
THE ECONOMIST INTELLIGENCE UNIT

Liveability ranking and overview

February 2013

Economist Intelligence Unit
20 Cabot Square
London E14 4QW
United Kingdom

Economist Intelligence Unit

The Economist Intelligence Unit is a specialist publisher serving companies establishing and managing operations across national borders. For 60 years it has been a source of information on business developments, economic and political trends, government regulations and corporate practice worldwide.

The Economist Intelligence Unit delivers its information in four ways: through its digital portfolio, where the latest analysis is updated daily; through printed subscription products ranging from newsletters to annual reference works; through research reports; and by organising seminars and presentations. The firm is a member of The Economist Group.

London
Economist Intelligence Unit
20 Cabot Square
London
E14 4QW
United Kingdom
Tel: (44.20) 7576 8000
Fax: (44.20) 7576 8500
E-mail: london@eiu.com

New York
Economist Intelligence Unit
The Economist Group
750 Third Avenue
5th Floor
New York, NY 10017, US
Tel: (1.212) 554 0600
Fax: (1.212) 586 0248
E-mail: newyork@eiu.com

Hong Kong
Economist Intelligence Unit
60/F, Central Plaza
18 Harbour Road
Wanchai
Hong Kong
Tel: (852) 2585 3888
Fax: (852) 2802 7638
E-mail: hongkong@eiu.com

Geneva
Economist Intelligence Unit
Rue de l'Athénée 32
1206 Geneva
Switzerland
Tel: (41) 22 566 2470
Fax: (41) 22 346 93 47
E-mail: geneva@eiu.com

This report can be accessed electronically as soon as it is published by visiting store.eiu.com or by contacting a local sales representative.

The whole report may be viewed in PDF format, or can be navigated section-by-section by using the HTML links. In addition, the full archive of previous reports can be accessed in HTML or PDF format, and our search engine can be used to find content of interest quickly. Our automatic alerting service will send a notification via e-mail when new reports become available.

Copyright

© 2013 The Economist Intelligence Unit Limited. All rights reserved. Neither this publication nor any part of it may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the prior permission of The Economist Intelligence Unit Limited.

All information in this report is verified to the best of the author's and the publisher's ability. However, the Economist Intelligence Unit does not accept responsibility for any loss arising from reliance on it.

Symbols for tables

"n/a" means not available; "--" means not applicable

The Economist Intelligence Unit's liveability survey

How the rating works

The concept of liveability is simple: it assesses which locations around the world provide the best or the worst living conditions. Assessing liveability has a broad range of uses, from benchmarking perceptions of development levels to assigning a hardship allowance as part of expatriate relocation packages. The Economist Intelligence Unit's liveability rating quantifies the challenges that might be presented to an individual's lifestyle in any given location, and allows for direct comparison between locations.

Every city is assigned a rating of relative comfort for over 30 qualitative and quantitative factors across five broad categories: stability; healthcare; culture and environment; education; and infrastructure. Each factor in a city is rated as acceptable, tolerable, uncomfortable, undesirable or intolerable. For qualitative indicators, a rating is awarded based on the judgment of in-house analysts and in-city contributors. For quantitative indicators, a rating is calculated based on the relative performance of a number of external data points.

The scores are then compiled and weighted to provide a score of 1–100, where 1 is considered intolerable and 100 is considered ideal. The liveability rating is provided both as an overall score and as a score for each category. To provide points of reference, the score is also given for each category relative to New York and an overall position in the ranking of 140 cities is provided.

The suggested liveability scale

Companies pay a premium (usually a percentage of a salary) to employees who move to cities where living conditions are particularly difficult, and there is excessive physical hardship or a notably unhealthy environment.

The Economist Intelligence Unit has given a suggested allowance to correspond with the rating. However, the actual level of the allowance is often a matter of company policy. It is not uncommon, for example, for companies to pay higher allowances—perhaps up to double the Economist Intelligence Unit's suggested level.

Rating	Description	Suggested allowance (%)
80–100	There are few, if any, challenges to living standards	0
70–80	Day-to-day living is fine, in general, but some aspects of life may entail problems	5
60–70	Negative factors have an impact on day-to-day living	10
50–60	Liveability is substantially constrained	15
50 or less	Most aspects of living are severely restricted	20

How the rating is calculated

The liveability score is reached through category weights, which are equally divided into relevant subcategories to ensure that the score covers as many indicators as possible. Indicators are scored as acceptable, tolerable, uncomfortable, undesirable or intolerable. These are then weighted to produce a rating, where 100 means that liveability in a city is ideal and 1 means that it is intolerable.

For qualitative variables, an "EIU rating" is awarded based on the judgment of in-house expert country analysts and a field correspondent based in each city. For quantitative variables, a rating is calculated based on the relative performance of a location using external data sources.

Category 1: Stability (weight: 25% of total)

Indicator	Source
Prevalence of petty crime	EIU rating
Prevalence of violent crime	EIU rating
Threat of terror	EIU rating
Threat of military conflict	EIU rating
Threat of civil unrest/conflict	EIU rating

Category 2: Healthcare (weight: 20% of total)

Indicator	Source
Availability of private healthcare	EIU rating
Quality of private healthcare	EIU rating
Availability of public healthcare	EIU rating
Quality of public healthcare	EIU rating
Availability of over-the-counter drugs	EIU rating
General healthcare indicators	Adapted from World Bank

Category 3: Culture & Environment (weight: 25% of total)

Indicator	Source
Humidity/temperature rating	Adapted from average weather conditions
Discomfort of climate to travellers	EIU rating
Level of corruption	Adapted from Transparency International
Social or religious restrictions	EIU rating
Level of censorship	EIU rating
Sporting availability	EIU field rating of 3 sport indicators
Cultural availability	EIU field rating of 4 cultural indicators
Food and drink	EIU field rating of 4 cultural indicators
Consumer goods and services	EIU rating of product availability

Category 4: Education (weight: 10% of total)

Indicator	Source
Availability of private education	EIU rating
Quality of private education	EIU rating
Public education indicators	Adapted from World Bank

Category 5: Infrastructure (weight: 20% of total)

Indicator	Source
Quality of road network	EIU rating
Quality of public transport	EIU rating
Quality of international links	EIU rating
Availability of good quality housing	EIU rating
Quality of energy provision	EIU rating
Quality of water provision	EIU rating
Quality of telecommunications	EIU rating

The findings of the latest survey

No change among top cities

With Vancouver slipping down the ranking slightly in 2011, Melbourne remains the most liveable location of the 140 cities surveyed, followed by the Austrian capital, Vienna. In fact, there has been no change among the top tier. The score and ranking of the top 65 cities remain identical to six months ago; in fact, the scores for most cities remain unchanged over the last 12 months or more. This may reflect renewed stability as some economies begin to recover from the global economic crisis of a few years ago, although the continuing crisis in the euro zone and tighter fiscal budgets may also have slowed planned improvements, meaning that scores have remained static rather than moving up or down.

Certainly, infrastructural development has been a driver over the last few years. Improvements to infrastructure in key cities in Australia, where the federal government initiated an ambitious long-term road-building programme in 2010, prompted rises in 2011. Vancouver has also now embarked on a series of high-profile projects. Work began on an "Evergreen" mass transit line in 2012 and the authorities are reported to be considering further measures. Although these will no doubt have a long-term benefit, they could be disruptive in the short term.

With such high scores already in place and with the slow nature of change for improvement, the overall impact on the top tier of cities is marginal and is likely to remain so, barring a significantly disruptive event. This is particularly the case in most developed cities given their already high score in these areas. There remains little difference between any of the ten most liveable cities: only 1.8 percentage points separate Melbourne in first place and Auckland in tenth place.

The performance of the most liveable cities reflects minimal variation between the scores of the top locations. Some 63 cities (down to Santiago in Chile) are considered to be in the very top tier of liveability, where few problems are encountered. Although 16.8 percentage points separate Melbourne in first place and Santiago in 63rd place, both cities can lay claim to being on an equal footing in terms of presenting few, if any, challenges to residents' lifestyles.

Nonetheless, there does appear to be a correlation between the types of cities that sit right at the very top of the ranking. Those that score best tend to be mid-sized cities in wealthier countries with a relatively low population density. This can foster a range of recreational activities without leading to high crime levels or overburdened infrastructure. Eight of the top ten scoring cities are in Australia and Canada, with population densities of 2.88 and 3.40 people per sq km respectively. Elsewhere in the top ten, Finland and New Zealand both have densities of 16 people per sq km. These compare with a global (land) average of 45.65 and a US average of 32. Austria bucks this trend with a density of 100 people per sq km. However, Vienna's population of 1.7m people is relatively small compared with the urban centres of New York, London, Paris and Tokyo.

It may be argued that violent crime is on an upward trend in the top tier of cities, but these figures should be put into context. Melbourne and Vancouver recorded murder rates of 2.7 and 2.5 per 100,000 population respectively in the year 2010/11. In Vienna, a city of 1.7m people, only 18 murders were reported in 2010 (or about 1.06 per 100,000). These figures compare with a US average of 4.8 homicides per 100,000 people (2010), with New York City reporting a rate of almost 6.4 in the same year. (The average in New York State was much lower, at 4.5.) In South Africa, the rate was 31.9 in 2010/11.

Global business centres tend to be victims of their own success. The "big city buzz" that they enjoy can overstretch infrastructure and cause higher crime rates. New York, London, Paris and Tokyo are all prestigious hubs with a wealth of recreational activity, but all suffer from higher levels of crime, congestion and public transport problems than would be deemed comfortable. The question is how much wages, the cost of living and personal taste for a location can offset liveability factors. Although global centres fare less well in the ranking than mid-sized cities, for example, they still sit within the highest tier of liveability, so should be considered broadly comparable, especially when compared with the worst-scoring locations.

Unrest impacts on scores in China

Elsewhere in the current survey, the impact of civil unrest on the position of cities in the ranking continues to be felt. In recent surveys, the Arab Spring, civil war in Libya and unrest in Greece and London had an impact on these cities' scores. The situation in Syria has prompted further declines in the score for Damascus, which, having fallen into the bottom tier of liveability six months ago, has now fallen to the very bottom of the ranking. More recently, hostage-taking by insurgents in Algeria made global headlines, but this reflects continued instability in Algeria, in line with the score already assigned, rather than prompting a fall.

The most notable movement on a national basis has been the decline in relative liveability in Chinese cities as a result of outbreaks of unrest across China. In many cases this unrest has been caused by anti-Japanese sentiment spilling over into violent demonstrations and damage to businesses. However, the trend of discontent has been felt in other areas as well. Labour disputes, opposition to developments and a number of other factors have spilled over into cases of disorder, affecting liveability scores across the board for Chinese cities.

Of the poorer-scoring cities, 13 now occupy the very bottom tier of liveability, where ratings fall below 50% and most aspects of living are severely restricted. The relatively small number of cities in this tier partly reflects the intended scope of the ranking—the survey is designed to address a range of cities or business centres that people might want to live in or visit. For example, the survey does not include locations such as Kabul in Afghanistan and Baghdad in Iraq. It also reflects a degree of convergence, where levels of liveability generally improve more quickly in developing economies, over time. Although few scores have risen in the most recent survey, evolving conditions in a number of cities have resulted in modest increases in living standards. Dubai in the UAE saw the most rapid growth, although this was in part due to a revision of scores to match the pace of change and development there in recent years.

Conflict is responsible for many of the lowest scores. This is not only because stability indicators have the highest single scores, but also because factors defining stability spread to have an adverse effect on other categories. For example, the threat of armed conflict will not just cause disruption in its own right, it will also damage infrastructure, overburden hospitals, and undermine the availability of goods, services and recreational activities. Africa (North and Sub-Saharan) and Asia account for all 13 cities, with violence, whether through crime, civil insurgency, terrorism or war, playing a strong role.

Although many cities at the bottom have seen a ranking rise, this has been largely related to Damascus becoming the lowest-ranked city, and does not reflect changes within many of these cities.

Regional round-up

Average regional performances

(100=ideal; 0=intolerable)

Region	Average rating	Stability	Healthcare	Culture & environment	Education	Infrastructure
Western Europe	91.8	86.9	95.5	93.1	93.8	92.8
North America	91.3	86.0	93.4	91.9	98.3	92.3
Asia & Australasia	71.5	74.2	69.4	67.8	77.0	72.5
Eastern Europe	72.2	71.1	72.6	74.6	77.4	67.1
Latin America	69.4	61.7	66.1	78.8	76.7	67.2
Middle East & North Africa	61.0	71.5	63.5	53.4	67.2	67.7
Sub-Saharan Africa	50.7	45.0	39.8	64.2	56.5	50.8
World average	75.5	73.0	74.9	75.8	80.8	76.0

Western Europe & North America

Western Europe and North America are the most liveable regions in the world. In Europe, however, there has been a slight depreciation in liveability. Over time this has been driven by mounting unrest and uncertainty relating to the euro zone crisis and the riots in London. Potential for further unrest in Spain, Greece, Italy and Portugal could have an impact on the overall European average score in the future, but this will probably be marginal. In fact, the regional average ratings for Western Europe and North America both exceed 90%, which is around 20 percentage points higher than the next best-performing regional average score.

Although stability scores in both regions reflect a low risk of conflict or civil unrest, this category is dragged down slightly by a higher perceived threat of crime or terror. This is a reflection of the growing threat of terrorism in the Western world over the last decade, together with the natural threat of crime in any large city. More recently, as mentioned, growing civil unrest in the face of austerity in Western Europe has also affected stability scores. However, the regional average scores are still well above the threshold where there are few, if any, challenges to living standards and are also higher than in any other region where other problems may prevail. Both regions achieve average scores of well over 90% for all other categories. In North America, the highest average score is supplied by the education category, whereas in Western Europe the healthcare score is the highest.

Changes in the liveability of any location will usually only occur as a result of gradual factors or of a sudden and tangible event. In the most developed locations in Western Europe and North America, the latter factor is rare and liveability levels are largely unchanged from survey to survey.

Athens remains the worst-performing West European city, ranked in 67th place with a score of 78.5%. This makes the Greek capital the only city in North America and Western Europe with a score that falls into the second tier of liveability, where challenges to lifestyle begin to register. Lexington (US, 59th, 85.4%) is the lowest-scoring North American city. Lexington's score is much more in line with the regional norm and only around 1% below that for New York (56th, 86.6%), with lower crime levels but not such diverse cultural or recreational activities.

Central and Eastern Europe

At 72.2%, the regional average liveability score in Central and Eastern Europe (CEE) reflects the performance of the cities it encompasses. The score is also gradually improving, perhaps as a result of convergence between Eastern, Central and West European countries, especially those with EU membership. Most cities occupy the second tier of liveability, where day-to-day living is fine in general but some aspects of life may entail problems. Former Soviet republics tend to inherit better underlying education indicators from the communist era, so regional averages for these categories are higher. However, underinvestment in infrastructure is another feature of the Soviet period, making this the poorest-scoring average category for the region, at 67.1%. Scores across CEE are more static than in any other region, with no index changes since 2010.

Just two cities occupy the top tier of liveability, Budapest in Hungary (50th, 88.9%) and Prague in the Czech Republic (60th, 84%). Budapest's score rose slightly in the most recent survey and it now sits above cities such as London and New York in the ranking. Bratislava in Slovakia (64th) falls just short of the 80% threshold with a score of 79.8%, although it has a higher liveability score than austerity-hit Athens. All three countries are EU members, which probably plays a role in their liveability scores. This may be partly a result of improvements made to meet membership requirements, or partly helped by infrastructural funding or economic concessions that the Union has provided.

Moscow (70th) and St Petersburg (67th) in Russia, the most important regional economy, are on the cusp of the top tier of liveability with scores of 78.4% and 78.5% respectively. The deterioration in Greece now means that St Petersburg stands above Athens in the ranking. Conversely, Turkey, an EU accession hopeful, may have a long way to go before liveability can match EU status. With a score of 60.3%, Istanbul (109th) lies far below EU members in the ranking and has the second-poorest score in the region. Tashkent in Uzbekistan (117th, 55.9%) is the only city in the region where liveability is substantially constrained.

Latin America

An average rating of 69.4% for Latin America reflects a region that continues to be hampered by concerns over stability. The highest category score was culture and environment, for which an average of 78.8% indicates a breadth of

activities, from the sites of Machu Picchu in Peru to the café culture of Buenos Aires and the world-famous carnivals of Rio de Janeiro. This, coupled with Rio's selection to host the 2014 football World Cup and 2016 Olympic Games, means that only Western Europe and North America attain higher regional average scores in this category. However, although improving, an average stability score of 61.7% also reflects unrest, gang-related violence, and concerns about border disputes or guerrilla activities. Only Sub-Saharan Africa performs worse in this category.

Buenos Aires (Argentina, 62nd) and Santiago (Chile, 63rd) achieve the highest degree of liveability in Latin America, with scores of 83.6% and 80.7% respectively. Montevideo (65th) in Uruguay sits just outside the top tier of liveability with a score of 79.1%, let down only by a relatively low stability score (70%) compared with other categories.

Improving stability in Bogota (Colombia) has resulted in a marked improvement in the city's overall score in recent years to 59.6%, placing it 111th in the ranking, up from 125th in 2009. In the last decade, not only has the murder rate and the number of active guerrillas halved, but the number of kidnappings has dropped even more radically. Nevertheless, stability still remains Bogota's biggest challenge, and only six cities in the overall ranking achieve lower scores in this category. In marked contrast to Bogota, the deterioration in stability in Mexico prompted a fall of 2.5% in the score of Mexico City over the same period, although its ranking remains unchanged at 105th.

Caracas (118th), in Venezuela, has the unenviable position of least liveable city in the region. Despite lower domestic unrest, an overall score of 55.2% places it just above the lowest tier of liveability.

Asia & Australasia

Unlike other regions, Asia does not have any consistent pan-regional liveability trends. An average score of 71.5% disguises a much broader range of scores across the region, although this score does also show a slight improvement on last year. In fact, only seven of the 38 Asian cities in the ranking conform to the tier of liveability reflected by this score, with the region offering a full range of cities from the best to the worst scores.

Thirteen cities occupy the very top tier of liveability, with cities from Australia and New Zealand making up one-half of the top ten in the global ranking. Melbourne offers the best standard of living in the world, with a score of 97.5, overtaking Vancouver in 2011. Hubs such as Hong Kong (92%, 31st) and Singapore (88.7%, 52nd) also perform well, reflecting locations where economic strength and political stability feed into strong infrastructure and broad cultural and recreational activities.

Although improving infrastructure and a strong economy is underpinning China's rise as a global economic powerhouse, unrest in Chinese cities has put a halt to a corresponding rise in liveability. Anti-Japanese sentiment in 2012 spilled over into violent unrest across China, with businesses targeted. In addition to this, some cities experienced protests over labour and planning disputes. This resulted in a weakening of liveability scores for all Chinese cities surveyed, although, notwithstanding further unrest, this is counter to trend in

China, which is generally seeing liveability improve in cities as economic development leads to infrastructure improvements and lifestyle gains.

However, at the other extreme, four Asian cities fall into the very bottom tier of liveability, with scores below 50%. Three of the bottom ten scoring cities in the ranking are in Asia, with a further three in the bottom 15 cities. Stability remains the key factor in defining the lowest-scoring locations. Although Dhaka, in Bangladesh, is no longer the worst-performing city, this is because of the deteriorating situation in Damascus. Dhaka itself has an unchanged rating and scores especially poorly in areas such as healthcare and infrastructure.

Middle East and Africa

The worst-performing regions are the Middle East and North Africa, and Sub-Saharan Africa, particularly Sub-Saharan Africa, where a regional average score of 50.7% is barely above the very bottom tier of liveability. Africa is home to seven locations where most aspects of living are severely restricted (five of which are in Sub-Saharan Africa) and none of the cities surveyed in either region achieves a top tier score of 80% or more.

Traditionally, there has been a clear differential between Middle Eastern (and North African) cities, where stability scores are higher than those relating to cultural availability, and Sub-Saharan African cities, where healthcare and the threat of crime or conflict are the key problems. One view is that safety in Middle Eastern cities has come at the expense of liberty, which affects freedom to engage in many activities, while in African cities the problem lies in the failure to sustain stability and harmony long enough to reap benefits in other areas. Ironically, the revolutionary events of the Arab Spring have borne out much of this theory, with protests and demonstrations for greater freedom prompting a pan-regional fall in stability levels in many North African and Middle Eastern cities.

In the Middle East, six cities fall into the second-highest category, led by Tel Aviv in Israel (75th, 74.2%), which bucks the trend somewhat by suffering from a low stability score but strong scores in other categories. In Sub-Saharan Africa, Johannesburg (South Africa, 92nd) scores best with 69.1%. Unrest in North Africa and the Middle East has had a significant impact on scores within the region since the beginning of the Arab Spring in late 2010. Although the revolt is over in many countries, the legacy of uprisings has had an impact on the stability scores of many cities. Equally, where unrest has spread to conflict or even regime change, a loss of stability has affected other scores. Recently this was the case for Tripoli in Libya (133rd, 42.8%), which fell into the very bottom tier of liveability in 2011. As the situation in Libya has subsequently improved, civil war in Syria has pushed the focus onto Damascus, which has fallen by almost 8 percentage points and is now the least liveable city to live in.

Full ranking with rating and category breakdown

Below is a ranking of all the cities surveyed, accompanied by the liveability rating for every city. The liveability score is the combination of all the factors surveyed across the five main categories. Scores are also given for each category.

Country	City	Rank	Overall Rating		Healthcare	Culture &		
			(100=ideal)	Stability		Environment	Education	Infrastructure
Australia	Melbourne	1	97.5	95	100	95.1	100	100
Austria	Vienna	2	97.4	95	100	94.4	100	100
Canada	Vancouver	3	97.3	95	100	100	100	92.9
Canada	Toronto	4	97.2	100	100	97.2	100	89.3
Canada	Calgary	5	96.6	100	100	89.1	100	96.4
Australia	Adelaide	5	96.6	95	100	94.2	100	96.4
Australia	Sydney	7	96.1	90	100	94.4	100	100
Finland	Helsinki	8	96.0	100	100	90	91.7	96.4
Australia	Perth	9	95.9	95	100	88.7	100	100
New Zealand	Auckland	10	95.7	95	95.8	97	100	92.9
Switzerland	Zurich	11	95.6	95	100	93.5	91.7	96.4
Switzerland	Geneva	12	95.2	95	100	92.1	91.7	96.4
Japan	Osaka	12	95.2	90	100	93.5	100	96.4
Sweden	Stockholm	14	95.0	95	95.8	91.2	100	96.4
Germany	Hamburg	14	95.0	90	100	93.5	91.7	100
Canada	Montreal	16	94.8	95	100	90	100	92.9
France	Paris	16	94.8	85	100	97.2	100	96.4
Japan	Tokyo	18	94.7	90	100	94.4	100	92.9
Germany	Frankfurt	18	94.7	85	100	97.2	91.7	100
Australia	Brisbane	20	94.2	95	100	93.5	91.7	89.3
Germany	Berlin	21	94.0	85	100	97.2	91.7	96.4
Denmark	Copenhagen	22	93.8	85	95.8	96.3	100	96.4
New Zealand	Wellington	22	93.8	95	91.7	95.4	100	89.3
Norway	Oslo	24	93.4	95	91.7	88.7	91.7	100
Luxembourg	Luxembourg	25	93.3	95	100	90.5	83.3	92.9
Netherlands	Amsterdam	26	92.8	80	100	97.2	91.7	96.4
US	Honolulu	26	92.8	90	91.7	88	100	100
Belgium	Brussels	28	92.7	85	100	91.4	100	92.9
Germany	Munich	29	92.6	85	100	97.2	91.7	89.3
US	Pittsburgh	30	92.3	85	91.7	90.7	100	100
Hong Kong	Hong Kong	31	92.0	95	87.5	85.9	100	96.4
Germany	Dusseldorf	32	91.4	85	100	93.5	75	96.4
France	Lyon	33	91.3	85	100	88.7	100	89.3
Spain	Barcelona	34	91.2	80	91.7	94.4	100	96.4
US	Washington DC	34	91.2	80	91.7	94.4	100	96.4
US	Chicago	36	91.1	85	91.7	91.7	100	92.9
US	Atlanta	36	91.1	85	91.7	91.7	100	92.9
US	Miami	36	91.1	85	91.7	91.7	100	92.9
Spain	Madrid	39	90.9	85	87.5	94.4	100	92.9
US	Detroit	40	90.7	85	91.7	90.3	100	92.9
US	Boston	41	90.5	80	91.7	91.7	100	96.4
US	Seattle	42	90.0	80	91.7	95.8	91.7	92.9
US	Minneapolis	43	89.8	85	91.7	86.6	100	92.9
US	Los Angeles	43	89.8	80	91.7	94.4	100	89.3
US	Cleveland	45	89.6	85	91.7	88.7	100	89.3
Ireland	Dublin	46	89.5	85	87.5	92.8	100	87.5
US	Houston	46	89.5	85	87.5	91.7	100	89.3
Italy	Milan	46	89.5	85	87.5	91.7	100	89.3
Italy	Rome	49	89.0	80	87.5	91.7	100	92.9
Hungary	Budapest	50	88.9	85	91.7	90	100	83.9
UK	Manchester	51	88.8	80	91.7	96.5	91.7	85.7

Country	City	Overall Rating			Culture &			
		Rank	(100=ideal)	Stability	Healthcare	Environment	Education	Infrastructure
US	San Francisco	52	88.7	85	91.7	94.4	83.3	85.7
Singapore	Singapore	52	88.7	95	87.5	76.6	83.3	100
Iceland	Reykjavik	54	88.0	90	95.8	81.7	91.7	83.9
UK	London	55	87.2	70	87.5	97.2	100	89.3
US	New York	56	86.6	70	91.7	91.7	100	89.3
Portugal	Lisbon	57	86.5	80	87.5	95.1	91.7	80.4
South Korea	Seoul	58	85.9	80	83.3	85.6	100	89.3
US	Lexington	59	85.4	85	91.7	81	91.7	82.1
Czech Rep	Prague	60	84.0	85	79.2	87.3	83.3	83.9
Taiwan	Taipei	61	83.9	85	83.3	75.2	100	85.7
Argentina	Buenos Aires	62	83.6	70	87.5	85.9	100	85.7
Chile	Santiago	63	80.7	75	70.8	89.1	83.3	85.7
Slovakia	Bratislava	64	79.8	90	75	82.2	75	71.4
Uruguay	Montevideo	65	79.1	70	83.3	83.6	83.3	78.6
Puerto Rico	San Juan	66	78.7	90	83.3	74.3	66.7	71.4
Greece	Athens	67	78.5	75	83.3	82.4	75	75
New Caledonia	Nouméa	67	78.5	95	87.5	66.7	66.7	69.6
Russia	St Petersburg	67	78.5	65	87.5	81.5	83.3	80.4
Russia	Moscow	70	78.4	65	79.2	81.5	91.7	83.9
Poland	Warsaw	71	78.2	80	70.8	80.3	75	82.1
Costa Rica	San Jose	72	75.2	85	79.2	75.5	75	58.9
China	Beijing	73	74.9	75	66.7	72.2	83.3	82.1
China	Suzhou	74	74.3	85	70.8	60.2	66.7	85.7
Israel	Tel Aviv	75	74.2	45	95.8	74.3	91.7	80.4
UAE	Dubai	75	74.2	85	66.7	63.4	66.7	85.7
China	Tianjin	77	74.0	85	66.7	65.3	66.7	82.1
Malaysia	Kuala Lumpur	77	74.0	80	62.5	67.8	91.7	76.8
UAE	Abu Dhabi	79	73.1	85	66.7	59	66.7	85.7
Peru	Lima	80	72.9	60	66.7	81.7	91.7	75
Romania	Bucharest	81	71.8	80	66.7	74.3	66.7	66.1
China	Shanghai	82	71.7	75	58.3	75	75	75
Bahrain	Bahrain	83	71.5	65	66.7	70.8	91.7	75
China	Shenzhen	83	71.5	80	62.5	63.7	66.7	82.1
Qatar	Doha	85	70.9	80	70.8	59.5	83.3	67.9
Bulgaria	Sofia	86	70.5	75	75	72.7	75	55.4
China	Dalian	87	69.7	80	62.5	62	66.7	75
Oman	Muscat	87	69.7	80	62.5	47	83.3	85.7
Kuwait	Kuwait City	89	69.6	70	70.8	49.8	83.3	85.7
China	Guangzhou	90	69.4	75	62.5	64.6	66.7	76.8
Ukraine	Kiev	91	69.2	70	75	73.4	83.3	50
South Africa	Johannesburg	92	69.1	50	58.3	90.5	83.3	69.6
Brazil	Rio de Janeiro	92	69.1	55	66.7	77.5	83.3	71.4
Brazil	Sao Paulo	92	69.1	60	70.8	80.3	66.7	66.1
Paraguay	Asuncion	95	68.8	65	66.7	78.7	66.7	64.3
South Africa	Pretoria	96	68.0	50	58.3	87.7	83.3	67.9
Panama	Panama City	97	67.8	75	54.2	68.1	83.3	64.3
Serbia	Belgrade	98	67.2	60	75	73.1	75	57.1
Kazakhstan	Almaty	99	66.7	75	66.7	63.2	66.7	60.7
China	Qingdao	100	66.1	80	58.3	60	58.3	67.9
Thailand	Bangkok	101	65.0	50	62.5	64.4	100	69.6
Brunei	Bandar Seri Begawan	102	64.4	85	70.8	39.1	66.7	62.5

Country	City	Rank	Overall Rating		Healthcare	Culture &		
			(100=ideal)	Stability		Environment	Education	Infrastructure
Jordan	Amman	103	64.2	60	70.8	63	75	58.9
Tunisia	Tunis	104	62.6	55	70.8	63.7	66.7	60.7
Mexico	Mexico City	105	62.0	45	66.7	82.4	75	46.4
Philippines	Manila	105	62.0	60	58.3	63.2	66.7	64.3
Ecuador	Quito	107	61.1	50	41.7	79.6	75	64.3
Azerbaijan	Baku	108	60.7	60	66.7	60.9	75	48.2
Turkey	Istanbul	109	60.3	55	50	68.8	58.3	67.9
Saudi Arabia	Riyadh	109	60.3	75	66.7	35.4	58.3	67.9
Colombia	Bogota	111	59.6	35	62.5	75.2	66.7	64.3
Morocco	Casablanca	112	58.6	65	45.8	60.9	58.3	60.7
India	New Delhi	112	58.6	55	58.3	55.6	75	58.9
Saudi Arabia	Jeddah	114	58.5	70	62.5	30.8	58.3	75
Guatemala	Guatemala City	115	58.2	55	50	71.8	58.3	53.6
India	Mumbai	116	56.9	60	54.2	56.3	66.7	51.8
Uzbekistan	Tashkent	117	55.9	50	58.3	55.3	75	51.8
Venezuela	Caracas	118	55.2	35	41.7	73.8	75	60.7
Indonesia	Jakarta	119	54.6	50	45.8	59.3	66.7	57.1
Saudi Arabia	Al Khobar	120	54.2	65	62.5	34	58.3	55.4
Vietnam	Hanoi	120	54.2	55	54.2	53.7	58.3	51.8
Egypt	Cairo	122	53.9	55	45.8	57.6	58.3	53.6
Vietnam	Ho Chi Minh City	123	52.7	55	50	50.5	66.7	48.2
Kenya	Nairobi	124	51.9	40	45.8	69.9	66.7	42.9
Zambia	Lusaka	125	51.7	60	33.3	59	41.7	55.4
Cambodia	Phnom Penh	126	51.4	60	37.5	49.3	58.3	53.6
Nepal	Kathmandu	127	51.0	65	37.5	52.8	58.3	41.1
Sri Lanka	Colombo	128	48.5	45	41.7	47.7	66.7	51.8
Senegal	Dakar	129	48.3	50	41.7	59.7	50	37.5
Cote d'Ivoire	Abidjan	130	45.9	30	45.8	54.2	50	53.6
Iran	Tehran	131	45.8	50	62.5	35.9	50	33.9
Cameroon	Douala	132	43.3	60	25	45.6	33.3	42.9
Libya	Tripoli	133	42.8	50	41.7	35.4	41.7	44.6
Pakistan	Karachi	134	40.9	20	45.8	38.7	66.7	51.8
Algeria	Algiers	134	40.9	40	45.8	42.6	50	30.4
Zimbabwe	Harare	136	39.4	30	20.8	55.8	66.7	35.7
Nigeria	Lagos	137	38.9	25	33.3	53.5	33.3	46.4
PNG	Port Moresby	137	38.9	30	37.5	44.2	50	39.3
Bangladesh	Dhaka	139	38.7	50	29.2	43.3	41.7	26.8
Syria	Damascus	140	38.4	20	41.7	47.9	41.7	44.6