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Abstract

The paper develops a set of key performance indicators (KPIs) for Seoul city administration, inaugurated in July 2006. Proper establishment and application of the KPIs into its administration would not only help accomplishing municipal leadership’s strategic initiations, but also enhance Seoul’s global competitiveness. At the same time, the KPIs can be a good communication tool through which the leadership and city customers can communicate each other.
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1. Introduction

The purpose of the study is to develop a set of key performance indicators (KPIs) for a City administration, Seoul metropolitan city. As a newly inaugurated Mayor or the chief executive of Seoul, he would like to establish a set of definitive and specific goals achievable during his tenure for fulfilling not only his long-lived vision, but also some of his election promises and his administration’s policy initiatives. Furthermore, he would like to see that Seoul be ranked high in its global competitiveness among the competing cities in the world.

For the sake of these purposes, the new leadership wants to have a set of KPIs or operational measures indicating the progress of city’s established goals or targets. If the KPIs are designed and developed so that Seoul’s competitiveness should be constantly evaluated and monitored, it is most likely that its global competitiveness could be managed to improve.

The operational KPIs can be valuable in various aspects. In the context of communicating with City’s customers domestically and abroad such as Seoul citizen, foreigners who are or plan to be in Seoul, potential foreign direct investors (FDI), and tourists, the KPIs could be a good communication vehicle. Through the KPIs, Seoul’s present status, performance progress, and what to be done next year or in three years can be communicated with the customers in terms of its global competitiveness, its policy-related projects, or both.

In accordance with the current global practice of empowering the people is the City’s effective and timely updating of the citizens regarding its latest performance progress. The use of KPIs to keep the citizens up to date and well informed is a meaningful effort by the City to promulgate particular basic democratic foundation to the people. From the perspective of citizens, the KPIs can be a tangible means to evaluate and monitor the work done by Mayor and City. From the perspective of Mayor, the KPIs can be a vital communication tool to update the citizens the progress and status of the Mayor’s projects, promises, and visions in a palpable form.

In the context of management and operation of Seoul City administration, the KPIs can be the targets to be accomplished by the city government officials or staffs. The city leadership can offer the indicators as a roadmap and definitive targets for his
administration, establishing specific and detailed expectations for each particular department of the City government, allowing the city leadership in turn to utilize the KPIs for monitoring and management purposes. If properly used by matching performance and compensation, the KPIs could be a good managing tool governing the behavior of city workers. The possible long-term benefit of the KPIs would be that it may plant securely a performance-based work environment, nurturing such conditions as to establish a positive tradition and culture within the city organization.

Interactive communication via the pre-defined KPIs among Mayor, City officials, and citizens may create a win-win result by increasing clarity, transparency, accountability and clear responsibility in managing the city administrations, more importantly through which, placing Seoul in the higher ranks among world class cities.

In section 2, the conceptual background is described for performance indicators and their driving factors. Section 3 presents the method to derive the KPIs for Seoul administration. Results are discussed in section 4. In section 5, conclusions are presented.

2. Conceptual Background

The study aims primarily to determine a handful number of the most focal and imperative KPIs, which will lead to enhance city’s global competitiveness while realizing city’s vision and goals. As presented in Exhibit 1, there are three core elements, namely, global factors, internal factors, and key performance indicators (KPIs).

Global factors are critical ingredients that determine a city’s global competitiveness (For examples, refer Appendix 1 and 2). They are the sources for KPIs, and can be obtained from the previous literatures and surveys on the city competitiveness.

Internal Factors can be drawn from various sources including Mayor’s vision, goals, policy directions, and promised projects. The internal factors are City’s imperative agendas to be resolved along with its vision and strategic intentions. The KPIs are developed to handle the urgent city’s agendas.
Much like the concept of an automobile’s dashboard indicating among many others strictly only the most critical information such as speed, temperature, lights, and fuel level, the KPIs should include only the most important indicators: ‘selection and focus’.

Too many indicators may mean nothing. Because the indicators would be used to communicate with citizens and to manage city workers, too many indicators would only cause confusion. In all actuality, the City could collect countless data and statistics to communicate, but all the data may be neither relevant nor effective. Therefore, communication through most effective and relevant indicators can be an important catalyst for the City successfully to achieve its goals and to improve its global competitiveness.

* KPI means a Key Performance Indicator.
3. Methodology

3.1 Method

The method for the study is graphically shown in Exhibit 2. The method is designed so that only the most focal and imperative indicators should be derived which will not only lead City’s enhanced global competitiveness, but also realize City’s vision and goal. The method has four steps as follows:

The first step involves undertaking a thorough document review of previous studies in the global competitiveness in order to find the *global factors* that were commonly used to measure a city’s global competitiveness.

The second step involves the examination of the common *global factors* to eliminate unnecessary, uncontrollable, infeasible, irrelevant, and incomplete factors, thus creating a set of most important, executable, imperative common factors to improve Seoul’s global ranking in competitiveness.

The third step involves obtaining the *internal factors* to incorporate the city leadership’s strategic intentions into the performance indicators. The study uses two ways to obtain such factors. First, we examined Mayor’s vision and election promises as well as City’s goals and policy directions. Second, we conducted personal interviews with Mayor and relevant city officials.

The final step smoothly meshes the global factors from step 2 and the internal factors from step 3, and they are consolidated through the rule of ‘selection and focus.’ and meaningful KPIs could be obtained.
3.2 Global Factors for the KPIs

3.2.1 Global Factors Representing Global Competitiveness

Using the method developed in section 3.1, the first step involves the examination of major studies on the global competitiveness among international cities. After reviewing the available literatures and surveys, the Economist Intelligence Unit Global Livability

---

1 The literatures examined include Anholt-GMI City, Urban Audit Perception Survey, UNDP Urban, Cushman etc., Money Magazine Survey, and Calvert-Henderson Quality of Life Indicators. Another
Survey (EIU Survey) and the Mercer Human Resource Consulting (MHRC) Survey were chosen for this study as the basis for forming the Common Global Factors. Among the several contending studies regarding international city’s global competitiveness, both surveys were selected mainly because they thoroughly include in their study Seoul and other major international cities in the world. Many of surveys were limited to their own regions rather than worldwide. Therefore, the addressed factors and indicators in their studies were limited the cities in the United States or the European Union.

The Appendix 1 presents the global factors in the EIU Global Livability Survey. In order to measure the quality city life among global cities, the EIU survey uses 29 factors in five categories: Stability (25%), Healthcare (20%), Education (10%), Infrastructure (20%), and Culture & Environment (25%). The survey takes over 40 indicators into consideration to measure the identified 29 factors (For detail, refer Appendix 1).

As a subsidiary of The Economist Magazine, the EIU has a vast network for statistical and data collection from The Economist Magazine available, making its comparative indexes high in authority and objectivity. The longevity of the EIU’s international city comparison is also optimistic for its continuation in the future.

As shown in Appendix 2, the MHRC Survey consider 40 across 10 categories such as political stability, economic stability, social stability, welfare and medical care, education, social services, housing, consumption, and the environment.

The factors of the MHRC Survey were used as one of the two primary sources in the study for two reasons. First, the MHRC survey has been conducted annually for many years by a well-respected global consulting firm with worldwide networks. Second, many global companies widely use the MHRC indicators when dealing with international market environments.

By combining the factors from the EIU Survey and those from the MHRC Survey and eliminating of any factors that may overlap between the two surveys, we obtained a set of global factors. These factors were compared to those from other surveys. Any stream of studies we reviewed is the comparative studies conducted independently by local municipalities or national government. We found that most researches of this kind are fragmented along either political or business perspective, and that they tend to be subjective.
important factors which are missing in the EIU and MHRC Survey are added to the list. Exhibit 3 shows the Key Global Factors derived from the above-mentioned process.

3.3 Internal Factors for the KPIs

Another driving force for deriving City’s performance indicators comes from the Mayor’s vision, City’s policy directions, and City’s key projects. The key internal factors were developed as follows.

3.3.1 The City’s Vision

The Mayor’s campaign promises, inauguration speech, announced administrative strategies, and other sources were analyzed from various angles to derive the necessary and executable goals and targets of Seoul. Furthermore, an interview with the Mayor was conducted to confirm what we know.

3.3.2 The City’s Policy Directions

Just after new Mayor’s inauguration, it was announced that there are five Policy Directions which Seoul is pursuing to fulfill the said goals and vision: “Economy with Creativity and Vitality”; “Culture with Tradition and Modernity”; “Welfare with Dreams and Hope”; “Environment for Humans and Nature”; and “Civil Participation and Public Trust.”

We also analyzed six core projects which Seoul has announced as core to be accomplished: “International Conferences and Events”; “Urban Renewal”; “Balanced City Development”; “The Han River Renaissance”; “Clean and Clear Seoul”; and “Citizen Satisfaction Upgrade.”

3.3.3 The City’s Key Projects

In order to implement its vision and five policy directions, the City has announced that there are fifteen key projects to be executed within Mayor’s term, which include “Top 5 Convention City in the World”, “Realization of Open City Administration with
Transparency”, “High Quality Public Transportation” and “Utilizing World Class Festivals and Landmarks for Global Promotion”.

The Mayor and the City were seeking salient projects executable during his term that could not only materialize the policy directions of the Administration, but also enhance Seoul’s place in global competitiveness among major international cities. Creating proper key performance indicators measuring the success or progress of the key projects appears important.

3.4 Consolidation of Internal and Global Factors: ‘Section and Focus’

Given a set of global factors derived from the EIU and MHRC Survey in section 3.2, in this section some factors are eliminated if they can not be controlled and managed by the City, and more importantly if they are already well managed by the City and thus do not require further monitoring and attention. Finally, some factors are added to the list if they are necessary to achieve the City’s vision, policy directions, and key projects as discussed in section 3.3.

3.4.1 Elimination of the Global Factors Unnecessary and Uncontrollable

The stage involved eliminating elements from the indicators derived from the EIU and MHRC Survey in section 2.1 that are not controllable by the city government. For example, environmental, economical and socio-political issues rest on the federal level, beyond the control of a mayor or the city government. Although those are important performance factors as a nation, unfortunately, they can not be controlled by the city, and are eliminated. Only the factors directly and indirectly affected by a city mayor were left remaining. Exhibit 4 presents the ‘Key Global Factors: Preliminary – Remaining’ after eliminating unnecessary and uncontrollable by the municipal city government.

Insert Exhibit 4 about Here

3.4.2 Addition of the Factors Needed as City’s Agenda

This step is adding into the set such factors as needed in accomplishing the city’s goals, policy directions, and key projects or Seoul’s current agenda as mentioned in section 3.3.
Although they were not included per se in the major global surveys like EUI or MHRC, these (additional) indicators are worthy of monitoring and tracking because they are significantly important to achieve City’s imperative agenda. Seoul’s imperative agenda we identified include the economic vitality in culture and fashion industries, the scenery and surrounding environmental conditions, housing for the poor, cultural diversity, and welfare facilities for the disadvantaged groups. The five factors in four categories are added to deal with Seoul’s agendas, and they are included in the internal factors.

Economic Environment
1) Economic Vitality (culture & fashion)

Housing & Living Environment
2) Scenery & surrounding (greenery, etc.)
3) Housing for the poor

Culture & Sports
4) Diversity: cultural space, exhibition, cultural heritage

Welfare
5) Welfare facilities for the Disadvantaged Groups

3.4.3 Selection and Focus

The fewer factors or indicators the leadership has to manage, the more effective and focused—“selection and focus.” The same principles apply to the citizens and city workers. If they do not somehow require urgent monitoring or attention, such indicators are intentionally eliminated for better focus on the remaining indicators.

Considering the realities Seoul is facing, the five global factors requiring special attention and further maintenance are selected from the list presented in Exhibit 2, namely, Accessibility to performance art (movies, etc), Transportation - public transit, Air Pollution, Corruption, and Schools: choices & quality. Note that they were used as the ingredients for city’s global competitiveness by the major global surveys like EUI or MHRC. Exhibit 3 shows ten Seoul’s imperative agenda or factors incorporating city’s internal strategic intentions.
Exhibit 3: Seoul’s Imperative Agenda

Economic Environment
1) Economic Vitality (culture & fashion)

Housing & Living Environment
2) Scenery & surrounding (greenery, etc.)
3) Housing for the poor

Culture & Sports
4) Diversity: cultural space, exhibition, cultural heritage
5) Accessibility to performance art (movies, etc.)

Infrastructure & Public Services
5) Transportation - public transit

Health & Sanitation
7) Air Pollution

Education
8) Schools: Choices & quality

Socio – cultural Factors
9) Corruption (city)

Welfare
10) Welfare facilities for the Disadvantaged Groups

4. Results

4.1 KPIs for each Factor Identified

For each factor or agenda identified in the previous section, its performance indicator(s) or operational measure(s) is developed. Since it will be used as a target to be accomplished, the operational measure would be better if more specific and quantifiable: clarity and transparency. The fourteen performance indicators in eight categories suggested as follows:

Economic Environment

1) Fashion/Design Industries Revenue
2) International Conferences & Events: World Rank

Housing & Living Environment
3) Adjacent park area per person
4) Number of Rental Housing

Infrastructure & Public Services
5) Kilometers of Central Lanes Used for Buses Only
6) Kilometers of Subway and Trams

Culture & Sports
7) Culture/Leisure Industries Revenue
8) Number of Foreign Tourists
9) Number of Local Cultural Facilities Used

Health & Sanitation
10) Particles / Nitrogen dioxide

Education
11) Financial Aid for Reducing Educational Differentials

Socio – cultural Factors
12) Corruption index

Welfare
13) Number of Facilities for Dementia-affected Old People
14) Number of Children Nursery Facilities

Exhibit 4 presents Seoul’s Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) which are rooted not only in City’s Policy Directions and Key Agenda, but also feasible and controllable factors for enhancing its global competitiveness. If properly managed around the KPIs, therefore, the imperative urgent agendas would be resolved and Seoul’s global ranking in competitiveness could be enhanced.
Exhibit 4: Linking Key Factors & KPIs

The City’s first policy direction of “Economy with Creativity and Vitality” shall be maintained through the indicators of “Fashion and Design Industries Revenue,” and “International Conferences and Events.” Success of this policy direction shall enhance “Economic Vitality of Culture and Fashion Industries” and therefore improve Seoul’s global ranking in competitiveness.

The second policy direction of “Culture with Tradition and Modernity” shall be maintained through the three indicators of “Number of Foreign Tourists,” “Local Cultural Facilities Used,” and “Culture/Leisure Industries Revenue.” If properly managed around the indicators above, the key agendas of “Cultural Activities Diversity” and “Accessibility to performance art, movies, and so forth” will be resolved. Cultural diversity and easy accessibility is likely to enhance Seoul’s global competitiveness.

“Welfare with Dream and Hope” or the third policy direction shall be maintained through the indicators of “Number of Facilities for Dementia-affected Old People,” “Number of Children Nursery Facilities,” and “Number of Rental Housing” for the poor.
The city’s agenda of “Welfare facilities for the Disadvantaged Groups” and “Housing for the poor” can be managed here.

The City’s “Environment for Human and Nature” includes the indicators of “Particles/Nitrogen Dioxide,” “Adjacent Park Area per Person,” and “Housing for the Poor” to monitor citizens’ satisfaction for the quality of health and living environment. The indicator of “Kilometers of Central Lanes Used for Buses Only” and “Kilometers of Subway and Trams” could enhance the quantity and quality of public transportation, traffic congestion, and road condition, leading to resolving the agendas of “Public Transit and Transportation.”

The final City policy direction of “Civil Participation and Public Trust” can be managed by the indicator of “The Corruption Index,” which will lead an improvement in Seoul’s global competitiveness.

Like “Housing for the poor,” the agenda of “Reduced Imbalance of Schools in Choices & Quality” can be overlapped across “Welfare with Dream and Hope” and “Environment for Human and Nature.”

4.2 How were the KPIs used?

After just 100 days since its inauguration, on October 9, 2006, the new leadership in Seoul has publicly announced their specific key projects to be carried out during their term, which are indispensable for achieving their said vision, goals and policy directions. To fulfill their said strategic intentions, the sixteen key performance indicators were proposed by the Seoul authority as follows:

**Exhibit 5: Seoul’s Official KPIs for Policy Goals (October 9, 2006)**

1) Number of Foreign Tourists  
2) Fashion/Design Industries Revenue  
3) International Conferences & Events (World ranking: no of times)  
4) Gross Regional Domestic Production (GRDP)*  
5) Adjacent park area per person  
6) Particles / Nitrogen dioxide  
7) Number of Screen Doors at Subway Station*  
8) Kilometers of Bicycle Roads*  
9) Number of Rental Housing  
10) Number of Facilities for Dementia-affected Old People  
11) Number of Children Nursery Facilities
12) Financial Aid for Reducing Educational Differentials
13) Kilometers of Central Lanes Used for Buses Only
14) Kilometers of Subway and Trams
15) Number of Local Cultural Facilities Used
16) Attendance Rate of Art & cultural Concerts

Among the fourteen KPIs the study suggested, the twelve KPIs were adopted as the City’s official KPIs. Two indicators of “Culture/Leisure Industries Revenue” and “Corruption index” were not adopted by the city authority. Instead, other four indicators (* for token) were added in the list: “Gross Regional Domestic Production (GRDP),” “Number of Screen Doors at Subway Station,” “Kilometers of Bicycle Roads,” and “Attendance Rate of Art & cultural Concerts.”

**Exhibit 6: Current Status in 2005 and Target in 2010 along the KPIs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KPI</th>
<th>Current Status in 2005</th>
<th>Target in 2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Foreign Tourists</td>
<td>6,020,000 Persons</td>
<td>12,000,000 Persons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fashion/Design Industries Revenue</td>
<td>World rank of 8th</td>
<td>World rank of 5th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Conferences &amp; Events</td>
<td>World rank of 9th (103 times)</td>
<td>World rank of 5th (170 times)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross Regional Domestic Production (GRDP)</td>
<td>KRW 182 Trillion</td>
<td>KRW 234 Trillion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjacent park area per person</td>
<td>5.19 m²</td>
<td>5.70 m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Particles / Nitrogen dioxide</td>
<td>58 μg/m³</td>
<td>46 μg/m³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Screen Doors at Subway Station</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kilometers of Bicycle Roads</td>
<td>629 km</td>
<td>800 km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Rental Housing</td>
<td>117,377</td>
<td>217,627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Facilities for Dementia-affected Old People</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Public Nursery Facilities</td>
<td>558</td>
<td>700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Aid for Reducing Educational Differentials</td>
<td>KRW 48.8 Brillion</td>
<td>KRW 457.9 Brillion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kilometers of Central Lanes Used for Buses Only</td>
<td>57.1 km</td>
<td>109.5 km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kilometers of Subway and Trams</td>
<td>362 km</td>
<td>453.5 km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Local Cultural Facilities Used</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attendance Rate of Art &amp; cultural Concerts</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Along the KPIs adopted officially, the city authority also announced the current status of Seoul’s position in 2005 (“as-is”) and target in 2010 (“to-be”). Exhibit 6 shows the
“as-is” and “to-be,” and the gap between them. The gap should be filled by City management and workers. The progress along each KPI will be reported, monitored, and managed. At the same time, citizens will be updated how much work or progress has been made. Since a good portion of KPIs come from the factors for city’s global competitiveness, successful implementation of the KPIs would enhance Seoul’s rank in global competitiveness.

5. Conclusion

The paper aims to develop a handful number of the most focal and imperative key performance indicators (KPIs) for Seoul city administration. Proper application of the KPIs into its administration would lead to enhance its global competitiveness while realizing its vision and goals.

The method of the study involves two phases. The phase one involves a thorough analysis of the City’s vision, policy directions, and its key projects in order to determine City’s imperative agenda or internal factors. The phase two involves a comprehensive analysis of existing comparative surveys of international cities, for example, the EIU and MHRC surveys, in order to find global factors indicating city’s global competitiveness. The internal factors and global factors are consolidated through the rule of ‘selection and focus,’ and meaningful KPIs could be obtained.

Following the method, five global factors and five internal factors were obtained. For each factor or agenda identified, its performance indicator(s) was developed. In the study, fourteen KPIs in eight categories were suggested. The KPIs shall not only accomplish the municipal leadership’s strategic initiations, but also enhance Seoul’s international standings in global competitiveness. At the same time, the KPIs can be a good communication tool through which the leadership and city customers can communicate.
Exhibit 3: Key Global Factors: Preliminary

1. Socio – Political Stability
   1) Terror Risks
   2) Foreign relations
   3) Military conflict risks
   4) Domestic instability risks
   5) Political stability

2. Health & Sanitation
   1) Medical services (private & public) : quality & accessibility
   2) Non-prescription drug supplies
   3) Epidemic
   4) Insects / harmful animals
   5) Drinking water
   6) Garbage collection
   7) Sewage
   8) Air pollutions

3. Culture & Sports
   1) Food diversity
   2) Drinks
   3) Accessibility to performance art
   4) Movies : Accessibility & variety
   5) Leisure sports : choices & accessibility
   6) Services : accessibility & variety

4. Infrastructure & Public Services
   1) Transportation – road, public transit, connections (domestic & international), airports
   1) Energy supplies
   2) Running water
   3) Telecommunications & postal
   4) Electricity

5. Economic Environment
   1) Foreign Exchange
   2) Financial services

6. Socio – cultural Factors
   1) Personal freedom
   2) Freedom of press
   3) Corruption
   4) Censorship
   5) Social & religious restrictions

7. Nature
   1) Climate, temperature, humidity
   2) Discomfort to travelers
   3) Natural disasters

8. Crimes
   1) Petty crimes
   2) Violent crimes

9. Consumer goods
   1) Food : meat, fishery, vegetable, fruits
   2) Daily Consumption
   3) Alcohol beverages
   4) Automobiles : purchase & maintenance

10. Housing
    1) Housing : Supplies
2) Home appliances: quality & variety
3) Maintenance: housing & appliances

11. Educations
   1) Schools: choices & quality
   2) Private educations: quality & accessibility
Exhibit 4: Key Global Factors: Preliminary – Remaining after eliminating unnecessary and uncontrollable by the municipal city government

1. Health & Sanitation
   1) Medical services (private & public): quality & accessibility
   2) Epidemic
   3) Insects
   4) Drinking water
   5) Garbage collection
   6) Sewage
   7) Air pollution

2. Culture & Sports
   1) Food diversity
   2) Drinks
   3) Accessibility to performance art
   4) Movies: Accessibility & variety
   5) Leisure sports: choices & accessibility
   6) Services: accessibility & variety

3. Infrastructure & Public Services
   1) Transportation – road, public transit, connections (domestic & international), airports
   2) Energy supplies
   3) Running water
   4) Telecommunications
   5) Electricity

4. Socio-cultural Factors
   1) Corruption

5. Nature
   1) Climate, temperature, humidity
   2) Discomfort to travelers
   3) Natural disasters

6. Crimes
   1) Petty crimes
   2) Violent crimes

7. Consumer goods
   1) Food: meat, fishery, vegetable, fruits
   2) Daily Consumption
   3) Alcohol beverages
   4) Automobiles: purchase & maintenance

8. Housing
   1) Housing: Supplies
   2) Home appliances: quality & variety
   3) Maintenance: housing & appliances

9. Educations
   1) Schools: Choices & quality
   2) Private educations: quality & accessibility
Appendix 1: EIU Survey Factors

1. Stability (25%)
   1) Prevalence of petty crime
   2) Prevalence of violent crime
   3) Threat of military conflict
   4) Threat of civil unrest / conflict

2. Healthcare (20%)
   1) Availability of private healthcare
   2) Quality of private healthcare
   3) Availability of public healthcare
   4) Quality of public healthcare
   5) Availability of over-the-counter drugs
   6) General healthcare indicators (up to 13 indicators)

3. Education (10%)
   1) Availability of private education
   2) Quality of private education
   3) Public education indicators (up to 12 indicators)

4. Infrastructure (20%)
   1) Quality of road network
   2) Quality of public transport
   3) Quality of international skills
   4) Availability of good quality housing
   5) Quality of energy provision
   6) Quality of water provision
   7) Quality of telecommunications

5. Culture & Environment (25%)
   1) Humidity / Temperature rating
   2) Discomfort of climate to travelers
   3) Level of corruption ( Transparency international / EIU )
   4) Social of Religious restrictions
   5) Level of censorship
   6) Sporting availability ( up to 3 indicators )
   7) Cultural availability ( up to 4 indicators )
   8) Food and drinks ( up to 4 indicators )
   9) Consumer goods and services
Appendix 2: MHRC Survey Factors

1. Political & Social Environment - Stability
   1) Relationship with other countries
   2) International Stability
   3) Crime
   4) Law Enforcement
   5) Ease of Entry

2. Economic Environment
   1) Currency Exchange Regulations
   2) Banking Services

3. Socio – Cultural Environment
   1) Limitations on personal freedom
   2) Media and censorship

4. Public Services & Transport
   1) Electricity
   2) Water availability
   3) Telephone
   4) Mail
   5) Public transport
   6) Traffic congestion
   7) Airport

5. Consumer Goods
   1) Food (Meat and Fish)
   2) Food (Fruit and Vegetables)
   3) Daily consumption items
   4) Alcoholic Beverage
   5) Automobiles

6. Medical and Health Considerations
   1) Hospital Services
   2) Medical Supplies
   3) Infectious disease
   4) Water portability
   5) Water removal
   6) Sewage
   7) Air pollution
   8) Troublesome / destructive animals & insects

7. Housing
   1) Housing
   2) Household appliance and furniture
   3) Household maintenance and repair

8. Natural Environment
   1) Climate Humidity / Temperature rating
   2) Discomfort to travelers
   3) Record of natural disasters

9. Schools and Educations
   5) Schools (range and standard)

10. Recreations
    1) Variety of restaurants
    2) Theatrical and musical performance
    3) Cinemas
    4) Sport and leisure activities
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