# A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF DEVELOPMENT ISSUES AMONG THE MEMBER COUNTRIES OF CIRDAP AND SAARC

**Dr. Shankar Chatterjee**

*Former Professor  & Head (CPME)*

*NIRD &PR, Rajendranagar,*

*Hyderabad-500 030*

*India*

## ABSTRACT

*This article based on recent data has analysed how the development indicators among different CIRDAP and SAARC countries vary. The study reveals that development is skewed among the member countries as some of the member  countries are having high growth rate of population coupled with high infant mortality rate, low illiteracy, high poverty,  low access to sanitation, drinking water  etc. For the benefit of readers full form of CIRDAP is Centre for Integrated Rural Development for Asia and the Pacific and on the other hand, SAARC means South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation is the regional inter-governmental institutions for promoting development among the member countries. CIRDAP was set up in 1979 with the initiative of Asia-Pacific region and Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) with the support from other organizations of United Nation.  There are 15 member countries of CIRDAP and on the other hand SAARC consisted of eight countries. For the comparative study data have been collected from Rural Development Statistics, 2011-12, National Institute of Rural Development  (NIRD, Government of India), and from same organization's publication i.e. Rural Development Statistics, 2016-17 of NIRD&PR (later on PR was added which means Panchayati Raj).*

*Key Words: CIRDAP, SAARC, Comparative study, Development and NIRD&PR.*

In this research paper a comparative discussion focusing on development issues has been carried out among the member countries of CIRDAP and SAARC. In this region of the world for the academicians, scholars and for educated persons CIRDAP and SAARC are popular name. Full form of CIRDAP is Centre for Integrated Rural Development for Asia and the Pacific and on the other hand, SAARC means South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation is the regional inter-governmental institutions for promoting development among the member countries. CIRDAP was set up in 1979 with the initiative of Asia-Pacific region and Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) with the support from other organizations of United Nation.  The 15 member countries of CIRDAP are viz.  Afghanistan, Bangladesh, Fiji, India, Indonesia, Iran, Lao PDR, Malaysia, Myanmar, Nepal, Pakistan, Philippines, Sri Lanka, Thailand and Vietnam. On the other hand 8 countries viz. Afghanistan, Bangladesh, India, Pakistan, Nepal, Sri Lanka, Maldives and Bhutan are member of SAARC.  The countries that are common to both the institutions are Afghanistan, Bangladesh, India, Nepal, Pakistan and Sri Lanka (RDS, 2011-12). For the comparative study data have been collected from Rural Development Statistics, 2011-12, National Institute of Rural Development  (NIRD, Government of India), and from same organization's publication

*i.e.* Rural Development Statistics, 2016-17 of NIRD&PR (later on PR was added which means Panchayati Raj). This means based on two publications of NIRD&PR data were collected and comparison has been made.

The important objectives of forming CIRDAP are to assist national action, promote regional cooperation and act as a servicing institution for its member countries for promotion of integrated rural development through research, action research, training and information dissemination. However prime concern of CIRDAP is amelioration of rural poverty. On the other hand, SAARC was established when its Charter was adopted on December 8, 1985. It is an organization that provides a platform for the people of South Asia to work together in a spirit of friendship, trust and understanding. It accelerates the process of economic and social development in Member States. It also encourages cooperation in agriculture, rural development, science and technology, culture, health, population control, narcotics control and anti-terrorism (www. maps of world.com).

In this article analysis has been made with respect to demographic indicator, health and nutrition indicators and education and economic indicators based on recent/latest data. For the benefit of readers mention may be made that in all the three tables portrayed here for the analysis combines both CIRDAP and SAARC countries.  The Column numbers from 5 to 18 in all the 3 tables mentioned in this paper represent CIRDAP countries where as Columns from 13 to 20 are for SAARC countries. No data are available for Fiji, so except Fiji all the countries either in CIRDAP group or SAARC group have been covered here.

**Table: 1 Demographic indicator - CIRDAP and SAARC Countries**

| Sl. No. | Item | Unit | Year | Lao PDR | Indonesia | Iran | Vietnam | Philippines | Thailand | Myanmar | Malaysia |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| 1. | Area | 000'Sq.Km | 2010 | 237 | 1905 | 1745 | 331 | 300 | 513 | 677 | 331 |
| 2. | Population | Millions | 2010 | 6.2 | 239.90 | 74 | 86.9 | 93.3 | 69.1 | 48.0 | 28.4 |
| 3. | Population Urbanized | % | 2005 | 20.6 | 48.1 | 56.3 | 26.4 | 62.7 | 32.3 | 24.9 | 67.3 |
| 4. | Population age 65 and above | % | 2010 | 4 | 6 | 5 | 6 | 4 | 9 | 5 | 5 |
| 5. | Population Annual Growth Rate | % | 2000-10 | 1.5 | 1.2 | 1.2 | 1.1 | 1.9 | 0.9 | 0.6 | 1.9 |
| 6. | Crude Birth Rate | Per 1000 population | 2010 | 23 | 18 | 17 | 17 | 25 | 12 | 17 | 20 |
| 7. | Crude Death Rate | Per 1000 Live Births | 2010 | 6 | 7 | 5 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 9 | 5 |
| 8. | Infant Mortality Rate | Per 1000 Live Births | 2010 | 42 | 27 | 22 | 19 | 23 | 11 | 50 | 5 |
| 9. | Life Expectancy at Birth | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Male | Years | 2010 | 66 | 67 | 71 | 73 | 65 | 71 | 63 | 72 |
| | Female | Years | 2010 | 68 | 71 | 75 | 77 | 72 | 77 | 66 | 76 |
| | Average | Years | 2010 | 67 | 69 | 73 | 75 | 68 | 74 | 65 | 74 |

**Contd: Table: 1**

| S.No. | Item | Unit | Year | Afghanistan | Bangladesh | India | Pakistan | Nepal | Sri Lanka | Maldives | Bhutan |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 |
| 1. | Area | 000'Sq.Km | 2010 | 652 | 144 | 3287 | 796 | 147 | 66 | 0.3 | 38.4 |
| 2. | Population | Millions | 2010 | 34.4 | 148.70 | 1224.60 | 173.60 | 30.0 | 20.9 | 0.3 | 0.6 |
| 3. | Population Urbanized | % | 2004 | NA | 25.1 | 28.7 | 34.9 | 15.8 | 15.1 | 29.6 | 11.1 |
| 4. | Population age 65 and above | % | 2010 | 2 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 8 | 3.8 | 4.6 |
| 5. | Population Annual Growth Rate | % | 2000-10 | 2.8 | 1.4 | 1.5 | 1.8 | 2.1 | 1.1 | 1.8 | 1.5 |
| 6. | Crude Birth Rate | Per 1000 population | 2010 | 44 | 20 | 22 | 27 | 24 | 18 | NA | 12 |
| 7. | Crude Death Rate | Per 1000 Live Births | 2010 | 16 | 6 | 8 | 7 | 6 | 7 | NA | NA |
| 8. | Infant Mortality Rate | Per 1000 Live B | 2010 | 103 | 38 | 48 | 70 | 41 | 14 | 33 | 65 |
| 9. | Life Expectancy at Birth | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Male | Years | 2010 | 48 | 68 | 64 | 64 | 68 | 72 | 67 | 62 |
| | Female | Years | 2010 | 48 | 69 | 67 | 66 | 69 | 78 | 67 | 65 |
| | Average | Years | 2010 | 48 | 69 | 65 | 65 | 68 | 75 | 77 | 67 |

NA: Not Available.          Data for Fiji not given

**Sources:  Rural Development Statistics, 2011-12, NIRD (Govt. of India), Hyderabad**

The observations made based on the above table are:

a)        Maldives is the smallest country in terms of area followed by Bhutan and Sri Lanka. India occupies highest position while area is taken into account, followed by Indonesia and Iran. Incidentally Malaysia and Vietnam are having same area.  While population is taken into account, India is top of the list followed by Indonesia and Pakistan. Among the low population countries, Maldives comes first followed by Bhutan and Lao PDR.

b)        The statistics on urban population reveal that in the countries like Malaysia, Philippines and Iran more than 50 percent population live in urban areas where as in Bhutan only 11 percent of total population of the country lives in urban areas followed by Sri Lanka & Nepal as 15 percent of their total population is only in urban areas.

c)        If aged populations are considered (65 years and above) then Thailand with 9 percent tops the list against Sri Lanka with 8 percent. Against the backdrop, only 2 percent population is of 65 years+ age in Afghanistan. All other countries hover around 5 percent. No countries could achieve double digit figure of 10 percent.

d)        High population growth is matter of concern in the world. With the increase number of population in absolute term world has been facing population boom. Need of the hour is to control population growth rate in the countries (all over the world) where this is high. China is the pioneer in the world as through one child policy they have been controlling the population in real and absolute term. Among the CIRDAP or SAARC countries, Afghanistan tops the list with 2.8 percent annual growth rate of population with high crude birth and death rates (per 1000 live birth).  And then Nepal with 2.1 percent is second in annual growth rate of population but with lower crude death rate. Against the backdrop, Myanmar and Thailand are having the laurel of low population growth as the growth rate is less than 1 percent but looking at crude death rate it is observed that both Myanmar and Thailand are having comparatively higher crude rate than the countries like Iran, Malaysia and Vietnam which are having 5 per 1000 live births. India is not well placed if crude birth and death rates are concerned. Impact of programmes like National Rural Health Mission (NRHM) etc., to reduce crude birth rate and death rate in India may be felt only when these scale down.

 The differences in life expectancy across the member countries reflect the variations in the social and economic development levels of these countries. Low level of life expectancy (48 years) in Afghanistan can be attributed to poor development of health services. While I was in Afghanistan observed many physicians after completing medical courses were working in social science related departments and thus general people are deprived of services of physicians. Afghanistan in-spite of having huge mineral resources like copper, chromium, uranium, marble, salt, gold, silver, iron ore, cobalt and lithium etc., is dependent on  foreign aid. "This has been the case from the 19th century, when the British Empire provided regular subsidies to Afghan Emirs in order to seek their cooperation in the region, to the cold war period, when aid was given to limit the former USSR's influence and fight their troops in Afghanistan. The flow of donations and aid started again after the ouster of the Taliban by the US-led western military operations in December 2001" (EPW, Sept 29, 2012). In spite of this country has been suffering from poverty. "Donations to Afghanistan since 2002 have not improved the lives of its people and 30 percent of the total population still lives under the poverty line. The unemployment rate in the economy is as high as 40% (in a labour force of around six million)" (EPW, Sept 29, 2012).

However, the statistics related to physicians among CIRDAP and SAARC countries reveal low number of physicians were available in Afghanistan as only 0.2 (per 1000 people) , lowest among the member countries of CIRDAP/SAARC (table-2). Vietnam with 1.2 physicians for 1000 people tops the list.

 g) It is interesting to note from the above table-1 that in all the CIRDAP or SAARC countries females' life expectancy at birth is higher than males. This of course, has been found true in developed countries also as the male life expectancy in UK is 77 years against 81 years for female. On the other hand, in United States for male and female averages are 74 years and 80 years respectively. It is believed that women normally outlive men, and this was as true in pre-industrial times as today. Theories for this inter alia, state smaller bodies (and thus less stress on the heart), a stronger immune system (since testosterone acts as an immunosuppressant), and less tendency to engage in physically hazardous activities facilitate women to live longer. Another belief is that women have evolutionary reasons to live longer so that they can take- care of grandchildren and great-grandchildren (en.wikipedia.org).      .

                The table -2 has thrown light about the health and nutrition indicators among the CIRDAP and SAARC countries.  Selected indicators like health expenditure, infants with low birth weight, prevalence of undernourished children, population with access to improved water source, and improved sanitation collected from Rural Development Statistics published by National Institute of Rural Development (NIRD), Hyderabad are presented in the table and discussed.

Table 2: Health and Nutrition Indicators of CIRDAP and SAARC Countries

| Sl.No. | Item | Unit | Year/Period | Lao PDR | Indonesia | Iran | Vietnam | Philipp-ines | Thailand | Myanmar | Malaysia |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| 1. | Health Expenditure total of GDP | % | 2010 | 4.5 | 2.6 | 5.6 | 6.8 | 3.6 | 3.9 | 2.0 | 4.4 |
| 2. | Prevalence of undernourished | % | 2006-08 | 22 | 13 | < 5 | 11 | 13 | 16 | NA | < 5 |
| 3. | Infants with low birth weight | % | 2002-07 | NA | 9 | 9 | 7 | 20 | 9 | NA | 9 |
| 4. | Population with access to improved water source | % | 2010 | 67 | 82 | 96 | 95 | 92 | 96 | 83 | 100 |
| 5. | Population with access to Improved Sanitation | % | 2010 | 63 | 54 | 100 | 76 | 74 | 96 | 76 | 96 |
| 6. | Physicians (per 1000 people) | No. | 2005-10 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.9 | 1.2 | NA | 0.3 | 0.5 | 0.9 |

Contd: Table:2

| Sl. No. | Item | Unit | Year/Period | Afghanistan | Bangladesh | India | Pakistan | Nepal | Sri Lanka | Maldives | Bhutan |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 |
| 1. | Health Expenditure total of GDP | % | 2010 | 7.6 | 3.5 | 4.1 | 2.2 | 5.5 | 2.9 | NA | NA |
| 2. | Prevalence of undernourished | % | 2006-08 | NA | 26 | 19 | 25 | 17 | 20 | NA | NA |
| 3. | Infants with low birth weight | % | 2002-07 | NA | 22 | 28 | NA | 21 | NA | 22 | 15 |
| 4. | Population with access to improved water source | % | 2010 | 50 | 81 | 92 | 92 | 89 | 91 | 83 | 62 |
| 5. | Population with access to Improved Sanitation | % | 2010 | 37 | 56 | 34 | 48 | 31 | 92 | 59 | 70 |
| 6. | Physicians (per 1000 people) | No. | 2005-10 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 0.6 | 0.8 | NA | 0.5 | NA | NA |

NA= Not Available.

Sources: Rural Development Statistics, 2011-12, NIRD (Govt. of India), Hyderabad

**The salient features as observed from the above table are**:

a) Health is important for life as without sound health survival of human being is at stake. The data on expenditure on health (out of total of Gross Domestic Product) vary from minimum of 2.0 percent (Myanmar) to 7.6 percent (Afghanistan). Against the backdrop most of the developed countries like USA, Switzerland, the Netherlands, Denmark, Canada, etc. spending on health was 10 percent and above. Cuba has some of the highest government health spending in the world - 91.5 percent of all health spending. The result is 6.7 physicians per 1000 populations, the highest of any major country. According to the WHO report Burma's government spends only $4 per person on healthcare (www. guardian.co.uk). If health aspect is neglected then as stated by Ragnar Nurkse, the country would live in vicious cycle of poverty as the people can do hard labour and thus production of goods and services will be hampered.

b) The statistics on undernourished and infant with low birth weight are not available for some of the countries. With the available data it is observed that Iran and Malaysia are well placed as rate of under nourished is less than 5 percent in both the countries.

c) Access to safe drinking water and improved sanitation are the indicators of leading quality life. It is evident from the table that countries like Malaysia, Thailand, and Iran are well placed. Whereas Afghanistan and Lao PDR are at the bottom. With regard to improve sanitation India is lowly placed with 34 percent people having the facilities and Nepal lowest with 31percent. In view of this it is suggested that Government of India and other State Governments should take initiative for improvement of sanitation among all echelons of the society. In fact drinking water and sanitation are the issues not only among CIRDAP or SAARC countries but also global phenomenon. The Report on Progress of Drinking Water and Sanitation published by World Health Organisation reveals an estimated 780 million people lacked safe drinking water in 2010, and the world is unlikely to meet the Millennium Development Goal (MDG) sanitation target (WHO, 2012).

d) Availability of physicians for 1000 population is very low in almost all the CIRDAP and SAARC countries. As mentioned already Cuba has 6.7 doctors for 1000 populations. One of the reasons is low spending on health services. In India less than 25 percent of rural health services are provided by the Government (Leonard, May 2012).

Table3: Education Indicator of CIRDAP and SAARC Countries

| Sl.No. | Item | Unit | Year | Lao PDR | Indonesia | Iran | Vietnam | Philippines | Thailand | Myanmar | Malaysia |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| 1. | Adult Literacy Rate (15 years and above) | % | 2005-10 | 73 | 92 | 85 | 93 | 95 | 94 | 92 | 92 |
| 2. | Youth Literacy Rate (15-24 years) -Male | % | 2005-10 | 89 | 100 | 99 | 97 | 97 | 98 | 96 | 98 |
| | Youth Literacy Rate (15-24 years) - Female | % | 2005-10 | 79 | 99 | 99 | 96 | 98 | 98 | 95 | 99 |
| 3. | Net Primary Enrolment Ratio | % | 2010 | 89 | 96 | NA | 98 | 89 | 90 | NA | NA |
| 4. | Net Secondary Enrolment Ratio | % | 2010 | 37 | 67 | NA | NA | 61 | 74 | 51 | 68 |

Contd-3

| Sl.No. | Item | Unit | Year | Afghanistan | Bangladesh | India | Pakistan | Nepal | Sri Lanka | Maldives | Bhutan |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 |
| 1. | Adult Literacy Rate ( 15 years and above) | % | 2005-10 | NA | 56 | 63 | 56 | 59 | 91 | 97.0 | 52.8 |
| 2. | Youth Literacy Rate (15-24 years) - Male | % | 2005-10 | NA | 74 | 88 | 79 | 87 | 97 | 98.2 | NA |
| | Youth Literacy Rate (15-24 years) - Female | % | 2005-10 | NA | 77 | 74 | 61 | 77 | 99 | NA | NA |
| 3. | Net Primary Enrolment | % | 2010 | NA | 92 | 92 | 74 | NA | 94 | 79 | NA |

8

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Ratio | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. | Net Secondary Enrolment Ratio | % | 2010 | NA | 46 | NA | 34 | NA | NA | 63 | NA |

NA= Not Available          Sources:  Rural Development Statistics, 2011-12, NIRD (Govt. of India), Hyderabad

Literacy important means for development of a society. Various studies reveal that literate parents always facilitate to develop children not only from education point of view but also from health and hygiene point also. The Wikipedia has mentioned that in U.S. A. during 1820, 20 percent of the adult population was illiterate, and illiteracy among Black population was 80 percent. By 1900 the situation improved even then 44 percent of Black population remained illiterate. There were significant improvements for Black and other races in the early 20th century as the descendants of Black community who had no educational opportunities earlier, grew up post-Civil War period and often had chance to obtain a basic education. Illiteracy gap between White and Black adults narrowed in 20th century, and in 1979 literacy rate was almost same as both the communities got the opportunity. Present economic or other social sectors development of USA may be attributed to high literacy among all communities.

In this case (table-3) the data pertinent to education for Afghanistan are not available albeit, these data are crucial to gauge the development. While couple of years back I was in Afghanistan, I was told Taliban rulers never allowed girls/women to go for higher education, however the present Government under the leadership of Hamid Karzai has been giving top priority to education including girls' education. Again I observed (while I was in Iran) Government of Iran gave maximum importance to education both for girls and boys.  By neglecting education (both for girls and boys) no country can develop in true sense.  Although data provided in the table are self-explanatory but net secondary enrolment ratio which is available for some of the countries reveals the same is lower than primary enrolment ratio indicating many students are not continuing higher education after primary education. India with not available data for net secondary enrolment ratio raises the question why data are not available in this regard?

Among the South Asian member countries, access to improved sanitation and percentage of underweight children are some of the critical challenges in the field of health and nutrition; the child malnutrition can be attributed to poverty. While talking about poverty, the question of below income of $ 1.25 per capita per day and below $ 2 per capita per day as well as national level poverty etc., arise. According to Rural Development Statistics, 2011-12, with the available data in Malaysia only 3.8 percent population was below the poverty line considering national level poverty data, followed by Thailand (8.1%), Sri Lanka (8.9%) and in all other countries the figure crosses double digit - Indonesia (12.5%), Vietnam (14.5%), Afghanistan (36%), Bangladesh (31.5 %), India (29.8%), Lao PDR (27.6%), Philippines (26.6.5%) and Nepal (25.2%).  The volume did not provide data for Bhutan, Maldives, Iran and Myanmar.

This analysis about the development indicators of CIRDAP and SAARC countries reveals that few of the countries like Malaysia, Iran, Sri Lanka and Vietnam etc. are ahead of development than the countries like Afghanistan, Lao PDR, Bangladesh, Bhutan etc. The situation in Afghanistan is shuddering as with 48 years of life expectancy, high poverty, high unemployment, high infant mortality rate etc., the youths may be lured towards Taliban, so members of CIRDAP and SAARC countries should focus more on development of Afghanistan and other countries like  Lao PDR, Nepal etc. who are sub-level of development. CIRDAP and SAARC have been formed with the objective of cooperation and development among the member countries so that people can lead quality of life. Instead of going for arm conflict among the member countries, cooperation is sine qua non so that common people are free from blights of poverty, undernourishment, illiteracy etc.; otherwise simply holding of meetings would not serve the purpose. With more and more amicable discussion among the Heads of the countries, situation can be normalized not by conflicting attitude or by military power.

**Comparative study:**

In this section analysis has been made with respect to demographic, health nutrition education economic etc., with recent/latest data as to show level of development based Rural Development Statistics of 2016-17 published by NIRD&PR.  It is pertinent to mention that in all the tables data pertaining to CIRDAP Countries have presented in column numbers 5 to 19. On the other hand, SAARC countries data may be found from column numbers 14 to 21.

## CIRDAP AND SAARC COUNTRIES

### Table 4: Demographic Indicators for CIRDAP and SAARC Countries

| S.No. | Item | Unit | Year/ Period | Lao PDR | Indonesia | Iran | Vietnam | Philippines | Thailand | Myanmar | Malaysia | Fiji |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 |
| 1. | Area | 000'Sq.Km | 2013 | 236.8 | 1910.9 | 1745.2 | 331 | 300 | 513.1 | 676.6 | 331 | 18.3 |
| 2. | Population | Millions | 2015 | 6.8 | 257.6 | 79.1 | 93.4 | 100.7 | 68.0 | 53.9 | 30.3 | 0.9 |
|  |  | Millions | 2030 [b] | 8.5 | 295.5 | 88.5 | 105.2 | 123.6 | 68.3 | 60.2 | 36.1 | 0.9 |
| 3. | Population Urbanised | % | 2013 | 36.0 | 52.0 | 72.0 | 32.0 | 45.0 | 48 | 33.0 | 73.0 | 48.0 |
| 4. | Population under age 15 | % | 2010 | 35 | 27 | 23 | 24 | 35 | 21 | 26 | 30 | -- |
| 5. | Population age 65 and above | % | 2010 | 4 | 6 | 5 | 6 | 4 | 9 | 5 | 5 | -- |
| 6. | Population Annual Growth Rate | % | 2010-15 | 1.9 | 1.2 | 1.2 | 1.0 | 1.9 | 0.3 | 0.8 | 1.6 | 0.7 |
| 7. | Crude Birth Rate | Per 1000 population | 2010 | 23 | 18 | 17 | 17 | 25 | 12 | 17 | 20 | -- |
| 8. | Total Fertility Rate | Births per woman | 2015 | 2.6 | 2.1 | 1.9 | 1.8 | 3.1 | 1.5 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.6 |
| 9. | Crude Death Rate | Per 1000 Live Births | 2010 | 6 | 7 | 5 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 9 | 5 | -- |
| 10. | Infant Mortality Rate | Per 1000 Live Births | 2013 | 53.8 | 24.5 | 14.4 | 19.0 | 23.5 | 11.3 | 39.8 | 7.2 | 20.0 |
| 11. | Mortality Rate Under 5 years age | Per 1000 Live Births | 2013 | 71.4 | 29.3 | 16.8 | 23.8 | 29.9 | 13.1 | 50.5 | 8.5 | 23.6 |
| 12. | Sex ratio at birth | Male to Female Births | 2015 | 1.05 | 1.05 | 1.05 | 1.10 | 1.06 | 1.06 | 1.03 | 1.06 | 1.06 |
| 13. | Life Expectancy at Birth |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Male | Years | 2015 | 65.2 | 67.0 | 74.5 | 71.2 | 65.0 | 71.3 | 64.0 | 72.6 | 67.3 |
|  | Female | Years | 2015 | 68.0 | 71.2 | 76.7 | 80.6 | 71.9 | 78.0 | 68.2 | 77.3 | 73.4 |
|  | Persons | Years | 2014 | 66.2 | 68.9 | 75.4 | 75.8 | 68.2 | 74.4 | 65.9 | 74.7 | 70.0 |

Note:       CIRDAP Countries : Column No. 5-19.

SAARC  Countries:  Column No. 14-21.

**Table 4: (Contd.)**

| S. No. | Item | Unit | Year/ Period | Afghanistan | Bangladesh | India | Pakistan | Nepal | Sri Lanka | Maldives | Bhutan |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 |
| 1. | Area | 000'Sq.Km | 2013 | 652.9 | 148.5 | 3287.3 | 796.1 | 147.2 | 65.6 | 0.3 | 38.4 |
| 2. | Population | Millions | 2015 | 31.5 | 161.0 | 1311.1 | 188.9 | 28.5 | 20.7 | 0.4 | 0.8 |
|  |  | Millions | 2030[b] | 43.9 | 186.5 | 1527.7 | 244.9 | 33.1 | 21.5 | 0.4 | 0.9 |
| 3. | Population Urbanised | % | 2013 | 47 | 33 | 28.7 | 38 | 18 | 18.0 | 43 | 37 |
| 4. | Population under age 15 | % | 2010 | 46 | 31 | 32 | 35 | 36 | 25 | 34 | 33 |
| 5. | Population age 65 and above | % | 2010 | 2 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 8 | 3.8 | 4.6 |
| 6. | Population Annual Growth Rate | % | 2010-15 | 2.4 | 1.2 | 1.2 | 1.7 | 1.2 | 0.8 | 1.9 | 1.6 |
| 7. | Crude Birth Rate | Per 1000 Population | 2010 | 44 | 20 | 22 | 27 | 24 | 18 | -- | 12 |
| 8. | Total Fertility Rate | Births per Woman | 2015 | 6.0 | 2.2 | 2.6 | 3.2 | 2.6 | 2.4 | 1.7 | 2.3 |
| 9. | Crude Death Rate | Per 1000 Live Births | 2010 | 16 | 6 | 8 | 7 | 6 | 7 | -- | -- |
| 10. | Infant Mortality Rate | Per 1000 Live Births | 2013 | 70.2 | 33.2 | 41.4 | 69.0 | 32.2 | 8.2 | 8.4 | 29.7 |
| 11. | Mortality Rate  Under 5 years age | Per 1000 Live Births | 2013 | 97.3 | 41.1 | 52.7 | 85.5 | 39.7 | 9.6 | 9.9 | 36.2 |
| 12. | Sex ratio at birth | Male to Female Births | 2015 | 1.06 | 1.05 | 1.11 | 1.09 | 1.07 | 1.04 | 1.06 | 1.04 |
| 13. | Life Expectancy at Birth |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Male | Years | 2015 | 59.5 | 70.7 | 66.9 | 65.4 | 68.6 | 71.7 | 76.0 | 69.6 |
|  | Female | Years | 2015 | 62.0 | 73.3 | 69.9 | 67.4 | 71.5 | 78.4 | 78.0 | 70.1 |
|  | Persons | Years | 2014 | 60.4 | 71.6 | 68.0 | 66.2 | 69.6 | 74.9 | 76.8 | 69.5 |

Note : -- : Not Available       b: Data refer to medium-variant projections       c: Data refer  to estimates for the period specified.

Source:  World Bank, World Development Indicators 2017 and UNDP , Human Development Report 2016 .

**Table 5: Health and Nutrition Indicators of CIRDAP and SAARC Countries**

| S.No. | Item | Unit | Year/Period | Lao PDR | Indonesia | Iran | Vietnam | Philippines | Thailand | Myanmar | Malaysia | Fiji |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 |
| 1. | a. Health Expenditure total of GDP | % | 2013 | 2.0 | 3.1 | 6.7 | 6.0 | 4.4 | 4.6 | 1.8 | 4.0 | 4.1 |
| | b. Health Expenditure Public of total | % | 2010 | 33.3 | 49.1 | 40.1 | 37.8 | 35.3 | 75.0 | 12.2 | 55.5 | -- |
| | c. Health Expenditure Per Capita | (PPP US $) | 2010 | 97 | 112 | 836 | 215 | 142 | 330 | 34 | 641 | -- |
| 2. | Child Malnutrition (% under 5)(Stunting moderate or severe) | % | 2008-13 | 43.8 | 36.4 | 6.8 | 23.3 | 30.3 | 16.3 | 35.1 | 17.2 | 7.5 |
| 3. | i. Prevalence of overweight children (% under age 5)- Male | % | 2005-10 | 1.5 | 11.3 | -- | 3.4 | 3.6 | 8.8 | -- | -- | -- |
| | ii. Prevalence of overweight children (% under age 5)- Female | % | 2007-13 | 1.0 | 11.2 | -- | 2.5 | 2.9 | 7.2 | -- | -- | -- |
| 4. | Infants with low birth weight | % | 2002-07 | -- | 9 | 9 | 7 | 20 | 9 | -- | 9 | -- |
| 5. | Population with access to improved water source | % | 2012 | 72 | 85 | 96 | 95 | 92 | 96 | 83 | 100 | 96 |
| 6. | Population with access to Improved Sanitation | % | 2012 | 65 | 59 | 89 | 76 | 74 | 96 | 76 | 96 | 87 |
| 7. | a. Physicians (per 1000 people) | No. | 2001-13 [b] | 1.8 | 2.0 | 8.9 | 11.6 | 11.5 | 3.9 | 6.1 | 12.0 | 4.3 |
| | b. Nurses and Midwives | No. | 2005-10 [b] | 1.0 | 2.0 | 1.4 | 1.0 | -- | -- | 0.8 | 2.7 | -- |
| 8. | Child Immunisation Rate (% of one year child) | | | | | | | | | | | -- |
| | -- Against Measles | % | 2013 | 18 | 16 | 2 | 2 | 10 | 1 | 14 | 5 | 6 |
| | -- DPT | % | 2013 | 11 | 2 | 2 | 17 | 2 | 1 | 10 | 1 | 1 |
| 9. | Births attended by skilled health staff | % | 2007-07 [a] | -- | 72 | 97 | 88 | 60 | 97 | 68 | 98 | -- |

Note:      CIRDAP Countries : Column No. 5-19.
          SAARC Countries: Column No. 14-21.

**Table 5 :( Contd.)**

| S.No. | Item | Unit | Year/Period | Afghanistan | Bangladesh | India | Pakistan | Nepal | Sri Lanka | Maldives | Bhutan |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 |
| 1. | a. Health Expenditure total of GDP | % | 2013 | 8.1 | 3.7 | 4.0 | 2.8 | 6.0 | 3.2 | 10.8 | 3.6 |
| | b. Health Expenditure Public of total | % | 2010 | 11.7 | 33.6 | 29.2 | 38.5 | 33.2 | 44.7 | -- | -- |
| | c. Health Expenditure Per Capita | (PPP US $) | 2010 | 44 | 57 | 132 | 59 | 66 | 148 | 494 | 93 |
| 2. | Child Malnutrition (% under 5)(Stunting moderate or severe) | % | 2008-13 | 59.3 | 41.4 | 47.9 | 45.0 | 40.5 | 14.7 | 20.3 | 33.6 |
| 3. | i. Prevalence of overweight children (% under age 5)- Male | % | 2005-10 | -- | 1.2 | 2.2 | -- | 0.6 | 0.7 | -- | -- |
| | ii. Prevalence of overweight children (% under age 5)- Female | % | 2007-13 | -- | 1.0 | 1.7 | -- | 0.6 | 1.0 | -- | -- |
| 4. | Infants with low birth weight | % | 2002-07 | -- | 22 | 28 | -- | 21 | -- | 22 | 15 |
| 5. | Population with access to improved water source | % | 2012 | 64 | 85 | 93 | 91 | 88 | 94 | 90 | 98 |
| 6. | Population with access to improved sanitation | % | 2012 | 29 | 57 | 36 | 48 | 37 | 92 | 99 | 47 |
| 7. | a. Physicians (per 1000 people) | No. | 2001-13 [b] | 2.3 | 3.6 | 7.0 | 8.3 | 2.1 | 6.8 | 14.2 | 2.6 |
| | b. Nurses and Midwives | No. | 2005-10 [b] | 0.5 | 0.3 | 1.0 | 0.6 | -- | 1.9 | -- | -- |
| 8. | Child Immunisation Rate (% of one year child) | | | | | | | | | | |
| | -- Against Measles | % | 2013 | 25 | 7 | 26 | 39 | 12 | 1 | 1 | 6 |
| | -- DPT | % | 2013 | 14 | 1 | 12 | 21 | 6 | 1 | 1 | 3 |
| 9. | Births attended by skilled health staff | % | 2007-07 [a] | -- | 18 | 47 | 39 | 19 | 99 | -- | -- |

-- : Not Available       PPP : Purchasing Power Parity.

a: Data refer to the average for the years specified.

b :Data refer to the most recent year available during the period specified.

c: Data refer to a year or period other than that specified. Differ from the standard definition or refer to only part of a country.

Source: World Bank, World Development Indicators 2017 and UNDP, Human Development Report 2016.

**Table 6: Education and Economic Indicators of CIRDAP and SAARC Countries**

| S.No. | Item | Unit | Year | Lao PDR | Indonesia | Iran | Vietnam | Philippines | Thailand | Myanmar | Malaysia | Fiji |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 |
| **A.** | **Education Indicators** | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. | Adult Literacy Rate (of 15 years and above) | % | 2005-13 | 72.7 | 92.8 | 84.3 | 93.5 | 95.4 | 96.4 | 92.6 | 93.1 | -- |
| 2. | Youth Literacy Rate (of 15-24 years) | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | - Male | % | 2005-13 | 89.2 | 98.8 | 98.3 | 97.4 | 97.0 | 96.6 | 96.2 | 98.4 | -- |
| | - Female | % | 2005-13 | 78.7 | 98.8 | 97.7 | 96.8 | 98.5 | 96.6 | 95.8 | 98.5 | -- |
| 3a. | Gross Pre-Primary Enrolment Ratio | % | 2008-2014 | 26 | 48 | 38 | 82 | 51 | 119 | 9 | 84 | 18 |
| b | Gross Primary Enrolment Ratio | % | 2008-2014 | 121 | 109 | 119 | 105 | 106 | 93 | 114 | 101 | 105 |
| 4. | Gross Secondary Enrolment Ratio | % | 2008-2014 | 50 | 83 | 86 | -- | 85 | 87 | 61 | 71 | 88 |
| 5. | Primary School Dropout Rates | % | 2008-2014 | 26.7 | 11.0 | 3.8 | 5.5 | 24.2 | -- | 32.7 | 0.9 | 3.5 |
| 6 | Expected Years of Schooling | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Male | Years | 2015 | 11.2 | 12.9 | 15.0 | 12.5 | 11.4 | 13.1 | -- | -- | -- |
| | Female | Years | 2015 | 10.4 | 12.9 | 14.6 | 12.9 | 12.1 | 14.1 | -- | -- | -- |
| 7 | Mean Years of Schooling | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Mean | Years | 2015 | 5.6 | 8.5 | 9.1 | 8.2 | 9.2 | 8.2 | 4.9 | 10.5 | 10.2 |
| | Female | Years | 2015 | 4.5 | 7.4 | 8.5 | 7.9 | 9.5 | 7.7 | 4.9 | 11.5 | 10.9 |
| **B.** | **Technology Indicators** | % | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6. | Telephone Mainlines | Per 100 population | 2010 | 2 | 16 | 36 | 19 | 7 | 10 | 1 | 15 | -- |
| 7. | Cellular Subscribers | Per 100 population | 2010 | 65 | 92 | 91 | 177 | 86 | 104 | 1 | 119 | -- |
| 8. | Internet Users | Per 100 population | 2010 | 7.0 | 9.9 | 13.0 | 27.9 | 25.0 | 21.2 | 0.2 | 56.3 | -- |

| S.No. | Item | Unit | Year | Afghanistan | Bangladesh | India | Pakistan | Nepal | Sri Lanka | Maldives | Bhutan |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 |
| **A.** | **Education Indicators** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. | Adult Literacy Rate (of 15 years and above) | % | 2005-13 | 31.7 | 58.8 | 62.8 | 54.7 | 57.4 | 91.2 | 98.4 | 52.8 |
| 2. | Youth Literacy Rate (of 15-24 years) – Total | | | | | | | | | | |
| | -    Male | % | 2005-13 | 61.9 | 78.0 | 88.4 | 78.0 | 89.2 | 97.7 | 99.2 | 80.0 |
| | -    Female | % | 2005-13 | 62.1 | 81.9 | 74.4 | 63.1 | 77.5 | 98.6 | 99.4 | 68.0 |
| 3a. | Gross Pre-Primary Enrolment Ratio | % | 2008-2014 | 1 | 26 | 58 | 82 | 87 | 89 | 82 | 14 |
| B | Gross Primary Enrolment Ratio | % | 2008-2014 | 106 | 114 | 113 | 92 | 133 | 98 | 98 | 107 |
| 4. | Gross Secondary Enrolment Ratio | % | 2008-2014 | 54 | 54 | 69 | 38 | 67 | 99 | 72 | 78 |
| 5. | Primary School Dropout Rates | % | 2008-2014 | -- | 33.8 | -- | 37.8 | 39.6 | 3.4 | | 21.1 |
| 6 | Expected Years of Schooling | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Male | Years | 2015 | 13.1 | 9.9 | 11.3 | 8.8 | 12.2 | 13.6 | 12.7 | 12.4 |
| | Female | Years | 2015 | 8.3 | 10.4 | 11.9 | 7.4 | 12.7 | 14.3 | 12.8 | 12.6 |
| 7 | Mean Years of Schooling | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Mean | Years | 2015 | 5.8 | 5.6 | 8.2 | 6.5 | 5.0 | 11.4 | 6.3 | 4.2 |
| | Female | Years | 2015 | 1.6 | 5.0 | 4.8 | 3.7 | 3.2 | 10.3 | 6.2 | 2.1 |
| **B.** | **Technology Indicators** | % | | -- | | | | | | | |
| 6. | Telephone Mainlines | Per 100 population | 2010 | -- | 1 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 17 | 98 | 51 |
| 7. | Cellular Subscribers | Per 100 population | 2010 | 38 | 46 | 61 | 57 | 31 | 83 | 466 | 59 |
| 8. | Internet Users | Per 100 population | 2010 | 3.7 | 32.1 | 7.5 | 16.8 | 7.9 | 12.0 | 59 | 39 |

Note:       CIRDAP Countries : Column No. 5-19.
            SAARC Countries:  Column No. 14-21.

**Table 6 :( Contd...)**

| S.No. | Item | Unit | Year/ Period | Lao PDR | Indonesia | Iran | Vietnam | Philippines | Thailand | Myan mar | Malaysia | Fiji |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 |
| C. | **Economic Indicators** | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8. | GDP Per Capita | PPP $ | 2013 | 4667 | 9254 | 15090 | 5125 | 6236 | 13932 | -- | 22589 | 7502 |
| 8b. | Estimated Gross National Income per capita | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Male | 2011PPP $ | 2015 | 5696 | 13391 | 27499 | 5846 | 9917 | 16145 | 5740 | 25209 | 11676 |
| | Female | 2011PPP $ | 2015 | 4408 | 6668 | 5132 | 4834 | 6845 | 12938 | 4182 | 18070 | 4695 |
| 9. | GDP Per Capita - Annual Growth Rate | % | 2012-13 | 6.2 | 4.9 | -3.2 | 4.1 | 5.0 | 6.2 | 10.4 | 3.9 | 1.5 |
| 10. | Average annual change in consumer price index | % | 2003-04 | 7.2 | 10.5 | 14.3 | 1.6 | 7.6 | 4.5 | 23.6 | 3.3 | -- |
| 11. | Public expenditure on education (% of GDP) | % | 2010 | 3.3 | 4.6 | 4.7 | 5.3 | 2.7 | 3.8 | -- | 5.8 | -- |
| 12. | Public expenditure on health (% of GDP) | % | 2009 | 4.1 | 2.4 | 5.5 | 7.2 | 3.8 | 4.3 | 2.0 | 4.8 | -- |
| 13. | Inequality in Income | % | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Income | | 2015 | 20.3 | 17.3 | 46.6 | 21.4 | 26.8 | 34.0 | | -- | 22.6 |
| | Gini Coefficient | | 2010-2015 | 37.9 | 39.5 | 37.4 | 37.6 | 43.0 | 37.9 | | 46.3 | 42.8 |
| 14a. | Human Development Index  (HDI) | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | -- Rank | | 2015 | 138 | 113 | 69 | 115 | 116 | 87 | 145 | 59 | 91 |
| | -- Value | % | 2015 | 0.586 | 0.689 | 0.766 | 0.683 | 0.682 | 0.740 | 0.556 | 0.789 | 0.736 |
| b. | Gender Development Index | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | -- Value | | 2015 | 0.924 | 0.926 | 0.862 | 1.010 | 1.001 | 1.001 | -- | 0.947 | 0.941 |
| 15. | Multidimensional Poverty Index | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | - Index | Value | 2012 | 0.186 | 0.024 | - | 0.026 | 0.033 | 0.004 | - | - | - |
| | - Headcount | % | | 36.8 | 5.9 | - | 6.4 | 6.3 | 1.0 | - | - | - |
| b | Population in Multidimensional Poverty | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | - Headcount | Thousands | 2012 | 2383 | 14644 | - | 3646 | 6169 | 667 | - | - | - |
| | - Intensity of deprivation | % | | 50.5 | 41.3 | - | 40.7 | 51.9 | 38.8 | - | - | - |
| c | Population near multidimensional poverty | % | 2012 | 18.5 | 8.1 | - | 8.7 | 8.4 | 4.4 | - | - | - |
| 16. | Population living below income poverty line | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | -- US $1.25 a day per capita | % | 2012 | 30.3 | 16.2 | - | 2.4 | 19.0 | 0.3 | -- | - | - |
| | --National Poverty Line | % | 2014 | 23.2 | 11.3 | - | 17.2 | 25.2 | 12.6 | - | - | - |

**Table 6 (Contd...)**

| S.No. | Item | Unit | Year/ Period | Afghanistan | Bangladesh | India | Pakistan | Nepal | Sri Lanka | Maldives | Bhutan |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 |
| **C.** | **Economic Indicators** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8. | GDP Per Capita | PPP $ | 2013 | 1884 | 2853 | 5238 | 4454 | 2173 | 9426 | 11283 | 7167 |
| 8b. | Estimated Gross National Income per capita | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Male | 2011PPP $ | 2015 | 3148 | 4285 | 8897 | 8376 | 2718 | 15869 | 13591 | 8308 |
| | Female | 2011PPP $ | 2015 | 511 | 2379 | 2184 | 1498 | 1979 | 6067 | 7155 | 5657 |
| 9. | GDP Per Capita - Annual Growth Rate | % | 2012-13 | 11.6 | 5.0 | 3.4 | 2.3 | 3.6 | 9.2 | 1.4 | 7.6 |
| 10. | Average annual change in consumer price index | % | 2003-04 | -- | 7.0 | 4.2 | 9.1 | 6.8 | 11.6 | 3.3 | 5.3 |
| 11. | Public expenditure on education (% of GDP) | % | 2010 | -- | 2.2 | -- | 2.4 | 4.7 | 2.1 | -- | -- |
| 12. | Public expenditure on health (% of GDP) | % | 2009 | 7.4 | 3.4 | 4.2 | 2.6 | 5.8 | 4.0 | 8.0 | 5.5 |
| 13. | Inequality in Income | % | | | | | | | | | |
| | Income | | 2015 | 10.8 | 28.3 | 16.1 | 11.6 | 13.9 | 13.7 | 23.2 | 19.6 |
| | Gini Coefficient | | 2010-2015 | -- | 32.1 | 35.2 | 30.7 | 32.8 | 39.2 | 38.4 | 38.8 |
| 14a. | Human Development Index (HDI) | | | | | | | | | | |
| | -- Rank | | 2015 | 169 | 139 | 131 | 147 | 144 | 73 | 105 | 132 |
| | -- Value | % | 2015 | 0.479 | 0.579 | 0.624 | 0.550 | 0.558 | 0.766 | 0.701 | 0.607 |
| b. | Gender Development Index | | | | | | | | | | |
| | -- Value | | 2015 | 0.609 | 0.927 | 0.819 | 0.742 | 0.925 | 0.934 | 0.937 | 0.900 |
| 15. | Multidimensional Poverty Index | | | | | | | | | | |
| | -   Index | Value | 2012 | 0.293 | 0.237 | 0.282 | 0.237 | 0.197 | -- | 0.008 | 0.128 |
| | -   Headcount | % | | 58.8 | 49.5 | 55.3 | 45.6 | 41.4 | -- | 2.0 | 29.4 |
| b | Population in Multidimensional poverty | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | Unit | Year | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | - Headcount | Thousands | 2012 | 16942 | 64816 | 642391 | 83045 | 7493 | -- | 7 | 212 |
| | - Intensity of deprivation | % | | 49.9 | 47.8 | 51.1 | 52.0 | 47.4 | -- | 37.5 | 43.5 |
| c | Population near multidimensional poverty | % | 2012 | 16.0 | 18.8 | 18.2 | 14.9 | 18.1 | -- | 8.5 | 18.0 |
| 16. | Population living below income poverty line | | | | | | | | | | |
| | -- US $1.25 a day per capita | % | 2012 | -- | 43.3 | 23.6 | 12.7 | 23.7 | -- | 1.5 | 2.4 |
| | --National Poverty Line | % | 2014 | 35.8 | 31.5 | 21.9 | 22.3 | 25.2 | -- | -- | 12.0 |

-- : Not Available.

Source:  World Bank, World Development Indicators 2017 and  UNDP, Human Development Report 2016 .

**Table 7: Work and Employment Indicators of  CIRDAP and SAARC Countries**

| S.No. | Item | Unit | Year/ Period | Lao PDR | Indonesia | Iran | Vietnam | Philippines | Thailand | Myanmar | Malaysia | Fiji |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 |
| 1. | Employment (% age 15 and older) | | | | | | | | | | | |
| a) | Employment to Population Ratio | % | 2015 | 76.1 | 63.4 | 39.9 | 76.7 | 60.4 | 70.6 | 74.3 | 61.5 | 50.2 |
| b) | Labour Force Participation Rate | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Total | % | 2015 | 77.4 | 67.4 | 44.5 | 78.3 | 64.7 | 71.4 | 78.0 | 63.3 | 54.3 |
| | Male | % | 2015 | 77.0 | 83.9 | 72.7 | 83.2 | 78.8 | 80.2 | 81.1 | 79.1 | 71.3 |
| | Female | % | 2015 | 77.0 | 50.9 | 16.2 | 73.8 | 50.5 | 62.9 | 75.1 | 69.4 | 37.0 |
| c) | Employment in Agriculture (% of total employment ) | % | 2010-14 | 71.3 | 34.3 | 17.9 | 46.8 | 30.4 | 41.9 | -- | 12.2 | -- |
| d) | Employment in Services | % | 2010-14 | 20.2 | 44.8 | 48.3 | 32.0 | 53.6 | 37.5 | -- | 60.3 | -- |
| e) | Labour force with tertiary education | % | 2007-12 | -- | 7.1 | -- | -- | 25.3 | -- | -- | 18.9 | -- |

20

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| f) | Vulnerable Employment (% of total employment) | % | 2008-2013 | 88.0 | 33.0 | 42.0 | 62.6 | 39.8 | 55.9 | -- | 22.2 | 38.8 |
| 2. | Unemployment | | | | | | | | | | | |
| a) | Total (% of labour force) | % | 2015 | 1.6 | 5.8 | 10.5 | 2.1 | 6.7 | 1.1 | 4.7 | 2.9 | 7.7 |
| b) | Long term (% of labour force) | % | 2008-2013 | -- | -- | -- | 0.3 | 0.1 | 0.1 | -- | -- | 2.6 |
| c) | Youth (% age 15-24) | % | 2015 | 4.0 | 19.3 | 24.1 | 5.3 | 15.7 | 4.7 | 12.1 | 10.4 | 18.2 |
| d) | Youth not in school or Employment (% age 15-24) | % | 2010-14 | -- | 24.1 | 34.3 | 9.3 | 24.8 | 13.8 | -- | 1.2 | -- |
| 3. | Labour Productivity | | | | | | | | | | | |
| a) | Output per worker | (PPP $ 2005) | 2005-2012 | 5114 | 9536 | 35432 | 5250 | 9571 | 14443 | -- | 35036 | 11894 |
| b) | Hours worked per week | Per employed person | 2005-2012 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 42.8 | -- | 43.2 | 37.5 |

(Contd…)

Note:  CIRDAP Countries : Column No. 5-19.
  SAARC  Countries:  Column No. 14-21.

**Table 7 :(Contd.)**

| S. No. | Item | Unit | Year/Period | Afghanistan | Bangladesh | India | Pakistan | Nepal | Sri Lanka | Maldives | Bhutan |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 |
| 1. | Employment (% age 15 and older) | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Employment to Population Ratio | % | 2015 | 47.5 | 59.4 | 51.9 | 51.0 | 80.5 | 49.3 | 59.9 | 64.7 |
| | Labour Force Participation Rate | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Total | % | 2015 | 52.5 | 62.2 | 53.7 | 53.9 | 83.0 | 51.8 | 68.0 | 66.4 |
| | Male | % | 2015 | 83.6 | 81.0 | 79.1 | 82.2 | 86.8 | 75.6 | 78.8 | 72.8 |
| | Female | % | 2015 | 19.1 | 43.1 | 26.8 | 24.3 | 79.7 | 30.2 | 57.3 | 58.7 |
| | Employment in Agriculture (% of total employment ) | % | 2010-14 | -- | 47.5 | 49.7 | 43.5 | 66.5 | 30.4 | 14.6 | 56.3 |
| | Employment in Services | % | 2010-14 | -- | 35.3 | 28.7 | 34.0 | 22.4 | 43.4 | 67.0 | 32.7 |
| | Labour force with tertiary education | % | 2007-12 | -- | -- | -- | 24.6 | -- | 14.6 | -- | -- |
| | Vulnerable Employment (% of total employment) | % | 2008-2013 | -- | 85.0 | 80.8 | 63.1 | -- | 43.1 | 29.6 | 53.1 |
| 2. | Unemployment | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Total (% of labour force) | % | 2015 | 9.6 | 4.4 | 3.5 | 5.4 | 3.1 | 4.7 | 11.8 | 2.6 |
| | Long term (% of labour force) | % | 2008-2013 | -- | -- | 1.4 | 1.1 | 1.0 | 1.9 | -- | -- |
| | Youth (% age 15-24) | % | 2015 | 19.9 | 11.6 | 9.7 | 10.7 | 5.1 | 20.2 | 27.9 | 9.2 |
| | Youth not in school or Employment (% age 15-24) | % | 2010-14 | -- | 40.3 | 27.2 | -- | 9.2 | 0.5 | 56.4 | -- |
| 3. | Labour Productivity | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Output per worker | (PPP $ 2005) | 2005-2012 | 5417 | 3457 | 8821 | 7367 | 2448 | 13234 | 18670 | 11438 |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Hours worked per week | Per employed person | 2005-2012 | -- | 44.3 | -- | 33.1 | 37.6 | 44.0 | -- | -- |

Source:  World Bank, World Development Indicators 2017 and UNDP , Human Development Report 2016 .

**Although the points in all the tables are self-explanatory but few important points as observed are:**

➢ Population living below income poverty line is lowest virtually nil in Maldives. This country is having many laurels like highest percentage of population lives in urban area, followed by Iran.

➢ Annual growth rate of population is lowest in Thailand and highest in Afghanistan. It is sorry to mention Afghanistan is lacking in many respects if socio-economic indicators are taken into account.

➢ Life expectancy at birth is very low in Afghanistan but very high in Maldives.

➢ Adult Literacy Rate (15 years and above) is very high in Maldives but very low in Afghanistan followed by Bhutan and Pakistan.

➢ Employment in Agriculture (% of total employment) is highest in Lao PDR and low in Maldives, no data were available for Afghanistan.

➢ Employment to population ratio is highest in Nepal and lowest in Iran.

        **REFERENCES:**
1. **Fayez  Hikmatullah, "The Role of Foreign Aid in Afghanistan's Reconstruction: A Critical Assessment", Economic and Political Weekly, Mumbai September, 29 , 2012**

2.  **Ibid.**

3. **Leonard David "Professional Services, Markets and the Poor" IDS, U.K.  May 2012**

4. **http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Longevity**

5. **National Institute of Rural Development (NIRD), Hyderabad, "Rural Development Statistics 2011 – 12."**
6. **www.mapsofworld.com/saarc-member-countries**
7. **www.guardian.co.uk/news/datablog/2012/jun/30/healthcare-spending-world-country**