

STATES UNDER THE SPOTLIGHT

Incorporating Human Rights into
Investment Strategies: 2020 Non-Financial
Rating of the 27 EU Member States and
United Kingdom

Article 1: All human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights. They are endowed with reason and conscience and should act towards one another in a spirit of brotherhood. Article 2: Everyone is entitled to all the rights and freedoms set forth in this Declaration, without distinction of any kind, such as race, colour, sex, language, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, property, birth or other status. Furthermore, no distinction shall be made on the basis of the political, jurisdictional or international status of the country or territory to which a person belongs, whether it be independent, trust, non-self-governing or under any other limitation of sovereignty. Article 3: Everyone has the right to life, liberty and security of person. Article 4: No one shall be held in slavery or servitude; slavery and the slave trade shall be prohibited in all their forms. Article 5: No one shall be subjected to torture or to cruel,



Preamble	4
2020 Non-Financial Rating of the 27 EU Member States and United Kingdom: ranking	9
PART 1: METHODOLOGY	10
1. Scope of the study	10
Member States	10
Human Rights Issues	10
Protection of the environment and human rights	11
2. Structure of the study	12
3. Choice of indicators and method of calculation	12
Identifying human rights-based indicators	12
Scoring system	13
Overall weighting and ranking	14
Data collection process	15
PART II: INDICATORS AND RESULTS	16
SECTION A: STATES' RESPECT FOR HUMAN RIGHTS AT THE DOMESTIC LEVEL	16
Criterion 1: Gender Equality and Women's Rights	16
Criterion 2: Non- Discrimination (except sex-based discrimination)	21
Criterion 3: Rights of Migrants and Refugees (Asylum Rights/Alien Rights)	26
Criterion 4: Good governance, political engagement and corruption	28
Criterion 5: Social Cohesion/ Economic and Social Rights	31
Criterion 6: Judicial Systems (right to a fair trial, torture, prison administration and access to legal aid)	35
Criterion 7: Freedom of expression and Right to information	38
Criterion 8: Labour rights	41
Section B: Respect for human rights at the international level	45
Criterion 9: International justice and human rights promotion	45
Criterion 10: Official Development Assistance/ Financial contributions to the UN	48
Criterion 11: Arms control	50
Criterion 12: Promoting corporate responsibility in business activities conducted abroad	54
Section C: States' respect for the environment and sustainable development	57
Criterion 13: Environmental management	57
Annex: Detailed ranking	60

STATES UNDER THE SPOTLIGHT: INCORPORATING HUMAN RIGHTS INTO INVESTMENT STRATEGIES: 2020 NON-FINANCIAL RATING OF THE 27 EU MEMBER STATES AND UNITED KINGDOM

The International federation for Human Rights is pleased to present the new version of its bi-annual report on the non- financial rating of the European Union (EU) Member States and United Kingdom. The publication of this report marks our continuing commitment to the promotion of responsible business and investment.

Non-financial concerns have become an important element of strategic decision-making for many investors. ESG (Environment, Social and Governance) criteria are becoming increasingly important for many investors. The development and study of ESG criteria has focused primarily on the performance of business enterprises. However, investment portfolios are not exclusively made up of private equity. Sovereign bond markets are also a key component of portfolios. Still, little attention has been paid to the non-financial performance of sovereign states. During 2020, the European Union has debated whether the 2021-27 budget and its COVID recovery plan should be linked to governments' adherence to the rule of law. Similarly, institutional investors should also consider how to link their own investments on sovereign bonds to non-financial performance of States.

The UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights and the OECD Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises define businesses responsibility to respect, protect and promote human rights. These soft-law frameworks are being increasingly translated into regional and national binding obligations, requiring businesses to conduct effective human rights due diligence. This process is being complemented by international legal developments lead by the UN Working Group mandated with designing a binding international instrument recognizing the obligations of corporate actors to respect human rights. Investment companies, as business enterprises, have to comply with these requirements and respect human rights in their operations, including investment on state bonds.

FIDH has persistently highlighted this crucial area of interest for investment purposes. Since establishing its own ethical mutual fund "Libertés & Solidarité" (now SRI Human Rights fund) with La Banque Postale Assent Management and devising a screening methodology for selecting both bonds and shares in 2001, FIDH has been publishing a non-financial rating of EU member states. The objective of these studies has been to establish a methodology and classification system that allow investors to take into account how states are fulfilling their obligations to respect, protect and promote human rights in their investment decisions. On what criteria should investment decisions be made? How should states rank when it comes to non-financial information? What indicators should be used?

The methodology includes a range of ESG indicators divided per criteria. Some of the chosen criteria are: Gender equality and women's rights, Non-discrimination, Good governance, Social cohesion/economic and social rights, Freedom of expression and right to information, Promoting corporate social responsibility at home and abroad and Environmental Management.

The edition of this year's report is marked by the Covid 19 pandemic. Prior to the emergence of the pandemic, new indicators were included to measure socio-economic inequalities, which were deemed essential to analyze States' response to pressing social and governance issues. Once the pandemic was declared, other indicators were included to try to capture key human rights areas specially impacted by the crisis (such as "Paid sick leave benefit- Purchasing Power Standard per inhabitant" or "Current Health Care Expenditure – purchasing power standard by inhabitant").¹

We acknowledge that the criteria and indicators included in this report do not cover all ESG issues. As we pointed out in previous editions, choosing human rights indicators is a particularly difficult challenge given the lack of data availability. States and international organizations still collect insufficient relevant quantitative and qualitative data to allow for the systematic comparison of states' policies and performance in the field of human rights. FIDH's approach is rooted in international law and aims to stimulate discussion between states, investors and civil society.

In the midst of the Covid 19 pandemic, most of the countries are facing social and economic crises, which add to the ongoing environmental crisis. We hope that through its methodology, data and identification of data deficits, this study will contribute to the development of human rights indicators by states and the inclusion of human rights in investment decisions on state bonds.

1. FIDH has monitored the impact on human rights of the covid-19 crisis, through the work of its different leagues across the globe. FIDH Member organizations have expressed concerns over the nature, scope and duration of the measures adopted by governments and their effects on human rights. Furthermore, due to the focus on covid-19, the organizations have alerted of the decreased attention over other human rights violations which are unrelated to covid-19, but which are still happening and have aggravated due to the health crisis. To consult the human rights analyses (statements, reports, and others) , produced by FIDH and its member organizations in more than 60 countries in the context of the COVID-19 crisis, please visit the following link: <https://www.fidh.org/en/issues/human-rights-defenders/covid-19-pandemic-and-human-rights>

PREAMBLE

We began the process of collecting the extensive data upon which each edition of this bi-annual report is based in late-January 2020. Despite the slowly evolving news-stories charting the emergence and gradual spread of a new strain of Coronavirus, we were not to know that the world was about to change so quickly and so fundamentally. This edition of FIDH's report was initiated in a pre-Covid-19 era and is being published at a moment where the full effects of the pandemic upon our world remain impossible to accurately and precisely discern. The pandemic has raised and will continue to raise a great many questions and challenges for the protection of human rights within the European Union and the United Kingdom. Many of these questions and challenges have been subjected to minute analysis and wide-ranging debate across many academic and civil society platforms over recent months.² No one should under-estimate the significance of Covid-19 for human rights. However, a report such as this requires the existence of a comprehensive body of carefully collected, methodologically reliable, data across the 28 countries included in the report. While we know that the pandemic severely impacts many peoples' enjoyment of specific human rights, we cannot presently provide a reliable and objective account of the extent of this impact since the data required for providing such an account a precise account does not yet exist. As a direct response to Covid-19, we did include three new indicators for existing human rights challenges which the pandemic particularly impacted (indicators 5.4, 5.13 and 7.4). Prior to the pandemic emerging, we had also decided to include a more substantial set of indicators for socio-economic inequalities, which have also proven to be particularly sensitive to the effects of Covid-19 (indicators 1.13, 2.8, 4.1, 6.4, 8.3 and 8.4) To this extent, we have attempted to offer some account of the earliest effects of the pandemic upon a limited, but relevant, collection of human rights.

In an effort to mitigate the frustrations resulting from the lack of available and reliable data, we thought that it would nevertheless be useful to provide a brief account of what we do presently and reliably know about the impact of Covid-19 upon human rights within and across the 28 countries. For this reason, we have asked Professor Andrew Fagan, Director of the Human Rights Center of the Essex University, to share with us some preliminary considerations on the impacts of Covid19 on human rights. While we cannot presently provide specific and detailed comparative measurements of the effects of Covid-19 upon human rights, there are a number of important known knowns, so to speak, which can be reliably presented.

On 11th March 2020, the World Health Organization officially declared that Covid-19 had reached the status of a global pandemic. In respect of both the urgency of response and the precise extent of measures taken, the 28 countries included in this report have responded in a variety of ways. Some countries, such as France, Italy and Spain, quickly instituted stringent lockdown measures, designed to limit the spread of the virus. Other countries, such as Germany, Sweden and the UK decided to pursue less stringent approaches. While governments and public health authorities have reacted in different ways to the pandemic, the effects of Covid-19 are profound.

As of the first week of 2021, 16,938,330 cases of Covid-19 have been reported in the EU/EEA. Those countries with the highest incidences of infection include France (2 783 256), Italy (2 276 491), Spain (2 111 782), Germany (1 921 024), Poland (1 390 385), Netherlands (877 219), Czechia (835 454). The countries included in this report with the lowest incidences of infection include, Luxembourg (47 984), Finland (38 590), Estonia (33 805), Cyprus (27 350), Malta (14 529). As of the first week of 2021, there have been

2. A particularly comprehensive and informative platform for analysing some of the principal challenges which Covid-19 raise for human rights is the RightOn webinar series. An archive of webinars broadcast from early April until mid-June 2020 is available here: <https://righton.dig.watch>

401 535 Covid-19 deaths in the EU/EEA. The countries with the highest total number of Covid-19 deaths include Italy (78 755), France (67 750), Spain (52 275), Germany (40 686), Poland (31 264). Those with the lowest number of total Covid-19 deaths Luxembourg (533), Norway (478), Estonia (287), Malta (233), Cyprus (148).³ As of January 20th 2021, 3,466,849 cases of Covid-19 and 91,470 deaths have been reported in UK.⁴

It is clear that the rates of infection and death would have been very much higher had governments not adopted various initiatives intended to limit the spread of the virus. A great deal has been written regarding the quality of the efforts specific governments have made to reduce their populations' exposure to the virus. Notwithstanding the effects of very important factors such as the size, density and composition of each country's population, and the degree to which particular countries were more potentially exposed to the global pandemic through key transport hubs, such as major airports and the like, it seems clear that some governments have been more successful than others in their efforts to protect their populations from the pandemic.

We have yet to see whether some governments may face legal challenges concerning the loss of life and suffering Covid-19 has resulted in. Given the sheer scale of death and infection the pandemic has caused within the 28 countries included in this report, it seems reasonable to assume that some governments may have failed to satisfactorily uphold their legal obligations to protect their citizens' fundamental right to life and equal access to health care in all cases.

Beyond questions concerning a fundamental right to life and to equal access to adequate health care, governments' responses to the pandemic have raised a number of very serious questions and concerns for human rights defenders.

Under international law, states are required to institute restrictive measures to protect their populations during public health crises. The lockdown measures established by the vast majority of the 28 states included in this report were mandated by this fundamental legal duty. The measures which many states have taken have inevitably adversely impacted many peoples' human rights to freedom of movement, assembly, expression, rights to work, to privacy and to a family life, amongst others. States may legitimately enact lockdown measures, but these are subject to a number of key conditions outlined by such international human rights treaties as the European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR), the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR) and the Charter for Fundamental Rights of the European Union (The Charter). Thus, lockdown measures must be publicly declared, lawful, necessary and proportionate. They must also not be arbitrary or discriminatory in their application or impact. Government restrictions of derogable human rights in response to public health crises must also be based upon credible scientific evidence and legitimate public health goals.

While available evidence and data remains limited, a number of agencies and bodies have been evaluating the effects of governments' response to the pandemic upon individuals' human rights within the 28 countries included in this report. A key such body is the European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights (FRA), which has been closely monitoring and reporting upon the impact of Covid-19 upon human rights within the EU. A series of bulletins beginning in March 2020 has specifically focused upon four interrelated areas of concern:⁵

3. These figures were provided by the European Centre for Disease Prevention: <https://www.ecdc.europa.eu/en/geographical-distribution-2019-ncov-cases>

4. These figures are taken from the official website of the UK government <https://coronavirus.data.gov.uk/>

5. To date the FRA has produced four separate Bulletins dedicated to studying the impact of Covid-19 measures upon human rights within the EU Member States. These may be accessed here: https://fra.europa.eu/sites/default/files/fra_uploads/fra-2020-coronavirus-pandemic-eu-bulletin-july_en.pdf

1. States of emergency or equivalent measures;
2. Measures to contain the spread of Covid-19 and mitigate its impact on social life, education, work, the justice system and travel to and within the EU;
3. The impact of the virus and efforts to limit its spread on particular groups in society, namely people in institutional settings, older persons, persons with disabilities, Roma and Travellers, detainees and victims of domestic violence;
4. Specific areas in which the pandemic has prompted significant fundamental rights issues, including racism and xenophobia, asylum and migration, disinformation, and data protection and privacy.

As time has passed, successive states have relaxed the stringent lockdown measures most instituted in the first few weeks following the WHO declaring a global pandemic. However, a number of emergency measures remain in place within many of the 28 countries. In accordance with its mandate, the FRA has typically focused upon the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union in identifying which rights have been affected by these measures. In this respect, it is clear that lockdown measures enacted under states of emergency have particularly affected fundamental rights such as freedom of movement (Article 45 of the Charter), freedom of assembly and of association (Article 12), and private and family life (Article 7). Peoples' willingness to comply with these restrictions have varied across the 28 countries. However, restrictions on freedom of assembly and of association became particularly controversial as large numbers of people took to the streets to demonstrate against systemic racism following the killing of George Floyd in the USA in late May. States adopted different positions regarding peaceful protest during this period.

In respect of the second area of particular concern regarding the impact of state measures on peoples' daily lives, the FRA has identified a significant collection of fundamental rights which have been adversely impacted as states have sought to restrict peoples' ordinary freedoms to go about their everyday lives. The fundamental rights affected include the rights to liberty and security (Article 6 of the Charter), respect for private and family life (Article 7), freedom of thought, conscience and religion (Article 10), freedom of expression and information (Article 11), freedom of assembly and of association (Article 12), freedom of the arts and sciences (Article 13), and freedom of movement and of residence (Article 45). Children's education has also been severely affected by states closing most schools and educational establishments. While attempts have been made in all of the 28 countries to provide some forms of alternative, online educational delivery, it is clear that these measures have impacted children's fundamental right to an education provided by Articles 14 and 21 of the Charter. There is evidence that children from poorer families have been particularly affected as a consequence of limited access to the internet and inadequate access to computers and laptops.

In addition to education, economic activities have been severely affected by the pandemic. At the time of writing this report, most economic sectors have resumed some form of limited functioning throughout the EU and the UK, whilst typically still been subject to a variety of health and hygiene protocols. To this point, it is clear that a combination of economic restrictions and virus preventative mechanisms have affected a broad range of fundamental rights including: workers' rights to information and consultation (Article 27), protection in the event of unjustified dismissal (Article 30), the right to fair and just working conditions (Article 31), social security and social assistance (Article 34), the right to health (Article 35). They have also impacted the freedom to choose an occupation, the right to engage in work (Article 15), and the freedom to conduct a business (Article 16).

Finally, in respect of the second area of concern highlighted by the FRA, states' responses to Covid-19 have also had a significant effect upon many peoples' access to justice as a consequence of the unavoidable disruption caused to judicial proceedings. Rights particularly impacted include, the right to an effective remedy and a fair trial (Article

47) and, in some cases, the right to equality before the law (Article 20). High rates of infections amongst prisoners and detainees in many prisons across the 28 countries have also raised serious concerns for several rights of detainees and prisoners contained within the Charter and, of course, the ECHR also.

As has been previously acknowledged, states are empowered to restrict a relevant range of derogable human rights during a public health crisis. However, the measures taken must not be discriminatory towards particular groups of individuals. In addition to the bulletins produced by the FRA and by combining the third and fourth areas of concern highlighted by the FRA, there is a growing body of research which testifies to the disproportionate impact of the pandemic upon particularly marginalized and vulnerable groups within many societies.⁶ In stark contrast to early claims that the pandemic did not discriminate and that we were all similarly at risk of the virus, a significant body of thoroughly reliable data indicates the extent to which disproportionately higher numbers of economically disadvantaged people, people from minority racial and ethnic communities, migrants, and the elderly have contracted and died from Covid-19. The virus has further exposed the very many systemic inequalities which exist across the EU and the UK.

The discriminatory character of Covid-19 has also extended to many states' responses to the pandemic, which the FRA and other bodies have carefully documented. There is clear evidence in many countries that elderly people living in care homes have been exposed to the greater likelihood of infection and death as a direct consequence of health authorities' attempts to manage an excessive demand placed upon finite health resources. Thus, legal proceedings have been instituted against the UK government for its alleged failure to protect the right to life of elderly care home residents.⁷

Beyond this, there is also clear evidence that authorities and law enforcement officials have acted in overtly discriminatory ways as they have sought to enforce various lockdown and physical distancing measures by specifically targeting marginalized groups such as the Roma, Travellers, and other racial and ethnic minority people. Thus, reports produced by Amnesty International and the European Network Against Racism have clearly documented discriminatory policing of lockdown measures in several EU countries and the UK.⁸ Racism and hate speech have also been widely documented in many of the 28 countries throughout the course of the pandemic, as particular groups of people have been falsely accused of bearing particular responsibility for the outbreak and spread of the pandemic. In several countries, this hateful climate has been fuelled by statements from prominent politicians and public officials. Finally, women have been generally and disproportionately affected by the pandemic. This is evident in significant increases in reported cases of domestic violence across the EU and UK. A growing body of evidence also points to the disproportionate impact upon many women's fundamental rights as the burden of home-schooling and caring for vulnerable family members has disproportionately fallen upon the female members of many households.⁹

This brief account of the effects of Covid-19 upon the human rights of people residing within the EU and the UK could not possibly have addressed all of the areas of concern

6. See the chapters by Bueno de Mesquita and Fagan in Carla Ferstman and Andrew Fagan (eds.) *Essex Dialogues. A Project of the School of Law and Human Rights Centre*. University of Essex, (2020). Accessible here: <https://www.essex.ac.uk/research-projects/covid-19-law-and-human-rights-essex-dialogues>
7. <https://www.carehome.co.uk/news/article.cfm/id/1628130/Daughter-taking-government-to-court-over-care-home-deaths-told-legal-action-is-not-in-public-interest>
8. European Network Against Racism, *COVID-19 impact on racialised communities: interactive EU-wide map*, 12 May 2020. Available here: <https://www.enar-eu.org/COVID-19-impact-on-racialised-communities-interactive-EU-wide-map> and Amnesty International, *Policing the Pandemic: Human Rights Violations in the Enforcement of Covid-19 Measures in Europe*; (2020). Available here: <https://www.amnesty.org/download/Documents/EUR0125112020ENGLISH.PDF>
9. See Council of Europe, *Women's rights and the Covid-19 pandemic* (2020). Available here: <https://www.coe.int/en/web/genderequality/women-s-rights-and-covid-19>

many human rights defenders have raised. As stated previously, it is far too early to provide a sufficiently comprehensive, detailed and objective account of the challenge which continues to confront us all as the search for a safe, effective and universally available vaccine continues. It is important to recognize that states may legitimately restrict our enjoyment of some derogable human rights during a severe public health crisis. States should not be condemned for acting in accordance with their duties under international law. However, it is also clear that many entirely illegitimate human rights violations have occurred within the EU and the UK during these past few months. The virus has had some of its most devastating effects upon communities of people who have been systemically neglected by various states. To this extent, it has shone a terrible light upon the discrimination which many communities of people have been subjected to within the EU and UK for so long.

Dr Andrew Fagan
Director, Human Rights Centre, University of Essex

2020 NON-FINANCIAL RATING OF THE 27 EU MEMBER STATES AND UNITED KINGDOM: RANKING

Overall		
Rank	Score	Country
1	74.11	Sweden
2	66.94	Finland
3	64.79	Denmark
4	64.77	Austria
5	63.50	Netherlands
6	63.15	Italy
7	62.96	Germany
8	62.88	Spain
9	61.62	Portugal
10	59.33	France
11	59.12	Slovenia
12	59.10	Ireland
13	58.59	United Kingdom
14	58.37	Belgium
15	57.59	Czech Republic
16	57.33	Lithuania
17	55.80	Croatia
18	55.22	Luxembourg
19	51.83	Romania
20	50.57	Latvia
21	50.49	Poland
22	50.02	Hungary
23	49.90	Estonia
24	49.69	Slovakia
25	48.77	Greece
26	45.71	Cyprus
27	43.25	Malta
28	39.83	Bulgaria

PART 1: METHODOLOGY

1. Scope of the study

Member States

This report extends to include all of the existing Member States of the European Union and the United Kingdom. Since the report was written during 2020, and the Brexit was still not formalised, we decided to include United Kingdom in this report.

Human Rights Issues

Human rights are widely considered to provide a fundamental touch-stone for the regulation of state conduct. The moral imperative of human rights takes concrete form through a number of international and regional treaties. All of the states included in this report are parties to the International Bill of Human Rights, which includes the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (1948), the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (1966) and the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (1966). All of the states included in this report are also party to the European Convention for Human Rights and are thus legally obliged to respect, protect and fulfil civil and political rights (e.g. the right to be free from torture, freedom of expression, the right to a fair trial etc.) as well as economic, social and cultural rights (e.g. the right to housing, to the highest attainable standard of health, the right to education etc.).

In keeping with previous editions of this report, the current study evaluates and compares all EU Member states and UK' "performance" in the field of human rights and on the basis of the comprehensive and binding body of human rights law. In defining the content of each right, international and regional jurisprudence – stemming either from judicial decisions or interpretations by international monitoring bodies (e.g. General Comments by UN Treaty Monitoring Bodies, the outcome of Universal Period Process undertaken by the UN Human Rights Council etc.) – provides essential guidance on what governments must do to discharge their human rights obligations. Such obligations include extraterritorial obligations, which are increasingly recognized as fundamental to human rights protection in a globalized context. This study takes these obligations into account by drawing on the Maastricht Principles (2012) and includes a section on the international dimensions of Member State obligations.

This 2020 edition of the report was produced against the backdrop of the global Covid-19 pandemic and the subsequent popular protests against systemic racism, following the killing of George Floyd in the USA in late May. Both Covid-19 and the growing recognition of the prevalence of systemic racism within the states included in this report will have profound effects for human rights in the months and years ahead. However, we were not able to radically revise the content report in the light of these two profound global crises for the simple reason of the lack of sufficiently available objective and reliable data for both at this point in time. We have included some new indicators designed to provide relevant data on human rights issues which are directly affected by Covid-19. We have also revised the text accompanying our analysis of racial discrimination. We have also included a detailed section that engages with some of the key human rights challenges of Covid-19 for the states included in this report. We expect the subsequent 2022 edition of this report will be substantially revised in order to provide a fully comprehensive and objective set of measurements of states' human rights records in the light of Covid-19 and the ongoing struggle against systemic racism. Astute readers of these bi-annual reports will notice various revisions to the indicators included from one edition to the next. In this edition, we have added several new indicators in an effort to more comprehensively measure rising socio-economic inequalities within the EU Member States and the UK. Socio-economic

inequality within otherwise affluent states has attracted increased and deserved attention within the human rights community and any sufficiently detailed and robust analysis of states' human rights performance should include such measures. We have also removed several indicators from this edition of the report. Typically, indicators were removed where sufficiently recent and reliable data was no longer available and where simply reproducing the data from the 2018 edition of this report appeared methodologically unsound.

As with previous editions of this study, the 2020 report is divided into three main sections: Section A examines states' respect for human rights at the domestic level; Section B focuses upon states' conduct in respect of their support for human rights at the international level; and Section C relates to protection of the environment.

For each section, the study follows a multi-layered structure: section>criterion>issue>indicator. While not claiming to be exhaustive, each of the selected issues and indicators reflects a specific aspect of the legal and social reality of EU Member States and the UK, as well as risks of human rights violations, such as those linked to discrimination or social exclusion.

Measuring human rights performance based solely on quantitative data is a difficult task and presents its limits. For certain human rights practitioners and advocates, an analysis of a country's human rights performance based only on a limited list of quantitative indicators presents an incomplete description of the reality. Others could argue that measuring states using the same quantitative indicators without taking into account, for example, their history or their economic power, creates further division and discrimination between north and south, and east and west. We acknowledge these views, and we share them. However, this report does not intend to paint an exhaustive picture of the countries' human rights performance, but it intends to construct an objective, comparable and comprehensive methodology which can be used as part of an investment decision. The methodology is updated every two years, and we are continuously rethinking how to improve and better overcome the limits of this type of methodology. In this regard, we welcome opinions and views on how better approach this task.

Protection of the environment and human rights

The inclusion of a specific section on protection of the environment is in line with FIDH's approach and mandate. FIDH promotes and defends the indivisibility of human rights and recognises the extent to which our future is dependent upon securing a sustainable environment for all. FIDH recognises the intrinsic relationship between environmental preservation and the protection of human rights, as well as the urgent need to address the issue of climate change. The inclusion of environmental criteria in this study was therefore inevitable. This approach is in line with the current work on climate change and human rights of the Office of the High Commissioner on Human Rights,¹⁰ which affirms that the human rights framework spells out the responsibilities of duty bearers to rights-holders with respect to all human rights harms, including those caused by environmental degradation. However, as with previous editions of this study, the methodology used for this section differs from the first two sections. Due to the specificities of this component, FIDH relied on external expertise to choose and evaluate the relevant criteria, issues and indicators. Although FIDH would have favoured an integrated approach by which environmental criteria could be directly integrated into the study's human rights criteria, this is not presently possible, because there are still very few experts working on both human rights and environmental standards, and there continues to be a lack of reliable and sufficiently objective quantitative data for measuring this relationship.

FIDH has therefore worked in collaboration with LBPAM, using Beyond Ratings data and the GREaT framework, that has been adjusted for countries. The criteria included in this report fall within the following categories: pollution, waste and circular economy and adapting and

10. Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights, *OHCHR and climate change*, available at: <https://www.ohchr.org/en/issues/hrandclimatechange/pages/hrclimatechangeindex.aspx>

contribution to the energy transition. From a human rights perspective, the methodology and criteria used present certain limits, since they might not sufficiently capture the possible human rights consequences of environmental degradation and climate change. However, the inclusion of these criteria remains essential, as they provide a perspective on state efforts regarding environmental protection

2. Structure of the study

In total, twelve human rights and one environmental criteria were carefully selected as indicators of states' performance in these areas.

Section A. States' respect for human rights at the national level

- I. Gender equality and women's rights
- II. Non-discrimination
- III. Rights of migrants and refugees
- IV. Good governance
- V. Social cohesion/economic and social rights
- VI. Judicial system
- VII. Freedom of expression and right to information
- VIII. Labour rights

Section B. States' respect for human rights at the international level

- IX. International justice and human rights promotion
- X. Overseas development assistance/financial contributions to UN
- XI. Arms control
- XII. Promoting corporate social responsibility at home and abroad

Section C. States' respect for the environment and sustainable development

- XIII Environmental Management

3. Choice of indicators and method of calculation

Identifying human rights-based indicators

The indicators used within each of the 12 human rights criteria are derived from the content of internationally recognised human rights, taking into account legally binding human rights obligations and principles inherent to all legally established human rights. As such, this study promotes a human rights-based approach (HRBA) to policy-making in ensuring that both human rights standards and principles are integrated into state decisions. The HRBA is often translated into a set of principles known as "PANTHER": Participation – Accountability – Non-discrimination – Transparency – Human dignity – Empowerment – Rule of law. Each indicator selected embraces these principles.

Despite being more difficult to quantitatively measure it was decided that some qualitative indicators would be retained as these are often the only indicators capable of reflecting specific human rights dimensions. The present study seeks to apply the aforementioned basic parameters as consistently as possible.

- Indicator categories

The methodology adopted here makes a distinction between three indicator categories: structural, process and outcome. This methodology is commonly used to measure human rights performance and is utilized by the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR) in its assessment of states' commitment to human rights.

The distinction aids clarity but is also intended to provide the user with recurring reference points in respect of how far the process of implementation has developed in a given country.

It also, at least partly, prevents the favouring of countries with greater financial resources at their disposal to the detriment of poorer countries that are nevertheless showing a willingness to make progress. Wherever possible, at least one indicator from each category has been included under each criterion.

- **Obstacles and challenges**

Successfully meeting the essential requirements of objectivity and transparency places certain limitations on a project of this nature. A basic prerequisite is the availability of up-to-date and comparable data for each country across each of the criteria. Suffice it to say that this report included only reliable data from multiple sources.

At the current time, human rights appear to be facing many obstacles and challenges across many of the EU Member States and the UK. Thus, in addition, to the continuing impact of Covid-19, the recognition of systemic racism, and continuing socio-economic inequalities, commitments to human rights have been shown to be increasingly precarious and under strain. The emergence and spread of so-called right-wing Populism in several of the states included in this report point towards the electoral appeal of attitudes which are hostile towards many of the core norms of human rights. Nationalism and nativism have also risen to prominence within several states in ways which have further adversely impacted the conditions many people experience. Where reliable and objectively comparative data exists, we have provided indicators for the effects of these challenges upon human rights within the EU Member States and the UK.

Scoring system

The method of calculation (MoC) used to score the indicators in the 2020 report follows on from that used for previous editions of the report. Indicators can be distinguished into quantitative and qualitative indicators. In both cases these are scored on a scale from positive to negative integers with zero as the midpoint of scale.

MoC for quantitative indicators

The quantitative indicators in this report have numerical values. The MoC for quantitative indicators was primarily calculated based on the distribution of the underlying data of each indicator. The mean plus/minus ½ standard deviations marked the midpoint of scale. Each further unit; i.e. score category, away from the midpoint is/was equivalent to ½ standard deviations (see table for example of setting bounds of scores – for the higher the numerical value the higher the score). If the distribution is/was heavily skewed to one side, further units, i.e. score categories, were added on. If results of this systematic approach were found to be contrary to a normative judgement of the minimum protection to be accorded by states for the right under consideration, then the bounds of the units were adjusted. If so, this was/is indicated and elaborated on.

Score	Lower Bound	Upper Bound
-2		<'-1 Lower Bound'
-1	'-1 Upper Bound' - ½ Standard Deviation	'0 Lower Bound' - 0.01
0	Mean - ½ Standard Deviation	Mean + ½ Standard Deviation
+1	'0 Upper Bound' +0.01	'+1 Lower Bound' + ½ Standard Deviation
+2	>'+1 Upper Bound'	
If heavily skewed to one side, add more scoring categories (= ½ Standard Deviations) to that side		

The scores for each indicator were transformed into a scale with the mean score for countries on that indicator acting as the midpoint of the scale. The intervals and upper and lower ends of the scale were then determined on the basis of two factors:

- A normative judgement of the minimum protection to be accorded by states for the right under consideration, and;
- Ensuring that the score for a point between the upper and lower end points on the scale accounts for an equal number of units as other points on the scale.

Using the country average facilitated the use of a less biased middle score and allows for substantively meaningful interpretation. The MoC for the environmental indicators was calculated in a manner similar to the quantitative indicators.

MoC for qualitative indicators

The category of qualitative indicators included measures of qualitative information such as state ratification of international or regional treaties on human rights amongst others. In accordance with FIDH's stance of encouraging ratification and discouraging reservations, states were rewarded for ratification and penalised for reservations or non-ratification. With the exception of the indicator measuring implementation of the Convention on the Prohibition of Anti-Personnel Mines, all other indicators were limited in scope to structural rather than process aspects of measuring a right. Other qualitative indicators included in the study captured the existence and scope of legislation, policies and programmes such as legislation legalising same-sex partnerships, programmes educating women about all forms of violence, etc. The scoring of these indicators was based on a normative judgement of the minimum standards that states should adhere to. Whenever possible, we also sought to capture variations in policies and the implementation of these policies by the states included in the study by assigning scores on a linear progression of the basic protection to a progressive realization of these rights.

Missing data

Countries have not been penalised for lack of data availability. The scores on the indicators have been marked as 'n/a' and counted as zero. These scores have been reconsidered if there is evidence to show that the state has deliberately not collected the data or made available access to the data with the aim of manipulating its human rights record. Thus, the exception to the scoring rule has been the indicator measuring the transparency of the state's budgetary process and the access that citizens and non-citizens have to this information. Since transparency and access to data is the content of the indicator, we assume that lack of data availability is a deliberate act on the part of the state to prevent access. States that have not made data available for this indicator have been penalised in this case.

Aggregate scoring (criterion-level)

The scores for each criterion were added together and this criterion score was converted to a scale of 0-10 and/or 0-5. This conversion is an approach adopted in order to standardize the scores and ensure that each criterion has a more equal weight in the scoring. It was decided that the weight of four human rights criteria should be halved – namely, the scores for the rights of migrants and refugees (Criterion 3), national judicial system (Criterion 6), freedom of expression and the right to information (Criterion 7), and the official development assistance/financial contributions to the United Nations (Criterion 10). This was done to reflect the number of indicators each criterion consists of to some extent. Each of these criteria had fewer than five indicators, in contrast to the remaining indicators which have five and more indicators. These criteria were converted to scores from 0-5. Thus, each state could score a maximum of 100 and a minimum of 0 on the 12 human rights criteria and between 10 and 0 on the two environmental criteria.

Overall weighting and ranking

The weighted sum of all human rights criteria for each country is the human rights criteria score; and the weighted sum of all environmental criteria for each country is the environment criteria score. The human rights and environmental criteria scores were then aggregated as follows. The human rights criteria score was weighted by 0.7 and the environment criteria score weighted by 0.3. These weighted scores were then summarized into a single score for each country. This is consistent with the approach included in the 2018 report and reflects the human rights emphasis of the study whilst giving due importance to environmental rights and protection. These aggregated scores are the final scores, and countries were ranked from 1 to 28 based on these final scores.

Data collection process

Given the need to base this report on objectively accurate and reliable sources, the vast bulk of the data collection process consisted of on-line research of a comprehensive range of authoritative data bases and data sets. Where necessary, internationally recognised human rights professionals were also consulted, including academics, UN Special Rapporteurs and representatives of leading NGOs.

Online research was conducted using a variety of sources such as Eurostat, the information portals of inter-governmental (e.g. European Commission, Council of Europe, FRA, OSCE, OECD, OHCHR, UNHCR, ILO, WHO) as well as non-governmental organisations and institutions (e.g. Reporters without Borders, ICC Coalition, Transparency International, Centre for Law and Democracy, International Trade Union Confederation, Center for Reproductive Rights, Tax Justice Network, ILGA, Access Info).

PART II: INDICATORS AND RESULTS

SECTION A: STATES' RESPECT FOR HUMAN RIGHTS AT THE DOMESTIC LEVEL

Criterion 1: Gender Equality and Women's Rights

While some progress has been made in some aspects within some countries, discrimination against women remains widespread across the EU and the UK and is inadequately addressed by many governments. Gender equality and women's rights are considered a central issue that is commonly applied transversally to any human rights study. Five main issues have been identified: political participation of women, gender and employment, gender and education, violence against women and reproductive rights. The results of this criterion differ from other well-known rankings such as the Gender Equality Index of the European Institute for Gender Equality. The differences can be explained by the type of indicators used in this report. Compared to the ranking mentioned before, in this criterion political participation of women has higher weight than other areas such as employment or financial resources, due to the number of indicators added per area. Moreover, the inclusion of two indicators on violence against women, also affect the results. Indeed, in countries which normally score higher in the Gender Equality Index of the European Institute for Gender Equality, there is a higher percentage of surveyed women which report that they have suffered gender-based violence. Contrary, in countries which normally have lower scores in gender equality, less surveyed women report incidents of gender-based violence. As mentioned below, it is important to notice that a variety of cultural, religious and socio-economic are highly likely to impact the ability and willingness of some women to report acts of violence towards them.

• Issue 1: Political Participation of Women

The rationale behind these five indicators is to examine the representation of women in all three branches of government: legislative, executive and the judiciary. It is important to note that advances made in the area of, for example, the political participation of women, must be set against the disturbing development of female Members of Parliament being increasingly targeted through social media and online attacks.

Indicator 1.1. Percentage of women in the national parliament/assembly (Upper and Lower Houses)

Score	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3	+4
MoC	n/a	n/a	<19.60	19.60 - 24.35	24.36 - 33.86	33.87 - 38.62	>38.62	n/a	n/a

Source: European Institute for Gender Equality, Politics, Parliament and Assemblies, September 2019. Accessed 13/01/20

Indicator 1.2. Quotas for the representation of women included in the electoral system for elections to national legislature (percentage)

MoC	Score	Description
	+2	Quota >30%
	+1	Quota <=30% and Voluntary Political Party Quota or inconsistent quota system
	0	No legislative quota but only Voluntary Political Party Quota
	-1	No legislative or Voluntary Political Party Quota

Source: Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance: Gender Quotas Database. Accessed 13/1/2020

Indicator 1.3. Percentage of women in the senior minister positions of national governments

Score	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3	+4
MoC	n/a	n/a	<14.68	14.68 - 21.95	21.96 - 36.51	36.52 - 43.79	>43.79	n/a	n/a

Source: European Institute for Gender Equality, Politics, Governments & other political executives, (September 2019). Accessed 13/01/20

Indicator 1.4. Percentage of women in level 1 administrative position in ministries or government departments

Score	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3	+4
MoC	n/a	n/a	<19.96	19.96 - 26.51	26.52 - 39.63	39.64 - 46.19	>46.19	n/a	n/a

Source: European Institute for Gender Equality, Public Administration (National administrations: top two tiers of administrators by function of government), 2018. Accessed 14/01/20

Indicator 1.5. Percentage of women in the highest judicial body: Judges of Supreme Courts (national)

Score	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3	+4
MoC	n/a	n/a	<18.57	18.57 - 27.55	27.56 - 45.52	45.53 - 54.52	>54.52	n/a	n/a

Source: European Institute for Gender Equality, Judiciary, National Courts, 2019. Accessed 14/01/20

• Issue 2: Gender and Employment

These two indicators track the continuing pay gap between men and women and the under-representation of women on the boards of commercial businesses.

Indicator 1.6. Size of Gender pay gap at the national level (percentage in unadjusted form)

Score	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3	+4
MoC	n/a	n/a	>19.35	16.67 - 19.35	11.31 - 16.66	8.62 - 11.30	<8.62	n/a	n/a

Source: European Commission, Eurostat Database, 2017 (unless indicated otherwise). Accessed 14/01/20

Indicator 1.7. Percentage of women in the highest decision-making body (board members, largest listed companies) in the private business sector

Score	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3	+4
MoC	n/a	n/a	<13.94	13.94 - 18.86	18.87 - 28.71	28.72 - 33.64	>33.64	n/a	n/a

Source: European Institute for Gender Equality, Business, Largest Listed Companies, presidents, board members and employee representatives, 2019 B-1. Accessed 14/01/20

• Issue 3: Gender and Education

This single indicator examines whether and to what extent gender stereotypes continue to hamper women or girls in their pursuit of diverse high-level qualifications.

Indicator 1.8. Percentage of the female population (20 -24 years) having completed at least upper secondary education, post-secondary non-tertiary, first and second stage tertiary (levels 3-8)

Score	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3	+4
MoC	n/a	n/a	<82.44	82.44 - 85.11	85.12 - 90.46	90.47 - 93.14	>93.14	n/a	n/a

Source: European Commission, Eurostat Database, 2018. Accessed 14/01/20

• Issue 4: Violence against women

Three indicators examine whether the government is actively gathering data of violence against women and is committed towards tackling this human rights violation through education and law. It is important to acknowledge that a variety of cultural, religious and socio-economic are highly likely to impact the ability and willingness of some women to report acts of violence towards them.

Indicator 1.9 Percentage of women surveyed who have experienced physical and/or sexual violence by any other person since the age of 15

Score	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3	+4
MoC	n/a	n/a	>41.20	36.53 - 41.20	27.19 - 36.52	22.52 - 27.18	<22.52	n/a	n/a

Source: European Agency for Fundamental Rights (FRA): Violence against women – an EU wide survey, 2014. Accessed 14/01/20

Indicator 1.10 Percentage of women surveyed who have experienced sexual harassment since the age of 15

Score	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3	+4
MoC	n/a	n/a	>56.93	49.38 - 56.93	34.27 - 49.37	26.71 - 34.16	<26.71	n/a	n/a

Source: European Agency for Fundamental Rights (FRA): Violence against women – an EU wide survey, 2014. Accessed 14/01/20

Indicator 1.11: Ratification of the council of Europe Convention on preventing and combating violence against women and domestic violence

MoC	Score	Description
	+3	Ratification or accession with no reservations
	+2	Ratification or accession with reservations
	+1	Signature
	0	Signature with reservations
	-2	No signature, ratification or accession

Source, Council of Europe. Accessed 14/01/20

• **Issue 5: Reproductive rights**

This indicator examines whether the state is committed to finding a balance between the right to life and women's reproductive freedom which, in particular, sufficiently respects the basic principles of individual reproductive self-determination and non-discrimination.

Indicator 1.12: Decriminalisation of abortion

MoC	Score	Description
	+1	Legal for up to 12 weeks of pregnancy without restriction to reason
	0	Legal for up to 12 weeks of pregnancy without restriction to reason but parental or spousal authorization required
	-1	Legal for up to 10 weeks of pregnancy without restriction to reason or up to 12 weeks of pregnancy on socioeconomic grounds and to save the woman's life, physical health and mental health
	-2	Legal to preserve physical or mental health or the woman's life
	-3	Prohibited altogether or allowed to save the woman's life

Source: Center for Reproductive Rights, New York, World Abortion Laws, 2019. Accessed 15/01/20

• **Issue 6: Gender, Poverty and Social inclusion**

This is a new issue which has been added to the 2020 report. While socio-economic inequality has increased across many of the EU Member States and the UK in recent years, women typically bear the brunt of poverty and social inclusion within many poor households.

Indicator 1.13: Percentage of women at risk of poverty or social exclusion (total age)

Score	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3	+4
MoC	n/a	n/a	>28.68	25.85 - 28.68	20.17 - 25.84	17.32 - 20.16	<17.32	n/a	n/a

Source: European Commission, Eurostat Database, 2018. Accessed 15/01/20

Criterion 1 Gender Equality and Women's Rights

Countries	Issue 1 Political Participation of Women						Issue 2 Gender and Empl.		Issue 3 Gender and Education	Issue 4: Violence against women				Issue 5: Repro- ductive rights		Issue 6	Aggregate Scores		
	Indicator 1.1	Indicator 1.2	Indicator 1.3	Indicator 1.4	Indicator 1.5	Indicator 1.6	Indicator 1.7	Indicator 1.8	Indicator 1.9	Indicator 1.10	Indicator 1.11	Indicator 1.12	Indicator 1.13	Raw score	Conversion to 10	Conversion to 12.5			
Range	+2 to -2	+2 to -2	+2 to -2	+2 to -2	+2 to -2	+2 to -2	+2 to -2	+2 to -2	+2 to -2	+2 to -2	+3 to -2	+1 to -3	+2 to -2	+26 to -27	0 to +10	0 to +12.5			
Austria	1	0	2	0	0	-2	0	0	2	1	3	1	1	9	6.79	8.49			
Belgium	2	2	0	-2	-1	2	2	0	0	0	3	1	0	9	6.79	8.49			
Bulgaria	0	-1	0	0	2	0	-1	0	0	2	1	1	-2	2	5.47	6.84			
Croatia	-1	2	-1	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	2	0	-1	4	5.85	7.31			
Cyprus	-2	0	-1	0	0	0	-2	0	2	1	2	-1	0	-1	4.91	6.13			
Czech Republic	-1	0	0	-1	-2	-2	-1	2	0	0	1	0	2	-2	4.72	5.90			
Denmark	2	-1	0	-2	0	0	1	1	-2	-2	2	0	2	1	5.28	6.60			
Estonia	0	-1	-1	-1	-1	-2	-2	1	0	0	3	1	-1	-4	4.34	5.42			
Finland	2	-1	2	0	0	-1	2	-2	-2	-2	2	-1	2	1	5.28	6.60			
France	1	2	2	0	1	0	2	0	-2	-2	2	1	1	8	6.60	8.25			
Germany	0	0	2	-2	0	-2	1	0	0	-1	2	1	1	2	5.47	6.84			
Greece	-1	2	-2	2	1	0	-2	1	1	0	2	0	-2	2	5.47	6.84			
Hungary	-2	0	-2	-2	1	0	-1	-2	0	1	1	1	0	-5	4.15	5.19			
Ireland	-1	2	0	-2	-1	0	0	2	1	0	2	-3	0	0	5.09	6.37			
Italy	1	2	0	1	0	2	2	0	1	0	3	1	-1	12	7.36	9.20			
Latvia	0	-1	-1	0	2	0	0	2	-1	0	1	0	-2	0	5.09	6.37			
Lithuania	-1	0	-2	2	0	0	-2	-1	0	1	1	0	-2	-4	4.34	5.42			
Luxembourg	0	0	0	0	-1	2	-2	1	-1	-1	3	1	0	2	5.47	6.84			
Malta	-2	0	-2	-1	-2	0	-2	2	2	0	2	-3	0	-6	3.96	4.95			
Netherlands	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	-2	-2	-2	3	1	2	3	5.66	7.08			
Poland	0	2	-2	2	0	2	0	-2	2	2	2	-2	1	7	6.42	8.02			
Portugal	1	2	0	0	-1	0	0	0	1	2	3	0	0	8	6.60	8.25			
Romania	-1	0	0	2	2	2	-2	1	0	2	2	1	-2	7	6.42	8.02			
Slovakia	-1	0	0	0	2	-2	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	2	5.47	6.84			
Slovenia	-1	2	0	2	0	2	0	-2	2	0	2	0	2	9	6.79	8.49			
Spain	2	2	2	1	-1	0	0	0	2	0	3	0	-1	10	6.98	8.73			
Sweden	2	0	2	1	-1	0	2	2	-2	-2	2	-1	1	6	6.23	7.78			
United Kingdom	0	0	0	0	-1	-2	1	-2	-2	-2	1	-1	0	-8	3.58	4.48			

Criterion 2: Non- Discrimination (except sex-based discrimination)

Besides issues of sex-based discrimination considered in the previous criterion, the prohibition of discrimination on the basis of race, religion, language, political opinion, national or social origin, sexual orientation, gender or other identity status is a fundamental human rights principle which entails according particular attention to vulnerable groups and marginalised communities. This section specifically addresses discrimination on the grounds of sexual orientation, gender identity, belonging to a minority, disability and age. It is important to note that, once again, our ability to provide a reliable and comparatively objective set of measurements for many of these forms of discrimination have been hampered by states deploying significantly different definitions and reporting methods. This is particularly the case in respect of hate crime and hate speech. The absence of reliable and comparable data which captures systemic racism in countries weakens the comprehensiveness of this criterion. However, it also shows the need to continue analysing and reporting this human rights violation, in order to achieve higher standardization of definitions and official reporting methods.

The countries with higher performance (more than 8 out of 10 points) are Austria and Finland, which present stronger legal frameworks and recognition of rights in this area, either through national legislation or ratification of international Conventions with no reservations. On the other side of the ranking, Bulgaria and Latvia have less than 4 out of 10 points, and present weaker or non-existing legislation in certain areas and high percentage of people at risk of poverty or social exclusion with 65 years and older or with some or severe level of activity limitation.

• Issue 1: Protection of sexual orientation and gender identity

The following three indicators measure discrimination against homosexual couples in respect of marriage and adoption and gauge the extent to which offences related to homophobia or gender identity are punished by law.

Indicator 2.1. Existence of Legislation recognising the legality of same-sex partnerships

MoC	Score	Description
	+3	Marriage in all or most regions
	+2	Registered partnership with similar rights to marriage only
	+1	Registered partnership with limited rights only
	0	Cohabitation only
	-2	Currently same-sex partnerships are not legally recognised

Source: ILGA, Europe, Rainbow Index, May 2019. Accessed 15/01/20

Indicator 2.2. Legislative provisions concerning adoption by same sex couples

MoC	Score	Description
	+2	Both second parent adoption and joint adoption
	+1	Second parent adoption
	0	No adoption rights but some parental authority and responsibilities for same sex couples
	-2	No adoption rights

Source: ILGA, Europe, Rainbow Index, May 2019. Accessed 15/01/20

Indicator 2.3 Criminal law provisions concerning offences related to sexual orientation and gender identity.

MoC	Score	Description
	+1 to +5	Cumulative count of each law; 1 point per law: Hate crime laws (sexual orientation) / Hate speech law (sexual orientation) / Hate crime law (gender identity) / Hate crime law (intersex)
	0	No laws but only policies tackling hate crimes related to sexual orientation and/or gender identity / intersex
	-2	No laws or policies

Source: ILGA, Europe, Rainbow Index, May 2019. Accessed 15/01/20

• Issue 2: Protection of national minorities and Roma people rights

The first two indicators examine whether the state is legally committed to the protection of national minorities and their special interests. The remaining indicator aims to examine whether state authorities act against political, social and economic marginalisation of Roma people.

Indicator 2.4: Ratification of the Framework convention for the protection of national minorities

MoC	Score	Description
	+3	Ratification or accession with no reservations
	+2	Ratification or accession with reservations
	+1	Signature
	-2	No signature, ratification or accession

Source: Council of Europe. Accessed 15/01/20

Indicator 2.5: Ratification of the European Charter for Regional or Minority languages

MoC	Score	Description
	+3	Ratification or accession with no reservations
	+2	Ratification or accession with reservations
	+1	Signature
	-2	No signature, ratification or accession

Source: Council of Europe. Accessed 15/01/20

Indicator 2.6: Measures taken by states to fight discrimination against Roma, including Travellers (by relevance to the respective sub areas of the Council recommendation / EU Framework for National Roma Integration Strategies)

MoC	Score	Description
	+1 to +6	Cumulative count for each measure taken by member states; 1/2 point per measure taken: Fight antigypsyism by raising awareness about the benefits of Roma integration / Fight antigypsyism by raising awareness on diversity / Fight antigypsyism by combatting anti-Roma rhetoric and hate speech / Fight violence, including domestic violence, against women and girls / Fight (multiple) discrimination faced by children and women involving all relevant stakeholders / Fight underage and forced marriage / Ensure the effective practical enforcement of directive 2000/43/EC / Fight trafficking in human beings / Implement desegregation measures regionally and locally / Ensure that eviction are in compliance with EU law and international human rights obligations / Fight begging involving children, through the enforcement of legislation / Promote the co-operation between Member States in situations with cross border dimension
	0	Claim of no Roma population
	-2	States that have not undertaken any of these measures

Source: European Commission, Annual Report (2019) 'Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament and the Council: Report on the implementation of national Roma integration strategies – 2019. Accessed 15/01/20

• Issue 3: Social inclusion of persons with disabilities

In addition to a long-established indicator addressing states' legal commitment to the aims of the UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, we have added an additional indicator concerned with the percentage of disabled people at risk of poverty or social exclusion.

Indicator 2.7: Ratification of UN Convention on rights of persons with disabilities

MoC	Score	Description
	+3	Ratification or accession with no reservations
	+2	Ratification or accession with reservations
	+1	Signature
	0	Cohabitation only
	-2	No signature, ratification or accession

Source: United Nations Treaty Collection (as of January 2020). Accessed 21/1/20

Indicator 2.8: Percentage of people at risk of poverty or social exclusion by level of activity limitation (some or severe level of activity limitation)

Score •	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3	+4
MoC	n/a	>42.02	38.30 - 42.02	34.57 - 38.29	27.13 - 34.56	23.40 - 27.12	<23.40	n/a	n/a

Source: European Commission, Eurostat Database, 2018, Accessed 20/01/20

• **Issue 4: Protection against age discrimination**

The two indicators measure to what extent older persons and minors are at risk of economic and social exclusion.

Indicator 2.9: Percentage of people at risk of poverty or social exclusion rate for persons 65 years and older

Score	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3	+4
MoC	n/a	>39.14	33.52 - 39.14	27.88 - 33.51	16.62 - 27.87	10.98 - 16.61	<10.98	n/a	n/a

Source: European Commission, Eurostat Database, 2018. Accessed 22/01/20

Indicator 2.10: Percentage of people at risk of poverty or social exclusion rate for persons less than 18 years

Score	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3	+4
MoC	n/a	>32.54	29.42 - 32.54	26.28 - 29.41	20.01 - 26.27	16.87 - 20.00	<16.87	n/a	n/a

Source: European Commission, Eurostat Database, 2018 Accessed 22/01/20

Criterion 2 Non-Discrimination (except sex-based discrimination)														
Countries	Issue 1 Existence of Legislation recognising the legality of same-sex partnerships			Issue 2 Protection of national minorities and Roma people rights			Issue 3 Social inclusion of persons with disabilities			Issue 4 Protection against age discrimination			Aggregate Scores	
	Indicator 2.1	Indicator 2.2	Indicator 2.3	Indicator 2.4	Indicator 2.5	Indicator 2.6	Indicator 2.7	Indicator 2.8	Indicator 2.9	Indicator 2.10	Raw score	Conversion to 10		
Range	+3 to -2	+2 to -2	+5 to -2	+3 to -2	+3 to -2	+6.5 to -2	+3 to -2	+2 to -3	+2 to -3	+2 to -3	+31.5 to -23	0 to +10		
Austria	3	2	2	3	3	4.5	3	2	1	0	21.5	8.17		
Belgium	3	2	3	1	-2	1	3	-1	0	0	11	6.24		
Bulgaria	-2	-2	-2	3	-2	1.5	3	-3	-3	-3	-6.5	3.03		
Croatia	2	-2	4	3	2	0.5	3	-2	-1	0	11.5	6.33		
Cyprus	2	-2	2	3	3	0	2	-2	0	0	10	6.06		
Czech Republic	1	-2	-2	3	3	2	3	0	1	2	11	6.24		
Denmark	3	2	2	3	3	0	3	0	2	2	20	7.89		
Estonia	1	-2	1	3	-2	0.5	3	-3	-3	1	2.5	4.68		
Finland	3	2	4	3	3	0	3	2	1	2	21	8.07		
France	3	2	4	-2	1	0	3	2	2	0	13	6.61		
Germany	3	2	0	3	3	0	3	-1	0	1	15	6.97		
Greece	2	-2	5	1	-2	0	2	-1	0	-3	3	4.77		
Hungary	2	-2	4	3	3	1.5	3	0	1	0	15.5	7.06		
Ireland	3	2	1	3	-2	0	2	-2	0	0	9	5.87		
Italy	2	-2	-2	3	1	3.5	3	-1	0	-2	6.5	5.41		
Latvia	-2	-2	-2	3	-2	1	3	-3	-3	0	-4	3.49		
Lithuania	-2	-2	2	3	-2	2	3	-3	-3	-1	0	4.22		
Luxembourg	3	2	4	1	3	0	3	-1	1	0	17	7.34		
Malta	3	2	5	2	1	0	2	-1	0	0	15	6.97		
Netherlands	3	2	1	3	3	2	3	2	1	2	20	7.89		
Poland	-2	-2	-2	3	3	0	2	-1	0	1	3	4.77		
Portugal	3	2	4	3	-2	1	3	-1	0	0	14	6.79		
Romania	-2	-2	1	3	3	0	3	-2	-1	-3	2	4.59		
Slovakia	-2	-2	2	3	3	1.5	2	2	1	0	8.5	5.78		
Slovenia	2	1	1	3	3	0	3	0	0	2	15	6.97		
Spain	3	2	4	3	3	2.5	3	-1	0	-2	18.5	7.61		
Sweden	3	2	2	3	3	1	3	-1	1	0	18	7.52		
United Kingdom	3	2	2	3	3	1	2	-1	0	-2	14	6.79		

Criterion 3: Rights of Migrants and Refugees (Asylum Rights/Alien Rights)

The rise of so-called right-wing Populism in several EU Member States and the UK has coincided with a long-standing hostile climate towards the rights of migrants and asylum seekers across the EU and the UK. While the hostility directed towards groups of people represented as “outsiders” takes many forms, we have sought to measure this particular criterion by focusing upon three indicators. It was discussed to include other indicators that would have provided a more comprehensive picture of this criterion. However, the absence of reliable, updated comparable data has hampered our ability to include other areas.

With this caveat in mind, it is easier to understand why that the country with the highest score in this indicator is Czech Republic. The country scores 5 out of 5 points and has a score difference of more than 1,5 points with the rest of better performing countries (Italy, Lithuania, Sweden and UK). The countries with worse scores are Luxemburg, Ireland, Belgium and Greece.

Indicator 3.1: Ratification of the Convention on the participation of foreigners in public life at local level

MoC	Score	Description
	+3	Ratification or accession with no reservations
	+2	Ratification or accession with reservations
	+1	Signature
	0	Signature with reservations
	-2	No signature, ratification or accession

Source: Council of Europe, (as at February 2020). Accessed 05/02/20

Indicator 3.2: First instance decisions on applications by citizenship, age and sex. Annual aggregated data (rounded) – Extra EU 28, Total Positive Decisions divided by the sum of Total Positive Decisions and Rejected Applications

Score	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3	+4
MoC	n/a	n/a	<42.70	42.70 - 50.65	50.66 - 66.56	66.57 - 74.52	>74.52	n/a	n/a

Source: European Commission, Eurostat Database, 2018, Accessed 24/02/20

Indicator 3.3: Percentage Employment rates by sex, age and country of birth, Non EU28 nor reporting country (15-64 yrs)

Score	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3	+4
MoC	n/a	n/a	<58.06	58.06 - 62.21	62.22 - 70.53	70.54 - 74.69	>74.69	n/a	n/a

Source: European Commission, Eurostat Database, 2018, Accessed 24/02/20

Criterion 3 Rights of migrants and refugees						
<i>Countries</i>				Aggregate Score		
	Indicator 3.1	Indicator 3.2	Indicator 3.3	Raw score	Conversion to 10	Conversion to 5
Range	+3 to -2	+2 to -2	+2 to -2	+7 to -6	+10 to 0	+5 to 0
Austria	-2	0	0	-2	3.08	1.54
Belgium	-2	-1	-2	-5	0.77	0.38
Bulgaria	-2	0	0	-2	3.08	1.54
Croatia	-2	1	-1	-2	3.08	1.54
Cyprus	1	0	0	1	5.38	2.69
Czech Republic	3	2	2	7	10.00	5.00
Denmark	3	-1	-1	1	5.38	2.69
Estonia	-2	1	0	-1	3.85	1.92
Finland	3	-1	-2	0	4.62	2.31
France	-2	1	-2	-3	2.31	1.15
Germany	-2	0	0	-2	3.08	1.54
Greece	-2	0	-2	-4	1.54	0.77
Hungary	-2	0	0	-2	3.08	1.54
Ireland	-2	-2	0	-4	1.54	0.77
Italy	3	1	-1	3	6.92	3.46
Latvia	-2	2	1	1	5.38	2.69
Lithuania	3	-1	1	3	6.92	3.46
Luxembourg	-2	-2	-1	-5	0.77	0.38
Malta	-2	0	2	0	4.62	2.31
Netherlands	3	0	-1	2	6.15	3.08
Poland	-2	2	1	1	5.38	2.69
Portugal	-2	-2	1	-3	2.31	1.15
Romania	-2	0	2	0	4.62	2.31
Slovakia	-2	-1	2	-1	3.85	1.92
Slovenia	1	0	0	1	5.38	2.69
Spain	-2	2	-1	-1	3.85	1.92
Sweden	3	0	0	3	6.92	3.46
United Kingdom	1	0	2	3	6.92	3.46

Criterion 4: Good governance, political engagement and corruption

Corruption and good governance are directly related to human rights to the extent that the protection of human rights is directly undermined by corrupt officials and poor governance. Thus, corrupt practices and lack of transparent institutional decision-making processes within governmental structures are undoubtedly recognised as determining factors contributing to the perpetuation of human rights violations. A state's good governance practices act as positive prerequisites for respecting human rights. For the 2020 edition of this report and in the light of wider concerns raised regarding the so-called crisis of democracy within established liberal-democracies, we have included an additional component of voter turnout in our effort to measure this key criterion

The countries with better scores are Sweden, Netherlands and Germany. All of them have a high percentage of voter turnout in parliamentary elections, low level of corruption percentage and a high percentage of citizens who tend to trust in national government.

On the flip side, Spain and Greece have the worst scores, with none or only one positive result in all the indicators, including low percentage of voter turnout in parliamentary elections and low trust in governments. Also, both countries lack transparency on management of public budgets and present high levels of financial secrecy

• Issue 1: Political Participation

This indicator measures the percentage of voter participation in parliamentary elections.

Indicator 4.1: Percentage voter turnout in parliamentary elections (most recent elections)

Score	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3	+4
MoC	n/a	n/a	<25.89	25.89 - 34.56	34.57 - 51.93	51.94 - 60.61	>60.61	n/a	n/a

Source: International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance (International IDEA) Accessed 22/01/20

• Issue 2: Corruption

The first indicator examines corruption in the public sector. It is based upon the perception of informed observers. The second indicator examines public trust in government. The final two indicators measure perceptions of the extent of corruption at governmental levels.

Indicator 4.2: Corruption percentage index, public sector

Score	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3	+4
MoC	n/a	n/a	<50.79	50.79 - 57.73	57.74 - 71.62	71.63 - 78.57	>78.57	n/a	n/a

Source: Transparency International, Corruption Perceptions Index, 2018. Accessed 22/01/20

Indicator 4.3: Trust in National Government (% who 'tend to trust')

Score	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3	+4
MoC	n/a	n/a	<24.74	24.74 - 32.22	32.23 - 47.20	47.21 - 54.69	>54.69	n/a	n/a

Source: European Commission, Eurobarometer, Public Opinion, June 2019. Accessed 22/01/20

• **Issue 3: Governance**

The first indicator measures the extent to which governmental expenditure and income are transparent and publicly accountable. The second indicator takes into account 15 criteria, such as banking secrecy, or automatic information exchange to measure the secrecy of a jurisdiction, which can have adverse consequences both domestically and in the frame of international offshore finance.

Indicator 4.4 Open Budget Index Scores

Score	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3	+4
MoC	n/a	n/a	no data	<56.04	56.04 - 60.98	60.99 - 70.87	70.88 - 75.83	>75.83	n/a

Source: International Budget Org. Open Budget Survey, 2017. Accessed 22/01/20

Indicator 4.5 Financial Secrecy Score

Score	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3	+4
MoC	n/a	n/a	no data or >59.75	56.64 - 59.75	50.41 - 56.63	47.29 - 50.40	<47.29	n/a	n/a

Source: Tax Justice Network, Financial Secrecy Index, 2018. Accessed 22/01/20

Criterion 4 Corruption and Governance							
<i>Countries</i>	Issue 1: Political Participation	Issue 2 Corruption		Issue 3 Governance		Aggregate Score	
	Indicator 4.1	Indicator 4.2	Indicator 4.3	Indicator 4.4	Indicator 4.5	Raw score	Conversion to 10
<i>Range</i>	<i>+2 to -2</i>	<i>+2 to -2</i>	<i>+2 to -2</i>	<i>+3 to -2</i>	<i>+2 to -2</i>	<i>+10 to -11</i>	<i>0 to +10</i>
Austria	1	1	1	-2	0	1	5.71
Belgium	0	1	0	-2	-2	-3	3.81
Bulgaria	-1	-2	-1	1	0	-3	3.81
Croatia	-1	-2	-2	0	1	-4	3.33
Cyprus	-1	0	0	-2	2	-1	4.76
Czech Republic	0	0	0	1	0	1	5.71
Denmark	1	2	2	-2	0	3	6.67
Estonia	1	1	0	-2	0	0	5.24
Finland	2	2	2	-2	0	4	7.14
France	-2	1	-1	2	0	0	5.24
Germany	2	2	0	1	1	6	8.10
Greece	-2	-2	-2	-2	1	-7	1.90
Hungary	0	-2	1	-1	0	-2	4.29
Ireland	0	1	0	-2	0	-1	4.76
Italy	-1	-1	-1	2	-1	-2	4.29
Latvia	-1	0	-1	-2	1	-3	3.81
Lithuania	0	0	0	-2	-2	-4	3.33
Luxembourg	2	2	2	-2	1	5	7.62
Malta	1	-1	2	-2	-2	-2	4.29
Netherlands	2	2	2	-2	2	6	8.10
Poland	0	0	0	0	1	1	5.71
Portugal	1	0	0	1	0	2	6.19
Romania	0	-2	-2	2	2	0	5.24
Slovakia	0	-2	-1	0	0	-3	3.81
Slovenia	-2	0	0	1	-2	-3	3.81
Spain	-2	0	-1	-1	-1	-5	2.86
Sweden	2	2	2	3	-2	7	8.57
United Kingdom	0	2	-2	2	-2	0	5.24

Criterion 5: Social Cohesion/ Economic and Social Rights

Socio-economic inequality has become a focal point of concern for many within the EU and the UK. The enduring effects of the 2008 economic crisis appear to be experienced most by those with least. In many respects, this growing inequality impacts upon many peoples' human rights, particularly those concerned with socio-economic well-being. Irrespective of its economic resources and policy choices, each state has committed to take steps towards progress in the field of economic and social rights. This section provides a series of measurements of the plight of some of the EU Member States' most vulnerable groups through a comprehensive range of indicators, which address core contributory factors to social and economic deprivation.

In this criterion, none of the countries have very good results. This can be partially explained by the fact that the criterion is made up of many indicators, which make it difficult for states to score high in all of them. The best country is Sweden, with 9,17 out of 12,5 points. The next ones are Finland and Czech Republic, with 8,54. At the end of the ranking, we find Latvia, with 2,08 points.

• Issue 1: Legal protection of economic, social and cultural rights (ESCR)

The indicators measure whether states have recognised the justiciability of economic, social and cultural rights before the UN and European complaint procedures.

Indicator 5.1 Ratification (and signature) of the Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights

MoC	Score	Description
	+3	Ratification or accession and have placed declarations recognising the competence of the Committee under Articles 10 and 11
	+2	Ratification or accession but no declarations under Articles 10 and 11
	+1	Signature
	-2	No signature, ratification or accession

Source: United Nations Treaty Collection (as of January 2020). Accessed 22/01/20

Indicator 5.2 Ratification of the Additional Protocol to the European Social Charter providing for a System of Collective Complaints

MoC	Score	Description
	+3	Ratification or accession with no reservations
	+2	Ratification or accession with reservations
	+1	Signature
	0	Acceptance of procedure of collective complaints
	-2	No signature, ratification or accession

Source: United Nations Treaty Collection (as of January 2020). Accessed 22/01/20

• **Issue 2: Right to social security**

This indicator examines the state's legal commitment to protect its vulnerable groups through financial assistance.

Indicator 5.3 At risk of poverty rate after social transfers

Score	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3	+4
MoC	n/a	n/a	>27.26	24.58 - 27.26	19.20 - 24.57	16.50 - 19.19	<16.50	n/a	n/a

Source: European Commission, Eurostat Database, 2018. Accessed 23/01/20

Indicator 5.4 Paid sick leave benefit – Purchasing Power Standard per inhabitant

Score	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3	+4
MoC	n/a	n/a	<48.71	48.71 - 145.39	145.40 - 338.78	338.79 - 435.48	>435.48	n/a	n/a

Source: European Commission, Eurostat Database, 2017

• **Issue 3: Right to education**

The indicator examines whether the state's efforts to provide its population with the opportunity for education are effective.

Indicator 5.5 Percentage of total population (25-64) having completed at least upper secondary education

Score	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3	+4
MoC	n/a	n/a	<69.41	69.41 - 75.06	75.07 - 86.39	86.40 - 92.05	>92.05	n/a	n/a

Source: European Commission, Eurostat Database, 2018. Accessed 23/01/20

• **Issue 4: Adequate standard of living**

These indicators draw upon widely recognised elements of an adequate standard of living in the light of levels of inequality.

Indicator 5.6 Percentage of total population living with a leaking roof, damp walls, floors or foundation, rot in window frames or floor

Score	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3	+4
MoC	n/a	n/a	>20.78	17.70 - 20.78	11.53 - 17.69	8.44 - 11.52	<8.44	n/a	n/a

Source: European Commission, Eurostat Database, 2018. Accessed 23/01/20

Indicator 5.7 Percentage of households with a heavy financial burden due to housing costs

Score	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3	+4
MoC	n/a	n/a	>43.59	35.95 - 43.59	20.66 - 35.94	13.00 - 20.65	<13.00	n/a	n/a

Source: European Commission, Eurostat Database, 2018. Accessed 23/01/20

Indicator 5.8 Percentage of people severely materially deprived (includes food poverty)

Score	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3	+4
MoC	n/a	n/a	>11.47	9.05 - 11.47	4.20 - 9.04	1.76 - 4.19	<1.76	n/a	n/a

Source: European Commission, Eurostat Database, 2018. Accessed 23/01/20

Indicator 5.9 GINI coefficient of inequality

Score	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3	+4
MoC	n/a	n/a	>0.35	0 . 3 3 - 0.35	0 . 2 8 - 0.32	0 . 2 7 - 0.25	<0.25	n/a	n/a

Source: OECD Data, Income Inequality, 'Latest available' (2015 – 2018). Accessed 22/01/20

• Issue 5: Right to health

These indicators provide a wide-ranging set of measurements for states' efforts to ensure the right to the highest attainable standard of health of its population.

Indicator 5.10: Healthy life years for females, in absolute value at birth

Score	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3	+4
MoC	n/a	n/a	<56.50	5 6 . 5 0 - 59.20	5 9 . 2 1 - 64.63	6 4 . 6 4 - 67.35	>67.35	n/a	n/a

Source: European Commission, Eurostat Database, 2017. Accessed 23/01/20

Indicator 5.11: Healthy life years for males, in absolute value at birth

Score	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3	+4
MoC	n/a	n/a	<56.39	5 6 . 3 9 - 58.95	5 8 . 9 6 - 64.08	6 4 . 0 9 - 66.64	>66.64	n/a	n/a

Source: European Commission, Eurostat Database, 2017. Accessed 22/01/20

Indicator 5.12 Out of pocket expenditure on healthcare (percentage share of total current health expenditure)

Score	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3	+4
MoC	n/a	>37.76	3 2 . 5 3 - 37.76	2 7 . 2 9 - 32.52	1 6 . 8 3 - 27.28	1 1 . 5 9 - 16.82	<11.59	n/a	n/a

Source: European Commission, Eurostat Database, 2017 (Poland, 2016). Accessed 22/01/20

Indicator 5.13 Current Health Care Expenditure – purchasing power standard by inhabitant

Score	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3	+4
MoC	n/a	n/a	<1464.95	1 4 6 4 . 9 5 - 1969.51	1 9 6 9 . 5 2 - 2978.65	2 9 7 8 . 6 6 - 3483.22	>3988.00	n/a	n/a

Source: European Commission, Eurostat Database, 2017 (unless otherwise stated). Accessed 23/1/20

• Issue 6: Right to live in a healthy environment

This is a new issue included for the first time in this edition of the report. The indicator measures the extent to which states address the issue of peoples' right to live in a healthy environment.

Indicator 5.14: Percentage share of population exposed to pollution, grime, or other environmental problems

Score	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3	+4
MoC	n/a	n/a	>18.78	1 6 . 0 9 - 18.78	1 0 . 7 0 - 16.08	8 . 0 0 - 10.69	<8.00	n/a	n/a

Source: European Commission, Eurostat Database, 2018. Accessed 23/01/20

Criterion 5 Social Cohesion/ Economic and Social Rights																					
Countries	Issue 1 Legal protection of economic, social and cultural rights		Issue 2 Right to social security		Issue 3 Right to education	Issue 4 Adequate standard of living						Issue 5 Right to health						Issue 6 Right to live in a healthy environment	Aggregate Score		
	Indicator 5.1	Indicator 5.2	Indicator 5.3	Indicator 5.4	Indicator 5.5	Indicator 5.6	Indicator 5.7	Indicator 5.8	Indicator 5.9	Indicator 5.10	Indicator 5.11	Indicator 5.12	Indicator 5.13	Indicator 5.14	Raw score	Conversion to 10	Conversion to 12.5				
Range	+3 to -2	+3 to -2	+2 to -2	+3 to -2	+2 to -2	+2 to -2	+2 to -2	+2 to -2	+2 to -2	+2 to -2	+2 to -2	+2 to -3	+2 to -2	+2 to -2	+37 to -29	+10 to 0	+12.5 to 0				
Austria	-2	1	1	1	0	1	2	1	0	-1	-1	0	2	1	3	5.33	6.67				
Belgium	3	3	0	0	0	-1	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	0	6	5.83	7.29				
Bulgaria	-2	0	-2	-1	0	0	-1	-2	0	1	0	-3	-2	0	-9	3.33	4.17				
Croatia	-2	3	-1	0	0	1	-2	0	0	-1	-1	2	-2	2	1	5.00	6.25				
Cyprus	-2	3	0	-1	0	-2	-2	-1	0	1	1	-3	-1	1	-4	4.17	5.21				
Czech Republic	-2	3	2	-1	2	2	1	1	2	0	0	1	0	0	12	6.83	8.54				
Denmark	-2	1	1	0	0	0	2	1	1	0	0	1	2	1	6	5.83	7.29				
Estonia	-2	-2	0	-1	1	0	1	1	0	-1	-2	0	-1	1	-3	4.33	5.42				
Finland	3	3	2	0	1	2	1	1	1	-2	-1	0	1	1	12	6.83	8.54				
France	2	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	2	0	9	6.33	7.92				
Germany	-2	-2	1	3	1	0	1	1	0	1	1	1	2	-2	1	5.00	6.25				
Greece	-2	3	-2	-2	-1	0	-2	-2	-1	1	1	-2	-1	-2	-9	3.33	4.17				
Hungary	-2	1	0	-1	0	-2	0	-1	0	0	0	0	-1	1	-3	4.33	5.42				
Ireland	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	1	1	2	11	6.67	8.33				
Italy	2	3	-2	-1	-2	0	-2	0	-1	1	1	0	0	0	0	4.83	6.04				
Latvia	-2	-2	-2	-1	1	-2	0	-1	-2	-2	-2	-3	-2	-2	-19	1.67	2.08				
Lithuania	-2	-2	-2	0	2	0	0	-1	-2	0	-1	-1	-1	-1	-10	3.17	3.96				
Luxembourg	2	-2	0	3	0	-1	-1	2	0	-1	0	2	2	0	1	5.00	6.25				
Malta	-2	-2	1	-1	-2	2	1	1	-2	2	2	-2	0	-2	-3	4.33	5.42				
Netherlands	1	3	1	3	0	0	2	1	0	-1	0	2	2	0	9	6.33	7.92				
Poland	-2	-2	1	0	2	0	-2	0	0	0	0	0	-2	0	-3	4.33	5.42				
Portugal	3	3	0	-1	-2	-2	0	0	-1	-1	0	-1	0	0	-1	4.67	5.83				
Romania	-2	-2	-2	-2	0	1	0	-2	-2	-1	0	0	-2	0	-10	3.17	3.96				
Slovakia	2	1	2	-1	1	2	0	0	2	-2	-2	0	-1	1	7	6.00	7.50				
Slovenia	1	1	2	0	1	-2	0	1	2	-2	-2	1	0	-1	2	5.17	6.46				
Spain	2	-2	-1	0	-2	0	-2	0	-1	2	2	0	0	1	-1	4.67	5.83				
Sweden	-2	3	1	2	0	2	2	2	0	2	2	1	2	2	15	7.33	9.17				
United Kingdom	-2	-2	0	0	0	-1	1	0	-2	0	0	1	0	0	-5	4.00	5.00				

Criterion 6: Judicial Systems (right to a fair trial, torture, prison administration and access to legal aid)

This criterion is analysed by means of four enduring challenges to European judicial systems' compliance with human rights standards. The first three issues have figured in previous editions of this report. The additional issue concerns access to legal aid and aims to measure the extent to which citizens' access to legal aid is a rapidly growing issue within the EU and the UK.

Sweden and Netherlands are at the top of the ranking of criterion 6, with 4,21 and 4,47 out of 5 points respectively. In both countries there is a high trust in the national legal judicial system coupled with a strong implemented public budget of legal aid (per inhabitant). At the bottom we find Bulgaria, Hungary, Latvia and Malta, all with less than 2 out of 5 points.

This criterion also includes an indicator that tries to address prison overcrowding. In this regard, it is noticeable the high prison occupancy levels of countries such as Belgium, Bulgaria, Cyprus, France, Hungary, Italy, Malta and Portugal, which has negatively affected their overall performance.

• Issue 1: Right to a fair trial

This issue is measured by a single indicator: the degree of trust citizens hold towards their own legal systems. Since the indicator is based on surveys, a variety of cultural, political and socio-economic are highly likely to impact the perception of citizens regarding their own legal system.

Indicator 6.1 The extent of trust in the national legal system – perceptions of independence of courts and judges.

Score	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3	+4
MoC	n/a	n/a	<36.74	36.74 - 46.58	46.59 - 66.27	66.28 - 76.12	>76.12	n/a	n/a

Source: Eurobarometer, Flash Eurobarometer 474: Perceived independence of the national justice systems in the EU among the general public, April 2019. Accessed 24/01/20

• Issue 2: Torture

Many will associate acts of torture with non-European states. While it is generally true that the majority of documented acts of torture occur beyond the European region, acts of torture continue to be perpetrated within some European states. We have sought to measure states' commitment to eradicating torture by examining whether states have committed themselves fully to the legal mechanisms designed to prevent torture.

Indicator 6.2 Ratification of the Optional Protocol to the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment

MoC	Score	Description
	+3	Ratification or accession with no reservations
	+2	Ratification or accession with reservations
	+1	Signature
	-2	No signature, ratification or accession

Source: United Nations Treaty Collection (as of January 2020)

• **Issue 3: Prison administration**

This indicator measures a key aspect of detention conditions. Prison overcrowding undermines the human dignity of detainees whilst also increasing the risk of re-offending.

Indicator 6.3: Prison Occupancy level (based on official capacity)

Score	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3	+4
MoC	n/a	no data	>114.30	105.73-114.30	88.57-105.72	79.98-88.56	<88.56	n/a	n/a

Source: World Prison Brief/Institute for Crime and Justice Policy Research, 2018-2019 figures (Netherlands, Sweden, 2017 data; Bulgaria 2014 data) Accessed 27/01/20

• **Issue 4: Access to Legal Aid**

Access to justice requires the provision of legal aid and assistance for those who are unable to bear the financial costs of legal advice and representation. The indicators below demonstrate states' records in ensuring equal access to legal aid across the EU and UK.

Indicator 6.4: Access to legal aid (Implemented public budget of legal aid per inhabitant)

Score	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3	+4
MoC	n/a	no data	< 1.00	1.00-2.31	2.32-12.46	12.47-17.54	17.55-22.62	>22.63	n/a

Source: European Judicial Systems Efficiency and Quality of Justice, CEPEJ STUDIES No. 26 2018 (2016 data). Accessed 23/1/20

Criterion 6 Judicial Systems							
<i>Countries</i>	Issue 1 Right to a fair trial	Issue 2 Torture	Issue 3 Prison administration	Issue 4 Access to Legal Aid	Aggregate Score		
	Indicator 6.1	Indicator 6.2	Indicator 6.3	Indicator 6.4	Raw score	Conversion to 10	Conversion to 5
Range	+2 to -2	+3 to -2	+2 to -3	+3 to -2	+10 to -9	0 to +10	0 to +5
Austria	2	3	0	-1	4	6.84	3.42
Belgium	0	1	-2	0	-1	4.21	2.11
Bulgaria	-2	3	-3	-2	-4	2.63	1.32
Croatia	-2	3	2	0	3	6.32	3.16
Cyprus	2	3	-2	-1	2	5.79	2.89
Czech Republic	0	3	0	-1	2	5.79	2.89
Denmark	2	3	0	0	5	7.37	3.68
Estonia	0	3	2	0	5	7.37	3.68
Finland	2	3	0	1	6	7.89	3.95
France	0	3	-2	0	1	5.26	2.63
Germany	1	3	1	0	5	7.37	3.68
Greece	0	3	0	-2	1	5.26	2.63
Hungary	-1	3	-3	-2	-3	3.16	1.58
Ireland	1	1	0	2	4	6.84	3.42
Italy	-1	3	-2	0	0	4.74	2.37
Latvia	-1	-2	2	-2	-3	3.16	1.58
Lithuania	0	3	1	-1	3	6.32	3.16
Luxembourg	1	3	0	0	4	6.84	3.42
Malta	0	3	-3	-2	-2	3.68	1.84
Netherlands	1	3	2	2	8	8.95	4.47
Poland	-1	3	0	-2	0	4.74	2.37
Portugal	-1	3	-3	0	-1	4.21	2.11
Romania	-1	3	-1	-2	-1	4.21	2.11
Slovakia	-2	1	0	0	-1	4.21	2.11
Slovenia	-1	3	-1	-1	0	4.74	2.37
Spain	-1	3	2	0	4	6.84	3.42
Sweden	2	3	0	2	7	8.42	4.21
United Kingdom	1	3	-1	2	5	7.37	3.68

Criterion 7: Freedom of expression and Right to information

Freedom of expression is a fundamental human right and essential to any democratic system. However, technology has dramatically affected peoples' rights to both express themselves and to access information upon which their views and opinions are based. Changes to EU laws governing digital protection were introduced in 2018, which have necessitated temporarily removing the former indicator for digital protection. We have, however, introduced a new indicator for the 2020 report which focuses upon access to the internet.

Sweden and Slovenia have the best scores in this criterion, with 4.05 out of 5 points. Slovenia has a strong performance on the Global Right to Information Rating and on Freedom of assembly, association & expression of LGBTI people. Sweden has also a strong performance on Freedom of assembly, association & expression of LGBTI people, as well as freedom of the press, although it could still improve its performance on the Global RTI Rating. The worst score is 1.19 of Bulgaria, which has no positive points in any of the indicators.

• Issue 1: Freedom of expression

The first indicator focuses upon the level of press freedom in each country. The second focuses upon the specific rights of LGBTI people to freely express themselves.

Indicator 7.1 Freedom of the Press

Score	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3	+4
MoC	n/a	n/a	>27.73	23.97 - 27.73	16.45 - 23.96	12.68 - 16.44	<12.68	n/a	n/a

Source: Reporters without Borders, World Press Freedom Index, 2019. Accessed 27/01/20

Indicator 7.2 Freedom of assembly, association & expression of LGBTI people

MoC	Score	Description
	0 to +3	Cumulative count of each right; 1 point per right: Freedom of assembly / Freedom of association / Freedom of expression
	-2	None

Source: ILGA, Rainbow of Europe, 2019. Accessed 29/01/20

• Issue 2: Right to Information

The right to freedom of information is an essential function of the right to freedom of expression and is a crucial resource for journalists and ordinary citizens within a democratic country. This indicator measures the scope of freedom of information laws implemented within EU Member States and the UK. We have also added a new indicator which measures inequalities in respect of households' access to the internet across the EU and UK.

Indicator 7.3 Global Right to Information Rating

Score	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3	+4
MoC	n/a	<49.31	49.31 - 59.78	59.79 - 70.25	70.26 - 91.20	91.21 - 101.67	101.68 - 112.15	>112.15	n/a

Source: Centre for Law and Democracy, Global Right to Information Rating Map. Accessed 29/01/20

Indicator 7.4 % Lowest 20% income level households with access to the internet

Score	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3	+4
MoC	n/a	<49.52	49.52 - 56.99	57.00 - 64.48	64.49 - 79.44	79.45 - 86.92	86.93 - 94.41	>94.41	n/a

Source: European Commission, Eurostat Database, 2019. Accessed 24/1/20

Criterion 7 Freedom of expression and Right to Information							
<i>Countries</i>	Issue 1 Freedom of expression		Issue 2 Right to Information		Aggregate Score		
	Indicator 7.1	Indicator 7.2	Indicator 7.3	Indicator 7.4	Raw score	Conversion to 10	Conversion to 5
<i>Range</i>	<i>+2 to -2</i>	<i>+3 to -2</i>	<i>+3 to -3</i>	<i>+3 to -3</i>	<i>+11 to -10</i>	<i>+10 to 0</i>	<i>+5 to 0</i>
Austria	1	3	-3	1	2	5.71	2.86
Belgium	2	3	-2	0	4	6.67	3.33
Bulgaria	-2	-2	0	-3	-5	2.38	1.19
Croatia	-2	3	3	0	3	6.19	3.10
Cyprus	0	3	0	0	4	6.67	3.33
Czech Republic	-1	3	0	-1	1	5.24	2.62
Denmark	2	3	-1	2	5	7.14	3.57
Estonia	2	3	1	1	5	7.14	3.57
Finland	2	3	2	1	6	7.62	3.81
France	0	3	-1	0	1	5.24	2.62
Germany	1	3	-2	1	3	6.19	3.10
Greece	-2	3	-1	-1	-1	4.29	2.14
Hungary	-2	2	0	-3	1	5.24	2.62
Ireland	1	3	1	0	4	6.67	3.33
Italy	-1	3	0	0	3	6.19	3.10
Latvia	0	3	0	-1	3	6.19	3.10
Lithuania	0	2	-1	-1	0	4.76	2.38
Luxembourg	1	3	0	0	5	7.14	3.57
Malta	-2	3	0	0	1	5.24	2.62
Netherlands	2	3	0	3	6	7.62	3.81
Poland	-2	3	0	-1	0	4.76	2.38
Portugal	2	3	0	-1	4	6.67	3.33
Romania	-1	3	0	-1	1	5.24	2.62
Slovakia	0	3	-1	0	3	6.19	3.10
Slovenia	0	3	3	0	7	8.10	4.05
Spain	0	3	0	0	2	5.71	2.86
Sweden	2	3	1	1	7	8.10	4.05
United Kingdom	0	3	1	2	3	6.19	3.10

Criterion 8: Labour rights

The relative predominance of neoliberalism has included a temptation of a “rush to the bottom” regarding labour rights by employers and governments. This has impacted many peoples’ working lives and extends to worsening labour conditions, diminished job security and incursions into the right to join a trade union. We have also added two new indicators, which point to the emergence of in-work poverty. Governments have repeatedly asserted that employment is the best antidote to poverty. However, a growing body of data indicates the extent to which a growing number of people are both in work and poor.

It is interesting to note that none of the countries have high scores in this criterion. This is partially explained by the inclusion of indicators such as “Employees working shifts as a percentage of employees”, “Percentage of total number of employees with a contract of limited duration”, and “Percentage in work and at risk of poverty”, where none of the countries scored well in all of them. Moreover, the inclusion of the ITUC Global Rights Index has also affected the final ranking, due to the methodology used to translate the results of this Index into our own ranking. As explain below, the maximum points a country could get in this indicator is -1, thus lowering the overall performance of countries in criterion 8.

With this caveat in mind, the best score is the one of Lithuania, with 7,24 out of 10 points. Similarly, there are no very low scores. Poland and Greece are the countries with lower total points, scoring 3,10 and 3,79 out of 10 respectively.

• Issue 1: Work and employment

Economic indicators often emphasise levels of unemployment as a key measure for the “health” of the economy. In contrast, this study focuses upon the specific conditions experienced by those in employment as providing important insights into peoples’ working lives.

Indicator 8.1 Employees working shifts as a percentage of employees

Score	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3	+4
MoC	n/a	n/a	>28.55	25.04 - 28.55	18.01 - 25.03	14.49 - 18.00	<14.49	n/a	n/a

Source: European Commission, Eurostat Database, 2018. Accessed 29/01/20

Indicator 8.2 Percentage of total number of employees with a contract of limited duration, (15-64 years, annual average)

Score	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3	+4
MoC	n/a	n/a	>15.99	13.12 - 15.99	7.35 - 13.11	4.47 - 7.34	<4.47	n/a	n/a

Source: European Commission, Eurostat Database, 2018. Accessed 29/01/20

Indicator 8.3: Percentage in work and at risk of poverty (18yrs +)

Score	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3	+4
MoC	n/a	n/a	>12.22	10.46 - 12.22	6.93 - 10.45	5.16 - 6.92	<5.16	n/a	n/a

Source: European Commission, Eurostat Database, 2018. Accessed 04/02/20

Indicator 8.4: Minimum Wage expressed in Purchasing Power Standards (Euros)

MoC	Score	Description
	+2	National minimum wage was at least PPS 1 000 in January 2020
	+1	National minimum wage was lower than PPS 1 000 in January 2020
	-2	No minimum wage

Source: European Commission, Eurostat Database, January 2020. Accessed 06/02/20

• Issue 2: Union rights

Article 6 of the revised European Social Charter promotes collective bargaining and recognises the right to strike. Vulnerable employment captures 'unpaid family workers and own-account workers' who are unlikely to enjoy the benefits of unionisation, employer provided health care and pensions. The International Trade Union Confederation Global Rights Index measures violations of the rights to freedom of association, collective bargaining and to strike faced by workers.

Indicator 8.5 Recognition of Article 6 of the (revised) European Social Charter

MoC	Score	Description
	+3	Ratification or accession with no reservations
	+2	Ratification or accession with reservations
	+1	Signature
	0	Signature, but declarations/denunciations specifically to Article 6
	-2	No signature, ratification or accession

Source: Council of Europe, situation as at 1st January 2020

Indicator 8.6 Vulnerable employment as a percentage of total employment

Score	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3	+4
MoC	n/a	n/a	>16.06	13.45 - 16.06	8.21 - 13.44	5.58 - 8.20	<5.58	n/a	n/a

Source: The World Bank, 2019. Accessed 29/01/20

Indicator 8.7 ITUC Global Rights Index¹¹

MoC	Score	Description
	0	0 No data
	-1	1 (Irregular violations)
	-2	2 (Repeated violations) or 3 (Regular violations)
	-3	4 (Systematic violations)
	-4	5 (No guarantee of rights)

Source: International Trade Union Confederation, 2019. Accessed 29/01/20

11. In the ITUC Index, all countries included present certain incidents of union rights. The best score a country could get in the ranking of the ITUC is 1 (Irregular violations). When translating this index into our own indicators, we decided to score negatively countries, since all present certain incidents of union rights. As a result, countries which scored 1 in the ITUC index (Irregular violations), scored -1 in our ranking, and countries which scored 5 in the ITUC index (No guarantee of rights), scored -4 in our ranking. Therefore, the maximum points a country could get is -1. However, as mentioned in the methodology section, countries have not been penalised for lack of data availability. The scores on the indicators have been marked as 'n/a' and counted as zero. This decision affects the logic of certain indicators, such as this one. Indeed, countries which did not appear in the ITUC ranking, such as Malta, have scored 0, which is better than the countries which appeared in the ranking in the first positions. This logic could be rethink for next versions of the report.

Criterion 8 Labour Rights

Countries	Issue 1 Work and employment				Issue 2 Union rights			Aggregate Score	
	Indicator 8.1	Indicator 8.2	Indicator 8.3	Indicator 8.4	Indicator 8.5	Indicator 8.6	Indicator 8.7	Raw score	Conversion to 10
Range	+2 to -2	+2 to -2	+2 to -2	+2 to -2	+3 to -2	+2 to -2	0 to -4	+13 to -16	+10 to 0
Austria	0	0	0	-2	2	1	-1	2	6.21
Belgium	2	0	-2	2	3	0	-2	3	6.55
Bulgaria	0	2	0	1	3	1	-2	4	6.90
Croatia	-2	-2	1	1	1	1	-2	-4	4.14
Cyprus	0	0	0	-2	2	0	0	2	6.21
Czech Republic	-1	1	2	1	0	-1	-2	-3	4.48
Denmark	2	0	1	-2	1	2	-1	4	6.90
Estonia	0	2	0	1	2	2	-2	4	6.90
Finland	0	-1	2	-2	3	0	-1	1	5.86
France	0	-1	0	2	2	1	-2	0	5.52
Germany	1	0	0	2	1	1	-1	2	6.21
Greece	-1	0	-1	1	2	-2	-4	-5	3.79
Hungary	1	1	0	1	3	1	-2	4	6.90
Ireland	0	0	2	2	3	0	-1	2	6.21
Italy	0	-1	-1	-2	3	-2	-1	-1	5.17
Latvia	0	2	0	1	3	1	-2	4	6.90
Lithuania	2	2	0	1	3	0	-2	5	7.24
Luxembourg	0	0	-2	2	0	1	0	1	5.86
Malta	0	1	1	1	2	0	0	3	6.55
Netherlands	2	-2	1	2	2	0	-1	1	5.86
Poland	-2	-2	0	2	0	-1	-2	-7	3.10
Portugal	0	-2	0	1	2	0	-2	-2	4.83
Romania	-1	2	-2	1	3	-2	-3	-1	5.17
Slovakia	-2	-1	1	1	2	0	-1	-2	4.83
Slovenia	-2	1	1	2	3	0	0	2	6.21
Spain	0	-2	-2	2	0	0	-2	-4	4.14
Sweden	0	-1	0	-2	2	1	-1	1	5.86
United Kingdom	0	1	-1	2	1	0	-2	0	5.52

Section B: Respect for human rights at the international level

In addition to their domestic human rights obligations, states have obligations beyond their own borders to respect, protect and fulfil human rights. This commitment extends to ensure the establishment of political environments conducive to the global protection of human rights. This section provides a series of measures of EU Member States' and the UK's performance in this particular sphere.

Criterion 9: International justice and human rights promotion

This criterion measures states' commitments to combat impunity for international crimes and to support and adopt the most recent UN human rights mechanisms. The strengthening of international justice and international human rights law are two crucial aspects of states' commitments to respect, protect and fulfil human rights. Many countries scored the maximum points in this criterion (10 out of 10): Belgium, Czech Republic, France, Germany, Netherlands and Spain. The worst score was Hungary, with 2,22 out of 10 points, specifically due to the non-ratification of the Convention for the protection of all persons from enforced disappearances, and the absence of National Action Plans (NAP) for the Implementation of UN Security Council 1325 on Women, Peace, and Security and for Business and Human Rights.

• Issue 1: Cooperation with international organisations

The two indicators for issue 1 measure states' domestic incorporation of the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court (ICC) and the extent of their contributions to the Trust Fund for Victims of the crimes punished by the ICC, which is an important tool to ensure victims' right to reparation.

Indicator 9.1 National legislation on cooperation in the ICC and incorporation of the ICC statute into criminal code

MoC	Score	Description
	+1	Yes
	-2	No

Source: International Criminal Court. Accessed 29/01/20

Indicator 9.2 State Parties Voluntary contributions to the Trust Fund Victims

MoC	Score	Description
	+1	Contribution 1 July 2017 – 30 June 2018
	0	No contribution

Source: Report to the Assembly of States Parties on the projects and the activities of the Board of Directors of the Trust Fund for Victims, 2018. Accessed 29/01/20

• Issue 2: Initiative in pursuing international human rights obligations

The first indicator maps the ratification of the Convention on Protection from Enforced Disappearances. The second concerns the adoption of a National Action Plan (NAP) for the Implementation of UN Security Council Resolution 1325 on Women, Peace and Security. We have added a new indicator which measures whether states have developed a NAP covering business and human rights.

Indicator 9.3 Ratification of the Convention for the protection of all persons from enforced disappearances

MoC	Score	Description
	+3	Ratification or accession with no reservations
	+2	Ratification or accession with reservations
	+1	Signature
	-2	No signature, ratification or accession

Source: United Nations Treaty Collection. Accessed 29/01/20

Indicator 9.4 National Action Plan (NAP) for the Implementation of UN Security Council 1325 on Women, Peace, and Security

MoC	Score	Description
	+2	NAP
	-2	No NAP

Source: The Women's International League for Peace and Freedom/PeaceWomen.Org (as at November 2019). Accessed 30/01/20

Indicator 9.5 Member states with National Action Plans for Business and Human Rights

MoC	Score	Description
	+3	Member states with a national action plan
	+2	Member states in the process of developing an action plan or have committed to doing one
	+1	States in which either the NHRI or civil society have begun steps in the development of a national action plan
	-2	Member states with no national action plans & no commitment to develop such plans

Source: OHCHR, State national action plans on Business and Human Rights. Accessed 30/01/20

Criterion 9 International Justice and human rights promotion							
Countries	Issue 1 Cooperation with international organisations		Issue 2 Initiative in pursuing international human rights obligations			Aggregate Score	
	Indicator 9.1	Indicator 9.2	Indicator 9.3	Indicator 9.4	Indicator 9.5	Raw score	Conversion to 10
<i>Range</i>	<i>+1 to -2</i>	<i>+1 to -0</i>	<i>+3 to -2</i>	<i>+2 to -2</i>	<i>+3 to -2</i>	<i>+10 to -8</i>	<i>+10 to 0</i>
Austria	1	0	3	2	-2	4	6.67
Belgium	1	1	3	2	3	10	10.00
Bulgaria	1	0	1	-2	-2	-2	3.33
Croatia	1	0	1	2	-2	2	5.56
Cyprus	1	1	1	-2	-2	-1	3.89
Czech Republic	1	1	3	2	3	10	10.00
Denmark	1	0	1	2	3	7	8.33
Estonia	1	0	-2	2	-2	-1	3.89
Finland	1	1	1	2	3	8	8.89
France	1	1	3	2	3	10	10.00
Germany	1	1	3	2	3	10	10.00
Greece	1	0	3	-2	2	4	6.67
Hungary	1	1	-2	-2	-2	-4	2.22
Ireland	1	1	1	2	3	8	8.89
Italy	1	0	3	2	3	9	9.44
Latvia	1	0	-2	-2	2	-1	3.89
Lithuania	1	0	3	2	3	9	9.44
Luxembourg	1	1	1	2	3	8	8.89
Malta	1	0	3	-2	-2	0	4.44
Netherlands	1	1	3	2	3	10	10.00
Poland	1	1	1	2	3	8	8.89
Portugal	1	1	3	2	2	9	9.44
Romania	1	0	1	-2	-2	-2	3.33
Slovakia	1	0	3	-2	-2	0	4.44
Slovenia	1	1	1	2	2	7	8.33
Spain	1	1	3	2	3	10	10.00
Sweden	1	1	1	2	3	8	8.89
United Kingdom	1	1	-2	2	3	5	7.22

Criterion 10: Official Development Assistance/ Financial contributions to the UN

This criterion assesses states' international obligations to assistance and cooperation, in compliance with Article 2 of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Article 2 commits states to provide, to their maximum of their available resources, financial and technical assistance to enable countries in need to ensure the fulfilment of their economic, social and cultural rights-based obligations. At the top of the ranking of this criterion we find Denmark and Sweden, scoring 5 out of 5, with high ODA as a percentage of GNI and high voluntary contributions to the OHCHR as a percentage of GDP. Contrary, Slovenia, Romania, Greece and Hungary are at the bottom of the ranking with 0,83.

• Issue 1: Overseas Development Assistance (ODA)

ODA is not necessarily linked to the active promotion of human rights. Nevertheless, it does reflect the extent to which the state is willing to honour its obligation to provide international economic assistance.

Indicator 10.1 Net ODA as a percentage of GNI, against U.N. target of 0.7%

Score	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3	+4
MoC	n/a	no	<0.05	0 . 0 5 - 0.19	0 . 2 0 - 0.47	0 . 4 8 - 0.62	0 . 6 3 - 0.69	>=0.70	n/a
	The upper bound of the +2 score is set to 0.69 and the minimum bound for score +3 to 0.70 to reflect target of 0.7.								

Source: OECD.Org, 2017 (figures for Cyprus 2015) Accessed 30/01/20

• Issue 2: Financial contributions to the United Nations

This indicator provides an indication of the extent of states' financial commitments to supporting the protection of human rights, specifically through the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights.

Indicator 10.2: Voluntary contributions (in \$) to the OHCHR as a percentage of GDP (in millions of \$) in 2018

Score	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3	+4
MoC	n/a	no 2018 contribu- tion	<1.05	1 . 0 5 - 6.00	6.01-10.80	10.8115.60	1 5 . 6 1 - 20.39	>20.39	n/a
Here not mean, but median is taken for calculating the scores. Scale is shifted by -1.									

Source: OHCHR.Org (2018), OECD.Org (2018), Accessed 30/01/20

Criterion 10 Official Development Assistance/ Financial contributions to the UN					
Countries	Issue 1 Overseas Development Assistance (ODA)	Issue 2 Financial contributions to the United Nations	Aggregate Score		
	Indicator 10.1	Indicator 10.2	Raw score	Conversion to 10	Conversion to 5
Range	+3 to -3	+3 to -3	+6 to -6	+10 to 0	+5 to 0
Austria	0	-1	-1	4.17	2.08
Belgium	0	1	1	5.83	2.92
Bulgaria	-1	-1	-2	3.33	1.67
Croatia	3	-3	0	5.00	2.50
Cyprus	-1	-1	-2	3.33	1.67
Czech Republic	-1	-1	-2	3.33	1.67
Denmark	3	3	6	10.00	5.00
Estonia	-1	0	-1	4.17	2.08
Finland	0	2	2	6.67	3.33
France	0	-1	-1	4.17	2.08
Germany	2	0	2	6.67	3.33
Greece	-1	-3	-4	1.67	0.83
Hungary	-1	-3	-4	1.67	0.83
Ireland	0	1	1	5.83	2.92
Italy	0	0	0	5.00	2.50
Latvia	-1	-1	-2	3.33	1.67
Lithuania	-1	-1	-2	3.33	1.67
Luxembourg	3	0	3	7.50	3.75
Malta	0	-3	-3	2.50	1.25
Netherlands	1	2	3	7.50	3.75
Poland	-1	-1	-2	3.33	1.67
Portugal	-1	-1	-2	3.33	1.67
Romania	-1	-3	-4	1.67	0.83
Slovakia	-1	-1	-2	3.33	1.67
Slovenia	-1	-3	-4	1.67	0.83
Spain	-1	-1	-2	3.33	1.67
Sweden	3	3	6	10.00	5.00
United Kingdom	3	0	3	7.50	3.75

Criterion 11: Arms control

Similar to the criterion regarding corruption and good governance, arms production and trade remains a high-risk factor for potential states' complicity in human rights abuses, particularly in respect of those countries importing arms produced within the EU. This criterion thus examines states' cooperation with initiatives designed to control and reduce global arms production and trade as a means for promoting peace and stability.

Two key indicators are the ones that affected more the final result of this criterion: Values of arms exports to all countries; and Dual Use Technology Export - Regulation and Control. In this regard, France, Italy, Germany, Netherlands, Spain and United Kingdom have the higher values of arms exports to all countries. In relation to the second indicator, Denmark, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, Portugal, Slovakia, Slovenia and Sweden are the countries with weaker controls and regulations over dual use technology export.

From the combination of the two aspects underlined above the conclusion is that at the top of the ranking of the indicator we find Austria with 9,69 out of 10 points. The only three countries with less than 5 points are: Poland (3,75/10), France (4,69/10) and Malta (4,69/10)

• Issue 1: Disarmament

The indicators included measure the extent of states' commitments to regulating or abolishing the particularly controversial manufacture of deadly weapons: respectively, small-arms, cluster munitions, anti-personnel mines and all conventional weapons.

Indicator 11.1 Ratification of the Protocol against the Illicit Manufacturing of and Trafficking in Firearms, Their Parts and Components and Ammunition

MoC	Score	Description
	+3	Ratification, acceptance or accession with no reservations
	+2	Ratification, acceptance or accession with reservations
	+1	Signature
	-2	None of the above

Source: United Nations Treaties Collection. Accessed 31/01/20

Indicator 11.2 Ratification of the Convention on Cluster Munition

MoC	Score	Description
	+3	Ratification, acceptance or accession with no reservations
	+2	Ratification, acceptance or accession with reservations
	+1	Signature
	-2	None of the above
	-1 point	In addition, one minus point for each of the following: States currently holding a stockpile / States with remaining areas of contamination

Source: United Nations Treaties Collection, accessed January 2020, and, Landmine and Cluster Munition Monitor (Monitor.Org), Cluster Munition Monitor Report, 2019. Accessed 31/01/20

11.3 Ratification and the implementation of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-Personnel Mines and on their Destruction

MoC	Score	Description
	+3	Ratification
	-1 point	In addition, one minus point for each of the following: States with a stockpile of > 1000 / States who have not submitted an Annual Transparency Report / States with remaining anti-personnel mine contamination

Source: United Nations Treaties Collection, accessed January 2020, and, Landmine and Cluster Munition Monitor (Monitor.Org), Landmine Monitor Report, 2019. Accessed 31/01/20

• Issue 2: Military and Arms exports

Several EU Member States and the UK have large and thriving arms industries. The indicators included here measure the value of domestic arms industries within all of the EU Member States and the value of state arms expenditure relative to other forms of state expenditure, such as health care.

Indicator 11.4 Trend Indicator Values of arms exports to all countries

Score	-5	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3
MoC	>133.1	100.0 - 133.0	67.0 - 99.0	34.0 - 66.0	0.1-33.0	No transfer		n/a	n/a
	Due to extreme values (see France, Germany and also UK), the Median is taken as the basis of calculating the scale. Any export is penalised, and therefore the scores categories are set from -1 to -5. One unit on the scale, is equivalent to ½ of the median value.								

Source: Stockholm Intl. Peace Research Institute (SIPRI), Arms Transfer database. Data for 2018. Accessed 31/01/20

Indicator 11.5 Ratio of health expenditure to military expenditure as a percentage of GDP

Score	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3	+4
MoC	n/a	n/a	<2.92	2.92 - 5.25	5.26 - 9.93	9.94 - 12.27	>12.27	n/a	n/a

Sources: OECD Data and The World Bank, 2017 figure. Accessed 31/01/20

Indicator 11.6 Dual Use Technology Export - Regulation and Control

MoC	Score	Description
	+5 to -5	<p>One point awarded/deducted in relation to the following regulations or controls being met: Has the application of brokering controls set out in Article 5(1) been extended in relation with Article 5(2) / Have brokering controls been extended in relation with Article 5(3)? / Have the transit control provisions of Article 6(1) been extended in relation with Article 6(2)? / Have the transit control provisions set out in Article 6(1) been extended in relation with Article 6(3)? / Have additional controls been implemented concerning non-listed goods for reasons of public security or human rights considerations in relation with Article 8(1)?</p> <p>Half a point awarded for partial compliance.</p>

Source: European Commission (Trade), Import & Export Rules: Overview of National Measures (January 2020). Accessed 03/02/20

Criterion 11 Arms control								
Countries	Issue 1 Disarmament			Issue 2 Military and Arms exports			Aggregate Score	
	Indicator 11.1	Indicator 11.2	Indicator 11.3	Indicator 11.4	Indicator 11.5	Indicator 11.6	Raw score	Conversion to 10
Range	+3 to -2	+3 to -2	+3 to 0	0 to -5	+2 to -2	+5 to -5	+16 to -16	+10 to 0
Austria	3	3	3	-1	2	5	15	9.69
Belgium	2	3	2	-1	1	-2	5	6.56
Bulgaria	3	2	2	-1	0	3	9	7.81
Croatia	3	2	1	0	-1	3	8	7.50
Cyprus	3	0	2	0	-1	-1	3	5.94
Czech Republic	3	3	2	-2	0	3	9	7.81
Denmark	3	3	1	-1	0	-5	1	5.31
Estonia	3	-3	3	-1	-1	5	6	6.88
Finland	3	-3	1	-3	0	3	1	5.31
France	3	3	2	-5	-1	-3	-1	4.69
Germany	1	2	3	-5	0	-1	0	5.00
Greece	3	-3	2	0	-1	3	4	6.25
Hungary	3	3	3	0	0	3	12	8.75
Ireland	-2	3	3	0	2	5	11	8.44
Italy	3	3	3	-5	0	3	7	7.19
Latvia	3	-2	3	0	-1	1	4	6.25
Lithuania	3	3	3	0	-1	-5	3	5.94
Luxembourg	1	3	3	0	0	5	12	8.75
Malta	-2	3	2	-1	2	-5	-1	4.69
Netherlands	3	3	3	-5	0	3	7	7.19
Poland	3	-3	3	-1	-1	-5	-4	3.75
Portugal	3	3	3	-1	0	-5	3	5.94
Romania	3	-3	2	0	-1	5	6	6.88
Slovakia	3	2	2	-1	0	-5	1	5.31
Slovenia	3	3	3	0	0	-5	4	6.25
Spain	3	3	1	-5	0	1	3	5.94
Sweden	3	3	2	-4	1	-5	0	5.00
United Kingdom	1	2	2	-5	0	1	1	5.31

Criterion 12: Promoting corporate responsibility in business activities conducted abroad

The final human rights criterion examines states' duties to protect individuals from abuses committed by businesses under their jurisdiction. States' obligations extend to include the overseas actions of EU-based companies. Human rights based approaches to the human rights obligations of transnational commercial enterprises is a rapidly developing area of law and practice. The indicators included here aim to provide a sufficiently comprehensive and contemporary assessment of EU Member States active and positive engagements within this field. Three new indicators have been included in this year's report to complement the coverage of this criterion: 12.3 "Legal persons in member States can be liable for offences"; 12.4 "National legislations on mandatory human rights due diligence for businesses in their operations and in their supply chain"; Indicator 12.5 "States with provisions on 'forum necessitatis'".

It is then interesting to note that as a result of this broader assessment and of the inclusion of these new indicators, Spain and Netherlands have the best scores in this criterion (9,74/10). Both countries present high scores in relation to the existence and structure of their OECD National Contact Points for Responsible Business Conduct with wide engagement with stakeholders. Spain also ranks good in two other indicators: it has a high number of ESG and/or sustainability voluntary and mandatory reporting instruments and both criminal and administrative liability for offences is foreseen in its legal system. In the case of Netherlands, it stands out also in two other indicators: it also foresees both criminal and administrative liability for offences its legal system, it has national child labour due diligence law and there is a legislative proposal in parliament for a comprehensive mandatory due diligence legislation.

Malta and Croatia are the lowest countries in the ranking with 2,05 out of 10 points, due to two main reasons: neither of them are OECD members, so they score low on indicator 12.1 and they don't have any ESG and/or sustainability voluntary and mandatory reporting instruments (or there is no data about it in the consulted source).

Indicator 12.1 Existence and Structure of OECD National Contact Point for Responsible Business Conduct and stakeholder engagement

MoC	Score	Description
	+0.5 – + 3	Existence of NCP plus 1/2 additional point for wider engagement with stakeholders (government, business, trade unions, NGOs or independent experts/advisory body)
	-2	Not a member

Source: OECD, Annual Report on the OECD Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises, 2019.
Accessed 03/02/20

Indicator 12.2 Reporting Instruments – General Sustainability; Environmental, Social, Governance (ESG); Non-financial

MoC	Score	Description
	+6 to +0.5	Cumulative count of voluntary and mandatory reporting; 1/2point for voluntary reporting each and 1 point for mandatory reporting each
	0	No Reporting instruments within this 'field' or no data

Source: Global Reporting Initiative, Carrots and Sticks Database, Reporting Instruments, accessed 03/02/20

Indicator 12.3: Legal persons in member States can be liable for offences

MoC	Score	Description
	+2	Criminal liability for offences is foreseen
	+1	Administrative liability for offences is foreseen
	-1	None

Source: Principal European Commission DG Justice (Gert Vermeulen, Wendy De Bondt, Charlotte Ryckman), "Liability of legal persons for offences in the EU" Report, February 2014; Official Website Supreme Court of Croatia-Legislation, Accessed 01/09/20

Indicator 12.4 National legislations on mandatory human rights due diligence for businesses in their operations and in their supply chain

MoC	Score	Description
	+2	Human Rights Due Diligence Legislation that covers all human rights
	+1	Human Rights Due Diligence Legislation with limited scope (certain human rights or certain sectors)
	+0.5	Draft/Initiative Human Rights Due Diligence Legislation in Parliament or public committee of government to support due diligence legislation
	-1	None

Source: Business and Human Rights Resource Center, Chart on National & regional movements for mandatory human rights & environmental due diligence in Europe, Accessed on 01/09/20

Indicator 12.5 States with provisions on 'forum necessitatis'

MoC	Score	Description
	+1	Forum necessitatis foreseen
	-1	Forum necessitatis not foreseen

Sources: European Commission (Prof. Arnaud, Nuyts, Liederkerke, Wolters, Waelbroeck, Kirkpatrick), Study on Residual Jurisdiction: Review of the Member States' Rules concerning the "Residual Jurisdiction" of their courts in Civil and Commercial Matters pursuant to the Brussels I and II Regulations, September 2007; European Parliament (Marx, Wouters, Bright), Study on Access to Legal Remedies for Victims of Corporate Human Rights Abuses in Third Countries, February 2019; European Commission (BIICL, Civic Consulting, LSE), Study on due diligence requirements through the supply chain. Part III: country reports, January 2020; Nwapi, Jurisdiction by Necessity and the Regulation of the Transnational Corporate Actor, February 2014; Accessed 01/09/20

Criterion 12 Promoting corporate responsibility in business activities conducted abroad							
Countries						Aggregate Score	
	Indicator 12.1	Indicator 12.2	Indicator 12.3	Indicator 12.4	Indicator 12.5	Raw score	Conversion to 10
Range	+6 to -2	+5 to 0	-1 to +3	+1.5 to -1	+1 to -1	+14.5 to -5	0 to +10
Austria	6	0.5	2	0.5	1	10	7.69
Belgium	5	0	3	0.5	1	9.5	7.44
Bulgaria	-2	0	1	-1	-1	-3	1.03
Croatia	-2	0	3	-1	-1	-1	2.05
Cyprus	-2	0.5	3	-1	-1	-0.5	2.31
Czech Republic	6	0	3	-1	-1	7	6.15
Denmark	4	1.5	3	0.5	-1	8	6.67
Estonia	3	0	3	-1	1	6	5.64
Finland	5	2	3	0.5	1	11.5	8.46
France	3	3	2	2	1	11	8.21
Germany	6	3	1	0.5	1	11.5	8.46
Greece	2	0	1	-1	-1	1	3.08
Hungary	2	1	2	-1	-1	3	4.10
Ireland	1	0.5	2	-1	-1	1.5	3.33
Italy	6	6	2	-1	-1	12	8.72
Latvia	4	0	1	-1	-1	3	4.10
Lithuania	6	0	3	-1	1	9	7.18
Luxembourg	3	0	3	-1	1	6	5.64
Malta	-2	0	3	-1	-1	-1	2.05
Netherlands	6	2.5	3	1.5	1	14	9.74
Poland	2	0	2	-1	1	4	4.62
Portugal	2	1	3	-1	1	6	5.64
Romania	3	2	3	-1	1	8	6.67
Slovakia	4	1	2	-1	-1	5	5.13
Slovenia	4	0	2	-1	-1	4	4.62
Spain	6	5	3	-1	1	14	9.74
Sweden	4	2	1	-1	-1	5	5.13
United Kingdom	5	2.5	3	1	1	12.5	8.97

Section C: States’ respect for the environment and sustainable development

This part of the study relies on Beyond Ratings data and on the GREaT framework that has been adjusted for countries. The criterion seeks to capture the country’s situation in terms of preservation and management of the environment. Indicators in these sections are drawn from the latest versions of the following sources available at the time of writing: World Bank and Beyond Ratings.

Criterion 13: Environmental management

The environmental management dimension is captured by two areas: resources (health, pollution and waste and circular economy), and energy transition (use of low-carbon energy and greenhouse gas emissions). These issues are linked to human rights such as the human right to a healthy environment (waste, pollution, low-carbon energy...) and the right to health (pollution) in particular of future generations. High energy consumption levels in particular are closely linked to climate change, which will have - and is already having - impacts on the enjoyment of human rights, in particular of the most vulnerable groups (right to food, right to water, migrants’ rights, etc.). As for human rights issues, the indicators for which no complete and comparable data was available had to be dropped.

We acknowledge that the number of indicators included in this criterion is limited. As a result, the final ranking might not paint a complete picture of each state’s efforts, policies and measures to address environmental impacts. As mentioned in the introduction, the methodology is updated every two years, and we are continuously rethinking how to define the criteria and what indicators should we include.

On the basis of the indicators selected, the conclusions are that none of the countries have high scores, except from Sweden, scores 8,08 out of 10 points. At the bottom of the list we find Netherlands with 3,46 points and Luxembourg, with 3,08. Both countries presented a high amount of hazardous waste generated per capita, and a low percentage of low-carbon energy in primary consumption (excluding nuclear), combined with average or low performance in the rest of indicators.

Indicator 13.1 Air pollution by fine particulate matter (2.5): proportion of the population exposed to levels above WHO guidelines

Score	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3	+4
MoC	n/a	n/a	>109.89	91.99 - 109.89	56.16 - 91.98	38.24 - 56.15	<38.24	n/a	n/a

Source: World Bank, LBPAM, accessed 15/09/2020

Indicator 13.2 : Fertilizer use (kg per hectare of arable land)

Score	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3	+4
MoC	n/a	n/a	>382.58	349.11 - 382.58	172.73 - 349.10	139.25 - 172.72	<139.25	n/a	n/a
Note: Middle value is here median and standard deviation was calculated without outliers.									

Source: World Bank, LBPAM, accessed 15/09/2020

Indicator 13.3 Amount of hazardous waste generated per capita

Score	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3	+4
MoC	> 1000	400.00 - 999.99	162.96 - 399.99	162.96 - 135.36	80.15 - 135.35	52.54 - 80.14	<52.54	n/a	n/a
Note: Middle value is here median and standard deviation was calculated without outliers. Increments are standard deviation divided by four.									

Source: World Bank, LBPAM, accessed 15/09/2020

Indicator 13.4 Share of recycling in waste treatment

Score	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3	+4
MoC	n/a	n/a	<19.08	14.21 - 19.08	19.09 - 28.83	28.84 - 33.71	>33.71	n/a	n/a

Source: World Bank, LBPAM, accessed 15/09/2020

Indicator 13.5 Green proxy: percentage of low-carbon energy in primary consumption (excluding nuclear)

Score	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3	+4
MoC	n/a	n/a	<1.93	1.93 - 3.69	3.70 - 7.24	7.25 - 9.02	>9.02	n/a	n/a

Source: Beyond Ratings, LBPAM, accessed 15/09/2020

Indicator 13.6 Difference between current greenhouse gas emissions and compatible emissions 2° by 2030, divided by the number of years

Score	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3	+4
MoC	n/a	n/a	<-4.99	-4.99 - 1.21	-4.98 - 1.21	1.22 - 4.31	>4.31	n/a	n/a

Source: Beyond Ratings, LBPAM, accessed 15/09/2020

Criterion 13 Environmental Risk Exposure								
Countries							Aggregate Score	
	Indicator 13.1	Indicator 13.2	Indicator 13.3	Indicator 13.4	Indicator 13.5	Indicator 13.6	Raw score	Conversion to 10
Range	+2 to -2	+2 to -2	+2 to -4	+2 to -2	+2 to -2	+2 to -2	+12 to -14	0 to +10
Austria	0.00	1.00	-1.00	0.00	2.00	0.00	2.00	6.15
Belgium	0.00	0.00	-2.00	2.00	-1.00	0.00	-1.00	5.00
Bulgaria	-1.00	2.00	-4.00	-1.00	0.00	0.00	-4.00	3.85
Croatia	-1.00	2.00	2.00	-1.00	2.00	0.00	4.00	6.92
Cyprus	-1.00	0.00	-1.00	-2.00	0.00	0.00	-4.00	3.85
Czech Republic	-1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	-2.00	0.00	-3.00	4.23
Denmark	0.00	2.00	-2.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	5.77
Estonia	2.00	2.00	-4.00	0.00	-2.00	-1.00	-3.00	4.23
Finland	2.00	2.00	-2.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.00	6.15
France	0.00	1.00	-1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	5.38
Germany	0.00	0.00	-2.00	2.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	5.38
Greece	-1.00	2.00	2.00	-1.00	1.00	0.00	3.00	6.54
Hungary	-1.00	2.00	1.00	0.00	-2.00	0.00	0.00	5.38
Ireland	2.00	-2.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	5.77
Italy	-1.00	2.00	-1.00	0.00	2.00	0.00	2.00	6.15
Latvia	0.00	2.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	3.00	6.54
Lithuania	-1.00	2.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.00	6.15
Luxembourg	0.00	0.00	-3.00	0.00	-2.00	-1.00	-6.00	3.08
Malta	-1.00	0.00	0.00	-2.00	-1.00	0.00	-4.00	3.85
Netherlands	-1.00	0.00	-2.00	0.00	-2.00	0.00	-5.00	3.46
Poland	-1.00	0.00	2.00	0.00	-2.00	0.00	-1.00	5.00
Portugal	2.00	0.00	1.00	-1.00	2.00	0.00	4.00	6.92
Romania	-1.00	2.00	2.00	-2.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	5.77
Slovakia	-1.00	2.00	1.00	-2.00	-1.00	0.00	-1.00	5.00
Slovenia	-1.00	0.00	1.00	2.00	0.00	0.00	2.00	6.15
Spain	1.00	1.00	1.00	-1.00	1.00	0.00	3.00	6.54
Sweden	2.00	2.00	-2.00	1.00	2.00	2.00	7.00	8.08
United Kingdom	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	5.38

ANNEX: DETAILED RANKING

Overall		
Rank	Score	Country
1	74.11	Sweden
2	66.94	Finland
3	64.79	Denmark
4	64.77	Austria
5	63.50	Netherlands
6	63.15	Italy
7	62.96	Germany
8	62.88	Spain
9	61.62	Portugal
10	59.33	France
11	59.12	Slovenia
12	59.10	Ireland
13	58.59	United Kingdom
14	58.37	Belgium
15	57.59	Czech Republic
16	57.33	Lithuania
17	55.80	Croatia
18	55.22	Luxembourg
19	51.83	Romania
20	50.57	Latvia
21	50.49	Poland
22	50.02	Hungary
23	49.90	Estonia
24	49.69	Slovakia
25	48.77	Greece
26	45.71	Cyprus
27	43.25	Malta
28	39.83	Bulgaria

Human Rights		
Rank	Score	Country
1	75.88	Netherlands
2	71.25	Sweden
3	69.26	Finland
4	67.83	Denmark
5	66.86	Germany
6	66.16	Austria
7	65.70	Luxembourg
8	64.13	Czech Republic
9	63.84	Italy
10	61.96	Belgium
11	61.81	Spain
12	61.68	France
13	60.63	United Kingdom
14	59.70	Ireland
15	58.36	Portugal
16	58.09	Slovenia
17	55.53	Lithuania
18	53.15	Estonia
19	50.70	Poland
20	50.05	Croatia
21	49.56	Slovakia
22	49.32	Romania
23	48.82	Cyprus
24	48.38	Hungary
25	45.31	Malta
26	44.23	Latvia
27	41.64	Greece
28	40.42	Bulgaria

Environment		
Rank	Score	Country
1	80.77	Sweden
2	69.23	Croatia
3	69.23	Portugal
4	65.38	Greece
5	65.38	Latvia
6	65.38	Spain
7	61.54	Austria
8	61.54	Finland
9	61.54	Italy
10	61.54	Lithuania
11	61.54	Slovenia
12	57.69	Denmark
13	57.69	Ireland
14	57.69	Romania
15	53.85	France
16	53.85	Germany
17	53.85	Hungary
18	53.85	United Kingdom
19	50.00	Belgium
20	50.00	Poland
21	50.00	Slovakia
22	42.31	Czech Republic
23	42.31	Estonia
24	38.46	Bulgaria
25	38.46	Cyprus
26	38.46	Malta
27	34.62	Netherlands
28	30.77	Luxembourg

Keep your eyes open



Director of publication:

Alice Mogwe

Editor in chief:

Éléonore Morel

Authors :

Dr. Andrew Fagan,

Dr. Julia Firmin,

Dr. Larissa C. S. K.

Kersten and FIDH

Coordination:

Maddalena

Neglia and Ana

Pérez Adroher

Design :

FIDH / CB

Establishing the facts - Investigative and trial observation missions

Supporting civil society - Training and exchange

Mobilizing the international community - Advocacy before intergovernmental bodies

Informing and reporting - Mobilizing public opinion

For FIDH, transforming societies relies on the work of local actors.

The Worldwide Movement for Human Rights acts at national, regional and international levels in support of its member and partner organisations to address human rights abuses and consolidate democratic processes. Its work is directed at States and those in power, such as armed opposition groups and multinational corporations.

Its primary beneficiaries are national human rights organisations who are members of the Movement, and through them, the victims of human rights violations. FIDH also cooperates with other local partner organisations and actors of change.

CONTACT US

FIDH

17, passage de la Main d'Or

75011 Paris - France

Tel: (33-1) 43 55 25 18

www.fidh.org

Twitter: @fidh_en / fidh_fr / fidh_es

Facebook:

<https://www.facebook.com/FIDH.HumanRights/>

La FIDH
represents 192
human rights organisations
on 117 countries



inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment. Article 6: Everyone has the right to recognition everywhere as a person before the law. Article 7: All are equal before the law and are entitled without any discrimination to equal protection of the law. All are entitled to equal protection against any discrimination in violation of this Declaration and against any incitement to such discrimination. Article 8: Everyone has the right to an effective remedy by the competent national tribunals for acts violating the fundamental rights granted him by the constitution or by law. Article 9: No one shall be subjected to arbitrary arrest, detention or exile. Article 10: Everyone is entitled in full equality to a fair and public hearing by an independent and impartial tribunal, in the determination of his rights and obligations and of any criminal charge against him. Article 11: (1) Everyone charged with a penal offence has the right to be presumed innocent until proved guilty

ABOUT FIDH

FIDH takes action for the protection of victims of human rights violations, for the prevention of violations and to bring perpetrators to justice.

A broad mandate

FIDH works for the respect of all the rights set out in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights: civil and political rights, as well as economic, social and cultural rights.

A universal movement

FIDH was established in 1922, and today unites 192 member organizations in 117 countries around the world. FIDH coordinates and supports their activities and provides them with a voice at the international level.

An independent organisation

Like its member organizations, FIDH is not linked to any party or religion and is independent of all governments.

fidh