GOOD GOVERNANCE INDEX OF
CENTRAL EUROPEAN COUNTRIES

2018

Hanns
Seidel
Alapítvány

Budapesti
képviselet

CONTRIBUTING EXPERTS

Austria

Andreas Khol, Former President of the Austrian National Council
Barbara Kolm, Founder of Austrian Economics Center

Bulgaria

Tatiana Tomova, Assistant Professor of Sofia University St. Kliment Ohridski
Todor Tanev, Former Minister of Education

Czechia

Roman Joch, Executive Director of Občanský institut
Jan Herzmann, Director of Herzmann s.r.o.
Lukáš Kovanda, Chief Economist of Czech Fund

Croatia

Kristijan Kotarski, Assistant Professor of University of Zagreb
Vladimir Milinović, Director of INMS

Poland

Bartłomiej Radziejewski, Director of Nowa Konfederacja
Jarema Piekutowski, Senior Researcher of Nowa Konfederecja

Romania

Clara-Alexandra Volintiru, Associate Professor of Bucharest University of Economic Studies
Csaba Asztalos, President of CDNC

Serbia

Oliver Nikolić, Owner of Accacia Media Agency

Slovakia

Peter Goliaš, Director of INEKO
Peter Serina, President of PAS

Slovenia

Boštjan Marko Turk, Professor of University of Ljubljana

The views expressed in this study reflect the position of Nézőpont Intézet.

SUMMARY

The number of indices evaluating the governance and development of countries has increased significantly since the 1990s. These rankings typically focus on a particular aspect of governance, such as the effectiveness of the rather flexibly interpreted press freedom, the rule of law and democracy.

Good Governance Index by Nézőpont Intézet looks at the quality of 2018 governance in nine EU Member States south of the Baltic States and north of Greece not through fixed values or in an ideologically driven context but by comparing the countries' own past and comparative achievements. We considered assessing the performance of the government of Serbia in the Good Governance Index important due to its significant role in Central European cooperation, even if consistent, comparable EU data on which the scores are based were not available in the case of most indicators.

Our study assesses the achievements of 2018 by taking into account three aspects of governance - economic growth, social well-being and political stability. All aspects are based on five factors (e.g. financial policy, material security, public confidence), and the factors include three quantitative indicators (e.g. budget balance, inflation, unemployment rate) and one qualitative (expert review) indicator. Giving scores in a total of sixty indicators, we relied on statistics, opinion polls, and country expert opinions that contextualised these indicators.

Overall Ranking of Good Governance Index 2018

	Country	Total	▶	Economic Growth	▶	Social Well-being	▶	Political stability
1.	Austria	55,0	1.	19	1.	18,2	2.	17,7
2.	Czechia	51,9	2.	18,5	2.	17,0	3.	16,4
3.	Hungary	51,7	3.	17,5	4.	15,7	1.	19,0
4.	Slovenia	48,2	4.	17	3.	16,5	4.	14,7
5.	Poland	44,9	5.	16,9	8.	14,3	5.	13,8
6.	Romania	42,7	6.	15,3	6.	14,9	8.	12,5
7.	Slovakia	42,2	6.	15,3	7.	14,8	9.	12,1
8.	Croatia	41,2	8.	13,3	5.	15,0	7.	12,9
9.	Bulgaria	38,7	8.	13,3	9.	12,2	6.	13,2

In the cumulative ranking of government performance in 2018, there is no doubt about Austria's number one spot. The performance of the Austrian government may stimulate Central European countries to achieve their own ambitious goals in the near future. Czechia also closed a successful year getting second place in economic and social welfare and third place in political stability. Hungary accomplished excellent results overall and specifically in two of the three aspects, such as economic growth and political stability.

Austria, being the most successful in terms of economic growth, after several decades and one year sooner than originally planned, has reached a budget surplus and a declining level of public debt. Czechia's low 35 percent government debt - compared to which only Bulgaria's 22.6 percent is lower in the region - has been coupled with a balanced budget discipline in recent years. In the area of economic policy, labour shortages limiting productivity and the labour market can be identified as regional problems. At the same time, fiscal policy in all countries was balanced, as evidenced by the fact that no regional government exceeded the three percent limit for the budget deficit.

In the ranking of social well-being, Austria has the lead, but the region as a whole has experienced development supported by economic activity in recent years. For example, fewer households are threatened by unexpected expenditure, there has been an improvement in public safety in all of the countries, and indicators of environmental pollution perceived by the population have also moved in a positive direction. Austria and the Czechia are followed by Slovenia, where the government received outstanding scores in education policy and environmental protection. The Visegrad Four countries have also achieved remarkable results in terms of social well-being. Based on the scores, the Visegrad Group countries constitute one of the safest populated zones in the European Union, where confidence in the police force and the overall sense of security are gradually improving.

In the political sense Hungary proved to be the most stable country of Central Europe in 2018, ahead of Austria and Czechia. This was made possible by the region's highest scores for confidence in public institutions and predictability of the political system, in addition to the government parties' third consecutive two-thirds majority election victory. The Austrian government has the best results in terms of decision-making efficiency and preparedness for unexpected situations, while the Czech government received high scores for legitimacy.

OVERVIEW OF GOVERNANCE IN CENTRAL EUROPEAN COUNTRIES IN 2018

I. ECONOMIC GROWTH

Economic Growth

	Country	Total	Financial Policy	Productivity	Commerce	Competitiveness	Labour Market
1.	Austria	19,0	4,1	4,0	3,2	4,0	3,8
2.	Czechia	18,5	4,3	4,2	3,3	3,9	2,9
3.	Hungary	17,5	3,5	2,9	4,0	3,7	3,4
4.	Slovenia	17,0	3,8	3,1	2,8	3,4	3,9
5.	Poland	16,9	3,4	3,3	3,2	3,4	3,6
6.	Slovakia	15,3	3,2	3,0	3,3	2,6	3,3
6.	Romania	15,3	2,7	3,1	3,2	2,8	3,7
7.	Croatia	13,3	3,0	1,8	3,2	2,7	2,6
7.	Bulgaria	13,3	3,6	2,0	2,8	1,7	3,3

Austria, Croatia and Bulgaria were located on the two poles of economic policy ranking of Central European governments in 2018. Austria's placement is not only due to its competitive advantage, which comes from having avoided communism, but also to positive trends compared to its own past performance. For example, a positive budget balance achieved after decades of hard work or public debt being on decline again. The weaker positions of Croatia and Bulgaria are due to more modest results in productivity and competitiveness.

However, governments of the region are characterised not only by different approaches but also common aspirations. For example, a labour shortage limiting productivity and the labour market is a typical problem throughout the region, while disciplined fiscal policy has been a common point among the governments of the region.

I.1. FINANCIAL POLICY

Country	Quantitative Score	Qualitative Score
Austria	3,7	4,5
Bulgaria	3,7	3,5
Czechia	4,5	4,0
Croatia	3,5	2,5
Poland	3,3	3,5
Hungary	3,0	4,0
Romania	1,8	3,5
Slovakia	2,3	4,0
Slovenia	3,5	4,0

When calculating the financial quantitative scores of the fiscal policy and inflation-related activity of governments, we have taken into account the GDP-proportionate budget balance , which is generally referred to as a budget deficit. This indicator is referred to as the balance of the government sector by the Eurostat data series used in the scoring. A similar macroeconomic indicator is the government debt-to-GDP ratio , for which we also used Eurostat data when compiling the ranking, more precisely statistics called the government sector debt by EU methodology. The third indicator of quantitative assessment was the maintenance of price stability. This was evaluated by comparing the so-called Harmonised Index of Consumer Prices (HICP) published by Eurostat to inflation targets, thus providing a comparative picture of the inflation process.

In financial policy Czechia tops the quantitative scores list in 2018. This is primarily due to the country's extremely low 35 percent government debt and its stable fiscal policy. In the region only Bulgaria has less public debt than Czechia, and last year was the third in a row when revenues exceeded spending in the Czech budget. Only Bulgaria could produce a better indicator in 2018 with a 0.9 percent budget surplus. Lower figures and declining trends in inflation were the reason why Czechia still finished ahead of Bulgaria (0.4 percent drop to 2 percent compared to the previous year, compared to Bulgaria's 1.4 percent increase to 2.6 percent). At the bottom of the list, Romania's quantitative score of 1.8 was caused by the region's worst inflation rate (4.1 percent) and its highest budget deficit (3.0 percent), which were not offset by its low government debt level of 35 percent.

In terms of qualitative scores, Austria was at the forefront, while Croatia's financial policy was rated the least successful by experts. As highlighted by expert opinions, the Austrian government's sound budgetary policy (a 0.1% budget surplus, a 4.4% reduction in government debt) was driven by an effective reduction in public spending rather than an increase in tax revenues. The main reason for the less optimistic expert opinions on Croatia was the region's highest public debt. According to evaluations, a faster increase in public expenditure relative to GDP growth (government spending increased by 6 per cent while GDP grew by 2.9 per cent) did not serve to reduce the deficit.

I.2. PRODUCTIVITY

Country	Quantitative Score	Qualitative Score
Austria	4,0	4,0
Bulgaria	1,5	2,5
Czechia	3,3	5,0
Croatia	1,2	2,5
Poland	3,7	3,0
Hungary	2,8	3,0
Romania	2,7	3,5
Slovakia	2,5	3,5
Slovenia	3,2	3,0

As a first indicator of productivity, we used GDP per capita based on the Purchasing Power Standard available in the Eurostat database. In calculating quantitative scores, the second indicator considered was labour productivity , which we based on GDP per capita values calculated on purchasing power parity available from the World Bank database. This data provides information on the contribution of employees to GDP. Thirdly, we took into account the activity of the industrial sector , which was based on the growth values of the volume of industrial production available in the Eurostat database.

On the basis of quantitative indicators, Austria was at the forefront of productivity. In the region, Austria has the highest per capita GDP (39,600 purchasing power units) and the highest labour productivity (95,100 international PPP dollars per year). These extraordinarily high values outshine the fact that in industrial production volume relative to the previous year Poland (7.5 percent), Slovenia (6.3 percent), Hungary (5.9 percent), and Slovakia (4.8 percent) all finished ahead of Austria (4.2 percent). The weakest productivity data in 2018 come from Croatia and Bulgaria. GDP per capita was the lowest in Bulgaria (15,900 purchasing power units), while Croatia was the second lowest (19,300 purchasing power units). The increase in industrial production volumes was also remarkably low in both countries, with 0.1 per cent in Croatia and 1.1 in Bulgaria.

Based on qualitative scores Czechia has overtaken Austria, which, according to expert opinion, is due to the tax environment having a positive impact on labour productivity and favourable trends in the German economy. Austria's good indicators were strengthened by the simplification and transparency of the economic regulatory environment. The position of Bulgaria and Croatia in quantitative ranking has been confirmed by expert opinions. With the exception of some infrastructural investments, the Bulgarian government has been shown to be passive in stimulating productivity, and in Croatia, expansive fiscal policy has been ineffective in terms of productivity, as the government did not prioritise the stimulation of enterprises and business investments.

I.3. COMMERCE

Country	Quantitative Score	Qualitative Score
Austria	2,3	4,0
Bulgaria	2,5	3,0
Czechia	2,5	4,0
Croatia	2,8	3,5
Poland	3,3	3,0
Hungary	4,0	4,0
Romania	2,3	4,0
Slovakia	2,2	4,5
Slovenia	3,7	2,0

In the examination of commerce policy we also took into account the foreign trade activity of the countries besides domestic traffic. The quantitative ranking is based on Eurostat data on retail sales growth showing the change in the volume of retail activity compared to the previous year. A slightly different statistical indicator, also used in Eurostat data releases, is the turnover of services , which refers to the turnover of transport, warehousing, catering, communication and other financial activities, excluding retail activities. In ranking commercial activity we also use Eurostat data of the current account balance , which provides information on the difference between cash inflow and outflow in a country. Hungary was at the forefront of commerce, based on quantitative indicators, partly due to a 10 percent increase in retail sales, in which only Romania achieved a better result (11.2 percent) in the region. The turnover of services in Hungary grew the most dynamically in the region compared to the previous year (12.5 percent), so despite the lower current account balance (0.4 percent of GDP) compared to previous years, Hungary still scored high. Slovakia ended at the bottom of the rank due to a negative current account balance (-2.2 percent of GDP) and the low growth rate of trade flow at regional level.

Qualitative assessment of the commercial pillar highlighted the need to interpret statistical data in context, as expert opinion suggested that Slovakia was leading the pack. Optimistic Slovak expert opinion was justified by the growth of the automotive industry, whose flagship is Jaguar's Nitra investment. The investment has already started to increase exports in November, but its impact is expected to be more pronounced in 2019. Slovenia closed the qualitative list, which was due to the formation of the new government in the autumn, as expert opinion suggests the new minority government's deprivatisation program may pose risks to the country's commercial success.

I.4. COMPETITIVENESS

Country	Quantitative Score	Qualitative Score
Austria	4,0	4,0
Bulgaria	1,3	2,0
Czechia	3,8	4,0
Croatia	3,3	2,0
Poland	3,3	3,5
Hungary	3,3	4,0
Romania	2,5	3,0
Slovakia	2,7	2,5
Slovenia	2,8	4,0

An essential condition for economic growth is the improvement of competitiveness, which includes, among other things, the ability to sell the products produced and the economic environment to provide incentives for start-ups. When scoring competitiveness we took into account the value of wages based on the data on median wages calculated by Eurostat's Purchasing Power Standard. Another indicator of competitiveness was the investment activity of enterprises, which we scored with the help of Eurostat data on the distribution of corporate investments within GDP . For the third indicator we used the so called Labour Cost Index of the European Commission's AMECO database, which compares companies' costs per employee and the nominal GDP per employee. Austria leads with quantitative scores for competitiveness since last year the purchasing power of the Austrian median wage was 23,000 units, while Slovenia had the second highest purchasing power of the region with 15,000 purchasing power units. In terms of the 15.9 percent corporate investment share of the GDP Austria was second only to Czechia with 18 percent. Statistics show that in competitiveness Bulgaria performed most poorly with the highest increase in labour costs in the region (nearly 21 percentage points compared to 2010) and low purchasing power wages (7527 purchasing units). Median wages were only lower in Romania (5303 purchasing units).

According to the qualitative assessment Austria was again the leader in competitiveness due to bureaucracy-reducing measures favourable to businesses. On the basis of expert scores evaluating the management of governmental challenges, Croatia closed the list due to an increase in the share of state-owned companies that are less efficient than private ones. In addition to the country's largest employer Agrokor shipyard, other state-owned companies such as the 3 Major and Ulyanik shipyards have also been struggling with long-standing structural problems and near bankruptcy.

I.5. LABOUR MARKET

Country	Quantitative Score	Qualitative Score
Austria	3,5	4,0
Bulgaria	3,7	3,0
Czechia	2,8	3,0
Croatia	2,7	2,5
Poland	4,2	3,0
Hungary	3,8	3,0
Romania	3,3	4,0
Slovakia	3,0	3,5
Slovenia	3,8	4,0

The most important indicators to evaluate labour market processes are also from the Eurostat database. The employment rate shows the proportion of population aged 15-64 who had at least one hour a week paid work or who were employed but were temporarily away from work. The unemployment rate , which shows the proportion of the population aged 15-74 who actively sought work in the reference period and were ready to engage in work immediately or within two weeks, is not an entirely complementary indicator of labour market processes. The third indicator provides a picture of labour shortages by examining the proportion of vacancies , including newly created, readily or soon-to- be available positions.

According to the quantitative assessment, in 2018 Poland's labour market performed most favourably. Poland had the highest employment rate (76.8 percent), while its 3.9 percent unemployment was the second lowest in the region, with only Czechia producing better figures (2.2 percent). Poland also occupies a prime position in terms of vacancies, with only Bulgaria showing a more favourable result of 1.1 percent. The last one in the labour market ranking is Croatia with the lowest employment rate (66.3 percent) and the highest unemployment rate (8.5 percent), but Czechia, despite the lowest unemployment rate, finished not far behind Croatia, as the vacancy rate was by far the highest in Czechia (6 percent).

According to the scores of qualitative evaluation, Austria, Romania and Slovenia were tied in the lead. In Austria, attempts were made to address labour shortages by

making the regulation of working time more flexible and easing other administrative constraints. In Romania, wage increases have proven to be an effective tool for increasing employment. The ranking closes with Croatia, where the unemployment rate was also reduced, but in this case this was also due to the favourable economic environment rather than the active government intervention. The Croatian labour market has been challenged by a low level of mobility caused by transport infrastructure problems, primarily an expensive, poor quality and very time-consuming public transport system.

II. SOCIAL WELL-BEING

Social Well-being

Country	Total	Material Security	Public Safety	Education	Health Care	Environmental Protection
Austria	18,3	3,6	3,7	4,0	3,4	3,7
Czechia	17,0	2,8	4,3	3,5	3,3	3,2
Slovenia	16,5	2,9	3,2	3,8	2,8	3,8
Hungary	15,7	3,5	4,6	2,6	2,3	2,8
Croatia	15,0	2,0	3,7	2,6	3,2	3,6
Romania	14,9	3,1	3,3	2,8	2,7	3,2
Slovakia	14,8	3,3	3,1	2,5	2,7	3,3
Poland	14,3	3,4	3,9	3,0	2,2	1,8
Bulgaria	12,2	2,0	2,1	2,7	2,3	3,2

Austria and Bulgaria are at the two ends of the ranking in terms of the social policy success of governments in the region. The Austrian government was first in the field of financial security, education, health and the environment. Bulgaria finished last due to issues related to financial security and education.

It can be stated in general that even if not spectacular but steady progress has been made in making welfare systems efficient through increased economic activity experienced in recent years. For example, there were fewer unexpected expenditures on households than in recent years, but public safety has improved in all countries, and indicators of environmental pollution perceived by the population have also moved in a positive direction.

II.1. MATERIAL SECURITY

Country	Quantitative Score	Qualitative Score
Austria	3,7	3,5
Bulgaria	1,5	2,5
Czechia	2,5	3,0
Croatia	2,0	2,0
Poland	3,3	3,5
Hungary	3,0	3,0
Romania	2,7	3,5
Slovakia	3,0	3,5
Slovenia	2,8	3,0

An important factor in social well-being is the sense of material security, the basic condition of which is that the livelihood of members of society should not be compromised. One of the most basic indicators in this respect is the value of the minimum wage , which we examined at purchasing power parity by eliminating differences in price levels. The pension replacement rate provides information on the financial situation of pensioners, the largest social group receiving social benefits. This is calculated as the quotient of the gross median of the pensions of persons aged 65 to 74 and the gross median of the work income of the population aged between 50 and 59, without other social benefits. As a third indicator we also took into account the results of research on the proportion of households unable to handle unexpected expenditure . All three sets of data are available from the Eurostat database.

In the quantitative assessment of material security, Austria were at the forefront of all three indicators, and Bulgaria finished last from all three aspects. Austria also reported the most favourable data in 2018 with regard to the pension replacement rate (64 percent), the minimum wage (estimated at 1,050 purchasing units), and the proportion of households unable to handle unexpected expenditure (20.7 percent). The greatest difference between pensions and wages is in Bulgaria with a 37 percent pension replacement rate. The minimum wage was also the lowest in Bulgaria (€ 525), while the proportion of households unable to handle unexpected expenditure was the highest here last year (53.2 percent).

The qualitative assessment elaborated the two-pole image of quantitative data. According to expert evaluations, Austria, Poland, Romania and Slovakia were in the lead. In the case of the Austrian government, the recipe for combating poverty is a long-term economic policy based on state intervention. In Poland, the 'Family 500+' program launched in 2016 has been largely responsible for a reduction in child poverty from 12 percent to 3 percent. In Romania, the pension reform aimed to increase the overall value of pensions and increased child support and the minimum wage through government measures. At the end of the qualitative ranking is Croatia where, according to expert evaluations, the government's dedication to long-term sustainability of social policy is lacking, whereas health, pension and social expenditures are constantly increasing along with the number of subsidised groups.

II.2. PUBLIC SAFETY

Country	Quantitative Score	Qualitative Score
Austria	3,3	4
Bulgaria	2,2	2
Czechia	3,7	5
Croatia	3,3	4
Poland	3,3	4,5
Hungary	4,2	4
Romania	2,5	4
Slovakia	2,7	3,5
Slovenia	3,3	3

When evaluating public security as an important aspect of social well-being, we used data from households reporting on the proportion of households experiencing poor public safety and vandalism as reported by Eurostat. In addition, based on the results of the polls published by Eurobarometer twice a year since 2016, we also ranked trust in the police . Our third indicator was a Eurobarometer survey on the overall perception of national security .

Hungary performed well in the quantitative ranking of public security. According to 2018 data, only 4.8 per cent of Hungarian households experienced a public safety issue in their immediate vicinity, and only Croatia produced a better indicator. With 63 percent Hungary was ranked second in terms of the police confidence index with only Austria producing better results at 77 percent. On the basis of research data, the list closes with Bulgaria, where the ratio of households experiencing public safety problems is the highest at 23.6 percent. Confidence in the police is also the lowest in Bulgaria, with less than half of society (42 percent) trusting in law enforcement agencies. The proportion of those who consider the country to be generally safe is the worst in Bulgaria: the 30 percent value does not even reach half of list leader Slovenia (64 percent).

Based on qualitative assessment, Czechia received the highest scores, ahead of Poland. Countries of the Visegrad Group are some of the safest areas in the European Union where confidence in the police and the overall sense of security are gradually improving. Slovakia is a bit of an exception, due to the murder of a journalist in February 2018, but expert opinions have shown that public security has improved in Slovakia as well. As in quantitative, Bulgaria also achieved the lowest score in qualitative ranking. Expert evaluations pointed out that in Bulgaria social exclusion and radicalisation of the rapidly growing Roma population undermines public safety, but similarly to Slovakia, there was also the murder of a journalist that created an international scandal..

II.3. EDUCATION

	Country	Quantitative Score	Qualitative Score
	Austria	4,0	4,5
	Bulgaria	2,8	2,5
	Czechia	4,0	3
	Croatia	2,7	2,5
	Poland	3,5	2,5
	Hungary	3,2	3
	Romania	2,5	3
	Slovakia	2,5	2,5
	Slovenia	3,7	4

In the evaluation of education policy we used the Eurostat youth employment rate , which measures the rate of employment in the 15-34 years old age group within three years of completing their highest level of training. The Eurostat drop-out rate , which measures the proportion of 18-24 year old students who drop out of training before completion, was also used in the calculation of scores. Eurostat's Lifelong Learning Survey provides information on the number of adults undergoing training, or more precisely the proportion of the total population aged 18-74 who had participated in education or training programs in the four weeks preceding the survey.

In the quantitative evaluation of education policy, Austria and Czechia lead the country list. According to the latest available data for 2017, young people can find employment in the largest numbers after completion of training (87.6 percent) in Czechia, while Austria ranks second (85.6 percent). In terms of drop-outs, the two countries also have good indicators (Czechia 6.4 percent, Austria 7.2 percent), while Croatia leads with 3.1 percent. Regarding the proportion of adults undergoing training, Austria leads the list (18.9 percent), ahead of Slovenia (16.2 percent) and Czechia (14 percent). The quantitative ranking closes with Romania and Slovakia. In case of Romania this is due to a drop-out rate that improved somewhat during 2018 but still remains rather high (16.9 percent). In Slovakia, although the overall drop-out rate is much lower, it has increased compared to previous years. (9.1 percent).

Qualitative assessment shows that Austria and Slovenia pursued the most successful education policy in 2018. The Austrian government announced a comprehensive education reform strategy, while in Slovenia an education system designed to assist youth employment was responsible for the favourable results. Bulgaria, Poland, Slovakia and Croatia had the lowest scores. In the case of Bulgaria, a particular problem is the increasing number of young people who neither study nor work. It should also be pointed out that the Bulgarian education system was not successful in managing the transition from school to the world of employment. In Croatia, the introduction of dual training has long been on the agenda, but no progress was made in 2018. According to expert opinion, structural reforms would also be needed in Poland, affecting teacher

salaries and the teacher evaluation system. There is great dissatisfaction with teacher wages among young teachers in the Bratislava region, although the Slovak government has increased salaries in education to greater degree than in other sectors in recent years.

II.4. HEALTH CARE

	Country	Quantitative Score	Qualitative Score
	Austria	3,3	3,5
	Bulgaria	2,5	2
	Czechia	2,5	4
	Croatia	3,3	3
	Poland	2,3	2
	Hungary	2,5	3
	Romania	2,3	3
	Slovakia	2,3	3
	Slovenia	2,7	3

In addition to good mental health, the preservation of physical health is also an important indicator of social well-being. The effectiveness of primary health care is highlighted by the proportion of the total population who report unmet medical needs . We also used subjective health as an indicator based on Eurostat data, in which we took into account the proportion of people who judged their health to be in poor condition. As a third indicator of the state of health care we used a series of data on the number of years expected to be spent in health , available from the Institute for Health Metrics and Evaluation.

On the basis of quantitative assessment, Austria and Croatia lead the group of countries examined. In Austria, the high score is due to the extremely low proportion of unmet medical needs (0.5 percent), the high number of years expected to be spent in health (70.4) and the low proportion (6.3 percent) of people who consider themselves to be in poor health. Croatia's high score is due to progress made compared to previous years. The 15.3 percent ratio of unmet medical needs in Croatia in 2010 fell to 4.5 percent by 2017, while the number of years expected to be spent in health increased by one and a half years in 2017 compared to 2008. In addition, the proportion of people who consider their health status poor was reduced from 21.4 percent in 2010 to 14 percent.

In the quantitative assessment, Poland, Romania and Slovakia close the list with unfavourable indicators in the above mentioned categories. The proportion of those dissatisfied with health care was 7.7 percent in Poland, the highest rate among the countries surveyed, and the nearly 11 percent of the population dissatisfied with their health status is the second worst after Croatia's 4.5 percent. Although subjective health

was best in Romania (6 percent dissatisfied), they also has the second worst indicator of dissatisfaction with care (6.7 percent). Slovakia's low score was the result of the third worst subjective health indicator (8.9 percent consider themselves to be in poor health).

On the basis of the qualitative assessment Czechia leads, while Bulgaria and Poland close the list in health care. Czechia's positive assessment is the result of government measures to replace nurses and doctors who had left for the West, mainly with guest workers from Slovakia and Ukraine. In contrast, Bulgaria's health minister was relieved from his post in 2018, and there has been a debate over health reform proposals ever since. In Poland changes in the health department took place after the demonstrations in 2017, but the extra fundings promised are yet to be sourced.

II.5. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

	Country	Quantitative Score	Qualitative Score
	Austria	3,8	3,5
	Bulgaria	2,8	3,5
	Czechia	3,3	3
	Croatia	3,7	3,5
	Poland	2,0	1,5
	Hungary	3,5	2
	Romania	2,8	3,5
	Slovakia	3,5	3
	Slovenia	3,5	4

Environmental protection is a pivotal indicator of social well-being. When evaluating environmental policy, we took into account Eurostat data on per capita municipal waste recycling . As a second indicator, we used the Eurostat data series on the share of renewable energy in gross final energy consumption . Based on Eurostat polls, the proportion of households experiencing environmental pollution was also taken into account for quantitative scores.

Based on the quantitative assessment of environmental protection, similarly to the area of health, Austria leads the way. Although Austria's growth rate of waste recycling has been halted in recent years, it remains the highest in the countries surveyed (58 percent), sharing the spot with Slovenia. The share of renewable energy is also the highest in Austria (32.6 percent), along with the second lowest proportion of households experiencing environmental pollution (9.9 percent). In contrast, Poland's weaker values at the bottom of the list were driven by the lowest share of renewable energy (10.9%) and the extremely high share of households experiencing direct environmental pollution (12.6 percent).

Based on scores, Slovenia leads the list in qualitative assessment, as in addition to the most significant renewable energy sources, including biomass and hydro-power, the use of solar energy and bio gas has also increased. Poland takes last place even according to the experts, due to its large cities suffering from the worst air pollution in the region.

III. POLITICAL STABILITY

Political Stability

Country	Total	Capacity	Legitimacy	Vision	Public Confidence	Predictability
Hungary	18,5	3,6	3,6	3,6	3,5	4,2
Austria	17,7	3,8	3,5	3,0	3,4	4,1
Czechia	16,4	3,3	3,9	2,8	2,9	3,6
Slovenia	14,7	2,9	2,5	3,4	2,3	3,6
Poland	13,8	2,8	2,5	2,8	2,2	3,5
Bulgaria	13,2	3,5	2,5	2,1	1,9	3,3
Croatia	12,9	3,0	2,1	2,6	1,9	3,5
Romania	12,5	2,3	2,3	2,6	2,4	2,9
Slovakia	12,1	2,5	2,7	2,2	2,2	2,6

As for the pillar of political stability, Hungary was the most successful and Slovakia the least successful of the countries examined. The background to the Hungarian result is the government parties' third consecutive super-majority parliamentary victory providing formal capacity and strong legitimacy. This is interrelated with the government's domestic and foreign policy visions and the guarantee of security, which is becoming increasingly important across Europe. At the bottom of the list is Slovakia where the region's most serious government crisis unfolded at the end of 2018, which ultimately did not result in early elections, but necessitated the replacement of the head of government. In order to identify the quantitative indicators of political stability, we used the results of public opinion polls, thus a comparison with the performance of previous years was not necessary.

III.1. CAPACITY

Country	Quantitative Score	Qualitative Score
Austria	3,1	4,5
Bulgaria	2,5	4,5
Czechia	2,6	4,0
Croatia	2,4	3,5
Poland	2,6	3,0
Hungary	3,1	4,0
Romania	2,2	2,5
Slovakia	2,4	2,5
Slovenia	2,8	3,0

The fundamental condition of political stability is the capacity of the state and the government exercising executive power. Factors determining this include the decision-making power of the government (coalition), which, according to our interpretation, means that executors of power are able to make timely decisions on important issues. The second aspect of the capacity we examined is the preparedness of governing forces for unexpected situations, such as the ability to deal with crises. As a third indicator, we examined the unity of the government (coalition), ie to what extent the government was subject to internal disruption that hindered decision-making.

On the basis of quantitative indicators, Hungary took the top spot in the political capacity category. In the countries we examined, Hungarian respondents were most likely to agree with the statement that the government would make decisions (44.7 percent) in good time, and that the government would be able to stay in control of an unexpected situation (47.1 percent). Romania closed the ranking, as Romanian public opinion was the lowest of the decision-making power of the government coalition (10.9 percent), and the least number of respondents believed that the government would be able to make the right decisions in a crisis situation (12.1 percent). In contrast, Romania had the highest proportion of people who thought that government conflicts had a detrimental effect on the country's governance (66 percent).

Austria and Bulgaria achieved the best results in qualitative scores. In Austria, after the change of government in 2017, governance practices based on cooperation have developed much further than before. Coalition partners made compromises based on mutual concessions, for example, the ÖVP in the abolition of the smoking ban in restaurants, while the FPÖ in its support of the free trade agreement between Canada and the European Union. The Bulgarian government as the current president of the Council of the European Union, has increased its capacity to act as a mediator for the accession of the Western Balkans to the EU. According to expert evaluations, Romania and Slovakia close the ranking. In Romania, not only the confusing legislation on justice and criminal law, but also conflicts with the head of state who possesses serious powers in the Romanian political system have limited the government's capacity to act. In Slovakia, the February 2018 murder of a journalist restricted the government's leeway, leading to the largest demonstration since the regime change. The case, without any concrete evidence implicating his person, finally ruined Prime Minister Robert Fico's image after it had been revealed that the murdered investigative journalist wanted to look into his relationship with the Italian mafia.

III.2. LEGITIMACY

Country	Quantitative Score	Qualitative Score
Austria	2,9	4,0
Bulgaria	2,5	2,5
Czechia	2,7	5,0
Croatia	2,2	2,0
Poland	2,5	2,5
Hungary	3,3	4,0
Romania	2,1	2,5
Slovakia	2,3	3,0
Slovenia	3,0	2,0

Acceptance of the government's political direction, ie legitimacy is also a part of political stability. One aspect of this is legal legitimacy, which means respect for the law by those with executing power. The second aspect of legitimacy is the enforcement of the will of the majority of society through governance, ie democratic or political legitimacy. The third indicator used is economic legitimacy, which means that the results of government policy are also reflected in rising living standards. The quantitative order of legitimacy is based on the results of our opinion polls covering these three topics.

In terms of quantitative indicators, Hungary leads the way. This is due to the largest number of Hungarian respondents agreeing fully with the statement that their government respected the laws of their country (35 percent). The second place in this index went to Austria (19 percent). In Hungary, more than 42 percent of respondents also think that people's opinions matter when the government makes decisions. In terms of economic legitimacy, nearly 34 percent of Hungarians are optimistic, and they believe that the current government is capable of raising living standards. Romania received the lowest score with 37.9 percent of respondents disagreeing with the statement that their government respected the laws of their country, and 39.4 percent disagreed that people's input would be important in decision-making. 34.9 per cent of the Romanian public considered their government incapable of raising living standards in the country.

In the qualitative assessment Czechia leads the way, as the effects of favourable economic developments impacted people and in turn increased support for the government. Based on expert opinion, Croatia and Slovenia finished last on the list. In the case of Croatia, the lack of prominent political leaders and subsequent general lack of interest caused the low score. Slovenia has also experienced political apathy, which, according to expert opinion, is reflected in the fact that in 2018 the new parliament was elected with an extremely low 49 percent participation.

III.3. VISION

Country	Quantitative Score	Qualitative Score
Austria	2,9	3,0
Bulgaria	2,6	1,5
Czechia	2,7	3,0
Croatia	2,1	3,0
Poland	2,5	3,0
Hungary	3,2	4,0
Romania	2,1	3,0
Slovakia	2,4	2,0
Slovenia	2,9	4,0

The first indicator of vision is the vision itself, ie the government's idea for the country in the medium and long term. The quantitative indicators included coherence between the government's vision and action, ie whether government measures served to realise plans. We also took into account whether the vision was realistic in terms of the government's capability.

Hungary also leads in terms of quantitative indicators. Nearly 43 percent of respondents in Hungary think that the current government has a plan on how to shape the country within 10 years. 33.5 percent said the government was doing everything to improve the country. The ranking closes with Croatia and Romania, with the least number of people in these two countries thinking that their governments had a vision (5 and 4.7 percent) and that they were doing their best to make their countries better (7.1 percent and 4 percent).

Hungary and Slovenia lead the qualitative ranking. The Hungarian Prime Minister interprets government decisions in the context of a coherent worldview and sets out plans for the future, such as putting responses to the migration crisis into a broader geopolitical and value-based context. In Slovenia, there is a completely different vision: Slovenian expert opinion is that the government's vision is based on full compliance with EU directives. However, the high score was due to the 2018 adoption of a 12 year long development strategy for the labour market, public education and the employment of foreign workers, as proposed by the government. The qualitative ranking closes with Bulgaria in the last place. Beyond following EU guidelines, the Bulgarian government did not have an independent overall strategy in 2018, and few area specific priorities could be identified, such as infrastructure development or increased defence spending.

III.4. PUBLIC CONFIDENCE

Country	Quantitative Score	Qualitative Score
Austria	3,2	3,5
Bulgaria	2,4	1,5
Czechia	2,7	3,0
Croatia	2,2	1,5
Poland	2,5	2,0
Hungary	3,0	4,0
Romania	2,3	2,5
Slovakia	2,4	2,0
Slovenia	2,6	2,0

The fundamental element of political stability is confidence in the operation of the state and in public institutions. One indicator of this is satisfaction with the level of public services. It is also important that the functioning of the justice system guarantees everyone the right to a fair trial, which is the concrete meaning of the abstract and subjective "rule of law" that has been used so frequently in political conflicts. As a third indicator, we emphasised the importance of the public interest, ie whether the holders of government power primarily represent the public interest as opposed to their private interests.

Based on quantitative indicators, operation of the state was judged to be best in Austria. 45.9 percent of Austrian respondents agree that the quality of public services is adequate. 40.8 percent said the same about Hungary, placing it in second place in the ranking. Judgement of the functioning of the judiciary is extremely positive in Austria: 51.3 percent of respondents think that the necessary conditions are given to conduct fair proceedings. The quantitative ranking was closed by Croatia, where the proportion of citizens satisfied with the level of public services (14.3 percent), the operation of the judiciary (11.7 percent), and the representation of public interest by the government (14.6 percent) was extremely low for the region.

On the basis of the qualitative assessment, Hungary takes the lead after of the ruling party alliance won its third consecutive constitutional mandate in the 2018 general election. Bulgaria and Slovenia are at the bottom of the ranking. In the case of Bulgaria, the level of public confidence has been consistently low since the change of regime as, according to expert opinion, at that time a bureaucratic, rather than a political system for solving problems was created. According to expert evaluations, the Bulgarian government was still passive in increasing public confidence in 2018. In Slovenia, the negative assessment was based on controversial court rulings.

III.5. PREDICTABILITY

Country	Quantitative Score	Qualitative Score
Austria	3,2	5,0
Bulgaria	3,0	3,5
Czechia	3,1	4,0
Croatia	3,0	4,0
Poland	2,9	4,0
Hungary	3,4	5,0
Romania	2,7	3,0
Slovakia	2,7	2,5
Slovenia	3,2	4,0

The key issue of political stability is predictability. A short-term condition for this is that the government should fill its mandate, ie the risk of early elections should not jeopardise the continuity of government work. Change of government during a cycle can threaten not only political but also economic stability. The next indicator can be considered mid-range as it shows whether government parties have a real chance of continuing the work they started even after the end of the government cycle. The implementation of a long-term vision usually requires work over several cycles, and at the same time winning the election from a governing position also means political stability. The third criterion taken into consideration for predictability is a moderate political atmosphere, ie the blocking of anti-systemic political forces.

Based on quantitative indicators, Hungary has the first place, as 42.5 percent of Hungarian respondents fully agreed with the statement that, knowing the work of the government, it would be able to continue it after the next parliamentary elections. In Hungary, nearly 39.8 percent of people believe that anti-systemic political forces in the country are becoming increasingly strong, which puts it behind behind the less polarised Bulgaria (24.4 percent) or Slovenia (33.7 percent), but this is still a more favourable rate than that of Slovakia (58.8 percent), Poland (53.3 percent) or Austria (49 percent). Romania and Slovakia close the quantitative ranking, as after the Bulgarian respondents (31.3 per cent), Romanians find the announcement of early elections most likely. (30.3 per cent) In addition, 61.8 percent of the Romanian public and 57.6 percent of the Slovak public think that the coalition currently governing the country cannot continue its work after the next elections.

In terms of predictability Austria and Hungary close the qualitative assessment. In Austria the biggest challenge was to consolidate cooperation between right-wing government parties and in Hungary this was the maintenance of the two-thirds parliamentary majority, with both governments successfully completing these tasks.

Early election or government crises were also the least likely in these two countries. The qualitative ranking was concluded with Slovakia and Romania. In Slovakia, a series of corruption scandals undermined the credibility of the political elite, especially the government, and the February 2018 murder of a journalist, in addition to reforming party politics, forced Prime Minister Robert Fico to resign. In 2018, the ruthless struggle between institutions and power groups seeking to govern political life continued in Romania, which also affected the predictability of governance. The government under the actual influence of Liviu Dragnea has been continually struggling to survive, and in addition to the early elections, the possibility of the fall of the government was one of the most frequent topics of discussion in Romanian political life.

OVERVIEW
Governance in Serbia in 2018

We consider including Serbia in the Good Governance Index important due to its significant role in Central European cooperation, even if consistent, comparable EU data on which the scores are based were not available in the case of most indicators.

Favourable macroeconomic trends in the region as a whole in 2018 were also apparent in Serbia. The public debt-to-GDP ratio fell from 57.9 percent in 2017 to below 50 percent, and the Serbian government pursued a balanced fiscal policy. In line with preliminary plans, the budget produced a 0.6 percent surplus, with only Slovenia (0.7 percent), Czechia (0.9 percent) and Bulgaria (2 percent) reaching higher figures. According to previous data, Serbia's 4.4 per cent economic growth was also close to the highest in the region, such as Poland (5.1 percent), Hungary (4.9 percent) and Slovenia (4.5 percent). In the area of commerce, entering into a free trade agreement with Turkey was an important milestone, which may lead to market expansion mainly for agricultural products. In addition to building eastern relations, EU legal harmonisation is a prerequisite for Serbia's European integration, enabling the free flow of goods and services in the future. The labour market was characterised by positive trends in 2018, at the same time there remains room for improvement in the declining unemployment rate that is still high, and the employment rate that is low in regional comparison.

The government made tangible efforts in matters of social welfare in 2018. The most spectacular results were achieved in the suppression of crime. Over the past year there has been a significant improvement in statistics concerning apprehended perpetrators and domestic violence (an increase of 23.5 percent and a decrease of 20 percent, respectively). The large-scale digitisation of education and the comprehensive EUR 1 billion reform of health care by 2021 (which includes among others wage development, modernisation of hospital equipment and completion of three major clinical centres) confirms the long-term planning of the cabinet, however, the results of these measures will have to be assessed in the coming years. Social inequality constitutes the most sensitive problem, and a significant part of the budget has been dedicated to its reduction. On the one hand, this reflects the Cabinet's commitment to combating poverty, on the other, it calls into question the long-term sustainability of the measures, with migration and the ageing of society impacting Serbia as well.

Serbia closed a successful year in terms of political stability in 2018. The biggest challenge, similarly to previous years, was Kosovo. The cabinet remained committed to the peaceful settlement brokered by international intermediaries despite the Kosovo government's unilateral move of applying extra tax on Serbian goods. Another challenge long awaiting management is lack of social confidence in the quality of public services. In order to solve this in the long term, the government established the National Academy of Public Service Vocational Training and adopted a new law on the remuneration of public servants. New chapters were also opened

in the EU accession negotiations last year, so twelve out of the sixteen chapters so far were opened during the current government cycle. Regarding the legitimacy of the government, support for the ruling Serbian Progressive Party (SNS) is also extremely high in regional comparison with a stable 60+ percent in opinion polls. Thus, according to the experts, it has a good chance of re-election in the next parliamentary elections.

METHODOLOGY

International Models of Measuring Quality of Governance

The notion of measuring the quality of governance began to receive wider public attention from the 1980s onward when scientific discourse on development interlocked with the issue of governmental performance. A 1989 World Bank Report on the Sub-Saharan region was the first to use the term good governance and to attempt to describe the universal recipe for good governance. Various concepts had emerged on the subject afterwards and finally, as a result of protracted methodological and conceptual debates, accountability, lack of political stability and violence, government efficiency, quality of regulation, rule of law, and prevention of corruption have become the generally accepted touchstones of good governance.

Since 1989, many organisations worldwide have produced indices of different metrics, scores, and serial numbers for the above concepts. They can be used to evaluate governance in general and in terms of various policies, and in many cases to influence politics as well. The most well-known global indices are the World Bank's Worldwide Governance Index, which evaluates 214 countries from 30 different sources of aggregated data, Freedom House's "Freedom in the World" ranking, examining the state of the rule of law with subjective tools in 209 countries, and the Economist Intelligence Unit's Democracy Index, which examines 165 countries based on peer reviews and surveys.

A common feature of these indices is that they place emphasis on the quality of the processes of governance, and give less consideration to the specific challenges faced by each country and the overall efficiency of governance in managing them. By using an abstract concept of 'good governance' as a basis for evaluation, these indices set a uniform standard for each country, and in many cases they are ranked without consideration for their special circumstances.

Good Governance Index by Nézőpont Intézet

Unlike international examples, Nézőpont Intézet's index is not an abstract category of good governance but approaches the assessment of government performance through each country's own past results and challenges. The Good Governance Index examines the government performance of Central European EU Member States (Austria, Bulgaria, Czechia, Croatia, Poland, Hungary, Romania, Slovakia and Slovenia) with the factuality of quantitative assessment and the context sensitivity of qualitative assessment. The Good Governance Index assesses the results of the past year from three aspects of governance such as economic growth, social well-being and political stability. We have assigned five factors to each of the three aspects, consisting of three quantitative and one qualitative indicators (see figure below).

GOOD GOVERNANCE INDEX

I. ECONOMIC GROWTH

STATISTICS

FINANCIAL POLICY
- Budgetary balance
- Public debt
- Inflation

PRODUCTIVITY
- GDP per capita
- Volume of industrial production
- Labour force productivity

COMMERCE POLICY
- Retail sales
- Service sales
- Current account balance

COMPETITIVENESS
- Median wage rate
- Corporate investment rate
- Labour force cost per capita

LABOUR MARKET
- Employment rate
- Unemployment rate
- Vacancies

EXPERT OPINION

FINANCIAL POLICY
- Budgetary stability
- Public debt management
- Inflation policy

PRODUCTIVITY
- Economic growth
- Volume of industrial production
- Value added production

COMMERCE POLICY
- Consumption
- Service sales
- Current account balance

COMPETITIVENESS
- Wage competitiveness
- Corporate investment activity
- Conditions for development

LABOUR MARKET
- Employment rate
- Unemployment rate
- Vacancies

II. SOCIAL WELL-BEING

STATISTICS

MATERIAL SECURITY
- Minimum wage rate
- Pension replacement rate
- Number of households unable to meet unexpected expenses

PUBLIC SAFETY
- Household security
- Confidence in the police
- Assessment of overall national security

EDUCATION
- Youth employment
- Drop-out rates
- Lifelong learning

HEALTH CARE
- Unmet medical needs
- Subjective health
- Healthy life years

ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY
- Waste recycling
- Renewable energy use
- Rate of households experiencing environmental pollution

EXPERT OPINION

MATERIAL SECURITY
- Minimum wage rate
- Pension rate
- Social exclusion rate

PUBLIC SAFETY
- Local public safety
- National public safety
- Factors determining public safety

EDUCATION
- Youth employment
- Efficiency of education system
- Lifelong learning

HEALTH CARE
- Coverage of health care supply system
- Efficiency of health care supply system
- Prevention

ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY
- Waste recycling
- Renewable energy use
- Environmental policy

III. POLITICAL STABILITY

PUBLIC OPINION

CAPACITY
- Decision-making capacity
- Management of unexpected situations
- Intragovernmental unity

LEGITIMACY
- Legal legitimacy
- Political legitimacy
- Economic legitimacy

VISION
- Political vision
- Strategic foundation for decision-making
- Confidence in strategic feasibility

PUBLIC CONFIDENCE
- Standard of public service
- Operation of the judiciary system
- Enforcement of public interest

PREDICTABILITY
- Risk of early elections
- Government party's chances for re-election
- Advancement of anti-systemic forces

EXPERT OPINION

CAPACITY
- Decision-making capacity
- Management of unexpected situations
- Intragovernmental unity

LEGITIMACY
- Legal legitimacy
- Political legitimacy
- Economic legitimacy

VISION
- Political vision
- Strategic execution of public policy
- Strategic feasibility

PUBLIC CONFIDENCE
- Standard of public service
- Operation of the judiciary system
- Legitimacy of governance

PREDICTABILITY
- Risk of early elections
- Government party's chances for re-election
- Advancement of anti-systemic forces

CALCULATION OF SCORES

In the course of quantitative assessment, we assigned scores to the statistical or public opinion survey data of the indicators. In the "Economic Growth" and "Social Well-being" aspects we first scored the quantified results of the countries surveyed in 2018. During the conversion of the data into a score, the two extreme values were identified by 1 (worst) and 5 (best) and the intervening values were proportionately graded according to the forms of normative assessment. As a second step, each country's 2018 status was compared to its previous economic and social achievements and given a score. In calculating the score we averaged achievements applicable for each indicator going back no further than 2008.[32]

The average displacements were lined up, the lowest and highest values were identified by 1 (worst) and 5 (best), and intervening values were set using the previously described methodology. Finally, for each factor, the quantitative scores of each country were determined by averaging these two scores. Quantitative scores of the "Political Stability" aspect were calculated on the basis of a survey.[33]

conducted in February 2019 in Hungary, Austria, the Czech Republic, Slovakia, Poland, Slovenia, Croatia, Serbia, Romania and Bulgaria using telephone interviews[2] with 1,000 respondents in each country. The survey focused on the evaluation of three statements per factor on a five-point scale, and then averaged the answers to the questions in proportion to their distribution, thus converting the survey results into scores.

Statistical or opinion poll data do not provide complete information on the factors explaining government performance in each country. That is why qualitative assessment was also necessary for each factor, such as country experts' opinions revealing the specific contexts of government performance. In the countries examined, we asked two political-economic experts to analyse the five factors of each of the three aspects. Peer reviews contained a textual assessment in which experts highlighted the key challenges, government measures and their effectiveness. In addition, the experts graded the effectiveness of government measures on a five-point scale, and we averaged their scores per factor for each country.

The qualitative and quantitative scores of the factors were totalled at the level of three aspects, which were combined to calculate the 2018 aggregate scores for each country.

NOTES

1   https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/cache/metadata/en/gov_10dd_esms.htm

2   https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/web/products-datasets/-/sdg_17_40&lang=en

3   https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/web/products-datasets/-/teicp000&lang=en

4   https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/cache/metadata/EN/sdg_10_10_esmsip2.htm

5   The Purchasing Power Standard (PPS) or Purchasing Power Unit (PPU) is a technical currency which overrides the difference between individual countries' prices

6   https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/SL.GDP.PCAP.EM.KD?view=chart

7   https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/web/products-datasets/-/teiis090

8   https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/web/products-datasets/-/teiis200

9   https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/web/products-datasets/-/teiis710

10 https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/web/products-datasets/-/tipsbp20

11 https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/web/products-datasets/product?code=ilc_di04

12 https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/statistics-explained/index.php/Glossary:Business_investment_rate

13 http://ec.europa.eu/economy_finance/ameco/user/serie/ResultSerie.cfm

14 https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/web/products-datasets/-/tesem010

15 https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/statistics-explained/index.php/Unemployment_statistics

16 https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/cache/metadata/EN/jvs_esms.htm

17 https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/cache/metadata/en/earn_minw_esms.htm; In Austria, there is no centrally defined minimum wage, so to calculate purchasing power we used the wages based on collective agreements concluded in sectors with average wages notmuch different from the national median wage.(https://www.gehaltskompass.at/)

18 https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/web/products-datasets/product?code=tespm100

19 https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/web/products-datasets/product?code=ilc_mdes04

20 https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/cache/metadata/en/sdg_16_20_esmsip2.htm

21 http://ec.europa.eu/commfrontoffice/publicopinion/index.cfm/Chart/getChart/themeKy/18/group-Ky/88

22 http://ec.europa.eu/commfrontoffice/publicopinion/index.cfm/Survey/getSurveyDetail/yearFrom/1974/yearTo/2018/surveyKy/1569

23 https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/web/products-datasets/product?code=edat_lfse_24

24 https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/statistics-explained/index.php/Early_leavers_from_education_and_training24

25 https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/statistics-explained/index.php?title=Adult_learning_statistics

26 https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/statistics-explained/index.php/Unmet_health_care_needs_statistics

27 https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/cache/metadata/en/hlth_silc_01_esms.htm

28 http://ghdx.healthdata.org/gbd-results-tool

29 https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/web/products-datasets/product?code=sdg_11_60

30 https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/cache/metadata/EN/t2020_rd330_esmsip2.htm

31 https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/web/products-datasets/product?code=ILC_MDDW02

32 Only data avaliable for all countries were taken into account. Due to incomplete timelines the averaged period may be shorter for some indicators.

33 The sample of the survey is representative for the 18+ population of each country by gender, age, region, type of settlement and educational level. For a sample size of 1,000 and a confidence level of 95 percent, the maximum sampling error is 3.1 percent.