TRENDS IN REGIONAL
HUMAN DEVELOPMENT INDICES

By

Haroon Jamal
Amir Jahan Khan

July 2007

TRENDS IN REGIONAL
HUMAN DEVELOPMENT INDICES

SUMMARY

The purpose of this research is to highlight changes in human development status of districts of Pakistan during the period between 1998 and 2005. The standard summary measure, Human Development Index (HDI) proposed by UNDP, is applied at the district level. District HDIs, estimated for both periods will provide an indication of existing trends in regional disparities in terms of economic development as well as in the education and health status of districts. The findings will facilitate district governments for future planning and resource allocation. The estimated HDIs indicate an overall annual growth of 3 percent during 1998-2005. On average, the highest growth rates are observed in NWFP districts mainly due to progress in the education sector.

1.   **INTRODUCTION**

Human development has been defined as "a process of enlarging people's choices" (UNDP, 1990). This definition is, of course, very broad, and includes non-material aspects such as the many dimensions of political, cultural and social freedoms. For policy and comparative purposes, however, a reductionist approach is used which quantifies human development of a country or region with some specific indicators.

The United Nations Development Programme's (UNDP) Human Development Index (HDI) is a composite index that measures the average achievements in a country/region in three basic dimensions: a long and healthy life, knowledge, and a decent standard of living. The HDI was created to re-emphasize that people and their capabilities should be the ultimate criteria for assessing the development of a country, not economic growth alone. Thus the HDI draws the attention of policy makers, the media and NGOs away from the more usual economic statistics to focus instead on human outcomes. It opens the debate on how two countries/regions with the same level of income per person can end up with such different human development outcomes (HDI levels). For example, Vietnam and Pakistan have similar levels of income per person, but life expectancy and literacy differ greatly between the two, with Vietnam having a much higher HDI value than Pakistan. These striking contrasts immediately stimulate debate on government policies on health and education, asking why what has been achieved in one country is far from the reach of the other. This summary measure also highlights differences within countries, between provinces or states, across gender, ethnicity, as well as other socio-economic groupings. Highlighting internal or regional disparities along these lines has raised the national debate in many countries.

After the promulgation of the Devolution of Power in Pakistan through Local Government Ordinance 2001 (LGO 2001), regional or district development is at the heart of the policy and of political discussion. Devolution or decentralization accelerates human development by providing an opportunity for citizens to solve problems that are more specific to their local situation. It aims to bring government closer to the people. Decisions made on the local level will be more sensitive to local conditions, more responsive to local needs and will allow for higher accountability and transparency, thus raising the level of good governance and further improving human development. It also provides an opportunity for broader participation and

representation of all ethnic and culture groups in the political decision-making process and at the local level.

Thus the new system of local government is a hope for speeding up the level of human development. Nonetheless, since the implementation of the devolution plan, some problems and issues have been encountered. Some of the major issues include an imprecise fiscal transfer framework and unclear delegation of financial powers. Other problems include multiple reporting lines at district level, non timely availability of funds, unsettled issues between provinces and districts, the centralization of power at the district level particularly delegation of financial powers to the DCO, adopting a top down planning approach by the DCOs and the lack of capacity building of the officials working at district level. Although many issues have been resolved, district governments are still facing a number of challenges in terms of working relationships with the province, fiscal transfers and development planning. Therefore, it would be too early to assess the achievements of local governments in terms of human development as measured by HDI.

In this background, it is not the intention of this research to determine cause and effect relationship between changes in district human development and the new system of governance. It only presents the status of and trends in human development at the district level for the years during 1998 and 2005 period. District HDIs, estimated for both periods, will provide an indication of regional disparities in terms of economic development as well as well as in the education and health status of districts. The findings will perhaps facilitate district governments for future planning and resource allocation, especially in the education and health sectors.

2. METHODOLOGY AND DATA LIMITATIONS

The UNDP HDI focuses on human development from three dimensions: a long and healthy life, as measured by life expectancy at birth, knowledge as measured by the adult literacy rate and combined primary, secondary and tertiary gross enrollment ratios, and a decent standard of living measured by the Gross Domestic Product (GDP) per capita in terms of Purchasing Power Parity in US dollars (PPP$). The knowledge or education index gives two-third weight to adult literacy and one-third to combined enrollment rates. To arrive at HDI value, arithmetic mean of the above three indices is calculated.

In the context of Pakistan, the first attempt to compute provincial and district HDIs was made by UNDP, Pakistan, in its National Human Development Reports 2003 (NHDR, Pakistan 2003). Due to data constraints at district level, Pakistan NHDR used some proxies for income and health components. Moreover, primary enrollment rates were used instead of combined enrollment rates. Barring income proxies, this research, however, uses standard indicators for the health and education components. Following is a brief description on the calculation of the components of HDI at a district level.

2.1   Health Index

Health is one of the three components of HDI proposed by UNDP. The rationale for inclusion of health in the HDI is obvious. The condition of a person's body is an important determinant of overall welfare of that individual. Employment opportunity also depends on bodily well being; therefore, labor market participation and earning prospects may be affected by weaker health. Health appears to be one of the important dimensions of human development. However, quantification of the health status is the most difficult part.

For Pakistan NHDR 2003, the health index was estimated with the help of infant survival rates and immunization figures. The report (NHDR, 2003) narrates "As there is no data available on life expectancy either for provinces or districts of Pakistan, we constructed a health index using infant survival rates (available only at the provincial level) and immunization rates (available at the district level). Our index gives a 70 percent weight to infant survival rates and consequently a 30 percent weight to immunization rates." Further, the report qualifies that "Note, that as infant survival rates are available only at the provincial level, therefore, when constructing the HDI at district level, the component of the health index used the value of the respective province for each of its districts".

On the contrary, this study has measured health component of HDI using standard estimates of "life expectancy at birth." These estimates were made using age and sex specific death rates from Pakistan Demographic Surveys[1] (PDS). Coale-Demeny life tables[2] are applied to compute the probability for life expectancy at birth. Nonetheless, PDS does not provide death

---

[1] Two Demographic Surveys are used; 1999 and 2003 for 1998 and 2005 HDIs, respectively.

[2] For details see, US Census Bureau Coale-Demeny life tables, http://www.census.gov/ipc/www/pas.html .

rates at districts level, therefore, estimated life expectancy for the provinces are used in the calculation of HDI for the respective districts. Following UNDP HDI, health index is calculated by choosing a global acceptable range of life expectancy, which suggests a maximum of 85 years and a minimum of 25 years.

2.2   Knowledge (Education) Index

This component of the HDI is calculated by using 100 percent as a maximum and 0 percent as a minimum for levels of educational attainment. It gives two-third weight to adult literacy rate (15 years and above) and one-third weight to combined enrolment rate for the 5-24 years age cohort.

Two data sources are used for the computation of the education index. These are the Population Census (Pakistan Census Organization, 1998) and Pakistan Social and Living Standard Measurement Survey (PSLM, 2005). The PSLM provides district level welfare indicators with a sample size of about 76,500 households. The PSLM data is statistically comparable with the census data, with some margin of sampling error.

2.3   Income Index

Real GDP in PPP$ is required to compute the income component of HDI. This data however is not available at district level. Therefore, some proxies are used to compute the income index for districts.

First provincial shares in national income are estimated using Household Integrated Economic Survey (HIES)[3]. These shares are applied to the national GDP in terms of PPP$[4] to estimate provincial income in PPP$. Following Pakistan NHDR 2003, cash value of agricultural produce and manufacturing value added are used as a proxy of income[5]. The district ratio to the provincial value of crop output and manufacturing value added was multiplied with the provincial real GDP in PPP$. The estimated per capita district GDP

---

[3] HIES 1998 and HIES/PSLM 2005, are used for estimating provincial income shares.

[4] Pakistan GDP in terms of PPP$ are taken from the World Development Indicators database.

[5] District-wise crop statistics and Census of Manufacturing Industries (CMI) of relevant years (close to 1998 and 2005) are used to estimate the cash value of agricultural produce and manufacturing value added of districts.

(PPP$) is adjusted[6] with a minimum of PPP$100 and a maximum of PPP$6,040 to calculate the income index for districts.

3.   MAJOR FINDINGS

District-wise estimated HDIs for 1998-2005, are furnished in the Appendix. This section briefly discusses the summary tables. Average values of District HDI for each province are reported in Table 1.

TABLE 1 HUMAN DEVELOPMENT INDICES [Districts Average]			
	HDI 2005	HDI 1998	Annual Rate of Change [%]
Overall	**.6196**	**.5156**	**2.7**
Punjab	.6699	.5640	2.5
Sindh	.6282	.5116	2.9
NWFP	.6065	.4855	3.4
Balochistan	.5557	.4796	2.1

TABLE 2 TOP TEN DISTRICTS [According to HDI 2005]			
	HDI 2005	HDI 1998	Annual Rate of Change [%]
Karachi	.7885	.6551	2.7
Jhelum	.7698	.6866	1.6
Haripur	.7339	.6420	1.9
Abbottabad	.7304	.6293	2.2
Sheikhupura	.7301	.6201	2.4
Kasur	.7132	.5896	2.8
Ghotki	.7090	.5412	3.9
Bhakkar	.7058	.5828	2.8
Ziarat	.6994	.6257	1.6
Gujranwala	.6958	.5621	3.1

The latest UNDP Human Development Report 2006, has ranked Pakistan 134, with an index value of 0.539, out of 177 countries in terms of its HDI. The figure for HDI 2005, is however not comparable because the UNDP report is based on 2004 data. Interestingly, the HDI estimated for 1998 (0.5156) is really close to UNDP HDI[7] for Pakistan (0.522). As expected, Punjab is on top in terms of average values of district HDI, while Balochistan possess the lowest rank. The differences in HDI magnitude also reflect nature of regional disparities.

[6] For detail, see UNDP Pakistan National Human Development Report 2003, (Annexure I-b).

[7] See UNDP Human Development Report, 2000.

TABLE 3 DISTRICTS WITH LOW LEVEL OF HUMAN DEVELOPMENT *[According to HDI 2005]*		HDI 2005	HDI 1998	Annual Rate of Change [%]
Sindh	Tharparkar	.3137	.3371	-1.0
NWFP	Hangu	.4941	.3781	3.9
	Battagram	.4904	.4010	2.9
	Kohistan	.4705	.3801	3.1
Balochistan	Awaran	.4997	.4526	1.4
	Sibi	.4976	.4831	.4
	Qilla Abdullah	.4674	.4418	.8
	Bolan	.4574	.3974	2.0
	Gwadar	.4492	.3721	2.7
	Jhal Magsi	.4347	.4161	.6
	Musa Khel	.4219	.3704	1.9

Overall, about 3 percent annual growth is observed in HDIs during 1998-2005. The highest annual growth is estimated in NWFP. The annual growth rates in HDIs are more than 3 percent in 14 out of 24 districts of the province. Districts of Balochistan, as expected, are showing rigidity and in most districts of the province, the annual growth rates are less than one percent. Another observation emerges from the table that annual growth rate in Punjab is lower than that in Sindh and NWFP.

Table 2 lists top ten districts according to the estimated values of HDI 2005. Five out of these 10 districts belong to Punjab (Jhelum, Sheikhupura, Kasur, Bhakkar and Gujranwala). Two districts of NWFP (Haripur and Abbottabad) appear in this grouping, while Karachi and Ziarat represent Sindh and Balochistan, respectively.

According to the UNDP categorization of HDI into high (more than 0.8), medium (0.5 to 0.79) and low (below 0.5) level of human development, no district of Pakistan emerges in the category of 'high human development.' All districts of Punjab meet the criteria of 'medium human development.' District Tharparkar is the only district in Sindh which emerges in the category of 'low human development' (Table 3). In fact, it is the only district of Pakistan

where the value of HDI has dropped due to the massive declining of income index during 1998-2005. According to Table 3, three districts (Hangu, Battagram and Kohistan) of NWFP, while seven districts (Awaran, Sibi, Qilla Abdullah, Bolan, Gwadar, Jhal Magsi and Musa Khel) of Balochistan are in the category of 'low human development.'

TABLE 4 DISTRICTS SHOWING GROWTH RATES OF MORE THAN 4 PERCENT IN HDI		HDI 2005	HDI 1998	Annual Change [%]		
				HDI	Education	Income
Punjab	Rajanpur	.6347	.4780	4.1	13.3	3.1
Sindh	Khairpur	.6603	.4915	4.3	7.2	5.1
	Shikarpur	.6147	.4631	4.1	12.4	1.5
NWFP	Dir Low	.5834	.3282	8.6	12.2	18.7
	Dir Upper	.5585	.3514	6.8	9.6	12.5
	Malakand	.6590	.4945	4.2	9.1	3.1
	Shangla	.5342	.3982	4.3	15.3	2.5
	Swat	.6657	.4777	4.9	9.5	5.1
Balochistan	Kharan	.5597	.3695	6.1	13.0	7.8
	Pishin	.6562	.4980	4.0	11.9	1.2

Table 4 is prepared to show districts which have shown extraordinary annual growth (more than 4 percent) in HDIs during the period of analysis. Rajanpur is the only district of Punjab in which 4.1 percent growth is observed. In Sindh, districts with more than 4 percent growth are Khairpur and Shikarpur. The table also reveals that the HDI growth in these districts is mainly due to progress in the education index. In two districts of NWFP (Lower Dir and Upper Dir), however, growth in income component is dominating. Three more districts (Malakand, Shangla and Swat) of NWFP also appeared in this grouping. More than 4 percent annual growth in HDI is also observed in districts Kharan and Pishin of Balochistan province, mainly due to improvement in education status.

The major reshuffling in district positions in terms of HDIs are reported in Table 5 and 6. Table 5 encapsulates those districts which moved at least 10th positions upward. A cursory look at Table 5 reveals that changes in HDI in these districts are due to the impressive

progress in their education index. The income component of HDI is dominating in few districts (Pakpattan from Punjab, Khairpur from Sindh, Lower and Upper Dir and Swat from NWFP, and Kharan from Balochistan) only. This is an interesting finding and future research may be directed towards the determination of factors responsible for the growth in education access in these particular districts.

		Rank Order			Change in Index Magnitude		
TABLE 5 **MAJOR SHIFTING IN RANK POSITION** *[Districts Moved Up in HDI Ranking]*							
		2005	**1998**	**Positions UP**	**HDI**	**Education**	**Income**
Punjab	Gujranwala	10	26	16 ↑	.13	.24	.12
	Pakpattan	26	51	25 ↑	.14	.18	.21
	Rajanpur	52	73	21 ↑	.16	.28	.15
	Sahiwal	11	25	14 ↑	.13	.19	.16
Sindh	Ghotki	7	42	35 ↑	.17	.28	.16
	Khairpur	35	68	33 ↑	.17	.20	.24
	Mirpurkhas	29	43	14 ↑	.13	.20	.13
	Nawabshah	14	52	38 ↑	.16	.33	.10
	Sanghar	50	63	13 ↑	.13	.21	.13
	Shikarpur	61	79	18 ↑	.15	.34	.06
	Sukkur	15	36	21 ↑	.14	.26	.10
NWFP	Chitral	64	76	12 ↑	.13	.24	.08
	Dir Lower	74	98	24 ↑	.26	.31	.37
	Dir Upper	79	96	17 ↑	.21	.16	.38
	Malakand	36	67	31 ↑	.16	.27	.14
	Mardan	24	39	15 ↑	.13	.23	.06
	Swat	33	74	41 ↑	.19	.23	.25
Balochistan	Kharan	78	95	17 ↑	.19	.19	.32
	Pishin	38	66	28 ↑	.16	.35	.06

Districts which lost their positions in the national ranking of HDI are shown in Table 6. Here the picture is different and a look at the table indicates that they lost their positions due to insignificant or negative growth in income component. Another noticeable observation is that only one district (Dadu) has lost its position in Sindh (Table 6), while 7 out of 16 districts of

Sindh significantly moved up in the HDI ranking (Table 5). Faisalabad, Rawalpindi, Peshawar and Quetta are notable districts which lost their rank position significantly during 1998-2005.

		TABLE 6					
		Rank Order			**Change in Index Magnitude**		
		2005	**1998**	**Positions Down**	**HDI**	**Education**	**Income**
Punjab	Attock	42	28	14 ↓	.10	.24	.01
	Bahawalpur	59	47	12 ↓	.08	.12	.08
	Faisalabad	28	9	19 ↓	.07	.15	.02
	Gujrat	51	30	21 ↓	.08	.14	.06
	Rahimyar Khan	41	22	19 ↓	.08	.15	.06
	Rawalpindi	49	7	42 ↓	.04	.15	-.08
Sindh	Dadu	31	18	13 ↓	.09	.18	.03
NWFP	Bannu	73	57	16 ↓	.07	.19	-.05
	Kohat	27	13	14 ↓	.09	.15	.02
	Nowshera	39	23	16 ↓	.09	.15	.03
	Peshawar	48	20	28 ↓	.07	.10	.02
Balochistan	Jhal Magsi	96	85	11 ↓	.02	.14	-.15
	Qilla Saifullah	86	62	24 ↓	.01	.07	-.10
	Lasbela	67	33	34 ↓	.04	.16	-.10
	Loralai	70	35	35 ↓	.04	.18	-.13
	Panjgur	77	49	28 ↓	.04	-.01	.08
	Quetta	82	64	18 ↓	.04	.18	-.13
	Sibi	89	71	18 ↓	.01	.18	-.20

4.   CONCLUDING REMARKS

Human development has emerged in recent years as an important concept among those seeking an alternative to the GDP per capita as a measure of human well-being or the quality of life. UNDP has devised and made good use of its HDI that integrates three distinct factors: (1) a long and healthy life measured in terms of life expectancy at birth (2) education treated as a combination of adult literacy and school enrollment and (3) a decent standard of living construed as GDP per capita.

Taking advantage of the UNDP National Human Development Report for Pakistan, this research has applied the HDI concept at district level and estimated Districts HDIs for the 1998 and 2005 period. The findings are useful for profiling and bench marking district positions and growth in terms of economic development as well as education and health. The results may be used as a criterion in determining the Provincial Financial Awards by the provincial governments and also will facilitate district governments in future planning and resource allocation, especially in the education and health sectors.

Although the HDI is a useful starting point, it is important to remember that the concept of human development is much broader and more complex than any summary measure can capture. The HDI is not, therefore, a comprehensive measure. It does not include important aspects of human development, notably the ability to participate in the decisions that affect one's life and to enjoy the respect of others in the community.

REFERENCES AND
DATA SOURCES

Government of Pakistan (1998), District Census Reports, Pakistan Census Organization, Islamabad

Government of Pakistan (1998), Household Integrated Economic Survey 1998, Federal Bureau of Statistics, Islamabad

Government of Pakistan (1999), *Pakistan Demographic Survey 1999*, Federal Bureau of Statistics, Islamabad

Government of Pakistan, *Agriculture Statistics of Pakistan,* Ministry of Food, Agriculture and Livestock, Islamabad, **Various Issues**

Government of Pakistan, *Crops Area Production (By Districts)*, Ministry of Food, Agriculture and Livestock, Islamabad, **Various Issues**

Government of Pakistan (2005), *Pakistan Social and Living Standard Measurement Survey* Federal Bureau of Statistics, Islamabad

Government of Punjab (2005), *Development Statistics,* Bureau of Statistics, Lahore

Government of Sindh (2005), *Development Statistics*, Bureau of Statistics, Karachi

Government of Pakistan, *Market and Prices*, Agriculture and Livestock Products Marketing and Grading Department, Karachi (Unpublished Data)

Government of Pakistan (2001), *Census of Manufacturing Industries 2001*, Federal Bureau of Statistics, Islamabad
http://www.statpak.gov.pk/depts/fbs/statistics/manufacturing_industry/cmi_2001.html
, (Accessed March 19, 2007)

Government of Pakistan (2003), Pakistan Demographic Survey 2003, Federal Bureau of Statistics, Islamabad
http://www.statpak.gov.pk/depts/fbs/statistics/pds2003/pds2003.html
(Accessed March 26, 2007)

United Nations Development Program, Human Development Reports, Oxford University Press, New York, Various issues

United Nation Development Program, Pakistan (2003), Pakistan National Human Development Report, Oxford University Press, Karachi

World Bank (2006), *World Development Indicators database,* 1 July 2006,
http://siteresources.worldbank.org/DATASTATISTICS/Resources/GDP_PPP.pdf

APPENDIX

TABLE A – 1 DISTRICT HUMAN DEVELOPMENT INDICES [Punjab Province]			
Districts	**HDI 2005**	**HDI 1998**	**Annual Rate of Change [%]**
Jhelum	.7698	.6866	1.6
Sheikhupura	.7301	.6201	2.4
Kasur	.7132	.5896	2.8
Bhakkar	.7058	.5828	2.8
Gujranwala	.6958	.5621	3.1
Sahiwal	.6955	.5645	3.0
Chakwal	.6937	.5841	2.5
Toba Tek Singh	.6932	.5920	2.3
Lahore	.6882	.5994	2.0
Sialkot	.6882	.5820	2.4
Khushab	.6851	.5856	2.3
Mundi Bahuddin	.6849	.5908	2.1
Leiah	.6828	.5658	2.7
Mianwali	.6819	.5692	2.6
Hafizabad	.6793	.5552	2.9
Pakpattan	.6729	.5288	3.5
Faisalabad	.6722	.5992	1.7
Okara	.6696	.5505	2.8
Khanewal	.6671	.5430	3.0
Sargodha	.6616	.5618	2.4
Jhang	.6589	.5546	2.5
Narowal	.6553	.5544	2.4
Rahimyar Khan	.6528	.5685	2.0
Attock	.6522	.5554	2.3
Bahawalnagar	.6470	.5505	2.3
Multan	.6437	.5308	2.8
Vehari	.6430	.5381	2.6
Rawalpindi	.6381	.5999	.9
Gujrat	.6367	.5546	2.0
Rajanpur	.6347	.4780	4.1
D.G. Khan	.6307	.5191	2.8
Muzaffargarh	.6201	.5076	2.9
Bahawalpur	.6182	.5370	2.0
Lodhran	.6144	.5160	2.5

TABLE A – 2 DISTRICT HUMAN DEVELOPMENT INDICES *[Sindh Province]*			
Districts	**HDI 2005**	**HDI 1998**	**Annual Rate of Change [%]**
Karachi	.7885	.6551	2.7
Ghotki	.7090	.5412	3.9
Nawabshah	.6921	.5278	3.9
Sukkur	.6902	.5517	3.3
Hyderabad	.6806	.5729	2.5
Mirpurkhas	.6711	.5404	3.1
Dadu	.6684	.5776	2.1
Khairpur	.6603	.4915	4.3
Sanghar	.6377	.5040	3.4
N. Feroz	.6308	.5390	2.3
Badin	.6280	.5164	2.8
Shikarpur	.6147	.4631	4.1
Thatta	.5948	.5066	2.3
Larkana	.5483	.4548	2.7
Jacobabad	.5228	.4065	3.7
Tharparkar	.3137	.3371	-1.0

TABLE A – 3 DISTRICT HUMAN DEVELOPMENT INDICES *[NWFP Province]*			
Districts	**HDI 2005**	**HDI 1998**	**Annual Rate of Change [%]**
Haripur	.7339	.6420	1.9
Abbottabad	.7304	.6293	2.2
Mardan	.6763	.5499	3.0
Swabi	.6756	.5527	2.9
Kohat	.6727	.5876	1.9
Swat	.6657	.4777	4.9
Malakand	.6590	.4945	4.2
Nowshera	.6553	.5659	2.1
Peshawar	.6391	.5697	1.7
Charsadda	.6293	.5362	2.3
Karak	.6176	.5123	2.7
Mansehra	.6144	.4854	3.4
Chitral	.6062	.4735	3.6
D.I.Khan	.5947	.4736	3.3
Lakki Marwat	.5874	.4864	2.7
Bannu	.5838	.5090	2.0
Dir Lower	.5834	.3282	8.6
Buner	.5776	.4599	3.3
Dir Upper	.5585	.3514	6.8
Shangla	.5342	.3982	4.3
Tank	.5064	.4099	3.1
Hangu	.4941	.3781	3.9
Battagram	.4904	.4010	2.9
Kohistan	.4705	.3801	3.1

TABLE A – 4 DISTRICT HUMAN DEVELOPMENT INDICES *[Balochistan Province]*			
Districts	**HDI 2005**	**HDI 1998**	**Annual Rate of Change [%]**
Ziarat	.6994	.6257	1.6
Pishin	.6562	.4980	4.0
Turbat	.6510	.5385	2.7
Mastung	.6404	.5489	2.2
Chagai	.6321	.5062	3.2
Jaffarabad	.6043	.5000	2.7
Nasirabad	.5978	.5090	2.3
Lasbela	.5954	.5528	1.1
Loralai	.5888	.5518	.9
Kalat	.5873	.4642	3.4
Barkhan	.5799	.4708	3.0
Panjgur	.5742	.5309	1.1
Kharan	.5597	.3695	6.1
Zhob	.5584	.4830	2.1
Quetta	.5397	.5037	1.0
Khuzdar	.5251	.4196	3.3
Qilla Saifullah	.5181	.5049	.4
Awaran	.4997	.4526	1.4
Sibi	.4976	.4831	.4
Qilla Abdullah	.4674	.4418	.8
Bolan	.4574	.3974	2.0
Gwadar	.4492	.3721	2.7
Jhal Magsi	.4347	.4161	.6
Musa Khel	.4219	.3704	1.9

Note: Due to missing data for 2005, districts Dera Bugti and Kohlu were not included.