CIRANO
Knowledge into action

GDP 5.0: REAL-TIME, MICRO-FOUNDED AND SUSTAINABLE METRICS FOR BEYOND-GDP ECONOMIC ASSESSMENT

THIERRY WARIN
SARAH ELIMAM

CS
2025s-20
WORKING PAPER

CIRANO
Knowledge into action

ISSN 2292-0838 (online version)

GDP 5.0: Real-Time, Micro-Founded and Sustainable Metrics for Beyond-GDP Economic Assessment[*]

Thierry Warin[†], *Sarah Elimam*[‡]

Abstract/Résumé

Gross Domestic Product (GDP) remains the dominant yardstick for economic performance, yet its aggregated, nation-bound and market-exclusive nature obscures crucial dimensions of prosperity, equity and environmental sustainability. Building on recent advances in data science and the expanding "Beyond-GDP" literature, this article argues for a generational shift in economic measurement designated "GDP 5.0." This new approach of GDP integrates high-frequency, geolocated micro-data with artificial-intelligence methods to generate real-time dashboards of economic activity, social welfare and planetary boundaries. The framework adopts an inductive, bottom-up approach, combining firm-level transactions, satellite imagery, sensor inputs, and social indicators. These diverse data streams are fused using explainable machine learning techniques to construct composite indices that capture regional heterogeneity and internalize negative externalities. The article examines the methodological foundations, governance challenges, and safeguards against algorithmic bias associated with GDP 5.0. It highlights the policy relevance of the framework through stylized applications in monetary, fiscal, and environmental domains. Aligning measurement practices with the complexities of the twenty-first century, GDP 5.0 proposes a pathway toward more responsive, inclusive, and sustainable economic governance.

Le produit intérieur brut (PIB) reste la principale mesure de la performance économique, pourtant sa nature agrégée, nationale et exclusivement axée sur le marché occulte des dimensions cruciales telles que la prospérité, l'équité et la durabilité environnementale. S'appuyant sur les récentes avancées en science des données et sur la littérature croissante consacrée au « au-delà du PIB », cet article plaide en faveur d'un changement générationnel dans la mesure économique, baptisé « PIB 5.0 ». Cette nouvelle approche du PIB intègre des microdonnées géolocalisées à haute fréquence et des méthodes d'intelligence artificielle afin de générer des tableaux de bord en temps réel sur l'activité économique, le bien-être social et les limites planétaires. Le cadre adopte une approche inductive et ascendante, combinant les transactions au niveau des entreprises, l'imagerie satellite, les données des capteurs et les indicateurs sociaux. Ces divers flux de données sont fusionnés à l'aide de techniques d'apprentissage automatique explicables afin de construire des indices composites qui reflètent l'hétérogénéité régionale et internalisent les externalités négatives. L'article examine les fondements méthodologiques, les défis en matière de gouvernance et les garde-fous contre les

[*] The authors would like to thank anonymous reviewers. The usual disclaimers apply.
[†] Fellow at CIRANO (Quebec, Canada)
[‡] CIRANO (Quebec, Canada)

biais algorithmiques associés au PIB 5.0. Il met en évidence la pertinence politique du cadre à travers des applications schématiques dans les domaines monétaires, fiscaux et environnementaux. En alignant les pratiques de mesure sur les complexités du XXIe siècle, le PIB 5.0 propose une voie vers une gouvernance économique plus réactive, inclusive et durable.

Keywords/Mots-clés: GDP 5.0; Beyond-GDP metrics; Real-time economic indicators; Artificial intelligence; Sustainable well-being / PIB 5.0 ; Indicateurs au-delà du PIB ; Indicateurs économiques en temps réel ; Intelligence artificielle ; Bien-être durable

Pour citer ce document / To quote this document

Warin, T., & Elimam, S. (2025). GDP 5.0: Real-Time, Micro-Founded and Sustainable Metrics for Beyond-GDP Economic Assessment (2025s-20, Working Papers, CIRANO.)

https://doi.org/10.54932/WFJI8791

Introduction

> "The welfare of a nation can scarcely be inferred from a measure of national income."
> — Simon Kuznets, 1934

Kuznets's first congressional report in 1934 opened with this prescient warning, and for nearly a century since, Gross Domestic Product (GDP) has provided policymakers a single numeric verdict on national success. It is an appealingly simple and seemingly objective yardstick that allows easy comparisons across countries. Yet this very simplicity can slip into reductionism. GDP tabulates monetary transactions but says nothing about how prosperity is distributed or whether it is sustainable. It remains silent on critical dimensions like income inequality, unpaid care work, environmental degradation, and the subjective well-being of citizens. In short, GDP measures an economy's size, not the welfare of its people. And in the twenty-first century—an era defined by intangible capital, global supply chains, and urgent planetary constraints—such a narrow focus has become untenable.

Three broad developments now make the case for a new generation of metrics. First, the structure of production has become increasingly globalized and digitalized, eroding the alignment between national borders and where economic value is created. Second, the goals of economic policy have expanded beyond growth to include sustainability and equity. Third, ubiquitous data and advances in artificial intelligence now allow measurement at a granularity and speed unimaginable to the mid-20th century architects of national accounts. Taken together, these trends invite an epistemic shift—from top-down, infrequently updated aggregates toward bottom-up, real-time, multidimensional dashboards. We term this prospective paradigm GDP 5.0. Yet for all their promise, data-science and AI tools remain underutilized in mainstream economics—prompting the question of how they can be harnessed to move "beyond GDP" in practice.

Historically, GDP has dominated as the primary gauge of economic performance. Originally conceived in the 1930s by Simon Kuznets to quantify the impact of the Great Depression, GDP was later refined during World War II by John Maynard Keynes to estimate Britain's wartime production capacity. Keynes's wartime formulation—essentially the sum of consumption, private investment, and government spending—gained international acceptance, and by 1944 the Bretton Woods Conference enshrined GDP as the standard benchmark for economic growth in the post-war international order. GDP's appeal lay in its operational simplicity and uniform definition, allowing for easy tracking of growth and straightforward country comparisons. Policymakers and the public alike embraced this single figure as a talisman of progress: when GDP rose it signaled prosperity, and when it fell, governments scrambled to revive it.

Over time, however, globalization and social change have revealed cracks in GDP's armor. The integration of economies worldwide means that production is now dispersed across borders through complex global value chains, blurring the link between a nation's GDP and the actual welfare of its citizens. Financial flows and multinational corporate activities often escape capture in national accounts, making GDP an increasingly noisy indicator in a globalized world. Additionally, beyond a certain threshold of material affluence, further GDP growth yields little improvement in average well-being—a phenomenon known as the Easterlin Paradox. Richard

Easterlin's seminal work showed that after a point, higher income doesn't markedly increase long-run happiness. This insight illustrates the complexity of the income–welfare relationship: GDP can increase even as many individuals see stagnating fortunes or as natural resources are depleted. In other words, the link between economic output and true prosperity is far more context-dependent and nuanced than a single aggregate number can capture.

The push to decouple economic growth from negative externalities—expanding GDP without commensurate rises in greenhouse gas emissions—further exposes GDP's shortcomings. Critics argue that GDP glosses over the harmful byproducts of growth, from pollution to resource depletion, effectively overestimating true progress when these costs are ignored. In response, economists and statisticians have called for more comprehensive indicators that account for sustainability and quality of life alongside output. Landmark reports have echoed this need—most notably the Stiglitz-Sen-Fitoussi Commission (2009), which urged that GDP be supplemented or replaced by metrics incorporating social and environmental well-being. Subsequent efforts have proposed alternatives like "green GDP," genuine savings, and indices of sustainable economic welfare that adjust for environmental damage and social inequality. These initiatives align with the sustainable development ethos underpinning the UN's Sustainable Development Goals. Some scholars and activists go further, questioning the very premise of perpetual GDP growth on a finite planet. The emerging degrowth literature (e.g. Weiss & Cattaneo, 2017) contends that endless growth is biophysically impossible and calls for a fundamental reorientation of economies toward human well-being and ecological balance rather than expansion for its own sake. Such critiques underscore the urgency of rethinking our measures of "progress" in light of 21st-century resource and climate constraints.

Addressing these challenges calls for reimagining how we measure prosperity to account for globalization's realities, negative externalities, and quality of life in an integrated way. Fortunately, emerging technologies—particularly AI and big-data analytics—promise exactly that: a more detailed, holistic representation of societal advancement and human well-being beyond what traditional GDP can capture. Researchers in psychology and economics have long explored broader gauges of prosperity, from measures of subjective well-being and life satisfaction (Diener et al., 2008; Veenhoven, 2012) to composite indices like the Human Development Index. AI-driven data science can supercharge these efforts, leveraging new data sources and computational methods to quantify dimensions of progress that were previously immeasurable or overlooked. This integration vividly demonstrates how our measurement tools shape our understanding of economic and social phenomena, and why we must continually refine those tools amid technological change. As we update what we measure, we gain new insights: for example, real-time data on air quality and mobility can augment our view of urban livability, while social-media sentiment or Google search trends can serve as proxies for aspects of well-being or distress that GDP ignores.

Methodologically, the rise of AI encourages a shift in economics from a primarily deductive approach (theory first, data second) to a more inductive approach that gleans patterns from vast empirical data. Philosophers of science like Carnap noted the power of induction in forming generalizations from observations. Today's machine learning algorithms embody this inductive spirit: they can sift through terabytes of data to detect patterns and make predictions without an a priori model. Incorporating such tools into economics opens the door to discovering new relationships and predictors of human welfare that traditional methods might miss. Notably, economists Athey and Imbens (2017) have advocated blending machine learning with causal inference to improve policy analysis, and Varian (2014) has similarly argued that economists should embrace techniques like decision trees, random forests, and neural networks to model complex, nonlinear relationships. By doing so, we can augment standard economic models with high-dimensional pattern recognition, improving both explanatory power and forecasting accuracy.

For instance, predictive analytics and machine learning can model and forecast the environmental and social impacts of policies with greater granularity than before. Hal Varian has observed that machine learning methods excel at handling large datasets and uncovering complex interactions, making them well-suited to economic questions involving many variables. In practice, this could mean using AI to predict how a carbon tax might ripple through an economy in terms of emissions, health outcomes, and jobs, or to simulate the long-term effects of an education reform on income distribution. The proliferation of satellite imagery and remote sensing data provides another powerful resource. Using platforms like Google Earth Engine, analysts can now monitor land-use changes, deforestation, or urban expansion in near real-time. These data can be translated into indicators of natural capital and environmental health, directly feeding into broader measures of sustainable growth. AI-powered analysis of big geospatial data has already been used to detect illegal mining, estimate crop yields, and monitor pollution, offering insights into environmental sustainability that GDP cannot capture. Similarly, advances in Earth-system modeling with AI (such as deep learning approaches in climate science) enable better predictions of phenomena like droughts, forest carbon flux, or climate tipping points—information vital to gauging the true long-term "wealth" of nations. On the social front, machine learning can illuminate patterns of inequality and opportunity by crunching massive administrative datasets. A prime example is the work of Raj Chetty and colleagues, who harnessed millions of tax records as "big data" to map intergenerational mobility across different regions and demographic groups. Their inductive, data-driven approach revealed nuanced relationships between economic growth and social outcomes—for instance, how factors like residential segregation or school quality drive mobility—thereby highlighting dimensions of progress (and regress) that a single GDP number would never reveal.

The integration of AI and data science into economic measurement is fostering a more granular and dynamic understanding of wealth, well-being, and sustainability. This paradigm shift naturally creates some tension between economics' traditional epistemology and these newer data-driven approaches. Economics has long prized elegant theoretical models and carefully identified causal effects, whereas machine learning emphasizes predictive accuracy and often treats the system as a "black box." Bridging these approaches requires openness to methodological innovation: economists must expand their toolkit to include AI's inductive techniques, even as they maintain rigor in interpretation. Some purists may hesitate, but the potential payoff is enormous. Embracing AI and big-data analytics offers a unique opportunity to rethink and redefine how we measure progress, enabling us to design metrics that truly reflect what matters for people and planet in the 21st century.

Importantly, this push to modernize metrics comes as the prevailing model of growth faces unprecedented challenges. The world economy today is vastly different from that of Keynes's era: over the past 50 years the global population has doubled from about 4 billion to 8 billion, and economic activity has exploded accordingly. Growth-centric policies have pushed up against the limits of sustainable resource use. Climate change, mass extinction, and resource depletion all sound alarms that current growth patterns are unsustainable. If our metrics continue to incentivize "growth at any cost," we risk overshooting planetary boundaries with catastrophic results. Updating our measurement frameworks is thus not just a theoretical exercise but a practical necessity. We need new solutions and new indicators to guide us toward a future where economic development is compatible with environmental stewardship and social well-being. In short, we need metrics that encourage quality of growth over quantity of growth.

One obvious shortcoming of GDP is its confinement to political boundaries. In a globalized economy, many of the most pressing issues—from supply chain resilience to tax evasion to carbon emissions—transcend national borders. It may be time to move beyond nation-bound metrics and develop indicators that capture the cross-border nature of economic activity. AI and data science now make it feasible to construct real-time, granular measures that offer a more accurate and holistic view of economic health. For example, we can aggregate data at the level of cities, regions, or even the entire globe, rather than just nation-states. We can track multinational companies' activities across countries to assess their true contributions (or damage) to welfare. Traditional GDP struggles to attribute production in complex global value chains—if a smartphone is designed in California, assembled in China, and uses minerals from Africa, who gets the GDP credit? A new metric could assign value-added more intelligently across borders. Moreover, stark differences in national economic structures (and statistical practices) mean that GDP is not always an apples-to-apples comparison for well-being. Two countries with identical GDP per capita may have vastly different outcomes in health, inequality, and environmental quality. This limits GDP's utility for cross-country comparisons, confining it mostly to tracking a single country's growth over time. By contrast, a data-rich dashboard of indicators or a composite index could enable more meaningful comparisons that account for each country's context.

In light of these challenges, we propose the concept of GDP 5.0 as a shorthand for a next-generation metric of prosperity—one that goes beyond GDP in its scope, methodology, and relevance. The name is inspired by Japan's "Society 5.0" vision, which imagines a human-centered society integrating cyberspace and physical space (the Internet of Things, big data, AI) to boost both economic development and quality of life (Fukuyama, 2018). Analogously, GDP 5.0 represents a human-centered measure of progress built for the information age. It is not just an incremental update to GDP, but a fundamental rethinking of how we quantify economic performance in a hyper-connected, tech-enabled world. By integrating social and environmental variables and utilizing real-time big data, GDP 5.0 aims to provide a more comprehensive and dynamic picture of national well-being. Imagine a metric that combines traditional output with measures of health, education, equity, happiness, and natural capital—and that updates continuously as new data come in. With modern data pipelines, this is no longer far-fetched: real-time satellite monitoring of forest cover and CO_2 levels could feed into an "eco-adjusted" output figure, while sentiment analysis on social media might inform a contemporaneous consumer-confidence or life-satisfaction index. Geolocation data from smartphones could help track human mobility and economic activity in real time, offering instant insight into the effects of a disaster or a policy change. In essence, GDP 5.0 would transcend political borders (acknowledging the global nature of many challenges) and look beyond narrow output metrics (capturing externalities and well-being), all enabled by inductive, data-driven methodologies that were inconceivable to the architects of GDP in the 20th century. This vision is still nascent—indeed, the integration of AI and comprehensive data into national accounting remains a gap in the current literature. By articulating the GDP 5.0 framework, we aim to help fill that gap, outlining how such an approach can be constructed and why it is needed.

The payoff of moving to a GDP 5.0 approach would be a more accurate and equitable assessment of global prosperity. By abandoning the narrow, nation-confined lens of GDP and embracing data-driven, real-time metrics, policymakers could gain better guidance for decision-making. We would be able to see, for example, whether growth is coming at the expense of environmental degradation or if improvements in one group's welfare are leaving others behind. This, in turn, is essential for crafting policies that truly enhance societal well-being and address the complex challenges of the 21st century—from climate change to inequality—rather than chasing a single aggregate number. In short, if we change how we measure success, we can change what we strive for.

This article is structured as follows. Section 2 provides a historical overview of GDP: its origins, its rise to prominence, and its well-documented limitations in today's globalized context—reinforcing why a sole focus on GDP is no longer sufficient. Section 3 examines efforts to incorporate social and environmental factors into our measures of progress. Here we discuss adjustments to GDP (such as accounting for wealth distribution or unpaid work) and alternative indicators that capture citizen well-being and sustainability. Section 4 explores how emerging technologies, especially AI and data science, can be leveraged to develop real-time, granular indicators—essentially sketching the blueprint of a "GDP 5.0." We present case studies and examples of how these technologies enhance traditional metrics, enabling us to internalize negative externalities and measure what truly matters in real time. Section 5 connects our discussion to related research and initiatives around the world, highlighting how our proposed framework aligns with or diverges from other "beyond GDP" endeavors, and what unique contributions it offers. Finally, Section 6 (Conclusion) summarizes the key insights and emphasizes the need for a paradigm shift in economic measurement. We argue that, armed with modern data analytics, it is both possible and necessary to develop new metrics that better capture holistic progress—metrics that will help guide us toward a more sustainable and inclusive future.

Origins of GDP as a National Accounting Metric (1930s–1940s)

The concept of "gross domestic product" (GDP) emerged from early 20th-century efforts to measure national income. Economist Simon Kuznets is widely credited with developing the first comprehensive national income accounts for the United States during the Great Depression. In a 1934 report to the U.S. Congress, Kuznets estimated U.S. national income for 1929–1932, essentially inventing what would later become GDP (initially expressed as gross national product, GNP). Notably, Kuznets warned from the start that aggregate income was not a true measure of national well-being: "The welfare of a nation can scarcely be inferred from a measure of national income". This caveat indicated an early awareness of GDP's limitations, even as the metric was being born. Kuznets's pioneering work (for which he later won a Nobel Prize) established a standardized way to quantify economic output and growth. By the late 1930s, Kuznets' framework for measuring GNP/GDP had gained traction among economists and policymakers.

World War II then catalyzed the refinement and adoption of GDP on a broader scale. In Britain, John Maynard Keynes recognized that precise national income statistics were crucial for wartime economic planning. Keynes, serving in the UK Treasury, worked with statisticians like Richard Stone and James Meade to develop national accounts that could estimate the country's production capacity and guide wartime budgeting. He even authored the text of the UK's first official national income and expenditure report in 1941, to assess "war finance" and resource allocation. Similarly, in the United States, the government drew on Kuznets' methods to plan wartime production and mobilization. During WWII both the US and UK found that having a single summary measure of output (GDP) was invaluable for answering questions like "How much can we spend on the military without crippling the civilian economy?". GDP estimates in current prices helped determine how to divert resources to the war effort while maintaining home-front consumption at acceptable levels. In this period, GDP was essentially a "war-time metric" – a tool for maximizing production under conditions of total war.

By the mid-1940s, GDP had proven its utility and was poised to become the cornerstone of global economic monitoring. The 1944 Bretton Woods conference – which designed the postwar international financial order – embraced GDP (and GNP) as the standard indicator of economic size and growth for all member countries. In the immediate postwar years, efforts turned to formalizing and institutionalizing GDP measurement across nations. In 1947 the newly formed United Nations Statistical Commission, under the leadership of Richard Stone, convened experts to establish international standards for national accounts. This led to the UN's System of National Accounts (SNA) – a unified framework that cemented GDP as the "centerpiece" of national accounting. The first SNA guidelines were published in 1953 (a slim 48-page document) and provided definitions of six standard accounts and tables for reporting a country's production, income, and expenditure. Thereafter, virtually all market economies adopted GDP (or GNP) reporting, and successive SNA revisions in 1968, 1993, and 2008 expanded and updated the standards. This postwar "national income accounting revolution" spread worldwide, meaning that by the 1950s–60s GDP was the dominant gauge of economic performance in both advanced and developing countries. (Notably, the Soviet Union maintained its own Marxist-flavored accounting system – the Material Product System – which excluded services, but even that ultimately converged toward the SNA after the Soviet era.) In sum, from Kuznets' calculations in the 1930s to the UN-backed SNA by 1953, GDP had been elevated from an academic concept to "the standard benchmark for economic growth" and an official tool of governments around the world.

Postwar Triumph of GDP and Early Criticisms

The post–World War II decades saw GDP reporting become routine and synonymous with national progress. High growth rates in the 1950s and 1960s – the "Golden Age" of capitalism – were celebrated through GDP statistics. GDP growth came to symbolize successful economic management, and international organizations like the IMF and World Bank used GDP to compare economies and determine development aid, quotas, etc. However, even during this period of GDP triumphalism, some economists remained cautious about over-interpreting the metric. Kuznets himself, in later writings (e.g. 1962), emphasized the need to distinguish "quantity of growth" from "quality of growth", urging policymakers to ask "more growth of what and for whom?". In other words, aggregate output was not a proxy for welfare unless one considered its composition and distribution. These early critiques were largely drowned out in practice, as GDP continued to "conquer the world" of policy. Still, the seeds of a critical discourse were present. GDP was a powerful macroeconomic indicator of market activity, but economists understood it had well-known shortcomings as a measure of economic welfare. By design, GDP focused on market transactions and production flows, not overall social well-being. As British economist Diane Coyle has noted, GDP prevailed historically "because the demands of wartime called for a measure of total activity," even though pioneers like Kuznets and Colin Clark would have preferred broader welfare metrics. Thus, from the very start GDP had its skeptics, but finding a better single measure proved challenging.

Critiques of GDP from the 1970s Onward

Serious critical discourse about GDP's limitations began to gain momentum in the 1970s, as the postwar boom faded and awareness grew about social and environmental issues. One of the most common criticisms that emerged was that GDP ignores environmental degradation and resource depletion. GDP can perversely count environmental destruction as economic gain – for example, clear-cutting a forest boosts timber output and thus GDP, even though it undermines long-term well-being. In 1972, the landmark Club of Rome report "The Limits to Growth" warned that unbridled economic and population growth would eventually hit finite resource limits, implicitly questioning the sustainability of GDP-driven growth (Meadows et al., 1972). That same year, Yale economists William Nordhaus and James Tobin published a famous study, "Is Growth Obsolete?" (1973), in which they introduced a "Measure of Economic Welfare" (MEW) as an alternative to "crude" GDP. Nordhaus and Tobin argued that GDP was an inadequate gauge of welfare: it fails to account for the value of leisure time, unpaid work, and environmental damage. Their MEW started with national output but added imputed values for leisure and household work (which increase welfare) and subtracted costs of pollution and urbanization (which reduce welfare). This adjusted index was an early attempt to reckon the trade-offs of growth. Importantly, Nordhaus and Tobin found that while U.S. MEW grew in tandem with GDP up to a point, the welfare gains of growth were not as high as raw GDP suggested – heralding the idea that beyond some level, "the costs of growth may outweigh its benefits." Their work in 1972 is considered a forerunner of later green accounting efforts.

By the late 1970s and 1980s, ecological economists and other scholars amplified the critique. Herman Daly, a leading figure in ecological economics, argued that the economy is a subsystem of the environment and cannot grow indefinitely without causing "uneconomic growth" – growth that actually diminishes overall welfare. Daly and theologian John Cobb proposed the Index of Sustainable Economic Welfare (ISEW) in 1989 as a direct challenge to GDP. The ISEW built on the insights of MEW, incorporating even more adjustments (e.g. for income distribution, environmental losses, and defensive expenditures). Their aim was explicitly to "debunk GDP as a measure" of progress. Analyses using ISEW/Genuine Progress indicators often showed that, after a certain point in time, many countries' welfare plateaued or even declined despite GDP growth – evidence that GDP growth beyond a threshold can be detrimental (through inequality, pollution, etc.). Around the same time, the concept of sustainable development entered the global agenda (e.g. the1987 Brundtland Report), further highlighting GDP's failure to account for long-term ecological health.

Another fundamental critique centered on income distribution and inequality, which GDP largely ignores. GDP per capita is an average; it says nothing about how evenly or unevenly income is shared. Beginning in the 1970s (and especially by the 1990s as inequality rose in many countries), analysts noted that GDP growth can coincide with stagnant or falling incomes for large segments of the population. As one report later put it, "average income per capita can remain unchanged while the distribution of income becomes less equal". For instance, if gains from growth accrue only to the top earners, GDP per person might stay the same or rise even as median household income stagnates. This disconnect was pointed out by various economists and eventually prompted calls to supplement GDP with median income or poverty indicators. In fact, addressing the distributional blind spot of GDP became one of the explicit recommendations of later "Beyond GDP" initiatives (e.g., the EU's 2009 GDP and Beyond roadmap called for "more accurate reporting on distribution and inequalities" alongside GDP).

A further line of critique concerned non-market activities and social welfare that GDP omits. GDP measures the value of goods and services exchanged in markets; by definition it excludes unpaid work and informal care, which are vital to societal well-being. As Diane Coyle observes, this boundary (what counts as "inside" the production boundary of the economy) is a matter of convention. For example, homemaking and child-rearing have enormous economic value but are not counted in GDP since no money changes hands. "A long-standing criticism" of GDP is precisely that it "excludes much unpaid work by households", and historically this meant the work disproportionately done by women. Feminist economists in the 1980s, such as Marilyn Waring, forcefully argued that by not valuing household labor, GDP provides a distorted picture of national progress (Waring's 1988 book If Women Counted was influential in this regard). As Coyle notes, it was "not surprising that feminist scholars have always decried the fact that work done mainly by women is literally not valued" in the national accounts. Although national statisticians drew the production boundary for practical reasons (it is difficult to measure home production), the consequence is that GDP underrates contributions to social welfare that fall outside formal markets.

By the turn of the 21st century, these critiques coalesced into a broad recognition among economists and international organizations that GDP is a narrow and incomplete gauge of societal progress. It captures the quantity of market output but not the quality of growth or its distributional and ecological dimensions. As the Commission on the Measurement of Economic Performance and Social Progress (the Stiglitz-Sen-Fitoussi Commission set up by France in 2008) noted, GDP was designed as an indicator of market production, not as a comprehensive measure of well-being. In its 2009 report, that high-level commission – chaired by Nobel laureate Joseph Stiglitz with Amartya Sen and Jean-Paul Fitoussi – famously concluded that "the time is ripe for our measurement system to shift emphasis from measuring economic production to measuring people's well-being". The Stiglitz-Sen-Fitoussi report detailed GDP's limits (for example, treating natural resource depletion as income, ignoring inequality and non-market services, and failing to account for sustainability) and recommended a dashboard of indicators tracking health, education, environment, employment, and distribution alongside GDP. It echoed the mantra that "what we measure affects what we do: if our measurements are flawed, decisions may be distorted." In short, by the 2010s there was a far-reaching consensus among experts that while GDP remains a crucial measure of economic activity, it is not a sufficient measure of economic welfare or progress, especially in an era of environmental stress and social upheavals.

Limits of Current GDP Methods and Indicators: Why GDP Is the Elephant in the Room

Today's limitations of Gross Domestic Product (GDP) as a measure of economic health underscore the need for more nuanced indicators of prosperity and sustainability (Bleys, 2012; Galiano Bastarrica et al., 2023). One fundamental shortcoming is GDP's inability to account for the complexities of global trade and supply chains. In a globalized economy, a single multinational firm might produce components in one country, assemble them in another, and ship the finished product elsewhere. GDP accounting treats these internal transfers as international trade, even though no real value is added when a product simply crosses from one corporate affiliate to another. As a result, official trade and GDP statistics can vastly overstate actual economic activity. In the words of Borin and Mancini, "[t]he diffusion of global value chains (GVC) has (…) deepened the divergence between gross flows, as recorded by traditional trade statistics, and the data on production and final demand as accounted for in statistics based on value-added (above all GDP)" (Borin & Mancini, 2019, p. 2). In effect, GDP has become the elephant in the room of economic metrics – a dominant indicator that everyone relies on, despite its glaring blind spots in capturing what is really happening in a globalized economy.

GDP's blind spots in global value chains (GVCs) mean that it often fails to reflect where wealth is truly created. Traditional measures do not distinguish between genuine value-added and mere transfers of goods within complex corporate networks. This calls into question GDP's validity as a realistic gauge of domestic production or national benefit – especially for countries deeply embedded in international supply chains (Piketty, 2014; Rodrik, 2015). Researchers have responded with methods to better capture global production networks. For instance, Wang et al. (2017) propose disaggregating production activities based on their involvement in GVCs – from entirely domestic production to complex multi-country processes. By focusing on value-added rather than gross output, this approach paints a clearer picture of each country's true economic contribution across global networks. It allows analysts to see how different segments of a value chain contribute to growth and how shocks propagate through supply networks. However, a limitation of such input–output based frameworks is that they rely on data that can be outdated by the time it's compiled, and they struggle to capture rapid shifts in production patterns due to political, economic, or environmental disruptions. In other words, even sophisticated value-added measures may lag reality in fast-changing global markets.

Building on the value-added perspective, Borin and Mancini (2019) tackle the problem of double-counting in trade statistics. They develop methods using inter-country input–output tables combined with detailed trade data to calculate the value added at each stage of production, across countries and sectors. This provides a more accurate mapping between supply and demand by stripping out the inflated figures caused by intermediate goods crisscrossing borders multiple times. Rethinking GDP on a value-added basis helps reveal the true economic interactions underlying global trade, underscoring the importance of looking at production in a granular, value-chain-aware way rather than through gross trade volumes. The takeaway from these efforts is that more detailed accounting of economic activity – who produces what, and where – significantly changes our understanding of national performance.

Other scholars emphasize that theory must catch up with these empirical complexities. Del Prete and Rungi (2017) argue that traditional economic models focused on broad factors (like demand conditions or contractual frictions) cannot fully explain the observed structure of GVCs. They call for expanding theoretical frameworks to include technological and firm-level determinants of global integration. In practice, this means recognizing the varied actors in a supply chain – from lead firms to suppliers – and how technological compatibility and innovation at the local level shape global production networks. This bottom-up view again highlights the need for micro-level granularity in our metrics. Taken together, the work of Wang et al., Borin & Mancini, Del Prete & Rungi, and others shows a clear trend: to measure economic performance accurately in a globalized era, we must incorporate the fine details of who is producing what and where, rather than just tallying up totals at national borders.

Crucially, these insights arrive at a time when embracing granularity is more feasible than ever. In the past, detailed supply-chain data were scarce or outdated, but today's digital revolution provides an abundance of real-time information. Big data, the Internet of Things (IoT), and AI have begun to transform how supply chains are monitored and managed, yielding continuous streams of data on production, shipments, and inventories. Our value chains are now awash with real-time data that could be used to map economic activity with unprecedented precision. This represents an enormous opportunity to improve national accounting. Granular, high-frequency data can help bridge the gap between abstract economic indicators and on-the-ground reality – if we learn how to harness it. In short, the push for more detailed microeconomic metrics coincides with a boom in data availability. The challenge (and opportunity) is to integrate these data into our measurement systems, which historically have not been very timely or detailed.

A second major limitation of GDP is its lack of timeliness. Traditional GDP statistics are reported with a delay and subject to revisions, leading to what economists call a recognition lag – a delay in recognizing turning points or emerging trends. In a fast-moving economy, this is a serious handicap: policymakers are often steering blind, relying on data from last quarter (or last year) to make decisions today. Here, too, researchers and institutions are striving for improvement. Ferrantino and Koten (2017) observe that modern supply chains have evolved from linear sequences to omnidirectional networks, where information flows in real time among suppliers, producers, and distributors. This real-time data sharing is making decision-making within firms more collaborative and instantaneous. The logical next step is for our aggregate economic indicators to catch up in speed.

To reduce this recognition lag, economists have begun developing real-time estimates of GDP. In this vein, some have proposed generating flash estimates of quarterly GDP growth using high-frequency data and advanced forecasting methods. For example, Jacobs et al. (2022) highlight how initial GDP estimates are frequently revised and can mislead decision-makers. They emphasize incorporating real-time information and machine learning techniques to improve the accuracy of early estimates of GDP. By continuously integrating new data as it becomes available – a process sometimes called nowcasting – their approach reduces delays and yields a dynamic, up-to-date reading of economic conditions. The goal is to provide policymakers with a "real-time" GDP signal that reflects the current state of the economy, rather than one that is months out of date. Importantly, Jacobs et al. find that using such methods can indeed shrink the errors in initial GDP reports and make subsequent revisions smaller. This illustrates how modern data and methods (like machine learning) can shore up one of GDP's biggest weaknesses: its lack of immediacy.

Researchers have also explored whether more sophisticated models can better capture economic ups and downs. Ferrara, Marcellino, and Mogliani (2015) tested non-linear models (which allow relationships to change during crises or booms) to see if they could improve GDP predictions, especially during extreme events like the 2008–09 Great Recession. While these complex models did not always outperform simpler linear models, they did show value in certain contexts – for instance, in capturing sharp swings in interest rates and prices during the crisis. The implication is that when the economy undergoes sudden regime shifts, flexible or time-varying models might depict reality better than static ones. This is another way economists are trying to refine GDP measurement: by allowing for non-linear dynamics and structural breaks, rather than assuming the same rules hold in normal times and crises alike.

Most recently, the rise of machine learning (ML) in economics has opened new frontiers for GDP estimation. Richardson et al. (2021) explored a range of ML algorithms for nowcasting GDP growth in New Zealand, tapping into an expansive dataset of about 600 indicators available in real time. They found that ML techniques – including boosted decision trees, support vector machines, and neural networks – substantially improved prediction accuracy compared to traditional statistical models. The best ML models reduced nowcast errors by roughly 20–30% and even outperformed the New Zealand central bank's official forecasts on occasion (Richardson et al., 2021). Such results are promising: they suggest that by feeding big data into powerful algorithms, we can get closer to the true pulse of economic activity in real time. These advances underscore how leveraging modern data science can make GDP (or similar indicators) not only more timely, but also more reliable as guides for policy.

Despite these improvements, a notable gap in the literature remains. The cutting-edge nowcasting models and machine-learning approaches mostly operate at the macro level, focusing on aggregate indicators like GDP, unemployment, or inflation. They generally do not incorporate the rich firm-level or sector-level detail that the GVC studies highlight, meaning they might still miss structural shifts beneath the surface of the economy. On the other hand, the detailed value-chain analyses and microeconomic datasets we discussed earlier are often only available with significant lags (annual input-output tables, multi-year firm surveys, etc.). In practice, this means we have one set of methods that are timely but coarse, and another set that are detailed but slow. No current approach fully captures both the high-frequency dynamics and the fine-grained complexity of the modern economy. This is the elephant in the room for economic measurement: everyone recognizes the importance of timely data and granular detail, but our primary metric (GDP) and its usual alternatives typically fail to combine both qualities.

Closing this gap will require integrating granular data with real-time analytics. The good news is that the data and technology to do so are increasingly at our disposal. As noted, global supply chains, financial transactions, remote sensors, and digital platforms are generating vast amounts of information in real time. The computing power to process these data has also grown exponentially. We are now in an era where economists and policymakers can access everything from high-frequency financial flows to satellite imagery of environmental changes. Harnessing these resources could revolutionize national accounting, enabling us to break out of the habit of making decisions based on incomplete, stale information. In short, we have an opportunity to "break the wheel" of flawed decision-making by building better metrics that reflect current realities. The challenge is largely methodological and institutional: how to sift valuable signals from the noise of big data, and how to incorporate new metrics into policy in a credible way. But the potential payoff – a more accurate and responsive picture of economic well-being – is enormous.

Another domain where GDP's limitations become evident is international trade and globalization narratives. Conventional metrics like the ratio of trade to GDP are often cited to gauge how "open" an economy is or to declare trends like globalization or deglobalization. However, as Richard Baldwin recently argued, these GDP-based ratios can be misleading in today's context. Baldwin (2023) points out that traditional openness indicators fail to adjust to structural changes, notably the rapid growth of the services sector in global trade. For instance, many countries show a declining share of trade in GDP in recent years, which some interpret as "deglobalization." Yet this decline often reflects the fact that services (which are less often exported than goods) now make up a larger share of GDP, rather than a true retreat from international integration. Baldwin advocates looking at price convergence (how closely prices of similar goods align across countries) and separating goods trade from services trade in our analyses. By drilling into more granular data – distinguishing exports from imports, and goods from services – he and colleagues reveal a more nuanced picture: globalization is not reversing but shifting toward services. In fact, about one-fifth of international trade today consists of intermediate services (things like business services, R&D, software, etc.), a segment that has been steadily growing (Baldwin et al., 2023). This insight was obscured by blunt metrics that lumped everything together. Baldwin's work is a call to update our trade metrics, and it exemplifies the broader theme that improving data granularity can overturn simplistic stories about the world economy. We fully concur with this approach – it shows that by using more detailed and appropriate indicators, we can better understand phenomena like globalization shifts, rather than mistakenly calling them "deglobalization" based on faulty metrics.

A further critical flaw of GDP is its failure to account for negative externalities and sustainability. GDP was never designed to subtract the costs of environmental degradation or social maladies. As a result, destructive or costly activities can perversely register as economic gains. A classic example is environmental exploitation: if a country were to log all its forests or overfish its waters, the immediate commercial activity would boost GDP, even though it would leave the nation poorer in natural capital and long-term prospects. The damage to ecosystems, biodiversity, and climate stability does not show up in GDP figures (P. Dasgupta, 2007; Stern, 2007). Likewise, expenditures related to negative outcomes – such as rebuilding after natural disasters, treating illnesses caused by pollution, or even the economic activity generated by higher crime and incarceration – all count positively toward GDP. In these cases, GDP is counting the remedy for a problem as if it were progress, when in reality a rise in such expenditures often means society is worse off. This disconnect has been noted by many economists and scholars (Arrow et al., 1993; Stiglitz et al., 2009), and it illustrates how GDP can give a false signal if taken as a proxy for well-being.

To illustrate this distortion, consider that a spike in GDP could come from an industrial accident that requires massive cleanup efforts and hospital care – activities which cost money and are counted in GDP – even though no one would argue that such an event makes the country richer in any meaningful sense. By focusing on the “shadows” of economic activity rather than its substance, GDP can mislead us (to borrow an analogy from Plato’s cave). We may obsess over the shadow on the wall – the GDP growth rate – without asking whether that growth comes from healthy, sustainable sources or from the erosion of our natural and social foundations. In the context of climate change and global environmental crises, this flaw is especially urgent. Policies that inflate GDP in the short run by encouraging resource extraction or high-carbon activity are actually undermining the basis of long-term prosperity. Yet, because these damages are externalized (not priced or accounted for), GDP gives the illusion of success right up until disasters strike.

Economists have long recognized the need to “internalize” negative externalities – essentially, to build the true costs of things like pollution into our accounting and decision-making (a concept dating back to Arthur Pigou in the 1920s). The idea is that if we deduct the cost of environmental damage or social harm from our measures of progress, we would get a more honest assessment of net welfare. In practice, however, bringing externalities into national accounts has proven extremely difficult. One reason is that these costs are hard to measure and even harder to agree upon internationally. Another reason is political: countries fear that if they unilaterally impose stricter environmental accounting or carbon taxes, they will hurt their industries’ competitiveness – a classic prisoner’s dilemma on a global scale. Dasgupta and Ehrlich (2013) illustrate a grim aspect of this problem: they show that when you have both population growth and consumption growth driving environmental decline, the two can reinforce each other in a vicious cycle. In such a scenario, each country might hope others will restrain themselves, while it continues with business-as-usual – but if every country thinks that way, the result is collectively disastrous and self-correcting mechanisms never kick in.

The competitive nature of international relations thus hampers the integration of externalities into economic metrics and policies. Short-term national gains are often prioritized over long-term global well-being, complicating efforts to adopt sustainable practices on a broad scale. Compounding this challenge is the fact that global economic governance lacks strong enforcement mechanisms. International bodies (like the United Nations or even agreements like the Paris Climate Accord) can set recommendations and targets, but they rely on voluntary compliance by sovereign states. There is no global authority to mandate a country to include deforestation losses in its GDP or to penalize it for prioritizing GDP growth over carbon emissions for example. Additionally, critical decisions on economic policy are often in the hands of a few powerful actors who may not be swayed by academic metrics. These actors – whether political leaders or influential business figures – might base decisions on ideology, lobbying, or short-term interests rather than data-driven evidence. As a result, GDP remains king in practical politics, simply because it is convenient and entrenched, even if it’s measuring the wrong things. This reflects a broader issue: without evidence-based decision-making at the leadership level, better metrics alone won’t change outcomes. It's easier for governments to stick with the familiar benchmark of GDP growth (and be judged by it) than to adopt new measures that could constrain their freedom to maneuver or expose uncomfortable trade-offs.

In response to these dilemmas, many experts have advocated for shifting our focus to alternative indicators that go "beyond GDP." Over the past few decades, a variety of composite indices and dashboards have been developed to capture aspects of well-being, sustainability, and inclusive growth that GDP overlooks (Bleys, 2012; Stiglitz et al., 2009). For example, the Human Development Index (HDI) combines income with health and education outcomes to gauge social progress. The Genuine Progress Indicator (GPI) starts with personal consumption (a major component of GDP) but then adjusts for factors like income distribution, adds values for positive things (volunteer work, household labor) and subtracts negatives like pollution and crime. The Social Progress Index (SPI) entirely skips economic measures, instead aggregating social and environmental performance indicators. These, and other similar metrics are attempts to broaden the definition of national success, reflecting the intuition that "progress" is not one-dimensional.

In earlier decades, such alternative metrics were often seen as academic exercises or advocacy tools with little practical traction. But in today's era of big data and digital measurement, the situation is changing. We now have the data granularity and computing power to measure concepts like health outcomes, education quality, environmental conditions, and even subjective well-being in real time and at fine geographic scales. This means that indices like HDI, GPI, or SPI can be calculated and updated with much higher frequency and detail than before, making them more relevant for policy. What was once dismissed as impractical is increasingly feasible: governments can, for instance, track air quality and greenhouse gas emissions continuously, use nationwide surveys or social media data to gauge public sentiment, and monitor inequality through tax records or other big datasets. The digital age offers an unprecedented opportunity to redesign our economic indicators by leveraging real-time, geolocated data on all facets of development. Even something as specific as business registry data – tracking new business start-ups, firm closures, etc. – can give timely signals of economic vitality or stress in a region, complementing the broader measures (this idea illustrates how unconventional data sources can enrich our understanding of economic dynamics beyond what GDP tells us).

However, while new metrics are proliferating, they have yet to dislodge GDP from its throne. One reason is that these alternatives often remain within the traditional nation-state framework and lack enforcement or incentives. A country might score well on the SPI or be praised for improving its HDI, but these accolades are not tied to the kind of market confidence or financing costs that GDP growth rates can influence. In the international arena, there is no binding obligation for countries to maximize well-being or minimize carbon emissions the way they feel obligated to maximize GDP growth. Thus, even well-designed indicators can end up as symbolic supplements to GDP, rather than replacements, if there's no mechanism to hold policymakers accountable to them. This is why some observers say new metrics need "teeth" to drive real change – in other words, they must be linked to policy levers or public accountability in a meaningful way. For now, GDP retains its primacy partly because the global system (from credit ratings to political campaigns) continues to revolve around it. Changing that system requires not just better metrics but also institutional change in how we use those metrics.

All of this points to the necessity of a paradigm shift in economic measurement. We need to move from viewing GDP growth as an end in itself to treating it as one piece of a much richer puzzle. This shift entails embracing new tools and interdisciplinary approaches. For example, advanced analytics and AI can be integrated into economic analysis to uncover patterns that traditional methods miss and to fuse disparate data (economic, social, environmental) into cohesive insights. By doing so, we could build composite indicators that reliably track sustainable prosperity – not just output. Imagine a dashboard for a country's performance that updates in real time and includes GDP alongside metrics for median income, health outcomes, carbon emissions, inequality, and natural capital depletion. Such a dashboard would give a far more balanced view of progress. Creating it is an ambitious goal, but increasingly within reach given modern technology. The interconnected challenges of the 21st century – from climate change to global pandemics – demand that we break down silos between economic data and other data. Our metrics should reflect the fact that the economy, society, and environment are deeply intertwined.

Economists have a pivotal role in driving this change. After all, they are the engineers and mechanics of the economic "engine." If that engine (our economy) is misfiring – producing growth that is neither inclusive nor sustainable – then the gauges we use (our indicators) need recalibrating. It falls to economists and other experts to diagnose why our traditional dials (like GDP) are misleading, and to design better instruments. This means updating the toolkit of economics: incorporating data science, embracing an inductive approach that mines insights from big data, and collaborating with environmental scientists, sociologists, and other fields. In essence, the discipline of economics must evolve from its old factory-floor mindset (where output is king and other concerns are external) to a digital-era mindset that values resilience, equity, and sustainability as integral parts of prosperity. Encouragingly, we are already seeing movement in this direction – with economists using machine learning to improve forecasts, or using satellite data to measure economic activity and environmental health in tandem. By leveraging new technologies and rich datasets, and by broadening the very definition of what constitutes "success," economists can help repair and improve the economic engine so that it runs on principles fit for a sustainable and equitable future.

GDP's century-long reign as the default measure of progress has left us with an indicator that is out of sync with contemporary realities. It's a giant, obvious problem hiding in plain sight – truly the elephant in the room. A growing chorus of research has exposed GDP's flaws: it mismeasures trade in a world of complex value chains, it ignores crucial aspects of well-being and sustainability, and it responds too slowly for real-time decision-making. Yet, simply critiquing GDP is not enough. The literature reveals pieces of the solution – value-added trade stats, real-time data analytics, alternative well-being indexes – but no single replacement has taken hold. The gap beckons for an answer: a new framework that combines the granularity of micro-level data, the speed of real-time monitoring, and the breadth of social and environmental indicators. The task now is to build on these insights and develop practical metrics that can guide policy beyond the narrow scope of GDP. In the following section, we turn to exactly that challenge – exploring how "beyond GDP" metrics, integrating well-being and environmental factors, can be implemented in practice to better capture what truly matters for national performance.

Implementing Other Metrics: Well-Being and Environmental Indicators

The discourse of neoclassical economics often juxtaposes economic growth with equity. This raises critical questions about whether society's objectives should prioritize maximizing GDP or achieving equity and sustainability. Traditional economic pragmatism emphasizes efficiency and GDP growth – "making the pie as big as possible" – with redistribution considered only in a second step. This focus on GDP has tended to sideline values like equality, diversity, inclusion (EDI), and environmental sustainability. The dilemma is clear: should societies prioritize economic efficiency, or broader measures of equity and sustainability? And can equity and sustainability be integrated into a long-term sustainable economic framework?

Some scholars in environmental sociology and ecological economics criticize standard growth-focused models, arguing that perpetual growth can incur more costs than benefits, especially environmental costs (e.g. climate change). They contend that such models marginalize long-term ecological and social sustainability issues. As Longo et al. (2016) put it, "sustainable socio-ecological systems must not only be resilient, but also socially just". This perspective highlights that resilience alone is not enough – social justice and equity are essential components of true sustainability.

International organizations have begun responding to these concerns. The OECD, for instance, notes that well-being "has become increasingly relevant as a 'compass' for policy". The OECD's Framework for Policy Action on Inclusive Growth (2018) embodies this approach by focusing on investing in people (especially those left behind), supporting business dynamism and technology diffusion, and rebuilding trust in efficient, responsive government. The idea is to ensure that growth is inclusive and translates into improved well-being. In fact, the framework explicitly positions well-being as the yardstick of success rather than GDP per capita. Key action areas include:

- Invest in people and places left behind: e.g. quality childcare, education, healthcare, and justice for disadvantaged communities.
- Support business dynamism and inclusive labor markets: e.g. promote innovation and technology diffusion (especially for small firms), strong competition and entrepreneurship, and access to good jobs for underrepresented groups.
- Rebuild trust and ensure responsive governance: develop an innovative public sector that uses data to personalize services and engages citizens, thereby improving confidence in government.

These priorities align with emerging concepts like smart cities. The development of smart cities invites decision makers to rethink traditional growth models and integrate sustainable, inclusive methods that prioritize quality of life, social equity, and environmental health (e.g. "smart growth" strategies). Smart cities leverage the Internet of Things (IoT), big data analytics, and AI to optimize and automate urban infrastructure and services. This integration helps manage resources more efficiently, reduce waste, and improve service delivery. In a smart city (or "Smart Nation"), real-time data collection and analysis inform decisions in areas like transportation, energy, education, and healthcare, improving both sustainability and citizen well-being. For example, data-driven insights can enable: real-time traffic management (reducing congestion and emissions), adaptive energy grids, targeted health interventions, and responsive education systems. By focusing on data as a resource, policymakers can shift from reacting to problems ex post to anticipating and addressing them ex ante, using up-to-date indicators of economic activity and well-being (as suggested by recent work on smart indicators in governance).

Well-being indicators aim to assess quality of life and happiness more holistically. As noted by Bleys (2012), numerous alternative measures have been developed and promoted since the early 1970s to capture well-being, economic welfare, and sustainability. For example, the Human Development Index (HDI) combines life expectancy, education, and per-capita income to gauge human development. Other composite indices incorporate survey data on life satisfaction, happiness, and mental health, as well as health metrics like morbidity, mortality rates, and access to healthcare (UNDP, 2024). The Gini coefficient, available via the World Bank's Poverty and Inequality Platform, measures income inequality by how far the income distribution deviates from perfect equality. Its calculation draws on income or consumption data from more than 2,000 household surveys across 169 countries, providing a rich basis for comparing inequality across time and place. Such inequality measures can be paired with indicators like employment rates (job availability and underemployment), education quality (literacy, school attainment), and crime rates (community safety) to give a broader picture of social health. Using these indicators aligns with the objective-based approach to measuring progress described by Bleys (2011), which emphasizes combining well-being and sustainability metrics alongside traditional economic metrics.

The Millennium Ecosystem Assessment (MA) (2005) was an early effort to integrate environmental factors into well-being evaluation. It assessed how ecosystem changes affect human well-being and was designed to inform decision-makers by filling gaps in two often overlooked components of well-being: equity and human–environment interrelationships. Today, the urgency of climate disruption has made environmental factors almost standard in alternative indicators to GDP. For instance, the Social Progress Index (SPI) captures performance on all 17 UN Sustainable Development Goals by measuring over 50 social and environmental outcome indicators across three dimensions: basic human needs, foundations of well-being, and opportunity. These include metrics like nutrition, water and sanitation, shelter, personal safety (basic needs); access to knowledge and information, health and wellness, environmental quality (well-being foundations); and personal rights, freedom, inclusion, and advanced education (opportunity). The SPI thus provides a comprehensive measure of societal progress beyond GDP, emphasizing outcomes that matter for people and planet.

Another global initiative is the Ecological Footprint by the Global Footprint Network, which gauges humanity's demand on nature. This open-source database (now maintained by York University's Ecological Footprint Initiative) uses approximately 15,000 data points per country per year to calculate each country's Ecological Footprint and biocapacity from 1961 to present. The results starkly illustrate unsustainable trends – over 85% of the world's population lives in countries with an ecological deficit, consuming more natural resources than their ecosystems regenerate. The Ecological Footprint (often expressed in "planet Earths" needed if everyone lived like a given country) can be paired with Carbon Footprint calculations (greenhouse gas emissions by country) to highlight environmental sustainability in concrete terms. As Bleys (2011) argues, classifying these indicators underscores the need to consider both sustainability and well-being when assessing societal progress – and to recognize the links between environmental health and human welfare.

One applied example at the subnational level is the Genuine Progress Indicator (GPI). The GPI was developed by the think tank Redefining Progress in 1995, building on the earlier Index of Sustainable Economic Welfare (ISEW) proposed by Herman Daly and John Cobb in the 1980s. Unlike GDP, the GPI attempts to account for the true economic welfare by adding positive contributions that GDP ignores (e.g. the value of household work and volunteer work, or the benefits of education) and subtracting negative externalities (e.g. environmental degradation, pollution, loss of natural habitats, crime, and income inequality). For instance, GDP would count expenditures on cleaning up an oil spill as economic "progress," whereas GPI would treat those as costs that reduce net welfare. The U.S. state of Maryland was the first to officially adopt GPI in 2010, using it as a "quality of life" indicator and maintaining annual GPI accounts as part of a state dashboard. Maryland's GPI includes ~26 indicators spanning economic, environmental, and social factors – such as net capital investment, cost of underemployment, cost of water pollution, cost of climate change, value of leisure time, and cost of income inequality. As understanding of these costs and benefits has improved and better data become available, Maryland updated the original GPI methodology. The "GPI 2.0" now takes advantage of higher-resolution data – for example, using spatial data for some indicators like forest cover and localized air pollution damage. This improves the accuracy of GPI and its relevance for policy at finer geographic scales. Other regions (Vermont, Hawaii, etc.) and countries (e.g. Canada and some EU nations) have also experimented with GPI or similar comprehensive welfare metrics.

At the city level, London (UK) has implemented an Economic Fairness framework as part of the "Smarter London Together" initiative. This measure, maintained by the City Data Analytics Programme, is designed to assess how fair and inclusive London's economy is. The framework defines economic fairness as a state where "all Londoners benefit from the city's success, with opportunity and prosperity shared". To track this, a set of indicators are grouped under three broad themes:

1. A labour market that works for everyone – covering pay differentials (e.g. the gap between top and bottom earners) and fair employment practices and representation (e.g. workforce diversity and inclusion).
2. Equal opportunities – covering measures of access to employment and "life chances" such as early childhood education (school readiness), school achievement, skills development, as well as indicators of inequality and perceptions of fairness in society.
3. Raising living standards – covering living costs (like housing affordability, transportation costs), poverty rates and financial inclusion (access to banking, credit, and financial advice).

These measures allow the Mayor's office to monitor problem areas and hold relevant actors (including national government, where appropriate) accountable for addressing unfairness. It's a good example of a data-driven, city-scale dashboard aiming to translate broad concepts of inclusive growth into specific, trackable metrics.

While all these alternative measures (HDI, Gini, SPI, Ecological Footprint, GPI, etc.) offer a more holistic view of progress, they are not without limitations. Many are composite indices that require subjective choices about weighting and valuation. Some suffer from data lags or limited geographic coverage. Moreover, most of these indices still rely on traditional data sources (e.g. surveys or annual reports) that are aggregated and infrequent.

Recent advances in data science and machine learning (ML) suggest ways to overcome some limitations. Studies have shown that using ML in economic forecasting can sometimes bypass human biases and yield more accurate predictions than classical models. For instance, an IMF study found that ML models outperformed both traditional statistical techniques and even the IMF's own forecasts in predicting GDP – but the best-performing ML model was a "black box" with low explainability. To address this, the OECD's Observatory of Public Sector Innovation (OPSI) developed an explainable machine learning (XML) model for economic forecasting. This approach allows users to generate accurate forecasts from multivariate time-series data and provides human-readable explanations of the model's predictions. Essentially, the model can display how each input variable (e.g. unemployment rate, consumer confidence, etc.) influences the GDP forecast, both in the short term and aggregated over time. Such tools help policymakers trust and interpret AI-driven forecasts by revealing the drivers behind the predictions, thus bridging the "black box" gap.

That said, these cutting-edge forecasting models still mostly rely on traditional GDP and macroeconomic indicators, and typically on national-level, quarterly or annual aggregate data. They do not yet incorporate the richer set of well-being indicators discussed above, nor do they fully utilize the high-frequency, granular data now available. In other words, the methodological advances are significant (combining inductive AI methods with economic analysis), but the metrics being forecast have not changed fundamentally. The challenge ahead is to integrate the diverse aspects of well-being, sustainability, and social cohesion into the data-driven models – essentially, to expand the target variables beyond GDP growth.

There are real trade-offs to consider. Prioritizing environmental sustainability might entail stringent regulations that slow down certain industries or require costly investments, affecting short-term productivity and GDP growth. Similarly, aggressive policies to achieve social equity (e.g. heavy redistribution or affirmative action) might, in theory, dampen some economic incentives or growth rates. Integrating multiple objectives into a coherent policy framework requires carefully analyzing trade-offs and synergies. Rather than treating economic growth as separate from (or opposed to) social and environmental goals, policymakers need models that show how these dimensions interact – where they complement each other and where there are real tensions.

In addition, the integration of Big Data and advanced analytics into public policy is becoming essential for moving beyond GDP. Today, governments have access to vast streams of digital data (e.g. satellite imagery, mobile phone data, social media, sensors) that, if properly analyzed, can provide real-time indicators of societal well-being. This enables a shift from static, retrospective measurement to dynamic, real-time monitoring of progress. Instead of waiting for annual statistics, governments can potentially track key metrics continuously – for example, real-time air quality and its health impacts, up-to-the-minute employment trends from online job market data, or daily mobility patterns indicating economic activity. Such dynamic indicators allow more timely and responsive policymaking, as policies can be adjusted based on current conditions rather than last year's averages. By leveraging these tools, governments can adopt a more holistic approach to measuring progress that reflects the complexity of modern economies and societies.

Integration of Big Data, AI, and ML into economic modeling is already reshaping analysis and policy. These technologies can identify complex patterns and relationships that elude traditional models. They can also incorporate non-traditional variables. For example, an AI might discover that the geographic clustering of certain industries (and the proximity of skilled workers, suppliers, and universities) is a key driver of productivity – an insight that might prompt new theories or policies around economic geography. Such patterns might challenge long-held economic theories, suggesting that some established concepts need revision in light of empirical evidence uncovered by AI. As one recent study highlighted, AI-driven macroeconomic analysis can offer "insights into economic dynamics with unprecedented accuracy", paving the way for innovative forecasting and policy-making approaches.

Beyond academia, AI and big data are also transforming business practices and global competition. Companies use AI for everything from automating routine processes to analyzing consumer behavior and optimizing supply chains, reshaping how businesses operate. This means that policymakers must also understand and harness these technologies, or risk their frameworks becoming obsolete. For instance, if GDP doesn't capture the real value being created in a data-driven economy (like digital services or free online platforms), new metrics will be needed to assess economic health.

Big Data Analytics (BDA) also offers government the chance to significantly improve public policy. By analyzing complex datasets, policymakers can make evidence-based decisions that improve governance and public welfare. Cities have already used big data to optimize traffic flows (e.g. by analyzing GPS data from smartphones to manage congestion in real time), resulting in better urban planning and resource allocation. Data-driven tools can increase transparency and accountability as well – for example, open data portals and real-time dashboards allow citizens to track government performance and outcomes, thereby rebuilding trust in public institutions. In essence, a data-driven approach can help shift governance from a slow, reactive mode to a more agile, proactive, and "smart" mode. According to a recent study by Hossin et al. (2023), big data has enormous potential to enhance public policy systems and enable a transition toward smart governance. The study identifies key big-data sources and techniques applicable at various policy stages – from planning and design to service delivery and evaluation – illustrating, for example, how satellite imagery analysis and natural language processing of text (like patent data or social media) can yield insights that go beyond traditional metrics like R&D spending. This heralds a shift toward a more nuanced understanding of economic and social progress, moving from crude proxy measures to capturing real impact and value creation on the ground. While challenges such as data privacy, quality control, and the need for robust ICT infrastructure remain, the capacity of BDA to provide accurate, timely, and context-specific insights can substantially improve policy effectiveness.

Governments thus play a crucial role in broadening the measures of progress beyond GDP. They can champion the development of new metrics, fund the necessary data infrastructure, and incorporate these metrics into decision-making. We are already seeing movement in this direction. Initiatives like Singapore's Smart Nation demonstrate a commitment to integrating data and technology into all aspects of governance – using digital innovations to optimize education, healthcare, transportation, and more (with a vision of greatly improving quality of life). Similarly, Japan's Society 5.0 concept envisions a technology-based human-centered society, blending economic advancement with resolution of social problems (Fukunaga, 2019). Bhutan's experiment with Gross National Happiness (GNH) is another pioneering example. Bhutan's GNH framework includes diverse dimensions of well-being – such as psychological well-being, health, time use, education, cultural diversity, good governance, community vitality, ecological resilience, and living standards – reflecting a holistic view of progress that goes far beyond income. Notably, GNH predates a lot of the modern tech revolution; it relies on extensive surveys and statistical weighting. One could imagine that combining Bhutan's GNH approach with modern data analytics and AI would make it even more powerful – for example, by tracking some of those domains (health, education, environmental quality) with real-time data and predictive analytics to inform policy in near-real time. Indeed, other countries and localities have started to take inspiration from GNH, and organizations like the OECD have launched their own well-being indices (e.g. the OECD Better Life Index) which share many domains with GNH.

In considering these developments, it's important to also reflect on historical lessons and philosophical underpinnings. The push for EDI (equality, diversity, inclusion) and broader well-being metrics can be seen as a continuation of long-standing debates about the purpose of economic activity and the role of the state. While the diagnosis – that pure GDP growth does not guarantee social well-being – is widely accepted, there is a cautionary tale in history: past attempts to engineer equitable outcomes (for example, in communist systems) sometimes led to the suppression of individual freedoms and poor economic results. The challenge is to advocate societal progress while preserving individual autonomy and innovation. In practice, this means new metrics and policies should empower citizens and encourage inclusive growth, rather than impose top-down constraints that might stifle personal freedoms or productivity. It is a delicate balance, essentially requiring liberal democratic institutions to internalize EDI goals without abandoning the competitive, open framework that has driven innovation.

GDP 5.0: A Data Science Perspective

The conversation around moving "beyond GDP" ultimately calls for a paradigm shift in how we measure economic health and societal well-being. We recognize that while the capitalist, market-based system has generated unprecedented prosperity, it has also led to serious issues like inequality and climate change. Traditional metrics like GDP, confined to political borders, have incentivized a sort of prisoner's dilemma between nations – each striving for higher growth at the expense of global commons (like the environment) and sometimes at the expense of equitable distribution. Simply introducing new metrics without addressing these underlying dynamics may yield limited results. As some economists (Stiglitz, Sen, Fitoussi, 2009) argued, we need better indicators that reflect true economic welfare and social progress, not just output. The Social Progress Index and others are steps in this direction. However, what we propose with "GDP 5.0" is a more radical approach: harnessing the power of data science to create an entirely new framework of metrics that capture real economic activity, well-being, and sustainability in real time.

Why “GDP 5.0”? The term is inspired by the idea of a disruptive generational leap, much like “Industry 4.0” or Japan’s “Society 5.0”. GDP 5.0 methodology departs from the traditional GDP in several key ways:

- **Inductive, bottom-up measurement:** Instead of aggregating a few macro variables top-down, GDP 5.0 builds indicators from granular microdata. With modern data, we can observe economic activity directly at the level of firms, households, and even individuals (through transactions, satellite images of nighttime lights, social media sentiment, etc.), then aggregate up to get a macro picture. This inductive approach can reflect the true complexity of global value chains and economic geography, rather than assuming all economic activity neatly fits within national borders. It challenges the relevance of measuring performance within the “boxes” of nation-states, when in reality production networks and supply chains are global and interwoven.

- **Real-time, high-frequency updates:** GDP is typically quarterly; many well-being stats are annual or less frequent. GDP 5.0 envisions continuous monitoring. For example, instead of an annual Consumer Price Index, we could compute a daily local inflation index using price data scraped from online retailers and scanners, tailored to different regions or demographic groups. We could estimate local real-time GDP growth by combining data on electricity usage, mobility (e.g. traffic or phone mobility data), and digital transactions, providing a proxy for economic activity in between official reports. Unemployment rates could be inferred from online job postings and tax records in real time, rather than monthly surveys. Essentially, if traditional indicators are like still photographs, GDP 5.0 would be more like a live video feed of the economy.

- **Granular spatial resolution:** Rather than a single number for a whole nation, metrics could be computed at the city or regional level, or even by industry cluster. This is crucial because economic conditions vary widely within countries. For instance, a single national interest rate or national inflation rate can obscure local realities – a point illustrated by the case of Canada’s recent monetary policy. The central bank applied a uniform interest rate hike to tackle national inflation, but inflation was much higher in some provinces than others. The one-size-fits-all policy ended up over-tightening in regions with lower inflation, arguably penalizing those areas unnecessarily. A GDP 5.0 approach, with regional inflation indices, might have suggested a more nuanced policy or complementary fiscal measures to account for these differences. In general, applying policy to “averages” often misfires; targeting interventions using granular data can make them more equitable and effective.

- **Integration of externalities and non-market factors:** As discussed, GDP 5.0 would incorporate environmental and social dimensions as fundamental components of economic performance, not just add-ons. This means internalizing negative externalities (like carbon emissions, pollution, resource depletion) by including them in the metrics (probably as subtractions or separate indexes) across global value chains. It also means leveraging ESG

(Environmental, Social, Governance) data, especially the Social dimension, to gauge qualitative aspects of growth – such as labor standards, human rights compliance, job satisfaction, community impact – across borders. For example, if a country's apparent productivity gains are achieved by offshoring production to sweatshops abroad, a GDP 5.0 metric would adjust for that by noting the social cost or unethical nature of that production. In this way, measures of progress become more ethical and accurate, reflecting not just the quantity of growth but its quality and impact on humans and the environment.

Developing and implementing GDP 5.0 will require new methodologies and international collaboration. Conceptually, one can envision a workflow for creating these advanced indicators (see Figure 2: Workflow for AI-Driven Economic Indicators). The process would involve: (1) Data Collection – gathering a vast array of real-time data from diverse sources (economic transactions, satellite images, IoT sensors, social media, health records, etc.); (2) Data Processing and Integration – cleaning and normalizing these data, and fusing them into integrated databases or data lakes; (3) AI/ML Analysis – applying machine learning algorithms, pattern recognition, and possibly natural language processing to extract meaningful signals and make predictions (for example, detecting an upcoming downturn by patterns in freight shipments, or measuring well-being by analyzing social media sentiment); (4) New Indicator Construction – synthesizing the analytical outputs into composite indices, live dashboards, or policy "scores" that decision-makers can use (e.g. a daily economic momentum index, or a real-time well-being index that combines stress levels, health indicators, and income changes); and (5) Policy Application & Feedback – using these indicators in policymaking and feeding the outcomes back to refine the models. The approach would be iterative: as policies are implemented, their effects would be immediately reflected in the real-time indicators, allowing continuous learning and adjustment.

By moving away from 20th-century, nationally-confined indicators and embracing data-driven, real-time, granular metrics, we can achieve a more accurate and equitable assessment of prosperity. This paradigm shift is essential for crafting policies that truly reflect our interconnected economy and for tackling complex global challenges like climate change, inequality, and technological disruption. It represents nothing less than a profound evolution in economic thought – akin to going from static snapshots to dynamic, high-definition maps of socio-economic activity.

Crucially, GDP 5.0 is not about making the GDP formula more complicated; it's about improving the data and dimensions that feed into our understanding of progress. Real change lies in better measurement rather than just better estimation of old measures. For example, rather than measuring inflation with a national consumer price index once a month, we could measure it city by city, in real time. Studies show that price levels and trends can differ significantly by location – something masked by national averages. With AI, local price data can be collected (from online marketplaces, local store scanners, etc.) and analyzed instantly, allowing targeted responses (such as city-level rent control or subsidies where inflation is hurting most). Similarly, local real-time GDP estimates can be produced using proxies like electricity consumption, mobility data, and electronic payments. High-frequency indicators of unemployment (using e.g. real-time payroll data or internet search data) can prompt quicker labor market interventions and retraining programs in areas where jobs are disappearing, rather than waiting for quarterly labor reports.

Another powerful tool is cluster analysis of economic activity. Traditional cluster analysis (pioneered by Michael Porter and others) has already shown that industry clusters – geographic concentrations of interconnected businesses, suppliers, and institutions – are key to regional economic performance. By applying advanced data analytics, we can map these clusters in greater detail and in real time. Recent work by Warin and colleagues, for instance, demonstrates how integrating big data can deepen our understanding of economic clusters, revealing nuanced interdependencies and opportunities that aggregate data might overlook (Warin et al., 2023). This means policymakers could pinpoint, say, a budding tech hub in a mid-size city and support it early, or detect when a historically strong manufacturing cluster is declining and intervene with revitalization policies.

Implementing localized, real-time metrics would make policy much more agile and precise. Imagine fiscal stimulus that is directed to specific communities the moment data shows they have entered a recession, rather than a nationwide stimulus that might overshoot in some areas and undershoot in others. Or consider monetary policy: central banks could adjust policies with regional nuances (or coordinate with regional authorities) if financial conditions diverge across areas. Employment programs could be tailored to neighborhoods experiencing factory closures as it happens, helping workers transition before long-term unemployment sets in. Housing policies could be dynamically tuned – if real-time data shows a surge in rents in a particular city, that city could quickly enact measures like rental assistance or fast-tracking new housing developments.

To give a concrete illustration: Figure 1 (Traditional GDP vs GDP 5.0) conceptualizes how our current approach (averaged, delayed, siloed by nation-state) compares to the proposed approach (granular, immediate, integrated globally). In the traditional view, a single GDP line aggregates everything, and policy is made for the "average" citizen or the "average" region, which can inadvertently increase inequalities because no one is actually average. Under GDP 5.0, we would have a dashboard of indicators – much like a car has multiple gauges (speed, fuel, engine temperature) – giving a multidimensional view of the economy's performance in real time and across different segments of society. This would enable more targeted and equitable public policies, which could not only improve outcomes but also reduce wasteful government spending by honing in on actual needs.

Of course, shifting to this paradigm poses challenges. One is complexity: a data-driven inductive approach is more complex than a few summary statistics. It demands technological innovation, new statistical methodologies, and a cultural shift among policymakers accustomed to simplistic metrics. There may be resistance, especially among those who are used to reasoning in terms of national averages and league tables. The notion of moving beyond the nation-state in measurement can be politically sensitive – governments often compare themselves by GDP rankings, and international relations are framed around national statistics. Convincing state actors to embrace a post-national view of economic accounting (for the sake of global goods like climate stability, or regional cooperation) is a diplomatic as well as technical hurdle. International competition can make it difficult to adopt approaches that transcend borders (who wants to be the first to possibly look "worse" in some new metric?). Yet, for issues like climate change and human well-being, clinging to purely territorial metrics is untenable – CO_2 emissions and pandemics, for example, do not respect borders, just as global supply chains blur the lines of national production.

Another challenge is ensuring that an AI-driven approach does not inadvertently reinforce biases or reduce human agency. If algorithms are naively applied, they might allocate resources in ways that favor those who already have advantages (because the data might show higher returns on investment in areas with more existing infrastructure or talent, for instance). If unchecked, this could exacerbate inequalities – for example, an AI might suggest investing more in wealthy regions because they yield bigger immediate economic gains, neglecting poorer regions that need investment most. To mitigate this, the design of GDP 5.0 must emphasize transparency, fairness, and inclusivity. AI models should be audited for bias, and the data inputs should be diverse and representative. Feedback loops from communities (e.g. participatory data collection or citizen reporting) can help ensure the metrics reflect on-the-ground realities and values, not just what's easy to measure.

So, what we propose is not just to use AI to better predict GDP, but to fundamentally redefine what we measure as success in the economy. Data science and AI give us the tools to capture a far richer picture of human welfare and our planet's health. We can move from a top-down, aggregated, infrequent metric to a bottom-up, granular, continuous system of metrics. This is a significant break from traditional economics, which often relies on high-level abstractions and static models. Indeed, this approach implies that economic theory itself may need to become more dynamic – instead of fixed laws, we might use adaptive algorithms that evolve as new data emerges. (For instance, an AI might discover that in the 2020s, education levels correlate with growth far more than, say, capital investment does – a suggestion that would prompt economists to revisit growth theory.) This kind of real-time theoretical evolution could unsettle policymakers, because it means the "optimal policy" might change as the algorithm learns. It introduces potential volatility in guidance: if our data-driven models are constantly updating, politicians might face a dilemma of chasing a moving target. Managing this – perhaps by setting broad strategy that is informed by AI but not slavishly following every fluctuation – will be important to maintain steady governance.

Ultimately, GDP 5.0 aims to mend the cracks in capitalism by updating its operating system. It treats capitalism not as an immutable ideology but as a tool – the price system embedded in institutional contexts – that we can improve with better information and incentives. By clearly distinguishing between the price mechanism (which efficiently coordinates supply and demand under many conditions) and the broader institutional framework of capitalism, we can introduce reforms that address inequality and sustainability without discarding the benefits of markets. For example, if real-time data shows exactly who is benefiting most from economic growth and who is left behind, policies (like targeted taxes or investments) can be calibrated to even it out, effectively asking those who gain most from the system to contribute more to fixing its inequities. This echoes ideas of inclusive capitalism, where those who succeed do so within rules that ensure benefits are shared and negative externalities are accounted for.

Convincing policymakers and the public to embrace GDP 5.0 will require demonstrating its value. Pilot programs could be started – perhaps a city or a small country implementing a mini "GDP 5.0 dashboard" – to showcase how it leads to better outcomes. Over time, as people see that focusing on well-being and sustainability metrics does not mean sacrificing prosperity (indeed, it may enhance resilience and quality of life), the new metrics will gain legitimacy. We also anticipate that as global problems intensify (e.g. climate impacts, tech-driven job disruptions), the pressure to move beyond narrow GDP will grow. In a globally interconnected system, it may even make sense to formulate policies at a supra-national regional level for certain issues. For instance, a cross-border regional policy (involving parts of multiple neighboring countries) might be more effective for managing a shared ecosystem or a common labor market than separate national policies. GDP 5.0 metrics could facilitate this by providing data aligned with economic realities rather than political boundaries.

While adopting a GDP 5.0 framework is undoubtedly complex, we are more prepared than ever to embark on this transformation. The world today has an abundance of new tools (AI, IoT, cloud computing) and an ever-increasing quantity of data, coupled with computational power that was unthinkable even a couple of decades ago. We have the means to implement solutions commensurate with the scale and interconnectedness of our global challenges. It is time to move beyond the obsolete metrics of the past and embrace a multidimensional, data-driven, humane vision of economic progress – one that truly reflects our global needs and values. In doing so, we can better diagnose issues, craft more effective and just policies, and ensure that the wealth of nations in the 21st century is measured in terms of sustainable well-being for all.

Real change does not necessarily require completely discarding familiar economic concepts or mathematical formulas. Rather, it requires feeding those frameworks with better data and interpreting the results in a richer context. A simple analogy: a car's speedometer (GDP growth) is useful, but if that's all you look at, you might ignore engine temperature (inequality) or oil pressure (carbon emissions) at your peril. By upgrading the "dashboard" with more indicators, and using state-of-the-art sensors (data sources) to keep them updated, we can navigate more safely and intelligently. The journey to GDP 5.0 is a journey toward an economy that is smarter, kinder, and more in tune with the planet. It acknowledges that what gets measured gets managed, and thus expands what we measure to ensure we manage what truly matters.

Conclusion

In the context of an increasingly globalized and complex economy, traditional metrics such as GDP have shown significant limitations in capturing the full spectrum of economic, social, and environmental dynamics. The GDP 5.0 approach presents a necessary and transformative paradigm shift in economic measurement, emphasizing the integration of real-time data, AI, and machine learning to develop more nuanced and comprehensive indicators. The approach proposed here, fundamentally reshapes the measurement of economic performance, especially in the context of global value chains. The traditional GDP measurement, confined within national borders, fails to capture the complexities of these chains, making a strong case for a methodology that extends beyond the nation-state framework. This approach is not just pertinent but necessary, as it aligns with the interconnected nature of today's global economy.

The Beyond GDP 5.0 methodology not only critiques but also proposes an evolution of economic metrics by emphasizing the importance of modern, digital data available in the 21st century. It argues that the debate around GDP's relevance often misses a crucial aspect: the critique is not necessarily about the age of the formula but about the datedness and limitations of the data it uses.

This approach suggests that while revising the formulas is beneficial, prioritizing the update and improvement of data inputs is perhaps more urgent and impactful, given the wealth of digital data now at our disposal.

Incorporating environmental and social indicators into this new framework addresses another layer of complexity. For environmental indicators, the global scope of value chains necessitates measurements that encompass the entire chain, thus mandating a departure from national-centric calculations. The approach to social or human development indicators might involve leveraging ESG (Environmental, Social, and Governance) criteria, particularly focusing on social aspects like labor quality and human rights across international value chains. This method proposes a more comprehensive and ethical evaluation of economic and social progress, grounded in the realities of global interconnectivity and the need for a holistic understanding of value creation and impact.

Concretely, this reimagined framework could lead to "augmented indicators," enhanced by AI and data science techniques, offering a more nuanced, real-time, and granular view of economic activities and their impacts. This not only allows for a micro-level analysis of macroeconomic trends but also enables tailored public policy responses based on detailed, localized insights rather than broad, aggregated data.

For the Montreal Conference, showcasing a proof of concept that illustrates the practical applications and benefits of this Beyond GDP approach could be immensely persuasive. Demonstrating how augmented indicators can reveal insights previously obscured by aggregate data would underline the argument for their adoption in both public and private decision-making processes. This presentation could explore the potential for these indicators to inform more nuanced, effective policies and business strategies that acknowledge and address the complexity of the modern global economy.

In essence, the conversation aims to transition from a critique of outdated metrics and methodologies to a constructive proposal for a more informed, ethical, and effective measurement of economic and social progress. This approach advocates for a significant paradigm shift in how we understand and evaluate economic performance, highlighting the role of advanced data analysis and AI in driving this evolution towards a more comprehensive, accurate, and equitable assessment of global prosperity.

References

Consolidated reference list (APA 7th), containing only the works cited in the manuscript

Athey, S., & Imbens, G. W. (2017). The state of applied econometrics: Causality and policy evaluation. *Journal of Economic Perspectives, 31*(2), 3–32. https://doi.org/10.1257/jep.31.2.3

Ando, S. (2024). *Smooth forecast reconciliation* (IMF Working Paper 24/66). International Monetary Fund.

Arrow, K., Solow, R., Portney, P. R., Leamer, E. E., Radner, R., & Schuman, H. (1993). Report of the NOAA Panel on Contingent Valuation. *Federal Register, 58*(10), 4601–4614.

Baldwin, R., Freeman, R., & Theodorakopoulos, A. (2023). Deconstructing deglobalization: The future of trade is in intermediate services. *Asian Economic Policy Review, 19*(1), 18–37. https://doi.org/10.1111/aepr.12440

Batsuuri, T., He, S., Hu, R., Leslie, J., & Lutz, F. (2024). *Predicting IMF-supported programs: A machine-learning approach* (IMF Working Paper 24/54). International Monetary Fund.

Bedi, C., Kansal, A., & Mukheibir, P. (2023). A conceptual framework for the assessment of and the transition to liveable, sustainable and equitable cities. *Environmental Science & Policy, 140*, 134–145. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envsci.2022.11.018

Bellini, P., Nesi, P., & Pantaleo, G. (2022). IoT-enabled smart cities: A review of concepts, frameworks and key technologies. *Applied Sciences, 12*(3), 1607.

Betley, E. C., Sigouin, A., Pascua, P., Cheng, S. H., MacDonald, K. I., Arengo, F., … Jupiter, S. D. (2023). Assessing human well-being constructs with environmental and equity aspects: A review of the landscape. *People and Nature, 5*(6), 1756–1773.

Bleys, B. (2012). Beyond GDP: Classifying alternative measures for progress. *Social Indicators Research, 109*, 355–376.

Blumenstock, J. (2018). Don't forget people in the use of big data for development. *Nature, 561*, 170–172.

Borin, A., & Mancini, M. (2019). *Measuring what matters in global value chains and value-added trade* (Policy Research Working Paper 8804). World Bank.

Chetty, R., Hendren, N., Kline, P., & Saez, E. (2014). Where is the land of opportunity? The geography of intergenerational mobility in the United States. *Quarterly Journal of Economics, 129*(4), 1553–1623.

Chia, E. S. (2016). *Singapore's smart nation programme: Enablers and challenges*. Lee Kuan Yew School of Public Policy.

Commission européenne, Direction générale de la recherche et de l'innovation, Breque, M., De Nul, L., & Petridis, A. (2021). *Industry 5.0: Towards a sustainable, human-centric and resilient European industry*. Publications Office of the European Union. https://doi.org/10.2777/308407

Costanza, R., Hart, M., Talberth, J., & Posner, S. (2009). *Beyond GDP: The need for new measures of progress* (Pardee Paper No. 4). Boston University.

Coulombe, P. G., Leroux, M., Stevanovic, D., & Surprenant, S. (2022). How is machine learning useful for macroeconomic forecasting? *Journal of Applied Econometrics, 37*(5), 920–964. https://doi.org/10.1002/jae.2910

Daly, H. E. (2006). *Beyond growth: The economics of sustainable development*. Beacon Press.

Daly, H. E., Czech, B., Trauger, D. L., Rees, W. E., Grover, M., Dobson, T., & Trombulak, S. C. (2007). Are we consuming too much—and for what? *Conservation Biology, 21*(5), 1359–1362.

Dasgupta, P. (2007). *Economics: A very short introduction*. Oxford University Press.

Dasgupta, P. S., & Ehrlich, P. R. (2013). Pervasive externalities at the population, consumption, and environment nexus. *Science, 340*(6130), 324–328.

Del Prete, D., & Rungi, A. (2017). Organizing the global value chain: A firm-level test. *Journal of International Economics, 109*, 16–30. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jinteco.2017.08.003

Department of State. (2021). *Enterprise data strategy: Empowering data-informed diplomacy*. U.S. Department of State.

Diener, E., Kesebir, P., & Lucas, R. (2008). Benefits of accounts of well-being—For societies and for psychological science. *Applied Psychology, 57*(S1), 37–53. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1464-0597.2008.00353.x

Easterlin, R. A. (1974). Does economic growth improve the human lot? In P. A. David & M. W. Reder (Eds.), *Nations and households in economic growth* (pp. 89–125). Academic Press.

Easterlin, R. A., Morgan, R., Switek, M., & Wang, F. (2012). China's life satisfaction, 1990–2010. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 109*(25), 9775–9780.

Ferrantino, M. J., & Koten, E. E. (2017). Understanding Supply Chain 4.0 and its potential impact on global value chains. In *Global value chain development report 2019* (pp. 103–119). World Trade Organization.

Ferrara, L., Marcellino, M., & Mogliani, M. (2015). Macroeconomic forecasting during the Great Recession: The return of non-linearity? *International Journal of Forecasting, 31*(3), 664–679. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijforecast.2014.11.005

Fox, M.-J. V., & Erickson, J. D. (2020). Design and meaning of the Genuine Progress Indicator: A statistical analysis of the U.S. fifty-state model. *Ecological Economics, 167*, 106441. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolecon.2019.106441

Fukunaga, T. (2019). Data free flow with trust and data governance. PECC.

Fukuyama, M. (2018). Society 5.0: Aiming for a new human-centered society. *Japan Economic Foundation Journal, 66*(6), 554–555.

Galiano Bastarrica, L. A., Buitrago Esquinas, E. M., Caraballo Pou, M. Á., & Yñiguez Ovando, R. (2023). Environmental adjustment of the EU-27 GDP: An econometric quantitative model. *Environment Systems and Decisions, 43*(1), 115–128. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10669-022-09872-0

Gentzkow, M., Kelly, B., & Taddy, M. (2019). Text as data. *Journal of Economic Literature, 57*(3), 535–574.

Giannetti, B. F., Agostinho, F., Almeida, C. M. V. B., & Huisingh, D. (2015). A review of limitations of GDP and alternative indices to monitor human wellbeing and to manage ecosystem functionality. *Journal of Cleaner Production, 87*, 11–25. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2014.10.051

Global Footprint Network. (2024). *Data and methodology*. https://www.footprintnetwork.org

Global Social Progress Index. (n.d.). Social Progress Imperative. https://www.socialprogress.org

Gorelick, N., Hancher, M., Dixon, M., Ilyushchenko, S., Thau, D., & Moore, R. (2017). Google Earth Engine: Planetary-scale geospatial analysis for everyone. *Remote Sensing of Environment, 202*, 18–27.

Hayden, A., & Wilson, J. (2018). Taking the first steps beyond GDP: Maryland's experience in measuring "genuine progress." *Sustainability, 10*(2), 462.

Herath, H. M. K. K. M. B., & Mittal, M. (2022). Adoption of artificial intelligence in smart cities: A comprehensive review. *International Journal of Information Management Data Insights, 2*(1), 100076. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jjimei.2022.100076

Hoe, S. L. (2016). Defining a smart nation: The case of Singapore. *Journal of Information, Communication and Ethics in Society, 14*(4), 323–333. https://doi.org/10.1108/JICES-02-2016-0005

Hossin, M. A., Du, J., Mu, L., & Asante, I. O. (2023). Big data-driven public policy decisions: Transformation toward smart governance. *Sage Open, 13*(4), 21582440231215123. https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440231215123

Hulten, C., & Nakamura, L. (2021). Is GDP becoming obsolete? The "Beyond GDP" debate. In B. Hall & J. Rosenberg (Eds.), *Measuring and accounting for innovation in the twenty-first century* (pp. 19–59). University of Chicago Press.

Jacobs, J. P. A. M., Sarferaz, S., Sturm, J.-E., & van Norden, S. (2022). Can GDP measurement be further improved? Data revision and reconciliation. *Journal of Business & Economic Statistics, 40*(1), 423–431.

Javidroozi, V., Carter, C., Grace, M., & Shah, H. (2023). Smart, sustainable, green cities: A state-of-the-art review. *Sustainability, 15*(6), 353. https://doi.org/10.3390/su15065353

Joo, Y.-M. (2023). Developmentalist smart cities? The cases of Singapore and Seoul. *International Journal of Urban Sciences, 27*(Suppl. 1), 164–182.

Kallis, G., Kerschner, C., & Martinez-Alier, J. (2012). The economics of degrowth. *Ecological Economics, 84*, 172–180. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolecon.2012.08.017

Kouloukoui, D., de Marcellis-Warin, N., Gomes, S. M. S., & Warin, T. (2023). Mapping global conversations on Twitter about environmental, social and governance topics through natural language processing. *Journal of Cleaner Production, 414*, 137369. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2023.137369

Kramer, M. R., & Porter, M. E. (2011). Creating shared value. *FSG*.

Krugman, P. (1991). Increasing returns and economic geography. *Journal of Political Economy, 99*(3), 483–499.

Kubiszewski, I., Costanza, R., Franco, C., Lawn, P., Talberth, J., Jackson, T., & Aylmer, C. (2013). Beyond GDP: Measuring and achieving global genuine progress. *Ecological Economics, 93*, 57–68.

Kuznets, S. (1934). *National income, 1929–1932*. National Bureau of Economic Research.

Keynes, J. M. (1936). *The general theory of employment, interest and money*. Macmillan.

Lim, T. K., Rajabifard, A., Khoo, V., Sabri, S., & Chen, Y. (2021). The smart city in Singapore: How environmental and geospatial innovation lead to urban livability and environmental sustainability. In T. Yigitcanlar & S. K. Han (Eds.), *Smart cities for technological and social innovation* (pp. 29–49). Elsevier.

Llena-Nozal, A., Martin, N., & Murtin, F. (2019). *The economy of well-being: Creating opportunities for people's well-being and economic growth* (OECD Statistics and Data Directorate Working Paper 102). OECD Publishing.

Longo, S. B., Clark, B., Shriver, T. E., & Clausen, R. (2016). Sustainability and environmental sociology: Moving toward an integrative socio-ecology. *Sustainability, 8*(5), 437. https://doi.org/10.3390/su8050437

Malek, J. A., Lim, S. B., & Yigitcanlar, T. (2021). Social inclusion indicators for building citizen-centric smart cities: A systematic literature review. *Sustainability, 13*(1), 376. https://doi.org/10.3390/su13010376

Maryland Genuine Progress Indicator. (n.d.). *Quality of life dashboard*. Maryland Department of Natural Resources.

Meadows, D., & Randers, J. (2012). *The limits to growth: The 30-year update*. Chelsea Green.

Observatory of Public Sector Innovation. (2021). *Forecasting GDP with explainable AI*. OECD.

OECD. (2018). *Opportunities for all: A framework for policy action on inclusive growth*. OECD Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264301665-en

Piketty, T. (2014). *Capital in the twenty-first century*. Harvard University Press.

Pratt, L., Bisson, C., & Warin, T. (2023). Bringing advanced technology to strategic decision-making: The Decision Intelligence/Data Science integration framework. *Futures, 152*, 103217. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.futures.2023.103217

Reichstein, M., Camps-Valls, G., Stevens, B., Jung, M., Denzler, J., Carvalhais, N., & Prabhat. (2019). Deep learning and process understanding for data-driven Earth system science. *Nature, 566*(7743), 195–204.

Richardson, A., van Florenstein Mulder, T., & Vehbi, T. (2021). Nowcasting GDP using machine-learning algorithms: A real-time assessment. *International Journal of Forecasting, 37*(2), 941–948.

Rockström, J., Steffen, W., Noone, K., Persson, Å., Chapin, F. S., Lambin, E. F., … Foley, J. A. (2009). A safe operating space for humanity. *Nature, 461*(7263), 472–475. https://doi.org/10.1038/461472a

Rodrik, D. (2015). *Economics rules: The rights and wrongs of the dismal science*. W. W. Norton.

Sachs, J. D. (2015). *The age of sustainable development*. Columbia University Press.

Sen, A. (1999). *Development as freedom*. Oxford University Press.

Sithey, G., Thow, A.-M., & Li, M. (2015). Gross National Happiness and health: Lessons from Bhutan. *Bulletin of the World Health Organization, 93*(8), 514.

Soni, N., Sharma, E. K., Singh, N., & Kapoor, A. (2020). Artificial intelligence in business: From research and innovation to market deployment. *Procedia Computer Science, 167*, 2200–2210. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.procs.2020.03.272

Stern, N. (2007). *The economics of climate change: The Stern Review*. Cambridge University Press.

Stevanovic, D. (2021). Prévision macroéconomique dans l'ère des données massives et de l'apprentissage automatique. In C. Mathieu (Ed.), *Le Québec économique 9* (pp. 315–351). CIRANO.

Stiglitz, J. E., Sen, A. K., & Fitoussi, J.-P. (2009). *Report by the Commission on the Measurement of Economic Performance and Social Progress*.

Suominen, A., & Hajikhani, A. (2021). Research themes in big data analytics for policymaking: Insights from a mixed-methods systematic literature review. *Policy & Internet, 13*(4), 464–484.

Talberth, J., Cobb, C., & Slattery, N. (2007). *The Genuine Progress Indicator 2006*. Redefining Progress.

UNDP. (2024). *Human development report 2023/24: Breaking the gridlock—Reimagining cooperation in a polarized world*. United Nations Development Programme.

Vanham, P. (2021). Stakeholder capitalism: A brief history of GDP—and what could come next. *World Economic Forum Agenda*.

Varian, H. R. (2014). Big data: New tricks for econometrics. *Journal of Economic Perspectives, 28*(2), 3–28. https://doi.org/10.1257/jep.28.2.3

Veenhoven, R. (2012). Cross-national differences in happiness: Cultural measurement bias or effect of culture? *International Journal of Wellbeing, 2*(4), 333–353.

Wang, Z., Wei, S.-J., Yu, X., & Zhu, K. (2017). Measures of participation in global value chains and global business cycles (NBER Working Paper 23222). National Bureau of Economic Research. https://doi.org/10.3386/w23222

Warin, T., De Marcellis-Warin, N., Elimam, S., & Panot, M. (2023). La diplomatie à l'heure de la science des données: Réflexions stratégiques et perspectives. CIRANO. https://doi.org/10.54932/JRBV7364

Weiss, M., & Cattaneo, C. (2017). Degrowth—Taking stock and reviewing an emerging academic paradigm. *Ecological Economics, 137*, 220–230.

World Bank. (2024). *GINI Index: Poverty and Inequality Platform*. https://pip.worldbank.org

World Economic Forum. (2022). Data free flow with trust, now entering implementation phase. *World Economic Forum Agenda*.