2026 Equal Measures Gender Equality Index
Technical note on methodology

Introduction

The 2026 Equal Measures Gender Equality Index assesses progress toward gender equality across 130 countries representing approximately 90% of the world's women and girls.

The 2026 edition represents a significant evolution of three previous Equal Measures indices. Drawing on feedback from gender equality advocates worldwide, the Index broadens its focus beyond traditional measures of opportunity to better capture dimensions of power, leadership, rights, civic participation, and the broader conditions that enable gender equality.

The Index was developed to provide a clear, accessible, and globally comparable assessment of gender equality outcomes, rights, opportunities, representation, power, and enabling conditions. It is designed for advocates, policymakers, funders, researchers, journalists, and others seeking to understand where progress is occurring, where challenges persist, and how countries compare across multiple dimensions of gender equality.

The 2024 edition of the Index looked at gender equality across 14 SDGs with 56 indicators. That breadth showed how gender runs through the whole 2030 Agenda, but it made the policy message harder to act on and data sensitive to gender issues were more difficult to locate and keep current. The 2026 Index maintains the SDG commitment while focusing more narrowly on where governments can make a difference on the issues that matter most for women and girls.

Table 1 compares the Index with key global gender indices.

Table 1. How the Equal Measures Gender Equality Index compares with other global gender indices

Index	Producer	What it measures	Structure	No. of countries	Time series?	Latest release
EM2030 Gender Index	Equal Measures 2030	Distance to equality in laws, services,	5 dimensions, 27 indicators	130	Y	2026

		finance & women's views				
Gender Inequality Index	UNDP	Inequality of men and women in human development	3 dimensions, 5 indicators	170	Y	2025
Women's Empowerment Index	UNDP and UN Women	Women's empowerment in absolute terms	5 domains, 10 indicators	114	N	2023
Global Gender Parity Index	UNDP and UN Women	Women's empowerment relative to men	4 domains, 8 indicators	114	N	2023
Global Gender Gap Index	World Economic Forum	Gaps between women and men	4 subindexes, 14 indicators	148	Y	2026
Women, Peace and Security Index	Georgetown GIWPS and PRIO	Women's inclusion, justice and security	3 dimensions, 13 indicators	181	N	2025

How the 2026 Gender Equality Index adds value

- **Targets, not only gaps.** Gap measures compare women with men, so a country where both fare badly can still score well. EM2030 scores against fixed targets, such as zero maternal deaths, and uses parity bands where parity is the goal, such as for women in political leadership.

- **Policy levers alongside outcomes.** Laws on abortion, parental leave and LGBTIQ+ rights, government social spending, debt risk and statistical capacity are things governments can change. The Women, Peace and Security (WPS) Index and others include some legal and institutional indicators.

- **Women's own views.** Gallup World Poll survey indicators capture whether women feel safe walking alone at night and are satisfied with healthcare, water and transport services.

- **Emerging issues.** Civil space, political voice, climate vulnerability, and sexual orientation and gender identity rights are rarely covered by global gender indices.

- **Built by and for advocates.** The Index is designed with feminist and civil society partners for accountability, and its statistical soundness has been audited by the Joint Research Commission of the European Commission for the previous three editions of the Index.

All of these indices provide complementary perspectives on the state of global gender equality. The Gender Inequality Index (GII) and Global Gender Gap Index (GGGI) offer long time series on core gaps, while the Women's Empowerment Index (WEI) and Global Gender Parity Index (GGPI) separate empowerment from parity. EM2030's contribution is a compact, policy-focused scorecard that shows how far each country is from key gender equality aspirations and targets.

1.1 Index structure

The 2026 Gender Equality Index focuses on five dimensions where public policy can do the most to advance gender equality: Health and Sexual and Reproductive Health; Safety and Security; Economic Opportunity and Power; Civic Space and Leadership; and the Enabling Environment for Gender Equality. It tracks 27 indicators across these five dimensions for two reference years - 2020 and 2025 - in 130 countries.

Dimension	No.	Indicators
1. Health & SRHR	6	Maternal mortality; adolescent birth rates; family planning needs met; women's satisfaction with healthcare availability; abortion laws; women's satisfaction with water quality
2. Safety & Security	5	Child, early and forced marriage; female homicide rates; women's perceptions of safety; women's access to justice; climate vulnerability
3. Economic Opportunity & Power	5	Girls' expected years of schooling; women in vulnerable employment; parenting and care laws; women's financial inclusion; women's internet use
4. Civic Space & Leadership	6	Women in parliament; women ministers; women in climate decision-making; women's freedom of expression; personal freedom and rights; sexual orientation and gender identity rights
5. Enabling Environment for Gender Equality	5	Women's satisfaction with public transportation; statistical data availability; risk of debt crisis; government social spending; equal access to public services

Together, these dimensions seek to capture:

- The outcomes women and girls experience;
- The rights and opportunities available to them;

- Their ability to exercise power and influence decisions affecting their lives; and
- The broader institutional environment that enables gender equality.

What the new structure means for the methodology:

- **Maintains the same basic approach and methods with fewer indicators and domains.** Indicators are still averaged arithmetically, then combined with a geometric mean, now across 5 dimensions instead of 14 goals (Section 1.6).
- **Each dimension carries more weight.** Each dimension counts 20% of the Index, against about 7% for each 2024 goal (Section 1.7).
- **Comparability.** Scores and ranks can be compared directly between the reference years 2020 and 2025.

1.2 Indicator selection

The 2026 Equal Measures Gender Equality Index was redesigned following extensive consultation with Equal Measures partners and gender equality advocates around the world. The objective was to ensure that the Index reflects not only what can be measured globally, but also the issues that advocates and movements identify as most urgent in their own contexts.

As part of the 2025 Gender Equality Advocates Survey, Equal Measures collected data from 422 advocates from around the world in four languages (English, French, Indonesian and Spanish. The survey explored advocates' priorities, experiences using gender data, and views on how gender equality should be measured. The advocate consultation did not determine individual indicators directly. However, it played an important role in validating the overall architecture of the Index and highlighting priorities that should be reflected in its design. The resulting framework seeks to balance three objectives:

- Reflecting the priorities identified by gender equality advocates;
- Maintaining global comparability across countries; and
- Drawing on the strongest available international data sources.

The survey findings ultimately reinforced a core principle of the 2026 Equal Measures Gender Equality Index: that gender equality cannot be fully understood through opportunity alone. It must also account for safety, rights, representation, power, and the systems that enable progress.

The indicators were selected using five criteria:

1. **Relevance** to monitoring gender equality, especially for gender advocates.
2. **Statistical rigor:** valid and reliable measures.
3. **Timeliness:** up to date and published on a regular schedule.
4. **Data quality:** the best available measure, from official or other credible sources.
5. **Coverage:** data for most countries.

1.3 Missing data and coverage thresholds

In the 2026 Gender Equality Index, 2.5% of the 7,020 data points (27 indicators × two years x 130 countries) were missing. Thresholds help to determine which indicators, dimensions and countries have enough data to be reliability scored. Basic imputation techniques were used to reach reliability thresholds for a small number of indicators.

What are thresholds?

A threshold is a minimum share of countries reporting data in order to publish a score for an indicator, dimension or country. Imputation estimates a missing value from other information, such as an earlier year, another source, or similar countries.

Why do they matter?

Global gender data often have large gaps that are not random. Data are often missing in the countries facing the greatest challenges. A country missing its weakest areas can look better than it is, and one scored on very few data points mostly reflects the imputation method.

How they improve the Index

- **Credibility:** scores are published only where data are sufficient.
- **Coverage:** careful imputation keeps more countries in the Index without inventing results.
- **Transparency:** flagging countries with sparse data tells users which ranks to read with caution.

The trade-off: stricter thresholds exclude countries, often those where gender data matter most. Looser thresholds put more weight on estimates. We would have had 162 countries in a more flexible model allowing 3 out of 5 indicators and 4 out of 6 ind. (coverage of 60 and 66% of the indicators at the dimension level)

Thresholds in the 2026 Index and earlier Index editions

Threshold	JRC-COIN benchmark	2026	2024	2022
Indicator coverage	Review or replace if > 20% missing	Most indicators have <5% missing 2 indicators > 20% missing	4 indicators > 20% missing	9 indicators > 20% missing
Goal or dimension score	≥ 75% of its indicators	4 of 5 or 5 of 6 indicators	75%	75%
Country inclusion	≥ 65% coverage	100% all 5 dimensions had to be available	13 of 14 goals	13 of 14 goals

Imputation used alternate years or data sources. Use the most recent year available, or a different data source with a similar definition. Estimate gaps from other sources, estimates for similar countries, or regional averages (23 countries for women's internet access).

1.4 Treatment of outliers: winsorisation

Kurtosis measures the heaviness of the tails of a distribution (and its propensity to produce extreme observations). High kurtosis suggests more observations in the tails than would be expected under a normal distribution. Skewness measures the asymmetry of the distribution. A value close to zero indicates that the distribution is relatively symmetric, even if it has extreme values.

In the 2026 Gender Index, 1 of 27 indicators, covering 130 countries and two reference years [2020 and 2025], had extreme values that needed treatment before normalisation. Three other indicators had distributions with more extreme values (heavy tails) than a normal distribution, but these extreme values were not concentrated on one side of the distribution.

What is winsorisation?

Winsorisation helps to address extreme values in a distribution. Values that are beyond a specified cut-off are assigned a threshold value. Thus, they remain amongst the highest or lowest, but no longer skew the overall scale. Unlike deleting data, every country maintains its observation (Becker et al., 2019).

Why is it needed?

Outlier detection and treatment: Potential problematic outliers in an indicator are identified using the JRC-COIN criteria: when both its absolute skewness exceeds 2.0 and its kurtosis exceeds 3.5. For flagged outliers, values beyond the 97th (or 98th) percentile are adjusted through a proportional compression of their distances from the percentile threshold. This reduces the influence of extreme values on the distribution while retaining differences between observations and preserving their original ranking. The degree of compression is calibrated to bring both skewness and kurtosis below the respective JRC thresholds.

How it improves the Index

- **Balance:** each indicator contributes information across all countries, not just the extremes.
- **Fairness between indicators:** a skewed indicator does not quietly outweigh the others in its goal.

Approach in the 2026 Index

An indicator is flagged when absolute skewness exceeds 2.5 *and* kurtosis exceeds 3.5 following the JRC-COIN recommendation used in earlier Index editions (Groeneveld & Meeden, 1984).

Flagged indicators are winsorised at the 98th percentile. As in 2022 and 2024, EM2030 uses a proportional variant that keeps the relative distances between treated values. If winsorising would change five or more values, a log transformation is used instead, as the JRC tested in 2022. Skewness and kurtosis are recomputed after treatment to verify the values are below the thresholds.

For technical readers, classic winsorisation of value x for country c, with cut-offs P_L and P_U:

$$x'_c = \min(\max(x_c, P_L), P_U)$$

1.5 Normalisation

All 27 indicators in the 2026 Gender Index are set to a 0–100 scale, where 0 is the lowest possible score and 100 means that the gender equality target has been met. As in 2024, 100 marks a target, not simply the maximum observed score or best-performing country.

What is normalisation?

Indicators come in different units: deaths per 100,000 births, years of schooling, percentages, legal scores. Normalisation converts them to a common scale so they can be compared and averaged to be able to create a composite index. Normalization also aligns the direction, for example the target might be fewer maternal deaths or more years of schooling. With normalization a higher score always means better performance.

Why does it matter?

Without a common scale, an index is not possible. JRC guidance is to choose a method that fits the framework and the data, and that users can easily interpret (Becker et al., 2019; OECD & JRC, 2008).

Method	How it works	Strength	Limitation
Distance to target (goalposts) (EM2030)	Rescales between a fixed lower bound and a target	Scores show distance to goal across editions	Targets must be justified and published
Min-max	Rescales from the lowest to the highest observed value	Simple; keeps relative distances	Sensitive to outliers; 100 = best country, not a target
Z-score	Centres on the average, in standard deviations	Common in statistics	Hard to explain; negative values
Percentile rank	Replaces values by rank	Removes outliers	Loses the size of gaps between countries

How it improves the Index

- **Meaningful scores:** a score of 70 means a country is 70% of the way from the lower bound to the target.
- **Comparable over time:** fixed targets allow scores to be compared across reference years.
- **Ambition reflected in the target:** reaching the best-performing country is not enough if girls are still out of school (Caperna et al., 2022).

The trade-off is that results will depend on the choices made for the ambition of the targets, which are partly normative (through the SDG compact for example) and must be documented.

Approach used for the 2026 Index

In 2026, the 27 indicators were normalized in the following ways compared to the 2024 Index:

Normalization method	2026	
	No. of indicators	Share, %
Already on a 0–100 scale (e.g. percentages, target 100)	10	37
Negative percentages reversed (100 − value)	2	7
Min-max with fixed bounds, positive or negative	10	37
Values from 0–1 multiplied by 100	2	7
Gender parity: 100 within a band between 45 and 55	3	11
Total	*27*	*100*

Targets come from official global SDGs, rights-based guarantees and obligations, or the average of top performers (EM2030, 2024, Annex 1). Bounds are set using all countries reporting data, not only those countries that are included in the Index, in order to better reflect the global picture.

For technical readers, with lower bound L, target T and upper bound U, scores capped at 0 and 100:

$$\text{Positive: } x' = 100 \times \frac{x - L}{T - L} \qquad \text{Negative: } x' = 100 \times \frac{U - x}{U - T}$$

Annex 1 lists each indicator's direction, normalisation method, the value that scores 0 and the target that scores 100.

Example: four indicators, one scale

Hypothetical raw values. Bracketed bounds are illustrative.

Indicator (dimension)	Raw value	Direction	Bounds	Score
Family planning needs met (1)	78%	Positive	0–100%	78.0
Girls' expected years of schooling (3)	13 years	Positive	L = 0, T = 17	76.5

Indicator (dimension)	Raw value	Direction	Bounds	Score
Female homicide rates (2)	2.0 per 100,000 women	Negative	U = [15], T = 0	86.6
Women in parliament (4)	30%	Parity	100 between 45-55%	60.0
Women in parliament (4)	61%	Parity	100 between 45-55%	78.0

Note: The parity indicator shows why one rule cannot fit every indicator. Equality is the target, so a country above 55% women also falls short on gender parity. Bracketed scores assume a straight-line drop to 0 at 0% and at 100%. In 2024 the parity band was also 45–55%.

1.6 Aggregation

The 2026 Gender Index combines 27 indicator scores in two steps, using the same method as for 2022 and 2024 Indices. Indicators are averaged into five dimension scores, and dimension scores are combined into the Index with a geometric mean.

What is aggregation?

Aggregation is how the set of normalized indicator scores become a single dimension or index score. After each indicator is transformed to a 0–100 scale, these scores are then averaged, first within each individual dimension and then across dimensions, to give one Index score per country. The weight of each indicator or dimension score in the overall index is discussed in the next section.

Why does the method of aggregation matter?

The formula expresses a view on trade-offs. An arithmetic mean is fully compensatory: a very high score on one dimension can make up for a very low score on another. A geometric mean is only partly compensatory: weak performance on any dimension pulls the total down more (Becker et al., 2019).

For gender equality this matters. Strong representation in parliament should not hide high maternal mortality or unsafe streets. The geometric mean reflects the idea that high scores in one area should not compensate for low scores in another (Papadimitriou & Caperna, 2019).

How it improves the Index

- **Balanced profiles rewarded:** countries that advance on all dimensions score higher than those with uneven results.
- **Dimensions carry equal weight:** the two dimensions with 6 indicators do not outweigh the three with 5.
- **Transparent results:** each dimension score is a simple average of its indicators, so users can trace what drives differences.

Approach in the 2026 Index

1. **Indicators to dimensions.** Each dimension score is the arithmetic mean of its 5 or 6 indicators, with equal weights
2. **Coverage rule.** In 2024 a goal score needed data for at least 75% of its indicators. Applied to 2026, that means 4 of 5 or 5 of 6 indicators.
3. **Dimensions to Index.** The Index is the geometric mean of the 5 dimension scores, each weighted equally (1/5 = 0.20).
4. **Country inclusion.** In 2024 a country needed 13 of 14 goals. In 2026, countries needed to have data for all five dimensions or a minimum coverage of 80 to 83% of the indicators for each dimension.

Example: balanced versus uneven profiles

Two hypothetical countries both average 70 across the 5 dimensions. Country A scores 70 on every dimension. Country B scores 90, 90, 70, 50 and 50.

	Country A (balanced)	Country B (uneven)
Arithmetic mean	70.0	70.0
Geometric mean	70.0	67.7

The arithmetic mean treats the scores as equal. The geometric mean ranks A ahead, because B's weak dimensions are not fully offset by its strong ones.

In the 2026 Equal Measures Gender Index Index, the five biggest differences between the arithmetic and geometric mean for the Index scores: were Saudi Arabia (-5.2 points), Kuwait (-3.7), Russian Federation (-3.3), Eswatini (-2.9) and Tajikistan (-2.9).

How the approach has changed over Index editions

Edition	Structure	Formula
2026	27 indicators → 5 dimensions → Index	Arithmetic within dimensions; geometric across dimensions
2024	56 indicators → 14 goals → Index	Arithmetic within goals; geometric across goals
2022	56 indicators → 14 goals → Index	Arithmetic within goals; geometric across goals
2019	51 indicators → Index directly	Arithmetic mean of all indicators

Does the choice matter?

In 2024 the JRC ran 5,000 simulations varying the formula (geometric or arithmetic), goal weights (±20%), imputation and low-coverage goals. For 92% of countries, the published rank was within five places of the median simulated rank. For 94%, the 90% rank interval was under 10 places. About 87% of rank variation came from the imputation method or its interaction with the formula (Casabianca et al., 2024).

1.7 Weighting

The 2026 Gender Index, like the 2024 SDG Gender Index, has no explicit weighting scheme. Every indicator counts equally within its dimension, and every dimension counts equally in the Index. Equal weights represent a choice, and they carry implicit weights that is discussed in this section.

What is weighting, and what are the options?

Weights set how much each dimension or indicator counts towards the total. Weights are informed by statistics, or from expert and public opinion, or from both. While there are a wide range of methods, many consider that the weighting approach should be easy to communicate and not obfuscate findings, and this often favours simpler approaches and methods (Becker et al., 2019; OECD & JRC, 2008).

Approach	How weights are set	Strength	Limitation
Equal weights (EM2030)	Same weight for every component at each level	Transparent; treats all dimensions as equally important	Does not imply relative importance; hides implicit weights
Expert or participatory	Experts or stakeholders allocate a budget of points, or compare pairs	Reflects policy priorities and voices	Subjective; hard to agree across 100+ countries
Statistical	Derived from the data, e.g. principal component analysis	Driven by the data's structure	Weights reflect correlations, not importance

What is implicit weighting?

Implicit weights can be seen as the weights a component creates or ends up with, rather than the weights it is assigned. They arise in three ways.

1. **Structure.** An indicator's weight in the Index is its weight in its dimension times the dimension's weight. Indicators in smaller dimensions therefore count more: in 2026, 0.040 in the five-indicator dimensions against 0.033 in the six-indicator ones. In 2019, with no

goal level, all 51 indicators counted equally. That gave goals with five indicators (SDG 5 and SDG 8) slightly more weight, a deliberate choice (Papadimitriou & Caperna, 2019).

2. **Correlation.** Equal weights do not guarantee equal influence (Becker et al., 2017). In 2024, SDG 2 and SDG 4 were very highly correlated with the Index, while SDG 17 was correlated at only 0.39. Goals with the same nominal weight shaped results unequally. Highly correlated goals, such as SDG 6 and SDG 7, also risk counting one concept twice (Casabianca et al., 2024).

The geometric mean adds a further effect: a goal with a very low score pulls the Index down more than its nominal weight suggests.

Approach in the 2026 Index

Each indicator's effective weight in the Index, for an indicator in dimension d with n_d indicators and D dimensions:

$$w_i^{\text{eff}} = \frac{1}{n_d} \times \frac{1}{D}, \quad D = 5$$

Dimension	Indicators	Dimension weight	Effective weight per indicator
1. Health & SRHR	6	0.20	0.033
2. Safety & Security	5	0.20	0.040
3. Economic Opportunity & Power	5	0.20	0.040
4. Civic Space & Leadership	6	0.20	0.033
5. Enabling Environment for Gender Equality	5	0.20	0.040

Indicators in five-indicator dimensions count 20% more than those in six-indicator dimensions. This spread is much narrower than in 2024, when effective weights ranged from 0.014 (five-indicator goals) to 0.024 (three-indicator goals). Each 2026 indicator also counts more than before, because there are fewer of them.

Annex 1: Indicators, targets and normalisation

The 27 indicators of the 2026 Index, with the direction and normalisation rules applied (Section 1.5).

Code	Indicator	Definition	Source	Direction	Normalisa-tion	Value scoring 0	Target (scores 100)
1.1	Maternal Mortality	Maternal mortality ratio (per 100 000 live births)	WHO	Negative	Min-max, reversed	[Highest value]	0
1.2	Adolescent Birth Rate	Adolescent fertility rate (births per 1,000 women ages 15-19)	World Bank	Negative	Min-max, reversed	[Highest value]	0
1.3	Women's Family Planning Needs Met	Demand for family planning satisfied with modern methods (percentage of women aged 15-49 years; women married or in a union)	UN Population Division/DESA	Positive	Already 0–100	0	100%
1.4	Women's Satisfaction with Healthcare Availability	Proportion of women (age 15+) who indicate they are satisfied with the availability of quality healthcare in the city or area where they live	Gallup World Poll	Positive	Already 0–100	0	100%
1.5	Abortion Laws	Extent to which there are legal grounds for abortion	Center for Reproductive Rights (CRR) World	Positive	Already 0–100	0	Best score = 100

Code	Indicator	Definition	Source	Direction	Normalisa-tion	Value scoring 0	Target (scores 100)
			Abortion Laws Map				
1.6	Women's Satisfaction with Water Quality	Proportion of women (age 15+ years) who say they are satisfied with the quality of water in the city or area where they live	Gallup World Poll	Positive	Already 0–100	0	100%
2.1	Child, Early and Forced Marriage	Proportion of young women (age 15-19 years) who have been married	OECD Gender Institutions and Development Database	Negative	Reversed	100	0
2.2	Female Homicide Rate	Female victims of intentional homicide (per 100,000 female population)	United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC)	Negative	Min-max, reversed	[Highest value]	0
2.3	Women Feeling Safe at Night	Proportion of women (age 15+ years) who say they feel safe walking alone at night in the city or area where they live	Gallup World Poll	Positive	Already 0–100	0	100%
2.4	Women's Access to Justice	Extent to which women enjoy equal, secure, and effective access to justice	Varieties of Democracy (V-Dem)	Positive	Min-max, adjusted	0	Best score = 4
2.5	Climate Vulnerability	Climate vulnerability (measures a country's exposure, sensitivity, and adaptive capacity across six key life-supporting sectors:	Notre Dame Global Adaptation Initiative Index (ND-GAIN)	Negative	0–1 scale × 100, reversed	1	Best score = 0

Code	Indicator	Definition	Source	Direction	Normalisa-tion	Value scoring 0	Target (scores 100)
		food, water, health, ecosystem services, human habitat, and infrastructure)					
3.1	Girls' Expected Years of Schooling	Expected years of schooling, girls	UNDP (based on UNESCO Institute for Statistics (UIS))	Positive	Min-max, capped at target	0	17 years or more = 100
3.2	Women in Vulnerable Work	The proportion of employed women who are 'contributing family workers' (a particularly vulnerable category of work)	International Labour Organization / World Bank (ILO/WB)	Negative	Reversed (100 – value)	100	0
3.3	Parenting and Care Laws	Parenting and Care Laws (composite index made up of four indicators - at least 14 weeks of paid leave for mothers, fully government administered maternity leave benefits, paid leave for fathers, and prohibited dismissal of pregnant workers)	World Bank - Women, Business and the Law (WB - WBL)	Positive	Already 0–100	0	Best score = 100
3.4	Women's Financial Inclusion	Proportion of women (15 years and older) with an account at a financial institution or mobile-money-service provider	United Nations Statistics Division (UNSD)	Positive	Already 0–100	0	100%

Code	Indicator	Definition	Source	Direction	Normalisa-tion	Value scoring 0	Target (scores 100)
3.5	Women's Internet Use	% of women who used the internet (from any location)	International Telecommunication Union (ITU)	Positive	Already 0–100	0	100%
4.1	Women in Parliament	The proportion of seats held by women in national parliaments	Inter-Parliamentary Union (IPU) via UNSD	Parity	Parity band	0% and 100%	Parity = 45%-55%
4.2	Women Ministers	Proportion of women in ministerial or equivalent positions (including deputy prime ministers) in the government.	Inter-Parliamentary Union (IPU) via World Bank	Parity	Parity band	0% and 100%	Parity = 45%-55%
4.3	Women in Climate Decision-Making	Total percentage of women party delegates for COP Climate meetings	Women's Environment and Development Organization (WEDO)/Gender Climate Tracker	Parity	Parity band	0% and 100%	Parity = 45%-55%
4.4	Women's Freedom of Expression	Are women able to openly discuss political issues in private homes and in public spaces?	Varieties of Democracy (V-Dem)	Positive	Min-max	0	Best score = 4
4.5	Personal Freedom and Rights	Level of personal autonomy, individual rights and freedom from discrimination (Country Assessment based on 4 areas: Freedom of Movement, Property Rights and Business, Personal Social Freedoms,	Freedom House	Positive	Min-max	0	Best score = 16

Code	Indicator	Definition	Source	Direction	Normalisa-tion	Value scoring 0	Target (scores 100)
		and Equality of Opportunity)					
4.6	Sexual Orientation and Gender Identity Rights	Extent to which laws criminalise, protect or recognise sexual orientation, gender identification, and same-sex relationships	Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Trans, and Intersex Association (ILGA World)	Positive	0–1 scale × 100	0	Best score = 1
5.1	Women's Satisfaction with Public Transport	Proportion of women (age 15+) who say they are satisfied with the public transportation systems in the city or area where they live	Gallup World Poll	Positive	Already 0–100	0	100%
5.2	Statistical Data Coverage	Statistics coverage and disaggregation (across 22 topics split across social, economic/financial, and environmental statistics)	Open Data Watch / Open Data Inventory (ODW / ODIN)	Positive	Already 0–100	0	Best score = 100
5.3	Risk of Debt Crisis	Country's vulnerability to a public and/or private debt crisis	Debt Justice UK	Positive	Already 0–100	0	Best score = 100
5.4	Government Social Spending	Percentage of government spending on education, health and social protection	Oxfam & DFI Commitment to Reducing Inequality (CRI) Index	Positive	Min-max, capped at target	0	60% or more = 100
5.5	Equal Access to	Extent to which access to public services are	Varieties of Democracy (V-Dem)	Positive	Min-max	0	Best score = 4

Code	Indicator	Definition	Source	Direction	Normalisa-tion	Value scoring 0	Target (scores 100)
	Public Services	distributed equally by gender					

References

- Becker, W. et al. (2019). *COIN Tool User Guide*. JRC, EUR 29899 EN.
- Becker, W., Saisana, M., Paruolo, P. & Vandecasteele, I. (2017). Weights and importance in composite indicators: Closing the gap. *Ecological Indicators*, 80, 12–22.
- Caperna, G., Kovacic, M. & Papadimitriou, E. (2022). *JRC Statistical Audit of the EM2030 SDG Gender Index 2022*. EUR 31016 EN.
- Casabianca, E., Ravanos, P. & Smallenbroek, O. (2024). *JRC Statistical Audit of the EM2030 SDG Gender Index 2024*. EUR 32019.
- EM2030 (2022). *'Back to Normal' is Not Enough: the 2022 SDG Gender Index*. Woking: Equal Measures 2030.
- EM2030 (2024). *A gender equal future in crisis? Findings from the 2024 SDG Gender Index*. Seattle: Equal Measures 2030.
- Groeneveld, R. A. & Meeden, G. (1984). Measuring skewness and kurtosis. *The Statistician*, 33, 391–399.
- OECD & JRC (2008). *Handbook on Constructing Composite Indicators: Methodology and User Guide*. OECD.
- Papadimitriou, E. & Caperna, G. (2019). *JRC Statistical Audit of the EM2030 SDG Gender Index*. EUR 29777 EN.
- Georgetown Institute for Women, Peace and Security & PRIO (2025). *Women, Peace and Security Index 2025/26*. Washington, DC: GIWPS.
- UNDP & UN Women (2023). *The Paths to Equal: Twin Indices on Women's Empowerment and Gender Equality*. New York: UNDP and UN Women.
- UNDP (2025). *Human Development Report 2025: Technical Notes*. New York: UNDP.
- World Economic Forum (2025). *Global Gender Gap Report 2025*. Geneva: WEF.