TABLE 12. **COMPARISON OF SPECIFIC COMMUNITY WELLBEING (CWB) AND INDIGENOUS WELLBEING MEASUREMENT FRAMEWORKS.**

Key

√	x	CI	D	n/a	PO	I
Meets criterion	Does not meet criterion	Composite index	Dashboard	Not applicable	Primary outcome	Inconclusive (insufficient information available to establish whether meets criterion), or only partially meets criterion

Table 12 (part 1): Framework, purpose, target audience, first published

Framework	Purpose, primary outcome (PO)	Target audience	First published, frequency
International			
OECD Better Life Initiative Framework http://www.oecdbetterlifeindex.org/	To bring together internationally comparable measures of wellbeing in line with the recommendations of the Stiglitz-Sen-Fitoussi Commission. PO: multidimensional wellbeing	National and international policy-makers, members of the public	2011, annual
UNDP Human Development Index http://hdr.undp.org/en/content/human-development-index-hdi	Serve as a frame of reference for social and economic development. PO: human development	Developed and developing countries, world bodies, development agencies	1990, annual
UN Sustainable Development Goals (2030 Agenda) https://www.un.org/sustainabledevelopment/sustainable-development-goals/	A set of political targets that are intended as the follow-on from the Millennium Development Goals. PO: sustainable development	National and international policy-makers, members of the public	2015
Human Rights Indicators https://www.ohchr.org/EN/Issues/Indicators/Pages/HRIndicatorsIndex.aspx	To measure the enjoyment of rights by rights holders. PO: human rights in a country	Central governments	2008
Human Rights Measurement Initiative https://humanrightsmeasurement.org/data/#/Rights/cpr-pilot/food/	A unique collaborative venture between human rights practitioners, researchers, academics, and other human rights supporters. The goal is to produce the first and best comprehensive set of metrics for tracking the human rights performance of countries. PO: fulfillment of human rights (at national level)	To support research and advocacy; to facilitate better policy design; to monitor/evaluate impact; to encourage more ethical capital flows	2018 (pilot metrics)
GIIN: IRIS and Impact Toolkit https://iris.thegiin.org/	Increasing the scale and effectiveness of impact investing (performance metrics used to measure social, environmental, and financial success). PO: return on investment	Impact investors	2009
City of Santa Monica: The Wellbeing Index https://wellbeing.smgov.net/	Working together to define, measure and actively improve wellbeing in Santa Monica. PO: community wellbeing	Local government, community members	2014
City of Sydney Community Wellbeing Indicators http://www.cityofsydney.nsw.gov.au/learn/research-and-statistics/community-indicators	A critical evidence-base on changing trends and issues affecting the community over time that can inform policy development and service provision investment planning. PO: wellbeing at city level	Local government, community agencies, community members	2012
Canadian Index of Wellbeing (CIW) https://uwaterloo.ca/canadian-index-wellbeing/what-we-do/domains-and-indicators	Provide a monitoring framework for assessing progress towards the wellbeing of Canadians as a whole. PO: wellbeing at national, regional and community levels	National and provincial decision-makers, members of the public	2011, variable frequency for regional and national
CIW Community Wellbeing Survey https://uwaterloo.ca/canadian-index-wellbeing/what-we-do/how-it-works/our-wellbeing-survey	Building on the success of the CIW national and provincial indices, the CIW developed a survey for measuring the subjective wellbeing of Canadians. The survey process uses the CIW framework – incorporating all eight domains. Adaptable to any population scale, the survey asks randomly selected members of a community, aged 18 and older, a range of questions to indicate how they are really doing with respect to aspects of each domain and wellbeing overall.	Local government, community groups	2012
Community Wellbeing Index: Forjaz https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007%2Fs11136-010-9794-2	A measure of the individual's level of satisfaction with the local place of residence, considering several items from a subjective perspective (in terms of satisfaction with the community services, with community attachment, and with physical and social environment. PO: CWB	Researchers, academics	2011
Bhutan Gross National Happiness Index http://www.grossnationalhappiness.com/	A multidimensional measure and it is linked with a set of policy and programme screening tools so that it has practical applications. The GNH index is built from data drawn from periodic surveys which are representative by district, gender, age, rural-urban residence, etc. The end objective is to ensure a just, equal and harmonious society in Bhutan. The GNH index supports policy-making within Bhutan. Policy selection tools are used to review the potential effects of proposed policies on GNH and the results of the GNH index is tracked over time to evaluate interventions. PO: happiness at national level	Government policy-makers	2008, variable frequency, 3 surveys to date
Gallup-Sharecare Well-Being Index https://wellbeingindex.sharecare.com/	A survey that acts as a barometer of Americans' perceptions of their wellbeing. PO: wellbeing (cities, regions)	Employers, health systems and community leaders	2012, annual
Community Wellbeing Composite Index: Sirgy 2009 https://www.researchgate.net/publication/227137725_Developing_a_Measure_of_Community_Well-Being_Based_on_Perceptions_of_Impact_in_Various_Life_Domains	A measure of subjective community wellbeing based on the notion that community residents perceive the quality-of-life (QOL) impact of community services and conditions in various life domains (e.g. family, social, leisure, health, financial, cultural, consumer, work, spiritual, and environmental domains). These perceptions influence residents' overall perception of community wellbeing, their commitment to the community, and their overall life satisfaction. PO: CWB	Community leaders, local councils	2009
Community Quality of Life Scale: Sirgy 2000 https://link.springer.com/article/10.1023/A:1006990718673	A valid community quality of life measurement tool that can be used by community leaders to assess community needs in a manner related to the overall life satisfaction of the community citizenry. The real value in such a tool lies in its ability to be applied to strategic planning within the community. PO: CWB	Community leaders, local councils	2000
Community Well-Being Questionnaire: Christakopoulou 2001 https://link.springer.com/article/10.1023/A:1012478207457	To develop a community wellbeing questionnaire that can effectively provide: (1) a valid, reliable, comparable and comprehensive profile of community wellbeing; (2) key information for policy-makers working with local communities that is not available from standard data sources; and (3) a replicable benchmark of community wellbeing to allow comparisons over time. PO: CWB	Policy-makers	2001
Personal Wellbeing Index (PWI) http://www.acqol.com.au/instruments	To create a quarterly index of subjective wellbeing for the Australian population, as an adjunct to the traditional economic indicators such as GDP. PO: wellbeing (individual, aggregated)	Researchers, academics	2006
WHO Quality of Life – brief version (WHOQOL-BREF) http://www.who.int/substance_abuse/research_tools/whoqolbref/en/	The aim was to develop an international cross-culturally comparable quality of life assessment instrument to assess the individual's perceptions in the context of their culture and value systems, their personal goals, standards and concerns. The WHOQOL instruments were developed collaboratively in a number of centres worldwide and have been widely field-tested. PO: quality of life (individual)	Clinicians, researchers in health policy and epidemiology, auditors of health and social services	1991
Burckhardt and Flanagan's Quality of Life Scale (QOLS) https://eprovide.mapi-trust.org/instruments/quality-of-life-scale2	To assess quality of life for healthy populations and those with chronic illness. PO: quality of life (individual)	Clinicians, researchers in health, wellbeing and community development	1970s (Flanagan), adapted later by Burckhardt
WHO European Healthy Cities Network: Healthy City Indicators https://www.hse.ie/eng/services/list/5/publichealth/publichealthdepts/howweimprovehealth/who-healthy-cities.html	Healthy Cities Network is a long-term international development initiative that aims to place health high on the agendas of decision makers and to promote comprehensive local strategies for health protection and sustainable development. Basic features include community participation and empowerment, intersectoral partnerships, and participant equity. WHO European Healthy Cities Network has developed a set of healthy city indicators (HCIs), to describe the health of its citizens and capture a range of local initiatives addressing the wider dimensions of health in European cities. PO: health of a given city for an individual	Individuals, communities, private and voluntary organisations, local governments who think and make decisions about health	1999
Economist Intelligence Unit's Global Livability Index http://www.eiu.com/topic/livability	Assesses which locations around the world provide the best or the worst living conditions. Assessing livability has a broad range of uses, from benchmarking perceptions of development levels to assigning a hardship allowance as part of expatriate relocation packages. The livability rating quantifies the challenges that might be presented to an individual's lifestyle in any given location, and allows for direct comparison between locations.	Relocation executives, human resource and finance executives	2011, annual
The Happy City Pulse http://www.happycity.org.uk/measurement-policy/happiness-pulse/	An online survey that measures three key areas of personal wellbeing: how people feel (BE), how they act (DO) and how they relate to others (CONNECT), as well as exploring how citizens engage with life in their city. This can be used in conjunction with the Thriving Places index, which measures the drivers of wellbeing. It is designed to be engaging and informative for individuals whilst giving vital data to business, community and city leaders on how they can better support improvements in wellbeing. It can be customised to different scales including community and city. PO: overall wellbeing (of an individual in a place)	Policy-Makers and Leaders – practical and rigorous tools to guide policy and resources to the things that are proven to improve lives. Businesses – to support wellbeing and resilience in the workforce – leading to lower absenteeism and staff turnover, greater productivity, creativity and teamwork. Communities and communitygroups – the capacity to map wellbeing needs and strengths, and evaluate and demonstrate the impact and social value of their work. Individuals – measure, explore and learn more about routes to lasting wellbeing, strengthening their capacity to build their own resilience.	2016 (pilot)
Happy City's Thriving Places Index (TPI) https://www.thrivingplacesindex.org/	A progress report on the conditions for wellbeing (i.e. drivers of wellbeing) at a city level - not wellbeing itself. This can be used in conjunction with the Happy City pulse, which measures subjective wellbeing itself. It helps decision makers understand and assess the determinants of wellbeing and establishes the foundation for better decisions and resource use for improving lives. It aims to challenge the current growth at all costs paradigm, grow awareness of the role of what we measure on our values and decisions, provide better measures that are more widely used, starting locally, challenge society to develop more measures of what matters to real progress. PO: conditions of wellbeing	Change-makers in local government, business and civil society. Specifically: Local Authority decision-makers and officers, Local Public Health leaders and teams, Health & Wellbeing boards, Private Sector organisations who are interested in place-based development or cross-sector partnerships, Civil Society organisations large and small, who play a crucial role in improving the conditions for citizens to thrive	2015 (pilot)
Australian National Development Index http://www.andi.org.au/the-index-in-a-nutshell.html	A holistic measure of national progress and wellbeing. The index reflects the values and priorities of Australians and tells us how we are doing as people, as communities and as a nation. A community-led initiative still under development (an incorporated member-owned initiative of leading community organisations, peak bodies, businesses, faith-based organisations, researchers, and independent, non-partisan grassroots citizens). PO: wellbeing	Australian public, policy and decision-makers	Not yet operational
Korean City Community Wellbeing Index http://www.jstor.org/stable/24721442?seq=1#page_scan_tab_contents	Measuring CWB to provide policy guidance to local government	Local government	2013
Korean Subjective Community Wellbeing QCA Method https://www.abacademies.org/articles/discovering-the-configurations-of-the-factors-affecting-community-wellbeing-in-korea-using-qca-method-6621.html	(1) Portray the causal connections among factors affecting community wellbeing and (2) to put forward policy implications whereby each province can strengthen its community wellbeing level	Academics	2015
New Zealand			
Sovereign Wellbeing Index https://www.sovereign.co.nz/about-us/community-and-wellbeing/pages/sovereign-wellbeing-index.aspx	NZ's first survey designed specifically to measure the wellbeing of New Zealanders. It provides a look into how New Zealanders are coping on a personal and societal level within the economic conditions and a comparison with European populations. PO: wellbeing (flourishing; regional and national)	General public, academics, public policy-makers	2013, 2015
Waikato Progress Indicators https://www.waikatoregion.govt.nz/community/waikato-progress-indicators-tupuranga-waikato/	A monitoring framework for assessing progress towards Waikato regional wellbeing. PO: wellbeing (regional)	Waikato Regional Council policy-makers, community members	2014 (developed), variable frequency
Statistics NZ General Social Survey https://www.stats.govt.nz/methods/general-social-survey-2018-final-content	A survey that provides information on the wellbeing of New Zealanders aged 15 years and over. In particular the survey provides a view of how wellbeing outcomes are distributed across different groups within the New Zealand population. PO: wellbeing (regional and national), and a wide range of social and economic outcomes	General public, academics, public policy-makers	2008, 2 yearly
Canterbury Wellbeing Index https://www.cph.co.nz/your-health/canterbury-wellbeing-index/	Canterbury Earthquake Recovery Authority (CERA) designed the Canterbury Wellbeing Index to monitor wellbeing and track the progress of social recovery from the 2010/11 earthquakes. PO: wellbeing (regional)	Social sector and government agencies	2013, annually till 2015, reviewed 2017
Quality of Life Project http://www.qualityoflifeproject.govt.nz/	Provide information to decision-makers to help improve the quality of life in major New Zealand urban areas	TLAs, key stakeholders, members of the public	2003, 2004, then 2 yearly
Wellington Region Genuine Progress Index (WR-GPI) http://www.gpiwellingtonregion.govt.nz/	Provide a monitoring framework for assessing progress towards the wellbeing goals of the Wellington Regional Strategy. It integrates economic data with environmental, cultural and social data PO: wellbeing via an adjusted economic lens (Wellington region)	Wellington Regional Strategy Committee, member TLAs, other key stakeholders and members of the public	2011 (data from 2001), updated 2 yearly
Waikato Vital Signs (Momentum Waikato) https://momentumwaikato.nz/vital-signs	Tell a holistic story of the social, environmental, cultural, and economic wellbeing of our Waikato communities, joining the dots between statistical information and what matters most to our communities to inform and support decision-making. PO: wellbeing ('vitality of communities')	Community foundations	2016, 3 yearly
Western Bay of Plenty's Vital Signs https://www.westernbay.govt.nz/our-district/our-community/Pages/Vital-Signs.aspx	A tool used to understand the community's perceptions of the place where they live. It looks at the social, cultural, health, environmental and economic wellbeing of the area and identifies the key priorities according to residents. This information is then used by local organisations to identify and prioritise areas for funding. PO: wellbeing of the community	Cultural, health, environmental and economic wellbeing of the area and identifies the key priorities according to residents. This information is then used by local organisations to identify and prioritise areas for funding.	2015, 3 yearly
Treasury Higher Living Standards Framework https://treasury.govt.nz/information-and-services/nz-economy/living-standards	So current income-based measures like per capita GDP can be supplemented in economic policy analysis with indicators of current and long-term wellbeing to produce a 'wellbeing budget' in 2019. PO: wellbeing (intergenerational at national and regional levels)	Government	2019, annual
MSD The Social Report https://www.msd.govt.nz/about-msd-and-our-work/publications-resources/monitoring/social-report/	Provide a national and regional overview of social wellbeing trends. The aims of the Social Report are to: • report on social indicators that complement existing economic and environmental indicators • compare New Zealand with other countries on measures of wellbeing. PO: wellbeing (regional and national) • contribute to better-informed public debate • aid planning and decision-making, and help identify key areas for action	Policy-makers, key stakeholders and members of the public	2001, annual until 2010, then 2016
Superu The Family Wellbeing Framework https://www.superu.govt.nz/sites/default/files/Families%20and%20Whanau%20Frameworks.pdf	To increase the use of evidence by people across the social sector so that they can make better decisions to improve the lives of New Zealanders and New Zealand's communities, families and whānau. PO: wellbeing (family)	The social sector (funders, policy-makers)	2014, annual
Tairāwhiti			
ECCT Framework "Vision 2030" https://www.ecct.org.nz/	Visioning research to inform a strategic review of ECCT's funding strategy and approach, in order to identify possible options to strengthen its impact in the region - towards its vision: 'To help build stronger, more sustainable communities'. PO: what would success look like?	ECCT, Tairāwhiti community members	2017, one off
Te Tairāwhiti Regional Group's Whānau Ora Population Outcomes Framework https://www.oag.govt.nz/2015/whanau-ora/appendix.htm	To enable Te Tairāwhiti Whānau Ora regional group to: • clearly explain its priorities for improving the lives of the Tairāwhiti population to the people living in the region; • discuss with the community how any individual, group, or organisation in the community could contribute to the priorities; • account for its decisions, actions, and use of public funds to anyone who asked; • make recommendations to Te Puni Kōkiri on funding applications; and • easily report on achievements. PO: wellbeing (of whānau i.e. whānau ora)	Te Tairāwhiti Whānau Ora regional group, people of Tairāwhiti, Te Puni Kōkiri	2015
Ngāti Porou Hauora (NPH) Health Dashboard https://uploads-ssl.webflow.com/5aefea03f167d6220569b7af/5b47e6588356b8662414la27_Dashboard-Final-Report-March-2016.pdf	To understand trends and progress in health outcomes and social determinants of health at population level for the people served by Ngāti Porou Hauora.	Ngāti Porou Hauora, Ngāti Porou iwi members	2016
Māori			
Statistics NZ Te Kupenga (Maori Social Survey) http://archive.stats.govt.nz/survey-participants/a-z-of-our-surveys/te-kupenga-survey.aspx	The first survey of Māori wellbeing. Gives a picture of the social, cultural, and economic wellbeing of Māori in New Zealand, including information from a Māori cultural perspective.	Tangata whenua	2013, next 2018
Stats NZ Te Ao Marama http://archive.stats.govt.nz/browse_for_stats/snapshots-of-nz/te-ao-marama.aspx	A collection of statistics about Māori wellbeing and development from a Māori perspective	Tangata whenua	2012, 2 yearly
Whānau Ora Outcomes Framework https://www.tpk.govt.nz/docs/tpk-wo-outcomes-framework-2016.pdf	Whānau Ora is a culturally-grounded, holistic approach to improving the wellbeing of whānau as a group, and addressing individual needs within the context of whānau. The framework recognises the long-term and progressive change required for whānau to achieve these aspirational goals by including short, medium and long-term outcomes.	Government agencies, Whānau Ora Regional population outcome groups, whānau	2015
Mason Durie Te Ritirito https://thehub.sia.govt.nz/assets/Uploads/1350-1415-Mason-Durie.pdf	A conceptual model for measuring Māori wellbeing that considers whānau, policy and measurement dimensions. PO: wellbeing (whānau, hapu and iwi mauri ora)	Government agencies	2017
Mason Durie and Te Kani Kingi: Hua Oranga https://mro.massey.ac.nz/handle/10179/2079	A Māori measure of mental health outcome consistent with Māori concepts of health and wellness and has been developed through the application of an existing model, Te Whare Tapa Wha. A triangulated approach providing an opportunity for views from three stakeholders to be explored, and then collated: Clinical views, Tangata Whaiora/Client views, Whānau views. Recommended as an appropriate outcome measure for determining responses of Māori clients to care and treatment in mental health settings. PO: wellbeing (Māori, individual, mental)	Māori mental healthcare settings	2002
Mason Durie: Whanau Capacities https://treasury.govt.nz/sites/default/files/2007-09/tgls-durie.pdf	A way to measure the wellbeing of whānau by assessing the collective capacity to perform tasks that are within the scope and influence of whānau. PO: wellbeing (whānau)	Tangata whenua, Government and government agencies	2007
Mason Durie: Te Ngahuru https://treasury.govt.nz/sites/default/files/2007-09/tgls-durie.pdf	To assist in the identification of specific outcomes and indicators that can be used as a global measure of Māori wellbeing	Tangata whenua, Government and government agencies	2006
Mason Durie: Te Whare Tapa Wha https://www.health.govt.nz/our-work/populations/Māori-health/Māori-health-models/Māori-health-models-te-whare-tapa-wha	Traditional Māori health model that acknowledges the seamless link between the mind, spirit, body and human connection with whānau, and the physical world. Based on the concept of 'te whare tapa whā' – the four cornerstones (or sides) of Māori health: taha wairua (the spiritual dimension), taha whānau (family), taha tinana (physical health), taha hinengaro (mental health), supported by a stable base of te ao turoa (the environment). Not designed as a way measure wellbeing but rather to conceptualise it. PO: total wellbeing	Health and education sectors, tangata whenua	1984
Mason Durie: Te Pae Mahutonga https://www.cph.co.nz/wp-content/uploads/TePaeMahutonga.pdf	A model that brings together elements of modern health promotion. The four central stars of the Southern Cross represent four key tasks of health promotion: Mauriora (cultural identity), Waiora (physical environment), Toiora (healthy lifestyles), Te Oranga (participation in society). The two pointers represent Ngā Manukura (community leadership) and Te Mana Whakahaere (autonomy). Not designed as a way measure wellbeing but rather to conceptualise its promotion.	Health sector, tangata whenua	1999
Rose Pere: Te Wheke (The Octopus) https://www.health.govt.nz/our-work/populations/Māori-health/Māori-health-models/Māori-health-models-te-wheke	Traditional Māori health model that acknowledges the seamless link between the mind, spirit, body and human connection with whānau, and the physical world. Based on the concept of an octopus (wheke) whereby the head of the octopus represents te whānau, the eyes of the octopus as waiora (total wellbeing for the individual and family) and each of the eight tentacles representing a specific dimension of health: Te whānau – the family, Waiora – total wellbeing for the individual and family, Wairuatanga – spirituality, Hinengaro – the mind, Taha tinana – physical wellbeing, whānaungatanga - extended family, Mauri – life force in people and objects, Mana ake – unique identity of individuals and family, Hā a koro ma, a kui ma – breath of life from forbearers, Whatumanawa – the open and healthy expression of emotion. Not designed as a way measure wellbeing but rather to conceptualise it. PO: total wellbeing ('waiora' of whānau and individual)	Health and education sectors, tangata whenua	Unknown
Superu Whānau Rangatiratanga Framework https://superu.govt.nz/sites/default/files/Whanau%20rangatiratanga%20frameworks%20summary.pdf	Provides a Māori lens to view trends in whānau wellbeing over time. PO: wellbeing (whānau)	The social sector (funders, policy-makers), tangata whenua	2014, annual
Oranga Tamariki: Te Toka Tumoana Framework https://www.orangatamariki.govt.nz/	8 principles are designed to assist social work practitioners in their engagement with mokopuna and whānau Māori, but can also be used cross culturally to support quality social work practice. PO: children's wellbeing	Social workers, tangata whenua	2015
He Pou Oranga Tangata Whenua (HPOTW) https://www.bopdhb.govt.nz/media/16339/he_pou_oranga_tangata_whenua.pdf	A framework that describes the tangawhenu worldview of wellbeing or toiora according to the iwi of the Bay of Plenty. To provide organisations with a framework to develop behavioral descriptors that can assist in the expression and application of kaupapa Māori principles to reflect its unique circumstance. PO: wellbeing (toiora)	Everyone involved in maximising health and independence and reducing disparities in the Bay of Plenty region, tangata whenua	2007
Panelli and Tipa: Integrated Culture-Environment Linked Well-Being http://www.academia.edu/2968287/Placing_Well-Being_A_Māori_Case_Study_of_Cultural_and_Environmental_Specificity	Conceptualizing a place-based notion of wellbeing that recognises the cultural and environmental specificity of wellbeing for specific Māori populations in a given setting	Wellbeing and indigenous academics, tangata whenua	2007
Other Indigenous			
First Nations Community Wellbeing: 'Approaches to Community Wellbeing' https://www.slfnha.com/application/files/5415/1723/7319/Approaches_to_Community_Wellbeing_model_description_2.pdf	To develop integrated, sustainable, and community-owned approaches to community wellbeing. The approach is rooted with the traditional teachings of our people and will promote healthy lifestyles, active leaders, and positive Anishinabe people.	First Nations community members, public health providers	2015
Interplay Wellbeing Project http://interplayproject.com/	A statistically validated collaborative approach to assessing wellbeing that is inclusive of other cultural worldviews, values and practices.	Indigenous communities of Australia, central Government, community wellbeing academics and researchers	2017
Yawuru Wellbeing Survey http://caepr.cass.anu.edu.au/news/community-wellbeing-ground-yawuru-example-report-mandy-yap-and-eunice-yu	An important tool for monitoring the wellbeing of the Yawuru people over time, based on measures identified by Yawuru people themselves according to their definitions of what might be considered success markers of living well. PO: wellbeing (community)	Yawuru people, indigenous communities, policy-makers	2016

Table 12 (part 2): CWB concept and Scope – People

Framework	CWB concept: Individual aggregate	Collective	Experienced state	Multidimensional construct	Individual (personal) resources – Health: Self assessed health	Mental health	Life expectancy	Learning/education	Subjective individual wellbeing	Children's wellbeing	Empowerment	Collective (social) capital: Close relationships	Wider community relationships (e.g. trust)	Belonging	Political (e.g. autonomy, trust in government, civic engagement)	Cultural	Equity of WB and determinants	Sustainability of wellbeing
International																		
OECD Better Life Initiative Framework	√	x	x	√	√	x	√	√	√	x	x	√	√	x	√	x	√	√
UNDP Human Development Index	√	x	x	√	x	x	√	√	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
UN Sustainable Development Goals (2030 Agenda)	√	√	x	√	x	√	x	√	x	I	x	x	x	x	√	x	I	I
Human Rights Indicators	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	x	x	x	√	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Human Rights Measurement Initiative	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	x	x	√	√	x	x	x	x	x	x	√	x	x	x
GIIN: IRIS and Impact Toolkit	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	x	x	x	√	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
City of Santa Monica: The Wellbeing Index	√	√	x	√	√	√	x	√	√	I	x	√	√	√	√	x	I	x
City of Sydney Community Wellbeing Indicators	√	√	x	√	√	√	√	√	√	I	I	√	√	√	√	x	I	x
Canadian Index of Wellbeing (CIW)	√	√	x	√	√	x	√	√	x	x	x	√	√	√	√	x	I	x
CIW Community Wellbeing Survey	√	√	√	√	√	√	x	√	√	x	x	√	√	√	√	x	x	x
Community Wellbeing Index: Forjaz	√	√	√	√	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	√	√	x	x	x	x
Bhutan Gross National Happiness Index	√	√	I	√	√	√	x	√	√	x	√	√	√	√	√	√	x	x
Gallup-Sharecare Well-Being Index	√	I	I	√	√	√	x	I	√	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I
Community Wellbeing Composite Index: Sirgy 2009	√	√	√	√	x	x	x	√	x	x	x	√	√	x	√	x	I	√
Community Quality of Life Scale: Sirgy 2000	√	√	I	√	x	x	x	√	√	x	x	x	x	x	I	x	x	x
Community Well-Being Questionnaire: Christakopoulou 2001					x	x	x	√	x	x	x	√	√	√	√	I	x	x
Personal Wellbeing Index (PWI)	√	x	√	√	√	x	x	I	√	√	I	√	√	I	x	x	x	x
WHO Quality of Life – brief version (WHOQOL-BREF)	√	x	√	√	√	√	x	x	√	x	I	√	x	x	x	x	x	x
Burckhardt and Flanagan's Quality of Life Scale (QOLS)	√	x	√	√	√	x	x	√	√	x	√	√	x	x	√	x	x	x
WHO European Healthy Cities Network: Healthy City Indicators	√	√	x	√	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Economist Intelligence Unit's Global Livability Index	√	x	x	√	x	x	I	√	x	x	x	x	x	x	√	I	x	x
The Happy City Pulse	√	√	√	√	√	√	x	√	√	x	√	√	√	√	√	I	x	x
Happy City's Thriving Places Index (TPI)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	√	√	√	√	x	I	x	√	√	x	√	x	√	I
Australian National Development Index	I	I	I	√	I	I	I	√	√	√	I	I	I	I	√	√	I	I
Korean City Community Wellbeing Index	√	√	x	√	√	√	√	√	x	x	x	√	√	x	x	x	I	x
Korean Subjective Community Wellbeing QCA Method	√	√	√	x	I	I	x	√	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	√	I
New Zealand																		
Sovereign Wellbeing Index	√	x	√	√	√	√	x	x	√	x	√	√	√	x	x	x	x	x
Waikato Progress Indicators	√	√	x	√	√	x	√	√	√	x	x	x	√	√	√	√	I	x
Statistics NZ General Social Survey	√	√	√	√	√	√	x	x	√	x	x	√	√	√	√	√	I	x
Canterbury Wellbeing Index	√	√	x	√	x	√	x	√	√	I	x	√	√	√	√	x	x	x
Quality of Life Project	√	√	x	√	√	√	√	√	√	I	x	√	√	√	√	x	x	√
Wellington Region Genuine Progress Index (WR-GPI)	√	√	x	√	√	√	√	√	√	x	x	√	√	√	√	√	I	x
Waikato Vital Signs (Momentum Waikato)	√	√	x	√	x	√	√	√	√	I	x	√	√	x	√	√	I	x
Western Bay of Plenty's Vital Signs	√	√	x	√	x	x	x	√	x	x	x	√	√	x	√	x	I	x
Treasury Higher Living Standards Framework	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	x	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
MSD The Social Report	√	√	x	√	√	√	√	√	√	x	x	√	x	√	√	√	x	x
Superu The Family Wellbeing Framework	√	√	x	√	√	√	x	√	x	x	I	√	I	x	√	x	I	x
Tairāwhiti																		
ECCT Framework "Vision 2030"	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	√	I	√	√	√	√	√	x	√	I	I
Te Tairāwhiti Regional Group's Whānau Ora Population Outcomes Framework	√	√	x	√	x	x	√	√	x	I	x	x	x	x	I	I	x	x
Ngāti Porou Hauora (NPH) Health Dashboard	√	x	x	√	x	x	x	√	x	I	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Māori																		
Statistics NZ Te Kupenga (Maori Social Survey)	√	√	I	√	√	√	x	√	√	x	√	√	√	x	√	√	I	x
Stats NZ Te Ao Marama	√	√	x	√	x	x	√	√	√	x	x	√	x	x	x	√	x	x
Whānau Ora Outcomes Framework	I	√	I	√	I	√	x	√	I	I	I	√	I	I	√	√	x	x
Mason Durie Te Ritirito	I	√	I	√	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	√	√	I	x	√	x	x
Mason Durie and Te Kani Kingi: Hua Oranga	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	√	√	x	x	√	x	√	√	√	x	x	√	x	x
Mason Durie: Whanau Capacities	√	√	I	√	I	I	x	√	x	x	I	x	x	x	I	√	x	x
Mason Durie: Te Ngahuru	√	√	I	√	x	x	x	√	x	x	I	I	I	I	I	√	x	x
Mason Durie: Te Whare Tapa Wha	I	I	I	√	I	√	I	I	I	x	I	√	√	I	x	√	x	x
Mason Durie: Te Pae Mahutonga	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	√	I	x	I	I	I	I	√	√	I	I
Rose Pere: Te Wheke (The Octopus)	I	√	I	√	I	√	I	x	√	x	√	√	√	√	x	√	x	x
Superu Whānau Rangatiratanga Framework	√	√	√	√	√	x	x	√	√	x	√	√	√	√	√	√	I	x
Oranga Tamariki: Te Toka Tumoana Framework	I	I	I	I	x	x	x	x	x	√	√	√	I	x	x	x	x	x
He Pou Oranga Tangata Whenua (HPOTW)	I	I	I	√	x	√	x	√	I	x	√	√	√	√	√	√	I	I
Panelli and Tipa: Integrated Culture-Environment Linked Well-Being	I	√	I	√	x	x	x	x	x	x	√	√	√	√	x	√	x	I
Other Indigenous																		
First Nations Community Wellbeing: 'Approaches to Community Wellbeing'	I	I	I	√	I	√	x	I	x	√	I	√	I	I	x	I	x	x
Interplay Wellbeing Project	√	√	I	√	√	√	I	√	√	x	√	I	√	I	I	√	I	√
Yawuru Wellbeing Survey	√	√	I	√	√	√	x	√	√	x	√	√	√	√	√	√	I	x

Table 12 (part 3): Scope – Place (external conditions), data sources, number of domains

Framework	Natural environment: Sustainability	Quality	Green space	Place attachment	Material infrastructure: Income	Employment: Job satisfaction	Employment rate	Housing	Healthcare	Transport	Data sources: Bespoke survey or questionnaire	Secondary data sources	No. of domains/indicators/measures
International													
OECD Better Life Initiative Framework	√	√	x	x	√	x	√	√	x	x	x	√	11 domains, 26 indicators
UNDP Human Development Index	x	x	x	x	√	x	x	x	x	x	x	√	3 domains, 4 indicators
UN Sustainable Development Goals (2030 Agenda)	√	√	√	x	√	x	√	√	√	√	x	√	17 domains, 232 indicators
Human Rights Indicators	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	√	√	x	x	√	3 domains (structural, process, outcome), 16 indicators
Human Rights Measurement Initiative	x	x	x	x	√	x	√	I	x	x	x	√	12 domains
GIIN: IRIS and Impact Toolkit	√	√	x	x	x	x	x	√	√	x	I	I	11, variable number of indicators
City of Santa Monica: The Wellbeing Index	x	√	√	√	√	I	√	√	√	√	√	√	6 domains
City of Sydney Community Wellbeing Indicators	√	√	√	x	√	x	√	√	√	√	x	√	4 domains, 88 indicators
Canadian Index of Wellbeing (CIW)	√	√	x	x	√	√	√	√	√	x	x	√	8 domains, 64 indicators
CIW Community Wellbeing Survey	√	√	√	x	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	x	8 domains
Community Wellbeing Index: Forjaz	x	√	x	x	I	x	x	x	√	x	√	x	3 domains, 10 indicators
Bhutan Gross National Happiness Index	√	√	x	x	√	x	√	√	√	x	√	x	9 domains, 33 indicators
Gallup-Sharecare Well-Being Index	I	I	I	I	I	√	I	√	√	I	√	x	6 domains
Community Wellbeing Composite Index: Sirgy 2009	x	I	√	x	√	√	I	√	√	√	√	x	14 domains
Community Quality of Life Scale: Sirgy 2000	x	x	√	x	x	x	I	x	√	√	√	x	3 domains (government services satisfaction, business services satisfaction, non profit services satisfaction)
Community Well-Being Questionnaire: Christakopoulou 2001	x	√	√	√	√	x	x	√	√	√	√	x	6 domains
Personal Wellbeing Index (PWI)	x	x	x	x	√	x	x	x	x	x	√	x	7 domains
WHO Quality of Life – brief version (WHOQOL-BREF)	x	√	x	x	√	x	x	√	√	√	√	x	4 domains, 24 facets
Burckhardt and Flanagan's Quality of Life Scale (QOLS)	x	x	x	x	√	√	x	√	x	x	√	x	5 domains, 16 indicators
WHO European Healthy Cities Network: Healthy City Indicators	x	√	√	x	√	x	√	√	√	√	x	√	4 domains, 32 indicators
Economist Intelligence Unit's Global Livability Index	x	I	x	x	x	x	x	√	√	√	x	√	5 domains, 30 indicators
The Happy City Pulse	x	x	√	I	√	√	√	√	I	√	√	x	3 modules, 9 domains, 35 indicators
Happy City's Thriving Places Index (TPI)	√	√	x	x	√	x	√	√	x	√	x	√	3 domains, 48 indicators
Australian National Development Index	√	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	12 domains
Korean City Community Wellbeing Index	I	√	x	√	√	√	√	√	√	I	x	√	2 levels (individual level and community level), each has 3 domains (existence, relatedness, growth) and multiple indicators
Korean Subjective Community Wellbeing QCA Method	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	√	x	6 dimensions
New Zealand													
Sovereign Wellbeing Index	x	x	x	x	√	√	√	x	x	x	√	x	5 domains
Waikato Progress Indicators	√	√	x	√	√	x	√	√	x	x	x	√	3 domains, 32 indicators
Statistics NZ General Social Survey	I	I	I	I	√	√	√	I	I	I	√	x	16 domains
Canterbury Wellbeing Index	x	√	x	x	√	x	√	√	√	x	√	√	7 domains
Quality of Life Project	√	√	√	√	√	I	√	√	√	√	√	√	11 domains, 68 indicators, 186 measures
Wellington Region Genuine Progress Index (WR-GPI)	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	x	√	4 domains, 9 indicators, 85 measures
Waikato Vital Signs (Momentum Waikato)	x	√	x	√	√	x	√	√	x	x	x	√	8 domains, 34 indicators
Western Bay of Plenty's Vital Signs	x	x	x	x	√	x	√	√	√	√	√	√	4 domains, 14 indicators
Treasury Higher Living Standards Framework	I	√	√	x	√	√	√	√	x	x	x	√	12 domains, 30 indicators
MSD The Social Report	x	x	x	x	√	√	√	√	x	x	x	√	10 domains, 49 indicators
Superu The Family Wellbeing Framework	x	x	x	x	√	I	√	√	x	x	x	√	6 themes, 30 indicators
Tairāwhiti													
ECCT Framework "Vision 2030"	I	√	x	x	√	I	I	x	√	x	√	x	7 themes, 26 indicators
Te Tairāwhiti Regional Group's Whānau Ora Population Outcomes Framework	x	x	x	x	x	x	√	√	x	x	x	√	5 domains, 6 indicators
Ngāti Porou Hauora (NPH) Health Dashboard	x	x	x	x	√	x	√	√	√	x	x	√	4 domains, 13 indicators, 20 measures
Māori													
Statistics NZ Te Kupenga (Maori Social Survey)	x	x	x	I	√	√	√	√	x	x	√	x	13 domains
Stats NZ Te Ao Marama	√	√	x	x	√	x	x	x	x	x	√	√	8 domains
Whānau Ora Outcomes Framework	√	I	x	x	√	x	√	√	√	x	n/a	n/a	7 dimensions
Mason Durie Te Ritirito	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	x	x	x	n/a	n/a	3 dimensions, 12 principles
Mason Durie and Te Kani Kingi: Hua Oranga	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	√	x	4 domains
Mason Durie: Whanau Capacities	I	I	I	I	I	x	√	I	x	x	I	I	3 capacity domains (human, resource, functional), 13 capacities
Mason Durie: Te Ngahuru	I	I	x	I	x	x	I	x	x	x	I	I	2 domains, 4 classes
Mason Durie: Te Whare Tapa Wha	I	√	x	√	x	x	x	x	x	x	n/a	n/a	4 dimensions (taha)
Mason Durie: Te Pae Mahutonga	I	√	√	I	I	I	√	x	√	x	n/a	n/a	6 dimensions (4 stars, 2 pointers)
Rose Pere: Te Wheke (The Octopus)	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	n/a	n/a	8 domains
Superu Whānau Rangatiratanga Framework	x	x	x	√	√	√	√	√	x	x	x	√	5 principles, 4 capability dimensions, 20 wellbeing dimensions
Oranga Tamariki: Te Toka Tumoana Framework	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	n/a	n/a	8 principles
He Pou Oranga Tangata Whenua (HPOTW)	√	√	√	√	I	I	I	I	I	I	n/a	n/a	15 dimensions of wellbeing + 8 wider determinants of wellbeing
Panelli and Tipa: Integrated Culture-Environment Linked Well-Being	I	I	I	√	√	x	x	√	x	x	n/a	n/a	7 values/principles
Other Indigenous													
First Nations Community Wellbeing: 'Approaches to Community Wellbeing'	x	√	I	x	I	x	x	x	√	x	n/a	n/a	4 domains
Interplay Wellbeing Project	x	x	x	x	x	√	√	x	√	x	√	I	6 domains, 48 indicators
Yawuru Wellbeing Survey	I	x	I	x	√	x	√	√	I	√	√	x	7 domains

Table 12 (part 4): Evidence, level of analysis, type of measurement and assessment criteria

Framework	Domains/indicators community informed (community engagement undertaken)	Domains/indicators evidence informed	Distinguishes CWB from determinants	Level of analysis: Individual	Whānau	Community	Aggregated individual (population)	Type of measurement: Objective	Subjective	Direct measure of overall subjective CWB: Individual endpoint[1]	Community endpoint[2]	Data availability	Dashboard (D) or composite index (CI)	Comparability (other regions, inter-temporal)	Compatibility with HLSF	Credibility	Framework fit for ECT[3]
International																	
OECD Better Life Initiative Framework	x	√	x	x	x	x	√	√	√	x	x	√	D	√	√	√	x
UNDP Human Development Index	x	√	x	x	x	x	√	√	x	x	x	√	CI	√	x	√	x
UN Sustainable Development Goals (2030 Agenda)	x	I	x	x	x	x	√	√	√	x	x	I	D	√	x	√	x
Human Rights Indicators	x	x	x	x	x	x	√	√	x	x	x	√	D	√	x	√	x
Human Rights Measurement Initiative	x	√	x	x	x	x	√	√	x	x	x	I	D	I	x	√	x
GIIN: IRIS and Impact Toolkit	x	x	x	x	x	x	√	√	x	x	x	I	D	I	x	√	x
City of Santa Monica: The Wellbeing Index	√	√	x	x	x	√	√	√	√	x	x	I	D	√	√	√	x
City of Sydney Community Wellbeing Indicators	x	√	x	x	x	√	√	√	√	x	x	I	D	√	√	√	x
Canadian Index of Wellbeing (CIW)	√	√	x	x	x	√	√	√	√	x	x	I	CI	√	I	√	x
CIW Community Wellbeing Survey	√	√	I	√	I	√	√	x	√	√	x	I	D and CI	√	I	√	x
Community Wellbeing Index: Forjaz	x	√	x	√	x	√	√	x	√	√	x	I	CI	I	I	√	x
Bhutan Gross National Happiness Index	I	√	x	√	√	√	√	x	√	x	x	I	CI	I	I	√	x
Gallup-Sharecare Well-Being Index	I	I	I	√	x	I	√	x	√	x	x	I	CI	I	I	√	x
Community Wellbeing Composite Index: Sirgy 2009	I	√	√	√	x	√	√	x	√	√	√	I	D and CI	I	I	√	x
Community Quality of Life Scale: Sirgy 2000	√	√	√	√	x	√	√	x	√	I	I	I	D and CI	I	I	√	x
Community Well-Being Questionnaire: Christakopoulou 2001	√	√	I	√	x	√	√	x	√	I	I	I	D and CI	I	I	√	x
Personal Wellbeing Index (PWI)	I	√	x	√	x	x	√	x	√	x	x	I	CI	I	x	√	x
WHO Quality of Life – brief version (WHOQOL-BREF)	√	√	x	√	x	x	√	x	√	x	x	I	CI	I	x	√	x
Burckhardt and Flanagan's Quality of Life Scale (QOLS)	√	√	x	√	x	x	√	x	√	x	x	x	CI	I	x	√	x
WHO European Healthy Cities Network: Healthy City Indicators	I	√	x	x	x	√	√	√	x	x	x	I	D	I	x	√	x
Economist Intelligence Unit's Global Livability Index	x	I	x	x	x	√	√	√	√	x	x	I	CI	√	x	√	x
The Happy City Pulse	I	√	I	√	√	√	√	x	√	√	x	I	D and CI	√	I	√	x
Happy City's Thriving Places Index (TPI)	I	√	√	√	x	√	√	√	√	x	x	I	D and CI	√	I	√	x
Australian National Development Index	√	√	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	x
Korean City Community Wellbeing Index	x	√	x	√	x	√	√	√	√	x	x	I	CI	√	I	√	x
Korean Subjective Community Wellbeing QCA Method	I	I	√	I	I	I	I	x	√	√	√	I	CI	I	I	I	x
New Zealand																	
Sovereign Wellbeing Index	x	√	I	√	x	√	√	x	√	x	x	I	CI	√	I	√	x
Waikato Progress Indicators	√	√	x	x	x	√	√	√	√	x	x	I	D	√	I	√	x
Statistics NZ General Social Survey	√	√	I	√	√	√	√	x	√	x	x	I	D	√	I	√	x
Canterbury Wellbeing Index	x	√	x	√	x	√	√	√	√	x	x	I	D	√	I	√	x
Quality of Life Project	I	I	I	√	x	√	√	√	√	x	x	I	D	√	I	√	x
Wellington Region Genuine Progress Index (WR-GPI)	I	√	I	√	x	√	√	√	√	x	x	I	CI	√	I	√	x
Waikato Vital Signs (Momentum Waikato)	√	I	x	√	x	√	√	√	√	x	x	I	D	√	I	√	x
Western Bay of Plenty's Vital Signs	I	I	x	x	x	x	√	√	√	x	x	I	D	I	I	√	x
Treasury Higher Living Standards Framework	I	√	I	x	x	√	√	√	√	x	x	I	D	√	√	√	x
MSD The Social Report	I	I	x	√	x	√	√	√	√	x	x	I	D	√	√	√	x
Superu The Family Wellbeing Framework	I	√	x	√	√	√	√	x	√	x	x	I	D	√	I	√	x
Tairāwhiti																	
ECCT Framework "Vision 2030"	√	x	x	√	√	√	√	x	√	x	x	I	D	I	I	I	x
Te Tairāwhiti Regional Group's Whānau Ora Population Outcomes Framework	√	I	x	√	x	x	√	√	x	x	x	√	D	√	I	√	x
Ngāti Porou Hauora (NPH) Health Dashboard	√	√	x	x	x	x	√	√	x	x	x	√	D	√	x	√	x
Māori																	
Statistics NZ Te Kupenga (Maori Social Survey)	√	√	I	√	√	√	√	x	√	x	x	I	D	I	I	√	x
Stats NZ Te Ao Marama	I	I	x	x	x	x	√	√	√	x	x	I	D	I	I	√	x
Whānau Ora Outcomes Framework	√	I	x	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	x	x	I	n/a	n/a	I	I	x
Mason Durie Te Ritirito	√	I	x	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	x	x	I	n/a	n/a	I	I	x
Mason Durie and Te Kani Kingi: Hua Oranga	I	I	n/a	√	x	x	x	x	√	x	x	I	CI	I	I	I	x
Mason Durie: Whanau Capacities	I	I	x	I	√	√	√	√	I	x	x	I	CI	I	I	I	x
Mason Durie: Te Ngahuru	I	I	x	I	I	√	√	√	I	x	x	I	CI	I	I	I	x
Mason Durie: Te Whare Tapa Wha	√	I	x	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	x	x	I	n/a	n/a	I	I	x
Mason Durie: Te Pae Mahutonga	x	√	x	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	x	x	I	n/a	n/a	I	I	x
Rose Pere: Te Wheke (The Octopus)	x	x	x	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	x	x	I	n/a	n/a	I	I	x
Superu Whānau Rangatiratanga Framework	I	√	x	√	√	x	√	x	√	x	x	I	D	√	I	√	x
Oranga Tamariki: Te Toka Tumoana Framework	I	√	x	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	x	x	I	n/a	n/a	I	I	x
He Pou Oranga Tangata Whenua (HPOTW)	√	I	√	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	x	x	I	n/a	n/a	I	I	x
Panelli and Tipa: Integrated Culture-Environment Linked Well-Being	I	I	x	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	x	x	I	n/a	n/a	I	I	x
Other Indigenous																	
First Nations Community Wellbeing: 'Approaches to Community Wellbeing'	√	I	I	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	x	x	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	I	x
Interplay Wellbeing Project	√	√	I	√	I	I	√	I	√	x	x	I	D	I	I	√	x
Yawuru Wellbeing Survey	√	I	x	√	√	√	√	x	√	x	√	I	D	I	I	√	x

Table 12 (part 5): Changes needed for ECT fit

Framework	Changes needed for ECT fit
International	
OECD Better Life Initiative Framework	The strengths of this framework are the direct measures of wellbeing sustainability and equity. However, to fit ECT's needs, the following would need to be added: community engagement in developing the domains/indicators, mental health, children's wellbeing, personal empowerment, belonging, cultural, green space, place attachment, job satisfaction, healthcare and transport. Consider adding a measure of overall subjective community wellbeing.
UNDP Human Development Index	Completely unsuitable for ECT. Not community informed, lacks subjective measures and very narrow scope of objective measures. Not direct measure of subjective wellbeing.
UN Sustainable Development Goals (2030 Agenda)	The goals are quite aligned with ECT's needs, however, the current proposed indicators are too numerous, mainly objective individual aggregate measures. Recommend the following: engage community in developing measures, add self assessed health, life expectancy, subjective individual wellbeing, subjective children's wellbeing, empowerment, more social indicators, cultural, sustainability of wellbeing and equity of wellbeing, place attachment and job satisfaction. Consider a measure of overall subjective community wellbeing.
Human Rights Indicators	Not suitable as focuses on human rights not wellbeing. As such the domain/indicators coverage is too narrow and there is no actual wellbeing measure. Note that a Human Rights Measurement Initiative is also under development, see: https://humanrightsmeasurement.org/data/#/
Human Rights Measurement Initiative	Not suitable as focuses on human rights not wellbeing. As such the domain/indicators coverage is too narrow and there is no actual wellbeing measure. There are only objective, not subjective measures.
GIIN: IRIS and Impact Toolkit	This tool is designed to measure performance impact rather than as a specific CWB measurement framework. It could potentially be customised to help measure the CWB impact of ECT distributions.
City of Santa Monica: The Wellbeing Index	Strengths include co-design with community, use of subjective and objective measures and mixed innovative data sources (bespoke survey, social media analysis, existing secondary data sources). Add the following measures: children's wellbeing, personal empowerment, cultural, job satisfaction, equity of wellbeing, sustainability of wellbeing, and environmental sustainability. Consider direct measure of subjective CWB and distinguishing CWB from determinants.
City of Sydney Community Wellbeing Indicators	Engage community as part of development of framework. Add the following measures: children's subjective wellbeing, cultural, equity of wellbeing, sustainability of wellbeing, place attachment , and job satisfaction. Consider direct measure of subjective CWB and distinguishing CWB from its determinants.
Canadian Index of Wellbeing (CIW)	Could be adapted and used in conjunction with the companion CIW community wellbeing survey. Add the following measures: subjective individual wellbeing, children's wellbeing, empowerment, cultural, equity of wellbeing, sustainability of wellbeing, green space, place attachment and transport. Consider direct measure of subjective CWB (which could potentially be derived from the CIW Community Wellbeing Survey) and distinguishing CWB from determinants.
CIW Community Wellbeing Survey	Could be adapted and used in conjunction with the companion CIW. Intention is that it be used to assess subjective wellbeing of individuals at any scale, including community, however, most of the questions focus on the impact of community conditions on the wellbeing of the individual rather than aspects of collective wellbeing. Recommend amending to include the latter. As it is a survey it lacks objective measures. Recommend adding objective measures and also add the following measures: life expectancy, empowerment, children's wellbeing, equity and sustainability of wellbeing and place attachment.
Community Wellbeing Index: Forjaz	Intention is that it be used to assess subjective satisfaction of an individual with their community conditions. However the focus of the questions is on the impact of community conditions on the wellbeing of the individual rather than aspects of collective wellbeing. Recommend also adding some questions that focus on the latter aspect of community wellbeing to give a more comprehensive picture. As it is a survey it lacks objective measures. Recommend adding objective measures and also add the following measures: all individual resource measures, close relationships, political, cultural, equity and sustainability of wellbeing life expectancy, empowerment, children's wellbeing, equity and sustainability of wellbeing and place attachment.
Bhutan Gross National Happiness Index	A survey, so only provides subjective measures. Recommend adding objective measures and the following specific measures: life expectancy, children's wellbeing, equity and sustainability of wellbeing, green space, place attachment and transport. Consider adding a direct measure of subjective CWB.
Gallup-Sharecare Well-Being Index	Insufficient detail available to make a complete assessment. Lacks objective measures. Unclear whether community and evidence informed. Does not appear to consider equity and sustainability of wellbeing.
Community Wellbeing Composite Index: Sirgy 2009	Intention is that it be used to assess subjective CWB overall as well as satisfaction of an individual with their community conditions. However the focus of the questions is on the impact of community conditions on the wellbeing of the individual rather than aspects of collective wellbeing. Recommend also adding some questions that focus on the latter aspect of community wellbeing to give a more comprehensive picture. As it is a survey, it lacks objective measures. Recommend adding objective measures and also add the following measures: health, subjective individual wellbeing, children's wellbeing, empowerment, belonging, cultural, environmental sustainability and place attachment.
Community Quality of Life Scale: Sirgy 2000	Intention is that it be used to assess subjective CWB overall as well as satisfaction of an individual with their community services. However it excludes community conditions other than services (e.g. health, employment, social capital) and the focus of the questions is on the impact of community conditions on the wellbeing of the individual rather than aspects of collective wellbeing. Therefore the scope is far too narrow. Recommend also adding some questions that focus on the latter aspect of community wellbeing, and other relevant non-service community conditions to give a more comprehensive picture. As it is a survey, it lacks objective measures. Recommend adding objective measures and also add the following measures: health, children's wellbeing, empowerment, all social/collective measures, environmental sustainability, quality, place attachment, income, job satisfaction, employment and housing.
Community Well-Being Questionnaire: Christakopoulou 2001	Intention is that it be used to assess satisfaction of an individual with their community conditions. However the focus of the questions is mostly on the impact of community conditions on the wellbeing of the individual rather than aspects of collective wellbeing. Recommend also adding some questions that focus on the latter aspect of community wellbeing to give a more comprehensive picture. As it is a survey, it lacks objective measures. Recommend adding objective measures and also add the following measures: health, subjective individual wellbeing, children's wellbeing, empowerment, equity and sustainability of CWB, cultural, environmental sustainability, employment rate and job satisfaction.
Personal Wellbeing Index (PWI)	Focuses on individual scale wellbeing (life satisfaction). Could potentially be used to assess subjective individual wellbeing at a population level in the community and also subjective wellbeing in children (there is a validated version for school children and adolescents). Lacks objective measures. Lacks the following measures: mental health, life expectancy, possibly education, possibly empowerment, possibly belonging, cultural, political, equity and sustainability of wellbeing, natural environment, material infrastructure (except for satisfaction with standard of living). Consider adding a direct measure of subjective community wellbeing.
WHO Quality of Life – brief version (WHOQOL-BREF)	Focuses on individual scale wellbeing. Could potentially be used to assess subjective individual wellbeing at a population level in the community (instead of life satisfaction). Lacks objective measures. Lacks the following measures: life expectancy, education, children's wellbeing, possibly empowerment, wider social capital, belonging, cultural, political, equity and sustainability of wellbeing, environmental sustainability, green space, job satisfaction and employment rate. Consider adding a direct measure of subjective community wellbeing.
Burckhardt and Flanagan's Quality of Life Scale (QOLS)	Focuses on individual scale wellbeing. Could potentially be used to assess subjective individual wellbeing at a population level in the community (instead of life satisfaction). Lacks objective measures. Lacks the following measures: mental health, life expectancy, children's wellbeing, wider social capital, belonging, cultural, equity and sustainability of wellbeing, natural environment, healthcare, transport and employment rate. Consider adding a direct measure of subjective community wellbeing.
WHO European Healthy Cities Network: Healthy City Indicators	Focuses on population health rather than wellbeing. No subjective measures. Add the following: subjective measures, health, educiton, subjective individual wellbeing, social, equity and sustainability of wellbeing, environmental sustainability, place attachment and job satisfaction. Consider adding overall measure of subjective CWB.
Economist Intelligence Unit's Global Livability Index	Focuses on the comfort of living in a city for an individual and seems to be targeted at travelers/expats/those relocating for business, rather than on native residents of a community. Lacks community focus and engagement; qualitative data derived from economic analyst expert opinions. Not all measures readily available in the public domain but the following measures appear to be lacking: health, subjective wellbeing, children's wellbeing, empowerment, social measures (other than corruption), natural environmental measures, income and employment measures. Lacking an overall measure of subjective CWB.
The Happy City Pulse	The Happy City Pulse used together with its companion tool, the Thriving Places Index, ticks many of the boxes required by ECT. More information about the details of Happy City Pulse (exact questions) and how overall wellbeing is calculated required before can make a full appraisal, but it has good potential to be adapted into a bespoke online survey to measure subjective CWB. The Thriving Places Index could then be adapted to measure the determinants of CWB in Tairawhiti. The main gaps (considering both tools) are children's wellbeing, cultural and healthcare. It is also unclear to what degree the community were involved in the development of the frameworks other than piloting them.
Happy City's Thriving Places Index (TPI)	The Happy City Pulse used together with its companion tool, the Thriving Places Index, ticks many of the boxes required by ECT. More information about the details of Happy City Pulse (exact questions) and how overall wellbeing is calculated required before can make a full appraisal, but it has good potential to be adapted into a bespoke online survey to measure subjective CWB. The Thriving Places Index could then be adapted to measure the determinants of CWB in Tairawhiti. The main gaps (considering both tools) are children's wellbeing, cultural and healthcare. It is also unclear to what degree the community were involved in the development of the frameworks other than piloting them.
Australian National Development Index	Still under development and incomplete information available in the public domain. Strengths include the process which draws together evidence experts and community aspirations; the inclusion of children's wellbeing and equity as domains.
Korean City Community Wellbeing Index	Clearly divides indicators into the two categories that are relevant to overall CWB, which most other frameworks fail to do: individual scale and community scale. However, the indicators do not appear to be community informed and some seem suitable for Korea but inappropriate for Tairawhiti (e.g. class awareness, observance of law). Add the following measures: subjective wellbeing, children's wellbeing, personal empowerment, belonging, political, cultural, equity and sustainability of wellbeing, more environmental sustainability measures and more transport measures. Consider adding a direct measure of subjective CWB.
Korean Subjective Community Wellbeing QCA Method	Insufficient detail available to make a complete assessment. The strengths of this framework are that it provides a direct measurement of overall subjective CWB, as well as of each domain that contributes to it. It also specifically looks at equity of CWB and determinants by analysing the population distribution of these results. As the actual questionnaire is not available, it is unfortunately not possible to fully assess which measures have been included or omitted. It is unclear whether the model is community and evidence informed. Weaknesses are that it lacks objective measures and appears to need further validation.
New Zealand	
Sovereign Wellbeing Index	Engage community as part of development of framework. Add objective measures. Add the following measures: life expectancy, children's wellbeing, community belonging, political, cultural, equity of wellbeing, sustainability of wellbeing, natural environment, housing, healthcare and transport. Consider direct measure of subjective CWB that is more community focused than individual flourishing.
Waikato Progress Indicators	Add the following measures: mental health, children's wellbeing, empowerment, close relationships, equity of wellbeing, sustainability of wellbeing, green space, healthcare and transport. Consider direct measure of subjective CWB.
Statistics NZ General Social Survey	Relatively good coverage of social measures, and in the 2018 supplement also good coverage of the 'place' measures (unclear whether this will continue). But lacking objective measures. Add the following measures: life expectancy, children's wellbeing, community belonging, equity of wellbeing, sustainability of wellbeing, and more 'place' measures. Consider direct measure of subjective CWB.
Canterbury Wellbeing Index	Engage community as part of development of framework. Add the following measures: self-assessed health, life expectancy, education, more children's wellbeing measures (including subjective), personal empowerment, cultural, equity of wellbeing and determinants, sustainability of wellbeing, natural environment sustainability and more quality measures, green space, place attachment, job satisfaction and transport. Consider direct measure of subjective CWB that is more community focused than individual life satisfaction.
Quality of Life Project	Engage community as part of development of framework (if not already done). Add the following measures: more children's wellbeing measures (including subjective wellbeing), personal empowerment, cultural, equity of wellbeing and determinants. Consider direct measure of subjective CWB that is more community focused than individual quality of life.
Wellington Region Genuine Progress Index (WR-GPI)	Engage community adequately as part of development of framework (if not already done). Add the following measures: children's wellbeing, personal empowerment, equity of wellbeing and determinants, sustainability of wellbeing. Consider direct measure of subjective CWB.
Waikato Vital Signs (Momentum Waikato)	Add the following measures: self-assessed health, children's wellbeing, personal empowerment, community belonging, equity of wellbeing and determinants, sustainability of wellbeing, environmental sustainability, green space, job satisfaction, healthcare and transport. Consider direct measure of subjective CWB.
Western Bay of Plenty's Vital Signs	Most of the subjective data was focused on perceptions of what needed to change rather than the current state of things, so need to change or add this as a focus. Add the following measures: self-assessed health, mental health, children's wellbeing, subjective individual wellbeing, personal empowerment, community belonging, cultural, equity of wellbeing and determinants, sustainability of wellbeing, environmental sustainability, quality, green space, job satisfaction, healthcare and transport. Consider direct measure of subjective CWB.
Treasury Higher Living Standards Framework	Engage community adequately as part of development of framework. For current wellbeing: in general add more community scale measures. Add the following measures: children's wellbeing, environmental sustainability, place attachment, healthcare and transport. Consider direct measure of subjective CWB.
MSD The Social Report	Engage community adequately as part of development of framework (if not already done). Is restricted to social measures only, not environmental. Add the following measures: children's wellbeing, personal empowerment, belonging, sustainability of wellbeing, natural environment measures, healthcare and transport. Consider direct measure of subjective CWB.
Superu The Family Wellbeing Framework	Engage community adequately as part of development of framework (if not already done). No objective measures. Is restricted to social measures only, not environmental. Focuses on family scale wellbeing rather than community scale. Add the following measures: life expectancy, subjective individual wellbeing, children's wellbeing, personal empowerment (better measure), wider community relationships (better measures), belonging, cultural, equity and sustainability of wellbeing, natural environment measures, healthcare and transport. Consider direct measure of subjective CWB.
Tairāwhiti	
ECCT Framework "Vision 2030"	Not designed as a measurement framework per se, although could be adapted into one. Good community engagement, lack of evidence-based input. No objective measures. Data availability is an issue. Need to identify actual measures. Add the following measures: health measures, subjective individual wellbeing, political, equity and sustainability of wellbeing, environmental sustainability more directly, housing, more general healthcare measures and transport. Consider how 'community flourishing' is actually measured.
Te Tairāwhiti Regional Group's Whānau Ora Population Outcomes Framework	Lacks subjective measures and sufficient range of dimensions. Add the following measures: self-assessed health, mental health, subjective individual wellbeing, children's wellbeing, empowerment, close relationships, wider community relationships, belonging, political, cultural identity, equity of wellbeing, sustainability of wellbeing, natural environment, income, healthcare and transport. Consider direct measure of subjective CWB. Unclear whether evidence informed.
Ngāti Porou Hauora (NPH) Health Dashboard	Rigorous analysis and relevant population, but focus is on population health outcomes and their determinants, rather than community wellbeing. Need to add subjective measures in general and specifically add the following measures: self-assessed health, mental health, life expectancy, subjective individual wellbeing, children's wellbeing, empowerment, collective (social) measures, natural environment measures, job satisfaction and transport.
Māori	
Statistics NZ Te Kupenga (Maori Social Survey)	Good measurements of Māori specific wellbeing measures, and includes whānau wellbeing, although deficient in measures around the natural world. Lacks objective measures. Survey only carried out infrequently (5 yearly at this stage). Add the following measures: life expectancy, children's wellbeing, belonging, equity of wellbeing and determinants, natural environment measures, healthcare and transport. Consider adding a measure of overall subjective CWB.
Stats NZ Te Ao Marama	Designed to measure wellbeing of whole Māori population rather than at community level. Add the following measures: self-assessed health, mental health, children's wellbeing, empowerment, wider community relationships, belonging, political, equity and sustainability for wellbeing, green space, place attachment, employment, housing, healthcare and transport. Consider adding an overall measure of subjective CWB.
Whānau Ora Outcomes Framework	High-level objectives have not been translated into actual indicators and specific measures. Add the following measures: self-assessed health, life expectancy, subjective individual wellbeing, children's wellbeing, empowerment, wider community relationships, belonging, equity of wellbeing, sustainability of wellbeing, more natural environment indicators, job satisfaction and transport. Consider direct measure of subjective CWB. Unclear whether evidence informed.
Mason Durie Te Ritirito	Not designed as a measurement framework per se, although could be adapted into one. Provides an excellent te ao Māori perspective on wellbeing at a high level but lacks detail. Would need community engagement and evidence-based input to develop into measurement framework and identify actual measures and data.
Mason Durie and Te Kani Kingi: Hua Oranga	Designed as a wellbeing measurement framework for Māori individuals within the mental healthcare service to track the impact of interventions, rather than to assess the wellbeing of communities. However as individual wellbeing is a component of community wellbeing, it could be adapted or aspects of this model borrowed to create a CWB measurement framework. Not designed as a measurement framework per se, although could be adapted into one. Provides an excellent te ao Māori perspective on individual wellbeing, but lacks other critical dimensions of community, such as environmental and material infrastructure.
Mason Durie: Whanau Capacities	Designed as a wellbeing measurement framework for Māori whanau and groups, rather than whole populations. This could potentially be applied to the community level. Provides an excellent te ao Māori perspective on collective wellbeing. Limited actual measures specified. Would need community engagement and evidence-based input to develop into measurement framework and identify complete measures and data. Need to add missing dimensions: subjective and children's wellbeing, relationships, equity and sustainability of wellbeing, environmental and material infrastructure measures. Consider adding an overall measure of subjective CWB.
Mason Durie: Te Ngahuru	Designed as a wellbeing measurement framework for whole Māori populations, possibly can be adapted to a smaller community scale. Provides an excellent te ao Māori perspective on population wellbeing. Limited actual measures specified. Would need community engagement and evidence-based input to develop into measurement framework and identify complete measures and data. Need to add missing dimensions: health measures, subjective and children's wellbeing, empowerment, relationships, belonging, equity and sustainability of wellbeing, environmental and material infrastructure measures. Consider adding an overall measure of subjective CWB.
Mason Durie: Te Whare Tapa Wha	Not designed as a measurement framework per se, although could be adapted into one. Provides an excellent te ao Māori perspective on wellbeing. Would need community engagement and evidence-based input to develop into measurement framework and identify actual measures and data. Focuses on some of the drivers of population wellbeing, but omits material aspects like income, employment, housing etc, and does not emphasise the measurement of wellbeing itself.
Mason Durie: Te Pae Mahutonga	Not designed as a measurement framework per se, although could be adapted into one. Provides an excellent te ao Māori perspective on wellbeing drivers. Would need community engagement and evidence-based input to develop into measurement framework and identify actual measures and data. Focuses on many of the drivers of population wellbeing, but does not emphasise the measurement of wellbeing itself.
Rose Pere: Te Wheke (The Octopus)	Not designed as a measurement framework per se, although could be adapted into one. Provides an excellent te ao Māori perspective on wellbeing. Would need community engagement and evidence-based input to develop into measurement framework and identify actual measures and data. Focuses on biopsychosocial/spiritual aspects of wellbeing, but does not address material/economic aspects or the natural environment.
Superu Whānau Rangatiratanga Framework	Engage community adequately as part of development of framework (if not already done). Strong on relationships, but is restricted to social measures only, not environmental. Focuses on whānau scale wellbeing rather than community scale. No objective measures. Add the following measures: mental health, life expectancy, children's wellbeing, belonging, cultural, equity (more measures) and sustainability of wellbeing, natural environment measures, job satisfaction, healthcare and transport. Consider direct measure of subjective CWB.
Oranga Tamariki: Te Toka Tumoana Framework	Not designed as a measurement framework but rather as best practice framework for maximising mokopuna and whānau wellbeing within statutory social work. Although cultural aspects are well addressed it fails to address many of the other relevant dimensions for CWB.
He Pou Oranga Tangata Whenua (HPOTW)	Not designed as a measurement framework per se, although could be adapted into one. Provides an excellent te ao Māori perspective on wellbeing and distinguishes between wellbeing, its dimensions and its determinants. Would need community engagement and evidence-based input to develop into measurement framework and identify actual measures and data. Covers many of the key dimensions but needs direct measures of health status, child wellbeing and material wellbeing.
Panelli and Tipa: Integrated Culture-Environment Linked Well-Being	Not designed as a measurement framework per se, although could be adapted into one. Provides an excellent te ao Māori perspective on wellbeing incorporating a place-based notion that features commonly in indigenous worldview (indigeneity), but is usually absent from a contemporary western perspective. Would need community engagement and evidence-based input to develop into measurement framework and identify actual measures and data. Covers many of the key dimensions but needs direct measures of health status, child wellbeing, political autonomy, equity and sustainability of wellbeing and natural environment and material wellbeing.
Other Indigenous	
First Nations Community Wellbeing: 'Approaches to Community Wellbeing'	Is a conceptual model of community wellbeing rather than a measurement framework per se, although could be adapted into one. Provides an indigenous perspective on wellbeing and utilises some good infographics. Bottom up approach to developing the model. Would need community engagement and evidence-based input to develop into measurement framework and identify actual measures and data. Covers some of the key dimensions but needs direct measures of health status, education, subjective individual wellbeing, empowerment, social capital, more environmental measures, employment, housing, transport, wellbeing equity and sustainability.
Interplay Wellbeing Project	The approach taking to designing this framework, and the way it depicts the quantitative relationship between overall wellbeing and its drivers fits well with the ECT ethos. The approach was community participatory, used shared space governance and codesign. An indigenous cultural worldview was applied and integrated with government priorities. Another strength is that it claims to measure past, present and future wellbeing, and therefore wellbeing sustainability, but need to know more detail on how this is measured. Insufficient information publicly available to ascertain whether the survey was paired with objective data. Unable to obtain full survey so cannot review all the indicators. Based on this partial information, recommend strengthening the framework by adding objective measures (e.g. life expectancy), close relationships, belonging, wellbeing equity, environmental measures, income, housing and transport.
Yawuru Wellbeing Survey	The key strength of this framework of relevance to ECT is the community participatory approach. This participatory process has the advantage of letting individuals and collectives define, identity and select aspects of wellbeing they value and brings everyone on a journey where a sense of ownership over process and data is realised. As a survey, it lacks objective measures so would need to be used in conjunction with these. Also recommend adding the following measures: life expectancy, children's wellbeing, sustainability of wellbeing, more measures of the natural environment, job satisfaction and healthcare.

[1] Individual endpoint (how the individual perceives that aspects of the community [community conditions] impact overall on their personal wellbeing). [2] Community endpoint (subjective individual or group assessment the global wellbeing of the community in its own right and/or perception of how community conditions impact on overall collective wellbeing in the community). [3] Based on literature review and ECT priorities.