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Abstract

The paper focuses on the various aspects especially as globally accepted fact is that social and key economic indicators are influenced by the government activities. Public Sector Performance and efficiency reflect government priorities. The paper evaluates the public sector performance of Pakistan by calculating the Public Sector Performance Index based on seven indicators and these seven indicators are further classified into two broad groups. Many international studies have carried out the performance evaluation of public sectors of industrialized countries missing the public sector performance of Pakistan with other countries. With the aim, Public Sector Performance of Pakistan was compared with countries of South Asia and some developed countries. The research analyzes the public sector performance indicators of countries to calculate the overall performance. The paper aims to compare public sector performance of Pakistan with South Asian Countries and members of Organization of Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), which currently includes 34 Countries.

Key Words: Performance Indicator, Public Sector, Performance Evaluation, OECD, Pakistan

Introduction

Public sector performance determines the outcome of activities in Public sector while public sector efficiency is calculated by comparing the finances used as public expenditure in achieving it (Fraser Alert, March 2007). Many studies have been carried out to determine and empirically assess the Public sector performance of countries but have mainly focused the industrialized countries. Over the years, Chinese government have been evaluating the impact of various systems
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implemented in their country and have transitioned from one to another in an effort
to improve the evaluation system of public sector performance (Sarfraz, 2014).

**Evaluation of Implemented systems by Chinese Government**

In an effort to bring transition in China, Chinese government carried out performance evaluation of various levels of government departments. The aim and objective of the activity was to bring transition in the country from a planned economy to market economy. It seems significantly considered because the indicators related to performance also depend on their accessibility and utility in the contextual paradigms (Carter, 2002). In 1990s, performance evaluation systems at various first levels of government, functional departments, social organizations and public level organizations were studied. It was found that some evaluation systems had local characteristics (Zhuhai, 1999).

**Evaluation of Internationally Recognized Performance Evaluation Systems by Chinese Government**

The performance evaluation systems that were studied also varied in characteristics as regards to contents and methods. Variations were also observed on defining the criteria for evaluation based on cycles or duration and the value. International, there is a consensus that the methods for performance evaluation be based on efficiency, economy and effect. A new concept has included quality as the fourth dimension worth evaluating. Out of all internationally available or adopted performance evaluation systems, “Balance Scorecard” and “3E” are the most widely used performance evaluation system for local government in China (Sarfraz, 2006).

**Suitability of Internationally Recognized Systems for China**

The existing performance evaluation systems in the world are designed and developed according to the environment and local conditions of the particular area. Applying the same systems across China do not cater for their needs. This either involves changing the values or local systems or requires redefinition of international systems as per the requirements of Chinese local Government keeping in view the local norms, customs and values.

**International Studies on Public Sector Performance Evaluation**

It is difficult to determine performance of a public organization due to difficulties in defining performance which may be the outcomes coming up on unintentional bases (Smith, 1995). This is a result of problems in defining a meaning of the concept of performance; means of obtaining performance and evaluation of
performance. It also seemingly shows that the performance related indicators may be clearly shown as a set of aspects to be observed and analyzed (Brignall, 2000). They believe that measurement of public sector performance involves taking into account the difference between input, procedures and processes, and the final outcomes (Tanzi, 2000).

Previous studies on efficiency of public sector show the comparison of the PSP factors was determined based on almost seven factors as shown in Figure 1 (Afonso et al 2005).

In March 2007, Fraser Institute carried out a study on comparing performance related to public sector at international level. The study determined the Public Sector Performance and Efficiency of twenty three industrial oriented countries. The performance related to Public Sector was determined on the seven indicators proposed by researchers. The study aimed at evaluating, on the same frame work as done by Fraser Institute, the Public Sector Performance of Pakistan as compared to South Asia and current 34 countries of Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (March, 2007).

Public sector performance indicators may base on the goals and objectives of the organizations, relying on to some extent the relative demand of such indicators in the public sector performance measurement (Rainey, 1976). In this way, comparison of the indicators of one Govt. with other Govt. may be a tough job, as it’s based on the circumstances, ideologies, and relevancy related aspect, but important issue is to measure and assess in comparison with each other (Walle, 2009). Similarly, comparing based on perceived performance and the actual performance is another issue which may need attention, generating an idea for the system of assessment in organizations (Leeuw, 2002).

Another aspect is the dynamics of performance indicators – here the perspectives related to performance vary as individual perspective, group perspective, team and organizational perspective, but then comes the system perspective of organizational performance which may matters a lot (Fowler, 2000). Researchers and authors also worked a lot on performance management or organizations especially in public sector organizations, where the indicators or markers of performance are considered of great significance (De Bruijn, 2003).

The study calculates the Public Sector Performance Index based on seven indicators. These seven indicators are further classified into two broad groups. The opportunity indicators consisting of administration, education related, health related and public infrastructure results. The “Musgravian” markers and factors include the income distribution, economic stability and Economic Performance. The average of all sub-indicators is the public sector performance indicator

For measuring the performance related to Public Sector in Pakistan, the general form of the score function used is based on the researchers’ proposition and already conducted studies as of Afonso et al, where they proposed various indicators related to this (Schuknecht, 1997).
\[ f(x) = \alpha_1 \times X_1 + \alpha_2 \times X_2 + \alpha_3 \times X_3 + \alpha_4 \times X_4 + \alpha_5 \times X_5 + \alpha_6 \times X_6 + \alpha_7 \times X_7 , \]

where:

\( \alpha_i \) = the coefficient related to importance

\( X_i \) = markers related to performance of public sector

The value of importance related coefficient has been taken as 1 for all the indicators. Each marker contributes one seventh towards the resultant performance of public sector Index provided by the function. \( X_1 \), \( X_2 \), \( X_3 \) and \( X_4 \) are opportunity indicators as named by Afonso, Schuknecht and Tanzi, while \( X_5 \), \( X_6 \) and \( X_7 \) are the Musgravian Indicators named after Harvard Professor Richard A. Musgrave (Fraser et al. 2007).

Each indicator is composed of equally contributing sub indicators. The details of sub indicators for each indicator are as follows

\( X_1 \) = Administrative: Composed of 4 sub-indicators:
  (a) Corruption 
  (b) Red tape 
  (c) Quality of Judiciary 
  (d) Shadow Economy

\( X_2 \) = Education: Consisting of 2 sub-indicators:
  (a) Secondary School Enrolment 
  (b) Education Achievement

\( X_3 \) = Health: Consisting of 2 sub-indicators:
  (a) Infant Mortality 
  (b) Life Expectancy

\( X_4 \) = Public Infrastructure: Having one sub-indicator - quality communication and transport infrastructure

\( X_5 \) = Distribution: Which is calculated on Inequality of Income Distribution

\( X_6 \) = Stability: Gives equal weights to 2 sub-indicators:
  (a) Stability of GDP growth 
  (b) Inflation

\( X_7 \) = Economic performance: Determined on 3 sub-indicators
  (a) GDP per capita (PPP) 
  (b) GDP growth 
  (c) Unemployment for the last 10 years
Instrumentation

Figure 1. Total Public Sector Performance (PSP) Indicator

Source: Afonso, Schuknecht, and Tanzi, 2005

Population and Sample

For the purpose of research, the Public Sector Performance of Pakistan was compared with countries of South Asia and some developed countries. The South Asian Countries include Afghanistan, Bangladesh, Bhutan, India, Maldives, Nepal.
and Sri Lanka while the 23 OECD countries taken for comparison include Australia, Canada, Japan, United States of America and United Kingdom.

**Data Collection Methods**

The data was collected from various sources. The detailed source of input data for each sub-indicator to calculate the respective indicator is as follows:

**Administrative**

This opportunity indicator is composed of 4 sub-indicators:

1. **Corruption:** In order to quantify the indicator of corruption and gauge it, CPI, which is called Corruption Perception Index (CPI) 2014, is employed. This marker is also utilized by many other authentic researchers and organizations including Transparency International as the input.

2. **Red Tape:** To quantifying this sub-indicator, we have used the Ease of Doing Business index defined by World Bank. Ease of doing business ranks economies from 1 to 189, with first place being the best. A high ranking (a low numerical rank) means that the regulatory environment is conducive to business operation. The index averages the country's percentile rankings on 10 topics covered in the World Bank's Doing Business. The ranking on each topic is the simple average of the percentile rankings on its component indicators. In our research, higher value indicates better performance in that indicator. Therefore, the ease of doing business index provided by World Bank had to be reversed by subtracting the value out of 200. The more numerical value indicates the regulatory environment is more conducive to the starting and operation of a local firm. So Canada gained 184 points while Afghanistan received 17 points.

3. **Quality of Judiciary:** This indicator has been calculated from the efficiency of legal framework for private business in settling disputes. The values have been taken from the Global Competitiveness Report 2104-15.

4. **Shadow Economy:** Shadow economy is the informal economy. Also called black market or underground economy, it is a market where transaction of goods or services is done illegally. The goods or services may or may not themselves be illegal to own, or to trade through other, legal channels. This sub-indicator shows the GDP percentage of underground economy and is based on the International reports. The values for shadow economies of the countries under study have been taken from World Bank Policy Research Working Paper No 5356 titled Shadow Economies All over the World from 1999 to 2007 (Montenegro, 2010).
**Education**

Education consists of 2 sub-indicators

1. **Secondary School Enrolment:** The values for this indicator have been taken from the Secondary School Enrollment rate provided in Global Competitiveness Report 2014-15. The data related to Afghanistan and Maldives was not available. The higher the value, the better the country in that indicator.

2. **Education Achievement:** To assess this indicator, we have used the Quality of Education System indicates how well does the education system in a country meets the needs of a competitive economy. The values have been taken from the Global Competitiveness Report 2014-15. The data related to Afghanistan and Maldives was not available. The higher the value in the indicator, the better the performance of the country.

**Health**

Health comprises 2 sub-indicators:

1. **Infant Mortality:** This indicator indicates the mortality of infant children (aged 0-12 months) per 1000 live births. The data for this indicator for the year 2013 has been taken from the Global Competitiveness Report 2014-15. Due to non-availability of data relating to Afghanistan and Maldives in this report, the data for these countries has been taken from CIA World Fact Book, which provides values for year 2014. In order to standardize with our model of higher value equals better performance, the mortality rate was subtracted from 1000 to determine the number of child surviving per 1000 live births.

2. **Life Expectancy:** The values for this indicator for the year 2013 have been taken from the Global Competitiveness Report 2014-15. Due to non-availability of data relating to Afghanistan and Maldives in this report, the data for these countries has been taken from CIA World Fact Book which provides values for year 2014.

3. **Public Infrastructure:** This aspect contains single sub-indicator that is quality communication and transport infrastructure. To check the standardized data, we tried to follow world economic forum, the Global Competitiveness Report 2014-15. The data related to Afghanistan and Maldives was not available.

4. **Distribution:** This is determined from the Gini coefficient, named after Corrado Gini an Italian statistician, demographer and sociologist, which measure the degree of inequality in the distribution of family income in a country. A value of 0 represents absolute equality, a value of 100 absolute inequalities. The data for GINI Index has been taken from CIA World Fact Book. In case of Afghanistan,
the values have been taken from UNDP Human Development Report October 2013. In order to standardize with our model of higher value equals better performance, the Inequality control was determined by subtracting the GINI index from 100. The higher the values of Inequality control, better the performance.

**Stability**

Stability indicator is based on equal weights of the following 2 sub-indicators

1. *Stability of GDP Growth:* This indicator determines the coefficient of variation in the growth of GDP. The data related to this indicator could not be determined.

2. *Inflation:* This is the annual percentage change in the consumer price index. The data for year 2013 was taken from the Global Competitiveness Report 2014-15. The data for year 2013 related to Afghanistan and Maldives has been taken from CIA World Fact Book. In order to standardize with our model of higher value equals better performance, the Inflation Control was determined by subtracting the inflation from 10. The higher the values of Inflation Control, better the performance.

**Economic Performance**

It relies on three factors

1. *GDP Per Capita (PPP):* It is the total output of a country and is obtained by dividing the Gross Domestic Product (GDP) with the number of people in the country. An increase in GDP per capita indicates growth in productivity. The 2013 data of GDP in US Dollars was taken from Global Competitiveness Report 2014. Due to non-availability of data regarding Afghanistan and Maldives, their 2014 GDP in US Dollars was taken from CIA World Fact Book which is substantiated by the research field experts (CIA World Fact Book, 2014).

2. *GDP Growth:* It is the annual percentage growth rate of GDP at market prices on constant local currency. The data for the year 2013 for GDP growth in annual percentage has been taken from the World Bank Report.

3. *Unemployment for the Last 10 Years:* The International Labor Organization (ILO), defines it that unemployed people are the people who have no work but they are actively ready to work and showing their willingness. The yearly data in percentage for 2004-2014 has been taken from World Economic Outlook Database, October 2013. The average of the data was taken for last ten years from 2004-2014. For Afghanistan, Bangladesh, India, Maldives and Nepal, the data was not available in the abovementioned database, therefore, the yearly values of unemployment given at CIA World Fact Book were taken. To keep the data in line
with the evaluation criteria of better performance with a higher value, the values of unemployment were subtracted from 100 to calculate the employment value which has been used for calculating the score. In this scenario, the reconsideration of fiscal role of govt. is also considered very important.

Analysis

After entering the values for the individual sub indicators, performance of countries was determined for the each indicator contributing towards calculation of Public Sector Performance (PSP) index.

Administrative

The data for the administrative indicator and its analysis is shown in Table 1 given on the next page. The graph (Figure 2) shows that Bhutan stands out administratively among the South Asian countries whereas Pakistan stands fifth after Bhutan, Sri Lanka, India and Nepal.

![Figure 2: Administrative wrt South Asia](image-url)
A comparison with 34 OECD countries (Figure 3) shows that Pakistan has the lowest score of 0.60 while New Zealand stands out with a score of 1.24.
Table 1.

| S. No. | Country     | Corruption Transparency International | Red Tape Ease of Doing Business Index (World Bank) | Quality of Judiciary Global Competitiveness Report 2014 | Shadow Economy Informal Economy | Ave. Score |
|--------|--------------|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------|------------|
|        |              | Year | CPI | Score | Year | Index | How Easy | Score | Year | Index | Score | Year | Index | How much controlled | Score | Average of 1999-2007 | Average of 1999-2007 | Average of 1999-2007 | Average of 1999-2007 |
| 1      | Afghanistan  | 2014 | 12  | 0.37  | 2014 | 183   | 17       | 0.26  | 2014 | 0    | 0.00  |       |       |                |        | 35.30  | 64.70  | 1.11               | 0.84   |
| 2      | Bangladesh   | 2014 | 25  | 0.77  | 2014 | 173   | 27       | 0.41  | 2014 | 2.9  | 1.07  |       |       |                |        | 28.70  | 71.30  | 1.22               | 1.47   |
| 3      | Bhutan       | 2014 | 65  | 1.99  | 2014 | 125   | 75       | 1.14  | 2014 | 4.1  | 1.52  |       |       |                |        | 22.20  | 77.80  | 1.33               | 1.20   |
| 4      | India        | 2014 | 38  | 1.16  | 2014 | 142   | 58       | 0.88  | 2014 | 3.8  | 1.41  |       |       |                |        | 29.50  | 70.50  | 1.21               | 0.81   |
| 5      | Maldives     | 2014 | 25  | 0.77  | 2014 | 116   | 84       | 1.28  | 2014 | 0    | 0.00  |       |       |                |        | 36.70  | 63.30  | 1.08               | 1.11   |
| 6      | Nepal        | 2014 | 29  | 0.89  | 2014 | 108   | 92       | 1.40  | 2014 | 2.9  | 1.07  |       |       |                | 36.70  | 63.30  | 1.08               | 1.11   |
| 7      | Pakistan     | 2014 | 29  | 0.89  | 2014 | 128   | 72       | 1.10  | 2014 | 3.3  | 1.22  |       |       |                | 35.70  | 64.30  | 1.10               | 1.08   |
| 8      | Sri Lanka    | 2014 | 38  | 1.16  | 2014 | 99    | 101      | 1.54  | 2014 | 4.6  | 1.70  |       |       |                | 43.90  | 56.10  | 0.96               | 1.34   |
| Total  |              |      |    |       |      |       |         |       |      |      |       |       | 43.90  | 56.10  | 0.96               | 1.34   |
| Average|              |      |    |       |      |       |         |       |      |      |       |       |       |                |        | 32.63  | 1.00               | 134.25 | 65.75  | 1.00               | 1.00   |

Pakistan with respect to South Asian Countries

| S. No. | Country     | Corruption Transparency International | Red Tape Ease of Doing Business Index (World Bank) | Quality of Judiciary Global Competitiveness Report 2014 | Shadow Economy Informal Economy | Ave. Score |
|--------|--------------|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------|------------|
| 1      | Pakistan     | 2014 | 29  | 0.43  | 2014 | 128   | 72       | 0.42  | 2014 | 3.3  | 0.76  |       |       |                |        | 35.70  | 64.30  | 0.80               | 0.60   |
| 2      | Australia    | 2014 | 80  | 1.17  | 2014 | 10    | 190      | 1.12  | 2014 | 4.8  | 1.11  |       |       |                |        | 14.0   | 86.00  | 1.07               | 1.12   |
| 3      | Austria      | 2014 | 72  | 1.06  | 2014 | 21    | 179      | 1.05  | 2014 | 4.9  | 1.33  |       |       |                |        | 9.7    | 90.30  | 1.12               | 1.09   |
| 4      | Belgium      | 2014 | 76  | 1.12  | 2014 | 42    | 158      | 0.93  | 2014 | 4.2  | 0.97  |       |       |                |        | 21.9   | 78.10  | 0.97               | 1.00   |
| 5      | Canada       | 2014 | 81  | 1.19  | 2014 | 16    | 184      | 1.08  | 2014 | 5.5  | 1.27  |       |       |                |        | 15.7   | 84.30  | 1.05               | 1.15   |
| 6      | Chile        | 2014 | 73  | 1.07  | 2014 | 41    | 159      | 0.94  | 2014 | 4.4  | 1.02  |       |       |                |        | 19.3   | 80.70  | 1.00               | 1.01   |
| 7      | Czech Republic | 2014 | 51  | 0.75  | 2014 | 44    | 156      | 0.92  | 2014 | 3.3  | 0.76  |       |       |                |        | 18.4   | 81.60  | 1.01               | 0.86   |
| 8      | Denmark      | 2014 | 92  | 1.35  | 2014 | 4     | 196      | 1.15  | 2014 | 5.0  | 1.16  |       |       |                |        | 17.7   | 82.30  | 1.02               | 1.17   |
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|   | Estonia | 2014 | 69 | 1.01 | 2014 | 17 | 183 | 1.08 | 2014 | 4.3 | 0.99 |
|---|---------|------|----|------|------|----|-----|------|------|-----|------|
| 10 | Finland | 2014 | 89 | 1.31 | 2014 | 9 | 191 | 1.13 | 2014 | 6.0 | 1.39 |
| 11 | France  | 2014 | 69 | 1.01 | 2014 | 31 | 169 | 1.00 | 2014 | 4.2 | 0.97 |
| 12 | Germany | 2014 | 79 | 1.16 | 2014 | 14 | 186 | 1.10 | 2014 | 5.4 | 1.25 |
| 13 | Greece  | 2014 | 43 | 0.63 | 2014 | 61 | 139 | 0.82 | 2014 | 2.7 | 0.62 |
| 14 | Hungary | 2014 | 54 | 0.79 | 2014 | 54 | 146 | 0.86 | 2014 | 3.3 | 0.76 |
| 15 | Iceland | 2014 | 79 | 1.16 | 2014 | 12 | 188 | 1.11 | 2014 | 4.9 | 1.13 |
| 16 | Ireland | 2014 | 74 | 1.09 | 2014 | 13 | 187 | 1.10 | 2014 | 4.9 | 1.13 |
| 17 | Israel  | 2014 | 60 | 0.88 | 2014 | 40 | 160 | 0.94 | 2014 | 4.1 | 0.95 |
| 18 | Italy   | 2014 | 43 | 0.63 | 2014 | 56 | 144 | 0.85 | 2014 | 2.0 | 0.46 |
| 19 | Japan   | 2014 | 76 | 1.12 | 2014 | 29 | 171 | 1.01 | 2014 | 5.2 | 1.20 |
| 20 | South Korea | 2014 | 55 | 0.81 | 2014 | 5 | 195 | 1.15 | 2014 | 3.5 | 0.81 |
| 21 | Luxembourg | 2014 | 82 | 1.20 | 2014 | 59 | 141 | 0.83 | 2014 | 5.4 | 1.25 |
| 22 | Mexico  | 2014 | 35 | 0.51 | 2014 | 39 | 161 | 0.95 | 2014 | 3.3 | 0.76 |
| 23 | Netherlands | 2014 | 83 | 1.22 | 2014 | 27 | 173 | 1.02 | 2014 | 5.5 | 1.27 |
| 24 | New Zealand | 2014 | 91 | 1.34 | 2014 | 2 | 198 | 1.17 | 2014 | 5.9 | 1.36 |
| 25 | Norway  | 2014 | 86 | 1.26 | 2014 | 6 | 194 | 1.14 | 2014 | 5.6 | 1.29 |
| 26 | Poland  | 2014 | 61 | 0.90 | 2014 | 32 | 168 | 0.99 | 2014 | 2.9 | 0.67 |
| 27 | Portugal | 2014 | 63 | 0.93 | 2014 | 25 | 175 | 1.03 | 2014 | 3.1 | 0.72 |
| 28 | Slovakia | 2014 | 50 | 0.73 | 2014 | 37 | 163 | 0.96 | 2014 | 2.4 | 0.55 |
| 29 | Slovenia | 2014 | 58 | 0.85 | 2014 | 51 | 149 | 0.88 | 2014 | 2.6 | 0.60 |
| 30 | Spain   | 2014 | 60 | 0.88 | 2014 | 33 | 167 | 0.98 | 2014 | 3.4 | 0.79 |
| 31 | Sweden  | 2014 | 87 | 1.28 | 2014 | 11 | 189 | 1.11 | 2014 | 5.4 | 1.25 |
| 32 | Switzerland | 2014 | 86 | 1.26 | 2014 | 20 | 180 | 1.06 | 2014 | 5.6 | 1.29 |
| 33 | Turkey  | 2014 | 45 | 0.66 | 2014 | 55 | 145 | 0.85 | 2014 | 3.8 | 0.88 |
| 34 | United Kingdom | 2014 | 78 | 1.15 | 2014 | 8 | 192 | 1.13 | 2014 | 5.7 | 1.32 |
| 35 | United States | 2014 | 74 | 1.09 | 2014 | 7 | 193 | 1.14 | 2014 | 4.9 | 1.13 |

**Total**  
2383.0 35.0 1059.0 5941.0 35.0 151.40 35.0 683.1 2816.9 35.0 35.0

**Average**  
68.09 1.00 30.26 169.74 1.00 4.33 1.00 19.52 80.48 1.00 1.00
Education

The analysis of data for the Education sub-indicator analysis is shown in Table 2 given on the next page. Due to non-availability of data regarding Afghanistan and Maldives, their scores could not be calculated. The graph (Figure 4) shows Sri Lanka leading in Education with a score of 1.79 while Pakistan stands lowest.
### Table 2. Education

| S No | Country          | Year | Rate | Score | Year  | Average Index | Score | Average Score |
|------|------------------|------|------|-------|-------|----------------|-------|---------------|
|      |                  |      |      |       | 2013-14 |                |       |               |
| **Pakistan with respect to South Asia** | | | | | | | | |
| 1    | Afghanistan      | 2013 | 0    | 0.00  | 2013-14 | 0              | 0.00  | 0.00          |
| 2    | Bangladesh       | 2013 | 53.6 | 1.08  | 2013-14 | 3.3            | 1.14  | 1.11          |
| 3    | Bhutan           | 2013 | 73.9 | 1.48  | 2013-14 | 4              | 1.39  | 1.43          |
| 4    | India            | 2013 | 68.5 | 1.38  | 2013-14 | 4.2            | 1.45  | 1.41          |
| 5    | Maldives         | 2013 | 0    | 0.00  | 2013-14 | 0              | 0.00  | 0.00          |
| 6    | Nepal            | 2013 | 66.6 | 1.34  | 2013-14 | 3.6            | 1.25  | 1.29          |
| 7    | Pakistan         | 2013 | 36.6 | 0.73  | 2013-14 | 3.4            | 1.18  | 0.96          |
| 8    | Sri Lanka        | 2013 | 99.3 | 1.99  | 2013-14 | 4.6            | 1.59  | 1.79          |
|      | **Total**        |      | 398.5| 8     | 2013-14 | 23.1           | 8     | 8             |
|      | **Average**      |      | 49.81| 1.00  |         | 2.89           | 1.00  | 1.00          |
| **Pakistan with respect to OECD Countries** | | | | | | | | |
| 1    | Pakistan         | 2013 | 36.6 | 0.36  | 2013-14 | 3.4            | 0.78  | 0.57          |
| 2    | Australia        | 2013 | 135.5| 1.32  | 2013-14 | 4.8            | 1.11  | 1.21          |
| 3    | Austria          | 2013 | 97.7 | 0.95  | 2013-14 | 4.5            | 1.04  | 0.99          |
| 4    | Belgium          | 2013 | 107.3| 1.04  | 2013-14 | 5.3            | 1.22  | 1.13          |
| 5    | Canada           | 2013 | 103.4| 1.00  | 2013-14 | 5.2            | 1.20  | 1.10          |
| 6    | Chile            | 2013 | 89   | 0.86  | 2013-14 | 3.7            | 0.85  | 0.86          |
| 7    | Czech Republic   | 2013 | 96.6 | 0.94  | 2013-14 | 3.6            | 0.83  | 0.88          |
| 8    | Denmark          | 2013 | 124.7| 1.21  | 2013-14 | 4.8            | 1.11  | 1.16          |
| 9    | Estonia          | 2013 | 107.1| 1.04  | 2013-14 | 4.4            | 1.02  | 1.03          |
| 10   | Finland          | 2013 | 107.7| 1.05  | 2013-14 | 5.9            | 1.36  | 1.20          |
|   | Country       | Year | Value 1  | Value 2 | Year | Value 3  | Value 4 | Value 5 |
|---|--------------|------|----------|---------|------|-----------|---------|---------|
| 11| France       | 2013 | 109.7    | 1.06    | 2013-14 | 4.4       | 1.02    | 1.04    |
| 12| Germany      | 2013 | 101.3    | 0.98    | 2013-14 | 5.2       | 1.20    | 1.09    |
| 13| Greece       | 2013 | 107.9    | 1.05    | 2013-14 | 3.0       | 0.69    | 0.87    |
| 14| Hungary      | 2013 | 101.6    | 0.99    | 2013-14 | 3.3       | 0.76    | 0.87    |
| 15| Iceland      | 2013 | 108.6    | 1.05    | 2013-14 | 4.9       | 1.13    | 1.09    |
| 16| Ireland      | 2013 | 119.1    | 1.16    | 2013-14 | 5.4       | 1.25    | 1.20    |
| 17| Israel       | 2013 | 101.7    | 0.99    | 2013-14 | 3.7       | 0.85    | 0.92    |
| 18| Italy        | 2013 | 100.7    | 0.98    | 2013-14 | 3.7       | 0.85    | 0.92    |
| 19| Japan        | 2013 | 101.8    | 0.99    | 2013-14 | 4.4       | 1.02    | 1.00    |
| 20| South Korea  | 2013 | 97.2     | 0.94    | 2013-14 | 3.6       | 0.83    | 0.89    |
| 21| Luxembourg   | 2013 | 101.0    | 0.98    | 2013-14 | 4.6       | 1.06    | 1.02    |
| 22| Mexico       | 2013 | 85.7     | 0.83    | 2013-14 | 2.8       | 0.65    | 0.74    |
| 23| Netherlands  | 2013 | 129.9    | 1.26    | 2013-14 | 5.3       | 1.22    | 1.24    |
| 24| New Zealand  | 2013 | 119.5    | 1.16    | 2013-14 | 5.3       | 1.22    | 1.19    |
| 25| Norway       | 2013 | 111.1    | 1.08    | 2013-14 | 5.0       | 1.15    | 1.12    |
| 26| Poland       | 2013 | 97.7     | 0.95    | 2013-14 | 3.6       | 0.83    | 0.89    |
| 27| Portugal     | 2013 | 112.9    | 1.10    | 2013-14 | 4.3       | 0.99    | 1.04    |
| 28| Slovakia     | 2013 | 93.9     | 0.91    | 2013-14 | 2.8       | 0.65    | 0.78    |
| 29| Slovenia     | 2013 | 97.6     | 0.95    | 2013-14 | 4.1       | 0.95    | 0.95    |
| 30| Spain        | 2013 | 130.8    | 1.27    | 2013-14 | 3.4       | 0.78    | 1.03    |
| 31| Sweden       | 2013 | 98.4     | 0.96    | 2013-14 | 4.6       | 1.06    | 1.01    |
| 32| Switzerland  | 2013 | 96.3     | 0.93    | 2013-14 | 4.6       | 1.06    | 0.99    |
| 33| Turkey       | 2013 | 86.1     | 0.84    | 2013-14 | 3.4       | 0.78    | 0.81    |
| 34| United Kingdom| 2013 | 95.4    | 0.93    | 2013-14 | 4.6       | 1.06    | 0.99    |
| 35| United States| 2013 | 93.7     | 0.91    | 2013-14 | 4.6       | 1.06    | 0.99    |
|   | **Total**    |      | 3605.20  | 35.00   |       | 151.60    | 35.00   | 35.00   |
|   | **Average**  |      | 103.01   | 1.00    |       | 4.33      | 1.00    | 1.00    |
Performance comparison of Pakistan with 34 OECD countries in field of education (Figure 5) shows that Pakistan has the lowest score of 0.60 while Netherlands stands out with a score of 1.24.

Health

The graph (Figure 6) shows comparison of health indicator which comprises of life expectancy and infant mortality. The data is tabulated in table 3 given on the next page. In health, Pakistan stands second last with a score of 0.98 after Afghanistan with a score of 0.84. High infant mortality rate and low life expectancy are the major contributors for low performance. Sri Lanka and Maldives take the top positions with a score of 1.07.
Table 3. Health

| S No | Country           | Life Expectancy | Infant Mortality | Average Score |
|------|-------------------|-----------------|------------------|---------------|
|      |                   | Global Competitiveness Report 2014 and CIA World fact Book | Global Competitiveness Report 2014 and CIA World fact Book |                |
|      |                   | Year | Years | Score | Year | Per 1000 Births | Survival Per 1000 | Score |                |
|------|-------------------|------|-------|-------|------|-----------------|-------------------|-------|-------|
| 1    | Afghanistan       | 2014 | 50.49 | 0.75  | 2014 | 117.23          | 882.77            | 0.93  | 0.84 |
| 2    | Bangladesh        | 2013 | 70.3  | 1.04  | 2013 | 33.10           | 966.90            | 1.01  | 1.03 |
| 3    | Bhutan            | 2013 | 67.9  | 1.01  | 2013 | 35.70           | 964.30            | 1.01  | 1.01 |
| 4    | India             | 2013 | 66.2  | 0.98  | 2013 | 43.80           | 956.20            | 1.00  | 0.99 |
| 5    | Maldives          | 2014 | 75.15 | 1.12  | 2014 | 24.59           | 975.41            | 1.02  | 1.07 |
| 6    | Nepal             | 2013 | 68    | 1.01  | 2013 | 33.60           | 966.40            | 1.01  | 1.01 |
| 7    | Pakistan          | 2013 | 66.4  | 0.99  | 2013 | 69.30           | 930.70            | 0.98  | 0.98 |
| 8    | Sri Lanka         | 2013 | 74.1  | 1.10  | 2013 | 8.30            | 991.70            | 1.04  | 1.07 |
|      | Total             | 538.54 | 8     | 365.62 | 7634.38 | 8     | 8           |
|      | Average           | 67.32 | 1.00  | 60.94  | 954.30  | 1.00  | 1.00    |
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|   | Country     | Year | Performance  | Year | Performance  | Year | GDP   | Year | GDP   | Year | Average | Year | Average | Year |
|---|-------------|------|--------------|------|--------------|------|-------|------|-------|------|---------|------|---------|------|
|   |             |      | 2013         |      |              |      |       |      |       |      |         |      |         |      |
|9  | Finland     | 2013 | 80.60        | 2013 | 2.40         | 2013 | 997.60| 1.00 | 1.01  |
|10 | France      | 2013 | 82.60        | 2013 | 3.40         | 2013 | 996.60| 1.00 | 1.02  |
|11 | Germany     | 2013 | 80.90        | 2013 | 3.40         | 2013 | 996.60| 1.00 | 1.01  |
|12 | Greece      | 2013 | 80.60        | 2013 | 4.10         | 2013 | 995.90| 1.00 | 1.01  |
|13 | Hungary     | 2013 | 75.10        | 2013 | 5.30         | 2013 | 994.70| 1.00 | 0.97  |
|14 | Iceland     | 2013 | 82.90        | 2013 | 1.80         | 2013 | 998.20| 1.00 | 1.02  |
|15 | Ireland     | 2013 | 80.90        | 2013 | 3.40         | 2013 | 996.60| 1.00 | 1.01  |
|16 | Israel      | 2013 | 81.70        | 2013 | 3.30         | 2013 | 996.70| 1.00 | 1.01  |
|17 | Italy       | 2013 | 82.90        | 2013 | 3.20         | 2013 | 996.80| 1.00 | 1.02  |
|18 | Japan       | 2013 | 83.10        | 2013 | 2.20         | 2013 | 997.80| 1.00 | 1.02  |
|19 | South Korea | 2013 | 81.40        | 2013 | 3.30         | 2013 | 996.70| 1.00 | 1.01  |
|20 | Luxembourg  | 2013 | 81.40        | 2013 | 1.70         | 2013 | 998.30| 1.00 | 1.01  |
|21 | Mexico      | 2013 | 77.10        | 2013 | 13.90        | 2013 | 986.10| 0.99 | 0.98  |
|22 | Netherlands | 2013 | 81.10        | 2013 | 3.40         | 2013 | 996.60| 1.00 | 1.01  |
|23 | New Zealand | 2013 | 81.20        | 2013 | 4.70         | 2013 | 995.30| 1.00 | 1.01  |
|24 | Norwey      | 2013 | 81.50        | 2013 | 2.20         | 2013 | 997.80| 1.00 | 1.01  |
|25 | Poland      | 2013 | 76.80        | 2013 | 4.30         | 2013 | 995.70| 1.00 | 0.98  |
|26 | Portugal    | 2013 | 80.40        | 2013 | 2.9          | 2013 | 997.10| 1.00 | 1.00  |
|27 | Slovakia    | 2013 | 76.10        | 2013 | 6.3          | 2013 | 993.70| 1.00 | 0.98  |
|28 | Slovenia    | 2013 | 80.10        | 2013 | 2.5          | 2013 | 997.50| 1.00 | 1.00  |
|29 | Spain       | 2013 | 82.40        | 2013 | 3.8          | 2013 | 996.20| 1.00 | 1.02  |
|30 | Sweden      | 2013 | 81.70        | 2013 | 2.3          | 2013 | 997.70| 1.00 | 1.01  |
|31 | Switzerland | 2013 | 82.70        | 2013 | 3.7          | 2013 | 996.30| 1.00 | 1.02  |
|32 | Turkey      | 2013 | 74.90        | 2013 | 12.2         | 2013 | 987.80| 0.99 | 0.97  |
|33 | United Kingdom | 2013 | 81.50        | 2013 | 4.1          | 2013 | 995.90| 1.00 | 1.01  |
|34 | United States | 2013 | 78.70        | 2013 | 6            | 2013 | 994.00| 1.00 | 0.99  |
|   | Total       |      | 2795.5       |      | 35           |      | 34788.6| 35   | 35    |
|   | Average     |      | 79.87        |      | 1.00         |      | 993.96| 1.00 | 1.00  |
When compared with 34 OECD countries (Figure 7), Pakistan is lowest with a score of 0.88 while Japan leading with as score of 1.02214 followed by Iceland.

Infrastructure

The graph (Figure 8) shows comparison of Infrastructure indicator which indicates the quality of communication and transport infrastructure of a country. The data analysis is tabulated in table 4 given on the next page. Data related to Afghanistan and Maldives was not available. With regards to infrastructure, Pakistan stands fourth with a score of 1.18 while the list in South Asia is topped by Sri Lanka with a score of 1.79.
### Table 4. Public Infrastructure

| S No | Country                | Year | Index | Score |
|------|------------------------|------|-------|-------|
| **Pakistan with respect to South Asia** | | | | |
| 1    | Afghanistan            | 2013 | 0.00  | 0.00  |
| 2    | Bangladesh             | 2013 | 2.80  | 1.00  |
| 3    | Bhutan                 | 2013 | 4.60  | 1.65  |
| 4    | India                  | 2013 | 3.70  | 1.33  |
| 5    | Maldives               | 2013 | 0.00  | 0.00  |
| 6    | Nepal                  | 2013 | 2.90  | 1.04  |
| 7    | Pakistan               | 2013 | 3.30  | 1.18  |
| 8    | Sri Lanka              | 2013 | 5.00  | 1.79  |
|      | Total                  |      | 22.3  | 8.00  |
|      | **Average**            |      | 2.79  | 1.00  |
| **Pakistan with respect to OECD Countries** | | | | |
| 1    | Pakistan               | 2013 | 3.30  | 0.62  |
| 2    | Australia              | 2013 | 5.10  | 0.95  |
| 3    | Austria                | 2013 | 6.20  | 1.16  |
| 4    | Belgium                | 2013 | 5.80  | 1.08  |
| 5    | Canada                 | 2013 | 5.60  | 1.05  |
| 6    | Chile                  | 2013 | 4.70  | 0.88  |
| 7    | Czech Republic         | 2013 | 5.00  | 0.93  |
| 8    | Denmark                | 2013 | 5.80  | 1.08  |
| 9    | Estonia                | 2013 | 5.20  | 0.97  |
| 10   | Finland                | 2013 | 6.40  | 1.20  |
| 11   | France                 | 2013 | 6.10  | 1.14  |
| 12   | Germany                | 2013 | 6.00  | 1.12  |
| 13   | Greece                 | 2013 | 4.60  | 0.86  |
| 14   | Hungary                | 2013 | 5.00  | 0.93  |
| 15   | Iceland                | 2013 | 6.20  | 1.16  |
| 16   | Ireland                | 2013 | 5.10  | 0.95  |
| 17   | Israel                 | 2013 | 4.40  | 0.82  |
| 18   | Italy                  | 2013 | 4.60  | 0.86  |
| 19   | Japan                  | 2013 | 6.20  | 1.16  |
| 20   | South Korea            | 2013 | 5.50  | 1.03  |
| 21   | Luxembourg             | 2013 | 5.90  | 1.10  |
| 22   | Mexico                 | 2013 | 4.20  | 0.78  |
| 23   | Netherlands            | 2013 | 6.30  | 1.18  |
|   | Country          | Year | Score | Risk Adjusted Score |
|---|------------------|------|-------|---------------------|
| 24 | New Zealand      | 2013 | 5.10  | 0.95                |
| 25 | Norway           | 2013 | 5.30  | 0.99                |
| 26 | Poland           | 2013 | 4.00  | 0.75                |
| 27 | Portugal         | 2013 | 6.00  | 1.12                |
| 28 | Slovakia         | 2013 | 4.20  | 0.78                |
| 29 | Slovenia         | 2013 | 5.10  | 0.95                |
| 30 | Spain            | 2013 | 5.90  | 1.10                |
| 31 | Sweden           | 2013 | 5.70  | 1.07                |
| 32 | Switzerland      | 2013 | 6.60  | 1.23                |
| 33 | Turkey           | 2013 | 5.10  | 0.95                |
| 34 | United Kingdom   | 2013 | 5.30  | 0.99                |
| 35 | United States    | 2013 | 5.80  | 1.08                |
| **Total** |                  |      | **187.30** | **35.00** |
| **Average** |                 |      | **5.35**   | **1.00**  |

When compared with 34 OECD countries (Figure 9), Pakistan is lowest with a score of 0.62 while Switzerland leads with a score of 1.23.

Figure 9: Public Infrastructure with respect to OECD Countries
Distribution

The graph (Figure 10) shows comparison of distribution of wealth determined by the Gini index. The data analysis is tabulated in table 5. In South Asia, Pakistan has a score of 1.09 after Afghanistan which leads with a score of 1.12. Sri Lanka is the lowest with a score of 0.79.

![Figure 10: Distribution with respect to South Asia](image)

Table 5. Distribution

| S No | Country          | Year | Inequality of Income Distribution GINI Index | CIA World factbook and UNDP Report |
|------|------------------|------|---------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
|      |                  |      |                                              | Year | 0-100 | Inequality Control | Score  |
| 1    | Afghanistan      | 2013 |                                              | 27.8 | 72.2  |                 | 1.12    |
| 2    | Bangladesh       | 2010 |                                              | 32.1 | 67.9  |                 | 1.05    |
| 3    | Bhutan           | 2012 |                                              | 38.7 | 61.3  |                 | 0.95    |
| 4    | India            | 2004 |                                              | 36.8 | 63.2  |                 | 0.98    |
| 5    | Maldives         | 2004 |                                              | 37.4 | 62.6  |                 | 0.97    |
| 6    | Nepal            | 2010 |                                              | 32.8 | 67.2  |                 | 1.04    |
| 7    | Pakistan         | 2011 |                                              | 29.6 | 70.4  |                 | 1.09    |
| 8    | Sri Lanka        | 2010 |                                              | 49   | 51    |                 | 0.79    |
|      | **Total**        |      |                                              | 284.2 | 515.8 |               | 8       |
|      | **Average**      |      |                                              | **35.53** | **64.48** |         | **1.00** |

Pakistan with respect to OECD Countries

| S No | Country | Year | Inequality of Income Distribution GINI Index | CIA World factbook and UNDP Report |
|------|---------|------|---------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| 1    | Pakistan| 2011 |                                              | 29.60 | 70.40 |                 | 1.03    |
| 2    | Australia| 2008 |                                              | 30.30 | 69.70 |                 | 1.02    |
|   | Country       | Score | Price  | Gle |   |
|---|--------------|-------|--------|-----|---|
| 3 | Austria      | 26.30 | 73.70  | 1.08|   |
| 4 | Belgium      | 25.90 | 74.10  | 1.08|   |
| 5 | Canada       | 32.10 | 67.90  | 0.99|   |
| 6 | Chile        | 52.10 | 47.90  | 0.70|   |
| 7 | Czech Republic | 24.90 | 75.10  | 1.10|   |
| 8 | Denmark      | 24.80 | 75.20  | 1.10|   |
| 9 | Estonia      | 31.30 | 68.70  | 1.00|   |
| 10| Finland      | 26.80 | 73.20  | 1.07|   |
| 11| France       | 30.90 | 69.10  | 1.01|   |
| 12| Germany      | 27.00 | 73.00  | 1.07|   |
| 13| Greece       | 34.40 | 65.60  | 0.96|   |
| 14| Hungary      | 24.70 | 75.30  | 1.10|   |
| 15| Iceland      | 28.00 | 72.00  | 1.05|   |
| 16| Ireland      | 33.90 | 66.10  | 0.97|   |
| 17| Israel       | 37.60 | 62.40  | 0.91|   |
| 18| Italy        | 31.90 | 68.10  | 1.00|   |
| 19| Japan        | 37.60 | 62.40  | 0.91|   |
| 20| South Korea  | 31.10 | 68.90  | 1.01|   |
| 21| Luxembourg   | 30.40 | 69.60  | 1.02|   |
| 22| Mexico       | 48.30 | 51.70  | 0.76|   |
| 23| Netherlands  | 25.10 | 74.90  | 1.10|   |
| 24| New Zealand  | 36.20 | 63.80  | 0.93|   |
| 25| Norway       | 25.00 | 75.00  | 1.10|   |
| 26| Poland       | 34.10 | 65.90  | 0.96|   |
| 27| Portugal     | 34.20 | 65.80  | 0.96|   |
| 28| Slovakia     | 26.00 | 74.00  | 1.08|   |
| 29| Slovenia     | 23.70 | 76.30  | 1.12|   |
| 30| Spain        | 34.00 | 66.00  | 0.97|   |
| 31| Sweden       | 23.00 | 77.00  | 1.13|   |
| 32| Switzerland  | 28.70 | 71.30  | 1.04|   |
| 33| Turkey       | 40.20 | 59.80  | 0.87|   |
| 34| United Kingdom | 32.30 | 67.70  | 0.99|   |
| 35| United States | 45.00 | 55.00  | 0.80|   |
|   | Total        | 1107.40 | 2392.60 | 35.00|   |
|   | Average      | 31.64  | 68.36  | 1.00|   |

As regards to comparison with 34 OECD countries (Figure 11), Pakistan ranks fifteenth with a score of 1.03 while United States, Mexico and Chile being the lowest three with a score of 0.8, 0.76 and 0.70 respectively. Sweden leads with a score of 1.13.
In terms of stability, Pakistan achieves a score of 1.12 and stands third in South Asia with Maldives having least inflation rate being the top scorer with a score of 2.59. The graph (Figure 12) shows comparison of stability indicator. The data analysis is tabulated in table 6 given on the next page.
| S No | Country                  | Stability of GDP Growth | Inflation Global Competitiveness Report 2014 and CIA World fact Book | Average Score |
|------|--------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------|
|      |                          | Year | Score | Year | %      | Inflation Control | Score |               |
|      |                          |      |       |      |        |                  |       |               |
| 1    | Afghanistan             | 2013 | 7.60  | 2013 | 7.60   | 2.40             | 1.04  |               |
| 2    | Bangladesh              | 2013 | 7.50  | 2013 | 7.50   | 2.50             | 1.08  |               |
| 3    | Bhutan                  | 2013 | 8.70  | 2013 | 8.70   | 1.30             | 0.56  |               |
| 4    | India                   | 2013 | 9.50  | 2013 | 9.50   | 0.50             | 0.22  |               |
| 5    | Maldives                | 2013 | 4.00  | 2013 | 4.00   | 6.00             | 2.59  |               |
| 6    | Nepal                   | 2013 | 9.90  | 2013 | 9.90   | 0.10             | 0.04  |               |
| 7    | Pakistan                | 2013 | 7.40  | 2013 | 7.40   | 2.60             | 1.12  |               |
| 8    | Sri Lanka               | 2013 | 6.90  | 2013 | 6.90   | 3.10             | 1.34  |               |
|      | Total                   | 0    | 61.5  | 0    | 18.5   | 8.00             |       |               |
|      | Average                 | 0.00 | 7.69  | 0    | 2.31   | 1.00             |       |               |

**Pakistan with respect to South Asia**

**Pakistan with respect to OECD Countries**

|      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| 1    | Pakistan | 2013 | 7.40 | 2013 | 7.40 | 2.60 | 0.32 |
| 2    | Australia | 2013 | 2.50 | 2013 | 2.50 | 7.50 | 0.92 |
| 3    | Austria   | 2013 | 2.10 | 2013 | 2.10 | 7.90 | 0.97 |
| 4    | Belgium   | 2013 | 1.20 | 2013 | 1.20 | 8.80 | 1.08 |
| 5    | Canada    | 2013 | 1.00 | 2013 | 1.00 | 9.00 | 1.10 |
| 6    | Chile     | 2013 | 1.80 | 2013 | 1.80 | 8.20 | 1.01 |
| 7    | Czech Republic | 2013 | 1.40 | 2013 | 1.40 | 8.60 | 1.06 |
| 8    | Denmark   | 2013 | 0.80 | 2013 | 0.80 | 9.20 | 1.13 |
| 9    | Estonia   | 2013 | 3.50 | 2013 | 3.50 | 6.50 | 0.80 |
| 10   | Finland   | 2013 | 2.20 | 2013 | 2.20 | 7.80 | 0.96 |
| 11   | France    | 2013 | 1.00 | 2013 | 1.00 | 9.00 | 1.10 |
| 12   | Germany   | 2013 | 1.60 | 2013 | 1.60 | 8.40 | 1.03 |
| 13   | Greece    | 2013 | -0.90| 2013 | -0.90| 10.90| 1.34 |
| 14   | Hungary   | 2013 | 1.70 | 2013 | 1.70 | 8.30 | 1.02 |
| 15   | Iceland   | 2013 | 3.90 | 2013 | 3.90 | 6.10 | 0.75 |
| 16   | Ireland   | 2013 | 0.50 | 2013 | 0.50 | 9.50 | 1.17 |
| 17   | Israel    | 2013 | 1.50 | 2013 | 1.50 | 8.50 | 1.04 |
| 18   | Italy     | 2013 | 1.30 | 2013 | 1.30 | 8.70 | 1.07 |
| 19   | Japan     | 2013 | 0.40 | 2013 | 0.40 | 9.60 | 1.18 |
| 20   | South Korea| 2013 | 1.30 | 2013 | 1.30 | 8.70 | 1.07 |
| 21   | Luxembourg| 2013 | 1.70 | 2013 | 1.70 | 8.30 | 1.02 |
| 22   | Mexico    | 2013 | 3.80 | 2013 | 3.80 | 6.20 | 0.76 |
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|   | Country         | 2013 | Economic Performance |
|---|-----------------|------|----------------------|
| 23| Netherlands     | 2013 | 2.60, 7.40, 0.91     |
| 24| New Zealand     | 2013 | 1.10, 8.90, 1.09     |
| 25| Norway          | 2013 | 2.10, 7.90, 0.97     |
| 26| Poland          | 2013 | 0.90, 9.10, 1.12     |
| 27| Portugal        | 2013 | 0.40, 9.60, 1.18     |
| 28| Slovakia        | 2013 | 1.50, 8.50, 1.04     |
| 29| Slovenia        | 2013 | 1.60, 8.40, 1.05     |
| 30| Spain           | 2013 | 1.50, 8.50, 1.04     |
| 31| Sweden          | 2013 | 0.00, 10.00, 1.23    |
| 32| Switzerland     | 2013 | -0.20, 10.20, 1.25   |
| 33| Turkey          | 2013 | 7.50, 2.50, 0.31     |
| 34| United Kingdom  | 2013 | 2.60, 7.40, 0.91     |
| 35| United States   | 2013 | 1.50, 8.50, 1.04     |
|   | Total           | 2013 | 0.00, 64.80, 285.20, 35.00 |
|   | Average         |      | 0.00, 1.85, 8.15, 1.00 |

Pakistan stands lowest with a score of 0.32 followed by Turkey with a score of 0.31 when compared with 34 OECD countries (Figure 13). Greece having a negative inflation rate along with Switzerland tops the position with a score of 1.34 followed by Switzerland with a score of 1.25.

Figure 13 : Stability with respect to OECD Countries

Economic Performance
Pakistan stands fifth in Economic performance in South Asia with a score of 0.84. Maldives is at the top with a score of 1.97 due to highest GDP in South Asia despite having highest unemployment rate in South Asia. Sri Lanka although second with a score of 1.25 has the highest growth rate and second highest GDP in South Asia. The graph (Figure 14) shows comparison of Economic Performance indicator. The data analysis is tabulated in table 7 given on next page.

Out of 34 OECD countries, Luxembourg tops the charts with a score of 1.9. Pakistan stands fourth with a score of 1.73. Greece has the lowest score of -0.54. The graph (Figure 15) shows comparison of Economic Performance indicator of 34 OECD countries.
Table 7. Economic Performance

| S | Country               | GDP Per Capita (PPP) | GDP Growth | Unemployment for last 10 Years | Average Score |
|---|-----------------------|----------------------|------------|-------------------------------|---------------|
|   |                       | US Dollars | Score   | Year | % | Score | Year | Unemployment | Employment | Score |
|   |                       |            |         |      |   |       |      |              |           |       |
|   |                       |            |         |      |   |       |      |   2004-14    |             |       |
|   |                       |            |         |      |   |       |      | 3.25         |             |       |
|   |                       |            |         |      |   |       |      | 96.75        |             |       |
|   |                       |            |         |      |   |       |      | 1.14         |             |       |
|   |                       |            |         |      |   |       |      | 0.82         |             |       |
|   |                       |            |         |      |   |       |      | 2004-14    |             |       |
|   |                       |            |         |      |   |       |      | 6.29         |             |       |
|   |                       |            |         |      |   |       |      | 93.71        |             |       |
|   |                       |            |         |      |   |       |      | 1.10         |             |       |
|   |                       |            |         |      |   |       |      | 0.84         |             |       |
|   |                       |            |         |      |   |       |      | 2004-14    |             |       |
|   |                       |            |         |      |   |       |      | 5.62         |             |       |
|   |                       |            |         |      |   |       |      | 94.38        |             |       |
|   |                       |            |         |      |   |       |      | 1.11         |             |       |
|   |                       |            |         |      |   |       |      | 1.25         |             |       |
|   |                       |            |         |      |   |       |      | 2004-14    |             |       |
|   |                       |            |         |      |   |       |      | 7.3          |             |       |
|   |                       |            |         |      |   |       |      | 3.0          |             |       |
|   |                       |            |         |      |   |       |      | 0.19         |             |       |
|   |                       |            |         |      |   |       |      | 4.59         |             |       |
|   |                       |            |         |      |   |       |      | 95.41        |             |       |
|   |                       |            |         |      |   |       |      | 1.03         |             |       |
|   |                       |            |         |      |   |       |      | 0.82         |             |       |
|   |                       |            |         |      |   |       |      | 2004-14    |             |       |
|   |                       |            |         |      |   |       |      | 7.97         |             |       |
|   |                       |            |         |      |   |       |      | 92.03        |             |       |
|   |                       |            |         |      |   |       |      | 1.00         |             |       |
|   |                       |            |         |      |   |       |      | 0.81         |             |       |
|   |                       |            |         |      |   |       |      | 2004-14    |             |       |
|   |                       |            |         |      |   |       |      | 7.06         |             |       |
|   |                       |            |         |      |   |       |      | 92.94        |             |       |
|   |                       |            |         |      |   |       |      | 1.01         |             |       |
|   |                       |            |         |      |   |       |      | 1.40         |             |       |

Pakistan with respect to South Asia

1. Afghanistan
2. Bangladesh
3. Bhutan
4. India
5. Maldives
6. Nepal
7. Pakistan
8. Sri Lanka

Total: 24637 8 36 8 120.76 679.24 8.00 8.00

Average: 3079.63 1.00 4.50 1.00 15.10 84.91 1.00 1.00

Pakistan with respect to OECD Countries

1. Pakistan
2. Australia
3. Austria
4. Belgium
5. Canada

Average: 1.73 1.67 0.82 0.81 1.40
|   | Country          | Year | Value | Year | Value | Year | Value | Average | Value | Average | Value | Average | Value |
|---|------------------|------|-------|------|-------|------|-------|---------|-------|---------|-------|---------|-------|
| 6 | Chile            | 2013 | 15776 | 2013 | 4.1   | 2004-14 | 7.92 | 92.08   | 1.00   | 1.75   |
| 7 | Czech Republic  | 2013 | 18858 | 2013 | -0.7  | 2004-14 | 6.88 | 93.12   | 1.01   | 0.28   |
| 8 | Denmark          | 2013 | 59191 | 2013 | -0.5  | 2004-14 | 5.85 | 94.15   | 1.02   | 0.68   |
| 9 | Estonia          | 2013 | 19032 | 2013 | 1.6   | 2004-14 | 9.29 | 90.71   | 0.98   | 0.99   |
| 10| Finland          | 2013 | 47129 | 2013 | -1.2  | 2004-14 | 7.84 | 92.16   | 1.00   | 0.36   |
| 11| France           | 2013 | 43000 | 2013 | 0.3   | 2004-14 | 9.56 | 90.44   | 0.98   | 0.78   |
| 12| Germany          | 2013 | 44999 | 2013 | 0.1   | 2004-14 | 7.78 | 92.22   | 1.00   | 0.75   |
| 13| Greece           | 2013 | 21857 | 2013 | -3.3  | 2004-14 | 14.73 | 85.27   | 0.92   | -0.54  |
| 14| Hungary          | 2013 | 13405 | 2013 | 1.5   | 2004-14 | 9.32 | 90.68   | 0.98   | 0.91   |
| 15| Iceland          | 2013 | 45356 | 2013 | 3.5   | 2004-14 | 4.37 | 95.63   | 1.04   | 1.82   |
| 16| Ireland          | 2013 | 45621 | 2013 | 0.2   | 2004-14 | 9.7  | 90.3    | 0.98   | 0.77   |
| 17| Israel           | 2013 | 37035 | 2013 | 3.2   | 2004-14 | 8.78 | 91.22   | 0.99   | 1.64   |
| 18| Italy            | 2013 | 34715 | 2013 | -1.9  | 2004-14 | 8.69 | 91.31   | 0.99   | 0.03   |
| 19| Japan            | 2013 | 38491 | 2013 | 1.6   | 2004-14 | 4.42 | 95.58   | 1.04   | 1.17   |
| 20| South Korea      | 2013 | 24329 | 2013 | 3.2   | 2004-14 | 3.43 | 96.57   | 1.05   | 1.49   |
| 21| Luxembourg       | 2013 | 110424| 2013 | 2.81  | 2004-14 | 5.17 | 94.83   | 1.03   | 1.90   |
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|   |     |     |     | Av |     |     |     |     |
|---|-----|-----|-----|----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| 22 | Mexico | 2013 | 10630 | 0.27 | 2013 | 1.1 | 1.03 | 2004-14 | 4.46 | 95.54 | 1.03 | 0.78 |
| 23 | Netherlands | 2013 | 47634 | 1.21 | 2013 | -0.7 | -0.66 | 2004-14 | 4.9 | 95.1 | 1.03 | 0.53 |
| 24 | New Zealand | 2013 | 40481 | 1.03 | 2013 | 2.5 | 2.35 | 2004-14 | 5.17 | 94.83 | 1.03 | 1.47 |
| 25 | Norway | 2013 | 100318 | 2.55 | 2013 | 0.6 | 0.56 | 2004-14 | 3.41 | 96.59 | 1.05 | 1.39 |
| 26 | Poland | 2013 | 13394 | 0.34 | 2013 | 1.7 | 1.60 | 2004-14 | 11.52 | 88.48 | 0.96 | 0.96 |
| 27 | Portugal | 2013 | 20728 | 0.53 | 2013 | -1.4 | -1.31 | 2004-14 | 11.03 | 88.97 | 0.96 | 0.06 |
| 28 | Slovakia | 2013 | 17706 | 0.45 | 2013 | 1.4 | 1.31 | 2004-14 | 13.82 | 86.18 | 0.93 | 0.90 |
| 29 | Slovenia | 2013 | 22756 | 0.58 | 2013 | -1 | -0.94 | 2004-14 | 7.23 | 92.77 | 1.00 | 0.21 |
| 30 | Spain | 2013 | 29150 | 0.74 | 2013 | -1.2 | -1.13 | 2004-14 | 16.95 | 83.05 | 0.90 | 0.17 |
| 31 | Sweden | 2013 | 57909 | 1.47 | 2013 | 1.5 | 1.41 | 2004-14 | 7.52 | 92.48 | 1.00 | 1.29 |
| 32 | Switzerland | 2013 | 81324 | 2.07 | 2013 | 1.9 | 1.78 | 2004-14 | 3.25 | 96.75 | 1.05 | 1.63 |
| 33 | Turkey | 2013 | 10815 | 0.27 | 2013 | 4.1 | 3.85 | 2004-14 | 10.55 | 89.45 | 0.97 | 1.70 |
| 34 | United Kingdom | 2013 | 39567 | 1.01 | 2013 | 1.7 | 1.60 | 2004-14 | 6.6 | 93.4 | 1.01 | 1.20 |
| 35 | United States | 2013 | 53101 | 1.35 | 2013 | 2.2 | 2.06 | 2004-14 | 6.96 | 93.04 | 1.01 | 1.47 |
|   | Total |   | 137723 | 3.00 | 35.00 | 37.30 | 35.00 | 268.16 | 3231.84 | 35.00 | 35.00 |
|   | Average |   | 39349.5 | 1.00 | 1.07 | 1.00 | 7.66 | 92.34 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
Public Sector Performance (PSP) Index

After combining the score of the individual indicators, the Public Sector Performance (PSP) Index and ranking of the countries is calculated as tabulated in Table 8.

Table 8. Public Sector Performance (PSP) Indicators

| S. No. | Country          | Administrative | Education | Health | Public Infrastructure | Distribution | Stability | Economic Performance | PSP Index | Rank |
|--------|------------------|----------------|-----------|--------|-----------------------|--------------|-----------|----------------------|-----------|------|
|        |                  |-opportunity     |           |        |                       |              |           |                      |           |      |
|        |                  | indicators      |           |        |                       |              |           |                      |           |      |
|        |                  | Musgravian      |           |        |                       |              |           |                      |           |      |
|        |                  | indicators      |           |        |                       |              |           |                      |           |      |
|        |                  | Rank            |           |        |                       |              |           |                      |           |      |
| 1      | Sri Lanka        | 1.34            | 1.79      | 1.07   | 1.79                  | 0.79         | 1.34      | 1.25                 | 1.34      | 1    |
| 2      | Bhutan           | 1.47            | 1.43      | 1.01   | 1.65                  | 0.95         | 0.56      | 0.82                 | 1.13      | 2    |
| 3      | Maldives         | 0.81            | 0.00      | 1.07   | 0.00                  | 0.97         | 2.59      | 1.97                 | 1.06      | 3    |
| 4      | Pakistan         | 1.08            | 0.96      | 0.98   | 1.18                  | 1.09         | 1.12      | 0.84                 | 1.04      | 4    |
| 5      | India            | 1.20            | 1.41      | 0.99   | 1.33                  | 0.98         | 0.22      | 1.03                 | 1.02      | 5    |
| 6      | Bangladesh       | 0.84            | 1.11      | 1.03   | 1.00                  | 1.05         | 1.08      | 0.92                 | 1.00      | 6    |
| 7      | Nepal            | 1.11            | 1.29      | 1.01   | 1.04                  | 1.04         | 0.04      | 0.57                 | 0.87      | 7    |
| 8      | Afghanistan      | 0.16            | 0.00      | 0.84   | 0.00                  | 1.12         | 1.04      | 0.61                 | 0.54      | 8    |
|        | Total            | 1.34            | 8.00      | 8.00   | 8.00                  | 8.00         | 8.00      | 0.54                 |           |      |
|        | Average          | 1.00            | 1.00      | 1.00   | 1.00                  | 1.00         | 1.00      | 0.07                 |           |      |
| 1      | Switzerland      | 1.19            | 1.16      | 1.02   | 1.23                  | 1.04         | 1.25      | 1.63                 | 1.22      | 1    |
| 2      | Luxembourg       | 1.10            | 1.02      | 1.01   | 1.10                  | 1.02         | 1.02      | 1.90                 | 1.17      | 2    |
| 3      | Iceland          | 1.11            | 1.09      | 1.02   | 1.16                  | 1.05         | 0.75      | 1.82                 | 1.14      | 3    |
| 4      | Australia        | 1.12            | 1.21      | 1.01   | 0.95                  | 1.02         | 0.92      | 1.67                 | 1.13      | 4    |
| 5      | Sweden           | 1.16            | 1.01      | 1.01   | 1.07                  | 1.13         | 1.23      | 1.29                 | 1.13      | 5    |
| 6      | New Zealand      | 1.24            | 1.19      | 1.01   | 0.95                  | 0.93         | 1.09      | 1.47                 | 1.13      | 6    |
| 7      | Canada           | 1.15            | 1.10      | 1.01   | 1.05                  | 0.99         | 1.10      | 1.40                 | 1.11      | 7    |
| 8      | Norway           | 1.18            | 1.12      | 1.01   | 0.99                  | 1.10         | 0.97      | 1.39                 | 1.11      | 8    |
| 9      | Japan            | 1.11            | 1.00      | 1.02   | 1.16                  | 0.91         | 1.18      | 1.17                 | 1.08      | 9    |
| 10     | United States    | 1.12            | 0.99      | 0.99   | 1.08                  | 0.80         | 1.04      | 1.47                 | 1.07      | 10   |
| 11     | South Korea      | 0.92            | 0.89      | 1.01   | 1.03                  | 1.01         | 1.07      | 1.49                 | 1.06      | 11   |
| 12     | Denmark          | 1.17            | 1.16      | 1.00   | 1.08                  | 1.10         | 1.13      | 0.68                 | 1.05      | 12   |
| 13     | Israel           | 0.94            | 0.92      | 1.01   | 0.82                  | 0.91         | 1.04      | 1.64                 | 1.04      | 13   |
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14 United Kingdom 1.17 0.99 1.01 0.99 0.99 0.91 1.20 1.04 14
15 Germany 1.14 1.09 1.01 1.12 1.07 1.03 0.75 1.03 15
16 Chile 1.01 0.86 1.00 0.88 0.70 1.01 1.75 1.03 16
17 Belgium 1.00 1.13 1.00 1.08 1.08 1.08 0.81 1.03 17
18 Ireland 1.09 1.20 1.01 0.95 0.97 1.17 0.77 1.02 18
19 Austria 1.09 0.99 1.01 1.16 1.08 0.97 0.82 1.02 19
20 France 1.01 1.04 1.02 1.14 1.01 1.10 0.78 1.02 20
21 Netherlands 1.15 1.24 1.01 1.18 1.10 0.91 0.53 1.02 21
22 Finland 1.21 1.20 1.01 1.20 1.07 0.96 0.36 1.00 22
23 Estonia 0.99 1.03 0.98 0.97 1.00 0.80 0.99 0.97 23
24 Hungary 0.84 0.87 0.97 0.93 1.10 1.02 0.91 0.95 24
25 Poland 0.87 0.89 0.98 0.75 0.96 1.12 0.96 0.93 25
26 Turkey 0.81 0.81 0.97 0.95 0.87 0.31 1.70 0.92 26
27 Slovakia 0.82 0.78 0.98 0.78 1.08 1.04 0.90 0.91 27
28 Portugal 0.91 1.04 1.00 1.12 0.96 1.18 0.06 0.90 28
29 Spain 0.90 1.03 1.02 1.10 0.97 1.04 0.17 0.89 29
30 Czech Republic 0.86 0.88 0.99 0.93 1.10 1.06 0.28 0.87 30
31 Slovenia 0.81 0.95 1.00 0.95 1.12 1.03 0.21 0.87 31
32 Pakistan 0.60 0.57 0.88 0.62 1.03 0.32 1.73 0.82 32
33 Italy 0.71 0.92 1.02 0.86 1.00 1.07 0.03 0.80 33
34 Mexico 0.77 0.74 0.98 0.78 0.76 0.76 0.78 0.80 34
35 Greece 0.74 0.87 1.01 0.86 0.96 1.34 -0.54 0.75 35

Total 35.0 35.0 35.0 35.0 35.0 35.0 35.0 35.0
Average 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1

1.34 1.13 1.06 1.04 1.02 1.00 0.87 0.54

Public Sector Performance wrt South Asia
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Figure 16: Public Sector performance with respect to OECD Countries
Conclusion

The Public Sector Performance (PSP) Index provides empirical evidence of difference between countries. Pakistan ranks 4\textsuperscript{th} among the 8 countries of South Asia while it is 32\textsuperscript{nd} when compared with 34 OECD countries of the world. In South Asia, Pakistan’s performance is 4\% above the normalized weighted average while it is 18\% below the normalized weighted average when compared with 34 OECD countries.

Recommendations

As a result of the above mentioned study, it is recommended that important related coefficient (\(\alpha\)) which has been taken as 1, be calculated for each indicator. Moreover, Public expenditure relevant to the category be utilized for weighing performance to indicate the Public Sector Efficiency.
Pakistan’s Govt. Sector Performance as Compare to South Asia and 34 OED Countries – Providing a Base for International Policy Issues in the Contemporary World

Public Sector performance wrt OECD Countries
References

Afonso, A., Schuknecht, L., & Vito, T. (2005). Public Sector Efficiency: An International Comparison. *Public Choice*: 123, 321-347.

Afonso, A., Schuknecht, L., & Vito, T. (2006). Public Sector Efficiency: Evidence for new EU member states and emerging markets. *European Central Bank Working Paper series*. 581.

CIA World Factbook: Unemployment rate for Afghanistan, Bangladesh, India, Maldives and Nepal.

CIA World Factbook: GDP per Capita in US Dollars of Afghanistan and Maldives for year 2014.

Drucker, P. (2001), Eficiența factorului decizional (“The efficiency of the decision makers”), București: Editura Destin.

Gwartney, J., Robert, L., Chris, E., Walter, P., de Rugy, V., & Wagh, S. (2002). Economic Freedom of the World: 2002 Annual report. Vancouver: The Fraser Institute.

Mueller, D. (ed). (1997). Perspectives on Public Choice. A Handbook. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Profiroiu, M., Profiroiu, A. (2001). Cadrul de analiza a performantelor sectorului public (The analysis of public sector performances), In Economie teoretica și aplicată, pp. 44-47.

Persson, T & Tabellini, G. (2001). Political Institutions and Policy Outcomes: What are the stylized Facts? (Mimeo)

Rodrik, D. (2000). Institutions for High Quality Growth: What Are and How to Acquire Them. (NBER Working Paper 7540)

Sarfraz, M. Ran, J. & Soliev, I. (2014). Restructuring and Performance Evaluation of Chinese Local Government: Problem, Reason, and Options of Change.

Shleifer, A & Vishny, R. (1998). The Grabbing Hand: Government Pathologies and Their Cures. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Tanzi, V. & Schuknecht, L. (1997). Reconsidering the Fiscal Role of Government: The International Perspective. *American Economic Review*, 87 (2), 164-168.

Tanzi, V., & Ludger Schuknecht (2000). Public Spending in the 20th Century: A Global Perspective. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Transparency International: Corruption Perceptions Index (CPI) 2014

The World Bank: [http://data.worldbank.org/indicator/SP.DYN.IMRT.IN](http://data.worldbank.org/indicator/SP.DYN.IMRT.IN)

World Economic Forum (2014). The Global Competitiveness Report 2014-15.