INSTITUTO NACIONAL DE ESTADISTICA

Multidimensional Quality of Life Indicator (MQLI)

Technical Project

Experimental

October 2026

Contents

1	Introduction: Quality of Life Indicators	3
2	Objectives	7
3	Scope of the research	8
4	Construction of the MQLI	9
5	Dissemination timetable and plan	16

INE. National Statistics Institute

1 Introduction: Quality of Life Indicators

1.1 THE "STIGLITZ-SEN-FITOUSSI" REPORT AND THE "GDP AND BEYOND" COMMUNICATION

Over the past two decades, various initiatives have been undertaken in the field of official statistics concerning the measurement of quality of life, an area that has gained increasing importance in academic circles in recent years. The fundamental idea is that measuring the progress of societies and wellbeing cannot be based solely on purely economic indicators such as Gross Domestic Product (GDP).

Among the initiatives for measuring social progress based on a paradigm other than GDP, probably the first to attract worldwide attention was the United Nations' Human Development Index (HDI), whose first report was published in 1990. It is produced by the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), the body responsible for development matters. The HDI was created to emphasise the importance of focusing analysis on people when assessing a country's development, rather than solely on economic growth.

Over the past fifteen years, academic initiatives promoting a measurement of social progress based on analysing people's living conditions and economic, social and environmental sustainability have proliferated. Numerous examples can be found of indices referred to as *social progress*, *quality of life* or even the *Happy Planet*. But the work that has probably attracted the most attention and had the greatest impact, not only in academia but also on official statistics, is the one known as the Stiglitz-Sen-Fitoussi report (SSF report). This document was produced in response to a commission from the French government and contained very specific recommendations on improving the measurement of societal progress. The report does not conclude with the creation of a composite index to replace or complement GDP; rather, it sets out a series of recommendations, aimed above all at official statistics, on how to undertake this task.

The French government's initiative is taking place alongside others, both by the European Commission (the "*GDP and beyond*" project) and the OECD (with its "*Better Life*" initiative), which are heading in the same direction. Indeed, one month before the SSF report was published in September 2009, the European Commission published a communication entitled 'GDP and beyond – Measuring progress in a changing world' [COM (2009) 433]. The aim of this communication was to promote the development of better indicators to complement GDP and better reflect social and environmental progress.

In 2009, the European statistical system took note of these various initiatives and adopted the recommendations of the SSF report. A *Sponsorship Group* was then set up, co-chaired by Eurostat and the French statistics institute (INSEE), in order to develop and elaborate those recommendations into effective proposals for the European Statistical System. Three working groups were set up with the following duties:

– Multidimensional measurement of the quality of life.

– Household perspectives and the distributive aspects of income, consumption and wealth.

– Environmental sustainability.

INE. National Statistics Institute

Following the completion of the work of these three groups, in 2011, the European Statistical System Committee (ESSC) adopted a report "on measuring progress, well-being and sustainable development"[1]. The report summarises 50 specific actions that should be undertaken by the European Statistical System (ESS) to implement some of the above recommendations.

1.2 RECOMMENDATIONS ON MEASURING QUALITY OF LIFE IN THE EUROPEAN STATISTICAL SYSTEM

The recommendations, both from the SSF report and the Sponsorship Group (SG), are organised around three pillars: the multidimensional measurement of quality of life, the inclusion of the household perspective in economic indicators, and the measurement of environmental sustainability. Of these three components, most recommendations focus on measuring quality of life. The SSF and SG reports establish a new paradigm in measuring quality of life, which needs to be explained in some detail. Quality of life or well-being should be measured using indicators that should adhere to several principles:

- Measuring outcomes: this involves avoiding the use of typical social-reporting indicators used hitherto that are based on resources or inputs, such as the "number of hospital beds per 1,000 inhabitants" or "expenditure per student" to measure healthcare or education respectively. These indicators give an idea of the effort made by government authorities in a particular area, but not of the outcomes for people. The multidimensional approach to measuring quality of life now being advocated seeks to avoid this type of indicator and, as far as possible, rely solely on outcome indicators (measuring their impact on the population), such as, for example, whether a person has been able to see a doctor when they needed to.
- Individual data. The indicators should be based on data collected from individual observations. For example, when measuring security, it is preferable to know people's perception of insecurity, or the incidents in which they may have been victims, rather than aggregated data such as a homicide rate per 100,000 inhabitants, typical of a classical approach to social indicators.
- Measure inequalities instead of average values. In line with the above, another cross-cutting recommendation from these reports is that the main indicators chosen should not be mean values but distribution statistics. A typical example is the at-risk-of-poverty rate, which is an inequality indicator as it measures the percentage of the population below a certain income threshold. This indicator would be preferable to an indicator such as average income when describing material well-being.

It is not always possible to obtain these indicators, as current statistical sources often do not provide them, meaning that it will therefore be necessary to resort to traditional aggregate indicators.

The Sponsorship Group report identifies the fundamental elements of multidimensional quality-of-life measurement by grouping the indicators into nine dimensions. This is always an arbitrary decision; indeed, a similar exercise, such as the aforementioned OECD Better Life Index project, considers 11 dimensions, but essentially the same elements are included, albeit grouped differently. Thus, the nine dimensions that

[1] Sponsorship Group on Measuring Progress, Well-being and Sustainable Development. Final Report adopted by the European Statistical System Committee

INE. National Statistics Institute

describe quality of life are: material living conditions, health, work, education, social relations, insecurity, governance and social participation, the environment, and subjective well-being.

1.3 QUALITY-OF-LIFE INDICATORS IN EUROSTAT AND THE MEMBER STATES

The Sponsorship Group's report adapts the SSF report's global recommendations to the European context and goes some way towards achieving a genuine statistical measurement of quality of life, but many details concerning the specific indicators and the implementation of a new statistical operation still need to be addressed. Thus, in 2012 Eurostat set up an expert group comprising several experts from academia, the OECD and various Member States, including Spain, which developed a specific proposal for quality-of-life indicators. Eurostat adopted the proposals and consequently launched a publication of quality-of-life indicators[1] in March 2014.

At present, the Eurostat website contains a series of indicators for each dimension, some of which are still under development, but it already provides abundant data on quality of life—not only overall data for each country, but also data by population groups (for example, broken down by sex and age).

Moreover, some of the major member states and other prominent countries (Australia, Canada) have developed their own quality-of-life websites in recent years.

1.4 THE INE QUALITY-OF-LIFE INDICATORS PUBLICATION

Spain played a leading role in the activities of both the Sponsorship Group (the INE was a member of the working group on multidimensional measurement of quality of life) and the group of experts that was subsequently set up. Spain is among the five EU Member States that developed some element of their statistical production[2] in this area from the outset.

The INE launched a statistical operation on Quality of Life Indicators as part of the 2013-2016 National Statistical Plan. The 2013 Annual Statistical Programme already envisaged the existence of the project.

During 2013 and 2014, work was carried out on a set of quality-of-life indicators, in parallel with the work of the expert group led by Eurostat. Since the INE was involved in that group, consistency was ensured between the work carried out at the EU level and the quality-of-life indicators developed for Spain.

However, the publication of quality-of-life indicators has its own elements beyond the Eurostat project. Clearly, when focusing on an EU project, Eurostat works with the common denominator of data available for all Member States; Spain has a significant body of its own information that is not harmonised at the EU level but which could improve the analysis of inequalities from a national perspective.

[1] https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/web/quality-of-life/overview

[2] See INE working document: Alternatives in constructing a Multidimensional Quality of Life Indicator (at www.ine.es)

From a formal point of view, the project saw the light of day in 2014 in the form of a consolidated publication: Quality of Life Indicators.

1.5 THE NEED FOR A MULTIDIMENSIONAL QUALITY OF LIFE INDICATOR

The ultimate aim underlying multidimensional quality-of-life measurement is the ever-appealing (and controversial) aggregation of all the elements into a single indicator: a quality-of-life index that could compare not only one country with another, or different regions, but also—as the indicators could potentially be constructed from individual data—enable us to compare the quality of life of young people and older people, men and women, people living alone and those living in family groups, according to educational attainment or employment status.

The power of an indicator like this would be enormous. Moreover, if the aim is to "compete" with GDP per capita as an aggregate indicator of well-being, a single data point is required. What makes GDP per capita or the Human Development Index so useful is their ability to summarise a comparison of quality of life between countries in a single figure.

The SSF report is unequivocal in recommending the construction of an aggregate indicator, although it does not go so far as to formulate one; instead, it proposes that statistical offices work on this and seek an international consensus.

As mentioned earlier, various composite indicators are already being developed in academia. In the sphere of international organisations, beyond the aforementioned UN HDI (and variants developed by the same organisation, such as the Multidimensional Poverty Index), perhaps the best example is the OECD's Better Life Index. The OECD selects several dozen indicators across 11 dimensions, but uses them to construct 11 representative indicators, one for each dimension. The next step, aggregating the 11 dimensions into a single "Better Life Index" indicator, is left to the user, who is allowed to choose how to weigh the 11 dimensions on a scale from 1 to 5.

Eurostat has not yet constructed any aggregate indicator. Moreover, this aggregation should take place in two stages: first, by aggregating the indicators of a dimension into a single indicator representing that dimension, and subsequently by aggregating the different dimensions into a single quality-of-life indicator. The Eurostat Expert Group concluded its work without fully addressing the possible integration into a single quality-of-life indicator.

In that situation, in 2017 the INE decided to include an aggregate multidimensional indicator comprising nine dimensions in the Quality of Life Indicators publication. The individual indicators are aggregated into a single indicator for each dimension, using the adjusted Mazziotta-Pareto Index (AMPI), a method recently employed by the OECD to construct a composite indicator. The AMPI indicators for each dimension are combined into a single quality-of-life indicator using an arithmetic mean, giving all dimensions equal weight.

Between 2017 and 2020, this multidimensional indicator was published in a section of the Quality of Life Indicators called "Multidimensional Analysis". The way it was published—with no press release and in a somewhat obscure section of a publication—means that it failed to arouse users' interest. However, other initiatives, such as the

aforementioned Better Life Index, have a significant impact among users of official statistics.

The recent launch, at the end of 2019, of the experimental statistics initiative at the INE[1] provides an opportunity to (re)launch this multidimensional indicator. Experimental statistics are created specifically for "*projects under development that incorporate innovation, whether in the information sources, statistical methods, scope of study, or the way of disseminating the results*".

2 Objectives

The MQLI is a composite indicator that enables quality of life to be measured from a multidimensional perspective. It is presented on an experimental basis and is subject to users' evaluation and contributions, with the aim of progressively improving its methodology and moving towards its consolidation as a stable indicator within the INE's official statistical output.

The description of the experimental statistics states:

The content presented is considered experimental because it has not yet reached a sufficient level of maturity in terms of data reliability, stability or quality to be included in official statistics. Nevertheless, the available results are provided to users for their use and assessment, given their potential importance and as a means of improving the products themselves by gathering the views of the final recipients of the information.

With the aim of encouraging user participation and gathering their views, the MQLI is presented in a more appealing and interactive way, inviting contributions and suggestions on the various methodological aspects involved in its compilation.

Understanding users' opinions is therefore a key objective of this project, which is why the publication explicitly provides a mailbox through which comments and suggestions that may help improve the indicator can be submitted.

One of the most important methodological aspects is the weighting of the dimensions, since the importance assigned to each of them, such as health, work or education, influences the final value of the MQLI. As this weighting includes a subjective component, the publication allows users to adjust the weight assigned to the various dimensions according to their preferences, following an approach similar to that of the Better Life Index initiative.

The MQLI is constructed using the INE's Quality of Life Indicators, which offer a panoramic (multidimensional) overview of the quality of life in Spain, by selecting a broad but limited set of indicators (55 in the calculation by autonomous communities) covering the different dimensions. This measurement of quality of life makes it possible to establish comparisons between territories and population groups and, in particular, with the other EU Member States, insofar as a similar project is developed at European level.

INE. National Statistics Institute

[1] https://www.ine.es/experimental/experimental.htm

Quality of life is broken down into nine dimensions:

1. Material living conditions
2. Work
3. Health
4. Education
5. Leisure and social interactions
6. Physical and personal safety and security
7. Governance and basic rights
8. Surroundings and environment
9. Subjective well-being

For each of them, a series of indicators is selected, obtained mainly from surveys of the population, such as the Living Conditions Survey or the Labour Force Survey, which are considered representative of quality of life in each dimension.

Initially, the MQLI was calculated only nationally and by Autonomous Community. From October 2026, results disaggregated by sex, educational level and nationality will be included, making it possible to analyse differences in quality of life between different population groups.

The process of aggregating the individual indicators, both for the autonomous communities and for the different population groups defined by sex, educational level and nationality, is carried out in two steps. First, the indicators that represent a dimension are aggregated into a single indicator of the dimension using the AMPI method. Secondly, these nine indicators are added in a single MQLI and this aggregation, by default, is done with all dimensions equally weighted. In the case of the autonomous communities, users can adjust this weighting, giving each dimension more or less importance according to their judgement.

3 Scope of the research

3.1 POPULATION SCOPE

The MQLI, like the quality-of-life indicators, generally relates to the population as a whole. However, due to the characteristics of the various statistical sources from which the data are derived, there are certain limitations regarding the age groups covered, particularly in the case of the population under 16.

To analyse differences in quality of life between different population groups, the MQLI incorporates breakdowns according to three characteristics:

– SEX

  There are two categories: men and women.

INE. National Statistics Institute

– EDUCATION LEVEL

The following education levels are considered:

- Level 0-2: pre-school, primary and 1st stage of secondary education).
- Level 3-4: Second stage of secondary education and post-secondary non-higher education.
- Level 5-8: 1st and 2nd stage of higher education and doctorate.

– NATIONALITY

The following nationalities are considered, defined as mutually exclusive categories:

- Spanish.
- Foreign (European Union): includes nationals of EU countries, excluding Spain.
- Foreign (Rest of the world): includes nationals of non-EU countries, excluding Spain and the EU itself.

3.2 GEOGRAPHIC SCOPE

The indicators refer to the entire national territory and are broken down geographically by Autonomous Communities.

3.3 TEMPORAL SCOPE

Annual data is provided from 2008.

4 Construction of the MQLI

4.1 INDICATORS USED

The 55 indicators used to calculate the MQLI come from the publication *Quality-of-Life Indicators (QLIs)*. Not all the indicators appearing in the QLI publication are included in the calculation of the MQLI, as some have similar characteristics and only one of them is selected as representative. For example, of the mean income and the median income, only the latter is used.

Moreover, not all indicators are available for every year. The most extreme case is that of the *Governance and basic rights* dimension, for which data are available only for 2013 and, partially, for 2022 [1].

When data are unavailable for a given year, the method requires a value to be assigned to the indicator, so the value for the most recent year available is used or, where applicable, that for the first year with available information.

[1] Readers are referred to the methodology of the QLI publication for further details on the source and availability of each indicator: https://www.ine.es/dynt3/ICV/index.html

INE. National Statistics Institute

Likewise, when information is not available for an autonomous community or city, the figure of the national total is used.

DIMENSION 1. MATERIAL LIVING CONDITIONS

1.1. Economic conditions

1.1.1. Median income

1.1.2. Population at risk of relative poverty

1.1.4. Inequality (S80/S20)

1.1.5. Satisfaction with the household economic situation

1.2. Material conditions

1.2.1. Difficulty in making ends meet

1.2.2. Material deprivation

1.2.3. Population living in homes with certain housing deficiencies

1.2.4. Population with lack of space in the household

1.2.5. Population with high spending on housing

1.2.6. Satisfaction with housing

1.3. Economic security

1.3.2. Incapability of meeting unexpected economic expenses

1.3.3. Delayed payments

DIMENSION 2. WORK

2.1. Quantity

2.1.1. Employment rate

2.1.2. Unemployment rate

2.1.3. Long-term unemployment rate (percentage of the active population)

2.1.4. Involuntary part-time employment (percentage of total part-time employment)

2.2. Quality

2.2.1. Low wages and salaries

2.2.2. Long workdays

2.2.3. Temporary work

2.2.4. Job satisfaction

INE. National Statistics Institute

DIMENSION 3. HEALTH

3.1. State of health

3.1.1. Life expectancy at birth

3.1.3. Self-perceived health

3.1.4. Chronic morbidity. People with a long-term disease or health issue

3.1.5. People with limitation of their daily activity in the last 6 months

3.2. Access to health care

3.2.1. Unmet medical care needs

3.3. Health determinants

3.3.1. Body mass index

3.3.2. Daily smokers

3.3.3. Regular physical exercise

DIMENSION 4. EDUCATION

4.1. Competencies and skills

4.1.1. Level of education attained by the total population

4.1.2. Adult population (25–64) with higher education qualifications

4.1.3. Level of education attained by the young adult population (18 to 24 years old)

4.1.4. Dropping out of education-vocational training in the 18- to 24-year-old population

4.2. Continuous training

4.2.1. People from 25 to 64 years old who have received education or training in the last 4 weeks

DIMENSION 5. LEISURE AND SOCIAL RELATIONS

5.1. Leisure

5.1.1. Satisfaction with one's available time

5.1.2. Attendance at cultural and sporting events

5.2. Social relationships

5.2.1. Frequency of meeting friends, family or workmates

5.2.2. Satisfaction with personal relations

INE. National Statistics Institute

5.2.3. Having family, friends or neighbours to call upon for help

5.2.4. Having someone to talk to about personal issues

5.2.5. Trust in others

DIMENSION 6. PHYSICAL AND PERSONAL SAFETY/SECURITY

6.1. PHYSICAL AND PERSONAL SAFETY/SECURITY

6.1.1.1 Homicides

6.1.1.2 Criminality

6.1.2. Delinquency or vandalism in the area

6.1.3. Perceived security (walking outside at night alone)

DIMENSION 7. GOVERNANCE AND BASIC RIGHTS

7.1. Institutions and public services

7.1.1. Confidence in the political system

7.1.2. Confidence in the judicial system

7.1.3. Confidence in the police

7.2. Citizen participation

7.2.1. Participation in political activities

DIMENSION 8. SURROUNDINGS AND ENVIRONMENT

8.1. Pollution, noise

8.1.1. Population suffering from pollution and other environmental problems

8.1.2. Population suffering from noise problems caused by neighbours or from outside

8.1.3. Urban population exposed to air pollution (micro-particles PM10)

8.2. Access to green spaces and recreational areas

8.2.1. Satisfaction with green space and recreational areas

8.3. Surrounding environment

8.3.1. Satisfaction with one's environment

INE. National Statistics Institute

DIMENSION 9. SUBJECTIVE WELL-BEING

9.1. Overall life satisfaction

9.1.1. Overall life satisfaction

9.2. Feelings and emotions

9.2.1 Positive feelings

9.3. Meaning and purpose of life

9.3.1. Rating of the meaning and purpose of life

The 55 selected indicators are used to calculate the MQLI by autonomous community. However, in the breakdowns by sex, nationality and educational level, it is not possible to include them all, as some indicators do not have information disaggregated according to these characteristics.

Specifically, the calculation by sex does not include indicators *6.1.1.1 Homicides*, *6.1.1.2 Crime* and *8.1.3. Urban population exposed to air pollution (micro-particles PM10),* as information disaggregated by autonomous communities is the only information available.

In the calculation by nationality, indicator 3.1.1 is excluded in addition to the previous indicators. Life expectancy at birth, as disaggregated information by nationality is not available.

Lastly, in the calculation by educational level, the indicators mentioned above are excluded, and the *Education* dimension is not included, as the educational-level classification variable coincides with the area analysed in that dimension. However, information is available for indicator 4.2.1. *Persons from 25 to 64 years old who have received training/education in the last four weeks*; this is the only indicator available for this dimension, so it has been excluded from the calculation. Furthermore, educational level is the classification variable used in this breakdown.

4.2 AGGREGATION: THE ADJUSTED MAZZIOTTA-PARETO INDEX METHOD (AMPI)

As discussed, aggregation is carried out in two steps:

– The elementary indicators for each dimension (for example, the three that make up dimension 9) are aggregated into a single indicator representing the dimension using the AMPI method; this is why they are referred to as AMPI indicators.

– The nine indicators are combined into a single MQLI using a weighted arithmetic mean, with equal weightings by default, although the application allows the user to vary the relative weight of each dimension.

The literature on the subject contains numerous methods for aggregating indicators, and there is no doubt that choosing one method over another is arbitrary. One of the methods used to construct composite indices for multidimensional social phenomena such as

INE. National Statistics Institute

quality of life is the Mazziotta–Pareto Index (MPI), developed by authors at ISTAT (the Italian National Institute of Statistics)[1].

The main characteristics of the Mazziota–Pareto method applied to multidimensional phenomena are based on aggregating indicators that cannot be substituted for one another, all of equal relevance to the phenomenon under analysis, and which do not offset one another (a low value in one indicator is not offset by a high value in another).

It is initially based on a linear aggregation, but subsequently adds a penalty factor to the arithmetic mean of the normalised indicators in order to take into account the variability of the indicators' results within each unit of analysis (horizontal variability).

The Mazziota-Pareto Method consists of the following steps:

1. Standardisation:

   Given the matrix X = {xij} with n rows (statistical units) and m columns (indicators).

   The normalised matrix Z = {z_{ij}} is calculated. Where indicator j has a mean of 100 and a standard deviation of 10:

$$Z_{ij} = 100 \pm \frac{(X_{ij} - M_{xj})}{S_{xj}} 10$$

   where M_{xj} and S_{xj} are the mean and standard deviation of indicator j. The sign $\pm$ will depend on the relationship between indicator j and the phenomenon being measured (+ if the indicator represents a positive variation and - if it represents a negative variation).

2. Aggregation:

   Where cv_i is the variation coefficient of the normalised values of the indicators {j=1,…..m} in statistical unit i, and Mz_i and Sz_i are the mean and standard deviation of the normalised values of the indicators {j=1,…..m} in statistical unit i. The generalised form of the MPI is:

$$MPI_i^{+/-} = M_{zi}\left(1 \pm cv_i^2\right) = M_{zi} \pm \frac{S_{zi}^2}{M_{zi}} = M_{zi} \pm S_{zi}\, cv_i$$

   The sign $\pm$ depends on the type of phenomenon being measured. If the composite index measures a positive phenomenon, that is, increasing index values correspond to positive changes in the phenomenon (for example, economic development), MPI^- is used. Conversely, if the composite index measures a negative phenomenon, that is, if increasing index values refer to increases in the negative phenomenon (for example, greater poverty), MPI^+ is used.

   The MPI result in each statistical unit i is broken down into two parts: the mean value (Mz_i) and the penalty ($S_{zi} - cv_i$).

[1] A methodological description can be found in "*Composite Indices of Development and Poverty: An Application to MDGs*" published in 2010:
https://www.researchgate.net/publication/227113176_Composite_Indices_of_Development_and_Poverty_ An Application_to_MDGs

INE. National Statistics Institute

The Mazziotta–Pareto method is recommended for conducting single-year analyses. Subsequently, the same authors developed an adjusted version of the MPI method, known as AMPI (Adjusted Mazziotta–Pareto Index), which allows spatial and/or temporal comparisons.

The **Adjusted Mazziotta-Pareto Index** (AMPI) is an adjustment to the Mazziotta-Pareto method described in the previous section, enabling comparisons **across space and/or over time**.

To make absolute comparisons over a period of time, the data normalisation process is different, rescaling the values of each indicator against two reference points: the 'maximum value' and the 'minimum value', which represent the range of each variable across all time periods and statistical units.

The steps for calculating the AMPI are as follows:

Given the matrix $X = \{x_{ij}\}$ with n rows (statistical units) and m columns (indicators), the normalised matrix $R = \{r_{ij}\}$ is calculated:

$$r_{ij} = \frac{(x_{ij} - Min_{xj})}{(Max_{xj} - Min_{xj})} 60 + 70$$

Where x_{ij} is the value of indicator j for unit i, and Min_{xj} and Max_{xj} are the extreme reference points for indicator j. If indicator j has negative polarity, the complement of r_{ij} with respect to 200 is applied. The range of the normalised values is (70; 130). This range can be changed to (85; 115).

Where M_{ri} and S_{ri} are the mean and standard deviation of the normalised values for unit i, the generalised form of the adjusted MPI is:

$$MPI_i^{+/-} = M_{ri} \pm S_{ri}\, cv_i$$

$cv_i = S_{ri} / M_{ri}$ is the variation coefficient of unit i. The $\pm$ sign depends on the type of phenomenon to be measured, as detailed in the MPI method.

The main difference between the MPI method and the AMPI method lies in normalisation. MPI is based on normalising each indicator and measures relative differences from the mean, while AMPI is based on rescaling each indicator and measures absolute differences from two predetermined reference points.

This method allows comparisons over time, between dimensions and between groups (by sex, age and Autonomous Community). The results are obtained on a relative scale against a reference value of 100 (values for a year t, national total).

In particular, the AMPI indicators selected for constructing the MQLI are calculated using the values (85, 115) as the range and 2008 as the base year, subject to the availability of indicators in the Quality of Life Indicators publication. As a first approximation, it is calculated only by autonomous communities.

As noted above, the AMPI method is just one of the possible methods for aggregation—the choice of one method over another is arbitrary—and it also implicitly gives equal weight to all dimensions, which is likewise arbitrary. All of this seems to reinforce the experimental nature with which this publication is conceived, at least initially.

INE. National Statistics Institute

5 Dissemination timetable and plan

Since 2022, the MQLI has been updated annually in October, simultaneously with the publication of the Quality of Life Indicators (QLIs) on which it is based, taking into account the data availability schedule and the annual nature of most of the indicators and their sources.

INE. National Statistics Institute