

## Appendix I

### The Global Innovation Index's rationale and origins, its conceptual framework and data limitations

#### Rationale and origins

The Global Innovation Index (GII) was launched in 2007 (see Appendix Box 1) with the aim of identifying and determining metrics and methods that could capture a picture of innovation in society that is as complete as possible.

There were several motivations for setting this goal. First, innovation is important for driving economic progress and competitiveness – for both developed and developing economies. Many governments are putting innovation at the center of their growth strategies. Second, the definition of innovation has broadened – it is no longer restricted to research and development (R&D) laboratories and published scientific papers. The concept of innovation has become more general and horizontal in nature, and now includes social, business model and technical aspects. Last, but not least, recognizing and celebrating innovation in emerging markets is critical for inspiring people – especially the next generation of entrepreneurs and innovators.

---

#### Appendix Box 1 History of the GII (2007–2022)

The GII project was launched by Soumitra Dutta, Dean of Saïd Business School at Oxford University, in 2007 during his tenure at INSEAD. WIPO's association with the GII started in 2011 and it began co-publishing the GII in 2012. In 2013, Cornell University joined as co-publisher, with Professor Dutta representing the GII at Cornell University and Bruno Lanvin at INSEAD. The GII continued to be co-published by Cornell University, INSEAD and WIPO until 2020. Since 2021, the GII has been published by WIPO in partnership with the Portulans Institute, various corporate and academic network partners and the GII Advisory Board.

---

Now in its 15<sup>th</sup> edition, the GII helps to create an environment in which innovation factors are subject to continual evaluation. It provides a key tool for decision-makers and a rich database of detailed metrics, offering a convenient source of information for refining innovation policies.

Measuring innovation outputs and their impact is a challenging task, hence great emphasis is placed on measuring the climate and infrastructure for innovation and assessing related outcomes.

Although the final results are presented as a series of rankings, the primary aim of the GII is to improve the “journey” to more accurate methods of measurement, understanding innovation and identifying targeted policies, good practices and other levers that foster innovation. The rich data metrics, at index, sub-index or indicator level, can be used to monitor performance over time and to benchmark developments against economies within the same region or income group classification.

#### Defining innovation in the GII

The GII adopts a broad definition of innovation, originally elaborated in the *Oslo Manual* developed by the European Communities and the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). In its fourth edition, in 2018, the *Oslo Manual* introduced a more general definition of innovation:<sup>1</sup>

“An innovation is a new or improved product or process (or combination thereof) that differs significantly from the unit's previous products or processes and that has been made available to potential users (product) or brought into use by the unit (process).”

This update of the *Oslo Manual* also introduced a series of definitions associated with innovation in business activities and for different types of innovation firms. In this context, innovation translates as improvements made to outcomes in the form of either new goods or new services, or any combination of these. While the GII focuses on a more general definition of innovation, it is important to highlight how these specific definitions capture the evolution of the way in which innovation has been perceived and understood over the past two decades.

Economists and policymakers previously focused on R&D-based technological product innovation, largely produced in-house and mainly in manufacturing industries. Innovation of this nature was executed by a highly educated labor force in R&D-intensive companies. The process leading to such innovation was conceptualized as closed, internal and localized. Technological breakthroughs were necessarily “radical” and took place at the “global knowledge frontier.” This characterization implied the existence of leading and lagging economies, with low- or middle-income economies only able to play “catch-up.”

Today, innovation capability is increasingly seen as the ability to exploit new technological combinations; it embraces the concept of incremental innovation and “innovation without research.” Non-R&D innovative expenditure is an important component of reaping the rewards of technological innovation. Interest in understanding how innovation evolves in low- and middle-income economies is increasing, along with an awareness that incremental forms of innovation can impact development. Furthermore, the process of innovation itself has changed significantly. Investment in innovation-related activity and intangible assets has intensified consistently at the firm, economy and global levels, adding both new innovation actors from outside high-income economies and non-profit actors. The structure of knowledge production activity is more complex and geographically dispersed than ever.<sup>2</sup>

A key challenge is to find metrics that capture innovation as it actually happens in the world today. Direct official measures that quantify innovation outputs remain extremely scarce. For example, there are no official statistics on the amount of innovative activity – defined as the number of new products, processes or other innovations – for any given innovation actor, let alone for any given country (see the GII 2013, Chapter 1, Annex 1, Box 1 (Cornell University, INSEAD and WIPO, 2013)). Most measurements also struggle to appropriately capture the innovation outputs of a wider spectrum of innovation actors, such as the services sector or public sector entities. This includes innovation surveys, which have contributed greatly to the measurement of innovation activities but fail to provide a good and reliable sense of cross-economy innovation output performance and are often not applicable to developing economies, where innovation is often informal.<sup>3</sup>

The GII aims to improve the measurement of innovation in order to provide a more complete picture of innovation ecosystems across the globe.

### **The GII conceptual framework**

The overall GII ranking is based on two sub-indices that are both equally important in presenting a complete picture of innovation; the Innovation Input Sub-Index and the Innovation Output Sub-Index. Hence, three indices are calculated:

- Innovation Input Sub-Index: Five input pillars capture elements of the economy that enable and facilitate innovative activities.
- Innovation Output Sub-Index: Innovation outputs are the result of innovative activities within the economy. Although the Output Sub-Index includes only two pillars, it carries the same weight as the Input Sub-Index in calculating the overall GII scores.
- The overall GII score is the average of the Input and Output Sub-Indices, on which the GII economy rankings are produced.

Each of the five input and two output pillars is divided into three sub-pillars, each of which is composed of individual indicators – a total of 81 this year (see the Economy profiles section for the Framework of the Global Innovation Index 2022). A detailed elaboration of the conceptual framework and pillars can be found in the 2020 edition of the GII.<sup>4</sup> Each sub-pillar is calculated by taking the weighted average of its individual indicators’ scores, which are normalized to again produce *scores* between 0 and 100. Pillar scores are calculated using the weighted average of each pillar’s sub-pillar scores.

### **Adjustments to the GII model in 2022**

Appendix Table 1 summarizes the adjustments made to the GII 2022 framework. The methodology of three indicators has changed, seven are new indicators (four of which replaced other indicators from the 2021 framework), one indicator was dropped completely and one indicator has a new data source.

**Appendix Table 1 Changes to the GII 2022 framework**

GII 2021		Adjustment	GII 2022	
1.3.1	Ease of starting a business*	Removed		
		New indicator	1.3.1	Policies for doing business†
1.3.2	Ease of resolving insolvency*	Removed		
		New indicator	1.3.2	Entrepreneurship policies and culture*
3.1.1	ICT access*	Methodology changed	3.1.1	ICT access*
3.1.2	ICT use*	Methodology changed	3.1.2	ICT use*
4.1.1	Ease of getting credit*	Removed		
		New indicator	4.1.1	Finance for startups and scaleups*
4.1.3	Microfinance gross loans, % GDP	Removed		
		New indicator	4.1.3	Loans from microfinance institutions, % GDP
4.2.1	Ease of protecting minority investors*	Removed		
		New indicator	4.2.4	Venture capital received, value, % GDP
6.2.1	Labor productivity growth, %	Methodology changed	6.2.1	Labor productivity growth, %
		New indicator	7.1.1	Intangible asset intensity, top 15, %
7.1.4	ICTs and organizational model creation†	Removed		
7.2.2	National feature films/mn pop. 15–69	New data source	7.2.2	National feature films/mn pop. 15–69
7.3.3	Wikipedia edits/mn pop. 15–69	Removed		
		New indicator	7.3.3	GitHub commits/mn pop. 15–69

Source: Global Innovation Index 2022, WIPO.

Notes: Refer to Appendix III: Sources and definitions for a detailed explanation of terminology and acronyms.

## Data limitations and treatment

This year, the GII model includes 132 economies, which represent 94.1 percent of the world’s population and 98.5 percent of the world’s GDP in purchasing power parity current international dollars.

The timeliest possible indicators are used for the GII 2022: from the non-missing data, 1.3 percent are from 2022, 28.6 percent are from 2021, 44.4 percent are from 2020, 10.2 percent are from 2019, 8.1 percent are from 2018, 2.4 percent are from 2017 and the small remainder of 5.3 percent are from earlier years.<sup>5</sup>

The GII 2022 model includes 81 indicators, which fall into three categories:

- quantitative/objective/hard data (65 indicators);
- composite indicators/index data (13 indicators); and
- survey/qualitative/subjective/soft data (3 indicators).

This year, for an economy to feature in the GII 2022, the minimum symmetric data coverage requirement is at least 36 indicators in the Innovation Input Sub-Index (66 percent) and 18 indicators in the Innovation Output Sub-Index (66 percent), with scores for at least two sub-pillars per pillar. In the GII 2022, 132 economies had sufficient data available to be included in the Index. For each economy, only the most recent yearly data were considered. As a rule, the GII indicators consider data from as far back as 2012, with a few noted exceptions (see Appendix I).

## Missing values

For the sake of transparency and replicability of results, missing values are not estimated; they are indicated with “n/a” and are not considered in the sub-pillar score. The audit undertaken by the European Commission’s Competence Centre on Composite Indicators and Scoreboards at the Joint Research Centre (JRC-COIN) (see Appendix II) assesses the robustness of the GII modeling choices (no imputation of missing data, fixed predefined weights and arithmetic averages) by imputing missing data, applying random weights and using geometric averages. Since 2012, based on this assessment, a confidence interval has been provided for each ranking in the GII as well as for the Input and Output Sub-Indices (Appendix II).

## Treatment of series with outliers

Potentially problematic indicators with outliers that could polarize results and unduly bias the rankings were treated according to the rules listed below, as per the recommendations of the JRC-COIN. Only hard data indicators were treated (34 out of 65).

### First rule: selection

Indicators were classified as problematic if they had:

- an absolute value of skewness greater than 2.25; and
- kurtosis greater than 3.5.<sup>6</sup>

### Second rule: treatment

Indicators with between one and five outliers (29 cases) were winsorized; the values distorting the indicator distribution were assigned the next highest value, up to the level where skewness and/or kurtosis had the values specified above.<sup>7</sup>

Indicators with five or more outliers, and for which skewness or kurtosis did not fall within the ranges specified above, were transformed using natural logarithms after multiplication by a given factor  $f$ .<sup>8</sup> Since only “goods” were affected (i.e., indicators for which higher values indicate better outcomes, as opposed to “bads”), the following formula was used:

$$\ln \left[ \frac{(\max \times f - 1) (\text{economy value} - \min)}{\max - \min} + 1 \right]$$

where “min” and “max” are the minimum and maximum indicator sample values, respectively.<sup>9</sup>

## Normalization

The 81 indicators were then normalized into the [0, 100] range, with higher scores representing better outcomes. Normalization was undertaken according to the min-max method, where the “min” and “max” values were the minimum and maximum indicator sample values, respectively. Index and survey data were exceptions; the original series range of values was kept as min and max values ([0, 1] for UNPAN/DPADM<sup>10</sup> indices; [1, 7] for the World Economic Forum’s Executive Opinion Survey questions; [0, 100] for the World Bank’s World Governance Indicators; [0, 10] for WIPO’s ICT Access and ICT Use Indices; and [1, 10] for the Global Entrepreneurship Monitor’s National Expert Survey indices). The following formulas were applied:

$$\text{Goods: } \frac{\text{economy value} - \min}{\max - \min} \times 100$$

$$\text{Bads: } \frac{\max - \text{economy value}}{\max - \min} \times 100$$

## Caveats on the year-to-year comparison of rankings

The GII compares the performance of national innovation systems across economies and presents the changes in economy rankings over time.

It is important to note that scores and rankings are not directly comparable between one year and another. Each ranking reflects the relative position of a particular economy based on the conceptual framework, the data coverage and the sample of economies of that specific GII edition, and also reflects changes in the underlying indicators at source and in data availability.

A number of factors influence the year-on-year rankings of an economy:

- the actual performance of the economy in question;
- adjustments made to the GII framework (changes in indicator composition and measurement revisions);
- data updates, the treatment of outliers and missing values; and
- the inclusion or exclusion of economies in the sample.

Additionally, the following characteristics complicate the time-series analysis based on simple GII rankings or scores:

- **Missing values:** The GII produces relative index scores, which means that a missing value for one economy affects the index score of other economies. Because the number of missing values decreases every year, this problem reduces over time.
- **Reference year:** The data underlying the GII do not refer to a single year but to several years, depending on the latest available year for any given variable. In addition, the reference years for different variables are not the same for each economy, due to measures to limit the number of missing data points.
- **Normalization factor:** Most GII variables are normalized using either GDP or population, with the intention of enabling cross-economy comparability. However, this implies that year-on-year changes in individual indicators may be driven either by the variable (numerator) or by its normalization factor (denominator).
- **Consistent data collection:** Measuring the change in year-on-year performance relies on the consistent collection of data over time. Changes in the definition of variables or in the data collection process could create movements in the rankings that are unrelated to performance.

A detailed economy study based on the GII database and the economy profile over time, coupled with analytical work on the ground, including that of innovation actors and decision-makers, yields the best results in terms of monitoring an economy's innovation performance, as well as identifying possible avenues for improvement.

## Notes

- 1 OECD and Eurostat, 2018.
- 2 See WIPO (2011–2021) for bi-annual elaborations on the changing nature and geographic dispersion of innovation. See Arundel *et al.* (2021) for an elaboration on the role and measurement of knowledge and technology transfer between innovation actors.
- 3 On innovation in the informal economy, see Kraemer-Mbula and Wunsch-Vincent (2017).
- 4 Cornell University, INSEAD and WIPO (2020), Appendix 1: [https://www.wipo.int/edocs/pubdocs/en/wipo\\_pub\\_gii\\_2020-appendix1.pdf](https://www.wipo.int/edocs/pubdocs/en/wipo_pub_gii_2020-appendix1.pdf).
- 5 The GII is calculated based on 9,482 data points out of a possible 10,692 (132 economies multiplied by 81 indicators), implying that 11.3 percent of data points are missing. The GII 2022 Database includes the data year used for each indicator and economy, downloadable at [https://www.wipo.int/global\\_innovation\\_index/en/2022/](https://www.wipo.int/global_innovation_index/en/2022/). If an indicator for an economy is missing, it is marked as “n/a” in the economy profiles.
- 6 Based on Groeneveld and Meeden (1984), which sets the criteria of absolute skewness above 1 and kurtosis above 3.5. The skewness criterion was relaxed to accommodate the small sample under consideration (132 economies).
- 7 This distributional issue affects the following variables: 4.2.1, 5.2.4, 5.3.2, 6.1.5, 7.2.4, 7.3.1 and 7.3.3 (one outlier); 2.2.3, 3.2.1, 4.1.3, 4.3.2, 5.2.3, 5.3.3, 5.3.4, 7.1.1, 7.1.4 and 7.2.1 (two outliers); 5.3.1, 6.1.3, 6.3.4, 7.1.2 and 7.3.2 (three outliers); 4.2.3 and 4.2.4 (four outliers); and 4.2.2, 4.3.3, 6.1.1, 6.1.2 and 7.2.5 (five outliers).
- 8 Indicators 2.3.3, 5.2.5, 6.3.1, 6.3.3 and 7.3.4 were treated using log-transformation (factor  $f$  of 1).
- 9 This formula achieves two things: it converts all series into “goods” and scales the series within the range [1, max] so that natural logs are positive, starting at 0, where “min” and “max” are the minimum and maximum indicator sample values. The corresponding formula for “bads” is:  
$$\ln \left[ \frac{(\max \times f - 1)(\max - \text{economy value})}{\max - \min + 1} \right]$$
- 10 The UNPAN/DPADM indices are generated by the United Nations Public Administration Network (UNPAN) and the Division for Public Institutions and Digital Government (DPIDG) (formerly the Division for Public Administration and Development Management (DPADM)).

## References

- Arundel, A., S. Athreye and S. Wunsch-Vincent (2021). *Harnessing Public Research for Innovation in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century: An International Assessment of Knowledge Transfer Policies*. Intellectual Property, Innovation and Economic Development series. Geneva and Cambridge: World Intellectual Property Organization and Cambridge University Press.
- Cornell University, INSEAD and WIPO (2013). *The Global Innovation Index 2013: The Local Dynamics of Innovation*, S. Dutta and B. Lanvin (eds). Ithaca, NY, Fontainebleau and Geneva: Cornell, INSEAD and World Intellectual Property Organization.
- Cornell University, INSEAD and WIPO (2020). *The Global Innovation Index 2020: Who Will Finance Innovation?*, S. Dutta, B. Lanvin and S. Wunsch-Vincent (eds). Ithaca, NY, Fontainebleau and Geneva: Cornell, INSEAD and World Intellectual Property Organization.
- Groeneveld, R.A. and G. Meeden (1984). Measuring skewness and kurtosis. *The Statistician*, 33, 391–399.
- Kraemer-Mbula E. and S. Wunsch-Vincent (2017). *The Informal Economy in Developing Nations: Hidden Engine of Innovation?* Intellectual Property, Innovation and Economic Development series. Geneva and Cambridge: World Intellectual Property Organization and Cambridge University Press.
- OECD and Eurostat (2018). *Oslo Manual 2018: Guidelines for Collecting, Reporting and Using Data on Innovation* (4<sup>th</sup> ed.). Paris and Luxembourg: Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development and Eurostat. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264304604-en>.
- WIPO (2011–2021). *World Intellectual Property Report* (various editions). Geneva: World Intellectual Property Organization.