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1. Context for measuring regional well-being

1. People’s well-being is shaped by both individual and neighbourhood/place characteristics.

2. Inequalities in outcomes are large among regions also in the same country: for example the range of life expectancy across OECD countries is of 9 years, 6 years across US States and 13 years among US Congressional Districts.

3. Outcome indicators to respond to citizens’ expectations to better understand the area in which they live to make decisions and voice their interests.

4. Strong demand from state and local governments that have different capacities to promote people’s well-being and deliver quality services.
To inform policy data need to capture the scale of people’s everyday life [place-based policy]

Different geographies: administrative (362 OECD large regions) and functional (metropolitan areas)

Nagoya (Japan)
People’s well-being is composed of many dimensions
Population averages and differences across regions and groups of people

Place characteristics
Including citizenship, governance and institutions

Individuals’ characteristics

2. Framework and results
A common set of indicators to compare OECD large regions

www.oecdregionalwellbeing.org

New York

Explore the map to find out how life is across OECD regions and discover regions with similar well-being.

Each region is measured in eight topics important for well-being. The values of the indicators are expressed as a score between 0 and 10. A high score indicates better performance relative to the other regions.

Regions with similar well-being in other countries:

- Canada, Manitoba
- United Kingdom, Greater London
- Luxembourg
- Germany, Mecklenburg-Vorpommern
Using GIS data to measure environmental performance of cities and regions

Lowest and highest average PM2.5 levels in metropolitan areas, 2010-2012
Accessibility to services is a key dimension of measuring regional well-being

Still little information on location of services (examples health and transport)

% of population with access to public transport
Possible developments to measure access to services

• Location of environmental amenities weighted by subjective values (Hotspot monitor – University of Groningen)
• Integrate surveys responses to “unmet medical needs” with data on location and typology of health services
• Transportation flows data and options within cities.
3. What have we learned?

- Recognise diversity of communities/regions in the choice of well-being indicators. Make available information accessible and guidance on methods to build the indicators.
- Technical capacity is varied. Global standards and datasets are useful benchmarks.
- There are many geographies of interest in a country. The availability of geo-located data is the first step to use different geographical scales beyond the administrative ones.
4. Emerging statistical agenda

1. Make available more geo-located data (infrastructure, services and housing).

2. Bridge the geo-coded information to users information or households’ surveys (including their self-assessment and perception) in the well-being agenda.

3. Expand the regional well-being framework to measure well-being in cities and other functional areas.

4. Agree on methods to combine different sources (e.g. household surveys, administrative records, Census data) to increase availability of information at different geographical scales.