

Michael Green: If we'd gone back 10 years or just over 10 years, we would've seen a child with a similar story. Just at the moment we were about to fall off the cliff of the global financial crisis and I think we're seeing a growing pattern that we are increasingly concerned that these headline economic numbers that we base our decisions on, it's the economy stupid or based on actually aren't telling us a full story about the state of our societies and the state of our economies now know 10 years ago we'd been sort of a slightly sort of lefty or blasphemous thought to question that the dominance of GDP and other economic indicators. But really I think since the financial crisis that has changed and people are increasingly willing to say, no, our current economic metrics are not good enough. We need to look at a broader perspective on the success of our societies.

Michael Green: Don't take my word for it. Take the word of Michael Porter from Harvard Business School. Michael is a professor of business world guru on economic competitiveness. You know, red in tooth and claw capitalist and Mike says very clearly is that you can't judge the success of a society based entirely on economic indicators alone. Real success is about economic and social progress. So what I want to talk about today is how when we look at the US through the lens of what we call the Social Progress Index, it tells us a very different story to the one we see from those headline economic numbers. So let me tell you what the social progress index is all about. The one fundamental you have to remember about the social progress index is that it has no economic indicators. So there were things like the UN has a human development index, DOTD has a better life index, Bhutan has gross national happiness, all these different measures of societal success, try and mix up other things with economic to create a super measure.

Michael Green: What we've done with the social progress index is something different. We've said, let's measure social progress directly independently of economic variables and then see what that tells us about the relationship with the economy. So that's the key thing to remember. The first design principle is no economic indicators. The second thing will be measuring social progress is we've tried to measure outcomes only. I think we find that actually many of our political debates are more about inputs than outcomes. People disagree about how much we spend, what law we should pass, but the social progress index we've done and measure the outcomes achieved over, which I think there's less controversy. Thirdly, we try to make it relevant to all the countries of the world and critically also, we've wanted to make it actionable because there are other ways of measuring the success of societies. Things like happiness.

Michael Green: There's a lot of push to measure happiness and yeah, we discovered the Denmark is the happiest country in the world and well, what do you do about it? Do we eat more bacon? Do we watch more episodes of Borgen? I don't know. Yeah, so we've very much with social programs. Next, once something is actually actionable, there's going to help us try and improve those metrics. So those are the design principles. All we had to do was define what is social

progress. Well, we have been trying since Aristotle, I don't to have bested Aristotle, but what we've come up with is a definition of social progress is based in the literature of the work of Amartya Sen and others. It looks like this. It says a good society is one in which the basic needs of survival is there of everyone is met essentially food, water, shelter, safety.

Michael Green: A good society is one where everyone has the foundations of wellbeing, education, access to information health and a good, good quality environment. And then finally a good society is one where everyone has opportunity with rights, freedom, inclusiveness and access to advanced education. These 12 components are what make up the social progress index. What we have to do that is go out and get data to measure each of these and here are all the indicators that we're using. I should say all the data, all the methodology is all on our website is fully open and transparent so you can look at this in detail any way you want to. So what we've done is we've taken for each of those 12 components, between three and six carefully selected indicators that then with some econometric magic, uh, put, added those together to produce an aggregate score on how a country performs on social progress.

Michael Green: And again, I'm very happy to talk about multiple colinearity or heteroscedasticity to anyone who wants to talk about it afterwards, but people tend not to want statistical methodological discussions. Um, so those are the indicators. Just so you know, they come broadly from the UN, the World Bank, some experts assessments and some survey data as well. All from trusted global sources. We don't take, I'm not taking responsibility for checking whether North Korea is education data is correct. I'll take it through your desk. Okay. So 51 different indicators. We bring them all together to produce an aggregate score out of a hundred for a country's performance on social progress. So let's see how things shape out. So we've uh, we bring them into tiers and tier one. And so the number one performing country in the world on social progress is any guesses? Sweden, Switzerland, all good guesses. It's in fact, it's Norway.

Michael Green: Um, Norway, which I think is not surprising indeed. I would find, I you say it's a little bit boring. Um, I prefer to say it's reassuringly boring. If we didn't have a country like Norway at the top, there'd be something wrong. And indeed, the whole of our top tier of countries are pretty much reassuringly boring. We've got Sweden and Switzerland, uh, very close. They're very close to Norway. We've got, uh, Japan, we've got the UK, we've got Germany and Canada. We don't have the United States. So the U S is not number one, and it's not in the top tier of social progress. Well, let's have a look, and it's got a second tier and I'm afraid is Australia tops the second tier and then followed by France, Belgium, Korea, Spain, Austria. Not in the top 29. So she's getting a bit worrying. Ah, who's next? Italy. Italy.

Michael Green: Italy is normally reliably bottom of the g seven on anything lower than Italy. Oh, no, no, no, no, no. But who's next? Oh, Slovenia. Well, the mighty Sylvia is, no,

no shame in losing out to the mightiest. Levenia who's next Singapore guest, Portugal and I lost 25th United States muscling out the Czech Republic and Estonia. So this is, this is a bit, it's a bit bad. This is not who the peer group we see the u s as being part of. Let's just finish out, this is the group of tier two. Those are the group that the U S is in. And again, I don't think we would normally see this as the peer group in the United States to be in. Let me just finish it. We ranked 146 countries. Tier three is mainly made up of emerging markets, so Mexico and Russia and Brazil. Um, you also find a few oil rich states like United Arab Emirates and a man in their tier four is actually where the majority of the world lives because that's where it's sharp.

Michael Green: We had find China in India in Tier Four. I think you also have on site at Saudi Arabia down in tier four. Tier five is a lot of a poorer countries. Bangladesh, Rwanda, Ethiopia. There's also Pakistan in there, which is a nuclear power. So you know, you could have nuclear weapons and still be in tier five. And then TSX is largely countries that have got a lot of governance issues. Some fail. It failed states in there as well. Um, our investment in Afghanistan has gotten up to 144. Um, so let's say a world rankings the U s 25 out of 146, why is this? Well, to put it in context, what I'm going to do is show you how the u s performs to a set of peers. Now what things we can do with social progress index is cause we have no GDP. And the model is we can say, how does a country compare to its GDP peers, how's it compare to countries of similar wealth?

Michael Green: So I'm going to compare the US performance to 15 countries listed there who have got a similar GDP to the u s and if the u s score is statistically significantly worse than that peer group, it's a red light. If it's this insignificantly better than that group, it's a blue light in the world of social progress. Traffic lights are red, yellow, and blue because it's better for people like me who are color blind. Um, and if it's somewhere within the expected range in the middle, it's a yellow. Okay, let's have a look at the u s scorecard. Let's break down what's driving this underperformance. So here's our score card. Let's fill it in bit by bit, starting in the top left hand corner nutrition or basic medical care. Now what this red circle means is that it's statistically significantly worse than the peers, but not by a lot in absolute terms.

Michael Green: So the score you see is absolutely, actually quite high. Most rich countries are getting close to a hundred, but the u s actually is not doing that well on some of the indicators, particularly maternal mortality rate. So that's a little bit worried. Water and sanitation pretty much with the expected range. Most rich countries, we've got a score of a hundred shelter is a little bit of a red light there. But I'd caution on that one because we've got problems with data on shelter. This is more a measure of aura countries. So I wouldn't pay a whole lot of weight on that one. But then safety, we see a big red light there. So the US is doing significantly worse than its peers on safety. Yes, it's homicide rate, but it's also perception of crime and also critically road traffic accidents. Road traffic deaths are the 10th biggest cause of death in the world.

Michael Green: And the U S is not doing well on road safety either. Moving on, uh, education obviously is a blue light. Oh no, sorry. It's a red light. Uh, I think, no surprises there. It's about people, kids not being enrolled in primary and secondary school and issues around the quality of education, access to information communications. The home of Silicon Valley we about, okay, but with a couple of red lights, especially around access to the Internet for everyone. And also around press, freedom, health and wellness. US invest more as a percentage of GDP than any other country in the world. How are we doing on health and wellness? What? La Red light again, 37th in the world, the US outcomes on health are the same as as Becky. Stan. Yeah. Environment. Perhaps we wouldn't be so surprised that are a red light there. And there's a red line around greenhouse gas emissions.

Michael Green: Yes, this is a rich economy producing all this stuff. We've adjusted greenhouse gas, gas emissions for per thousand dollars of GDP and still the u s is underperforming, right? Sort of. Okay. Personal freedom and choice. Slight worry about child marriage but all right. But then inclusiveness or red light. Finally, some good news. We do see a blue light for access to advanced education. The U s does have a preponderance of the best universities in the world. A lot of people in higher education. We are not measuring the cost of going to higher education. We just measured the with the quality of the education itself. But we do see a red light in terms of the fact that it's only a tiny minority of students who are actually going to those top, top tier schools. And so if we just bring this all together as a summary, top right hand corner, you see a red dot.

Michael Green: The U S is, is exceptional amongst developed economies in being statistically significantly performing worse than its peer group. This is a very poor performance. So that's all, um, bad news. Um, so maybe it's time for some good use. Hm. Well I'm praying I haven't gotten any. Um, uh, uh, cause it actually gets worse because uh, the US is getting worse. So we've been tracking social workers since 2014 and we see the u s is the only g seven countries. You've gone backwards. Indeed only six countries in the world have significantly gone backwards over that period, including places like Turkey and Brazil. And the u s is going backwards on social progress over that period where, well, we can break it down again. It's health and wellness. We know about the issues around health, the opioid crisis, a declining life expectancy, access to basic knowledge. The education system is not working.

Michael Green: Personal rights have gone backwards. Personal Safety has gone backwards. Inclusiveness has gone backwards. So as well as being a bad position to start with, the US position is deteriorating even further. And that's obviously this, these two stories, economic numbers, it seems going up inexorably, but there's social progress, story, flatlining or deteriorating. There were two different stories about where this country is going. Now. The US is of course, a very big country and there's gonna be different things happening in different parts of the

country. And we're going to see that it's going to be about different regions, different demographic groups, et cetera. So what we'll do now is break this down a bit and have a look at the performance state by state because we've done the social progress index for the 50 states. So here we go. 50 states broken just six tiers again, who do we think is the highest social progress state in the country?

Michael Green: California. Any other guesses? Washington, Delaware, New York. Well, actually a, it's a Massachusetts [inaudible]. Um, who do we think is the worst? Alabama, Louise, Mississippi. And there we go. So again, Massachusetts at the top, Mississippi at the bottom, once again. Reassuringly boring. Yeah. And what we see, if you look at the bottom category, it's also pretty reassuringly boring as well. I think there's the states we'd expect to see in that bottom category. Alabama's in there. Those were the worst performing states. The top performing states I think is a little bit more varied with Minnesota, Vermont, New Hampshire, and Connecticut. Perhaps more, not so surprising. Our second tier, um, we've got, again, some of the states that you mentioned, a New York's in there, Washington's in there, Colorado's in the second tier. Uh, that's good news. Looking at tier five, just pop over there to the bottom. Again, I think a lot of that we would expect to see. So some of those southern states that aren't in TSX, we find in a, in Tier Five, Kentucky and South Carolina, but also look their number 42, Texas, Texas, 42nd. And if that's surprises people. And then if you look in the middle, we've got two years, three and four. And can you see where California was 33rd? Yeah, just about, just below Florida 32nd.

Michael Green: So we can look at this in a different way and say, well, what's driving this? Um, all I will do is just show you these schools, uh, plotted against median household income for each state. So the vertical access is, uh, social progress, horizontal access, his median household income per state. And what we see is that there's a pattern like this and I'll just put the regression line through. So what we see is that yes, there is a relationship. States that have higher levels of median household income do generally have higher levels of social progress, but it's clearly not the whole story at any level of median household income. There can be very big differences between levels of social progress, median household income. Explain this whole pattern and let's look at two examples. Let's look at Colorado since we're here. They were just Colorado. It's above the line.

Michael Green: So that's a good thing. Generally states at or above the line are doing a better than average job or turning their wealth and just social progress. And then here's Parol California down there below the line, not doing a such good job. And so for each of these states we can produce a scorecard just as we did for, for the, for the u s as a whole. So here is the Colorado scorecard only, just Colorado. You see a lot of yellow and that means Colorado is generally batting average. So if you see in sorta 11th and Social Progress, 12 on median household income, it's quite an average performance, but we're to stand our parts. The first is a positive, a very strong score on personal rights and on here

from Colorado. Excellent. Then it would tell you whether that makes sense or not. I'd love to know. And then a really, really clear weakness on shelter.

Michael Green: Does that make sense in Colorado? Yeah. Okay, so this is a, this Colorado, so there's so we can see there's a lot of average. Then we can also see where there were some differences. Yeah, there's some quite big differences, some big strengths and weaknesses. Let's have a look now. California, California, very different story. A lot of red here. Yeah. And so on California we can see weakness on this left hand side. This is basic human needs, weaknesses in water and sanitation or we know about California and water, don't we? Weaknesses in shelter, all the housing problems you seeing in California, weakness in personal safety, strong leaders there. The education system is not working. Uh, we also see issues around rights. But as I say to my audience as of California, at least you're nice. You're a question sir.

Audience Member: Yeah. Cause you can't really see the indicators here. Could you just define shelter, what it means for them?

Michael Green: Yeah, so shelter we have here. Um, so we've got a housing problems as reported housing problems as potentially households, availability of affordable housing, homelessness and unsheltered homelessness. So there's a measurable people outside home, but also people who are the cost of housing for other people as well. Yeah. Um, should I say this? This stays over the 50 state index. Again, it's all online. All our data is available, all the scorecards are available. So this is where we see California where this said or weaknesses are for California. And I'll talk a bit more about California at the moment, but let me actually show you one other chart. Which is this one which shows the relationship between social progress and the unemployment rate. Because I think we've often used unemployment as being a measure of inclusive growth. If the economy is growing on the unemployment rate is declining, we actually think that's a sign that the economy is being inclusive and people are getting jobs, that people are being abroad being brought in.

Michael Green: And what we find here is a surprisingly weak relationship between the unemployment rate and social progress. And this is a pattern we're finding elsewhere. We finding was in Europe, we finding this in the UK and I think what we're seeing is the way the labor market is changing is that the absence of unemployment is not the measure we used to be of being a successful inclusive society where the rise of the GIG economy and other factors not, not having not being unemployed is no longer an indicator of having a good life. And so there is a relationship. Low unemployment is broadly associated with high levels of social progress, but the relationship is surprisingly weak. And so that's a, an important finding when we think about, especially the historically low levels of unemployment that we're seeing at the moment. So that's a, the story of the states when what we can then do, Dan is drill down a little bit further.



Michael Green: Um, and so we've just used to work now on California itself. And what we've now done is we've mapped out social progress for the counties of California and this a piece of work that we're doing that's in partnership with um, with, uh, Gavin Newsome seen the new governance team who, because he's very much set an agenda for a inclusive and sustainable growth for California. So our data has very much been a validated that California really has some challenges around building an inclusive and sustainable growth agenda. And so what we've done is we've now mapped out social progress across the different counties of the state. And what we see is that it's sort of, there's a cluster and so yellow is good. Um, there's a cluster around the bay area and as soon as we'd expect this very wealthy part of the county to have, the state does have a higher level of social progress.

Michael Green: Now I don't have it here, but if you drill down, look at the scorecards for those, those counties though again you see lots of areas of weakness and relative to their very high levels of wealth, they're not necessarily actually doing that well. And then if you look down sir further, you'll see Los Angeles County is not doing so well. And then there's a lot of, the low level of social progress is concentrated around that central value at southern central valley region. So California is a big place. There's a lot of variation geographically across the state in terms of social progress. And then when even within the counties that are doing well, there can be real challenges too. And so this data is now being used to help think about the strategy for the state going forward. But we haven't quite finished there because even these counties can be quite big.

Michael Green: La County is a very big place. So what we've started doing now is actually mapping social progress for cities. And one of the places we've started, he's actually in San Jose, California. Um, now San Jose sits right next to silicon valley. So I think it's one of the richest cities in the u s so very high level of income, but also a city that's got very persistent levels of poverty, persistent problems of housing, of, of housing with homelessness, overcrowding on affordable housing. So all we've been able to do in San Jose's, we've actually mapped social progress down for level of census tract. So very, very small communities to actually look at the pattern of social progress across the, the city itself. Looking at that, comparing that to household income. And so that's giving a very detailed granular map of the story within that, within that city. And we've actually done the same thing for another city, which Jackson, Mississippi, we thought if we're gonna do, uh, one of the richest cities in the u s then we should do one of the poorest cities in the u s and especially in the, uh, lowest performing state.

Michael Green: So we are also done the same thing for Jackson, Mississippi. Mapping out our level of social progress. So what we are giving to policy makers and other stakeholders in those communities. It is very detailed information about how, how the city is performing, where there are the pockets of deprivation, where there are the biggest needs. But we can also go a level further. Cause what we've also done for these cities is we started mapping within those

communities where their biggest skills needs are. So we've mapped 27 different clusters of skills and this is now being used to help think through a strategy for workforce development for both of these cities, both in terms of the skills needed. But also what we've done further from that is we've also mapped automation risk because that's a huge worry for people is I may have a good job now, but do I have a good job tomorrow?

Michael Green: And what this is helping to do is come up with an integrated way of thinking about workforce development to create inclusive, sustainable cities for the future. Because you know, the classic problem is, you know, teaching coal miners to code. Uh, so many interventions around workforce development aren't actually focusing on the real niche skills people need both for their level of training but also for their local labor market. So we're refining this data so it's relevant for the local labor market and also cause we mapped against social progress. We can start seeing where are the non skill barriers, is it lack of childcare, is it lack of transportation? And that allows a much more sophisticated plan to be developed for the city to read, to bring up all of the, all of the areas of the city or really promote sustainable inclusive development. Now this is just data and I think I want to sort of call out um, the two mayors, uh, Sam Locarno and a chocolate Lumumba.

Michael Green: It's the mayors who are going to be the ones who have to implement this working with their partners and civil society. We are very proud that we were able to, we've been able to work with two leaders like this who really want to take data and they have a data developer driven approach to develop their cities. Our hope is that this is a useful tool. This data actually a you're going to go uh, exclusive preview. We actually not releasing this data until July, but then after that point we are looking to scale this to other cities in the u s to give uh, leaders this kind of tool. So that's what we're doing very much measuring social progress and the level of the world down to various neighborhoods and communities to try and help give leaders the tools to actually improve outcomes for citizens because it's very, I used to work in government working, you can go home with his heart, you know, people suddenly see the government is sort of forensic and knows what's going on.

Michael Green: Working in government is like trying to button your shirt, wearing a pair of boxing gloves with a blindfold on. And what we're trying to do is give doc policymakers better data to understand where the problems are. To understand where there are other successes. I think we often dwell on the red markers in this, on these scorecards, telling us where the problems are. But the blue mark is also tell us where successes are, where there's a solution, where perhaps there's something that could be shared to help peers learn from one another. And that's a big part of our agenda and what it also can do is create a common language of data to help government where with business and the nonprofit sector to find the solutions and deliver those solutions in the right places. I'm



just to conclude this, there's the question about what does this mean for the United States?

Michael Green: Here I'll just put social progress and GDP per capita, and this is the world and the curve shows the average relationship and there's a u s sitting below the curve. It's doing pretty well on GDP, but not very well on social progress. Where does the U S go next? And this is not about a trade off. I mean, one of the reasons that Mike Porter as a competitive guy who's interested in this area of work, because fundamentally he believes the longterm economic success is built on strong social foundations. It's not about making a choice between the economic and the social. Actually America's social progress problem is actually the economic problem of tomorrow unless the two can be addressed together, there's going to be big problems. But I think what we also see in the data is that they were real practical measures that can be taken but to address those problems and it is possible to turn this around and that actually is a win win for the economy and for society. Thank you very much. Wow,

Audience Member: thank you. Uh, very interesting data and thank you very much for how you broken this down for us and defined social progress. It's very enlightening. Um, it seems when we just look at the United States and I don't want to make too many gross general statements, but it's a little difficult not to, that the government is more of the problem then the solution or it has been. Now if you get down to the local levels, to the mayor, the mayor levels, city council levels, um, are you, um, working with them to partner also with private sector, non governmental agencies, how are you, are you still engaged with them in terms of developing um, you know, actionable ways to improve the situation along the social progress dimension?

Michael Green: Yes, it's a record. And so I actually, um, we, we got San Jose, I actually came in through the, uh, a group called the workforce Development Board, which is a government private sector partnership. And one of the issues they have in San Jose is you've got this enormous economic engine as you know, sucking in very talented people and the businesses say we're having trouble finding the talent. And the city is saying we keep training people but our talent doesn't go into your business as you keep recruiting from elsewhere. So this is to the city's really working with the private sector

Michael Green: on. So that very much like on a partnership is something that we are we working with. I didn't mention in the presentation, but one of the partners we're working with in California is a group called win-win and they uh, they've got a number of tools and one of the things they work on is what they call the Win-win Wiki, which actually is looking at a very granular level in a community of brothers say who's on the team, government business, private sector. And what they've done in some of their mappings is they've shown how often the services aren't where the needs are and there's actually, if you can get better coordination, you can actually get people to have services and the right places, I

mean just one example, they were looking at a case study where there was a program for, to give people double value for food stamps at farmer's markets, but the farmers markets were nowhere near the people with food stamps or actually people didn't have the information to know where to go to get the best value in their food stamps. And they brought in an app that actually was able to, there was a win for the food stamp recipients, but also for the businesses who then could market a food stamp recipients. So very much it's to create this agency's useful to drive those collaborations because it's gotta be trisector. It can't just be about government on its own.

Audience Member: California there are many undocumented people. There is that information factored into some of the decisions that are made and the pictures that I see? Yeah.

Michael Green: There's always going to be limits on

Michael Green: what the data can show us, so some of the data's going to be able to, is going to factor in the lives of undocumented people. Some of it not. That's just one of the problems that we have. I mean, I should also say, I mean for confession, we would love to be able to dis-aggregate this in other ways. We'd love to be able to disaggregate this by gender desegregated by race in other ways. I think if you're trying to get to what's going on, you'd love to be able to desegregate in other ways that data doesn't yet exist. So I think what we've got is a, the best measure we can produce. It's giving a meaningful signal, but there's other ways we'd love to improve the data to see whether we can actually measure, measure those things better. And I actually think we are getting close to a revolution in that kind of data measurement that isn't just about official censuses and official, uh, you know, medical action, the power of satellite data, social media data. I think we can build to start measure these things much more in real terms to give decision makers more of those dashboards. But the point is very well taken and that's something we're very conscious of to make sure that we're measuring everyone.

Audience Member: I'm sorry, we came in a few minutes late, so if we miss this, but it, to demonstrate the point that it's not either or what, as far as countries, what do you think are the best examples of where social progress demonstrates that it's a precursor to economic expansion?

Michael Green: Yeah, I have to say this is

Michael Green: Mike Porter's intuition at the moment. Yeah. I think what we haven't got yet is the time series data to demonstrate that or they, if we do get the time series data that's going to be really important proposition to test. Um, we're currently actually building a historical social progress index going back to 1990 and I think that will then give us that sort of time series data to stand that up empirically. I mean what I would say is if you look at what's in the social progress framework,

a lot of these things are what we see in competitiveness frameworks, whether it's the quality of infrastructure, the quality of human capital. We've also seen is that it's talking to some investors. They say that actually this is data they're trying to incorporate in their frameworks, whether it's about sovereign or sub sovereign risk measurement. Uh, I mean I was talking to a municipal bond fund and they were talking about how the North Carolina transgender toilets controversy ultimately negatively impacted the state's bond price because it impacted the inbred investments in the state.

Michael Green: So actually things like inclusiveness that can seem very intangible actually can have economically material impacts. And so Deloitte or one of our partners had done some work for is looking at the relationship between 408 investment and social progress. And they see they're very much a ladder of social progress and how, especially for the highest performing economies, things like inclusion really matter. Because if you're trying to attract the most talented people, you want to be able to say we're a place of welcome to everyone. So it's, it's work in progress. Um, but I think if we can establish that that then becomes really, really important is it, then nothing means we start looking at the social sector not as a cost, but actually as an investment. I think that starts to change how investments and patterns of where money is spent.

Speaker 6: Okay.

Audience Member: Thank you. Can you explain the decision not to include factors like mental illness or a social connection?

Michael Green: You know, how to hurt a man, don't you? Sorry. Um, what would you say is that we've got enough data to give, um, a meaningful signal. What we do know is that there's a huge issue around things we'd love to measure. A mental health is right at the top of the list. Yeah. I mean so much about global mental health, global health infrastructure is still focused around measuring mortality. No, but actually increasingly morbidity is something that's going to be very important and mental health, huge burden on people's lives and on the economy, et cetera. But the data on it just doesn't exist that we can really compare and do measurement and that's something really missing. The other one I'd say related to that is, and we do try and do a bit of this in some of the sub national work in the u s is thinking about disability and not talking about whether people have disability, but the quality of life for people with a disability.

Michael Green: Because you know, with the aging population, a lot of us are going to at some point in our life experience, disability or fragility. That's, that's just gonna be the nature of life. And the question is going to be do people who experienced disability originally have a good life? But that data doesn't exist either. So there's lots of areas where we are actively campaigning to get kind of better data, social connectedness. I think we in the global index have a measure around around can I rely on friends or neighbors in a time of need? Um, so I just

as a side, I did a, I did a presentation about the global data in Saudi Arabia. Uh, have you maybe had surprise that Saudi Arabia is in tier four and the Saudi Arabia score card is all red. Uh, so by thought, if you're gonna criticize someone, you can bet.

Michael Green: Just show up and tell them. So I went to Saudi Arabia and I gave my presentation. And, uh, the first question is, uh, I think your index reflects Western values. I said, oh, fine, thank you very much. Why is that? Says, well, you have an indicator about tolerance for gays and lesbians and in our society that's just wrong. And therefore it's, it's, it's, it's irrelevant. And I said, well, actually there's a fairly fair point. We're going to have to disagree on that one. But actually we can't measure tolerance for gays and lesbians in your society because it's illegal to ask that question. And that's not the reason why you sock on inclusiveness. It's actually because you do really badly on kind of rely on a friend or neighbor in a time of need. And as far as I'm concerned, there's nothing western about that concept. So we do try and measure those kinds of things as well, where we can, where the date of the data's available.

Audience Member: Thank you. From Vista, since I wasn't able to read the charts that well, but on an international level, what's the difference between Norway number one and the US at 25.

Michael Green: It's six points.

Audience Member: And how does that on the scale where it is that?

Michael Green: So the scale ones are about a 92 about 34 as a bottom scoring country.

Audience Member: And is it, you measure it every year then?

Michael Green: Yep.

Audience Member: And where is the United States been going?

Michael Green: Downwards. I think it was 14 in the first year. And it's gone steadily down whatsoever. Every year has gone down. Yep.

Speaker 6: Okay.

Audience Member: You know, there's so much, uh, even at the festival with Mark Zuckerberg here yesterday, there's so much commentary about the impacts of social media and connectedness and how people do commune. And I'm wondering as you continue with your social progress, uh, definition, if that doesn't become more and more a piece of how we measure that sense of wellbeing is, you know, with technology we're more and more isolated in some ways and we're more and

more connected, but in different ways. Has that, has that raised its head at all in your data?

Michael Green: Well, you know how to hurt me on that one as well. Yes. The once when we'd love to measure, I mean, we'd actually love on safety to measure safety online. I mean, that's an increasing aspect of safety in our lives. It's not just our physical safety, but our online safety and then thinking about inclusiveness, our experience, whether we're living in inclusive communities online. Would it be something we'd also love to measure? So trying to get there and trying

Michael Green: to follow where the data's going to give us that.

Speaker 6: Cool.

Audience Member: Have you checked in country's solvency, meaning equity compared to that? Well, I think the u s would be in big trouble. Most people don't have net equity after they pay up the up debts. And that's a huge load on people.

Michael Green: Yeah. Actually is what we will show. We could look at that. I mean one of the issues we have comparing countries is sometimes problems with the data and definitions. The data. I mean one finding we have on the global index comparing all the countries is that we find no relationship between social progress and income inequality. Um, which is a bit surprising given the amount of the attention we see on income inequality. What I would say on that is, is that the global data on income inequality is terrible. Yeah. Huh [inaudible] I'll come back. So there's one the issues of example, Pakistan comes as born the most equal countries in the world. I think that's just about the money is hidden somewhere. So sometimes the international comparisons can be quite difficult. Um, and we've done things like looking at financial inclusion and again, haven't quite found strong relations, but that might be different. But certainly within the states set, we could actually look at that. We haven't looked at that one yet, but, and that's something we want to do more work with the data is look at some of these hypotheses. Where do we find some of those relationships? Are there factors that are explaining those kinds of outcomes? So that's a very good idea. So I will do that. Thank you.

Audience Member: Uh, thank you for the presentation. Um, in your experience and assessment, how ready are cities in terms of the structures that are in place, uh, to use this data? Um,

Michael Green: yeah, yeah. Um, so we, we working around the world using this. I think what we've found is that the, I mean, so we're, we said we've got partnerships working with governments and national or local level, uh, across Latin America in 16 countries in Latin America. Yeah. Social brackets index is being used by the European Commission across the whole of the European Union and with EU member states. It's being used by the government of India and we're now just

starting working in Australia, South Africa and Canada as well as the work in the U S and we'd be going for about six years now. And so actually the, and our biggest problem is actually excess demand. And I think the pickup that we've had from people is because what we're offering people is not a replacement for GDP, but a compliment, and there's a very wise person said to me is if you want to get someone to do something, don't ask them to stop doing something first.

Michael Green: Yeah. So what we said was, look, carry on with your measurement. GDP competitiveness does matter. Carry on with that. That's useful still. But if you do this as well, you may find it is useful. And that, and what we found is once people try it, they start using it. And so that's why we would have a whole range of different national governments, state governments, city governments around the world who are using this tool because it actually helps them make decisions. Because again, one of the hardest things in government in particular is about making choices because you always got different lobbies for different sectors. Education wants this environment. Group One says the rights group one says it helps decision makers put things on a common platform, a platform that could be shared with citizens and other stakeholders. It's also something in the private sector, like companies like Coca Cola and Cargill are using this because it's a way for them to understand the communities they working with, communities or matter in their supply chain because social risk is actually a big risk for their supply chain.

Michael Green: So they're using it as well. So we've actually had that, had a very strong pickup on this. We're very glad with the two. Uh, the partnership with the state of California and with the two cities we have in San Jose and Jackson, we remember us looking to expand and our model has always been to go, uh, go where there's a, well, um, we're a nonprofit, we haven't got any money, we don't pay anyone to do this. We make a virtue of our poverty. Ah, and so we always say, look, we'll come and bring, we'll train you on the tools, we can work with you on this, but you've got to bear the cost. Yeah. So that means we always go where people are willing or where people really want to make a difference. And that's where we kind of follow our nose and see who, who would he want, who he wants certain leadership. And that's why we have pretty proud of the partners we have. And I'm looking for more if you know, a city, you know, a progressive mayor and we don't love to look for other partners to work.

Audience Member: Cool. So to your point, I'm wondering is given that America's going down, are there more cities and say, um, Denmark or Norway, that would be more milling as opposed to American cities? Do you have any data on that?

Michael Green: Yeah. Been a, across the European Union, a lot of will around this. There's a, I think after the financial crisis there was a big push around the idea of social Europe that the economy alone is not enough. I think also the European Union is very worried about fracturing the, you've got parts of the union that are lagging behind. And what they have found is that the tools that they've been



using haven't been so effective. So the European Union has a massive program of what they call cohesion policy. So this is, this is about 50 60 billion euros a year is cohesion. Yeah. So the occasion of the union, there's been about 50 60 billion euros a year on investments in the poorer parts of the, of the union. And that traditionally has gone on roads and bridges, et cetera. And they know it's not working. And so what they've done is they brought social progress index in to try and help think differently about what the real needs of the population to refocus on the real needs of the population. So I think there are some parts of will for who, who this is very directly, it speaks to the European mindset, but it also

Michael Green: works in a whole range of different contexts. I said from India to Latin America as well.

Speaker 6: Okay.

Audience Member: Ah, so I actually have a question that's kind of multiple things you were just talking about. Um, you know, South American countries and I immediately was thinking about, cause I didn't really see it anywhere around here was Venezuela, which is a country that's just completely falling apart. Is it harder to measure a country where something like their entire government is falling apart and, um,

Audience Member: okay,

Audience Member: like is that a country is like, do you have any sort of data about like the country with the quickest decline or something like that?

Michael Green: Yeah, so Venezuela. We actually, we have the data but we think it's wrong. Sure. So, yeah, so it's like, it's hard. It's probably pretty hard to get that information. So there will be a, some of the, it's I think we say, so we, we got a complete score for 146 countries. We've got partial scores for the rest. Okay. Um, where we struggle to measure is failed states where the data is easy. The meeting I saw was collapsing a also very small island states, uh, where there's not the richness of data as well. So that's, and we're looking at how we can fix that and bring them into the net as well. But it's as good as the data available. And that's why for us trying to sort of revolutionize how, what data we can use to measure this is really important so we can get more accurate, more timely measure of more places at a more granular basis.

Speaker 6: Okay.

Michael Green: Please, please, please. I'm, you can say, I mean, yeah, we've really profited from feedback through this process and the products have got better. That's why we keep it open. So this is really, really helpful. So I guess please, now I was thinking,

Audience Member: um, impact, uh, climate impact, places where life is getting worse because of climate impacts. That might be another interesting trend to look at too. Like you might have at one time put California very high for being extremely desirable place to live. It might be going downhill. Another one is, um, sense of connection to a local history or, so like I'm thinking of, I was talking to a scientist about art and she works in Micronesia working with the people there and they're trying to save their islands, but in large part to save their culture, not just the place where they live and that is making their, you know, their society stronger. So I wonder if there's a way to look at how much people are connected to a sense of history or tribe or whatever where they are and whether that's a good or bad thing would be another question. I guess

Michael Green: we certainly, we find that smaller countries do better. There's a general bias small, and I think that's because smaller countries, it's easy to get something done, but also smaller countries will tend to be more cohesive and a bunch of ways. So as I say, Iceland outperforms India on inclusiveness, but you know, Iceland is basically monocultural. India is massively diverse. So I think there's ways those cultural differences will be reflected in different ways in different places. Just on the climate change point. Yeah, I think trying to factor in that risk, I think we've not yet seen it in the data, but factor in that risk in, um, I don't know if you know the, so the United Nations has a set of goals for 2030 the sustainable development goals that are all about a huge, huge transformation in the state of the world. By 2030 we've done some, we're doing projections and we've allowed projections.

Michael Green: The 2030 goals will not be achieved until 2094 so the world is massively off track. And even within that we, for example see a country like Bangladesh is actually making really rapid progress on health issues. I mean I think this is what we see in our data very clearly is that the world is actually getting better inequalities, narrowing in terms of the quality of life of those or the bottom is getting better and very quickly. And on current trends it would go very well. But for a country like Bangladesh, climate change risk really could blow them entirely off course. So that's another sort of factor we could bring into the analysis.

Michael Green: Cool. Please. I was just the last one. Yep.

Speaker 4: I live in California where lack of affordable housing is a major problem. Um, I believe that Los Angeles and maybe New York have the highest rate of homelessness in the country. Are there places, cities probably in the country who have been able to um, provide, uh, a low cost housing successfully?

Michael Green: I don't know, but I think we could have a look and see what we can find in the data. Um, yeah, I mean, I mean just the California story's interesting. What we find. So for example, where like a San Jose is that for a lot of people the housing is affordable because they're being paid so well. But what we then seeing is the

other effect is a very high incidence of overcrowding and homelessness. Uh, so you can actually manifest itself in different ways. But that's exactly what we want to do, provide the data for, is to look in and say, well, she has someone solve this, has someone found a solution and then get that learning going between peers. I haven't done it. Don't off the top of my head, but it's a great question and I'll happily look into it for you.

Michael Green: Please. Yeah.

Audience Member: I live in the Bay Area and homelessness is a huge problem and I don't know whether Gavin Newson can do something about it. This has been going on for years and it's a small area and now it's hugely populated. Uh, how do you work on something like that?

Michael Green: Oh, I think the, the answer is yeah, I'm an optimist about the world because I think the most problems have probably been solved somewhere already. And the problem is actually we don't share it very well. And again, this is only the Mike Porter says, is that in the business world, there's a very sophisticated set of benchmarking. If I want to go into the widget industry, it's easy to find out who's the best in the business and how do they do it. In the social sector, the data's much weaker. And I think if we can start learning or learning from relevant peers, I think the solutions are out there. So I don't have the top of my head, but I think there must be a solution.

Audience Member: There's a big resistance to affordable housing. Yeah. It's like never in my backyard.

Michael Green: And that may be the thing. There's a, there's difficult choice. Says nobody's remaining. Thank you all very much. Really appreciate the conversation.