



# Economic and Social Council

Distr.: General

2 June 2023

English only

## Economic Commission for Europe

### Conference of European Statisticians

#### Seventieth plenary session

Geneva, 22-23 June 2023

Item 4 (a) of the provisional agenda

#### **Outcomes of the recent in-depth reviews carried out by the Bureau of the Conference of European Statisticians**

### **In-depth review on measurement of well-being**

#### **Addendum**

#### **Outcome of the electronic consultation on in-depth review on measurement of well-being**

#### **Prepared by the Secretariat**

#### *Summary*

This document presents the outcome of the in-depth review on measurement of well-being that the Bureau of the Conference of European Statisticians (CES) carried out in February 2023, and summarizes the feedback from the electronic consultation on the review among CES members in April–May 2023.

The in-depth review paper (ECE/CES/2023/7) was prepared by a group of experts led by Israel. The paper summarizes country practices and international activities in measuring current well-being, as well as the common conceptual and measurement challenges encountered, and concludes with a set of recommendations for future work in this area.

The Conference will be invited to endorse the outcome of the in-depth review on measurement of well-being.



## **I. Introduction**

1. Each year, the Bureau of the Conference of European Statisticians (CES) reviews selected statistical areas in depth. The purpose of the reviews is to improve coordination of statistical activities in the region of the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (UNECE), identify gaps or duplication of work, and address emerging issues. These reviews focus on strategic issues and highlight concerns of statistical offices of both a conceptual and coordinating nature.
2. The Bureau carried out an in-depth review on measurement of well-being in February 2023 based on a paper by a group of experts led by Israel (provided as document ECE/CES/2023/7).
3. The UNECE Secretariat conducted an electronic consultation in April–May 2023 to inform all CES members about the in-depth review on measurement of well-being and provide an opportunity to comment on its outcomes.
4. The following 19 countries and organizations replied to the electronic consultation: Armenia, Canada, Ecuador, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Hungary, Latvia, Malta, Mexico, Netherlands, Portugal, Romania, Russian Federation, Switzerland, Ukraine, the United Kingdom and the United States.

## **II. Outcome of the Conference of European Statisticians Bureau discussion in February 2023**

5. The Bureau made an in-depth review of measurement of well-being at its February 2023 meeting.
6. The Bureau found the paper comprehensive and helpful in directing further work on measurement of well-being. The Bureau agreed to establish a task force to develop guidelines for measurement of well-being to support countries that produce or consider producing well-being indicators. However, the guidelines should be built on existing frameworks (e.g., the Framework for measuring Well-being and Progress of the Organisation of Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), Eurostat's Quality of Life Indicators, the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and the 2025 System of National Accounts (SNA)), and focus on synthesizing these into operational guidelines.
7. The guidelines should examine a limited number of core indicators across the dimensions of well-being where harmonisation and improved international comparability is possible. In addition, the guidelines should clarify typology, provide definitions, and give operational guidance on data sources, compilation methods and communication.
8. As national well-being frameworks are developed to serve national purposes and adapted to specific conditions and needs in countries, the guidelines must give leeway to national frameworks to adapt to country needs and inclusion of country specific indicators. Furthermore, the Bureau stressed that the guidelines should be forward looking, and the task force should ensure coordination with relevant ongoing work, including on Beyond GDP, the SDGs and the SNA update.
9. Israel agreed to chair the task force. The following countries and organisations expressed interest in joining the task force to draft the guidelines on measuring well-being: Armenia, Canada, France, Ireland, Japan, Netherlands, New Zealand, Poland, Portugal, United Kingdom, United States, OECD, the United Nations Statistics Division (UNSD) and Leiden University (Netherlands). The Bureau will review the terms of reference of the task force at its 2023 October Bureau meeting.

## **III. General comments received in the electronic consultation**

10. Countries praised the quality of the in-depth review, agreed with the necessity for well-being measurement harmonization and comparability across countries, and expressed support for the proposal of establishing a task force to develop guidelines to assist countries

in producing well-being indicators (**Ecuador, Hungary, Latvia, Mexico, Netherlands, Portugal, Russian Federation, Ukraine, the United Kingdom, and the United States**). The analysis of country practices and international activities in measuring well-being was considered very useful, with valuable insights on the challenges in attempting to harmonize measures of well-being domestically and internationally (**Portugal, Ukraine and United States**). It was suggested that the overview of international activities could benefit from a more systematic comparison of international frameworks (**Portugal and Switzerland**).

11. Countries highlighted the need to create a harmonized conceptual scheme on subjective well-being measures and to develop guidance on how to deal with proxy reporting in the context of subjective well-being measurement (**Canada and Netherlands**). It would be helpful to also include discussions about the relationship between subjective economic well-being and subjective poverty measures (the **United States**).

12. There is a need for international collaboration to play a role not just in shaping measurement standards for indicators, but also in identifying best practice and orientation from a process perspective (e.g., different target frequency for production of various indicators, specific guidance for each measure, etc. ) and in providing detailed guidance on alternative data sources (e.g., big data, administrative data) proposed for each measure to achieve frequent and timely data (**Canada, Portugal, and the United States**).

13. **The Netherlands** raised several useful suggestions. For instance, the common language for measurement of well-being could be derived from multiple disciplines; theories used to define what well-being is and how it is produced could be shifted from a descriptive view (looking at relevant aspects) to a more systematic (behavioural and institutional) view; future work could look at a broader scope and encompass all dimensions of sustainable well-being; and that the challenges raised in the paper in measuring well-being are conceptual challenges rather than methodological ones.

14. Other valuable suggestions raised include: the guidelines could develop a set of single and composite indicators for each dimension; communication of well-being indicators should be carefully planned, sufficient documentation and explanations should be made available to users (**Mexico**); intervention at the community-level could be an aspect to be taken into consideration due to its potential impacts on mental and physical well-being, especially during the Covid-19 pandemic (the **United States**); it is ideal to publish both scoreboards and composite indicators when needed to provide overall measures as well as meaningful breakdowns to support evidence-based decision making (**Mexico and Portugal**). **Switzerland** stressed the importance of the guidelines in providing leeway for countries to adapt to their country specific needs. It was recommended by **Finland** that Eurostat should be involved in the work of the task force.

15. **Canada, Hungary, Malta, Netherlands, Portugal, Romania, Russian Federation and Ukraine** shared valuable experience in different aspects (e.g., measurement of distributional differences, dimensions, granularity, use of subjective indicators, etc.) of national practices in measurement of well-being.

16. Detailed substantive comments are provided in the Annex. Countries also sent editorial corrections and additional information which are not listed here. The comments will be taken into account in the CES discussion and in further work in this area.

## Annex

### Detailed substantive comments received from electronic consultation

<i>Country / Organization</i>	<i>Comments</i>
Canada	<p>Para 20 - The SWB approach is often described this way, but I am not aware of anyone who is seriously advocating for a purely subjective approach to well-being measurement. Most of the value of SWB is in its ability to shed light on the factors that determine it, and how they ‘rank’ relative to one another in explanatory power. So, I would say the third approach is a more ‘fair’ characterization of what the SWB approach really is. It is not about a narrow focus on only measures of SWB themselves.</p> <p>Para 21 - Consider ‘dashboard’ instead of ‘score board’. Frameworks can monitor progress towards a set of targets (as with the SDGs) or be used to monitor comprehensive trends in order to establish priorities (and potentially targets).</p> <p>Para 27 - This could be a good spot to highlight the structure of Canada’s Quality of Life framework, which measures multi-dimensionality through a set of domains and indicators, then inclusion (and sustainability) through two cross-cutting lenses applied as relevant to each of these domains and indicators. Investments in disaggregated data are extending survey coverage to better understand distributional differences in quality-of-life outcomes. Assessment of these distributional differences occurs throughout the policy development, implementation and evaluation cycle by means of an established though continually improving toolkit called Gender-based Analysis Plus.</p> <p>Para 106 - I think at the international level, there is value in digger deeper than what this item implies as described. Once there is consensus about what measures are relevant and should be standardized, it would be useful to think not just about frequency, but to provide some guidance as to what vehicles should be used for which measures, and I am thinking specific guidance for what should be census content, household survey content, LFS, time use surveys – that kind of thing. It isn’t clear what should go where.</p> <p>Additionally, related to the above there needs to be some guidance re: subjective measures and how to deal with proxy reporting. It is tempting to include SWB in household surveys, but we get a lot of pushbacks where survey managers are expecting high rates of proxy responses – this is particularly true for the LFS, for example. It is relevant also for child well-being, a group that is systematically excluded from many national statistics because they cannot consent themselves.</p> <p>On timeliness, I think there is a need to push back on the instinct to measure social indicators on 4–5-year timelines ‘because they don’t change much’. There should be some discussion that there is value in having fresh data, frequently to compete for attention with employment statistics or quarterly GDP estimates for example.</p>
Ecuador	<p>Para 28 - The introduction of the document states that the scope of this review is not to include wellbeing in the future, the inclusion or development of this section is a bit ambiguous in this context.</p>

<i>Country / Organization</i>	<i>Comments</i>
	<p>Para 50 - Again the development of sustainability in well-being is a bit ambiguous given that the introduction says that this is out of the scope of the review.</p> <p>Para 112 - Comparability across countries should be one of the goals of this taskforce, even though, definitions and terminology as well as guides of measurement will build towards comparability, I believe it should be made explicit.</p>
Finland	If a new working group continues the work, it would be important for Finland that Eurostat is involved and that the work takes into account the work done in the past.
Hungary	<p>Thank you for the very useful and forward-looking materials on measuring well-being and social cohesion. We believe it is important to measure well-being in as many dimensions as possible, which is a great challenge due to the steady decline in response rate to social surveys. The first large-scale representative well-being survey in Hungary was conducted in 2013, coordinated by the Hungarian Central Statistical Office. The survey was part of the SILC annual survey module coordinated by Eurostat. In the same year, our institution constructed its eight-dimensional well-being indicator system<sup>1</sup>, which was published in 2014. In 2015, the subjective well-being of the Hungarian population was again assessed; four questions in the core part of HU-SILC national questionnaire giving a permanent base, and every second year a more detailed set of well-being related questions are asked. In 2016, a survey of subjective well-being was carried out as part of the micro census, the results of which were published in a separate publication. We also find it important to measure social cohesion and the initiative for mapping of threats to cohesion as well. Currently, we primarily measure its economic aspects in the framework of the HU-SILC survey. We agree that the continuous development of the methodology of data collection measuring social cohesion is essential. At the moment, we do not wish to participate in the work of the working groups, but we would like to monitor the results in order to adopt the good practices and use the experiences.</p>
Malta	<p>In relation to this interesting document, we would like to share the NSO's progress in this domain, which was mainly achieved in collaboration with the University of Malta. Last year, several indicators related to general health and well-being, collected in the European Statistics on Income and Living Conditions (EU-SILC) survey, were cleaned and investigated. This led to a release titled EU-SILC 2021: Well-being, Social and Health Indicators, which was published in March this year. The release published information relating to certain well-being characteristics, such as the perceived satisfaction of persons (16+ years) with their overall life, financial situation, current job, and personal relationships with others. These figures were broken down based upon gender, age, as well as at-risk-of-poverty or social exclusion. Similarly, data relating to certain quality-of-life characteristics, including feelings of nervousness and agitation, calmness and peacefulness, downheartedness and depression, happiness, and loneliness, was also reported. Finally, figures</p>

<sup>1</sup> The indicator system developed in 2013 covers the following subjective and objective dimensions: 1) Work and leisure time 2) Material living conditions 3) Education, knowledge, educational attainment, 4) Mental well-being 5) Living environment and infrastructure, 6) Social capital 7) Social participation 8) Social renewal.

Country / Organization	Comments
	<p>relating to the extent to which persons felt they would receive material or non-material help, levels of trust and social exclusion were also provided.</p> <p>In addition to the publication of the release, we are currently working with The Malta Foundation for the Wellbeing of Society to issue more information with regards to the Maltese population satisfaction (with their overall life, financial situation, current job, time use and personal relationships) and overall feelings (nervousness, calmness and peacefulness, downheartedness or depression, happiness, and loneliness). Weekly meetings are being held in order to monitor the ongoing progress on the creation of related tables, some of which were presented in Parliament on the occasion of the International Day of Happiness. Data contained in these tables includes national averages for wellbeing variables by gender, age, district, material deprivation, problems with the dwelling, perceived general health, and dwelling problems (such as noise from neighbors or street, pollution and grime, and crime, violence, and vandalism). The data used is from EU-SILC 2018 up until EU-SILC 2021.</p>
Mexico	<p>Mexico, through INEGI, supports the proposal to develop guidelines for the measurement of well-being, the necessity to establish definitions and terminology, and determine possible indicators for the different dimensions of current well-being.</p> <p>A range of methodological challenges are linked to the compilation of well-being indicators. These include the definition of the dimensions of the well-being framework, the selection and compilation of indicators and different approaches to measuring inequalities. Compilation of subjective indicators and their inclusion in the framework as well as weighting and aggregation of individual indicators into composite measures are also mentioned as challenges by many countries.</p> <p>We suggest this guideline to include a set of single and composite indicators for each dimension that reflects the result for individuals and households and that already contains both objective and subjective perspectives, as well as the necessary disaggregation that allows for evaluating the inequalities between population subgroups.</p> <p>To provide meaningful information for decision making, scoreboards must be produced covering the dimensions and indicators of the framework. NSOs may decide to compile composite indicators for specific dimensions of well-being to meet user's needs. This will require a careful process to decide on weighting and aggregation methods.</p> <p>Regarding the communication of well-being statistics, they can be disseminated in many ways: as individual indicators, as a scoreboard or by use of composite measures or a combination of these. Because of the complexity and multidimensional nature of well-being, the communication should be carefully planned and may involve consultation with stakeholders and user groups. Publication of composite measures may help to reach out to some user groups, including medias, but may also be questioned and raise criticism for being political or value laden. In all cases, sufficient documentation and explanations must be made available to users to facilitate correct interpretation and use of the indicators.</p>
Netherlands	<p>The "In-depth review" comes at the right moment. We firmly agree with the need for harmonization and comparability across countries. We do believe that the scope of an international guideline should be broader. Given the challenges</p>

Country /  
Organization

Comments

our planet faces, an international statistical guideline or standard should encompass all dimensions of sustainable well-being: ‘here and now’, ‘later’ and ‘elsewhere’. And the challenges are not methodological but conceptual.

We agree with the observation that “within the framework of ‘official statistics’, there are no agreed concepts or approaches for measuring well-being, and practices vary among countries.” In our experience, many countries measure well-being and sustainability, yet not two instruments are the same. Comparisons can only be made from the perspective of a single country.

#### A common language

The strength of GDP (the SNA) is that it has created a common language for the measurement and analysis of economies around the globe.

The delineation of concepts and the choice of appropriate terms (the language of measurement) will be at the heart of the challenge of producing a statistical guideline or standard. The use of different terms for the same or comparable things such as happiness, quality of life, satisfaction etcetera is confusing for users of statistics. It also reflects theoretical confusion as much as nuance in the views on well-being.

The language should not borrow too much from a single discipline. In section III.G of the review the authors refer to the ‘capital approach’ prescribed by the CES Recommendations on Measuring Sustainable Development: “Different types of capital, mainly natural capital, economic capital, human capital and social capital, represent these resources, and the measurement focuses on flows and changes in stocks of the resources.” Though seemingly logical, the language and choice of concepts is clearly derived from economic theory.

#### Scope and theory

The authors note (e.g., in Box 1 and section III.C) that well-being is often defined as a ‘multidimensional phenomenon’ with various relevant ‘aspects’ (which typically are different themes or human needs, subjective and objective). For the development of a statistical guideline or standard that can be applied in every country, that is based in science, and that captures all relevant nuances, we believe that the statistical community needs to shift from a descriptive view (looking relevant aspects) to a more systematic (behavioral and institutional) view on what well-being is as well as how it is produced. At Statistics Netherlands, we relate well-being outcomes to choices made by people (as individuals or in households, families, communities, etcetera). We are exploring complex systems theory to formalize our understanding of the interactions between ecology, society and economy (the major systems) and to better understand how individual (or local) choices and interactions accumulate to national and global outcomes. For this reason, we are also looking into planetary boundaries and their connection to sustainable well-being as proposed by Kate Raworth. From a complexity perspective, subjective indicators may be seen to reflect preferences and values that drive behavior, while objective indicators may represent emergent outcomes of well-being. Complex systems also make it easier to conceptualize and consequently measure phenomena such as social life and social interaction.

In the review of the Personal Well-being Index of Statistics Netherlands, the authors note that “A classification of types of subjective well-being is helpful to obtain a structured description and measurement of the phenomenon. Many existing well-being frameworks combine these three types of subjective well-being and explore their relations and interdependencies. However, there is still no single conceptual (nor statistical) scheme that unites the field.” This single

Country / Organization	Comments
	<p>conceptual scheme that unites the field lies at the heart of the challenge of producing an international statistical guideline or standard.</p> <p>In section III.H the authors see “the definition of the dimensions, the selection and compilation of individual indicators and the weighting and aggregation of individual indicators if composite measures are compiled” as the main methodological challenges in measuring well-being. I would argue that these are conceptual or formal challenges, rather than methodological ones. This refers to the challenge of what might be called a ‘unified theory of sustainable well-being’. The scope, dimensions, and definitions in a statistical guideline or standard should refer to components of this ‘unified theory’ rather than to ‘relevant aspects’.</p> <p><u>Use in policy</u></p> <p>The authors focus on the use of well-being indicators. This is understandable given that this is a report by statisticians for the statistical community. Our experience is a different one. Where initially the focus was on indicators, in recent years there has been a rapid increase in the use of sustainable well-being (in Dutch: “brede welvaart”) in policy making and evaluation. This shift is associated with a shift in the <u>values</u> that underlie decision making rather than with the statistics we produce. Other priorities than purely economic or financial ones are gaining ground. There is increasing awareness of the effects of decisions on future generations and people elsewhere as well as of the possibility that the effects of policies may not be distributed fairly.</p> <p>Since 2018, Statistics Netherlands has produced an annual Monitor of Well-being and the SDG’s. In it, we measure well-being ‘here and now’, ‘later’ and ‘elsewhere’. The monitor is based on the CES Recommendations on Measuring Sustainable Development. The SDGs have been integrated into this monitor: sustainable well-being is the phenomenon; the SDGs represent internationally agreed goals for specific aspects of well-being. In the monitor, we compare well-being ‘here and now’, ‘later’ and ‘elsewhere’ with the EU-27.</p> <p>We do not produce a composite index of sustainable well-being. A composite indicator communicates more easily but obscures the different values (e.g., environment versus social versus cultural versus economic) that underlie decisions based on notions of sustainable well-being. Our users have indicated that they prefer a dashboard of indicators, because it provides them with insights into trade-offs and because different users have different values and priorities and therefore different informational needs. The review examines the Personal Well-being Index of Statistics Netherlands. This index is no longer used in our annual Monitor of Well-Being and the SDGs for this very reason.</p>
Portugal	<p>The background review of the various attempts, writings, and productions to measure well-being is reliable and comprehensive. It summarizes well the path taken since the early 1960s in this context.</p> <p>The description of the scope of the well-being measure area starts by defining its purpose and analyzing terminology and meaning. Finally, it adopts the broad definition of wellbeing of the Stiglitz-Sen-Fitoussi report.</p> <p>For the Portuguese Well-being Index, we also follow the Stiglitz-Sen-Fitoussi report, and we consider well-being as a multidimensional concept with ten dimensions:</p>



- Economic well-being
- Economic vulnerability
- Employment
- Health
- Work-life balance
- Education, knowledge, and skills
- Social relations and subjective well-being
- Civic participation and governance
- Personal security
- Environment.

Regarding the different approaches to well-being, Portugal also thinks of well-being as including objective and subjective indicators. We also measure well-being using composite indicators. We publish ten composite dimension indexes and two composite indicators summarizing the 'Material living conditions' and the 'Quality of life' perspectives. And finally, the Well-being index is computed as an equally weighted average of the values of the ten index dimensions.

The review's authors said that since a single composite indicator will not support evidence-based decision-making, it is "needed to know what drives the composite indicator". That is precisely what Portugal's "Well-being Index" does, publishing both the composite indexes and the respective indicators.

We only use the "evaluative" type of subjective well-being. We do not publish "affective" and "eudemonic" types because we could not find appropriate data.

Furthermore, we do not measure inequalities except those that can be measured by concentration coefficients (Gini), or the gender pay gap.

#### Methodological issues and challenges

Regarding the opposition between the scoreboard and the composite indicator approaches, we believe that it is not impossible to combine the two. For countries like Portugal with a composite indicator approach and publishing the values for all base indicators, it is easy to publish both the index and the scoreboard.

Even when limiting yourself to the well-being "here and now", there is a possibility of not having "now" enough data if you want to build a yearly composite index. That is the problem with the frequency and timeliness of data for producing the Well-being index. That is why there is a need for alternative data from other sources (e.g., big data).

#### Overview of international activities

This is also a comprehensive chapter, but a systematic comparison between the different frameworks must be made.

#### Challenges in the measurement of well-being

If a solution comprising two classes of indicators is adopted, a set of core and common indicators and a set of other indicators, there is a need to be cautious for a possible situation where the results of the common core indicators are not in congruence with the other national indicators.

It has been said that "NSOs may decide to compile composite indicators for specific dimensions of well-being" (paragraph 105). Why restrain the construction of composite indicators only for specific dimensions? The

<i>Country / Organization</i>	<i>Comments</i>
	<p>building of composite indicators using all dimensions used in a scoreboard is plausible.</p> <p>What should we aim for? International comparability, answers to methodological challenges, or both?</p> <p>We agree with the decision to establish a Task Force to develop guidelines for the measurement of well-being. We also agree with the very complex tasks attributed to the Task Force.</p> <p>We are interested in being involved in further work.</p>
Romania	<p>Referring to chapter 9 “United Nations Economic Commission for Europe – online inventory of Satellite Accounts”:</p> <p>In the inventory of satellite accounts presented by UNECE, we mention that, similar to all other EU member states, in the field of social protection, INS Romania has implemented the European system of integrated social protection statistics (ESSPROS), according to the provisions of the European Regulation (EC) no 458/2007 of the European Parliament and of the Council on the European system of integrated social protection statistics (ESSPROS).</p> <p>ESSPROS data are annually sent to Eurostat and are published in Eurostat's European database and also in the INS online TEMPO database.</p> <p>Therefore, please find attached the Romanian input to be added to the UNECE online inventory of Satellite Accounts, social protection statistics.</p>
Switzerland	<p>It provides a good overview on the subject.</p> <p>Only two remarks:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Table 3 (p. 14): It would be interesting to see which or how many countries use which conceptual framework for their well-being indicators (as in Table 1, for example).</li> <li>- We agree with the idea of establishing a Task Force to develop guidelines to improve comparability. However, it is not bad per se for countries to create or adapt frameworks to their own needs. It is probably better that an international organization conducts an international comparison (and collects the data needed to do so, such as the OECD with the better life index) rather than to strictly harmonize different national approaches and measures, as is done, for example, with national accounts.</li> </ul>
Ukraine	<p>The in-depth review covers the issues related to measurement of well-being, describes both historic deliberations and modern status of this type of statistics. The document presents information about international activity on measuring and publishing well-being indicators.</p> <p>The objective to measure well-being is to give a comprehensive and full picture of current life situation of selected persons, households and communities including both positive and negative aspects. The well-being indicators are focused on the things that are important for life of people in measurements context. The well-being indicators present information which can be used to assess the general life situation of citizens and households and for decision-making.</p> <p>The poll results of statistical services of the countries reveal that in order to measure the current well-being, two-thirds of countries make use of information obtained through the results of household surveys (LFS, household expenses survey, time use survey). A third of countries uses administrative data sources. Only two countries reported the usage of big data</p>

<i>Country / Organization</i>	<i>Comments</i>
	<p>and other data sources (for instance, mobile data on the time to get to the office, data from international tourist platforms).</p> <p>A majority of the EU countries base their national framework on the EU-SILC system of measurement. This includes objective and subjective indicators and has multidimensional perspective of using monetary and non-monetary approaches oriented towards selected persons and households. The review gives information about approaches to measuring current well-being and its types.</p> <p>Ukraine supports the necessity to resolve such issues as data harmonization and comparability among countries, improvements to timeliness, new data sources for measuring well-being. Of special relevancy is the conclusion as to setting up the Task Force to develop the guiding principles for well-being measurement in order to support the countries producing or considering the possibility of well-being indicators production.</p> <p>In particular, starting from 2025, in Ukraine it is foreseen to implement the European survey "Statistics of income and living conditions (EU-SILC)", whose program would include a system of indicators for life quality measurement harmonized with the Eurostat requirements. Also, we support the proposal regarding the seminar to be run for the national experts in order to exchange experiences in current well-being measurement.</p>
United States of America	<p>The United States commends the work of the Central Bureau of Statistics of Israel on their thorough, in-depth review of the measurement of current well-being. The report does an excellent job of conveying the inherent challenges in attempting to harmonize measures of well-being domestically and internationally. We would like to raise attention to a couple of key issues. There is some reference to "human needs" early in the report. This concept could be expanded upon to ensure a holistic approach to understanding well-being. That said, there may be differing opinions as to what these needs are, and it is well-stated in the report that capturing both the objective and subjective nature of well-being makes its measurement "one of the most challenging tasks in official statistics". For this reason, we suggest focusing interventional efforts on the objective dimensions of well-being as it is easier to commit to making changes to an individual's conditions rather than focus on changing their perceptions and beliefs. Also, the U.S. recognizes that statistical agencies should consider harnessing the power of big data and administrative records to provide information on well-being more efficiently. Given the limited space on most surveys for content data linkage could provide the important contextual indicators of well-being without having to sacrifice critical survey time. As noted, in a recent report from the U.S. Surgeon General, there is an emerging public health epidemic of loneliness and social isolation in the U.S., key indicators of well-being. The U.S., therefore, also recommends considering interventions at the community-level which have been shown to have some of the greatest impacts in improving mental and physical well-being while decreasing mortality and morbidity. Lastly, the U.S. believes that discussions about the relationship between subjective economic well-being and subjective poverty measures would be helpful.</p>