	**Argentina**	75.90

1. **Personal Safety:** Japan is a leading performer on Personal Safety, ranked 11th with a score of 91.66 However, Italy ranks only 56th (72.10) because of high perceived criminality and level of violent crime, while the United States (US) (86.76, ranked 21st) and France (82.74, 30th) fall in between. In the US, there are more homicides and traffic deaths, while in France, a higher level of violent crime and perceived criminality contribute to lower performance.
2. **Health and Wellness:** Italy (84.81) ranks second in the world on Health and Wellness with long life expectancy and a low level of premature deaths from non-communicable diseases and suicides. Japan (79.89, 20th) and France (79.06, 22nd) have the highest and second highest life expectancy (at 60), but Japan ranks 114th on suicide rate and France ranks 106th. The US performs far below countries at the same level of GDP per capita, registering relative weaknesses on all indicators in the component.
3. **Personal Freedom and Choice:** France (81.50, 16th), the United States (79.88, 19th), and Japan (78.60, 21st) perform similarly on this component, with relatively high performance overall. Italy, however, ranks only 48th (66.14) because of low freedom over life choices, lower satisfied demand for contraception, and higher corruption.

Sixteen of the EU28 have achieved high social progress, the most within any tier (eight achieve Very High Social Progress, and two achieve Upper Middle Social Progress Tier; Malta and Luxembourg do not have a Social Progress Index score because their data are incomplete). Average performance among the 26 EU countries for which data are available is 83.62, and among the 16 EU countries in this tier it is 81.97. While performance among the 16 EU28 countries in the Very High Social Progress tier is fairly uniform, there is a regional divide in performance among them.

The Eastern and Central European countries that have achieved this tier (Slovenia, Czech Republic, Estonia, Slovakia, Poland, Latvia, Lithuania, Croatia, and Hungary) on average perform lower on Opportunity than Western and South Europe, especially in Tolerance and Inclusion. They perform well on Nutrition and Basic Medical Care, all scoring above 98.00, but are not yet able to meet the level of Health and Wellness achieved by the other countries in this tier, based on a high number of deaths from non-communicable diseases and suicides. Slovenia is the best performing among the group, especially on Opportunity where other countries in this region lag. Slovenians report higher freedom over life choices and a stronger community safety net than their neighboring countries.

Among the three southern European countries in this tier, Spain (86.96, 16th) and Portugal (85.44, 20th) perform better than Greece (78.92, 33rd), mainly due to Greece's shortfalls in Opportunity. Greece lags behind most countries in the High Social Progress Tier on both Personal Freedom and Choice, and Tolerance and Inclusion. Its score on freedom over life choices is one of the lowest across countries, ranking between Ukraine and Yemen, and it has low satisfied demand for contraception, low tolerance for immigrants, and low religious tolerance. Conversely, both Spain and Portugal are strong performers on Tolerance and Inclusion, both overperforming on the component in relation to countries of similar GDP per capita. Portugal also registers a relative strength in Personal Freedom and Choice compared to its peers.

Three of the four Latin American countries in this tier are among the top performing countries in the world relative to their income. Chile (82.54, 25th), Costa Rica (81.03, 28th), and Uruguay (80.09, 31st) strongly outperform their peer countries in Personal Rights, Personal Freedom and Choice, and Tolerance and Inclusion. The region's consistent efforts to build democratic institutions over the last three decades, as well as strong civic movements championing social and environmental causes, has enabled these Latin American countries to perform particularly well relative to their global economic peers. The fourth Latin American country, Argentina, outperforms its peer countries in the areas of Tolerance and Inclusion and Access to Information and Communications. It underperforms in Shelter and Personal Safety.

The differences in performance within the High Social Progress Tier illustrate a key overall finding of the 2017 Social Progress Index: every country has strengths, but also areas for improvement. Contrasts in strengths and weaknesses reflect both cultural differences and policy and investment choices. European countries, Japan, and the high-performing Latin American countries in this tier tend to have broad social safety nets that help explain success on some social progress outcomes. However, such countries register lower absolute scores outside of Basic Human Needs and Foundations of Wellbeing in the areas of Opportunity. In contrast, the US tends to make policy choices and social commitments with a philosophy of greater individualism, performing better on the Opportunity dimension than on Foundations of Wellbeing. Even at relatively high levels of economic development, there is considerable variation among countries across components of social progress.

Upper Middle Social Progress Countries

A third tier of 31 upper middle social progress countries is composed of mostly Balkan, former Soviet Union, and Latin American countries, but also includes three Middle Eastern countries (Kuwait, Jordan, and Saudi Arabia); two upper middle-income sub-Saharan African countries (Mauritius and South Africa); three middle-income countries in Asia (Malaysia, Thailand, and the Philippines); along with Tunisia and Turkey, whose high performance is unique among their conflict-ridden neighbors. The group includes countries at sharply different levels of economic development, ranging from Bolivia (GDP per capita of $6,531) to Kuwait (GDP per capita of $70,107). Scores range from Mauritius (75.18) to Bolivia (66.93), reflecting a broader finding that economic development alone is far from the only driver (or enabler) of social progress. Three of the countries in this tier (Brazil, Russia, and South Africa) are part of the BRICS group of emerging economies.

Figure 3.6 / **Upper Middle Social Progress**

Upper Middle Social Progress

Rank	Country	Score
39	Mauritius	75.18
40	Panama	74.61
41	Bulgaria	74.42
42	Kuwait	74.12
43	Brazil	73.97
44	Romania	73.53
45	Serbia	73.41
46	Jamaica	72.42
47	Peru	72.15
48	Mexico	71.93
49	Colombia	71.72
50	Malaysia	71.14
51	Tunisia	71.09
52	Albania	70.97
53	Georgia	70.80
54	Montenegro	70.01
55	Ecuador	69.97
56	Jordan	69.85
57	Saudi Arabia	69.45
58	Macedonia	69.35
59	Armenia	69.01
60	Paraguay	68.73
61	Turkey	68.68
62	Thailand	68.51
63	Dominican Republic	68.42
64	Ukraine	68.35
65	Belarus	67.80
66	South Africa	67.25
67	Russia	67.17
68	Philippines	67.10
69	Bolivia	66.93

This diverse group of countries achieves good performance overall, ranking in the top half of countries globally but with more areas for improvement. Whereas higher tier countries have generally eliminated extreme hunger and have near universal access to water and basic education, many upper middle social progress countries still face challenges in these areas. In Thailand, for example, only slightly more than half the population has piped water. In Bolivia, the Philippines, and the Dominican Republic, more than 10% of the population is undernourished. For South Africa, Brazil, Jamaica, Mexico, and Colombia, Personal Safety is problematic.

Several countries in this tier are tightly clustered in performance, with scores close to 70.00 (starting with Jordan) and up to 72.15 (Peru). Despite uniform performance on overall social progress, each presents its own success and challenges among the components. Among them are Mexico (71.93, 48th), which despite high performance in Nutrition and Basic Medical Care, Water and Sanitation, and Shelter, still has much to improve in Personal Safety due to a relatively high homicide rate and very high level of violent crime. Malaysia (71.14, 50th), in addition to performing relatively well on Basic Human Needs, has developed a high level of Access to Basic

Knowledge, and registers fairly strong performance on other components in the Foundations of Wellbeing dimension, but in Opportunity struggles with Personal Rights, and Tolerance and Inclusion. There, freedom of religion is strongly restricted, and tolerance for immigrants and tolerance for homosexuals are very low.

Compared to higher tiers of social progress, a main finding in this group of countries is sharply lower scores on the components of the Opportunity dimension — especially Personal Rights — versus other areas. Every country in the upper middle social progress group, regardless of region, scores significantly lower on the Opportunity dimension than Basic Human Needs and Foundations of Wellbeing. Compared to countries of similar income, Saudi Arabia and Russia are among the most underperforming countries in the world on Personal Rights, Personal Freedom and Choice, and Tolerance and Inclusion. Turkey also drastically underperforms on Personal Rights, while registering smaller weaknesses in Personal Freedom and Choice and Tolerance and Inclusion. More than a quarter of the countries in this tier score below 40.00 on Access to Advanced Education, and ten countries in this group have no globally ranked universities. This indicates that in order to advance to high social progress status and potentially to higher income, countries need to promote and invest in the policies and institutions that strengthen Opportunity.

Lower Middle Social Progress Countries

The fourth tier, Lower Middle Social Progress, comprising 25 countries, ranges from El Salvador at 70th (with a score of 66.43) to Senegal at 94th (with a score of 58.31). This group also includes China and India. A meaningful level of social progress is realized, particularly compared to the Low and Very Low Social Progress Tiers. No country in this group scores below

Figure 3.7 / **Lower Middle Social Progress**

Lower Middle Social Progress

Rank	Country	Score
70	El Salvador	66.43
71	Lebanon	66.31
71	Moldova	66.31
73	Sri Lanka	66.16
74	Kazakhstan	66.01
75	Algeria	65.41
76	Azerbaijan	65.33
76	Kyrgyzstan	65.33
78	Morocco	65.25
79	Indonesia	65.10
80	Botswana	64.44
81	Nicaragua	64.17
82	Egypt	63.76
83	China	63.72
84	Guatemala	62.62
85	Uzbekistan	62.02
86	Mongolia	62.00
87	Namibia	61.98
88	Iran	61.93
89	Honduras	61.76
90	Ghana	61.44
91	Nepal	60.08
92	Tajikistan	58.87
93	India	58.39
94	Senegal	58.31

60.46 in Basic Human Needs or 61.15 in Foundations of Wellbeing. The average score on areas such as Nutrition and Basic Medical Care is 89.95 and on Access to Basic Knowledge is 89.33. However, no country within this tier scores above 57.65 on the Opportunity dimension on the Index.

The countries in this tier are closely bunched in terms of their overall Social Progress Index scores, but they have widely differing strengths and weaknesses that lead to diverse social progress agendas. Latin American countries stand out for very low scores on Personal Safety, due to high homicide rates, perceived criminality, and violent crimes, but comparatively strong performance on Health and Wellness, Environmental Quality, and Tolerance and Inclusion. Eastern European countries, on the other hand, score poorly on Environmental Quality, Personal Freedom and Choice, and Tolerance and Inclusion but have high scores on Access to Information and Communications, and Access to Advanced Education. Their strong performance on Access to Advanced Education may stem from residual effects of the universal education system and tertiary specialization under the former Soviet system, while higher Access to Information and Communications may signify these countries' transition into more open participation in the global economy.

The largest divergence in scores in this tier is in the area of Personal Rights. Two Sub-Saharan African countries in this group, Ghana and Senegal, score fairly well with scores of 80.10 and 74.75 respectively. Five countries in this tier register the lowest five scores of all countries on Personal Rights (Uzbekistan, China, Tajikistan, Azerbaijan, and Iran). These countries have restrictive political systems or remnants of prior systems that deviated from the democratic systems found in leading European nations and the Americas. In Egypt, where democratic systems have remained unstable, country performance on Personal Rights is extremely low as well, achieving a score of only 28.14. China (63.72, 83rd), in addition to its low performance on Personal Rights, struggles to maintain consistent performance across components of social progress. It performs highest on Nutrition and Basic Medical Care and Access to Basic Knowledge, achieving scores of over 90.00 on each. However, Personal Safety is low due to high levels of political terror and perceived criminality, and Access to Information and Communications is impeded by a relatively low percentage of internet users. Its performance on Tolerance and Inclusion is not only low on an absolute basis (due to low tolerance for immigrants, high discrimination against minorities, and low community safety net), but is also lower than its expected performance based on countries of similar GDP per capita.

Conversely, India, though still facing many challenges, is nearing China on social progress, and has surpassed Bangladesh and Pakistan. It has only recently entered this tier of social progress,[2] with strong performance on Personal Rights relative to countries of similar GDP per capita. However, there is still much room for improvement: within Personal Rights, freedom of assembly is restricted, and India's performance on Tolerance and Inclusion is among the lowest in the world. To achieve the level of performance of its economic peers, India must improve Tolerance and Inclusion as well as focus on improving Access to Information and Communications, and Environmental Quality.

Seven out of the 25 countries in the Lower Middle Social Progress Tier perform best relative to others. Nepal in South Asia and Senegal in West Africa have low absolute performance (91st and 94th respectively) but perform strongly versus similar low-income peers. Since the establishment of a multiparty democracy in the 1990s, Nepal has made great strides in health and education. Investments, especially in the health sector, accompanied by holistic reforms and decentralization that helped mobilize community health volunteers to remote areas, significantly improved health

2. Based on back-calculations of the Social Progress Index for 2014, 2015, and 2016 using the 2017 Social Progress Index framework.

infrastructure. For example, it facilitated improvements in antenatal care with incentives for pregnant mothers and institutional delivery.[3] Access to piped water and sanitation also increased. Life expectancy has risen 12.1 years since 1990, one of the largest gains worldwide. Senegal stands out among its income peers for its stability and good governance. Relative to similar countries, political rights and freedom of expression are high. Stability has facilitated investment in the agriculture sector and food security programs so that undernourishment, while still high at 10%, is significantly below the average of 22% for its income peers. Through the use of public-private partnerships, over half the population of Senegal has access to piped water compared to only 17% on average for countries at a similar level of income.

Three of the overperformers in this tier (Kyrgyzstan, Moldova, and Tajikistan) are former republics of the Soviet Union. Their strong relative social progress performance results from two factors. The first is legacy strengths on some key aspects of social progress that remain and offer promise for the future. Former Soviet Republics also benefit from a legacy of prior investments in basic and advanced education and basic health services. The second is weak economic performance resulting from economic challenges. These former Soviet Republics are all countries that have struggled economically since the break-up of the Soviet Union, due to the challenges of radically transforming their economic systems. For example, Moldova is the poorest country in Europe ($4,742 GDP per capita). But compared to economic peers such as Yemen, Mauritania, and Nigeria, Moldova registers a favorable social progress score. While it is achieving on social progress, Moldova is under-performing on GDP per capita.

Low Social Progress

The fifth tier of 27 countries, Low Social Progress, ranges from Kenya (56.17, 95th) to Ethiopia (45.29, 121st). It includes 22 Sub-Saharan African countries and five

Figure 3.8 / **Low Social Progress**

Low Social Progress

Rank	Country	Score
95	Kenya	56.17
96	Myanmar	55.69
97	Bangladesh	54.84
98	Cambodia	54.54
99	Laos	54.17
100	Malawi	53.09
101	Rwanda	52.78
102	Swaziland	52.64
103	Lesotho	51.74
104	Benin	51.69
105	Pakistan	51.54
106	Côte d'Ivoire	50.65
107	Tanzania	50.21
108	Zimbabwe	50.10
109	Nigeria	50.01
110	Burkina Faso	49.75
111	Uganda	49.59
112	Liberia	49.34
113	Mauritania	48.44
114	Congo, Republic of	48.24
115	Togo	48.21
116	Mozambique	47.90
117	Cameroon	47.83
118	Mali	47.75
119	Madagascar	47.40
120	Sierra Leone	47.10
121	Ethiopia	45.29

3. Ministry of Health and Population Nepal, Partnership for Maternal, Newborn & Child Health, WHO, World Bank and Alliance for Health Policy and Systems Research. Success factors for women's and children's health: Nepal. Geneva: World Health Organization; 2014. http://www.who.int/pmnch/knowledge/publications/nepal_country_report.pdf

countries in South and Southeast Asia — Myanmar, Bangladesh, Cambodia, Laos, and Pakistan. GDP per capita in this group is quite low, all below $6,000, with the exception of Swaziland ($8,122).

Countries in this tier have, on average, not yet achieved the level of economic development to make significant advances in Basic Human Needs. For example, less than a fifth of the population in this tier's countries has access to piped water and half the population lacks basic electricity. In nearly half of this tier's countries, more than 20% of the population is undernourished.

A group of South and Southeast Asian countries leads the tier on Basic Human Needs. The strong performance of Myanmar, Bangladesh, Cambodia, Laos and Pakistan in the dimension is largely driven by relatively high scores on Nutrition and Basic Medical Care. Basic health in these countries is far from admirable — most achieve average performance on Undernourishment, Maternal Mortality Rate, and other indicators within the component — but compared to other countries in their tier, they perform well.

Among the low social progress countries, there are unusually large deviations in scores across the three dimensions, especially among the Sub-Saharan African countries. Kenya, for example, scores relatively strongly in aggregate but has a mixed picture at the component levels. Kenya performs better than most countries in the tier on Access to Basic Knowledge (79.49) and Health and Wellness (62.67), but scores low on Personal Safety (51.43), Personal Rights (52.59), and Tolerance and Inclusion (37.20), likely due to increasing security concerns and conflict. Ethiopia, the lowest scoring country in this group, reveals similarly large contrasts between components. Despite its low overall Index score, compared to the other countries in this group, it does relatively well on Personal Safety (66.38) because of its low rates of violent crime. Ethiopia also performs relatively well on Health and Wellness (60.04) because life expectancy (at 60), while low, is better than most countries at a similar level of GDP per capita.

While the countries in this group face serious development challenges in multiple areas, the Social Progress Index also points to some countries in the group that are models for success. For example, despite its challenges noted above, Kenya scores highly on Access to Basic Knowledge (79.49). The country introduced free primary education in 2003, significantly increasing enrollment rates. Many of the countries in this tier score at levels similar to higher tiers in Tolerance and Inclusion, Personal Rights, and Personal Safety. While these components of social progress are nevertheless important, in order to advance social progress to the lower middle tier, countries in this group need to focus their efforts on meeting their people's most basic needs of food, water, electricity, and literacy.

Very Low Social Progress

A final group of seven countries registers the world's lowest levels of social progress, ranging from Yemen (43.46) to the Central African Republic (28.38), a material step-down from the previous tier. All countries in this tier underperform on the Social Progress Index compared to countries at a similar level of GDP per capita.

Figure 3.9 / **Very Low Social Progress**

• Very Low Social Progress

Rank	Country	Score
122	**Yemen**	43.46
123	**Guinea**	43.40
124	**Niger**	42.97
125	**Angola**	40.73
126	**Chad**	35.69
127	**Afghanistan**	35.66
128	**Central African Repubic**	28.38

Of the final tier, the top four countries cluster together. Yemen, Guinea, Niger, and Angola have scores ranging from 43.46 to 40.73. Among these countries, though performance on all aspects of social progress is quite low, we see potential for improvement. For example, Yemen's government prioritizes education, but its score of 64.66 on Access to Basic Knowledge — though highest within the tier — reflects low levels of access to schools, particularly for girls. Likewise, Niger scores relatively high among countries in the tier on Health and Wellness (61.29) because of lower rates of premature deaths from non-communicable diseases and suicide, yet its life expectancy (at 60) is significantly below more progressed countries.

The lowest ranked country, the Central African Republic, is the world's weakest performing country on all three dimensions of the Social Progress Index. Its results show no strengths in any aspects of social progress. In order to improve its performance, the country requires holistic reforms that could improve health, education, environment, political opportunity, and inclusion. Its very low social progress cannot be attributed to extreme poverty alone, though the two variables are highly correlated. In this tier, only Central African Republic, Guinea, and Niger are also among the world's poorest seven countries. Other poor countries, such as Malawi and Rwanda, are able to achieve significantly higher levels of social progress with more aggressive policies toward meeting the Basic Human Needs and Foundations of Wellbeing of their citizens.

Among these very low performing countries, we also find countries like Angola and Yemen, which are both classified by the World Bank as middle-income countries but face challenges in social progress due to conflict. Angola is struggling to overcome the effects of its 27-year civil war, while Yemen's current conflict continues to cause a humanitarian crisis. Conflict can be both a cause and a symptom of low social progress.

Despite the very low performance on social progress among countries in this tier, there are pathways for them to improve. Afghanistan is the second lowest-placed country (ranked 127th), and on some components is achieving relatively high performance given its low income and state of war since 2001. On Nutrition and Basic Medical Care, it scores 72.74, compared to Central African Republic's achievement of 41.62. Similarly on Access to Basic Knowledge it scores 53.37, while Central African Republic (ranked last at 128th) scores only 37.03. As such, two countries with very similar low overall social progress can diverge widely on achieving aspects of social progress. The lessons taken from one could very well help the other to achieve higher social progress across this lowest tier.

Unranked Countries

Based on available data, the 2017 Social Progress Index ranks 128 countries grouped into the six tiers described above. Given the time lag between data collection and publication, the data available for Syria and Venezuela do not accurately represent the rapidly deteriorating situation in these countries. For this reason, Syria and Venezuela are excluded from the 2017 Social Progress Index.

An additional 33 countries have sufficient data to measure only 9 to 11 of the 12 components. For these countries, we cannot calculate an overall Social Progress Index score, but we can estimate their likely social progress tier based on the data that is available (see Figure 3.10).

With data for at least one dimension missing for each of these countries, we have a limited snapshot of their performance on overall social progress. For example, among the estimated high social progress performers, Singapore performs well on Foundations of Wellbeing and Opportunity, its scores ranking 33rd and 26th, respectively, among countries with complete data. Though it is missing data on Nutrition and Basic Medical Care, Singapore scores high on Water and Sanitation, Shelter, and Personal Safety, and within Nutrition and Basic Medical Care, its maternal mortality and child

Figure 3.10 / **Estimated Social Progress tiers for countries with insufficient data**

Very High Social Progress

- Luxembourg

High Social Progress

- Malta
- Singapore

High/Upper Middle Social Progress

- Barbados
- Qatar
- United Arab Emirates

Upper Middle Social Progress

- Bahrain
- Belize
- Bhutan
- Bosnia and Herzegovina
- Oman
- Suriname
- Trinidad and Tobago

Upper Middle/Lower Middle Social Progress

- Cabo Verde

Lower Middle Social Progress

- Cuba
- Gabon
- Guyana
- Vietnam
- West Bank and Gaza

Lower Middle/Low Social Progress

- Comoros
- Iraq
- Libya
- Timor-Leste
- Turkmenistan

Low Social Progress

- Djibouti
- Gambia
- Zambia

Low/Very Low Social Progress

- Burundi
- Guinea-Bissau
- Haiti
- Papua New Guinea

Very Low Social Progress

- Democratic Republic of Congo
- Sudan

mortality rates are very low. Therefore, its performance on overall social progress is estimated to be quite high. We estimate Social Progress Index tiers for these countries by regressing components within a dimension for those missing data for one component per dimension, or by regressing dimensions for those missing more than one component per dimension. Based on the regression results, we can calculate estimated values.

Those countries that we estimate would perform in the middle tiers of social progress follow similar trends to those countries that have complete data, presenting varying results across components, even within dimensions. Cuba, for example, achieves high performance in Access to Basic Knowledge and average performance on Health and Wellness and Environmental Quality, but is significantly behind other countries on Access to Information and Communications

(ranking second lowest, above Djibouti). Iraq performs relatively well on Nutrition and Basic Medical Care, Water and Sanitation, and Shelter, but faces challenges in Personal Safety due to high levels of violent crime, perceived criminality, political terror.

Among the estimated low performers, Opportunity is quite low, with countries such as Sudan scoring second-lowest in the world on Personal Freedom and Choice, and most of the countries recording the extremely low scores on Access to Advanced Education.

Four additional countries, North Korea, South Sudan, Somalia, and Eritrea, are large but lack sufficient data to calculate even nine of the 12 components, usually for political or conflict reasons. These countries would most likely be classified as very low social progress countries.

Forty-nine additional countries and territories have such limited data that only one to six components can be calculated. Many are small countries where data collection is prohibitively expensive for many of the data sources or organizations. Results, to the extent that they can be calculated, are available at **www.socialprogressimperative.org** website. Twenty-six countries and territories do not have sufficient data to calculate any components, but indicator-level data are reported.

CONCLUSION

The Social Progress Index, based exclusively on indicators of social and environmental outcomes, offers a revealing picture of countries' levels of development that is independent of traditional economic measures. Countries achieve very different overall levels of social progress and widely differing patterns of social progress by dimensions and components. A country's level of social progress is the result of cumulative incremental choices its governments, communities, citizens, and businesses make about how to invest limited resources and how to integrate and work with each other. In general terms, the Index reveals that high-income countries tend to achieve higher social progress than low-income countries. Yet this relationship is neither simple nor linear.

Countries at all levels of development can use this data to assess their performance and set priorities for improvement. Most countries will be able to identify areas of relative strength, which represent social progress foundations upon which they can build. However, every country exhibits areas for improvement and the Social Progress Index allows a strategic approach to social development that identifies areas for prioritization and investment.

CHAPTER 4

GLOBAL TRENDS IN SOCIAL PROGRESS 2014–2017

HIGHLIGHTS

- Global social progress is improving. The world score on the Social Progress Index has increased from 63.19 in 2014 to 64.85 in 2017, and 113 out of the 128 ranked countries registered a positive change over that same period.
- Access to Information and Communications and Access to Advanced Education are driving this positive change. More and more lower-income countries are gaining widespread access to mobile phone coverage, increasing the number of subscriptions and converging with high-income countries where subscriptions are already high. Many countries are also improving in terms of the ability of their universities to join global rankings.
- However, global performance on Personal Rights has declined over time. On this Personal Rights, Personal Safety and Tolerance and Inclusion, there are especially wide disparities in performance between countries, with many countries both improving and declining.
- Components closely related to the Millennium Development Goals – Nutrition and Basic Medical Care, Water and Sanitation, and Access to Basic Knowledge – saw accelerated improvement in the past two decades. Since 2014, when data are widely available, that improvement has stagnated. Over the past four years, there has been slow change to these components.

SOCIAL PROGRESS OVER TIME

The annual Social Progress Index benchmarks social progress across countries, and helps identify the specific strengths and weaknesses of individual countries in terms of their social progress performance. As we enter the fourth year of the Social Progress Index, we can for the first time introduce a new element to our analysis, the evaluation of social progress over time.

To do so, we utilize the improved 2017 Index framework, then apply that methodology across countries and years back to 2014.[1] We can measure, for the first time, the overall evolution of social progress over time, and also identify the relative movement of each component and dimension of the Social Progress Index.

While data allow evaluation of the full index only since 2014, we have constructed longer time-series for some components. We highlight those instances here and provide deeper analysis. This dynamic analysis is a first and critical step towards not simply measuring the social progress agenda for a country but also examining social progress improvement over time and in particular locations, and what works in achieving it.

We find that social progress overall is improving, but some components of social progress that have experienced deeply worrying erosion. Access to Information and Communications and Access to Advanced Education, for example, improved markedly in a relatively short period. Across other components, progress is slow and/or uneven. But this is in sharp contrast to the declines or stagnation in Personal Rights, Personal Safety, and Tolerance and Inclusion. Improved social progress in the aggregate must not mask the erosion in personal rights and challenges to tolerance and safety. These threaten to undermine or offset hard-earned gains in other areas.

SOCIAL PROGRESS OVERALL IS IMPROVING

To understand how the world is performing on social progress, we weight each country's score by population and sum across all countries. In 2017, the world score on the Social Progress Index was 64.85, which corresponds to a ranking between Indonesia and Botswana. Average global performance is generally better on the components of the Basic Human Needs dimension and worst on average on the components of the Opportunity dimension (see Figure 4.1). Overall, global performance on the Social Progress Index has increased by 1.66 points since 2014, which is heartening. While the world average has improved across most components of the Social Progress Index, creating a society with opportunity for all citizens remains an elusive goal for many countries.

Of 128 countries, 113 have improved their Social Progress Index score since 2014. By country, the average change in the Social Progress Index since 2014 has been 1.14 points. Improving countries have improved by 1.37 points on average. The population-weighted global average improvement (1.66 points) registers a sharper improvement relative to the performance on a country-by-country basis. The population-weighted world score is greater because it accounts for the fact that a disproportionate number of improving countries have larger populations. Improvement of social progress is largely concentrated in South Asian and Western African nations, whose 2014 scores were in the lower middle or low tier of the Index. This improvement suggests that countries at a relatively low level of social progress may be able to improve more rapidly since they both have more opportunities for improvement and can also draw on lessons and approaches that have been implemented elsewhere.

Among advanced economies, the overall pattern is one of positive but modest improvement in social

1. As such, our analysis accounts for retroactive data revisions from sources as well as minor changes in the Social Progress Index methodology. Accordingly, the figures cited here may differ from the Social Progress Index scores and rankings that were reported in the context of earlier annual reports. Full datasets from 2014–2017 are available at www.socialprogressimperative.org.

Figure 4.1 / **Population-weighted world Social Progress Index scores in 2014 and 2017**



progress since 2014. All of the G7 countries show an increase, but the average level of that increase is just 0.51 points. As we highlight further below, the most notable divergence among advanced economies is in Tolerance and Inclusion. In particular a handful of countries experienced significant (greater than five points) declines in this component, including Central European countries such as Hungary, Poland, Slovakia, and Slovenia, as well as Latvia and, surprisingly, the United States. Advanced economies improving markedly in Tolerance and Inclusion included Norway, Cyprus, Germany, and Spain.

While global social progress is improving, a small group of 15 countries registers a marked decline in their overall score, with an average decline of 0.64 points. The biggest decliners are mainly in Central America or Sub-Saharan Africa, but Hungary stands out with the largest decline by far among European countries, driven largely by change in Tolerance and Inclusion.

Figure 4.2 / **Top improvers and decliners on Social Progress Index 2014 to 2017**



VARYING TRENDS IN SOCIAL PROGRESS BY COMPONENT

On a component-by-component basis, we are limited to a four-year analysis that dates back to the launch of the Social Progress Index, in 2014. For some components, we are able to extend our measurement back further, and get a longer-term perspective.

Figure 4.3 reports the avreage evolution of social progress by component by a country. Figure 4.4 highlights the number of countries who experience a significant positive or negative shift in each component between 2014 and 2017.

Three important patterns stand out. First, two components — Access to Information and Communication and Access to Advanced Education — experience significant improvement across a wide range of countries. As shown in figure 4.3, countries improved from an average 66.15 to 69.30. Indeed, more countries improved on these two components than on any others (See Figure 4.4). This highlights the impact of mobile devices and information technology as tools for advancing social progress. Second, Personal Rights, Personal Safety, and Tolerance and Inclusion all show absolute stagnation or decline on average. Personal Rights declined from an average score of 59.38 to 58.26, and Personal Safety declined from 69.71 to 69.34. Tolerance and Inclusion saw little change, with an average score of 51.74 in 2014 and 52.22 in 2017. These three components saw marked declines for a meaningful number of countries. More than 10 countries experienced a decline of more than five points on each of these components; among other components few or no countries saw such drastic declines. This variation highlights an important area for concern even as we acknowledge the global improvement in social progress overall.

Third, the remaining seven components, concentrated primarily in the Basic Human Needs and Foundations of Wellbeing dimensions, register more stability over time, with a lower rate of overall improvement and less variability in performance across countries. The accompanying figures show that on these components of social progress, change has stagnated and few countries have shown major improvements or decline. For many of these components, changes in social progress are likely to be slow and require investments and shifts in policy so that social progress improvements are realized over a longer period of time.

Figure 4.3 / **Change in average scores for components of the Social Progress Index**



Figure 4.4 / **Distribution of countries across categories of change from 2014 to 2017, by component**

	Component	Large Improvement	Modest Improvement	Little or No Change	Modest Decline
Basic Human Needs	Nutrition and Basic Medical Care	1	24	125	1
	Water and Sanitation	-	13	147	-
	Shelter	16	43	75	21
	Personal Safety	7	33	76	23
Foundations of Wellbeing	Access to Basic Knowledge	9	26	111	6
	Access to Information and Communications	36	57	60	7
	Health and Wellness	5	40	115	1
	Environmental Quality	5	23	127	3
Opportunity	Personal Rights	4	14	94	33
	Personal Freedom and Choice	22	42	80	9
	Tolerance and Inclusion	30	19	58	26
	Access to Advanced Education	29	36	88	4

1. Access to Information and Communications and Access to Advanced Education show the fastest improvement.

Relative to the modest improvement in the overall Social Progress Index, Access to Information and Communications and Access to Advanced Education experienced a more rapid upward trajectory over the past four years, despite erosion in many countries in the area of press freedom.

The single largest component-level improvement was in Access to Information and Communications, which increased 3.17 points. In many ways, this is not surprising. Mobile technology and the Internet have rapidly diffused around the globe over the last half-decade. According to the World Bank, "more households in developing countries own a mobile phone than have access to electricity or clean water, and nearly 70% of the bottom fifth of the population in developing countries own a mobile phone."[2] While this diffusion has largely been discussed in the context of potential economic gains (i.e., the ability of technology to raise traditional measures of productivity), an equally important consequence of this diffusion is the advancement of social progress. Mobile networks allow individuals to communicate with loved ones at a distance (which both directly affects well-being and also enables a higher level of mobility and choice), allow individuals to gather knowledge to make more informed and considered life choices (e.g., by giving them access to information about relevant options and alternatives), and also allow individuals to access dispersed resources (e.g., health care providers) that might otherwise be unavailable.

The global improvement in mobile telephone access can be seen even more clearly by considering a longer time frame. As highlighted in Figure 4.6, over the past 15 years, mobile telephony has not only diffused to essentially 100% in high-income countries, but middle and lower-income nations also have experienced significant adoption, resulting in a global convergence in mobile telephony adoption rates. For example, by 2016, mobile diffusion is more than 50% in low-income countries. The global diffusion of

2. *World Development Report 2016.* World Bank.

Figure 4.5 / Improving Components



Figure 4.6 / Change in indicators of Access to Information and Communications Over Time



mobile telephony is a key driver of improved global social progress. Among these improvers is Myanmar, whose liberalization has been accompanied by a remarkable increase in Access to Information and Communiications. Myanmar's score on Access to Information and Communications increased from 23.92 to 54.55 due to large increases in mobile phone subscriptions from just 7 per 100 people in 2014 to 76 per 100 people in 2017 and Internet users from 1% of the population in 2014 to nearly 22% in 2017.

At the same time as mobile telephony has improved, access to the internet has been improving but more unevenly. Whereas mobile telephony has been associated with substantial convergence among countries across income groups, a significant digital divide has also emerged. There is a very large gap in access to the Internet depending on the level of economic development, with a less than 10% penetration rate in low-income countries. As opportunity is increasingly linked to Internet connectivity, this is a concern for efforts to reduce global social progress inequality.

Of further concern is access to free, impartial, and trustworthy news. In the last four years, press freedom has declined in nearly three-quarters of the countries in the Social Progress Index. There are many causes for this disturbing trend, including increasingly authoritarian tendencies of governments and tighter government controls in countries that were previously regarded as progressive. Private consolidation of media into large companies has led to increasing editorial influence by owners and on-going security concerns for journalists. This further adds to pressures on media freedom.[3] The countries with the largest declines since 2014 are Libya, Burundi, Tajikistan, Poland, and Azerbaijan.[4]

A second component of improvement has been in the area of Access to Advanced Education. On average, country performance improved by 2.62 points from 2014 to 2017. The change is largely due to changes in globally ranked universities. Though most world-class universities are in Europe, North America, and Australia, this is slowly changing. The number of universities selected for global ranking by the three main ranking organizations has expanded, reflecting the greater number of universities able to meet their standards.[5] As a result, the number of countries with at least one globally ranked university increased from 75 in 2014 to 89 in 2017, with the most gains in East Asia, the Middle East, and North Africa. While Access to Advanced Education in Sub-Saharan Africa is low on an absolute level, there are positive developments. In 2014, only South Africa had globally ranked universities, but by 2017, this list expanded to include Ghana, Kenya, Nigeria, and Uganda. Locally-based, globally well-regarded universities undoubtedly provide greater opportunity to students, but also provide benefit to countries by keeping talented potential future leaders in the country, as well as being a conduit and amplifier of cutting-edge knowledge.

2. Personal Rights, Safety and Tolerance are eroding or at risk.

In contrast to the areas of improvement just described, trends for Personal Rights, Personal Safety, and Tolerance and Inclusion are troubling. On Personal Rights, since 2014, more countries declined than improved. The average score across countries has decreased on Personal Safety, and on Tolerance and Inclusion, nearly as many countries declined as improved.

3. Reporters without Borders. https://rsf.org/en/deep-and-disturbing-decline-media-freedom

4. We reference the most significant changes among countries that have full or partial Social Progress Index scores. Brunei Darussalam, Andorra, Liechtenstein, and Venezuela registered equally large declines, but are lacking enough data to calculate nine or more Social Progress Index components.

5. The three main university ranking organizations include: Times Higher Education World University Rankings, QS World University Rankings, and Academic Ranking of World Universities.

Figure 4.7 / **Eroding Components**



Personal Rights are eroding across the world

Personal Rights is the only component in the Social Progress Index that registered an average decrease in performance (-1.00 point) and on which more countries declined than improved. The indicators on which countries declined the most are political rights and freedom of expression. A disturbing trend is the emergence of authoritarian regimes that are more aggressive in their restrictions of liberties, and the growing populist and nationalist factions gaining strength and threatening basic freedoms and rights in democratic countries.

Six countries, representing a range of income groups, geographies, and political systems, have shown the most rapid deterioration in Personal Rights, especially in the reduction of free political participation and freedoms of expression and assembly. These are Burundi, Hungary, Lesotho, Tajikistan, Thailand, and Turkey, that have declined more than nine points on Personal Rights since 2014. Angola, Azerbaijan, El Salvador, Nicaragua, Russia, and Yemen declined more than five points. An additional 33 countries declined more than 2 points, including Brazil, which saw the messy impeachment of President Dilma Rousseff, China, which has continued limits on free expression and political participation, and Poland, which has increasingly restricted free speech and dissent.

However, we also see some positive developments in Personal Rights since 2014. Madagascar and Sri Lanka are improving freedom of expression and freedom of assembly, and allowing greater political participation. Despite economic and security challenges, Tunisia is maintaining the freedoms and liberties gained in its democratic transition. Guinea-Bissau also improved from 2014 to 2015 due to the first open elections since its 2012 coup and has maintained this level through 2017.

Personal Safety just stable

Global performance on Personal Safety has remained stable, and not improving. . From 2014 to 2017, nearly the same number of countries declined in performance as improved (see Figure 4.9). A reduction in average

Figure 4.8 / **Number of countries improving and declining on Personal Rights 2014 to 2017**



Figure 4.9 / **Number of countries improving and declining on Personal Safety 2014 to 2017**



rate of homicides globally was off-set by an increase in other violent crimes, a trend that dates back farther based on the historical data we observed. This divergence is widespread globally. Most countries either reduced both homicides and violent crime, such as Thailand, or experienced increased levels of both homicides and crime, such as Mexico. The close correlation between these two indicators suggests that improvement in one may lead to improvement in the other, greatly improving a country's performance on Personal Safety.

Most of the largest declines and improvements in Personal Safety are among countries in Latin America and the Caribbean, where homicide rates far exceed any other part of the world. Examining longer-term data over the past decade, we have found that Honduras has seen the most dramatic increase in homicides since 2009 – from 44.5 in 2006 to most recently 74.6 deaths per 100,000 people, far higher than the next largest increases. In Panama, Mexico, and Bolivia, the homicide rate has increased by more than 6 people per 100,000 to rates between 12.4 and 17.4 per 100,000 overall. Some of largest declines in Latin America occurred in countries that still have homicides rates far exceeding these levels. Colombia, Guatemala, and Jamaica reduced their homicide rates by 8.9 to 13.7 people per 100,000, but still have high rates from 27.9 to 36.1 per 100,000 overall. Other countries showing large declines in the homicide rate include Iraq, Sri Lanka, and Mongolia.

The three additional indicators that compose Personal Safety have remained relatively stable across the world, with few countries showing major change on any of the three. Progress in Personal Safety requires a holistic approach to improving all aspects of the component. Given the uneven progress in addressing Personal Safety challenges mentioned above, global improvement on Personal Safety is not yet in place.

Volatility in Tolerance and Inclusion

Though the average is relatively stable, country-level scores on Tolerance and Inclusion are the most volatile in the Index. Performance on most components of the

2017 Social Progress Index reflects decades of policies and investment and generally shows relatively steady change over time. Since Tolerance and Inclusion is largely based on public opinion surveys, it tends to fluctuate more year-to-year. As a result, short-term changes should be interpreted with care.

The lowest performing regions on Tolerance and Inclusion, South Asia and Eastern Africa, reveal contradictory trends. On average, South Asia has the lowest score of any sub-region, 36.67, yet Bangladesh and Nepal are among the most improved countries. Both showed strong improvements on tolerance for homosexuality. Bangladesh improved from less than 1% of the population stating that the country is a good place for gay and lesbian people to 36% between 2010 and 2017. Nepal improved from 56% of the population stating the country is a good place for gay and lesbian people to 83%.

Eastern Africa has the second-lowest average Tolerance and Inclusion score, after South Asia. Apart from Burundi, Ethiopia and Tanzania, it is becoming even less tolerant and inclusive. It is one of the least tolerant regions of the world for homosexuals. In this region there has also been a large decline in the percentage of people who indicate that they have relatives or friends they can count on if they need help.

In Europe, tolerance for immigrants is declining in countries like Czech Republic and Estonia. Over the past two years, Denmark, Spain, France, Croatia, Greece, Lithuania, Macedonia, and Russia have also started showing signs of deteriorating tolerance of immigrants after showing improvement in the years prior. The refugee crisis and subsequent pressure on resources have likely had a negative effect on this.

Overall, Tolerance and Inclusion scores in Europe show considerable regional variation. Northern European countries are among the most tolerant in the world, while many Central and Eastern European countries rank in the bottom half of all countries. Most countries in Europe now show consistent or

Figure 4.10 / **Number of countries improving and declining on Tolerance and Inclusion 2014 to 2017**



gradually improving scores, but there have been substantial declines in the Czech Republic, France, Hungary, Latvia, Poland, Russia, and Slovakia due to decreasing tolerance for immigrants and increasing discrimination against minorities. The United States has also declined for the same reasons.

The United States and Canada have both experienced declines in Tolerance and Inclusion due to decreasing religious tolerance and increasing discrimination against minorities. But whereas tolerance for immigrants has also declined in the United States, it has slightly improved in Canada. In the US, Tolerance and Inclusion scores declined significantly due to an increase in anti-Semitic activities and an increase in discrimination against minorities. The US ranks just 23 in the world across this component, placing it behind less prosperous countries including Argentina, Chile, Uruguay, and Costa Rica.

Figure 4.11 / **Slow and uneven components by indicator**

3. Progress is slow and/or uneven on other components.

For seven of the other 12 components of the Social Progress Index, we see stability between 2014 and 2017. Social progress change in these components is slow, likely because it involves significant investment and societal prioritization over a longer period of time.

Nutrition and Basic Medical Care, Water and Sanitation, and Access to Basic Knowledge

On an absolute level, average global performance in 2017 is best on the components that have the most overlap with the Millennium Development Goals, the global development priorities set by the UN for the period 2000–2015: Nutrition and Basic Medical Care (89.62), Access to Basic Knowledge (87.63),

Figure 4.12 / **Convergence in Nutrition and Basic Medical Care, Access to Basic Knowledge, and Water and Sanitation**



and Water and Sanitation (71.26). Across the three components, most countries showed little to no change in performance from 2014 to 2017, with few registering a modest decline. This is not to understate the improvement in these components over the past two and a half decades, which saw child mortality rate fall by 53% and access to piped water increase from 76% to 91%. Global net primary school enrollment has increased by 8 percent since 1999.

Longer historical trends show that convergence among countries is closest in Nutrition and Basic Medical Care relative to Water and Sanitation and Access to Basic Knowledge (Figure 4.12).[6] If the current rate of progress continues, most countries could achieve the updated global targets, the UN Sustainable Development Goals, by 2030. But progress will need to accelerate dramatically for the bottom decile of countries, which have not seen the gains achieved elsewhere.

Considerable progress has been made in Access to Basic Knowledge as well. Most countries will likely achieve high levels of basic education in the next fifteen years if current rates of progress continue. Countries in the bottom two income deciles, including Angola, Chad, Niger, and Sudan have noticeably improved literacy rates among their populations, but have room to improve school enrollment for girls, which remains low.

6. Historical trends are based on computations of the Social Progress Index dating back to 1993 for Nutrition and Basic Medical Care, 2002 for Access to Basic Knowledge, and 1992 for Water and Sanitation.

Figure 4.13 / **Number of countries improving and declining on Health and Wellness, and Environmental Quality 2014 to 2017**



Global progress in Water and Sanitation, though positive, has not seen the same acceleration as Nutrition and Basic Medical Care and Access to Basic Education. Overall, average performance across all countries improved since the early 1990. But at the current rate of progress, by 2030 more than one-quarter of countries will still not have reached today's global average.

The achievements of the last 15 years deserve to be celebrated, but we must recognize the unfinished work of the Millennium Development Goals that relate to these three components:

- More than 790 million people lack regular access to sufficient food.[7]
- Globally, 216 women die from childbirth per 100,000 live births, nearly all of which are preventable.[8]
- Despite great progress in reducing child mortality, an estimated 5.9 million children under the age of five died in 2015.[9]
- According to the latest data, 59 million children of primary school age were not in school and it is estimated that 2 in 5 of these children will never set foot in a classroom.[10]
- An estimated 663 million people rely on water that is not safe from contamination and nearly a billion people lack sanitation facilities of any kind.[11]

Slow progress in Health and Wellness, and Environmental Quality

Regardless of how many resources are devoted to Health and Wellness and Environmental Quality, or how many new policies are proposed and adopted

7. https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/sdg2
8. https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/sdg3
9. ibid
10. https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/sdg4
11. https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/sdg6

Figure 4.14 / **Number of countries improving and declining on Personal Freedom and Choice and Shelter 2014 to 2017**



to benefit these aspects of social progress, long-term health and environmental outcomes are changing slowly. On both components, most countries show little to no change in performance (see Figure 4.13). Measurable differences in life expectancy require many years of social change, and the outcomes of conservation efforts may not be known for decades after they are enacted. Though there has been a notable positive shift in Health and Wellness, and Environmental Quality, global performance on these components has remained relatively stable over time or shown only slight improvement.

Uneven progress in Personal Freedom and Choice, and Shelter

The world on average improved on Personal Freedom and Choice and Shelter by 1.80 and 1.26 points, respectively. However, on both components, a considerable number of countries either improved very little or declined (See Figure 4.14).

In Tanzania and the West Bank and Gaza Strip, the number of girls married between the ages of 15 and 19 has decreased, although the rate is still high by global standards. Other improvers on the component include Senegal, which saw increased satisfied demand for contraception. Nigeria and Romania lessened restrictions on religion and corruption decreased in Albania and Myanmar. Though Iraq, Morocco, and Pakistan register poor performance on freedom over life choices and rank in the bottom 10% of all countries, all three have improved considerably since 2014.

The countries showing the greatest declines are generally those countries where people express less freedom to choose what they do over their lives compared to four years earlier.[12] Most are also rated as more corrupt by Transparency International. Many

12. Measured by comparing the number of respondents answering "satisfied" to the Gallup World Poll question, "Are you satisfied or dissatisfied with your freedom to choose what you do with your life?" in 2017 and 2014.

of the countries showing large declines are countries that were already performing poorly in 2014, such as the Central African Republic, Mauritania, Niger, Burundi, and Haiti. Hungary declined more than 6 points since 2014 – the second largest decline after Haiti. Corruption in the country has worsened substantially and government restrictions on minority religions have increased.

Much of the improvement on Shelter was driven by reductions in the number of deaths attributable to household air pollution, but progress remains slow and such deaths globally remain very high. Most of the countries with the largest declines in Shelter saw a large reduction in the availability of good, affordable housing.[13] Some of the largest declines were in Sub-Saharan African countries, including Benin, Burkina Faso, and Mauritania, that already had among the lowest rates in the world.[14] A number of high-income countries, such as Canada, France, and Ireland, also saw declines in the availability of good, affordable housing, primarily driven by the housing markets in urban centers.

CONCLUSION

Overall, the world is improving, with most countries increasing their score on the Social Progress Index from 2014 to 2017. The countries with the most room for improvement, which are mostly low-income countries, are also those that are progressing most rapidly. And although these countries have the most volatile Social Progress Index scores, even the biggest declines in performance are not of the same magnitude as the biggest increases. There is particularly significant improvement in key areas, including greater global access to technology (particularly mobile) and higher education, along with steady and improved outcomes in nutrition, water and sanitation, basic knowledge, and environmental quality.

Despite these positives, there is still a lot of work to be done. The greatest improvements have been in areas where social progress most often accompanies economic prosperity, whereas the areas where world performance has declined or stagnated are those where this correlation is weakest. Even among high-income countries, Personal Rights are declining, and Personal Safety and Tolerance and Inclusion are under threat. The data show that all countries have areas for prioritization and improvement, but by tracking social progress over time, countries and stakeholders can hold themselves accountable to achieve meaningful goals and improve quality of life for the widest possible set of individuals.

13. Measured by comparing the number of respondents answering “satisfied” to the Gallup World Poll question, “In your city or area where you live, are you satisfied or dissatisfied with the availability of good, affordable housing?” in 2017 and 2014.

14. http://www.stabilityjournal.org/articles/10.5334/sta.ap/

SUPPLEMENTAL SECTION

FROM INDEX TO ACTION TO IMPACT

The Social Progress Imperative is about more than numbers and measurement; it is about what those data tell us and how we use that knowledge to make real improvements in people's lives.

National and local governments are defining new agendas in Latin America, Europe and Asia using the Social Progress Index. Industries such as extractives, tourism, and consumer products are using the Index to evaluate their impact on the countries and communities in which they operate. Capital investments and bond ratings are factoring in social progress indicators. These are ways in which bold leaders are using the Social Progress Index to change the way they make decisions about priorities and investments.

Conventional wisdom has been that as economies and businesses thrive, so do societies. Not always. At a time when economic prosperity has been growing, societies find themselves challenged. From 2012 to 2017, global GDP rose 3%, yet while economies are growing and businesses are meeting earnings targets, many citizens are experiencing a different reality. Educational opportunities for women and girls are improving, yet equity with men and boys still lags. Access to water and sanitation may be improving in many parts of the developing world and emerging economies, but too many people still lack these most basic services. Gender, racial,

ethnic, religious, sexual orientation and age discrimination protections have advanced in many countries, yet real inclusion is a long way off.

To understand why economies are improving but society is not, we need a different lens, a measure of social and environmental progress, to grasp how citizens are faring and understand their real lived experience. The Social Progress Index provides this, not as a replacement for traditional economic indicators but as a complement to them.

Our network of partners now extends to 44 countries worldwide. In these countries, the Social Progress Index is galvanizing government and business leaders, academics and researchers, civil society organizations and citizens to take action. They are coming together to ask and answer, "What does the community we want to live in look like, and what do we need to do to create that community?" By taking ownership of and creating localized social progress indices, leaders and citizens are being empowered to define for themselves what Basic Human Needs, the Foundations of Wellbeing, and Opportunity mean in their nations and communities.

WHO IS USING THE INDEX?

National leaders are crafting long-term planning strategies. Mayors and city planners are devising and monitoring urban development plans. Businesses are evaluating market entry, risk mitigation, and corporate social responsibility action plans for where to allocate resources to improve communities and build supply chain pipelines. Investors are evaluating municipal bond opportunities. Governments and businesses are tracking the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). Others are using the framework as an ecosystem mapping tool.

From Amazonia to India, Iceland to Thailand, presidents to mayors, business leaders to business schools are organizing across sectors to form networks of partners at regional, state, and community levels. Using the Social Progress Index framework, Social Progress Imperative is helping them create their own localized indices measuring issues relevant to the society in which they want to live.

"There are 'do no harm' investments and 'do some good' investments. We need more 'do some good' investments."

— Julie Katzman
Executive Vice President and COO
Inter-American Development Bank

The outcomes are used as benchmarks and decision drivers to make or adapt policies, create community services, invest in enterprises, and improve living conditions.

CATALYZING ACTION AROUND THE WORLD

LATIN AMERICA

PARAGUAY

In Paraguay, the national government has incorporated the Social Progress Index into the National Development Plan to 2030 as a tool to guide public and private investments and to track progress. The insights revealed by the Social Progress Index are already leading to concrete actions: the government doubled budget allocation for nutrition programs and has set a target to reduce child malnutrition to 2% or less by 2018.

The Index also revealed that a globally ranked university would be critical for Paraguay's transition towards a knowledge-based economy. Realizing the difficulty of any one university achieving this alone, the government brought together the country's leading research institutions to collaborate in the creation of a second, higher tier of advanced education that will give Paraguayan students access to the world's most advanced knowledge. This is just one example of how combining insights from the Social Progress Index with local knowledge and initiative can result in creative, locally-tailored solutions that drive progress forward.

"The (Social Progress Index) allows us to have a more meaningful national budget, that traces taxpayers' money to the outputs that government institutions will deliver to citizens."

— José R. Molinas Vega
Executive Secretary of the Secretariat
for Technical Planning of Economic
and Social Development
Government of Paraguay

BRAZIL

In the Brazilian Amazon, the Social Progress Index helped make visible the social needs of the often forgotten populations living in remote areas.

The Social Progress Index Amazonia, led by regional partner Fundación Avina and local nonprofit Imazon, represents the most detailed social and environmental diagnosis of the Amazon's 772 municipali-

ties across nine states.[1] This index revealed that just one of the 141 municipalities in the state of Pará achieves a level of social progress above the national average, prompting the state government to create a Special State Secretariat for Social Policy Integration. In addition to being the catalyst for the creation of a new office specifically tasked with addressing citizens' needs, the Index is also playing an ongoing role in Pará by informing the Secretariat's policy formulation and allowing the government to monitor the effectiveness of its social sector investments.

The Amazonia Index also spurred businesses to take action to improve their communities in the municipality of Carauari. Alarmed by the low levels of social progress in an important region for their supply chain, Coca-Cola and Natura partnered with Ipsos to create a community needs survey based on the Index framework. This community-level Social Progress Index has been the foundation for a new development program – a collaboration between citizens, government, business, and civil society. Guided by the social progress data, this program has improved water and sanitation infrastructure, providing 500 households with consistent sources of clean water for the first time. They also constructed new river piers to improve transportation during seasonal flooding and increase connectivity with neighboring communities. These improvements have already changed lives in Carauari, where business has taken responsibility for acting on the insights of the index and taking the necessary actions to mobilize partners to generate impact.

In 2016, in response to clear evidence that the massive investments spurred by preparations for the 2014 World Cup and 2016 Olympics did not adequately benefit society as a whole, Rio de Janeiro launched its own Social Progress Index. The first Index for a city of its size, it has laid the foundation for the development of indices for all 5,570 municipalities of Brazil in 2017. In addition to serving as a powerful decision-making tool for the local government, this index is enabling citizens to see for themselves the challenges facing different parts of their city and verify that public resources are being allocated in an equitable way.

"Thanks to the Social Progress Index for the city of Rio we now have a clearer diagnosis of what is needed in Rio de Janeiro. Now we want to deepen that work at the community level by empowering citizens and multiplying partnerships for change with all sectors of society."

— Pedro Massa
Shared Value Director, Coca-Cola Brazil

1. www.ipsamazonia.org.br

COSTA RICA

In Costa Rica, the groundbreaking Social Progress Index in Tourism Destinations has given the government new insights about the relationship between tourism and social progress that it is using to reshape its tourism strategy. Created in partnership with Vice President Ana Helena Chacón and the cross-sector coalition Costa Rica Propone, it is the first comprehensive measure of the social effects of tourism. The Index revealed that tourism microenterprises like small boutique hotels, independent tour operators, and informal restaurants actually lead to higher levels of social progress than major international resort chains. In addition to showing the Costa Rican government what forms of tourism are most beneficial for society, the Index pinpoints the specific ways in which larger tourism enterprises can tweak their model to have a more positive social impact.

For this innovative approach to understanding the interplay between social and economic progress in the tourism sector, the government of Costa Rica received an Award for Innovation in Public Policy & Governance at the 13th annual UN World Tourism Organization Awards. Efforts to replicate this Index are already under way in Iceland, another country where tourism is having a transformative but insufficiently understood social impact.

Also in Costa Rica, the Social Progress Index for the Cantons of Costa Rica was developed by one of our key regional partners in Latin America, the Latin American Center for Competitiveness and Sustainable Development (CLACDS) at INCAE Business School. This Index was also supported by other members of the platform Costa Rica Propone, and provides local leaders and private investors alike with the data they need to improve quality of life in their canton.

More broadly in Central America, food and agricultural company Cargill is developing a Social Progress index to better understand how their local supply chain's relationships with co-ops – small and large businesses with local workforces – is affecting social progress in their communities.

Figure 5.1 / **Social Progress Index for the Cantons of Costa Rica**



"We are the first nation in the world to use the Social Progress Index to measure social progress in every canton."

— Ana Helena Chacón
Vice President of Costa Rica

PERU

In Peru, a Social Progress Index for all 26 regions is being used to create a more cohesive regional development plan for the country. The Index highlights the significant gap that exists between how the country's urban and rural citizens live, in particular the need for better access to water and sanitation in the Amazonian and Andean regions. Already, public-private partnerships are forming to design new policies and identify the investment opportunities that will improve water and sanitation in rural areas.

Additionally, in the valley of the Apurímac, Ene, and Mantaro (VRAEM) rivers – the main center of coca production in Peru, and notorious for the presence of drug-trafficking and the last remnants of the Shining Path guerrillas – the Index is being used to monitor implementation of Peru's Social Action Strategy with Sustainability (EASS).

"At the local level, you don't care about ideology, you don't care about political parties. You care about the problems of your community. And this is where I think SPI is very powerful."

— Victor Umaña
Director, CLACDS
INCAE Business School

CHILE

The Social Progress Index for the community of Cabrero, the first in Chile, is giving business and governmental leaders the information they need to address their community's challenges with solutions specific to their local context.

Although Cabrero as a whole scores relatively well on the access to piped water indicator, the Index revealed that rural portions of the community score far lower, with some 25% of households without regular access to clean water. The Social Progress Committee, a multisector alliance of stakeholders, carefully considered the local circumstances to develop a Cabrero-specific solution to this problem. They installed small, decentralized water purification systems throughout the geographically scattered rural parts of the commune, addressing one of the major challenges highlighted by their Index in the way that makes most sense in their local context.

Similarly, in southern Chile, forestry company Masisa is going beyond job creation to determine how people are faring from the investments and engagement of their workforce in the communities where they operate. Working with municipal leaders, they are creating recreation programs and nutrition education to address health disparities. They are also creating technology labs with computers and Internet access in order to bridge the digital divide that is limiting access to higher education opportunities.

ARGENTINA

The province of Salta is leading the way in Argentina by creating a provincial Social Progress Index composed of 52 indicators, 16 of which are closely aligned with the SDGs. The provincial government relied on this Index as they designed Plan Salta 2030, their newly-adopted sustainable development strategy, and will continue to use it as they track the results of their development initiatives.

On the national level, a Social Progress Network led by the Secretary of Planning (Government Ministry), and comprising approximately 60 organizations, is mapping social and environmental metrics to effectively monitor the country's efforts to meet the SDGs.

EUROPE

EUROPEAN UNION

The Social Progress Imperative has supported the European Commission, in a partnership including the Orkestra Basque Institute for Competitiveness and DG Regio, in the creation of a Social Progress Index for 272 regions of the European Union. This Index is being used to monitor the Commission's 2014–2020 action program and identify best practices within regions that can be scaled and applied elsewhere. We are also working with countries and regions of the EU — including some of the highest performing regions in Scandinavia, as well as in lower performing regions in Southern and Eastern Europe — to use the Index to help tackle challenges such as environmental quality, social inclusion, disaffected youth, and other needs.

"The Social Progress Index provides a concrete framework for understanding and then translating policies into an action-oriented agenda which advances both social and economic competitiveness in Europe's regions. This is essential for us as policymakers."

— Nicola Caputo
Member of the European Parliament

Figure 5.2 / **EU Regional Social Progress Index**



ASIA

INDIA

In India, policymakers will be able to act on new insights about priority areas for investment and development thanks to a multi-year endeavor to assess progress in 28 states and one territory, 50 cities, and 562 districts, launched in 2016 by the Institute for Competitiveness India in association with government think tank NITI Aayog. Beyond its utility for India's state governments and national leaders, the Social Progress Index India will also equip the corporate sector with a comprehensive outline of the thematic areas where their legally-mandated corporate social responsibility funds can be directed. By sparking cross-learning and competitive opportunities across the states, the India Index has the potential to improve quality of life for more than 1.3 billion people.

In Southeast Asia, a number of exciting initiatives are under way that will give stakeholders the tools to ensure the economic growth is accompanied by social progress.

"The only way India can improve is when we measure states against states and make them compete."

— Amitabh Kant
CEO, NITI Aayog

"(The Social Progress Index) will help define the agenda, policies, and corporate strategies to move India into caring about quality of life for our citizens — education, access to health services."

— Amit Kapoor
CEO, India Council on Competitiveness
Institute for Competitiveness India

Social Progress Imperative CEO Michael Green attends Professor Michael E. Porter's NITI lecture delivered to Prime Minister Narendra Modi, his cabinet, and the Indian civil service, 25 May 2017.

In Malaysia, key partners are aligning around a recently established social progress network, and plans are in development regarding which tools and actions will best address the country's challenges.

The Social Progress Imperative is also engaging with leading academics in Thailand to kickstart a network of social innovators and define a roadmap for the development of a country-level Social Progress Index.

A tool with cross-sector applications

Healthy societies are often characterized by thriving businesses and thriving economies. Now, companies are using the Social Progress Index to identify the needs of the communities they operate in and translate their organizational values into investment and impact. And as institutional and individual investors are becoming more sophisticated, so too are their expectations that strategies account for social and environmental benefit in addition to financial returns.

"Business cannot succeed if society fails – and vice versa."

— Rik Vanpeteghem
CEO, Deloitte Belgium

Financial institutions, fund managers, and impact investment groups have already begun applying the Social Progress Index to evaluate social and environmental risk for credit worthiness, as well as to drive capital towards social investments.

"We feel in using the Social Progress Index, we can better understand which communities are poised to be successful."

— Peter Coffin
CEO, Breckinridge Capital Advisors

One example is Breckinridge Capital Advisors, which is using the Index and its framework to support analysis of the US municipal bond market. Breckinridge is using the Index alongside measures of economic prosperity to identify cities and counties that are achieving sustainable, inclusive growth so investors can maximize opportunity and minimize risk.

"SPI is a way to democratize the way finance works."

— Nigel Kershaw
CEO, Big Issue Invest

Similarly, UK-based Big Issue Invest is using the Social Progress Index to inform a fund being created to invest in infrastructure projects with positive social outcomes, starting in London.

Box.5.1 / THE WHAT WORKS SUMMIT

Real progress comes about when the best models and solutions can be replicated and scaled. In partnership with Cognitio, the Social Progress Imperative collaborator in Iceland, social innovators from around the world gathered in April 2017 in Reykjavik to share success stories and spark collaborations to advance social progress.

Through case studies, debates, and interactive workshops, the second What Works international summit to advance social progress showcased how governments and businesses are using the Social Progress Index to identify what is working and to pinpoint areas of weakness in their programs; how areas of weak social performance but also opportunity in cities have been identified and targeted for improvement; how we can heal troubling divides and use social indicators to create more inclusive policies; and how promising social progress solutions are being scale around the world.

Agents of Social Progress that Shared at the Summit

- Mayors from the around the world are embracing the Social Progress Index to drive solutions in their cities. In Somerville, Massachusetts, in the United States and in Kópavogur, Iceland, the cities are pioneering the index's application in their respective countries and using it to complement their policy agendas. Housing, mobility, education, and inclusive growth are key issues faced by these cities.
- To supplement a national plan to address education success in Ecuador, technology company HP launched the National Education Assessment, a tool which assesses whether schools have the readiness to accept technology. The tool can pinpoint knowledge and skill gaps in using computers, the Internet and other tools, and teach those skills to teachers and students before deploying computers in schools.
- Access to Information and Communications is essential to advancing social progress. Facebook is supporting this with a goal to bring Internet access to the remaining 60% of the world that is not connected. Working with telecommunications companies, they are bringing infrastructure and free basic services such as access to government services, basic learning tools, health information, and Facebook Messenger to reach friends and family.
- Statistics show that personal rights in Bangladesh are improving, particularly for women – but violence against women, the burden of family care, and equity with men remain problematic. By changing language use in the media, monitoring women's health care providers to hold them accountable, using the court systems to challenge laws and policies, and building a grassroots network of women's organizations, organizations like Naripokkho are making real progress in advancing women's rights.

"We have to continue fighting on many fronts. If we are to succeed, it's not enough to protest on the streets or argue at the policy table." — Dr. Shireen Huq, Co-founder, Naripokkho

What Works has been a successful forum for bringing together ministers, mayors, business and community leaders, activists, and social entrepreneurs to build bonds, share, and take away actionable examples. Successes will be replicated to create or modify policies, build collaborative partnerships between business and government and civil society, formulate business strategies to address national and local needs, and gauge progress against the Sustainable Development Goals.

what works

Cognitio

SOCIAL PROGRESS IMPERATIVE

Note: To learn more about What Works and view videos from the 2017 Summit, visit **www.whatworksinspi.com**

Measuring progress to make progress

Around the world, the Social Progress Imperative is encouraging courageous and skillful leaders – in business, universities, nonprofits, and government – to be agents of progress. We have catalyzed a network of partners and users to drive innovation and investment, share experiences, and replicate what works. These agents of progress are bringing together other community leaders to articulate what the positive lived experience should be in nations and communities they call home.

Throughout the Americas, across Europe, and now launching in Asia, progress is in motion. Big change and genuine understanding of impact come with time. Over the coming years, we will report and share the stories of what the data are telling us about the social benefit of capital investments in cities; air quality improvements and better inclusion of minorities in Europe; improvements in economic opportunities for local farmers in Latin America; and priorities to be defined in regions of Asia.

In our nonprofit's first five years, we have seeded a global movement that is redefining how we measure the success of a society. Thanks to our partnerships with dedicated change-makers around the globe, social progress is becoming a central component of policy planning and a leading concern for businesses. As the social progress network continues to grow, new agents of change will use our existing indexes and create new ones to target their actions and generate impact. It has never been enough simply to measure progress – together with our partners, we are driving it.

"The Social Progress Index is a tool, it's not an end in itself. It's a tool that's designed to help business and government and civil society to collaborate better, achieve better outcomes and build better lives."

— Michael Green
CEO, Social Progress Imperative

APPENDICES

Appendix A / Definitions and Data Sources

All data in the 2017 Social Progress Index is the most recent available as of February 1, 2017

Indicator name	Definition	Source	Link
BASIC HUMAN NEEDS: Nutrition and Basic Medical Care			
Undernourishment (% of pop.)	The percentage of the population whose food intake is insufficient to meet dietary energy requirements continuously. Data showing as 5% signifies a prevalence of undernourishment at or below 5%.	Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations	http://www.fao.org/economic/ess/ess-fs/ess-fadata/en/
Depth of food deficit (calories/ undernourished person)	The number of calories needed to lift the undernourished from their status, everything else being constant. The average intensity of food deprivation of the undernourished, estimated as the difference between the average dietary energy requirement and the average dietary energy consumption of the undernourished population (food-deprived), is multiplied by the number of undernourished to provide an estimate of the total food deficit in the country, which is then normalized by the total population.	Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations	http://www.fao.org/economic/ess/ess-fs/ess-fadata/en/
Maternal mortality rate (deaths/100,000 live births)	The annual number of female deaths from any cause related to or aggravated by pregnancy or its management (excluding accidental or incidental causes) during pregnancy and childbirth or within 42 days of termination of pregnancy, irrespective of the duration and site of the pregnancy, per 100,000 live births.	World Health Organization	http://www.who.int/reproductivehealth/publications/monitoring/maternal-mortality-2015/en/
Child mortality rate (deaths/1,000 live births)	The probability of a child born in a specific year dying before reaching the age of five per 1,000 live births.	UN Inter-agency Group for Child Mortality Estimation	http://data.worldbank.org/indicator/SH.DYN.MORT
Deaths from infectious diseases (deaths/100,000)	Age-standardized mortality rate from deaths caused by HIV/AIDS, tuberculosis, diarrhea, intetinal infections, respitory infections, otitis media, meningitis, encephalitis, diptheria, whooping cough, tetnus, measles, varicella, herpes zoster, malaria, Chagas disease, leishmaniasis, typanosomiasis, schistosomiasis, cysticercosis, cycstic echinococcosis, lymphatic filariasis, onchocerciasis, trachoma, dengue, yellow feber, rabies, intestinal nematode infections, food-borne trematodiases, leprosy, ebola, and other and other infectious diseases per 100,000 people.	Institute for Health Metrics and Evaluation	http://vizhub.healthdata.org/gbd-compare/
BASIC HUMAN NEEDS: Water and Sanitation			
Access to piped water (% of pop.)	The percentage of the population with a water service pipe connected with in-house plumbing to one or more taps or a piped water connection to a tap placed in the yard or plot outside the house.	WHO/UNICEF Joint Monitoring Programme for Water Supply and Sanitation	http://www.wssinfo.org/data-estimates/tables/
Rural access to improved water source (% of pop.)	The percentage of the rural population with piped water into dwelling, piped water to yard/plot, public tap or standpipe, tubewell or borehole, protected dug well, protected spring, or rainwater.	WHO/UNICEF Joint Monitoring Programme for Water Supply and Sanitation	http://www.wssinfo.org/data-estimates/tables/
Access to improved sanitation facilities (% of pop.)	The percentage of the population with improved sanitation, including flush toilets, piped sewer systems, septic tanks, flush/pour flush to pit latrine, ventilated improved pit latrines (VIP), pit latrine with slab, and composting toilets.	WHO/UNICEF Joint Monitoring Programme for Water Supply and Sanitation	http://www.wssinfo.org/data-estimates/tables/

Appendix A / **Definitions and Data Sources** *(continued)*

Indicator name	Definition	Source	Link
BASIC HUMAN NEEDS: Shelter			
Availability of affordable housing (% satisfied)	The percentage of respondents answering satisfied to the question, "In your city or area where you live, are you satisfied or dissatisfied with the availability of good, affordable housing?"	Gallup World Poll	
Access to electricity (% of pop.)	The percentage of the population with access to electricity.	Sustainable Energy for All	http://data.worldbank.org/indicator/EG.ELC.ACCS.ZS
Quality of electricity supply (1=low; 7=high)	Average response to the question: "In your country, how would you assess the reliability of the electricity supply (lack of interruptions and lack of voltage fluctuations)? "[1 = not reliable at all; 7 = extremely reliable]	World Economic Forum Global Competitiveness Report	http://reports.weforum.org/global-competitiveness-index/downloads/
Household air pollution attributable deaths (deaths/100,000)	Age standardized deaths caused from indoor air pollution, including indoor air pollution-derived cases of influenza, pneumococcal pneumonia, H influenzae type B pneumonia, respiratory syncytial virus pneumonia, other lower respiratory infections, trachea, bronchus, and lung cancers, ischemic heart disease, ischemic stroke, hemorrhagic and other non-ischemic stroke, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease, and cataracts per 100,000 people.	Institute for Health Metrics and Evaluation	http://vizhub.healthdata.org/gbd-compare/
BASIC HUMAN NEEDS: Personal Safety			
Homicide rate (deaths/100,000)	Number of homicides, defined as unlawful death inflicted upon a person with the intent to cause death or serious injury, per 100,000 people.	UN Office on Drugs and Crime	https://data.unodc.org/
Level of violent crime (1=low; 5=high)	Evaluation based on the question: "Is violent crime likely to pose a significant problem for government and/or business over the next two years?" Measured on a scale of 1 (strongly no) to 5 (strongly yes).	Institute for Economics and Peace Global Peace Index	http://static.visionofhumanity.org/#/page/indexes/global-peace-index
Perceived criminality (1=low; 5=high)	An assessment of the level of domestic security and the degree to which other citizens can be trusted. Measured on a scale of 1 (majority of other citizens can be trusted; very low levels of domestic security) to 5 (very high level of distrust; people are extremely cautious in their dealings withothers; large number of gated communities, high prevalence of security guards).	Institute for Economics and Peace Global Peace Index	http://static.visionofhumanity.org/#/page/indexes/global-peace-index
Political terror (1=low; 5=high)	The level of political violence and terror that a country experiences based on a 5-level "terror scale": 1 = Countries under a secure rule of law, people are not imprisoned for their views, and torture is rare or exceptional. Political murders are extremely rare. 2 = There is a limited amount of imprisonment for nonviolent political activity. However, few persons are affected; torture and beatings are exceptional. Political murder is rare. 3 = There is extensive political imprisonment or a recent history of such imprisonment. Execution or other political murders and brutality may be common. Unlimited detention, with or without a trial, for political views is accepted. 4 = Civil and political rights violations have expanded to large numbers of the population. Murders, disappearances, and torture are a common part of life. In spite of its generality, on this level terror affects those who interest themselves in politics or ideas. 5 = Terror has expanded to the whole population. The leaders of these societies place no limits on the means or thoroughness with which they pursue personal or ideological goals.	Institute for Economics and Peace Global Peace Index	http://static.visionofhumanity.org/#/page/indexes/global-peace-index
Traffic deaths (deaths/100,000)	Estimated road traffic fatal injury deaths per 100,000 population.	World Health Organization	http://apps.who.int/gho/data/node.main.A997

Appendix A / **Definitions and Data Sources** *(continued)*

Indicator name	Definition	Source	Link
FOUNDATIONS OF WELLBEING: Access to Basic Knowledge			
Adult literacy rate (% of pop. aged 15+)	The percentage of the population aged 15 and above who can, with understanding, read and write a short, simple statement on their everyday life. Literacy also encompasses numeracy, the ability to make simple arithmetic calculations.	UN Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization Institute for Statistics	http://data.uis.unesco.org/Index.aspx?DataSetCode=EDULIT_DS&popupcustomise=true&lang=en
Primary school enrollment (% of children)	Total number of students of official primary school age who are enrolled in any level of education, expressed as a percentage of the total population of official primary school age. Statistic is termed 'total net primary enrollment rate.'	UN Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization Institute for Statistics	http://data.uis.unesco.org/Index.aspx?DataSetCode=EDULIT_DS&popupcustomise=true&lang=en
Secondary school enrollment (% of children)	Total enrollment in secondary education, regardless of age, expressed as a percentage of the total population of official secondary education age. The gross enrollment ratio can exceed 100% due to the inclusion of over-aged and under-aged students because of early or late school entrance and grade repetition. In the SPI model, data are capped at 100.	UN Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization Institute for Statistics	http://data.uis.unesco.org/Index.aspx?DataSetCode=EDULIT_DS&popupcustomise=true&lang=en
Gender parity in secondary enrollment (girls/boys)	The ratio of girls to boys enrolled at the secondary level in public and private schools. In the SPI model, absolute distance from 1 is used.	UN Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization Institute for Statistics	http://data.uis.unesco.org/Index.aspx?DataSetCode=EDULIT_DS&popupcustomise=true&lang=en
FOUNDATIONS OF WELLBEING: Access to Information and Communications			
Mobile telephone subscriptions (subscriptions/ 100 people)	Subscriptions to a public mobile telephone service using cellular technology, including the number of pre-paid SIM cards active during the past three months, expressed as the number of mobile telephone subscriptions per 100 inhabitants. In the SPI model, scores are capped at 100 mobile telephones per 100 people.	International Telecommunications Union	http://www.itu.int/en/ITU-D/Statistics/Pages/stat/default.aspx
Internet users (% of pop.)	The estimated number of Internet users out of the total population, using the Internet from any device (including mobile phones) in the last 12 months.	International Telecommunications Union	http://www.itu.int/en/ITU-D/Statistics/Pages/stat/default.aspx
Press Freedom Index (0=most free; 100=least free)	The degree of freedom that journalists, news organizations, and netizens enjoy in each country, and the efforts made by the authorities to respect and ensure respect for this freedom.	Reporters Without Borders	https://rsf.org/en/ranking_table
FOUNDATIONS OF WELLBEING: Health and Wellness			
Life expectancy at 60 (years)	The average number of years that a person of 60 years old could expect to live, if he or she were to pass through life exposed to the sex- and age-specific death rates prevailing at the time of his or her 60 years, for a specific year, in a given country, territory, or geographic area.	World Health Organization	http://apps.who.int/gho/athena/api/download/life_expectancy.xls?target=GHO/WHOSIS_000001,WHOSIS_000015&format=xml&profile=excel
Premature deaths from non-communicable diseases (deaths/100,000)	Mortality rate due to cardiovascular diseases, cancers, diabetes, and chronic respiratory diseases among populations aged 30–70 years.	Institute for Health Metrics and Evaluation	http://ghdx.healthdata.org/record/global-burden-disease-study-2015-gbd-2015-health-related-sustainable-development-goals-sdg
Obesity rate (% of pop.)	The percentage of the population aged 20 years or above with a body mass index (BMI) of 30 kg/m2 or higher (age-standardized estimate), both sexes.	Institute for Health Metrics and Evaluation	http://ghdx.healthdata.org/record/global-burden-disease-study-2013-gbd-2013-obesity-prevalence-1990-2013
Suicide rate (deaths/100,000)	Mortality due to self-inflicted injury, per 100,000 people, age adjusted.	Institute for Health Metrics and Evaluation	http://vizhub.healthdata.org/gbd-compare/

Appendix A / **Definitions and Data Sources** *(continued)*

Indicator name	Definition	Source	Link
FOUNDATIONS OF WELLBEING: Environmental Quality			
Outdoor air pollution attributable deaths (deaths/100,000)	The number of deaths resulting from emissions from industrial activity, households, cars and trucks, expressed as the rate per 100,000 people, age adjusted.	Institute for Health Metrics and Evaluation	http://vizhub.healthdata.org/gbd-compare/
Wastewater treatment (% of wastewater)	The percentage of collected, generated, or produced wastewater that is treated, normalized by the population connected to centralized wastewater treatment facilities.	Yale Center for Environmental Law & Policy and Columbia University Center for International Earth Science Information Network Environmental Performance Index	http://epi.yale.edu/downloads
Biodiversity and habitat (0=no protection; 100=high protection)	The protection of terrestrial and marine areas as well as threatened or endangered species, comprising Critical Habitat Protection, Terrestrial Protected Areas (National Biome Weight), Terrestrial Protected Areas (Global Biome Weight), and Marine Protected Areas, scaled from 0 (no protection) to 100 (high protection).	Yale Center for Environmental Law & Policy and Columbia University Center for International Earth Science Information Network Environmental Performance Index	http://epi.yale.edu/downloads
Greenhouse gas emissions (CO_2 equivalents per GDP)	Emissions of carbon dioxide (CO_2), methane (CH_4), nitrous oxide (N_2O), hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs), perfluorocarbons (PFCs), and sulfur hexafluoride (SF_6) expressed in CO_2 equivalents using 100 year global warming potentials found in the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change Second Assessment Report per GDP-PPP. In the SPI model, data are capped at 1,500.	World Resources Institute	http://cait2.wri.org/wri/Country%20GHG%20Emissions?indicator[]=Total%20GHG%20Emissions%20Excluding%20Land-Use%20Change%20and%20Forestry%20Per%20GDP&indicator[]=Total%20GHG%20Emissions%20Including%20Land-Use%20Change%20and%20Forestry%20Per%20GDP&year[]=201

Appendix A / **Definitions and Data Sources** *(continued)*

Indicator name	Definition	Source	Link
OPPORTUNITY: Personal Rights			
Political rights (0=no rights; 40=full rights)	An evaluation of three subcategories of political rights: electoral process, political pluralism and participation, and functioning of government on a scale from 0 (no political rights) to 40 (full political rights). Some countries and terrotories score below zero on the questions used to copose the indicator. In the SPI model, data below zero are treated as zero.	Freedom House	https://www.freedomhouse.org/report-types/freedom-world
Freedom of expression (0=no freedom; 16=full freedom)	An evaluation of multiple aspects of freedom of expression including private discussion, academic expression, and cultural expression	Freedom House	https://www.freedomhouse.org/report-types/freedom-world
Freedom of assembly (0=no freedom; 1=full freedom)	An assessment of whether people can freely attend community meetings, join political organizations, hold peaceful public demonstrations, sign petitions, and express opinions against government policies and actions without fear of retaliation.	World Justice Project Rule of Law Index	http://data.worldjusticeproject.org/
Private property rights (0=none; 100=full)	The degree to which a country's laws protect private property rights and the degree to which its government enforces those laws, measured on a scale of 0 (private property is outlawed, all property belongs to the state; people do not have the right to sue others and do not have access to the courts; corruption is endemic) to 100 (private property is guaranteed by the government; the court system enforces contracts efficiently and quickly; the justice system punishes those who unlawfully confiscate private property; there is no corruption or expropriation).	Heritage Foundation	http://www.heritage.org/index/download
OPPORTUNITY: Personal Freedom and Choice			
Freedom over life choices (% satisfied)	The percentage of respondents answering satisfied to the question, "Are you satisfied or dissatisfied with your freedom to choose what you do with your life?"	Gallup World Poll	
Freedom of religion (1=low; 4=high)	A combined measure of 20 types of restrictions, including efforts by governments to ban particular faiths, prohibit conversions, limit preaching or give preferential treatment to one or more religious groups. In the SPI model, scores range from 1 (low freedom) to 4 (very high freedom).	Pew Research Center Government Restrictions Index	http://www.pewforum.org/files/2015/02/Restrictions2015_GRI.pdf
Early marriage (% of women aged 15-19)	The percentage of women married between 15-19 years of age.	OECD Gender, Institutions and Development Database	http://stats.oecd.org/Index.aspx?datasetcode=GIDDB2014
Satisfied demand for contraception (% of women)	The percentage of total demand for family planning among married or in-union women aged 15 to 49 that is satisfied with modern methods.	United Nations Population Division	http://www.un.org/en/development/desa/population/theme/family-planning/cp_model.shtml
Corruption (0=high; 100=low)	The perceived level of public sector corruption based on expert opinion, measured on a scale from 0 (highly corrupt) to 100 (very clean).	Transparency International	www.transparency.org/cpi
OPPORTUNITY: Tolerance and Inclusion			
Tolerance for immigrants (0=low; 100=high)	The percentage of respondents answering yes to the question, "Is the city or area where you live a good place or not a good place to live for immigrants from other countries?"	Gallup World Poll	
Tolerance for homosexuals (0=low; 100=high)	The percentage of respondents answering yes to the question, "Is the city or area where you live a good place or not a good place to live for gay or lesbian people?"	Gallup World Poll	
Discrimination and violence against minorities (0=low; 10=high)	Group Grievance indicator. Discrimination, powerlessness, ethnic violence, communal violence, sectarian violence, and religious violence, measured on a scale on 0 (low pressures) to 10 (very high pressures).	Fund for Peace Fragile States Index	http://fsi.fundforpeace.org/

Appendix A / **Definitions and Data Sources** *(continued)*

Indicator name	Definition	Source	Link
Religious tolerance (1=low; 4=high)	A measure of 13 types of religious hostility by private individuals, organizations or groups in society, including religion-related armed conflict or terrorism, mob or sectarian violence, harassment over attire for religious reasons or other religion-related intimation or abuse. In the SPI model, scores range from 1 (low) to 4 (very high).	Pew Research Center Social Hostilities Index	http://www.pewforum.org/files/2016/06/Restrictions2016appendixB.pdf
Community safety net (0=low; 100=high)	The percentage of respondents answering yes to the question, "If you were in trouble, do you have relatives or friends you can count on to help you whenever you need them, or not?"	Gallup World Poll	
OPPORTUNITY: Access to Advanced Education			
Years of tertiary schooling	The average years of tertiary education completed among people over age 25.	Barro-Lee Educational Attainment Dataset	http://www.barrolee.com/
Women's average years in school	The average number of years of school attended by women between 25 and 34 years old, including primary, secondary and tertiary education.	Institute for Health Metrics and Evaluation	http://ghdx.healthdata.org/record/global-educational-attainment-1970-2015
Inequality in the attainment of education (0=low; 1=high)	The loss in potential education due to inequality, calculated as the percentage difference between the Human Development Index Education Index, which comprises mean years of schooling and expected years of schooling, and the Inequality-adjusted Education Index.	United Nations Development Programme	http://hdr.undp.org/en/data
Number of globally ranked universities (0=none; 10=most highly ranked)	The number of universities ranked on any of the three most widely used international university rankings, measured on a scale from 0 (no ranked universities) to 10 (most number of highly ranked universities). Universities in the top 400 on any list are given double weight.	Times Higher Education World University Rankings, QS World University Rankings, and Academic Ranking of World Universities; SPI calculations	https://www.timeshighereducation.com/world-university-rankings/2016/world-ranking#!/page/0/length/25; http://www.topuniversities.com/university-rankings/world-university-rankings/2015#sorting=rank+region=+country=+faculty=+stars=false+search=; http://www.shanghairanking.com/ARWU2015.html
Percent of tertiary students enrolled in globally ranked universities (0=none; 6=highest enrollment)	The enrollment at globally ranked universities as a percentage of the total number of tertiary students on a scale from 0 (0%) to 6 (60+%).	UNESCO; Times Higher Education World University Rankings, QS World University Rankings, and Academic Ranking of World Universities; SPI calculations	Sources above and http://data.uis.unesco.org/Index.aspx?DataSetCode=EDULIT_DS
OTHER			
GDP per capita, PPP (constant 2011 international $)	GDP per capita based on purchasing power parity (PPP). PPP GDP is gross domestic product converted to international dollars using purchasing power parity rates. An international dollar has the same purchasing power over GDP as the U.S. dollar has in the United States. GDP at purchaser's prices is the sum of gross value added by all resident producers in the economy plus any product taxes and minus any subsidies not included in the value of the products. It is calculated without making deductions for depreciation of fabricated assets or for depletion and degradation of natural resources. Data are in constant 2011 international dollars.	World Bank	http://data.worldbank.org/indicator/NY.GDP.PCAP.PP.KD

Appendix B / 2017 Social Progress Index Full Results

	GDP	Social Progress Index	Basic Human Needs	Foundations of Wellbeing	Opportunity	Nutrition and Basic Medical Care	Water and Sanitation	Shelter	Personal Safety	Access to Basic Knowledge	Access to Information and Communications	Health and Wellness	Environmental Quality	Personal Rights	Personal Freedom and Choice	Tolerance and Inclusion	Access to Advanced Education
Denmark	$44,042	90.57	96.79	90.86	84.06	99.28	99.87	94.27	93.75	98.49	95.64	77.91	91.39	97.89	89.83	78.29	70.24
Finland	$38,941	90.53	96.16	89.52	85.90	99.65	99.24	92.64	93.13	96.46	94.77	77.08	89.77	95.77	91.69	84.04	72.12
Iceland	$42,325	90.27	94.96	89.06	86.81	99.54	99.60	87.15	93.55	98.13	93.70	83.32	81.07	92.41	87.17	93.04	74.61
Norway	$63,650	90.27	95.44	91.15	84.21	99.38	99.37	89.27	93.75	98.79	95.80	81.29	88.74	96.32	89.37	81.74	69.39
Switzerland	$56,517	90.10	96.18	91.75	82.37	99.42	99.96	91.38	93.96	98.77	92.19	83.05	92.99	90.74	89.02	75.17	74.57
Canada	$42,895	89.84	94.88	86.64	88.00	99.26	99.42	88.12	92.74	99.68	85.11	81.60	80.17	94.32	88.47	81.87	87.34
Netherlands	$46,354	89.82	94.97	91.15	83.33	99.24	99.27	91.31	90.08	99.22	94.82	80.38	90.17	93.60	88.90	77.73	73.10
Sweden	$45,505	89.66	95.36	90.40	83.21	99.46	99.78	88.19	94.02	95.04	92.80	80.95	92.81	93.51	87.15	78.80	73.36
Australia	$43,631	89.30	94.44	88.82	84.65	99.43	100.00	87.10	91.23	97.99	89.09	83.40	84.82	93.41	87.19	77.19	80.80
New Zealand	$35,159	89.30	93.86	88.72	85.31	99.20	100.00	85.23	91.00	97.38	93.05	80.74	83.72	94.08	88.16	83.89	75.09
Ireland	$61,378	88.91	93.03	87.86	85.86	99.23	95.34	87.82	89.72	98.85	89.98	80.49	82.11	93.09	83.71	86.21	80.42
United Kingdo..	$38,519	88.73	92.96	90.28	82.96	99.11	99.74	87.53	85.45	98.46	89.61	81.16	91.88	90.76	87.31	69.49	84.26
Germany	$43,788	88.50	94.46	89.78	81.26	99.36	99.75	89.03	89.71	97.85	91.06	78.62	91.60	92.75	84.83	73.64	73.84
Austria	$44,048	87.98	95.72	89.56	78.64	99.53	100.00	90.15	93.22	98.00	90.70	78.77	90.78	93.93	84.41	73.76	62.47
Belgium	$41,826	87.15	93.27	87.84	80.34	99.19	99.83	90.18	83.87	95.03	90.62	75.67	90.03	89.44	84.79	75.17	71.94
Spain	$32,330	86.96	92.28	90.98	77.63	99.37	99.95	86.43	83.37	99.55	86.74	84.92	92.70	84.67	75.36	77.99	72.51
Japan	$37,872	86.44	95.92	87.57	75.83	99.19	99.58	93.25	91.66	99.86	86.70	79.89	83.82	85.66	78.60	62.11	76.95
United States	$52,704	86.43	93.42	84.19	81.68	98.96	98.77	89.18	86.76	97.95	84.63	75.88	78.31	88.98	79.88	68.30	89.55
France	$37,775	85.92	92.49	89.16	76.10	99.27	99.56	88.40	82.74	99.59	86.85	79.06	91.14	86.03	81.50	61.16	75.72
Portugal	$26,514	85.44	93.45	87.00	75.88	99.10	99.89	84.38	90.41	98.11	85.06	80.11	84.71	88.93	78.73	76.17	59.69
Slovenia	$29,097	84.32	94.05	86.04	72.87	99.41	99.15	84.84	92.81	99.36	84.35	76.31	84.15	79.87	80.85	63.76	67.00
Czech Republic	$30,381	84.22	95.50	85.00	72.15	99.39	99.71	89.98	92.92	98.79	88.67	72.24	80.30	86.91	76.50	57.86	67.33
Estonia	$27,345	82.96	91.97	85.19	71.71	99.46	97.76	87.24	83.41	97.40	91.46	70.52	81.40	91.92	78.59	50.25	66.08
Italy	$34,220	82.62	89.10	88.30	70.46	99.50	99.84	84.94	72.10	98.99	79.81	84.81	89.58	79.67	66.14	63.66	72.38
Chile	$22,197	82.54	88.62	85.95	73.04	98.14	96.27	82.40	77.67	97.64	83.16	79.37	83.65	89.66	73.54	72.76	56.19
Korea, Republ..	$34,387	82.08	91.74	83.96	70.54	99.22	92.44	88.16	87.13	97.25	86.36	72.44	79.78	72.43	70.04	63.28	76.40
Cyprus	$30,604	81.15	90.63	84.31	68.52	99.51	100.00	81.85	81.15	99.05	83.88	81.28	73.02	84.95	71.04	52.96	65.12
Costa Rica	$14,647	81.03	87.75	84.82	70.54	97.65	93.75	84.18	75.41	97.10	85.04	82.51	74.61	83.06	77.20	69.86	52.02
Israel	$31,971	80.61	90.95	87.10	63.78	99.27	100.00	83.23	81.28	99.06	81.56	84.04	83.74	77.80	71.68	32.56	73.06
Slovakia	$28,254	80.22	93.22	83.87	63.56	98.95	99.02	86.09	88.84	96.40	88.99	69.79	80.31	78.48	68.67	50.02	57.04
Uruguay	$19,952	80.09	87.22	76.51	76.54	97.86	95.80	81.21	74.02	92.49	84.52	67.92	61.09	89.54	81.29	80.18	55.17
Poland	$25,323	79.65	90.69	81.48	66.80	99.23	97.15	78.71	87.65	97.53	82.37	67.12	78.88	79.59	73.44	50.38	63.76
Greece	$24,095	78.92	89.87	85.77	61.13	99.39	99.67	82.48	77.92	95.58	79.60	82.68	85.20	72.63	56.68	47.58	67.65
Latvia	$23,080	78.61	89.05	83.16	63.62	98.83	93.22	80.07	84.08	98.52	87.84	60.38	85.89	78.48	69.96	44.50	61.55
Lithuania	$26,807	78.09	87.64	78.48	68.13	99.17	91.17	80.59	79.64	98.40	84.77	52.75	78.00	86.03	68.42	52.52	65.56
Croatia	$20,664	78.04	91.80	82.26	60.06	99.37	98.77	85.82	83.26	97.83	81.32	69.73	80.13	73.88	64.95	45.36	56.05
Hungary	$24,831	77.32	90.06	80.67	61.22	99.16	98.90	80.45	81.75	98.30	82.03	62.64	79.71	63.72	65.90	50.96	64.32
Argentina	$19,126	75.90	81.71	79.41	66.58	97.34	98.32	67.25	63.92	97.23	82.29	70.57	67.54	67.51	67.52	72.42	58.88
Mauritius	$18,864	75.18	88.97	75.91	60.65	96.72	97.66	78.76	82.73	94.89	76.16	67.95	64.66	81.72	64.80	65.81	30.25
Panama	$20,885	74.61	83.02	80.87	59.95	93.34	84.46	79.57	74.70	90.52	75.34	82.46	75.17	70.71	65.03	62.96	41.09
Bulgaria	$17,000	74.42	88.18	76.54	58.52	98.70	94.74	83.42	75.86	96.27	75.33	62.82	71.76	68.17	58.77	49.34	57.81
Kuwait	$70,107	74.12	90.15	78.73	53.47	98.25	97.61	80.26	84.48	92.04	82.82	72.80	67.27	40.33	66.12	56.95	50.46
Brazil	$14,455	73.97	76.49	79.55	65.86	97.07	86.62	73.90	48.38	94.11	76.67	73.57	73.87	71.64	73.23	68.34	50.21
Romania	$20,484	73.53	84.01	77.51	59.08	98.29	83.12	75.09	79.54	94.90	78.96	65.57	70.59	71.83	70.06	39.43	54.99
Serbia	$13,278	73.41	88.51	75.10	56.61	99.04	96.68	76.52	81.80	98.20	80.25	63.44	58.52	69.43	53.29	48.87	54.87
Jamaica	$8,333	72.42	75.30	78.60	63.37	94.34	81.44	76.05	49.37	88.05	79.85	75.79	70.70	73.95	73.25	64.94	41.32
Peru	$11,768	72.15	76.59	81.55	58.31	94.27	72.01	76.00	64.06	97.10	72.82	80.78	75.50	73.86	60.96	54.05	44.38
Mexico	$16,490	71.93	79.22	77.66	58.91	97.17	89.44	79.38	50.90	93.58	64.93	77.59	74.53	65.87	60.31	52.92	56.54
Colombia	$12,988	71.72	75.59	79.06	60.51	94.42	78.34	77.95	51.66	93.62	71.45	78.05	73.11	65.62	67.03	58.03	51.35
Malaysia	$25,312	71.14	87.53	75.59	50.29	97.24	94.46	87.13	71.30	90.64	74.56	68.04	69.13	43.57	58.72	41.97	56.88
Tunisia	$10,770	71.09	84.00	77.26	51.99	97.54	89.22	77.51	71.73	91.41	74.24	72.72	70.68	71.74	62.60	36.92	36.71
Albania	$11,015	70.97	85.53	78.35	49.04	98.17	90.69	80.45	72.82	95.99	78.81	74.99	63.62	60.53	54.87	48.60	32.16
Georgia	$9,016	70.80	87.14	74.06	51.21	95.96	90.26	79.48	82.87	99.26	75.38	62.85	58.74	64.85	57.87	26.30	55.80
Montenegro	$15,254	70.01	83.88	75.94	50.22	99.38	94.00	67.97	74.17	95.52	79.02	66.12	63.12	62.05	49.96	46.38	42.49
Ecuador	$10,777	69.97	79.15	77.99	52.77	92.59	79.60	79.22	65.18	97.11	66.61	77.23	71.01	49.27	63.88	60.45	37.51
Jordan	$10,240	69.85	85.38	74.60	49.56	97.20	93.50	81.38	69.43	92.68	70.64	73.29	61.80	44.56	64.17	40.28	49.25
Saudi Arabia	$50,284	69.45	86.42	76.51	45.43	97.93	89.58	86.39	71.77	90.03	69.17	74.52	72.32	25.17	60.98	48.31	47.26
Macedonia	$12,732	69.35	86.99	73.32	47.74	99.28	94.35	78.84	75.48	88.72	77.94	66.88	59.73	58.11	52.14	41.13	39.60
Armenia	$7,907	69.01	85.83	76.49	44.70	96.85	96.42	77.71	72.32	95.69	77.91	66.12	66.26	43.06	49.32	39.84	46.58
Paraguay	$8,639	68.73	78.00	73.46	54.73	92.10	89.32	64.82	65.77	87.80	73.45	72.13	60.48	60.18	64.99	62.89	30.88
Turkey	$19,460	68.68	85.16	74.95	45.94	98.38	98.34	79.31	64.61	94.90	66.94	76.77	61.18	35.69	56.13	41.50	50.43
Thailand	$15,347	68.51	82.12	74.12	49.28	94.99	85.01	86.76	61.73	94.86	66.87	67.31	67.45	37.30	72.02	37.51	50.30
Dominican Re..	$13,372	68.42	73.49	77.23	54.54	90.54	78.79	68.87	55.75	85.07	71.03	75.39	77.43	62.20	63.27	62.49	30.20
Ukraine	$7,457	68.35	79.91	68.62	56.53	98.47	89.12	74.74	57.32	97.52	73.84	52.73	50.37	62.99	53.56	40.52	69.07

SPI: 0 — 100

GDP: $500 — $150,000

Appendix B / **2017 Social Progress Index Full Results** *(continued)*

	GDP	Social Progress Index	Basic Human Needs	Foundations of Wellbeing	Opportunity	Nutrition and Basic Medical Care	Water and Sanitation	Shelter	Personal Safety	Access to Basic Knowledge	Access to Information and Communications	Health and Wellness	Environmental Quality	Personal Rights	Personal Freedom and Choice	Tolerance and Inclusion	Access to Advanced Education
Belarus	$16,662	67.80	87.20	67.37	48.84	99.29	95.42	78.74	75.36	99.50	69.25	45.11	55.61	23.49	61.58	48.00	62.29
South Africa	$12,393	67.25	67.48	69.79	64.50	88.64	73.02	62.82	45.43	86.32	78.83	53.39	60.60	74.71	72.94	60.70	49.65
Russia	$23,895	67.17	79.31	72.09	50.10	98.34	83.50	77.57	57.83	98.48	73.37	47.14	69.35	25.42	56.77	36.15	82.08
Philippines	$6,938	67.10	71.88	71.18	58.23	88.65	71.59	68.54	58.74	92.61	67.19	61.04	63.89	63.31	66.69	55.38	47.56
Bolivia	$6,531	66.93	74.42	73.36	53.00	86.16	68.29	75.52	67.71	91.22	70.51	70.96	60.73	57.11	60.94	60.45	33.52
El Salvador	$8,096	66.43	71.92	76.36	51.00	92.29	79.68	78.37	37.36	92.51	70.16	75.43	67.35	64.26	65.06	51.77	22.91
Lebanon	$13,089	66.31	75.94	75.65	47.35	98.22	87.06	63.48	55.00	83.74	78.14	72.06	68.67	50.22	58.29	34.06	46.83
Moldova	$4,742	66.31	79.32	70.52	49.08	97.96	71.17	72.27	75.89	93.07	75.65	59.99	53.36	64.77	52.11	37.30	42.14
Sri Lanka	$11,048	66.16	76.30	72.75	49.42	87.19	78.05	71.29	68.68	95.47	64.22	62.15	69.15	53.60	66.21	34.11	43.76
Kazakhstan	$23,522	66.01	81.23	66.60	50.20	97.86	81.98	76.29	68.79	98.98	71.46	44.18	51.77	27.97	61.83	49.12	61.87
Algeria	$13,823	65.41	78.15	77.09	40.98	95.01	81.23	70.58	65.77	93.31	67.65	77.81	69.59	36.21	60.11	38.58	29.00
Azerbaijan	$16,699	65.33	82.66	73.83	39.50	96.18	76.97	82.40	75.10	98.42	71.83	65.66	59.42	18.40	48.17	39.90	51.53
Kyrgyzstan	$3,225	65.33	77.85	68.72	49.44	95.22	80.04	69.36	66.77	97.64	69.92	55.32	51.98	48.60	60.59	44.73	43.81
Morocco	$7,365	65.25	77.43	73.19	45.12	94.54	66.43	80.84	67.92	81.66	72.33	68.44	70.34	45.36	64.54	43.30	27.27
Indonesia	$10,385	65.10	74.13	70.81	50.34	91.98	56.54	78.02	69.99	92.10	63.31	62.09	65.74	64.54	64.16	35.47	37.19
Botswana	$14,876	64.44	70.62	66.78	55.92	75.60	77.62	53.89	75.37	87.89	71.95	43.32	63.99	69.06	76.44	57.49	20.68
Nicaragua	$4,884	64.17	72.57	74.53	45.40	88.49	66.17	66.76	68.87	85.39	67.62	77.15	67.97	40.73	55.72	58.63	26.53
Egypt	$10,250	63.76	82.30	68.94	40.05	96.72	97.64	70.30	64.54	91.15	62.69	62.94	58.99	28.14	57.84	35.10	39.11
China	$13,572	63.72	79.98	68.67	42.53	94.94	81.80	79.15	64.01	95.48	53.18	68.03	58.00	15.21	71.09	37.76	46.05
Guatemala	$7,253	62.62	71.70	72.12	44.05	88.53	77.98	75.12	45.17	80.61	66.08	74.01	67.79	54.54	59.56	47.72	14.39
Uzbekistan	$5,716	62.02	82.58	61.34	42.12	94.76	76.79	88.08	70.70	98.04	52.06	60.06	35.22	5.31	68.00	55.78	39.39
Mongolia	$11,478	62.00	67.05	61.31	57.65	87.50	47.37	60.62	72.70	96.13	68.54	36.68	43.87	70.18	65.09	51.41	43.92
Namibia	$9,778	61.98	61.88	69.37	54.68	65.30	58.23	57.75	66.24	81.22	73.51	60.38	62.36	66.93	74.96	54.16	22.67
Iran	$16,507	61.93	82.71	69.24	33.86	97.17	90.96	77.84	64.86	94.38	57.77	68.80	56.00	18.62	50.08	26.38	40.34
Honduras	$4,785	61.76	68.56	69.28	47.44	91.05	84.16	66.91	32.14	82.56	60.21	74.09	60.27	50.00	59.96	57.21	22.59
Ghana	$3,955	61.44	60.46	69.92	53.95	86.15	43.02	43.12	69.54	86.71	72.76	57.55	62.66	80.10	60.17	52.02	23.51
Nepal	$2,312	60.08	69.69	65.20	45.35	88.88	58.04	56.48	75.35	81.43	64.46	63.95	50.98	55.76	54.49	61.58	9.58
Tajikistan	$2,661	58.87	71.91	67.97	36.74	78.36	67.83	72.92	68.52	93.58	58.74	65.89	53.68	16.35	48.02	46.83	35.78
India	$5,730	58.39	66.74	61.15	47.29	84.64	57.57	64.42	60.35	85.57	56.10	55.91	47.01	72.30	58.43	26.36	32.05
Senegal	$2,274	58.31	64.64	61.90	48.38	84.27	55.06	48.84	70.41	66.24	68.44	56.27	56.65	74.75	54.64	56.68	7.46
Kenya	$2,901	56.17	52.65	68.78	47.08	74.35	35.97	48.83	51.43	79.49	66.82	62.67	66.13	52.59	60.82	37.20	37.70
Myanmar	$4,931	55.69	66.23	61.28	39.57	85.39	56.50	57.16	65.88	85.42	54.55	59.29	45.86	31.21	64.80	35.91	26.35
Bangladesh	$3,137	54.84	67.40	60.41	36.72	86.34	57.26	55.94	70.05	77.14	53.30	62.69	48.52	37.53	49.98	41.59	17.78
Cambodia	$3,278	54.54	61.47	62.70	39.44	87.73	45.64	52.16	60.36	73.56	62.91	56.57	57.76	37.61	61.83	41.19	17.13
Laos	$5,345	54.17	68.45	57.54	36.53	81.64	56.83	59.31	76.00	81.59	34.40	53.65	60.53	19.78	58.13	51.04	17.19
Malawi	$1,112	53.09	54.88	58.80	45.59	70.37	50.87	33.69	64.57	75.96	43.22	57.09	58.92	67.99	58.96	41.10	14.31
Rwanda	$1,655	52.78	57.38	60.83	40.13	73.81	49.82	44.85	61.04	76.07	46.94	62.73	57.59	28.38	73.85	42.36	15.93
Swaziland	$8,122	52.64	58.20	54.78	44.93	66.53	54.67	45.58	66.04	80.84	52.05	32.74	53.48	33.21	65.38	57.56	23.56
Lesotho	$2,770	51.74	51.63	51.21	52.38	67.66	45.60	34.22	59.02	65.33	66.66	29.03	43.83	60.18	63.80	60.98	24.54
Benin	$1,932	51.69	52.79	57.15	45.13	78.90	38.70	30.52	63.02	63.85	59.05	52.81	52.88	71.33	48.78	52.88	7.53
Pakistan	$4,706	51.54	64.38	54.34	35.90	78.34	66.89	57.99	54.30	61.82	48.00	58.79	48.74	46.18	52.09	22.43	22.91
Côte d'Ivoire	$3,300	50.65	54.43	58.09	39.45	71.68	44.75	45.92	55.38	55.27	67.45	49.53	60.10	53.93	49.71	44.80	9.35
Tanzania	$2,510	50.21	47.45	61.35	41.84	69.96	23.51	34.52	61.80	68.75	55.34	59.09	62.21	50.86	55.35	43.03	18.13
Zimbabwe	$1,678	50.10	51.31	60.78	38.21	63.66	44.62	42.66	54.28	81.60	56.95	49.44	55.15	26.09	56.31	43.77	26.66
Nigeria	$5,639	50.01	47.90	63.31	38.81	72.88	30.54	45.25	42.93	62.94	66.04	62.53	61.75	53.13	45.72	36.39	20.01
Burkina Faso	$1,593	49.75	49.69	56.36	43.19	71.48	37.80	28.49	60.98	54.85	60.92	55.59	54.07	63.04	47.43	55.64	6.65
Uganda	$1,738	49.59	52.50	57.17	39.11	73.94	36.78	36.58	62.68	68.00	48.55	54.92	57.21	41.77	47.99	36.93	29.77
Liberia	$785	49.34	46.11	59.48	42.44	62.53	29.17	30.97	61.75	62.06	56.55	59.29	60.01	61.87	53.10	45.37	9.42
Mauritania	$3,694	48.44	55.02	58.21	32.08	80.96	42.25	35.96	60.91	62.84	64.47	64.25	41.27	39.56	33.83	44.50	10.44
Congo, Repub..	$5,993	48.24	45.58	62.66	36.49	71.06	24.06	34.19	52.99	77.95	61.72	53.98	56.98	28.29	48.44	45.66	23.57
Togo	$1,372	48.21	49.40	55.86	39.37	78.44	19.68	31.84	67.65	64.63	52.30	53.77	52.73	46.98	51.37	47.65	11.49
Mozambique	$1,120	47.90	45.53	58.20	39.96	66.89	20.06	36.49	58.67	68.76	55.13	52.41	56.49	53.05	42.08	54.47	10.27
Cameroon	$2,926	47.83	51.72	55.84	35.91	74.93	37.77	39.50	54.68	78.44	53.49	54.45	36.99	38.25	46.47	41.72	17.22
Mali	$1,905	47.75	54.02	53.75	35.49	76.40	36.02	41.76	61.89	47.05	60.93	59.35	47.68	52.08	35.51	48.43	5.94
Madagascar	$1,376	47.40	45.52	54.75	41.95	71.78	16.03	28.89	65.36	71.41	44.44	53.12	50.00	57.64	40.95	53.08	16.12
Sierra Leone	$1,474	47.10	43.49	58.63	39.19	54.89	21.87	23.34	73.85	71.16	58.91	49.64	54.80	56.83	44.67	50.43	4.82
Ethiopia	$1,530	45.29	52.19	54.26	29.42	70.56	28.86	42.95	66.38	65.75	39.06	60.04	52.18	20.12	53.14	36.49	7.94
Yemen	$2,649	43.46	54.24	52.03	24.11	78.31	43.73	45.72	49.22	64.66	43.20	53.42	46.85	26.64	41.20	23.28	5.31
Guinea	$1,135	43.40	44.99	53.22	31.98	69.61	35.61	23.53	51.23	48.28	57.47	56.68	50.45	46.09	37.31	41.07	3.45
Niger	$897	42.97	47.92	45.92	35.08	74.98	22.39	31.24	63.07	37.12	45.68	61.29	39.60	53.73	36.77	41.98	7.85
Angola	$6,938	40.73	44.37	48.76	29.05	69.33	27.63	28.49	52.04	60.59	47.64	46.10	40.70	28.28	27.26	46.70	13.96
Chad	$2,044	35.69	36.72	44.62	25.72	52.61	20.34	22.68	51.26	40.63	37.50	56.30	44.07	27.81	27.83	42.08	5.15
Afghanistan	$1,808	35.66	42.65	38.00	26.34	72.74	29.33	22.92	45.63	53.37	47.61	29.37	21.64	37.40	38.97	22.25	6.73
Central Africa..	$581	28.38	27.82	35.41	21.90	41.62	26.67	6.96	36.05	37.03	35.61	37.16	31.83	20.55	35.90	18.75	12.39

SPI: 0 100

GDP: $500 $150,000

Appendix B / **2017 Social Progress Index Full Results** *(continued)*

	GDP	Social Progress Index	Basic Human Needs	Foundations of Wellbeing	Opportunity	Nutrition and Basic Medical Care	Water and Sanitation	Shelter	Personal Safety	Access to Basic Knowledge	Access to Information and Communications	Health and Wellness	Environmental Quality	Personal Rights	Personal Freedom and Choice	Tolerance and Inclusion	Access to Advanced Education
American Sa..							85.77										
Andorra							100.00				87.42	86.21					
Anguilla																	
Antigua and ..	$21,660						92.35			95.21	82.80	76.76					
Aruba							96.61			98.99							
Bahamas, The	$21,603						95.31					75.33		81.33			
Bahrain	$43,754			79.28	49.25		99.74	87.45	71.60	96.97	77.38	73.08	69.69	27.24	66.93	51.94	50.91
Barbados	$15,408			76.59		97.30	98.23	83.88		94.92	83.00	71.08	57.37	89.73			33.86
Belize	$7,968			66.66		95.39	91.69	73.01		90.43	62.81	62.08	51.32	68.35		55.83	28.77
Bermuda	$50,669																
Bhutan	$7,861			71.63	47.48		72.64	80.42	89.21	80.61	67.67	72.07	66.15	61.46	73.23	48.38	6.85
Bosnia and H..	$10,119		86.40		44.99	99.25	94.85	75.08	76.43		76.38	73.40	50.22	52.93	47.66	43.42	35.96
British Virgin ..							90.08										
Brunei Darus..	$73,605					98.14				98.27	71.82	74.38					
Burundi	$683			56.12	29.85		45.69	25.18	60.29	79.55	35.07	55.55	54.29	28.49	45.25	34.41	11.24
Cabo Verde	$6,158			72.19		92.51	74.08	59.78		90.33	77.26	61.87	59.30	85.54			20.61
Cayman Islan..																	
Channel Islan..																	
Comoros	$1,393			63.93	39.15		57.37	50.92		77.65	50.24	59.63	68.20	53.42	40.27	50.22	12.70
Congo, Demo..	$737			52.22	33.79		19.75	24.16	40.71	64.02	38.36	57.48	49.01	29.96	38.82	48.96	17.39
Cook Islands							92.84										
Cuba	$19,950			67.38		98.44	86.95		79.17	94.76	31.74	72.77	70.27	20.86	50.22		46.80
Curaçao																	
Djibouti	$3,279			46.41	32.44	80.42	53.66		68.72	62.16	26.58	57.22	39.67	31.13	50.73	40.12	7.78
Dominica	$10,204						81.48					72.03	69.80	76.67			
Equatorial Gu..	$38,243						35.39		69.64		41.98	53.45	54.28				
Eritrea				36.32			26.27		57.89	46.84	8.90	49.07	40.49				
Falkland Isla..																	
Faroe Islands																	
Fiji	$8,756					95.63	84.46				74.51	43.53	63.74				37.55
French Guiana							80.94										
French Polyn..							98.89										
Gabon	$18,860		69.40		44.74	87.69	55.99	61.51	72.41		67.34	58.89	64.07	42.70	49.98	56.62	29.67
Gambia, The	$1,578		60.43	55.46		80.74	61.25	43.73	55.98	67.95	60.19	59.51	34.21	24.76	42.16		8.25
Gibraltar																	
Greenland							100.00										
Grenada	$12,734						93.86					63.26					
Guadeloupe							98.58										
Guam							95.91										
Guernsey																	
Guinea-Bissau	$1,367			51.84		68.83	30.27		58.33	58.29	52.39	48.45	48.24	45.41	43.45		6.76
Guyana	$7,064		74.27	60.92		87.90	85.06	64.08	60.04	88.25	61.64	42.07	51.72	67.49			29.93
Haiti	$1,651		43.82		33.78	54.70	27.61	30.54	62.44		56.21	55.93	47.33	42.18	38.35	40.11	14.47
Hong Kong	$53,463										85.14				84.63		
Iraq	$14,459		70.17	57.35		84.83	74.63	79.44	41.77	73.29	55.06	55.97	45.08		48.20	28.33	37.79
Jersey																	
Kiribati	$1,873					90.72	39.67					38.20					
Korea, Demo..						74.45	90.87		62.12	96.66	10.72	54.14					
Kosovo	$9,142																

SPI: 0 — 100

GDP: $500 — $150,000

Appendix B / **2017 Social Progress Index Full Results** *(continued)*

	GDP	Social Progress Index	Basic Human Needs	Foundations of Wellbeing	Opportunity	Nutrition and Basic Medical Care	Water and Sanitation	Shelter	Personal Safety	Access to Basic Knowledge	Access to Information and Communications	Health and Wellness	Environmental Quality	Personal Rights	Personal Freedom and Choice	Tolerance and Inclusion	Access to Advanced Education
Libya				64.61	35.88			68.75	26.39	91.47	56.37	68.14	42.45	19.87	53.97	45.50	24.17
Liechtenstein											92.12						
Luxembourg	$92,468			91.43	82.98	99.51	99.22	89.14		97.67	93.80	81.63	92.63	92.41	86.28	84.26	68.99
Macao	$104,718									96.51							
Maldives	$11,994					97.05	83.63				74.85	75.15					14.88
Malta	$32,720			86.65	69.97	99.07	100.00	82.51		92.14	84.58	84.33	85.58	87.99	73.92	78.46	39.52
Marshall Isla..	$3,673						65.09			82.23		48.23					
Martinique																	
Mayotte																	
Micronesia	$3,284						63.18					48.21					
Monaco																	
Montserrat							92.91										
Nauru	$14,975																
New Caledon..							97.57										
Niue							98.74										
North Cyprus																	
Northern Mar..							87.99										
Oman	$37,541		86.92	75.34		97.20	85.51	86.44	78.53	96.26	77.73	75.40	51.98	37.12	62.61		
Palau	$14,386						92.17			89.69							
Papua New G..	$2,723			47.57			17.77		54.46	64.53	46.80	32.88	46.06	59.30	51.87		23.08
Puerto Rico	$33,844							79.70		85.57							
Qatar	$132,938			82.26	55.45		97.77	86.64	86.10	93.33	84.41	77.91	73.40	45.05	68.35	60.92	47.47
Réunion							98.17										
Samoa	$5,574					96.46	92.97			92.80	59.68	62.37					
San Marino																	
Sao Tome an..	$3,023					89.86	57.77			88.60		64.55					
Seychelles	$25,525						95.79			92.54	77.18	67.21					
Singapore	$80,192			82.97	71.06		100.00	94.28	93.90	85.93	75.07	83.78	87.11	60.85	83.23	69.53	70.62
Solomon Isla..	$2,067					90.44	46.59					37.32	55.78				
Somalia							10.99		40.60		32.16	50.35			50.25		
Somaliland																	
South Sudan	$1,741						23.02			16.48		54.73				29.33	
St. Helena																	
St. Kitts and ..	$23,563						92.84										
St. Lucia	$10,279						91.50					71.97		82.87			
St. Martin																	
St. Pierre and..																	
St. Vincent a..	$10,462					95.31	84.80					64.78		82.16			
Sudan	$4,121		49.88	48.65		77.11	31.48	41.70	49.25	55.82	42.43	60.04	36.31		27.78	28.38	12.38
Suriname	$15,687			72.09	57.26	92.68	78.59	72.38		83.22	78.38	57.89	68.87	70.19	68.87	58.71	31.28
Syria																	
Taiwan											84.87						
Timor-Leste	$2,253		58.22			78.66	41.97	48.42	63.84	83.12	64.72	63.37		58.99	57.37		15.66
Tokelau																	
Tonga	$5,198						91.01			94.08	66.34	61.81					
Trinidad and ..	$31,284		79.72		61.92	94.50	90.52	78.94	54.93		82.92	59.17	59.42	75.40	67.61	65.13	39.55
Turkmenistan	$15,527		71.11	57.83		93.65	44.74	77.81	68.23	93.86	45.57	56.56	35.32	9.49	58.37	59.56	
Turks and Ca..							68.45										
Tuvalu	$3,687						92.36										

SPI: 0 — 100

GDP: $500 — $150,000

Appendix B / **2017 Social Progress Index Full Results** *(continued)*

	GDP	Social Progress Index	Basic Human Needs	Foundations of Wellbeing	Opportunity	Nutrition and Basic Medical Care	Water and Sanitation	Shelter	Personal Safety	Access to Basic Knowledge	Access to Information and Communications	Health and Wellness	Environmental Quality	Personal Rights	Personal Freedom and Choice	Tolerance and Inclusion	Access to Advanced Education
United Arab ..	$65,717		90.77		56.12	98.38	93.44	90.35	80.92		83.69	69.92	75.87	31.01	75.25	62.75	55.47
Vanuatu	$2,806					93.40	65.39					42.56					
Vatican City																	
Venezuela														30.50			
Vietnam	$5,667		78.82		41.91	92.29	71.68	76.29	75.03		59.12	73.79	61.19	23.71	66.09	49.75	28.08
Virgin Islands..							84.99										
Wallis and Fu..																	
West Bank a..	$4,715						76.99	79.20	71.52	89.09	64.41	67.76			60.54	32.03	34.50
Western Sah..																	
Zambia	$3,602		48.01		45.05	57.74	36.23	32.80	65.25		56.58	47.08	54.89	49.63	60.36	48.54	21.69

SPI: 0 100

GDP: $500 $150,000

Appendix C / Social Progress Index vs Log of GDP Per Capita



Appendix D / **Country Scorecard Summary**



Appendix D / **Country Scorecard Summary** *(continued)*



- Strength relative to the 15 countries with most similar GDP per capita
- Neither strength nor weakness relative to the 15 countries with most similar GDP per capita
- Weakness relative to the 15 countries with most similar GDP per capita

Appendix D / **Country Scorecard Summary** *(continued)*



- Strength relative to the 15 countries with most similar GDP per capita
- Neither strength nor weakness relative to the 15 countries with most similar GDP per capita
- Weakness relative to the 15 countries with most similar GDP per capita

Appendix D / **Country Scorecard Summary** *(continued)*



- Strength relative to the 15 countries with most similar GDP per capita
- Neither strength nor weakness relative to the 15 countries with most similar GDP per capita
- Weakness relative to the 15 countries with most similar GDP per capita

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

BRIZIO BIONDI-MORRA
CHAIR

Fundación Avina, Avina Americas
Chair Emeritus of INCAE
Business School

ROBERTO ARTAVIA LORÍA
VICE CHAIR

VIVA Trust
Fundación Latinoamérica Posible

DAVID CRUICKSHANK
Deloitte Global Chairman

SALLY OSBERG
Skoll Foundation

ÁLVARO RODRÍGUEZ
ARREGUI
IGNIA Partners, LLC

MATTHEW BISHOP
The Economist

MICHAEL GREEN
CEO
Social Progress Imperative

LEAD SCIENTIFIC TEAM

PROFESSOR MICHAEL
E. PORTER, CHAIR
Bishop William Lawrence
University Professor, Harvard
Business School

SCOTT STERN
Massachusetts Institute
of Technology

ADVISORS

JUDITH RODIN
The Rockefeller Foundation
(former president)

HERNANDO DE SOTO
Institute for Liberty
and Democracy

NGAIRE WOODS
University of Oxford

COLLABORATORS

The creation of the Social Progress Index has been made possible only with the help of many, many people and organizations. We thank everyone who has contributed to our effort. We could never hope to name all those who have helped us, but we would like to highlight the following individuals and organizations for their contributions. To anyone we may have forgotten, we can only ask that you be as generous in spirit as you were with your time.

Thanks to our partners Deloitte Touche Tohmatsu Limited, Ford Foundation and Skoll Foundation. We are also grateful to several individual donors. These organizations and individuals had faith in our project and have generously funded our work.

Thanks to Deloitte for their significant contributions globally across a number of strategic areas: leadership and direction on the board of directors; strategic input to develop an engagement strategy for the private sector; convening key stakeholders around the Social Progress Index and the Social Progress Imperative's agenda; economic consulting expertise and insight to author a global report on the relationship between foreign direct investment and social progress; strategic communications advice, expertise and execution to support launch activities globally, and in country, with the media, government and the private sector to build awareness and advance the global debate on social progress; guidance and support in progressing subnational index discussions in North America and the EU; and active engagement in social progress networks across Latin America to advance discussions and actions on national priorities. We especially want to thank Leena Patel for her invaluable contributions.

Special thanks to the great team at Skoll Foundation: Edwin Ou, Zach Slobig, Renee Kaplan, Suzana Grego and Alison Gilbert. At the Skoll World Forum, Jessica Fleuti, thanks to Sarah Borgman, Lindsey Fishleder, Jill Ultan, Gabriel Diamond, Phil Collis and Tina Tan-Zane.

The Forum provided a platform for the 2013 launch of our organization and the beta version of our index, as well as for the 2014 launch of the Social Progress Network and the 2017 event, "Porter on Progress." Additionally, the Forum has enabled us to benefit from the wisdom of some of the world's leading social innovators.

At The Rockefeller Foundation, thanks to Zia Khan, Nancy MacPherson, John Irons, Alyson Wise, Jeremy Cooper, Tommy O'Donnell, Laura Gordon, Abigail Carlton, Erissa Scalera, Michael Myers, Selina Patton and Laura Fishler.

Much thanks for the groundbreaking work and inspiration of Professor Jean-Paul Fitoussi, Institut d'Études Politiques de Paris; Professor Amartya Sen, Harvard University; Professor Joseph E. Stiglitz, Columbia University; Professor Enrico Giovannini, University of Rome Tor Vergata; and the late Professor Mahbub ul Haq, University of Karachi. Our project would be literally unimaginable without the ability to build on their work.

Thanks also to scholars whose wisdom has helped shape our work: Marc Fleurbaey, Princeton University and the members of the International Panel on Social Progress; Nava Ashraf, Harvard Business School; Sigal Barsade, Wharton School, University of Pennsylvania; Manuel Trajtenberg, Council for Higher Education in Israel; Justin Wolfers, University of Michigan; Denise Lievesley, Green Templeton College, University of Oxford; Sabina Alkire, Oxford Poverty and Human Development Initiative, University of Oxford; Terra Lawson-Remer, Cimarron; and Allister McGregor, Institute for Development Studies, University of Sussex.

Very special thanks to Professor Michael E. Porter of Harvard Business School, without whose knowledge and expertise our work would be impossible. Also at

Harvard Business School and its Institute for Strategy and Competitiveness, thanks to Richard Bryden, Marcela Merino, Alexandra Houghtalin, Jill Hogue, Christian Ketels, Jorge Ramirez-Vallejo, Ivan Stoitzev, Laurel McCaig and Melissa Fall.

Special thanks to Professor Scott Stern, Professor of Management, MIT Sloan School of Management, whose contributions and guidance have been invaluable. Also at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, thanks to Jason Jay and Tetyana Pecherska.

Special thanks to Hakon Gunnarsson, Rosa Jonsdottir and colleagues, who partnered with us to host the What Works conferences in Reykjavik, Iceland April 2016 and April 2017, and to all the speakers and sponsors of those events. Thanks to Icelandic political leaders Prime Minister Bjarni Benediktsson and Mayor of Kópavogur Ármann Kristinn Ólafsson for convening the event. Thanks to RIDG for adding an exciting new dimension to the conference with their graphic recordings.

For their partnership on the groundbreaking People's Report Card, special thanks to Simon Moss and the team at Global Citizen.

Thanks to Regitze Hess at the International Federation for Housing and Planning; Alison Kennedy and Anuja Singh at UNESCO Institute for Statistics; Juan Botero and Alejandro Ponce at the World Justice Project; and Diana Fletschner at Landesa for technical input on components and indicators.

For reviewing the Social Progress Index, providing advice on human rights measurement, and inviting us to participate in a human rights conference, thank you to Anne-Marie Brook of Motu Economic & Public Policy Research and David Richards of the Human Rights Institute of the University of Connecticut, as well as conference participants Susan Randolph of the University of Connecticut and K. Chad Clay of the University of Georgia.

At the World Bank, thanks to Kaushik Basu, Maitreyi Bordia Das, Fabrice Houdart, Aleem Walji, Anil Sinha and Neil Fantom. At the Inter-American Development Bank, thanks to Julie Katzman for participating in "Social Progress Reconsidered: What Really Is Success?" event in November 2015, and "Betting on Social Progress" panel in April 2017.

Thanks to Peter Schechter, Jason Marczak, Natalie Alhonte, María Fernanda Pérez Argüello, Rachel DeLevie-Orey, Abby Moore and Andrea Murta at the Adrienne Arsht Latin America Center of the Atlantic Council. At the Center for Global Development, thanks to Andy Sumner and Owen Barder. Thanks also to Andrew Maskrey and Bina Desai at Global Assessment Report on Disaster Risk Reduction.

At the UN Human Development Report Office, thanks to Selim Jahan and Milorad Kovacevic. Thanks also to Ed Cain and Elizabeth Cheung of the Conrad N. Hilton Foundation for inviting us to participate in the Indices Summit at UCLA in March 2016.

Thanks too to our friends Henry and Colleen Timms, Indy Johar, Randolph Kent, Laurie Joshua, Paula Kravitz, and Michael Borowitz for wisdom and inspiration.

Thanks to Karen Weisblatt and her team at Weisblatt & associés: Alex Kirchberger, Dr Jan Niessen, Dr. André Carmo and Dr. Andreas Tsolakis for their invaluable help evaluating our efforts

Thank you to Astrid Scholz, Steve Wright and the team at Sphaera for their thought partnership and efforts to highlight effective solutions to key social challenges.

Special thanks to our staff, led by Michael Green: Luke Greeves, Ladan Manteghi, Amy Wares, Abi Weaver, Steve Chaplain, Anne Snouck-Hurgronje, Jonathan Talbot, Justin Edwards, Tamar Epner, Franklin Murillo, Petra Krylova, Jaime Garcia, Tiana Noecker, Carlos Jáuregui, and Brent Nagel.

Thanks to our new regional partners for coordinating work across many countries and dozens of partner organizations: INCAE for leading Progreso Social Mesoamérica, and Fundación Avina for leading Progreso Social Sudamérica. Thanks to Victor Umaña, Jaime Garcia and Beatriz Miranda, our regional team in Mesoamérica; and Glaucia Barros, Juan Cristóbal Birbuet and Marcelo Mosaner, our regional team in Sudamérica.

Numerous partner organizations in Latin America were among our earliest and remain our most constant and innovative supporters. At VIVA, special thanks to Roberto Artavia, for leading our pioneering efforts and for his continuous guidance and support of the Social Progress Network in Latin America, as well as to Shannon Music, Monika Schmid and Roberto J. Artavia. At VIVA, thanks to Urs Jagger and Arturo Rodriguez. At GENTERA, thanks to Alejandro Puente and Jorge Daniel Manrique. At IGNIA, thanks to Sebastian Cueva Pena and Gladys Garza Rivera. At INCAE Business School, special thanks to Enrique Bolaños for continuous support to our deployment in Latin America; and to Camelia Ilie, Andrea Prado and Juan Carlos Barahona for leading an applied research agenda on social progress.

For tireless work on our behalf to carry our work forward across Latin America, thanks to the team at Fundación Avina and Avina Americas: Gabriel Baracatt, Glaucia Barros, Cecilia Barja, Edgard Bermudez, Marcus Fuchs, Tatiana Lopez, Cynthia Loría, Sean McKaughan, Valdemar Oliveira, Francisca Rivero, Eduardo Rotela, Guillermo Scallan, Bernardo Toro, Luis Miguel Artieda, Marcela Mondino and Pablo Vagliente. The team of Guayana Acosta, Emily Fintel Kaiser and Adrian Naranjo provided critical support to the Social Progress Imperative before it became an independent organization and has supported us since. Raul Gauto led special efforts at Fundación Avina to create our social progress network in Latin America.

Many organizations in Paraguay took a risk, organized our first national network and helped to pioneer use of the Social Progress Index framework. Thanks to the leaders and teams at Secretaría Técnica de Planificación del Desarrollo Económico y Social (STP), Fundación Avina, Fundación Paraguaya, Fundación Moisés Bertoni, Fundación Desarrollo en Democracia, Mingarã, Feprinco, Asociación de Empresarios Cristianos, Club de Ejecutivos, Pro Desarrollo Paraguay, Equipo Nacional de Estrategia País, Fundación MAE UC, Global Shapers Asunción, Deloitte Paraguay, Red de Líderes para la Competitividad and Red del Pacto Global Paraguay. We would especially like to thank Lyliana Gayoso and Jimena Vallejos. Special thanks to Minister José Molinas for leading the first National Development Plan Paraguay 2030, which adopts the Social Progress Index as key performance indicator. Thanks to Eduardo Rotela, chair of the national network, and to Paula Burt, executive coordinator.

In Argentina, many individuals and organizations have been critical to introducing the Social Progress Index in relevant spaces for policy debate. Thanks to Roberto Artavia, Gabriel Baracatt, Fernando Bach, Carlos March and Marcela Mondino for leading our efforts in Argentina. Special thanks to Governor Juan Manuel Urtubey and his team, especially Carlos Parodi, Daniel Sanchez and Micaela Perez Balzarini for developing the first application of the Social Progress Index at the provincial level in Argentina. Thanks to AACREA, CIPPEC, Fundación Banco de la Provincia, Fundacion Minka, the Government of the Province of Buenos Aires, GIFE and to the Ministry of Social Development for their special interest in SPI. We also want to thank Vice President of Argentina Gabriela Michetti, Secretary Fernando de Andreis, Minister Carolina Stanley, Catalina de la Puente, Carolina Langan, Santiago López Medrano, Agustina Suaya, Liliana Paniagua, Fundación Banco de la Provincia de Buenos Aires, Fundación Banco de la Provincia de Córdoba and Daniela Nasif.

In Bolivia, special thanks to the Ministry of Autonomies for it interest in SPI, in partnership with Fundación Avina. We would especially like to thank Miguel Castro, Chiaki Kinjo, Carlos Gustavo Machicado and

David Barrera Ojeda. Thanks to Ciudadanía Bolivia, to the regional government of Cochabamba and to the city of Cochabamba for conducting and debating innovative applications of the social progress framework.

In Brazil, several partner organizations have been critical to some of the first real-world applications of our tools at the subnational level. Special thanks to Imazon to lead the first subnational Social Progress Index at the Municipal level; to Coca-Cola, Natura and IPSOS for leading the first application of the social progress methodology at the community level; and to Instituto Pereira Passos, Fundacion Avina and Fundação Roberto Marinho for leading the first Social Progress Index for the Administrative Regions of Rio de Janeiro. Thanks to Banco do Brasil, Coca-Cola Brazil, Comunitas, Camargo Correa, Centro Ruth Cardoso, CLUA, Deloitte, Fundacíon Avina, Fundação Amazônia Sustentável, Fundação Dom Cabral, Fractal Processos, GIFE, Giral, Good Energies, Instituto Arapyaú, Instituto Ethos, Instituto Pereira Passos, ICE, Imazon, Imaflora, IPSOS, ISA, Natura, Observatório do Clima, Pontifícia Universidade Católica de São Paulo, Instituto EcoSocial, IBM, Sistema B and Vale. Thanks to Paulo Seiffer, and to Eduarda La Rocque, Sergio Besserman, Ladislau Dowbor, Marcelo Neri, Thereza Lobo, Junia Santa Rosa, André Luis André Soares for their contributions to the launch of the Social Progress Index for the Administrative Regions of Rio de Janeiro. Special thanks to José Roberto Marinho for continuous support of the application of the Social Progress Index in Brazil. Thanks to Glaucia Barros, chair of the network, Renato Souza, communications lead, and to Mateus Mendonca and Marina Viski for executive coordination.

In Chile, thanks to the Ministerio de Desarrollo Social, Acción, Deloitte, Fundación Avina, Fundación Superación Pobreza, and Masisa who joined efforts to organize SPI-related activities in Chile. Thanks to Francisca Rivero for chairing the Network, and to Hernan Blanco, Pamela Ríos, Roberto Salas, Regina Massai, Gracia Navarro, Verónica González, Jorge Maluenda, Pabla Flores and Magdalena Aninat. And special thanks to the Universidad de Concepción, to the municipality of El Cabrero in the Bio-Bio region, and to the citizens of El Cabrero, where a community-based SPI is being used to promote multi stakeholder partnerships.

In Costa Rica, special thanks to the Vice President of the Republic of Costa Rica, Ana Helena Chacón Echeverría, for her support in the development of the platform Costa Rica Propone, and to the Presidential Council for Innovation and Human Talent. Many thanks to the Minister of Tourism Mauricio Ventura and the team at the Costa Rica Tourism Board lead by Rodolfo Lizano and Roxana Arguedas for the support and implementation of the SPI Tourism Destinations. Thanks to those supporters who are building on Social Progress Index data to empower communities including VIVA Idea, Asociación Empresarial para el Desarrollo, Impactico, Yo Emprendedor, Ministerio de Comercio Exterior, Ministerio de Ciencia y Tecnología, Universidad Latina de Costa Rica, Universidad Nacional, Central American Healthcare Initiative, Federación de Organizaciones Sociales Costa Rica, Ideas en Acción, TEDx Pura Vida Jovén, Reinventing Business for All, Grupo Inco, Borge & Asociados, Cenecoop, Deloitte, Fifco, Fundación Avina, INCAE Business School, and Infocoop. Special thanks to Xavier Velasco, Maria Nelly Rivas and Jorge Calderon from Cargill for supporting social progress and applying the index in the region.

In Colombia, thanks to Fundación Avina, Fundación Corona, Compartamos con Colombia, Deloitte, Red Colombiana de Ciudades Cómo Vamos, Escuela de Gobierno de la Universidad de los Andes, Llorente y Cuenca. Special thanks to Angela Escallón, Cecilia Barja, Maria Cristina Piñeros, Mónica Villegas and José Francisco Aguirre for leading our efforts to build the first application of the Social Progress Index to the city level, to Alvaro Bernal, Sofía Salas and Camila Ronderos for securing the executive coordination of our emerging network, to Oscar Jimenez for leading the application of the SPI methodology to the city level

and to the directors of the Ciudades Cómo Vamos Network. We also want to thank Rocío Mendoza, Carlos Javier Velasquez, Ramiro Avendaño, Antonio Celia, Governor Ricardo Gómez Giraldo, Mayor Jose Octavio Cardona León, Felipe Cesar Londoño, John Jairo Granada Giraldo, Felipe Calderón Uribe and Darío Gómez Jaramillo.

In El Salvador, special thanks to Alejandro Poma, Manuel Sanchez Masferrer, Rodrigo Tobar and the organizations promoting the Social Progress Index: Fundación Poma, Escuela Superior de Economía y Negocios, Centro de Progreso Social, Fundación Empresarial para la Acción Social, Fundación para la Educación Superior, Fundación La Niñez Primero and TECHO.

In Guatemala, special thanks to Emmanuel Seidner, Sebastián Soliz, Macarena Corlazzoli and the teams at the Instituto Progreso Social Guatemala and supporting organizations like: AGEXPORT, Alianza por la Nutrición, ALTERNA, ASIES, CABI, CEMPRO, CentraRSE, CIEN, CISU, Deloitte, Empresarios por la Educación, Farmacias Chapinas, Foro Latinoamericano de Inversión de Impacto Centroamérica, Fundación Avina, Fundación Fe y Alegría, Fundación Novella, Fundación Puente, Fundación Shalom, FUNDESA, Grupos Gestores, IDC, IDIES-URL, INCAE Business School, Instituto Progreso Social Guatemala, La Valija y la Cobija, Ludi Verse, Obras Sociales del Hermano Pedro, Tikonb'al, VIVA Idea and WAKAMI.

In Nicaragua, thanks to Juan Sebastián Chamorro, General Director of FUNIDES, for supporting and coordinating the local Social Progress Network. Thanks to those supporters who are building on social progress through collaboration aad are part of the local network, including Cargill, UnirSE, INCAE Business School, Universidad Americana, Global Communities, Telefónica, Casa Pellas, Polaris Energy Nicaragua S.A., Centro de Producción más Limpia, Thriive Nicaragua, TECHO, Fundación Avina, Bluefields Indian and Caribbean University, Universidad de las Ciencias Comerciales, Eduquemos, Red Nicaragüense de Recicladores, Latam Entreprenuership, Movimiento Club Jóvenes Ambientalistas and Plataforma Carazo Sostenible. Special thanks to Eric Ponçon, Regional Director of the Coffee Division for Central America of ECOM Agroindustrial Corporation, for innovating in the use of SPI in Nicaragua.

In Panama, special thanks to Marcela Alvarez Calderon for chairing our emerging network and to Maripaz Vindas for securing its executive coordination. Many thanks to the following supporting organizations: Alcaldía de Panamá, APEDE Asociación Panameña de Ejecutivos de Empresa, Cámara de Comercio, Industria y Agricultura de Panamá, Centro Nacional de Competitividad, Consejo Empresarial de América Latina – CEAL, Contraloría General de la República, Deloitte Panamá, Despacho de la Primera Dama, Ministerio de la Presidencia, Dichter & Neira, Fundación Avina, Fundación Ciudad del Saber, INADEH Instituto Nacional de Formación Profesional y Capacitación para el Desarrollo Humano, Instituto Nacional de Estadística y Censo, Llorente y Cuenca, Ministerio de Desarrollo Social, Ministerio de Economía y Finanzas, Ministerio de Salud, SUMARSE, United Way Panamá and Universidad Latina.

In Peru, special thanks to Juan Manuel Arribas for chairing our emerging network, to Alexandra Ames for securing its executive coordination and to Centrum Catolica Business School for hosting the network secretariat. Many thanks to the following supporting organizations: Ministerio de Cultura, Ministerio de Desarrollo e Inclusión Social, Fundación Avina, CIES, Deloitte, Perú 2021, Grupo Radio Programas del Peru, Soluciones Empresariales contra la Pobreza, Sociedad Nacional de Industrias, UNACEM, Universidad del Pacífico and Aporta. Special acknowledgements to Centrum Catolica Business School which made possible the publication of the first Social Progress Index for the Peruvian regions and to Alexandra Ames, Oscar Jimenez and Josefina Vizcarra, the team in charge of its elaboration. We also want to thank Fernando D'Alessio, Luis del Carpio and Frida Delgado.

In Uruguay, special thanks to Guillermo Valles.

We also want to acknowledge the following organizations which are supporting related activities and emerging networks: Government of Salta and Fundación Avina (Argentina), Ciudadania (Bolivia), India Institute for Competitiveness (India) and Scope Consult (Malaysia).

In Europe, the active leadership of the European Commission, through the Directorate-General for Regional and Urban Policy, the Joint Research Centre, and the support of Orkestra (Basque Competitiveness Institute) and Deloitte, is leading towards the first Social Progress Index applied at the regional level. Their ongoing work has also benefitted the methodology and structure of the global Social Progress Index. We especially thank Paola Annoni, Moray Gilland, and Lewis Dijkstra at DG Regio, Susana Franco at Orkestra, and members of the Scientific Committee, including Enrico Giovannini of Tor Vergata, Walter Radermacher of Eurostat, Martine Durand of OECD, and Filomena Maggino of the University of Firenze. We would also like to thank Herman Van Rompuy, President Emeritus of the European Council, Nicola Caputo MEP, members of the SPI Interest Group of the European Parliament, European Policy Centre, European Political Strategy Centre, Directorate General for Employment, Social Affairs & Inclusion, Committee of the Regions, United Nations Development Programme, European Regions Research and Innovation Network, Conference of Peripheral Maritime Regions of Europe, Conseil des Communes et Régions d'Europe and European Parliamentary Research Service.

In North America, numerous champions of our work are leading the growth of networks in the US and Canada. Special thanks also to Jens Molbak whose innovative work with Win/Win lays the groundwork to enable all sectors and individuals to play a role in improving social progress globally. Thanks to Emechete Onuoha of Xerox Canada. In Michigan, thanks to Harvey Hollins of the Office of Urban and Metropolitan Initiatives, Mark Davidoff of Deloitte, Dan Pitera, and Alicia Douglas. Special thanks to Mayor Joseph Curtatone whose vision for the city of Somerville, Massachusetts is one of social progress, and his team at SomerStat including Skye Stewart, Emily Monea, and Alex Lessin. Many thanks also to James Head at the East Bay Community Foundation in Oakland, California, and his colleagues Sachi Yoshii and Peggy Saika. Thanks also to Mark Simon of the San Mateo County Transit District. Thanks also to Jason Denoncourt of the 6th Congressional District of Massachusetts, and Julie Bishop of the Essex County Community Foundation.

Thank you also to Mark Esposito of Harvard Business School and the Microeconomics of Competitiveness network, and Patrick O'Sullivan of Grenoble École de Management.

At Deloitte Digital, thanks to Ed Greig and his team including Michael Martin, Alyson Young, Undine Rubeze, Russell Smith, Shannen Smyth, Garry Irwin, Victoria Sloan, Jack Munnelly, Vitaly Kondratiev, Albert Vallverdu, Richard Ankers, Lizzie Owens and Tiina Bjork; and to Kasia Zan and her team Volena Valcheva, Jason Karayiannis, and Rebecca Ferguson for designing, creating, and iteratively improving our new web platform at www.socialprogressimperative.org. Special thanks to Olivier Binse. Thanks to Benjamin Wiederkehr and his team at Interactive Things for designing the original data exploration tool.

Special thanks to Alberto Rojas, Lucía Sánchez, Andrés Díaz, Keren Ramírez and the rest of the team at Estudio Manatí for creating the data visualization and host site for the 2017 Index results.

Thanks to Alexander Jutkowitz, Merrie Leininger, Patrick Ryan, Berit Mansour, Shannon Wright, and the rest of the talented team at H&K Strategies for expert counsel and assistance on our communications. Thanks to Oliver Kendall at Westminster Public Affairs for leading our efforts to put the Social Progress Index in front of journalists.

Thank you to Broadgreen Solutions for advising our information technology strategy.

Thanks to Maggie Powell and Leigh Lawhon for graphics and layout work on the 2017 Social Progress Index report.

Thanks to Mungo Park, Aimee Parnell and team at blueprint.tv for creating videos to promote the Social Progress Index and for leading on social media strategy to increase our reach to online audiences.

Finally, our gratitude to the organizations on whose data we relied to create the 2017 Social Progress Index: Academic Ranking of World Universities, Barro-Lee Educational Attainment Dataset, Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, Freedom House, Fund for Peace Fragile States Index, Gallup World Poll, Heritage Foundation, Institute for Economics and Peace Global Peace Index, Institute for Global Health Metrics and Evaluation, International Telecommunications Union, OECD Gender Institutions and Development Database, Pew Research Center Government Restrictions Index, Pew Research Center Social Hostilities Index, QS World University Rankings, Reporters Without Borders, Sustainable Energy for All, Times Higher Education World University Rankings, Transparency International, United Nations Development Programme, United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization Institute for Statistics, United Nations Inter-agency Group for Child Mortality Estimation, United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime, United Nations Population Division, University of Connecticut Human Rights Institute, WHO/UNICEF Joint Monitoring Programme for Water Supply and Sanitation, World Bank, World Economic Forum Global Competitiveness Report, World Health Organization, World Resources Institute, Yale Center for Environmental Law & Policy and Columbia University Center for International Earth Science Information Network Environmental Performance Index. Our use of their data does not imply their endorsement. As an organization that believes that better information can build a better world, we recognize and appreciate those who created such important sources of data.

SOCIAL PROGRESS IMPERATIVE

2101 L Street NW, Suite 800
Washington, DC 20037
socialprogressimperative.org
@socprogress