

- **Presentation of answerers and their familiarity with EU-SPI**

100 respondents originating from 19 EU countries took the EU-SPI survey. 47% work at regional level, 30% work at national level and 15% work at local or city level.

There are as approximately as many respondents familiar with the global SPI as with the EU-SPI. But the respondents are familiar with the EU-SPI to a greater extent than with the global SPI.

A large majority of the respondents (63%) is familiar with the EU-SPI Pilot project, amongst which 40% are part of a Pilot region and 11% are part of an associated region to the pilot.

- **Relevance**

“Health and Wellness”, “Nutrition and Basic Medical Care” and “Access to Basic Knowledge” are the components that count as the most important policy priorities and that are reflected the most faithfully by the index scores.

Over 70% of the respondents at each administrative level considered that that the EU-SPI was either a fairly useful or very useful, the administrative levels where the EU-SPI is the most considered as useful being the regional level and the national level.

64% of the respondents are in favour of using new criteria (other than GDP) for peers’ comparison between regions, the most suggested criteria being “Demography”, followed by “Urban-rural disparities”, “Educational level” and “Unemployment”.

“Culture”, “Mobility” and “Accessibility” were suggested the most to be included in the EU-SPI as a measure of social progress.

- **Coherence**

Only 32% of the respondents use other indicator frameworks for measuring social progress in their organisation (*the Social Justice index, the Human Development Index; Social Vulnerability Index; indicator framework of the European Social Fund; the Sustainable Society Index and; the Regional Composite Index*).

The most result-contested components in the eyes of the respondents are **“Access to Basic Knowledge”, “Access to Advanced Education”, “Environmental Quality”, “Access to Information and Communication”**

Culture and Mobility, Energy efficiency, Urban planning and Valorisation of cultural heritage are the main fields used in national/regional cohesion policies, but which are not covered by the EU-SPI.

The most useful EU-SPI measurement frequency should be a mid-term frequency of 2 years.

The EU-SPI framework is in fact useful to measure progress towards achieving the SDGs.

- **Effectiveness**

The primary purposes of the EU-SPI are considered to be a comparison tool with other regions in the EU (65%) but also a measure instrument of their respective region’s progress (57%). A majority of the respondents thinks the EU-SPI framework is used as a benchmark to improve relative regional social performance and for policy making purposes by their organisation.

Over 70% of the respondents think that the EU-SPI platform it either fairly user-friendly or very user-friendly and that the regional data is accessible and presented in a comprehensive manner.

Only 13% of the respondents indicate that there was of causing an inappropriate policy focus as an effect of the “indicator race”, whereas 30% claimed that there was no risk.

- **EU added-value**

The large majority of the respondents thinks that there is an added value resulting from the EU-SPI compared to what could be developed at national, regional and/or local level and that stopping EU-SPI would deprive them of important basis for orientating regional social progress policies.

88% would use the EU-SPI after learning about it, 73% envisage to increase the use of the EU-SPI in the future. 17% think about maintaining their use of the EU-SPI.