



Report on Sustainable

Competitiveness of Cities Worldwide

(2013-2014)

■ Ni Pengfei, Marco Kamiya, Guo Jing, Xu Haidong, Zhang Yi, etc



中国社会科学院财经战略研究院
National Academy of Economic Strategy, CASS

UN HABITAT
FOR A BETTER URBAN FUTURE

Table of contents

Introduction	4
1.The sustainable competitiveness of cities worldwide steadily improved with gap between different cities narrowed	4
1.1 The sustainable competitiveness of cities worldwide improved steadily and cities in North America, Europe and Asia are in leading positions	
1.2 Cities in North America, Europe and Asia are in the lead and cities in Asia and South America are moving up rapidly	
1.3 Sustainable competitiveness of cities worldwide is rising and gaps between cities are narrowing	
1.4 Asian, South American and African are moving faster up the rankings than European and North American cities	
1.5 Cities in G20 countries are more competitive, show higher growth rates, and have smaller gaps between them	
2.The sustainable competitiveness of cities in North America, Europe and Asia is higher, with more of them in leading positions in the world, and gaps between cities vary across continents	9
2.1 The sustainable competitiveness of cities in North America is polarized, and the U.S. cities are far ahead of others	
2.2 The sustainable competitiveness of European cities remains stable with relatively narrow gaps	
2.3 The sustainable competitiveness of Asian cities is relatively high on the whole; that of Japanese cities is particularly high, while Chinese cities are moving up	
2.4 The sustainable competitiveness of South American cities is relatively low	
2.5 The sustainable competitiveness of African cities is low and has generally declined	
3.U.S. and German cities are clearly in the lead while cities in emerging economies such as China, India, Brazil and Nigeria remain low on the global list	13
3.1 The sustainable competitiveness of Indian cities is relatively low, and the overall trend is a downward trend	
3.2 The sustainable competitiveness of Chinese cities gradually improved but remain relatively low; some cities moved up the list, some down	
3.3 The sustainable competitiveness of Nigerian cities is low and declining sharply	
3.4 The sustainable competitiveness of Brazilian cities shows a clear hierarchical structure	
3.5 U.S. cities lead the world in sustainable competitiveness	
3.6 The overall sustainable competitiveness of German cities is rising, with a significant advantage in high-income population density	
Appendix	18

Introduction of GUCR

The Global Urban Competitiveness Report (GUCR) is a cooperative research conducted by the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences (CASS) and UN-Habitat focusing on sustainable urban competitiveness, urban land and urban finance. Led by Prof. Ni Pengfei and Mr. Marco Kamiya, the project is participated by experts from CASS, UN-Habitat and well-known scholars in relevant fields. Through theoretical research and empirical investigation, the report establishes an indicator system to measure the economic competitiveness and sustainable competitiveness of more

than 1,000 cities in the world. Meanwhile, it selects important issues of global urban development as the themes for in-depth studies, aiming to promote the implementation of the UN 2030 agenda through the assessment of urban competitiveness. Currently, five annual reports have been published successively, among which GUCR (2018-2019) was launched at the UN headquarters in New York City during the 74th session of the UN General Assembly, and the GUCR (2019-2020) was released in Abu Dhabi during the 10th World Urban Forum.

About the Authors



Ni Pengfei, Director of Center for City and Competitiveness, CASS; Assistant to the Director of National Academy of Economic Strategy, CASS; PhD in economics, doctoral supervisor. Leader and Chief Urban Economist of the CASS-UN-Habitat joint research group. Specialized in theoretical and applied studies in urban economics, urban competitiveness and real estate economics.



Marco Kamiya is a Senior Economist of Knowledge & Innovation Branch of UN-HABITAT, and his research interests include development economics and public economics. Mr. Marco leads global operational work on urban economy and finance and conducts research on municipal finance, the economics of urban expansion and local infrastructure-investment policy.



Introduction

The global economy generally remains on the track of recovery, but the pace has slowed down significantly and support for the recovery is weak. Economic growth is fast in the South and slow in the North. In the West, economic growth has slowed down and risk factors accumulated significantly. In particular, growth in developed economies has decreased sharply as the growth rate of the United States is significantly lower and the European debt crisis has intensified, adding to the uncertainties for the overall economic recovery of the world. On the contrary, emerging economies are experiencing fast development, and their status in the global economic pattern has further improved. However, situations different among

different emerging economies. As economic and social development accelerates, concerns have been rising about how to promote the competitiveness of cities in these countries with less resource consumption and environmental impact, and how to turn constraints in environmental and societal aspects into new driving forces for economic growth. This is exactly what sustainable competitiveness of cities is about. Facing uncertainties such as the lack of momentum for global economic recovery and the European debt crisis, a central issues we now face is how to find new growth drivers for cities around the world. This is also key to determining the sustainable development ability of cities.

1 The sustainable competitiveness of cities worldwide steadily improved with gap between different cities narrowed

1.1 The sustainable competitiveness of cities worldwide improved steadily and cities in North America, Europe and Asia are in leading positions

Table 1 shows changes in the sustainable competitiveness of cities worldwide, high-income population increment and high-income population density from 2010 to 2011. Figure 1 shows changes in the rankings. It is clear that the sustainable competitiveness of the world's top cities is relatively stable and the Top 20 are the same as in the previous years, with only changes in the rankings within the group. In addition to Barcelona and Chicago swapped positions and Stuttgart entered the Top 10. Other than these, the Top 10 list largely


remained unchanged, indicating that it is difficult for any other city to take the places of these front runners in the short term. In comparison, cities in the 10th to 20th places saw more changes. The sustainable competitiveness of North American cities declined to some extent, while that of European and Asian cities increased. In terms of high-income population increment and high-income population density, the situation in the world's top cities are relatively stable, and the global rankings did not change much. This means that the top cities in

the world are still highly attractive to high-caliber talents in the world, and this played an important role in the keeping their positions in the global rankings of sustainable competitiveness.

Table 1 Sustainable competitiveness of Top 20 cities and changes in their rankings

City	Country	Continent	Sustainable competitiveness		High-income population increment		High-income population density	
			2011 ranking	2010 ranking	2011 ranking	2010 ranking	2011 ranking	2010 ranking
Tokyo	Japan	Asia	1	1	1	1	10	10
New York	U.S.A.	N. America	2	2	2	2	46	45
Singapore	Singapore	Asia	3	3	15	16	1	1
Paris	France	Europe	4	4	4	4	39	37
Hong Kong	China	Asia	5	5	20	17	3	4
London	U.K.	Europe	6	6	7	7	26	23
Osaka	Japan	Asia	7	7	3	3	83	83
Barcelona	Spain	Europe	8	9	27	25	9	9
Chicago	U.S.A.	N. America	9	8	6	6	90	90
Stuttgart	Germany	Europe	10	11	42	39	4	5
San Francisco	U.S.A.	N. America	11	10	12	12	42	42
Seoul	Republic of Korea	Asia	12	12	9	8	69	67
Moscow	Russia	Europe	13	16	28	26	18	26
Munich	Germany	Europe	14	18	66	73	2	2
Frankfurt	Germany	Europe	15	15	47	44	7	7
Boston	U.S.A.	N. America	16	14	13	13	61	60
Philadelphia	U.S.A.	N. America	17	13	11	10	71	66
Madrid	Spain	Europe	18	17	19	19	43	44
Berlin	Germany	Europe	19	20	43	38	15	15
Taipei	China	Asia	20	19	39	34	16	16

Figure 1 Changes in global rankings by sustainable competitiveness, 2011-2012



Note: Red indicates positive change in ranking while blue indicates negative change, and the bigger the dot the greater the change of ranking

1.2 Cites in North America, Europe and Asia are in the lead and cities in Asia and South America are moving up rapidly

Figure 2 and Figure 3 show the distribution of global sustainable competitiveness in 2010 and 2011, respectively, and the distribution of the Top 200 cities by continent. It can be seen that European, North American and Asian cities are relatively more competitive. North American cities have particularly strong sustainable competitiveness, while European and Asian cities see their sustainable competitiveness remain stable. For the year 2011, Europe and Asia each has 58 cities in the global Top 200. To some extent, uncertainties such as the financial crisis and the European debt crisis have slowed down the improvement of the sustainable competitiveness of European cities. Therefore, in the wake of the crises, the rankings of cities in Asia and South America improved, with each continent having one more city in the Top 200 mainly due to increases in the high-income population increment.

Figure 2 Sustainable competitiveness of cities worldwide, 2011





Figure 3 Number of cities among the Top 200 by continent



1.3 Sustainable competitiveness of cities worldwide is rising and gaps between cities are narrowing

Table 2 shows statistics of sustainable competitiveness, high-income population increment and high-income population density of cities worldwide for the years 2010 and 2011. It can be seen that the average sustainable competitiveness score of cities worldwide increased by about 6.7%, indicating that world cities, on the whole, have become more competitive for sustainable development. At the same time, the coefficient of variation has declined slightly, indicating a narrow gap between different cities in terms of their sustainable competitiveness. This comes from the 7.3% and 4% decreases respectively in the variation coefficient of high-income population increment and high-income population density of cities worldwide, which indicates narrower gaps for both of the two Tier-2 indicators. From this, we know that more high-income people have gathered in cities of emerging economies, perhaps even more than those who concentrate in cities of developed countries.

Table 2 Statistics of sustainable competitiveness of cities worldwide

Year	Indicator	Sample size	Mean	Standard deviation	Coefficient of Variation
2011	Sustainable competitiveness	1,006	0.352	0.172	0.488
	High-income population increment	1,006	0.264	0.158	0.599
	High-income population density	1,006	0.392	0.180	0.460
2010	Sustainable competitiveness	1,006	0.330	0.169	0.512
	High-income population increment	1,006	0.233	0.150	0.646
	High-income population density	1,006	0.383	0.184	0.479

1.4 Asian, South American and African are moving faster up the rankings than European and North American cities

It can be seen from Table 3 that the sustainable competitiveness of cities in all continents is on the rise, but gaps remain huge. The sustainable competitiveness of cities in North America, Europe and Oceania is significantly higher than that of cities on other continents, but the average growth rates are respectively 7.7%, 7.6% and 6.9% for Asian, South American and African cities, all higher than the 5.6% and 5% for North American and European cities. This, to a certain extent, indicates that the divide between continents has narrowed. Improvement in the sustainable competitiveness of Asian, South American and African cities is attributable to improvement in their high-income population increment and high-income population density. In comparison, the increases in high-income population density in European and American cities are respectively -1.9% and 1.8%, which hampered the improvement of their sustainable competitiveness.

Table 3 Statistics of sustainable competitiveness of cities worldwide by continent

Continent	Year	Sustainable competitiveness		High-income population increment		High-income population density	
		Mean	Standard deviation	Mean	Standard deviation	Mean	Standard deviation
N. America	2011	0.494	0.158	0.408	0.170	0.512	0.158
	2010	0.468	0.160	0.361	0.174	0.513	0.160
Europe	2011	0.483	0.177	0.354	0.138	0.545	0.215
	2010	0.460	0.178	0.316	0.138	0.544	0.219
Asia	2011	0.307	0.144	0.226	0.135	0.345	0.150
	2010	0.285	0.141	0.200	0.128	0.332	0.151
S. America	2011	0.381	0.111	0.294	0.105	0.416	0.123
	2010	0.354	0.111	0.255	0.107	0.408	0.121
Africa	2011	0.216	0.114	0.133	0.090	0.270	0.135
	2010	0.202	0.111	0.113	0.083	0.264	0.136
Oceania	2011	0.626	0.080	0.544	0.134	0.622	0.059
	2010	0.598	0.085	0.494	0.143	0.506	0.161

1.5 Cities in G20 countries are more competitive, show higher growth rates, and have smaller gaps between them

It can be seen from Table 4 that the average sustainable competitiveness score of G20 cities has increased by 6.4%, which is a relatively high growth rate. This shows that G20 cities are generally more competitive for sustainable development. At the same time, the coefficient of variation of G20 cities decreased, indicating that the gap between cities was narrowed. The

high-income population increment and high-income population density of G20 cities have been greatly improved, which has enhanced their sustainable competitiveness. The variation coefficient of high-income population increment and high-income population density of G20 cities has declined, which also shows that the gap between G20 cities has declined.

Table 4 Statistics of sustainable competitiveness of G20 cities

Year	Indicator	Mean	Standard deviation	Coefficient of Variation
2011	Sustainable competitiveness	0.380	0.171	0.449
	High-income population increment	0.291	0.157	0.539
	High-income population density	0.416	0.180	0.432
2010	Sustainable competitiveness	0.357	0.170	0.475
	High-income population increment	0.260	0.152	0.585
	High-income population density	0.408	0.185	0.453

2

The sustainable competitiveness of cities in North America, Europe and Asia is higher, with more of them in leading positions in the world, and gaps between cities vary across continents

2.1 The sustainable competitiveness of cities in North America is polarized, and the U.S. cities are far ahead of others

It can be seen from Table 5 that for 2010 and 2011, nine of the Top 10 cities in North America are in the United States, and only one is in Canada. There is a significant country gap in North America and gaps among cities within the same country have also expanded. While New York, Houston and Cleveland maintain their

previous positions, the other six cities of the United States have all moved down the list. These cities see lower growth in their high-income population increment than cities in emerging economies and this is an important reason for the decline of rankings of North American cities, especially U.S. cities.

Table 5 Top 10 cities of North America

City	Country	Sustainable competitiveness		High-income population increment		High-income population density	
		2011	2010	2011	2010	2011	2010
New York	U.S. A.	2	2	2	2	46	45
Chicago	U.S. A.	9	8	6	6	90	90
San Francisco	U.S. A.	11	10	12	12	42	42
Boston	U.S. A.	16	14	13	13	61	60
Philadelphia	U.S. A.	17	13	11	10	71	66
Toronto	Canada	21	22	22	21	59	57
Los Angeles	U.S. A.	25	21	5	5	217	204
Miami	U.S. A.	26	23	24	22	62	59
Houston	U.S. A.	27	27	8	11	135	134
Cleveland	U.S. A.	29	29	72	76	12	13

2.2 The sustainable competitiveness of European cities remains stable with relatively narrow gaps

Table 6 shows the Top 10 European cities in terms of sustainable competitiveness for the years 2010 and 2011. It can be seen that the sustainable competitiveness of German cities is significantly higher than that of cities in other countries, as two fifths of the Top 10 cities are in Germany while the rest are scattered in five other countries. Such a distribution pattern

indicates gaps within Europe but this gap is narrower than that in North America. At the same time, because of the relatively high rankings of European cities by high-income population increment and high-income population density, the sustainable competitiveness of these cities is also high on the whole.

Table 6 Top 10 cities of Europe

City	Country	Sustainable competitiveness		High-income population increment		High-income population density	
		2011	2010	2011	2010	2011	2010
Paris	France	4	4	4	4	39	37
London	U.K.	6	6	7	7	26	23
Barcelona	Spain	8	9	27	25	9	9
Stuttgart	Germany	10	11	42	39	4	5
Moscow	Russia	13	16	28	26	18	26
Munich	Germany	14	18	66	73	2	2
Frankfurt	Germany	15	15	47	44	7	7
Madrid	Spain	18	17	19	19	43	44
Berlin	Germany	19	20	43	38	15	15
Stockholm	Sweden	23	26	41	41	23	21



2.3 The sustainable competitiveness of Asian cities is relatively high on the whole; that of Japanese cities is particularly high, while Chinese cities are moving up

In Table 7, we can see that the overall sustainable competitiveness of Chinese and Japanese cities is higher than that of cities in other countries, and Japanese cities are even more competitive with half of the Top 10 being Japanese cities. In particular, Tokyo tops the world in terms of sustainable competitiveness, which is great proof that Japanese cities are among the competitive in the world. At the same time, the sustainable competitiveness of Chinese cities have been on the rise. Hong Kong SAR of China ranks the fifth in the world, and Shenzhen ranks 35th for the year 2011. Asian cities generally

have lower high-income population increment and high-income population density than cities in North America and Europe, which is the direct reason why the sustainable competitiveness of Asian cities is lower than that of developed cities in Europe and North America. However, in recent years, the increase of high-income population increment and high-income population density in Asian cities is significantly higher than that the increases of European and American cities on both indicators, so the gap between the Asia and the West in sustainable competitiveness is narrower now.

Table 7 Top 10 cities of Asia

City	Country	Sustainable competitiveness		High-income population increment		High-income population density	
		2011	2010	2011	2010	2011	2010
Tokyo	Japan	1	1	1	1	10	10
Singapore	Singapore	3	3	15	16	1	1
Hong Kong	China	5	5	20	17	3	4
Osaka	Japan	7	7	3	3	83	83
Seoul	Republic of Korea	12	12	9	8	69	67
Taipei	China	20	19	39	34	16	16
Nagoya	Japan	28	34	40	42	31	39
Hiroshima	Japan	32	30	65	55	21	18
Shenzhen	China	35	37	71	70	19	20
Kitakyushu-Fukuoka	Japan	41	35	37	30	85	82

2.4 The sustainable competitiveness of South American cities is relatively low

Table 8 shows the sustainable competitiveness rankings of the Top 10 cities in South America. Only the first two, Buenos Aires and Sao Paulo, are in the Top 100 of the world, while all other cities on the list rank lower. This is attributable to their low rankings by high-income population increment and high-income population density, especially the latter.

At the same time, all of the Top 10 cities, except for Barcelona-La Cruz, Caracas and Valencia, has moved down the global rankings, which to some extent shows that the growth of sustainable competitiveness of South American cities is slow. It can be seen from Table 8 that this is mainly due to the decline of high-income population increment in these cities.

Table 8 Top 10 cities of South America

City	Country	Sustainable competitiveness		High-income population increment		High-income population density	
		2011	2010	2011	2010	2011	2010
Buenos Aires	Argentina	45	44	32	29	92	100
Sao Paulo	Brazil	64	57	34	28	138	146
Santiago	Chile	112	107	60	51	197	200
Rio de Janeiro	Brazil	122	113	73	63	196	187
Bogota	Columbia	136	131	94	83	190	202
Lima	Peru	143	138	99	88	199	206
Barcelona-La Cruz	Venezuela	165	199	185	231	141	173
Montevideo	Uruguay	167	163	209	199	129	131
Caracas	Venezuela	184	202	136	137	228	255
Valencia	Venezuela	191	219	207	243	168	198

2.5 The sustainable competitiveness of African cities is low and has generally declined

Table 9 shows the sustainable competitiveness of Top 10 African cities for the years 2010 and 2011. It can be seen that the sustainable competitiveness of African cities is generally low and lower than that of South American cities. At the same time, Half of the Top 10 cities of Africa have moved down on the global list, which indicates that there are great obstacles to the improvement of the sustainable competitiveness of these cities.

Table 9 Top 10 cities of Africa

City	Country	Sustainable competitiveness		High-income population increment		High-income population density	
		2011	2010	2011	2010	2011	2010
Pretoria	South Africa	142	139	186	183	106	109
Tripoli	Libya	148	128	178	143	118	107
Johannesburg	South Africa	210	209	217	206	203	203
Luanda	Angola	236	262	242	252	236	268
Cape Town	South Africa	253	247	249	232	252	248
Oran	Algeria	267	291	346	410	209	229
Algiers	Algeria	279	283	319	301	257	278
Durban	South Africa	326	314	334	306	318	321
Lagos	Nigeria	344	329	410	364	313	304
Benghazi	Libya	365	350	236	228	496	460

3

U.S. and German cities are clearly in the lead while cities in emerging economies such as China, India, Brazil and Nigeria remain low on the global list

3.1 The sustainable competitiveness of Indian cities is relatively low, and the overall trend is a downward trend

Table 10 shows the changes of sustainable competitiveness rankings of Indian cities between 2010 and 2011. The Top 10 cities are all ranked below 300th in the world, indicating that the sustainable competitiveness of Indian cities is low. Specifically, rankings of these cities by high-income population increment are clearly low in the world, and their rankings by high-income population density are also below 200th. For the year 2011, the sustainable competitiveness of the Top 10 cities in India shows a downward trend, and cities such as Delhi and Mumbai see particularly large drops.

Table 10 Top 10 cities of India

City	Sustainable competitiveness		High-income population increment		High-income population density	
	2011	2010	2011	2010	2011	2010
Delhi	319	292	615	541	181	182
Mumbai	383	347	623	543	271	265
Bangalore	387	363	698	649	251	246
Chennai	480	453	772	728	322	322
Kochi	536	531	829	823	328	343
Pune	546	508	740	705	406	394
Coimbatore	557	540	821	806	350	354
Hyderabad	607	571	756	710	489	481
Kozhikode	638	636	858	847	416	446
Calcutta	644	612	762	709	552	548

3.2 The sustainable competitiveness of Chinese cities gradually improved but remain relatively low; some cities moved up the list, some down

From Table 11, we can see that compared with 2010, the sustainable competitiveness of Chinese cities has increased by a small margin in 2011. Only four mainland cities rank among the Top 100 of the world by global sustainable competitiveness, and Shanghai and Guangzhou both rank lower than the previous year. Meanwhile, the gap in sustainable competitiveness among Chinese cities is wide, with eastern coastal cities significantly more competitive than central and western cities (see Figure 2). In addition, it can be seen that the change of high-income population increment in Chinese cities lags behind that of high-income population density.

Table 11 Top 10 cities of China

City	Sustainable competitiveness		High-income population increment		High-income population density	
	2011	2010	2011	2010	2011	2010
Hong Kong	5	5	20	17	3	4
Taipei	20	19	39	34	16	16
Shenzhen	35	37	71	70	19	20
Shanghai	66	64	67	59	80	89
Beijing	79	82	54	53	108	130
Guangzhou	82	73	77	71	93	97
Macao	119	154	418	573	20	33
Taichung	124	118	119	106	124	124
Qingdao	125	125	103	91	144	163
Kaohsiung	133	123	118	103	150	147

3.3 The sustainable competitiveness of Nigerian cities is low and declining sharply

By observing changes in the sustainable competitiveness of the Top 10 Nigerian cities between 2010 and 2011, we find that the overall sustainable competitiveness of Nigerian cities shows a downward trend, with Abuja as the only exception. The sustainable competitiveness rankings of all the other nine cities has declined significantly. Specifically, the increase of urban high-income population increment and high-income population density are both low and moving further down in Nigerian cities, which is also the direct reason for the decline of their sustainable competitiveness.

Table 12 Top 10 cities of Nigeria

City	Sustainable competitiveness		High-income population increment		High-income population density	
	2011	2010	2011	2010	2011	2010
Lagos	344	329	410	364	313	304
Abuja	451	476	451	566	470	439
Kano	524	499	709	689	410	396
Port Harcourt	537	498	594	549	527	495
Benin City	583	561	778	786	426	398
Ikorodu	604	580	791	798	442	404
Enugu	615	592	802	796	449	419
Aba	619	584	785	769	481	448
Ibadan	637	614	679	666	614	589
Akure	651	631	811	820	486	465



3.4 The sustainable competitiveness of Brazilian cities shows a clear hierarchical structure

Comparing the rankings of Brazilian cities for 2010 and 2011, as is shown in Table 13, we can see that the sustainable competitiveness of Brazilian cities has declined significantly. Among the Top 10, only Sao Paulo is in the global Top 100, at the 64th place, down by seven places. The next two, Rio de Janeiro and Porto Alegre are within the Top 200, and the

other seven cities all rank even lower. This indicates that the sustainable competitiveness of Brazilian cities is low. Specifically, the high-income population density of Brazilian cities is relatively low. Sao Paulo, the highest-ranking Brazilian city on the world list, is at the 138th place, and the high-income population increment has declined.

Table 13 Top 10 cities of Brazil

City	Sustainable competitiveness		High-income population increment		High-income population density	
	2011	2010	2011	2010	2011	2010
Sao Paulo	64	57	34	28	138	146
Rio de Janeiro	122	113	73	63	196	187
Porto Alegre	197	177	225	211	161	158
Brasilia	203	193	124	119	282	272
Greater Vitória	207	198	177	167	233	226
Campinas	246	249	210	213	281	270
Belo Horizonte	287	267	168	149	383	364
Ribeirao Preto	290	298	408	465	210	210
Sao Jose dos Campos	295	296	381	419	240	232
Jundiai	327	332	543	614	216	213

3.5 U.S. cities lead the world in sustainable competitiveness

Table 14 shows the sustainable competitiveness of the Top 10 U.S. cities for the years 2010 and 2011. About one third of the global Top 50 cities are in the U.S., fully showing their clear leading edges. At the same time, the increase of high-income population increment in these cities is

high compared with other cities. This shows that U.S. cities has attracted a large number of high-end talents from around the world. In comparison, although the high-income population density of the United States is high, the leading edge is not that great.

Table 14 Top 10 cities of the United States

City	Sustainable competitiveness		High-income population increment		High-income population density	
	2011	2010	2011	2010	2011	2010
New York	2	2	2	2	46	45
Chicago	9	8	6	6	90	90
San Francisco	11	10	12	12	42	42
Boston	16	14	13	13	61	60
Philadelphia	17	13	11	10	71	66
Los Angeles	25	21	5	5	217	204
Miami	26	23	24	22	62	59
Houston	27	27	8	11	135	134
Cleveland	29	29	72	76	12	13
Baltimore	34	39	58	64	28	27



3.6 The overall sustainable competitiveness of German cities is rising, with a significant advantage in high-income population density

It can be seen from Table 14 and Table 15 that German cities' are less competitive than U.S. cities but more competitive than Chinese, Brazilian and Nigerian cities as well as cities in many other countries. All of the Top 10 German cities but Cologne and Dortmund have maintained or improved their positions in the global rankings by sustainable competitiveness. At the same time, the high-income population density

of German cities has remained in leading positions in the world, which is also an important reason why the sustainable competitiveness of German cities has been high. In contrast, the high-income population increment increased in some German cities but decreased in others, and this is an important factor holding back the sustainable competitiveness of German cities on the whole.

Table 15 Top 10 cities of Germany

City	Sustainable competitiveness		High-income population increment		High-income population density	
	2011	2010	2011	2010	2011	2010
Stuttgart	10	11	42	39	4	5
Munich	14	18	66	73	2	2
Frankfurt	15	15	47	44	7	7
Berlin	19	20	43	38	15	15
Hamburg	31	32	70	69	17	17
Hannover	36	38	127	125	8	8
Cologne	58	56	120	115	25	25
Dortmund	76	74	281	311	11	11
Essen	89	89	328	336	14	14
Dusseldorf	110	112	284	315	33	32

As the economy of cities worldwide recovered slowly in 2011 amid uncertainties, the sustainable competitiveness of cities worldwide has gone up slightly with overall stability. European, North American and Asian cities have been dominating the overall situation. Cities in developed countries in Europe and North America is generally higher, and these cities are more attractive to high-income population from around the world, with sharp increases in both the high-income population increment and the high-income population density of these cities among the highest in the world. The sustainable competitiveness

of cities in emerging economies in Asia and South America has seen sharper increases, but the sustainable competitiveness of these cities remain at a low level. On all continents but Europe, gaps are wide. In addition, the level of sustainable competitiveness of cities in selected countries is also vastly different. In summary, for the year 2011, the sustainable competitiveness of cities worldwide grew slightly, and progress of cities in developed countries slowed down. Cities in emerging economies did not show clear advantages. The gap narrowed somewhat but remained big.

Appendix

Sustainable Competitiveness Rankings of Cities worldwide

City	Country	Score	Ranking	City	Country	Score	Ranking
Tokyo	Japan	1.0000	1	Los Angeles-Long Beach-Santa Ana	U.S.A.	0.7457	25
New York-Newark	U.S.A.	0.9229	2	Miami	U.S.A.	0.7443	26
Singapore	Singapore	0.9228	3	Houston	U.S.A.	0.7397	27
Paris	France	0.8752	4	Nagoya	Japan	0.7396	28
Hong Kong	China	0.8715	5	Cleveland	U.S.A.	0.7331	29
London	U.K.	0.8658	6	Manchester	U.K.	0.7239	30
Osaka	Japan	0.8411	7	Hamburg	Germany	0.7214	31
Barcelona	Spain	0.8214	8	Hiroshima	Japan	0.7174	32
Chicago	U.S.A.	0.8191	9	Milan	Italy	0.7155	33
Stuttgart	Germany	0.8092	10	Baltimore	U.S.A.	0.7147	34
San Francisco-Oakland	U.S.A.	0.8052	11	Shenzhen	China	0.7143	35
Seoul	Republic of Korea	0.7889	12	Hannover	Germany	0.7121	36
Moscow	Russian	0.7876	13	Atlanta	U.S.A.	0.7093	37
Munich	Germany	0.7874	14	Birmingham	U.K.	0.7078	38
Frankfurt am Main	Germany	0.7829	15	Montreal	Canada	0.7040	39
Boston	U.S.A.	0.7826	16	San Jose	U.S.A.	0.7009	40
Philadelphia	U.S.A.	0.7818	17	Kitakyushu-Fukuoka	Japan	0.6983	41
Madrid	Spain	0.7781	18	Vienna	Austria	0.6973	42
Berlin	Germany	0.7647	19	Sydney	Australia	0.6973	43
Taipei	China	0.7644	20	Seattle	U.S.A.	0.6967	44
Toronto	Canada	0.7596	21	Buenos Aires	Argentina	0.6965	45
Melbourne	Australia	0.7484	22	Amsterdam	Netherlands	0.6942	46
Stockholm	Sweden	0.7477	23	Zurich	Switzerland	0.6900	47
Rome	Italy	0.7475	24	Copenhagen	Denmark	0.6862	48

Dallas-Fort Worth	U.S.A.	0.6831	49	Essen	Germany	0.6187	89
Doha	Qatar	0.6804	50	Istanbul	Turkey	0.6170	90
Salt Lake City	U.S.A.	0.6758	51	Austin	U.S.A.	0.6164	91
West Yorkshire	U.K.	0.6746	52	Haifa	Israel	0.6151	92
Denver-Aurora	U.S.A.	0.6745	53	Lille	France	0.6140	93
Detroit	U.S.A.	0.6729	54	Calgary	Canada	0.6115	94
Vancouver	Canada	0.6720	55	Antwerp	Belgium	0.6108	95
Washington, D.C.	U.S.A.	0.6684	56	Naples	Italy	0.6098	96
Raleigh	U.S.A.	0.6682	57	Athens	Greece	0.6095	97
Cologne	Germany	0.6676	58	Busan	Republic of Korea	0.6081	98
Richmond	U.S.A.	0.6665	59	Gwangju	Republic of Korea	0.6045	99
San Diego(US)	U.S.A.	0.6648	60	Louisville	U.S.A.	0.6035	100
Incheon	Republic of Korea	0.6640	61	Las Vegas	U.S.A.	0.6026	101
Bridgeport-Stamford	U.S.A.	0.6621	62	New Haven	U.S.A.	0.6022	102
Tel Aviv-Yafo	Israel	0.6612	63	Jedda	Saudi Arabia	0.6012	103
Sao Paulo	Brazil	0.6610	64	Daegu	Republic of Korea	0.6003	104
Hartford	U.S.A.	0.6600	65	Rotterdam	Netherlands	0.5966	105
Shanghai	China	0.6575	66	San Jose	Costa Rica	0.5957	106
Geneva	Switzerland	0.6552	67	Virginia Beach	U.S.A.	0.5948	107
Valencia	Spain	0.6542	68	Mexico City	Mexico	0.5943	108
Perth	Australia	0.6541	69	Malaga	Spain	0.5921	109
Dubai	United Arab Emirates	0.6539	70	Dusseldorf	Germany	0.5902	110
Milwaukee	U.S.A.	0.6484	71	Lyon	France	0.5879	111
Ulsan	Republic of Korea	0.6480	72	Santiago de Chile	Chile	0.5876	112
Kuala Lumpur	Malaysia	0.6451	73	Worcester	U.S.A.	0.5868	113
Orlando	U.S.A.	0.6437	74	Zaragoza	Spain	0.5800	114
Jerusalem	Israel	0.6422	75	Hamilton	Canada	0.5785	115
Dortmund	Germany	0.6381	76	Saint Petersburg	Russian	0.5780	116
Sapporo	Japan	0.6368	77	Belfast	U.K.	0.5778	117
Brussels	Belgium	0.6360	78	San Juan	Puerto Rico	0.5767	118
Beijing	China	0.6357	79	Macao	China	0.5760	119
Riyadh	Saudi Arabia	0.6348	80	Buffalo	U.S.A.	0.5755	120
Daejeon	Republic of Korea	0.6346	81	Brisbane	Australia	0.5753	121
Guangzhou	China	0.6293	82	Rio de Janeiro	Brazil	0.5744	122
Columbus	U.S.A.	0.6259	83	Dresden	Germany	0.5737	123
Medina	Saudi Arabia	0.6235	84	Taichung	China	0.5735	124
Phoenix-Mesa	U.S.A.	0.6231	85	Qingdao	China	0.5735	125
Helsinki	Finland	0.6223	86	Leipzig	Germany	0.5733	126
Adelaide	Australia	0.6218	87	Tehran	Iran	0.5690	127
Glasgow	U.K.	0.6199	88	Baton Rouge	U.S.A.	0.5686	128

Torino	Italy	0.5643	129	Dongguan	China	0.5297	169
Sharjah	#N/A	0.5637	130	Florence	Italy	0.5289	170
Auckland	New Zealand	0.5636	131	Honolulu	U.S.A.	0.5285	171
Colorado Springs	U.S.A.	0.5634	132	Kansas City	U.S.A.	0.5272	172
Kaohsiung	China	0.5622	133	Budapest	Hungary	0.5270	173
Tampa-St. Petersburg	U.S.A.	0.5618	134	Bologna	Italy	0.5263	174
Nashville-Davidson	U.S.A.	0.5591	135	San Antonio	U.S.A.	0.5252	175
Bogota	Colombia	0.5591	136	Tainan	China	0.5244	176
Suzhou	China	0.5587	137	Indianapolis	U.S.A.	0.5237	177
Liege	Belgium	0.5582	138	Ahvaz	Iran	0.5217	178
Hague, The	Netherlands	0.5552	139	Porto	Portugal	0.5202	179
Minneapolis-Saint Paul	U.S.A.	0.5532	140	Gold Coast	Australia	0.5198	180
Kuwait City	Kuwait	0.5532	141	Ogden	U.S.A.	0.5173	181
Pretoria	South Africa	0.5532	142	Wuhan	China	0.5172	182
Lima	Peru	0.5517	143	Memphis	U.S.A.	0.5166	183
Sendai	Japan	0.5501	144	Caracas	Venezuela	0.5160	184
Mecca	Saudi Arabia	0.5501	145	Niigata	Japan	0.5147	185
Provo-Orem	U.S.A.	0.5496	146	Dalian	China	0.5146	186
Charlotte	U.S.A.	0.5493	147	Hangzhou	China	0.5142	187
Tripoli	Libya	0.5477	148	Changsha	China	0.5137	188
Providence	U.S.A.	0.5476	149	Bristol	U.K.	0.5134	189
Abu Dhabi	#N/A	0.5451	150	Oklahoma City	U.S.A.	0.5129	190
Wuxi	China	0.5445	151	Valencia(Venezuela)	Venezuela	0.5128	191
Lisbon	Portugal	0.5445	152	Dayton	U.S.A.	0.5118	192
Venice	Italy	0.5445	153	Rochester	U.S.A.	0.5109	193
Tianjin	China	0.5440	154	Toulouse	France	0.5104	194
Nanjing	China	0.5424	155	Ningbo	China	0.5094	195
Shizuoka-Hamamatsu M.M.A.	Japan	0.5408	156	Xiamen	China	0.5087	196
Pittsburgh	U.S.A.	0.5399	157	Porto Alegre	Brazil	0.5084	197
Liverpool	U.K.	0.5386	158	Columbia	U.S.A.	0.5081	198
Marseille-Aix-en- Provence	France	0.5380	159	Cincinnati	U.S.A.	0.5061	199
Leicester	U.K.	0.5371	160	Chengdu	China	0.5055	200
Ottawa-Gatineau	Canada	0.5367	161	Catania	Italy	0.5048	201
Verona	Italy	0.5363	162	Rosario	Argentina	0.5037	202
Foshan	China	0.5358	163	Brasilia	Brazil	0.5033	203
New Orleans	U.S.A.	0.5347	164	Zhongshan	China	0.5029	204
Barcelona-Puerto La Cruz	Venezuela	0.5328	165	Hefei	China	0.5028	205
Karaj	Iran	0.5319	166	Charleston-North Charleston	U.S.A.	0.4999	206
Montevideo	Uruguay	0.5304	167	Greater Vitória	Brazil	0.4949	207
Dublin	Ireland	0.5303	168	Kumamoto	Japan	0.4931	208

Riverside-San Bernardino	U.S.A.	0.4919	209	Portland	U.S.A.	0.4618	249
Johannesburg	South Africa	0.4915	210	Zhuhai	China	0.4609	250
Changwon	Republic of Korea	0.4909	211	Poznan	Poland	0.4609	251
Birmingham(US)	U.S.A.	0.4907	212	Winnipeg	Canada	0.4608	252
Yantai	China	0.4906	213	Cape Town	South Africa	0.4604	253
Muscat	Oman	0.4900	214	Zhengzhou	China	0.4597	254
Amman	Jordan	0.4896	215	Havana	Cuba	0.4589	255
Nottingham	U.K.	0.4887	216	Bursa	Turkey	0.4585	256
Sheffield	U.K.	0.4882	217	Nantong	China	0.4580	257
Knoxville	U.S.A.	0.4875	218	Allentown	U.S.A.	0.4576	258
Prague	Czech Republic	0.4866	219	Izmir	Turkey	0.4573	259
Minsk	Belarus	0.4858	220	Tangshan	China	0.4572	260
Oslo	Norway	0.4858	221	Xi'an	China	0.4540	261
Sofia	Bulgaria	0.4853	222	Nanchang	China	0.4537	262
Genoa	Italy	0.4848	223	Thessaloniki	Greece	0.4526	263
Mendoza	Argentina	0.4847	224	Batam	Indonesia	0.4526	264
Akron	U.S.A.	0.4844	225	Grand Rapids	U.S.A.	0.4525	265
Bangkok	Thailand	0.4834	226	Jakarta	Indonesia	0.4521	266
Changzhou	China	0.4811	227	Oran	Algeria	0.4507	267
jinan	China	0.4805	228	Palermo	Italy	0.4501	268
Newcastle upon Tyne	U.K.	0.4779	229	Baku	Azerbaijan	0.4500	269
Shenyang	China	0.4772	230	Zibo	China	0.4497	270
Edmonton	Canada	0.4770	231	Toulon	France	0.4491	271
Quebec	Canada	0.4770	232	Daqing	China	0.4490	272
Bari	Italy	0.4741	233	Medellin	Colombia	0.4477	273
Cape Coral	U.S.A.	0.4739	234	Astana	Kazakhstan	0.4470	274
Leon	Mexico	0.4729	235	Santo Domingo	#N/A	0.4462	275
Luanda	Angola	0.4708	236	Bucuresti	Romania	0.4429	276
Ankara	Turkey	0.4708	237	Guadalajara	Mexico	0.4429	277
Bordeaux	France	0.4703	238	Johor Bahru	Malaysia	0.4417	278
Maracay	Venezuela	0.4686	239	Algiers	Algeria	0.4408	279
Nantes	France	0.4674	240	Yangzhou	China	0.4404	280
Xuzhou	China	0.4671	241	Quanzhou	China	0.4404	281
Monterrey	Mexico	0.4665	242	Hsinchu	China	0.4403	282
Cordoba	Argentina	0.4660	243	Taizhou(js)	China	0.4397	283
Maracaibo	Venezuela	0.4653	244	Padova	Italy	0.4396	284
Changchun	China	0.4646	245	Gothenburg	Sweden	0.4378	285
Campinas	Brazil	0.4633	246	Shaoxing	China	0.4375	286
Seville	Spain	0.4633	247	Belo Horizonte	Brazil	0.4374	287
Zhenjiang	China	0.4626	248	Fuzhou(FJ)	China	0.4373	288

Nice	France	0.4355	289	Taiyuan	China	0.4098	329
Ribeirao Preto	Brazil	0.4333	290	Kiev	Ukraine	0.4088	330
El Paso	U.S.A.	0.4327	291	Be'er Sheva	Israel	0.4074	331
Chongqing	China	0.4316	292	Recife	Brazil	0.4052	332
Tijuana	Mexico	0.4307	293	Buraydah	Saudi Arabia	0.4048	333
Bakersfield	U.S.A.	0.4307	294	Mar Del Plata	Argentina	0.4036	334
Sao Jose dos Campos	Brazil	0.4303	295	Rizhao	China	0.4030	335
Dammam	Saudi Arabia	0.4298	296	Handan	China	0.4024	336
Baoding	China	0.4294	297	San Luis Potosi	Mexico	0.4010	337
Shijiazhuang	China	0.4282	298	Xiangtan	China	0.4007	338
Tucson	U.S.A.	0.4279	299	Baghdad	Iraq	0.4005	339
Ipoh	Malaysia	0.4279	300	Tulsa	U.S.A.	0.3996	340
Gebze	Turkey	0.4270	301	Bremen	Germany	0.3990	341
Dongying	China	0.4267	302	Wuhu	China	0.3979	342
Sacramento	U.S.A.	0.4267	303	Weifang	China	0.3953	343
Warsaw	Poland	0.4264	304	Lagos	Nigeria	0.3924	344
Panama City	Panama	0.4252	305	Santa Cruz	Bolivia	0.3917	345
Santa Fe	Argentina	0.4241	306	Merida	Mexico	0.3916	346
Krakow	Poland	0.4240	307	Jilin	China	0.3916	347
Asuncion	Paraguay	0.4237	308	Nanning	China	0.3913	348
Quito	Ecuador	0.4214	309	Manaus	Brazil	0.3907	349
Omaha	U.S.A.	0.4202	310	Belgrade	Serbia	0.3907	350
Santiago de Los Caballeros	#N/A	0.4201	311	Shiraz	Iran	0.3897	351
Tyumen	Russian	0.4200	312	Fresno	U.S.A.	0.3894	352
Adana	Turkey	0.4186	313	Zhuzhou	China	0.3894	353
Ufa	Russian	0.4184	314	Kunming	China	0.3885	354
Jiaxing	China	0.4175	315	Sarasota-Bradenton	U.S.A.	0.3881	355
Weihai	China	0.4175	316	Zhoushan	China	0.3873	356
Samut Prakan	Thailand	0.4173	317	Huizhou	China	0.3853	357
Jining	China	0.4167	318	Torreon	Mexico	0.3849	358
Delhi	India	0.4166	319	Sorocaba	Brazil	0.3849	359
Zagreb	Croatia	0.4144	320	Albuquerque	U.S.A.	0.3849	360
Lodz	Poland	0.4137	321	Xuchang	China	0.3844	361
Anshan	China	0.4133	322	Villahermosa	Mexico	0.3844	362
Harbin	China	0.4130	323	Yancheng	China	0.3841	363
Taizhou(zj)	China	0.4118	324	Perm	Russian	0.3839	364
Surabaya	Indonesia	0.4118	325	Benghazi	Libya	0.3834	365
Durban	South Africa	0.4117	326	Lianyungang	China	0.3816	366
Jundiai	Brazil	0.4115	327	Cartagena	Colombia	0.3808	367
Curitiba	Brazil	0.4100	328	Zhangzhou	China	0.3805	368

Pingdingshan	China	0.3801	369	Zhaoqing	China	0.3597	409
Fortaleza	Brazil	0.3795	370	Cali	Colombia	0.3594	410
Wenzhou	China	0.3791	371	Goiania	Brazil	0.3590	411
Huangshi	China	0.3787	372	Shiyan	China	0.3589	412
Qinhuangdao	China	0.3787	373	Toluca	Mexico	0.3572	413
Ma'anshan	China	0.3784	374	Albany	U.S.A.	0.3571	414
Kazan	Russian	0.3780	375	Jieyang	China	0.3569	415
McAllen	U.S.A.	0.3771	376	Matamoros	Mexico	0.3566	416
Hohhot	China	0.3770	377	Taian	China	0.3562	417
Jiangmen	China	0.3763	378	Almaty	Kazakhstan	0.3560	418
Luoyang	China	0.3761	379	Riga	Latvia	0.3554	419
Guatemala City	Guatemala	0.3755	380	Mashhad	Iran	0.3544	420
Yichang	China	0.3750	381	Guiyang	China	0.3538	421
Salvador	Brazil	0.3747	382	Binzhou	China	0.3532	422
Mumbai	India	0.3744	383	Baotou	China	0.3529	423
Panjin	China	0.3738	384	Ashgabat	Turkmenistan	0.3528	424
Pekanbaru	Indonesia	0.3721	385	Bengbu	China	0.3524	425
Dezhou	China	0.3700	386	Haikou	China	0.3523	426
Bangalore	India	0.3688	387	Arequipa	Peru	0.3523	427
Anyang	China	0.3675	388	Tabriz	Iran	0.3521	428
Puebla	Mexico	0.3669	389	Manila	Philippines	0.3513	429
Belem	Brazil	0.3669	390	Huaian	China	0.3511	430
Saratov	Russian	0.3659	391	San Miguel de Tucuman	Argentina	0.3507	431
Antalya	Turkey	0.3659	392	Nanyang	China	0.3500	432
Liuzhou	China	0.3658	393	Yaroslavl	Russian	0.3497	433
Jinzhou	China	0.3656	394	Kuching	Malaysia	0.3479	434
Puyang	China	0.3655	395	Shantou	China	0.3474	435
Samara	Russian	0.3654	396	Yuxi	China	0.3472	436
Samarinda	Indonesia	0.3650	397	Putian	China	0.3470	437
Juarez	Mexico	0.3639	398	Queretaro	Mexico	0.3467	438
San Salvador	El Salvador	0.3633	399	Jiaozuo	China	0.3456	439
Guayaquil	Ecuador	0.3627	400	Aguascalientes	Mexico	0.3436	440
Maoming	China	0.3624	401	Urumqi	China	0.3434	441
Jinhua	China	0.3624	402	Xinyu	China	0.3433	442
Huzhou	China	0.3622	403	Liaoyang	China	0.3430	443
Xiangyang	China	0.3614	404	Londrina	Brazil	0.3427	444
Zaozhuang	China	0.3612	405	Songyuan	China	0.3422	445
Deyang	China	0.3611	406	Erbil	Iraq	0.3413	446
Lanzhou	China	0.3609	407	Culiacan	Mexico	0.3402	447
Joinville	Brazil	0.3608	408	Maturín	Venezuela	0.3398	448

Tieling	China	0.3396	449	Baoji	China	0.3219	489
Uberlandia	Brazil	0.3392	450	Yingkou	China	0.3215	490
Abuja	Nigeria	0.3388	451	Jingmen	China	0.3212	491
Bandung	Indonesia	0.3387	452	Cairo	Egypt	0.3202	492
Port Elizabeth	South Africa	0.3385	453	Novosibirsk	Russian	0.3199	493
Cochabamba	Bolivia	0.3384	454	Luohe	China	0.3194	494
Jingdezhen	China	0.3383	455	Palembang	Indonesia	0.3180	495
Langfang	China	0.3380	456	Sanming	China	0.3170	496
Nairobi	Kenya	0.3375	457	Beihai	China	0.3167	497
Mianyang	China	0.3363	458	La Plata	Argentina	0.3157	498
Zigong	China	0.3362	459	Tunis	Tunisia	0.3150	499
Trujillo	Peru	0.3356	460	Malang	Indonesia	0.3147	500
Ezhou	China	0.3355	461	Ziyang	China	0.3146	501
Longyan	China	0.3341	462	Beirut	Lebanon	0.3145	502
Barnaul	Russian	0.3329	463	Barranquilla	Colombia	0.3141	503
Hengshui	China	0.3319	464	Yinchuan	China	0.3136	504
Valparaiso	Chile	0.3298	465	Luzhou	China	0.3124	505
Fushun	China	0.3297	466	Shuozhou	China	0.3108	506
Liaocheng	China	0.3289	467	Dhaka	Bangladesh	0.3099	507
Pereira	Colombia	0.3286	468	Hufuf-Mubarraz	Saudi Arabia	0.3096	508
Chenzhou	China	0.3271	469	Qingyuan	China	0.3095	509
Guilin	China	0.3270	470	Gaziantep	Turkey	0.3093	510
Kaifeng	China	0.3268	471	Hebi	China	0.3090	511
Saltillo	Mexico	0.3264	472	Zhoukou	China	0.3088	512
Ganzhou	China	0.3264	473	Wuhai	China	0.3087	513
Yibin	China	0.3257	474	Ryazan	Russian	0.3085	514
Huambo	Angola	0.3254	475	Tolyatti	Russian	0.3083	515
Xingtai	China	0.3252	476	Damascus	Syrian	0.3080	516
Tomsk	Russian	0.3251	477	Joao Pessoa	Brazil	0.3080	517
Huaipei	China	0.3250	478	Yueyang	China	0.3079	518
Samsun	Turkey	0.3246	479	Tegucigalpa	Honduras	0.3075	519
Chennai	India	0.3245	480	Ta'if	Saudi Arabia	0.3074	520
Pingxiang	China	0.3245	481	Siping	China	0.3072	521
Cangzhou	China	0.3238	482	Quzhou	China	0.3072	522
Juiz De Fora	Brazil	0.3236	483	Teresina	Brazil	0.3065	523
Suqian	China	0.3234	484	Kano	Nigeria	0.3060	524
Grande Sao Luis	Brazil	0.3230	485	Shangrao	China	0.3057	525
Wroclaw	Poland	0.3227	486	Linyi	China	0.3056	526
Jingzhou	China	0.3226	487	Hermosillo	Mexico	0.3052	527
Xining	China	0.3220	488	Alexandria	Egypt	0.3048	528

Balikpapan	Indonesia	0.3044	529	Ordoss	China	0.2909	569
Tongling	China	0.3044	530	Yiyang	China	0.2903	570
Heze	China	0.3043	531	Barquisimeto	Venezuela	0.2903	571
Dazhou	China	0.3042	532	Medan	Indonesia	0.2903	572
Campo Grande	Brazil	0.3040	533	Chaozhou	China	0.2892	573
Zhumadian	China	0.3040	534	Xianning	China	0.2892	574
Feira De Santana	Brazil	0.3040	535	Qinzhou	China	0.2889	575
Kochi	India	0.3026	536	Lishui	China	0.2886	576
Port Harcourt	Nigeria	0.3023	537	Huainan	China	0.2886	577
Xinxiang	China	0.3019	538	Jincheng	China	0.2882	578
Datong	China	0.3018	539	Changde	China	0.2878	579
Kingston	Jamaica	0.3004	540	Pachuca de Soto	Mexico	0.2876	580
Irkutsk	Russian	0.3004	541	Weinan	China	0.2873	581
Yingtian	China	0.3001	542	Chihuahua	Mexico	0.2871	582
Astrakhan ¹	Russian	0.3001	543	Benin City	Nigeria	0.2871	583
Liaoyuan	China	0.3000	544	Makassar	Indonesia	0.2863	584
Yangjiang	China	0.2998	545	Orenburg	Russian	0.2862	585
Pune	India	0.2995	546	Krasnodar	Russian	0.2856	586
Reynosa	Mexico	0.2992	547	Bogor	Indonesia	0.2856	587
Kemerovo	Russian	0.2983	548	Marrakech	Morocco	0.2852	588
Benxi	China	0.2977	549	Huludao	China	0.2850	589
Xinyang	China	0.2975	550	Semarang	Indonesia	0.2848	590
Wuzhou	China	0.2972	551	Nanping	China	0.2846	591
Changzhi	China	0.2969	552	Sanya	China	0.2845	592
Tbilisi	Georgia	0.2969	553	Accra	Ghana	0.2844	593
Panzhuhua	China	0.2961	554	Sanmenxia	China	0.2834	594
Zhanjiang	China	0.2959	555	Mersin	Turkey	0.2834	595
Tonghua	China	0.2956	556	Hengyang	China	0.2828	596
Coimbatore	India	0.2954	557	Hamadan	Iran	0.2824	597
Yangquan	China	0.2953	558	Xianyang	China	0.2818	598
Yulin(gx)	China	0.2953	559	Zhangjiakou	China	0.2817	599
La Paz	Bolivia	0.2942	560	Huaihua	China	0.2817	600
Meishan	China	0.2933	561	Tongliao	China	0.2815	601
Padang	Indonesia	0.2928	562	Yulin(sx)	China	0.2814	602
Casablanca	Morocco	0.2928	563	Mexicali	Mexico	0.2792	603
Cancun	Mexico	0.2925	564	Ikorodu	Nigeria	0.2788	604
Leshan	China	0.2924	565	Yunfu	China	0.2780	605
Ningde	China	0.2915	566	Esfahan	Iran	0.2776	606
Liupanshui	China	0.2912	567	Hyderabad	India	0.2776	607
Cuiaba	Brazil	0.2911	568	Shaoguan	China	0.2776	608

Krivoi Rog	Ukraine	0.2774	609	Maceio	Brazil	0.2619	649
Orumiyeh	Iran	0.2769	610	Fangchenggang	China	0.2619	650
Vereeniging	South Africa	0.2766	611	Akure	Nigeria	0.2618	651
Nanchong	China	0.2765	612	Yuncheng	China	0.2613	652
Cuernavaca	Mexico	0.2761	613	Shizuishan	China	0.2611	653
Rostov-on-Don	Russian	0.2751	614	Kannur	India	0.2610	654
Enugu	Nigeria	0.2749	615	Jiujiang	China	0.2603	655
Chaoyang	China	0.2745	616	Veracruz	Mexico	0.2596	656
Kayseri	Turkey	0.2733	617	Rajshahi	Bangladesh	0.2587	657
Misratah	Libya	0.2725	618	Qingyang	China	0.2584	658
Aba	Nigeria	0.2718	619	Luliang	China	0.2578	659
Chifeng	China	0.2718	620	Phnom Penh	Cambodia	0.2576	660
Ibague	Colombia	0.2715	621	Jos	Nigeria	0.2575	661
Guangan	China	0.2713	622	Rasht	Iran	0.2573	662
San Pedro Sula	Honduras	0.2700	623	Warri	Nigeria	0.2571	663
Shangqiu	China	0.2697	624	Neijiang	China	0.2571	664
Chengde	China	0.2697	625	Celaya	Mexico	0.2560	665
Kampala	Uganda	0.2693	626	Managua	Nicaragua	0.2555	666
Omsk	Russian	0.2681	627	Bhiwandi	India	0.2553	667
Novokuznetsk	Russian	0.2680	628	Suining	China	0.2552	668
Chelyabinsk	Russian	0.2675	629	Dehra Dun	India	0.2544	669
Port-au-Prince	Haiti	0.2671	630	Anqing	China	0.2543	670
Natal	Brazil	0.2671	631	Concepcion	Chile	0.2538	671
Fuxin	China	0.2670	632	Dandong	China	0.2530	672
Acapulco	Mexico	0.2665	633	Jiamusi	China	0.2528	673
Lahore	Pakistan	0.2663	634	Cebu	Philippines	0.2524	674
Chittagong	Bangladesh	0.2662	635	Nizhny Novgorod	Russian	0.2514	675
Voronezh	Russian	0.2661	636	Fuyang	China	0.2510	676
Ibadan	Nigeria	0.2659	637	Sulaymaniyah	Iraq	0.2503	677
Kozhikode	India	0.2658	638	Colombo	Sri Lanka	0.2502	678
Morelia	Mexico	0.2654	639	Khabarovsk	Russian	0.2499	679
Xiaogan	China	0.2654	640	Chiclayo	Peru	0.2496	680
Eskisehir	Turkey	0.2654	641	Bucaramanga	Colombia	0.2495	681
Gaza	State of Palestine	0.2651	642	Karachi	Pakistan	0.2493	682
Huangshan	China	0.2641	643	Aracaju	Brazil	0.2492	683
Kolkata	India	0.2637	644	Yekaterinburg	Russian	0.2490	684
Jinzhong	China	0.2635	645	Karamay	China	0.2477	685
Tampico	Mexico	0.2625	646	Hanzhong	China	0.2475	686
Linfen	China	0.2621	647	Ji'an	China	0.2475	687
Libreville	Gabon	0.2620	648	Ulan Bator	Mongolia	0.2458	688

Malappuram	India	0.2456	689
Loudi	China	0.2455	690
Hamah	Syrian	0.2446	691
Shymkent	Kazakhstan	0.2440	692
Khartoum	Sudan	0.2436	693
Poza Rica	Mexico	0.2432	694
Laibin	China	0.2428	695
Meknes	Morocco	0.2426	696
Izhevsk	Russian	0.2425	697
Guwahati	India	0.2417	698
Qom	Iran	0.2413	699
Harare	Zimbabwe	0.2412	700
Chongzuo	China	0.2403	701
Tasikmalaya	Indonesia	0.2403	702
Durg-Bhilai Nagar	India	0.2396	703
Yan'an	China	0.2394	704
Ilorin	Nigeria	0.2392	705
Denizli	Turkey	0.2392	706
Puducherry	India	0.2390	707
Kollam	India	0.2388	708
Ahmedabad	India	0.2387	709
Chisinau	Republic of Moldova	0.2387	710
Cucuta	Colombia	0.2382	711
Kerman	Iran	0.2377	712
Shanwei	China	0.2375	713
Fuzhou(JX)	China	0.2374	714
Port Said	Egypt	0.2373	715
Chizhou	China	0.2364	716
Aleppo	Syrian	0.2361	717
Davao	Philippines	0.2359	718
Guigang	China	0.2353	719
Kota	India	0.2348	720
Baishan	China	0.2347	721
Latakia	Syrian	0.2343	722
Krasnoyarsk	Russian	0.2335	723
Rabat	Morocco	0.2334	724
Jinchang	China	0.2330	725
Florianopolis	Brazil	0.2326	726
Yichun(jx)	China	0.2323	727
Can Tho	Viet Nam	0.2322	728

Thiruvananthapuram	India	0.2322	729
Douala	Cameroon	0.2322	730
Qujing	China	0.2320	731
Mangalore	India	0.2318	732
Safaqis	Tunisia	0.2317	733
Qitaihe	China	0.2312	734
Tuxtla Gutierrez	Mexico	0.2303	735
Chuzhou	China	0.2296	736
Diyarbakir	Turkey	0.2296	737
Guangyuan	China	0.2295	738
Abidjan	Cote d'Ivoire	0.2292	739
Xuancheng	China	0.2287	740
Haiphong	Viet Nam	0.2284	741
Mudanjiang	China	0.2283	742
Owerri	Nigeria	0.2279	743
Ya'an	China	0.2269	744
Basra	Iraq	0.2269	745
Sanliurfa	Turkey	0.2264	746
Bozhou	China	0.2263	747
Ulanqab	China	0.2260	748
Hulunbuir	China	0.2254	749
Oaxaca	Mexico	0.2253	750
Shuangyashan	China	0.2249	751
Oshogbo	Nigeria	0.2242	752
Tangier	Morocco	0.2231	753
Jiayuguan	China	0.2229	754
Ludhiana	India	0.2227	755
Baicheng	China	0.2221	756
Onitsha	Nigeria	0.2220	757
Salem	India	0.2220	758
Volgograd	Russian	0.2220	759
Zaria	Nigeria	0.2218	760
Kermanshah	Iran	0.2203	761
Ciudad Guayana	Venezuela	0.2200	762
Bahawalpur	Pakistan	0.2193	763
Kirkuk	Iraq	0.2183	764
Hyderabad	Pakistan	0.2180	765
Da Nang	Viet Nam	0.2177	766
Vladivostok	Russian	0.2171	767
Al-Raqqqa	Syrian	0.2170	768

Hanoi	Viet Nam	0.2167	769
Xalapa	Mexico	0.2165	770
Yongzhou	China	0.2163	771
Santa Marta	Colombia	0.2162	772
Zunyi	China	0.2159	773
Fes	Morocco	0.2159	774
Cagayan de Oro	Philippines	0.2159	775
Donetsk	Ukraine	0.2158	776
Brazzaville	Congo	0.2156	777
Mosul	Iraq	0.2154	778
Kitwe	Zambia	0.2147	779
Hezhou	China	0.2142	780
Qiqihar	China	0.2137	781
Heyuan	China	0.2135	782
Ho Chi Minh City	Viet Nam	0.2131	783
Nagpur	India	0.2131	784
Tabuk	Saudi Arabia	0.2127	785
Xinzhou	China	0.2116	786
Mombasa	Kenya	0.2115	787
Asmara	Eritrea	0.2115	788
Huanggang	China	0.2113	789
Suihua	China	0.2112	790
Uyo	Nigeria	0.2112	791
Denpasar	Indonesia	0.2103	792
Meizhou	China	0.2102	793
Makhachkala	Russian	0.2096	794
Suzhou (AH)	China	0.2087	795
Pointe-Noire	Congo	0.2085	796
Bhubaneswar	India	0.2080	797
Karbala	Iraq	0.2078	798
Kharkov	Ukraine	0.2074	799
Dakar	Senegal	0.2068	800
General Santos City	Philippines	0.2065	801
Suizhou	China	0.2062	802
Anshun	China	0.2044	803
Visakhapatnam	India	0.2041	804
Sialkot	Pakistan	0.2040	805
Nouakchott	Mauritania	0.2037	806
Faisalabad	Pakistan	0.2035	807
Islamabad	Pakistan	0.2034	808

Lusaka	Zambia	0.2030	809
Jodhpur	India	0.2025	810
Pingliang	China	0.2024	811
Surat	India	0.2018	812
Liuan	China	0.2017	813
Jixi	China	0.2017	814
Jalandhar	India	0.2015	815
Hegang	China	0.2011	816
Thrissur	India	0.2004	817
Konya	Turkey	0.1995	818
Amritsar	India	0.1994	819
Bayannur	China	0.1984	820
Ardabil	Iran	0.1982	821
Yerevan	Armenia	0.1976	822
Tongchuan	China	0.1974	823
Khulna	Bangladesh	0.1961	824
Lome	Togo	0.1960	825
Asansol	India	0.1952	826
Baoshan	China	0.1940	827
Bandar Lampung	Indonesia	0.1934	828
Patna	India	0.1920	829
Zahedan	Iran	0.1917	830
Aurangabad	India	0.1916	831
Kinshasa	Congo	0.1913	832
Baise	China	0.1905	833
Ulyanovsk	Russian	0.1904	834
Kumasi	Ghana	0.1903	835
Shangluo	China	0.1901	836
Ankang	China	0.1897	837
Kolhapur	India	0.1896	838
Mysore	India	0.1894	839
Tirupati	India	0.1894	840
Nasiriyah	Iraq	0.1892	841
Tlaxcala	Mexico	0.1878	842
Kathmandu	Nepal	0.1877	843
Zhongwei	China	0.1875	844
Tashkent	Uzbekistan	0.1859	845
Shaoyang	China	0.1857	846
Tiruchirappalli	India	0.1853	847
Dar es Salaam	Tanzania	0.1851	848

Jaipur	India	0.1846	849	Zamboanga	Philippines	0.1663	889
Yazd	Iran	0.1839	850	Srinagar	India	0.1656	890
Pontianak	Indonesia	0.1832	851	Jamnagar	India	0.1651	891
WuZhong	China	0.1830	852	Nashik	India	0.1646	892
Rawalpindi	Pakistan	0.1829	853	Rajkot	India	0.1644	893
Lucknow	India	0.1823	854	Gujranwala	Pakistan	0.1639	894
Erode	India	0.1816	855	Hechi	China	0.1638	895
Vellore	India	0.1812	856	Guyuan	China	0.1632	896
Dnipropetrovs'k	Ukraine	0.1811	857	Guntur	India	0.1628	897
Tiruppur	India	0.1810	858	Raurkela	India	0.1627	898
Bazhong	China	0.1808	859	Suez	Egypt	0.1626	899
Heihe	China	0.1802	860	Tianshui	China	0.1620	900
Villavicencio	Colombia	0.1798	861	Bokaro Steel City	India	0.1618	901
Kaduna	Nigeria	0.1788	862	Gwalior	India	0.1595	902
homs	Syrian	0.1786	863	Vijayawada	India	0.1594	903
Agadir	Morocco	0.1786	864	Peshawar	Pakistan	0.1584	904
Zaporizhzhya	Ukraine	0.1782	865	Namangan	Uzbekistan	0.1584	905
Baiyin	China	0.1777	866	Kabul	Afghanistan	0.1572	906
Jamshedpur	India	0.1776	867	Sangali	India	0.1569	907
Sokoto	Nigeria	0.1763	868	Dingxi	China	0.1565	908
Madurai	India	0.1757	869	Vadodara	India	0.1564	909
Jammu	India	0.1755	870	Aligarh	India	0.1562	910
Lvov	Ukraine	0.1752	871	Saharanpur	India	0.1559	911
Meerut	India	0.1749	872	Salta	Argentina	0.1556	912
Banjarmasin	Indonesia	0.1738	873	Hubli-Dharwad	India	0.1550	913
Sylhet	Bangladesh	0.1736	874	Yichun(hlj)	China	0.1536	914
Jambi	Indonesia	0.1735	875	Zhaotong	China	0.1523	915
Varanasi	India	0.1734	876	Allahabad	India	0.1523	916
Bacolod	Philippines	0.1725	877	Kanpur	India	0.1521	917
Wuwei	China	0.1724	878	Indore	India	0.1520	918
Kurnool	India	0.1724	879	Chandigarh	India	0.1502	919
Lincang	China	0.1697	880	Muzaffarnagar	India	0.1501	920
Odessa	Ukraine	0.1691	881	Longnan	China	0.1490	921
Zhangye	China	0.1686	882	Cotonou	Benin	0.1488	922
Cuttack	India	0.1679	883	Bhopal	India	0.1486	923
Cherthala	India	0.1674	884	Freetown	Sierra Leone	0.1485	924
Durango	Mexico	0.1671	885	Yaounde	Cameroon	0.1478	925
Siliguri	India	0.1671	886	Dhanbad	India	0.1472	926
Sukkur	Pakistan	0.1669	887	Multan	Pakistan	0.1460	927
Ranchi	India	0.1668	888	Lubumbas-hi	Congo	0.1453	928

Bareilly	India	0.1435	929	Nellore	India	0.1194	968
Najaf	Iraq	0.1435	930	Warangal	India	0.1176	969
Zhangjiajie	China	0.1431	931	Aden	Yemen	0.1172	970
Kigali	Rwanda	0.1428	932	Nay Pyi Taw	Myanmar	0.1170	971
Agra	India	0.1418	933	Firozabad	India	0.1169	972
Zanzibar	Tanzania	0.1412	934	Mwanza	Tanzania	0.1157	973
Bulawayo	Zimbabwe	0.1406	935	Gorakhpur	India	0.1153	974
Bogra	Bangladesh	0.1401	936	Quetta	Pakistan	0.1150	975
Rangoon	Myanmar	0.1398	937	Malegaon	India	0.1138	976
Sekondi	Ghana	0.1397	938	Bishkek	Kyrgyzstan	0.1132	977
Lijiang	China	0.1392	939	Bamako	Mali	0.1130	978
Amravati	India	0.1376	940	Blantyre-Limbe	Malawi	0.1118	979
Belgaum	India	0.1374	941	Abomey-Calavi	Benin	0.1114	980
Solapur	India	0.1366	942	Djibouti	Djibouti	0.1106	981
Vientiane	Lao	0.1365	943	Bikaner	India	0.1019	982
Jiuquan	China	0.1364	944	Ouagadougou	Burkina Faso	0.1012	983
Moradabad	India	0.1359	945	Raipur	India	0.0937	984
Bien Hoa	Viet Nam	0.1339	946	Bouake	Cote d'Ivoire	0.0923	985
Imphal	India	0.1330	947	Antananarivo	Madagascar	0.0873	986
Pu'er	China	0.1329	948	Bujumbura	Burundi	0.0862	987
Monrovia	Liberia	0.1325	949	Lilongwe	Malawi	0.0846	988
Ajmer	India	0.1324	950	Conakry	Guinea	0.0836	989
Gulbarga	India	0.1322	951	Matola	Mozambique	0.0834	990
Sana'a'	Yemen	0.1317	952	Maputo	Mozambique	0.0823	991
Durgapur	India	0.1315	953	Mogadishu	Somalia	0.0819	992
Maiduguri	Nigeria	0.1305	954	Tshikapa	Congo	0.0785	993
Bhavnagar	India	0.1305	955	Mandalay	Myanmar	0.0785	994
Jabalpur	India	0.1304	956	Bobo Dioulasso	Burkina Faso	0.0755	995
Niamey	Niger	0.1290	957	Hargeysa	Somalia	0.0755	996
Nyala	Sudan	0.1268	958	Mbuji-Mayi	Congo	0.0682	997
Kayamku-lam	India	0.1255	959	Hodeidah	Yemen	0.0633	998
Addis Ababa	Ethiopia	0.1237	960	Dushanbe	Tajikistan	0.0633	999
Tirunelveli	India	0.1233	961	Kananga	Congo	0.0579	1000
Nanded Waghala	India	0.1225	962	Bukavu	Congo	0.0564	1001
Mathura	India	0.1219	963	Nampula	Mozambique	0.0491	1002
Sargodha	Pakistan	0.1211	964	Bangui	Central African	0.0424	1003
Nnewi	Nigeria	0.1211	965	Taiz	Yemen	0.0296	1004
Ujjain	India	0.1210	966	N'Djamena	Chad	0.0204	1005
Jhansi	India	0.1207	967	Kisangani	Congo	0.0000	1006

Member of the Task Force

Consultants

Wang Weiguang (Former President of Chinese Academy of Social Sciences)

Maimunah Mohd Sharif (Under Secretary-General of the UN and Executive Director of UN-HABITAT)

Gao Peiyong (Vice President of Chinese Academy of Social Sciences)

He Dexu (Director of National Academy of Economic Strategy, CASS)

Yang Rong (Interregional Adviser of UN-Habitat)

Fan Gang (Vice President of China Society of Economic Reform)

Saskia Sassen (Professor of Columbia University, USA)

Peter Taylor (Director of Globalization and World Cities Research Network)

Main Authors

Ni Pengfei, Marco Kamiya, Guo Jing, Xu Haidong, Li Bo, Ma Hongfu, Cao Qingfeng, Guo Jinhong, Peng Xuhui, Shen Li, Liu Xiaonan, Zhang Yi, Wang Yufei, Zhang Yangzi, Gong Weijin, Huang Xuliang.

Statistical Data and Big Data Group

Guo Jinhong, Li Jianquan, Chen Shuai, Wang Xiaodong, Liu Xiaokang, Xing Wentao, Bin Youcai, Hu Min, Hu Xufeng, Luo Zikang, Liu Xingchen, Chen Jie, Liu Jing, Chen Jie, Zhou Kuan, Ouyang Sijian, Chen Haichao, Qin Yige, Tang Keyu.

Report Coordinators

Huang Jin, Guo Jinhong, Guo Jing, Zhang Yi, Huang Xuliang


Contact information

National Academy of Economic Strategy, CASS

R503, No.1 Dongchang Hutong, Dongcheng District, Beijing, China.

T: +86-10-65268963

E: csjzl2009@163.com



UN-HABITAT



@un-habitat

United Nations Human Settlements Programme

P.O.Box 30030, Nairobi 00100, Kenya

T: +254-20-76263120

E: Infohabitat@unhabitat.org