

The BRAINPOoL Project:

Summary, Recommendations and Next Steps



This project has received funding from the European Union's Seventh Programme for research, technological development and demonstration under grant agreement No 283024.

Authors:

Alistair Whitby (WFC), Charles Seaford (nef), Christine Berry (nef), Saamah Abdallah (nef)

Cover photo:

[istock-photo-6904689-little-explorer](#)

Printed on FSC (Forest Stewardship Council) paper using vegetable-based inks

Contents

Part 1: BRAINPOoL project: summary of results	3
1.1 Defining the problem	3
1.2 A review of Beyond GDP indicators and their uses	4
1.3 Evidence of demand and lack of demand for Beyond GDP indicators	5
1.4 Indicator success factors	6
1.5 Barriers to the use Beyond GDP indicators in policy making	7
Part 2: Recommendations and next steps	8
2.1 Overview of recommendations	8
2.2 Next Steps and projects to take forward these recommendations	8
2.3 From recommendations to actions: putting projects into practice	13



This project has received funding from the European Union's Seventh Programme for research, technological development and demonstration under grant agreement No 283024.

Part 1: BRAINPOoL project: summary of results

It is now widely recognised that the objectives that have dominated economic policy for the last 40 years and more – maximising Gross Domestic Product (GDP) and market efficiency – are no longer adequate goals for society. There is now a broad coalition that recognises that economic growth alone cannot deliver sustainability, social justice and improved well-being. Institutions such as Eurostat, the OECD, the World Bank, National Statistical Offices (NSOs) and others are responding to the desire from governments and civil society to consider a more nuanced set of economic policy objectives. At the same time non-governmental actors are using alternative ‘Beyond GDP’ indicators as an advocacy tool to promote more radical societal change including greater equality, higher levels of well-being for all and a vision of progress that is consistent with long-term environmental sustainability.

The BRAINPOoL project’s activities have been directed at making sense of the array of actors, aims, indicators and initiatives that have emerged from these efforts with a focus on exploring the barriers to the use of Beyond GDP indicators in policy making and how these can be overcome. Our work has moved from rather classical research towards more innovative brokerage activities and finally the co-development of what could be called ‘policy strategy’ with some of the actors we engaged with.

1.1 Defining the problem

One of our early findings was that there was considerable confusion about what ‘Beyond GDP’ really means. We found it necessary to underline that ‘Beyond GDP’ does not simply mean the limited additional use of environmental and social indicators, since of course these are already used in environmental and social policy making. The fundamental problem remains that in the negotiation of trade-offs between economic, environmental and social policy objectives, it is economic objectives that still trump others. For a variety of reasons there is a bias in policy making towards prioritising GDP growth and efficient markets. It is precisely to correct this bias that we need new indicators. This bias also led us to decide that we needed to define more clearly what we mean by ‘Beyond GDP’ and also its ‘use in policy making’.

We therefore defined Beyond GDP indicators as:

“those indicators and indicator sets that have been proposed as necessary and central to the measurement of societal progress in a broad sense, other than those indicators, such as GDP or the unemployment rate, that are already playing this role.”

In terms of their use in policy we do not simply mean their use in parallel with traditional economic indicators but as part of an *integrated policy process* that also informs a more holistic approach to *economic* policy making. If Beyond GDP indicators are to overcome the bias in favour of growth and have the impact necessary to change our policy goals and outcomes, they are going to have to be used in at least some contexts where GDP is currently used, as integrated decision-making tools. This will allow policy makers to target good quality growth (where economic *and* social/environmental indicators show improvement) not bad quality growth (where social/environmental indicators of progress are sacrificed for growth).

1.2 A review of Beyond GDP indicators and their uses

The project's next task was to explore the wide variety of Beyond GDP initiatives, assess the intentions of indicator producers, learn about the impacts that alternative indicators were already having on policy, the media and 'on the ground', and (where this was happening) chart the factors that were contributing to this success.

We found that despite their many useful applications in both defining the intermediate objectives of policy (policy drivers) and in measuring ultimate outcomes (e.g. well-being/sustainability), the sheer number and diversity of alternative indicators has made it difficult for their relevance and meaning to be appreciated by decision makers. We therefore suggested a number of ways indicators can be usefully classified to increase clarity and developed our own indicator policy fact sheets to provide basic, comparable and easy to digest information on a range of alternative indicators.

Almost all indicator producers we surveyed primarily want to influence or be useful to policy makers and thus ultimately have a 'real world' impact, although we found a number of other objectives including influencing opinion formers (media, academics) or directly influencing societal change. Beyond these intentions we found that there are a number of different ways that alternative indicators are actually being used, not all of which are entirely legitimate:

- ▶ *Instrumental use*, where indicators are seen as objective information tools to improve policy making, solving problems and consciously influencing decisions.
- ▶ *Conceptual use*, which sees the prime value of the indicator to be more intangible, influencing how policy makers define a problem or provide an instructive perspective.
- ▶ Finally, *political use* which includes three interesting sub-categories. *Strategic use*, where indicators are used to justify or bolster a position or decision which has already been taken (where the indicators that are 'successful' tend to be ones that provide the desired message). *Tactical use* whereby decisions are postponed or avoided with the excuse that data is being awaited but the content of the indicator is actually of little relevance. *Symbolic use* whereby indicators are used only to convey a message or present an image.

We identified several examples of Beyond GDP indicators having traction in policy. For example, the Genuine Progress Indicator (GPI), Index of Sustainable Economic Welfare (ISEW) and the Regional Index on Alternative Quality of Life Indicators (QUARS) were found being integrated into regional or local official assessment frameworks in the US, UK and Italy respectively. Also noteworthy is the Ecological Footprint being used to set environmental impact targets in several national governments.

Actual policy changes connected to indicators were also found. These include (i) the implementation of schemes to improve habitat for farmland birds after changes to the UK Defra Sustainable Development Indicator (SDI) set, and (ii) the investment of \$15 billion by the United Arab Emirates (UAE) government to develop alternative energy sources spurred on by a poor ranking in the Ecological Footprint.

The most significant successes, however, were achieved by local level indicators, perhaps because the distance between producer and user of the indicators is much smaller, making it easier to achieve a better 'fit' while also achieving legitimacy and relevance. For example, the Jacksonville Community Council Indicators (JCCI) are believed to have been instrumental in reducing infant mortality rates,

recidivism and water pollution in the area. The Council of Europe's SPIRAL (Societal Progress Indicators and Responsibility for All) project, meanwhile, achieved changes in the delivery of food relief in France and the transformation of the approach to homelessness in Belgium.

It is worth noting, however, that these impacts are largely not 'Beyond GDP' in the sense we have defined it (as measures of progress in the broadest sense) and rather than impacting *economic* policy, the influences are largely on detailed social and environmental policy issues (delivery of public health services or farmland bird protection).

1.3 Evidence of demand and lack of demand for Beyond GDP indicators

Given the significant variations we found in the uptake and impacts that different Beyond GDP indicators were experiencing, one of the project's key tasks was to explore the different aspects of 'demand' and also the reasons why many Beyond GDP indicators were experiencing a 'lack of demand'. Several types of Beyond GDP demand were identified:

- ▶ *Societal demand for new models.* While we found little evidence of strong 'bottom up' demand for indicators *themselves* (the general public, of course does not think in terms of indicators), what certainly exists in parts of civil society is an appetite for social change and even a transformation of the economic system itself, in part as a response to the impacts of the financial crisis. Many official indicator initiatives can be seen as a technical interpretation of elements of this societal demand. The fact that civil society is impacting the debate at all reveals important progress in a field that was once almost the exclusive preserve of statisticians and economists.
- ▶ *Political demand for new measures.* Demand for Beyond GDP indicators from the political mainstream tends to favour indicators compatible with the status quo or incremental change and are likely to serve a conceptual, assessment or communication role rather than a role in decision making. An increasing political demand was, however, observed for a single, simple, yet multi-dimensional indicator and better environmental indicators. Political demand tends to be strongest at the local and regional levels, due in part to the relative proximity of local leaders and civil society.
- ▶ *Democratic Legitimacy.* We encountered repeated demands for greater democratic participation, particularly in the construction and development phases of Beyond GDP indicators, and for wider public access to statistical information. Debates around Beyond GDP are commonly formulated through very technical debates with the involvement of high-level actors and with poor civil society participation.

Generally we found that the use of Beyond GDP indicators remains weak, both within institutions and in the policy making process. This weak demand can be explained in terms of (i) a lack of belief in the need to move away from GDP and a lack of knowledge of alternatives ('user factors') (ii) the difficulties of moving away from GDP in the current political context ('policy factors') (iii) and concerns about the quality, robustness and neutrality of Beyond GDP indicators themselves ('indicator factors').

While there is a general acknowledgement of some weaknesses and limitations in GDP, even amongst most statisticians and economists, we found that many feel there is nothing new about Beyond GDP indicators. They point out that there are plenty of alternative indicators already available and the problem is primarily with how the media misuses GDP, rather than with the metric itself.

Ultimately, even if GDP is not considered a good proxy for welfare it is seen as measuring something so central to the current societal model that it needs to remain in a central place. Given this importance, zero growth, de-growth and even inclusive growth models are generally dismissed as unrealistic and incompatible.

If the limits of GDP are only moderately recognised by mainstream actors, a secondary problem is the even poorer knowledge of the alternatives. Aside from the ‘Stiglitz Report’, Human Development Index and Ecological Footprint awareness of Beyond GDP indicators and initiatives remains negligible. Moreover, we found a general mistrust of subjective data as well as the suspected ulterior motives and normative assumptions of Beyond GDP alternatives which serve to dampen political demand.

One of GDP’s undoubted strengths is that it is published at regular three-monthly intervals, allowing decision makers to use it as a timely policy making tool. In contrast, many alternative indicators are either published irregularly or with too much of a time lag to impact policy cycles. In addition they necessarily incorporate long-term issues (such as sustainability) and long-term trends (changes in well-being) which struggle to attract the attention of politicians or the media focused on short-term political and news cycles.

Alongside these factors identified as negatively influencing the demand for alternative indicators we found several clear drivers of demand. At the political level these include the increasing institutionalisation of Beyond GDP indicators in programmes like National Sustainable Development Strategies such as those in Germany, France and the UK in which indicators have a specific and embedded role. We also found an increasing demand for composite indicators, particularly for assessment purposes, and were able to identify increasingly proactive moves on the part of statisticians and decision makers, actively requesting the supply of specific types of data.

At the societal level, there is now good international evidence to show that the public favours the use of broader indicators that incorporate health, social and environmental statistics. At the same time the emergence of the Beyond GDP agenda has opened up the ‘measurement’ debate to a much wider set of actors. Progress is no longer just a topic for economists but now includes academics, political actors, NGOs, psychologists and civil society actors among others.

1.4 Indicator success factors

Given the range of drivers and opportunities being experienced by some alternative indicators on the one hand and the persistent reasons for a lack of Beyond GDP demand on the other, the BRAINPOoL project also explored the question of why some indicators manage to achieve success while others fall short. We could identify a clear set of success factors which include the need for:

- ▶ *Salience for decision makers.* Indicators were successful when they could demonstrate real relevance for policy or strategy, measuring things that can be influenced by policy.
- ▶ *Salience for a broader audience.* Producing a simple, attractive message that links to a meaningful concept while avoiding certain ‘taboo’ words and concepts is key to impacting a broad audience.

- ▶ **Credibility.** While some interviewees continue to express doubts about the lack of variability in the trends of subjective well-being data and the potential for arbitrary weighting in composite indicators, data quality and the appearance of neutrality continue to be the best routes to overcoming resistance and achieving credibility.
- ▶ **Relationships.** The importance of relationship-building including developing indicators in partnership with the audience at whom they are targeted is critical, including in policy where face-to-face channels and active engagement with those least sympathetic to the Beyond GDP agenda (Treasuries, Economics/Finance departments) were cited as vital.

1.5 Barriers to the use Beyond GDP indicators in policy making

As we have seen, some, but not all, of the activity around alternative indicators is effective at having a ‘real world’ impact, that is, helping policy makers, and those influencing policy makers, crystallise their objectives, assess their performance, and as a result change and improve what they do. So the project also spent time assessing what the key barriers are to using new measures of societal progress in a broad sense to guide policy and how these hurdles can be overcome.

We carried out seven action research case studies, where we worked with governmental bodies across Europe from the city and regional level (Rotterdam, Chrudim in the Czech Republic, the Midi-Pyrenees region in France, and Wales) up to national level government Ministries (The German Environment Ministry and the UK ministry for Business, Innovation and Skills), as well as the OECD. In each case we worked with people within these bodies who were interested in promoting Beyond GDP indicators, and explored the barriers to that taking place, both within and outside the organisations.

We found that although there are a number of technical barriers to do with data quality and lack of adequate resources, these are really only symptoms of low current political priority and of more fundamental underlying barriers:

- ▶ **Political barriers,** including perceived lack of democratic legitimacy, lack of a clear and compelling narrative underpinning new indicators, and lack of clear political imperative for change (due to low public awareness of new indicators).
- ▶ **Indicator barriers,** including disagreements over methodology and a perceived lack of theoretical foundation underpinning new indicators (particularly composite indicators of adjusted GDP).
- ▶ **Process and structural barriers,** including organisational and analytical challenges posed by a more holistic, multi-dimensional view of progress; institutional resistance to change, and a failure of indicator producers to connect with the priorities of potential users.

Part 2: Recommendations and next steps

2.1 Overview of recommendations

Based on the findings in part 1 and particularly those in part 1.5, we make six broad recommendations under three headings, each directed specifically to relevant actors (indicated in brackets):

Politics

1. Develop processes to engage citizens and establish democratic legitimacy (*political parties, NGOs, officials*).
2. Develop a Beyond GDP narrative, illustrated with policies where use of Beyond GDP indicators make a difference (*political parties, NGOs, OECD*).

Indicators

3. Continue technical, theoretical and harmonisation work (*academics, official statisticians, OECD, international agencies*).

Processes

4. Improve processes for integrated and innovative policy making (*officials, political parties*).
5. Develop strategies for overcoming institutional resistance (*political parties, NGOs*).
6. Strengthen the role of ‘indicator entrepreneurs’ (*official and unofficial statisticians*).

Two of these recommendations – numbers 2 and 4 – were discussed at BRAINPOoL’s final conference on 24th March 2014.

Below, for each of the six key recommendations of the BRAINPOoL project, we identify some possible ‘next steps’ projects which could advance these recommendations. These suggestions build on the project’s work and are drawn from discussions at the final conference and the two workshops which surrounded it.

2.2 Next Steps and projects to take forward these recommendations

Recommendation 1: Develop processes to engage citizens and establish the democratic legitimacy of Beyond GDP indicators (Political parties, officials, NGOs)

Beyond GDP concepts need to be rooted in processes, goals and targets that have legitimacy. A democratic process with wide representative and public engagement on the measurement of ultimate goals (end indicators), including subjectively measured ends, will help to raise legitimacy and public awareness of (harmonised) Beyond GDP concepts. This probably has highest potential for success on the local level, as democratic engagement might be easier to organise at smaller scales, but is important at all scales, including at the European level.

More generally, the debate about how we measure progress cannot be left to experts. The complexity and multi-dimensionality of Beyond GDP in fact makes deliberation necessary, based on exchanging knowledge and experiences between various stakeholders and partners.

Some possible next steps include:

- ▶ Projects to facilitate participatory public discussions on what we mean by ‘societal progress’ and ‘good lives’, and how we should measure this; as well as participatory processes for policy development. Some attendees at our workshops suggested that wellbeing provides a particularly useful framework for convening such discussions, encouraging citizens to think about what matters most to their own wellbeing.
- ▶ Projects to link the outcomes of these participatory initiatives to work with politicians (particularly at local level) to develop new frameworks for measuring progress – including obtaining funding to scale up existing local-level initiatives.
- ▶ Forging links between the Beyond GDP community and those engaged in working for democratic renewal.

Recommendation 2: Develop a Beyond GDP narrative, and demonstrate the difference use of Beyond GDP indicators will make to policies and outcomes (Political parties, OECD, NGOs)

There is a need for further work to develop politically compelling messages around Beyond GDP indicators. To be successful as a public communication tool, Beyond GDP indicators must connect with things that have real impact on people’s lives – dramatising a real problem and pointing the way towards a solution. Such messages must go beyond the division between economic, environmental and social, instead articulating a new, more holistic vision of progress which resonates with the public. Discussions at the conference and workshops centred around concepts such as equality, stability, security, good jobs and a better quality of life.

The foundation for this work will be what people care about and thus public engagement initiatives of the kind described above (see Recommendation 1). **Other possible projects building on this might include:**

- ▶ Engaging communications and branding specialists to help translate Beyond GDP indicators into compelling messages for a wider audience, and provide advice on how these messages can be disseminated more effectively. Different messages will need to be developed for different audiences, albeit underpinned by a common narrative; business in particular was identified as a group which the Beyond GDP community needed to engage with more.
- ▶ Media training and capacity-building programmes for statisticians and indicator producers, so that statistical releases more effectively penetrate the public debate and generate positive media coverage which advances a wider Beyond GDP narrative.
- ▶ Harnessing ‘big data’ to produce timely Beyond GDP data which is more attuned to the news cycle, e.g. a wellbeing index based on online content such as search terms which would be released in real time.
- ▶ Mapping governments which have shown interest in Beyond GDP and where the key opportunities for gaining traction with Beyond GDP narratives might be; facilitating cross-jurisdictional learning about what has, and has not, worked.
- ▶ Identifying a set of headline Beyond GDP indicators that will form part of the narrative (in the way that GDP forms part of the broader GDP narrative that markets will deliver optimal

outcomes and that maximising growth will maximise welfare). These can then be introduced into EU and national policy processes – see recommendation 4 below.

There is also a clear need for further work to develop the theoretical foundations for Beyond GDP narratives. Various speakers at our final conference stressed that this was vital if Beyond GDP was to compete with conventional neoclassical narratives. **Some possible projects might include:**

- ▶ Synthesising and building on existing work in heterodox economics – in particular to answer key questions such as how an economy with lower or zero growth might work, and how we can have wellbeing without growth.
- ▶ Building networks of researchers, facilitating discussions and collaboration between them, and creating opportunities for their work to be debated and discussed by a wider (academic and political) audience – for example through workshops and events.
- ▶ Promoting changes to economics curricula in schools and universities to better reflect the strong assumptions of the neoclassical model and the alternative schools of thought which challenge these assumptions.

The narrative will need to be populated with specific policies that are both appealing and the success of which can be measured. We return to this under recommendation 4.

Recommendation 3: Continue work on the technical and theoretical foundations of alternative indicators, with particular focus on standard setting and harmonisation, and paying attention to the need for engagement by politicians as well as experts (Academics, official statisticians, OECD, international agencies)

Although we conclude that the political and policy related barriers to Beyond GDP are fundamental, it is of course true that technical issues remain. There is a need for greater scientific consensus on sound methodologies, based on peer reviewing etc.; we also recommended that a neutral body or institute should have a role in safeguarding data quality and neutrality of those Beyond GDP indicators which are based on non-official data.

Policy makers will find it easier to deal with the complexity inherent in multiple indicators if the latter are properly categorised and grouped, in such a way that policymakers can access them easily and use them. Accordingly we recommended that indicator producers and their sponsors ensure that existing and future indicators are categorised in this way and brought together into a database. This is being addressed in another FP7 funded project, NETGREEN.

International comparability is particularly important for Beyond GDP indicators in an increasingly globalised world, since it not only enables benchmarking of progress against other countries, but also enhances the credibility and legitimacy of indicators. This work is underway through the European Statistical System and other initiatives. However under recommendation 4 we have suggested some initial actions to link the UN's SDG process to Beyond GDP.

As work in this field is well underway, the conference did not propose any further specific actions.

Recommendation 4. Improve processes for integrated and innovative policy making (Officials, political parties)

This requires the ability to manage complexity without recourse to standard economic thinking. Three strands of change are needed:-

- ▶ *More and different people are needed at the table* when decisions are made. This requires multi-disciplinary working (i.e. incorporating insights from disciplines beyond economics), working across silos within organisations, increased co-operation between organisations and potentially re-organising in order to bring together diverse perspectives and challenge orthodoxies.
- ▶ *New approaches to analysis and policy development are needed.* Dealing more robustly with multiple objectives and the trade-offs between them requires new approaches to policy analysis, and, at least in the short term, a willingness and ability to innovate when the results of policies cannot be accurately modelled.
- ▶ *The adoption of beyond GDP indicators to measure key goals*, by local and national governments and the EU as part of its mid-term review of the Europe 2020 targets and possibly the European Semester process. This would be strengthened by harmonisation with the UN's SDGs.

Some possible projects might include:

- ▶ Mapping the existing landscape: how (and to what extent) are different countries working towards integrated and innovative policymaking, and what more needs to be done? This could be the foundation for a community of practice.
- ▶ Research/outreach projects to identify innovative policymaking initiatives which could support Beyond GDP policymaking but may not yet be doing so, and to connect these with the Beyond GDP community.
- ▶ Research to identify the impact which existing 'Beyond GDP compliant' policy tools are having (e.g. the New Zealand living standards framework).
- ▶ Identifying successful government organisational innovations which could support Beyond GDP (e.g. the Hungarian Ombudsman for Future Generations, the UK Wellbeing Policy Unit, or Korea's success in maintaining a commitment to wellbeing across a change of administration), and advocating these models in other jurisdictions and contexts.
- ▶ Identifying the scope for change within economics ministries and developing workable proposals for these, for example the recruitment of a wider range of voices and specialisms, and greater transparency about the use of models.
- ▶ Engaging with EU institutions to influence the Europe 2020 mid-term review, the European Semester process, and Europe's interactions with the UN's SDG process.

It is also important to demonstrate how Beyond GDP indicators will lead to different policy outcomes from conventional policy. Attendees at the workshops strongly endorsed the need to do this more systematically and disseminate these messages directly to policymakers. **Some possible projects might include:**

- ▶ Further work along the lines of the case studies we examined at the final conference (labour markets and the green economy) illustrating the implications of a ‘Beyond GDP’ approach for specific policy areas – including work to disseminate these findings to policymakers and advocate for the recommendations they point towards.
- ▶ More generally translating wellbeing evidence into simple, clear messages about how a wellbeing approach to policy would be different: e.g. ‘Three key lessons from the wellbeing evidence’ (for instance, think about social relations, side effects, and preventative policymaking).
- ▶ Working with politicians to identify the specific policies that they would want to introduce in line with these two outputs and identifying the indicators that would measure the success of these policies.
- ▶ Identifying Beyond GDP indicators that can attract broad support from parties and then getting these adopted as headline indicators (see recommendation 2).

Recommendation 5: Develop strategies for overcoming institutional resistance (Political parties, NGOs)

Significant change always encounters resistance; as any competent change manager knows, advocates of change must have a strategy for neutralising that resistance. We did not develop specific recommendations for this in BRAINPOoL; it is, however, vital.

Some possible projects might include:

- ▶ More concerted outreach efforts by the Beyond GDP community, in particular to economic and financial ministries. Participants at the workshops pointed out that though these can often be treated as the ‘enemy’ by Beyond GDP advocates, there are often opportunities to build alliances and shift perspectives from the inside.
- ▶ Work to develop theoretical foundations for Beyond GDP (see Recommendation 2) – some participants felt that this would be crucial to overcoming resistance.

Recommendation 6: Strengthen the ‘indicator entrepreneur’ role (Official and unofficial statisticians)

Those responsible for indicators (whether statisticians, policy-makers, politicians, or independent watch dogs) need to be alert to opportunities to promote the use of new and existing indicators. In other words they should act as ‘statistical entrepreneurs’. Since Beyond GDP is both a political and a technocratic problem, it also necessitates much closer collaboration between statisticians and democratic representatives. At national level this allows indicators to better match objectives, while at local level it can help achieve the right balance between sophistication (the priority of the experts) and feasibility (the priority of the representatives).

Some possible projects might include:

- ▶ Creation of ‘safe spaces’ for iterative discussions about priorities between policymakers and statisticians/officials – recognising that the boundary between political priority setting and technocratic policy implementation is not clear cut, and that ‘measurement is political’. As well as helping to facilitate more integrated and innovative policy making (see

recommendation 4), this could help to create the space for ‘indicator entrepreneurs’ to influence political priorities.

- ▶ Capacity-building for statisticians and indicator producers to help develop their role as agents of change (this might link to the project identified under Recommendation 2 regarding media training for indicator producers).

2.3 From recommendations to actions: putting projects into practice

The day after the BRAINPOoL final conference, a workshop was held, attended by some of those participating in the final conference, to begin developing an action plan for taking forward some of the recommendations. Attendees at the workshop committed to taking this plan forward, working groups were formed, and it was agreed that there was value in co-ordinating the work of these groups. The new economics foundation (nef), one of the BRAINPOoL partners, undertook to provide the secretariat for the groups.

Since a key lesson of the project and the workshops was the need for indicator specialists to become more outward-facing and engage strategically with influential actors, the working groups were structured according to the key audiences for new projects. All the groups are designed to get Beyond GDP indicators used in policy making. However while policy makers and politicians are the decision makers, they are influenced by others, and therefore these others also need to be influenced. The groups were:

- ▶ The EU institutions and through them, the UN SDG process
- ▶ National governments and politicians
- ▶ Local government and politicians
- ▶ The public¹
- ▶ The media
- ▶ Business
- ▶ Academia²

In addition to external-facing activities of this kind, a key next step identified throughout our discussions was that agents of change – the Beyond GDP community – need to have more opportunities to meet each other, learn from successes and failures, and collaborate on projects to bring Beyond GDP into the mainstream. This is an overarching recommendation which underpins and cuts across all of the other activities discussed in this document. We envisage that the network itself will provide a crucial platform for building and developing this community.

¹ One group was set up to serve both these audiences, although in due course this may split into two groups

² A group was set up to co-ordinate work on theory; it is assumed the immediate target for this group will be academia

recommendation 4), this could help to create the space for ‘indicator entrepreneurs’ to influence political priorities.

- ▶ Capacity-building for statisticians and indicator producers to help develop their role as agents of change (this might link to the project identified under Recommendation 2 regarding media training for indicator producers).

2.3 From recommendations to actions: putting projects into practice

The day after the BRAINPOoL final conference, a workshop was held, attended by some of those participating in the final conference, to begin developing an action plan for taking forward some of the recommendations. Attendees at the workshop committed to taking this plan forward, working groups were formed, and it was agreed that there was value in co-ordinating the work of these groups. The new economics foundation (nef), one of the BRAINPOoL partners, undertook to provide the secretariat for the groups.

Since a key lesson of the project and the workshops was the need for indicator specialists to become more outward-facing and engage strategically with influential actors, the working groups were structured according to the key audiences for new projects. All the groups are designed to get Beyond GDP indicators used in policy making. However while policy makers and politicians are the decision makers, they are influenced by others, and therefore these others also need to be influenced. The groups were:

- ▶ The EU institutions and through them, the UN SDG process
- ▶ National governments and politicians
- ▶ Local government and politicians
- ▶ The public¹
- ▶ The media
- ▶ Business
- ▶ Academia²

In addition to external-facing activities of this kind, a key next step identified throughout our discussions was that agents of change – the Beyond GDP community – need to have more opportunities to meet each other, learn from successes and failures, and collaborate on projects to bring Beyond GDP into the mainstream. This is an overarching recommendation which underpins and cuts across all of the other activities discussed in this document. We envisage that the network itself will provide a crucial platform for building and developing this community.

¹ One group was set up to serve both these audiences, although in due course this may split into two groups

² A group was set up to co-ordinate work on theory; it is assumed the immediate target for this group will be academia

Funded by:



**EUROPEAN
COMMISSION**

Partner organisations:



Contact:

World Future Council
100 Pall Mall
London, SW1Y 5NQ
+44 (0) 20 7321 3810
alistair.whitby@worldfuturecouncil.org

new economics foundation
3 Jonathan St
London, SE11 5NH
+44 (0) 20 7820 6300
Charles.Seaford@neweconomics.org