



Remittance Prices Worldwide

Issue n. 19, September 2016

This Report reflects the latest trends observed in the data published in September 2016. Remittance Prices Worldwide is available at <u>http://remittanceprices.worldbank.org</u>

Overview

Remittance Prices Worldwide (RPW) monitors remittance prices across all geographic regions of the world. Launched in September 2008, RPW remains a key tool to monitor the cost incurred by remitters when sending money along major remittance corridors. RPW is used as a reference for measuring progress towards global cost reduction objectives, including the G20 commitment to reduce the global average to 5 percent, which is being pursued in partnership with governments, service providers, and other stakeholders.

As of Q2 2016, *RPW covers 48 remittance sending countries and 105 receiving countries, for a total of 365* (up from 227 in Q4 2015) country corridors worldwide. This Report uses data from RPW's most recent release to analyze the global, regional, and country specific trends in the average cost of migrant remittances.

Key Findings

- The Global Average decreased to reach 7.42 percent in Q3 2016 from 7.60 percent in Q2 2016.
- The International MTO Index decreased modestly to 8.05 percent in Q3 2016.
- The Global Weighted Average decreased to 5.73 percent.
- The Global SmaRT Average for Q3 2016 was recorded at 5.36 percent, down from the Q2 2016 value, which was adjusted to 5.40 percent.
- In Q2 2016 the RPW sample was increased to reach 365 corridors. Increasing the sample had no significant impact on global trends. In Q3 2016, the previously monitored 227 corridors registered a Global Average of 7.43 percent and Global Weighted Average of 5.81 percent.
- As of Q3 2016, a total of 76 percent of all services recorded in RPW were below an average cost of 10 percent. Less than one percent of all services have an average cost greater than 20 percent.
- South Asia remains the cheapest receiving region, with an average cost of 5.41 percent. Sub-Saharan Africa experienced a slight decrease, from its 9.58 percent average in Q2 2016 to 9.52 percent in Q3 2016.
- Banks remain the most expensive RSP type, recorded at 11.18 percent. Prepaid card services are the cheapest ones, with an average cost of 1.75 percent.

Content

Global trends	2
Smart Remitter Target (SmaRT)	4
Trends in Average Total Costs	4
G8 and G20 countries	5
Regional trends	8
Costs by RSP Type	8
Costs by Service type	10
Annex - Tables	11
Notes	14

Global trends

Global Average Total Cost increases slightly

In Q3 2016, the Global Average cost for sending remittances was 7.42 percent, recording a decrease from Q2 2016 (7.60 percent). This decrease follows consecutive quarterly increases in Q1 and Q2 2016. The Global Average remains below 8.00 percent, as it has since Q3 2014 (see Figure 1 and Table 2 in the Annex). Overall this represents a decline of 2.25 percentage points since Q1 2009, when the figure was recorded at 9.67 percent. A decrease of 1.31 percentage points can be observed over the last year between Q3 2015 and Q3 2016.

International MTO Index decreases

The International MTO Index tracks the prices of MTOs that are present in at least 85 percent of corridors covered in the RPW database.ⁱ A convergence between the Global Average and the International MTO Index was noted in Q1 2014. This convergence continued for several quarters. In Q3 2016 the International MTO Index continued its downwards movement from 8.14 percent in the previous quarter to 8.05 percent. This follows the decrease seen in the Global Average.



Figure 1 Global Average Total Cost for sending USD 200ⁱⁱ

Global Weighted Average

In addition to the Global Average, a weighted average total cost is calculated, which accounts for the relative size of the flows in each remittance corridor.ⁱⁱⁱ The Global Weighted Average of sending remittances, as illustrated in Figure 2 (see also Table 2 in the Annex), has at times shown a different



pattern from the simple average. The Global Weighted Average has exhibited a slight increase since Q2 2016, increasing from 5.68 percent to 5.73 percent.



Figure 2 Global Weighted Average for sending USD 200 (Corridors Present in Q3 2015)

Global trends remain unaffected by RPW sample increase

In the last three quarters, RPW's coverage has increased substantially – from 227 corridors in Q3 2015 to 300 in Q4 2015, and again to 365 in Q2 2016. To account for this notable improvement in the sample, several indicators were calculated considering only those corridors covered in Q3 2015 before coverage was expanded.

When considering only the 227 corridors monitored until Q3 2015, the 227 corridor Global Average in Q3 2016 was 7.43 percent, which is nearly equal to the 365 corridor Global Average of 7.42 percent. The Global Weighted Average for the 227 corridors is 5.81 percent, which is also very close to the 365 corridor Global Weighted average of 5.73 percent. The differences between the two sets of averages of the 227 corridor sample size and the 365 corridor sample size are not significant, thus we can conclude that increasing the corridor sampling in the RPW database is a progressive move and will provide increasingly more accurate statistics for the global remittance market.



The Smart Remitter Target (SmaRT)

To complement the Global Average and Global Weighted Averages described above, the World Bank introduced the SmaRT indicator in Q2 2016, which more accurately reflects the cost that a savvy consumer with access to sufficiently complete information could pay in each corridor.

SmaRT is calculated as the simple average of the three cheapest services for sending the equivalent of USD 200 in each corridor and be expressed as a percentage of the total amount sent. In addition to transparency, services must meet additional criteria to qualify for being included in the SmaRT calculation, including transaction speed (five days or less), and accessibility, determined by geographic proximity of branches for services that require physical presence, or access to any technology or device necessary to use the service, such as a bank account, mobile phone, or the Internet.^{iv}

In Q2 2016, the SmaRT average was stated to be 7.05 percent. Due to a procedural adjustment which improved the manner in which SmaRT Access Criteria were applied, the recalculated SmaRT average for Q2 2016 is now recorded at 5.40 percent.v In Q3 2016, the Global SmaRT average was 5.36 percent – just over 2 percentage points lower than the Global Average.

The full potential of SmaRT can be appreciated at the corridor level. In Q3 2016, 52 of the 365 corridors had fewer than 3 qualifying services. 8 corridors did not meet SmaRT Access Criteria. Comparing the corridor SmaRT average with the corridor average including all services illuminates the importance of the role of financial inclusion and access.

As the methodology of SmaRT further improves and a time series is built, this indicator has the potential to play a major role in informing policy actions.

Trends in Average Total Costs

Figure 3 shows that compared to Q1 2009, 15 percent more corridors in the dataset are at a cost between 5-10 percent in Q3 2016, one percent lower than in Q2 2016. The number of services in the 0-5 percent range increased since Q2 2016, by 1 percent. A total of 76 percent of all services recorded in the RPW dataset are available below the cost of 10 percent. Conversely, the number of services at the higher ranges of costs is steadily decreasing. In Q2 2016, 5 percent of services were available at 15-20 percent – this remained true in Q3 2016. The major change occurred in the highest total cost range - those services priced at greater than 20 percent. Since Q1 2009 the number of services in the RPW dataset priced at this range has decreased from 5 percent of those services sampled to less than 1 percent (0.27 percent).



Figure 3 Distribution of Average Total Costs



G8 and G20 countries

Cost of sending remittances from G8 countries decreases slightly

The G8 countries include some of the major sending countries in the world. The average cost for sending remittances from the G8 countries experienced a modest decrease from 7.19 percent in Q2 2016 to 6.97 percent in Q3 2016. This is a modest quarterly variation, but reflects an overall yearly decrease of 0.75 percentage points.

As Figure 4 illustrates, there are significant disparities in the cost levels across these countries. The average cost of sending money from Japan, Germany, and Canada are consistently above both the Global and G8 average, while costs in Russia, the United States, and Italy are consistently below. France, until recently, was among the countries above, but has remained below the global average since Q4 2015. The UK tends to oscillate between the two – typically above G8 average but below Global Average, like in Q1 and Q2 2016. This remained true in Q3 2016.



Figure 4 Total average in G8 countries

The largest increase was seen in Canada (8.01 percent to 8.36 percent). Russia remains the least expensive sending country in the G8, with an average cost of 1.71 percent. Japan experienced the next largest decrease, from 12.48 percent in Q2 2016 to 11.30 percent in Q3 2016, a decrease of 1.18 percentage points. The quarterly and yearly variation figures can be found in Table 3 in the Annex.



Cost of sending remittances from and to G20 follows trends in the Global Average

The cost of remitting from G20 countries was recorded at 7.57 percent in Q3 2016, a modest decrease from 7.65 percent in Q2 2016, as shown in Figure 5 (also see Table 5 in the Annex). This is still slightly higher than the 7.46 percent average seen in Q4 2015.







South Africa remains the costliest G20 country to send remittances from (see Figure 6), and this is in spite of an overall decrease from its peak in Q1 2013, when the cost of sending from South Africa was in excess of 20 percent. In Q3 2016, remitting from South Africa incurred an average cost of 16.95 percent, a small decrease from the Q2 2016 average cost of 16.72 percent. The cost of sending from the second most expensive G20 sending country Japan – was recorded at 11.30 percent in Q3 2016, a decrease from 12.48 percent in Q2 2016. Russia remains the least

expensive G20 sending country, recorded at 1.71 percent, followed by Saudi Arabia (4.59 percent), Korea (5.06 percent) Brazil (5.73 percent), Italy (5.98 percent), and the United States (6.09 percent).







Figure 8 Average cost of remitting to G20 countries in Q3 2016



Figures 7 and 8 display the total average cost of sending USD 200 to G20 countries over time and in Q3 2016, respectively. The average cost of sending money to the G20 countries that are included in RPW as receiving markets was recorded at 7.56 percent in Q3 2016. Apart from a few quarters, the average cost of sending money to the G20 countries has followed the pattern of the Global Average. In Q3 2016 the cost of remitting to G20 countries

average cost has remained above the Global Average. The most expensive countries in this grouping to remit to was China (10.24 percent), followed by South Africa (7.77 percent) and Indonesia (7.43 percent). India and Mexico were the cheapest receiving markets in the G20 group, with 6.23 and 6.35 percent total average cost, respectively.



Regional trends

The cost for remittance services varies significantly depending on the region where the money is being sent (see Figure 9 below and Table 6 in the Annex). Different trends are observed in different regions. All regions experienced very modest changes or remained stable. South Asia (5.41 percent) maintains its position as least costly region to send money to, falling from its Q2 2016 level of 5.56 percent. Sub-Saharan Africa experienced a small decrease from Q2 2016 to Q3 2016, falling from 9.58 percent to 9.52 percent. This maintains its trend of remaining below 10 percent average total cost.



Due to the peculiarity of the Russian market and its heavy influence on the ECA region, an additional value for the ECA region, excluding Russia, has been calculated and considered: the average excluding Russia was recorded at 7.49 percent – a little over one percentage point higher than the average including Russia, recorded at 6.36 percent in Q3 2016.

Costs by RSP Type

RPW tracks the cost of sending remittances for three main RSP types; commercial banks, MTOs, and post offices. Figure 10 provides a time series visual of all of the RSP Types included in the RPW dataset.

Over time, Banks and MTOs have seen a general decline of total average costs, while Post Office services have led a volatile trend and overall recorded an increase since the historic low recorded in Q3 2013. Banks are firmly above the Global Average, whereas Post Offices and MTOs remain below.



Figure 10 Total averages over time by RSP type



Figure 11 provides an overview for each RSP Type in Q3 2016. Banks continue to be the costliest RSP type, with an average cost of 11.18 percent, a modest decrease from 11.32 percent seen in Q2 2016. Post Office services remain below the global average, recorded at 6.36 percent in Q3 2016. The cheapest service is Pre-Paid Card services, recorded at a total average cost of 1.75 percent. Mobile operators are the second cheapest, recorded at 3.46 percent.



Figure 11 Total average by RSP type



Costs by Service type

Cash services remain one of the most widely covered in RPW and are among the cheapest ways to send money, with an average cost of 6.78 percent, as shown in Figure 12. Account to account services are still the most expensive, recorded at 8.92 percent in Q3 2016, a slight increase from the Q2 2016 statistic of 8.78 percent. The cost of transfers within the same bank (or to a partner bank in the receiving country) was cheaper at an on-average cost of 6.13 percent. The cost of account to account services continues to converge towards the price of cash services and, for the seventh time, as recorded by RPW, bank transfers within the same bank (or to a partner bank in the receiving country) were cheaper than cash to cash services.

Pre-paid card services emerged as the least expensive product type at 3.53 percent in Q1 2016, but still account for a very small share of services covered by RPW. In Q3 2016, Pre-paid card services were recorded at an on-average cost of 2.58 percent.



Figure 12 Average cost by Service type in Q3 2016



Annex - Tables

	Q1 2011	Q3 2011	Q1 2012	Q3 2012	Q1 2013	Q2 2013	Q3 2013	Q4 2013	Q1 2014	Q2 2014	Q3 2014	Q4 2014	Q1 2015	Q2 2015	Q3 2015	Q4 2015	Q1 2016	Q2 2016	Q3 2016
Intl MTO Index	10.12	10.16	9.80	9.51	9.24	8.86	8.95	8.74	8.35	8.22	8.04	8.23	8.03	8.16	8.04	8.05	8.25	8.14	8.05
Global Weighted Average	7.21	7.02	7.10	7.26	6.92	6.63	6.62	6.13	5.91	5.85	5.71	6.03	5.94	5.92	5.91	5.60*	5.68	5.68	5.73
Global Average	9.02	9.30	9.11	9.00	9.05	8.88	8.93	8.58	8.36	8.14	7.90	7.99	7.72	7.68	7.52	7.37	7.53	7.60	7.42

Table 2 – International MTO Index, Global Weighted Average (%)

Table 3 – Quarterly and Yearly Variation for G8 Countries (Q3 2015, Q2 2016, Q3 2016) (%)

	Q1 2011	Q3 2011	Q1 2012	Q3 2012	Q1 2013	Q2 2013	Q3 2013	Q4 2013	Q1 2014	Q2 2014	Q3 2014	Q4 2014	Q1 2015	Q2 2015	Q3 2015	Q4 2015	Q1 2016	Q2 2016	Q3 2016
Canada	10.31	11.87	11.08	10.06	11.03	11.09	10.97	10.79	10.31	9.50	9.31	9.52	9.34	9.31	9.08	8.05	7.80	8.01	8.36
France	8.76	11.63	11.78	11.68	10.72	10.96	10.48	10.43	10.91	10.65	10.74	10.70	7.45	7.22	7.56	6.91	6.82	6.73	6.67
Germany	10.98	12.64	11.16	10.94	10.16	9.62	9.01	9.31	8.37	8.03	7.76	8.43	7.43	7.48	7.32	7.64	8.12	8.52	8.56
Italy	7.57	8.18	7.88	7.47	7.64	7.31	7.42	7.28	7.06	6.70	6.83	6.73	6.49	6.49	6.05	6.02	6.42	6.40	5.98
Japan	17.54	16.84	15.70	16.32	16.66	18.31	16.57	15.73	14.36	14.00	13.74	13.28	13.43	13.55	12.97	11.95	12.43	12.48	11.30
Russia	2.88	2.68	2.33	2.42	2.43	2.34	2.43	2.44	2.16	1.92	1.83	2.44	2.82	2.51	1.92	1.95	2.11	2.05	1.71
UK	8.33	7.73	7.93	7.88	7.96	7.69	8.40	8.38	7.86	7.80	7.56	7.55	7.49	7.20	7.41	7.25	7.29	7.25	7.35
USA	6.67	6.93	6.91	6.80	6.75	6.65	6.42	6.18	5.80	5.78	5.92	5.97	5.92	6.30	6.04	5.93	6.03	6.06	6.09
G8 Average	8.36	8.53	8.49	8.31	8.53	9.19	8.44	8.20	7.73	7.54	7.49	7.54	7.19	7.17	7.02	6.89	7.06	7.19	6.97
Global Average	9.08	9.30	9.12	8.96	9.05	8.88	8.93	8.58	8.36	8.14	7.90	7.99	7.72	7.68	7.52	7.37	7.53	7.60	7.42



REMITTANCE PRICES WORLDWIDE – ISSUE N. 19, SEPTEMBER 2016 | 11

Table 4 – Total average in G20 sending countries (%)

	Q1 2011	Q3 2011	Q1 2012	Q3 2012	Q1 2013	Q2 2013	Q3 2013	Q4 2013	Q1 2014	Q2 2014	Q3 2014	Q4 2014	Q1 2015	Q2 2015	Q3 2015	Q4 2015	Q1 2016	Q2 2016	Q3 2016
Australia	15.21	14.82	11.02	10.84	11.07	10.21	10.19	9.12	9.80	9.60	8.88	8.92	8.97	9.22	9.24	9.60	9.50	9.76	9.66
Brazil	6.31	11.12	13.00	5.88	8.66	6.35	5.94	9.65	6.35	4.24	5.26	4.74	5.02	5.72	7.40	6.81	6.76	6.05	5.73
Canada	10.31	11.87	11.08	10.06	11.03	11.09	10.97	10.79	10.31	9.50	9.31	9.52	9.34	9.31	9.08	8.05	7.80	8.01	8.36
France	8.76	11.63	11.78	11.68	10.72	10.96	10.48	10.43	10.91	10.65	10.74	10.70	7.45	7.22	7.56	6.91	6.82	6.73	6.67
Germany	10.98	12.64	11.16	10.94	10.16	9.62	9.01	9.31	8.37	8.03	7.76	8.43	7.43	7.48	7.32	7.64	8.12	8.52	8.56
Italy	7.57	8.18	7.88	7.47	7.64	7.31	7.42	7.28	7.06	6.70	6.83	6.73	6.49	6.49	6.05	6.02	6.42	6.40	5.98
Japan	17.54	16.84	15.70	16.32	16.66	18.31	16.57	15.73	14.36	14.00	13.74	13.28	13.43	13.55	12.97	11.95	12.43	12.48	11.30
Korea	8.28	6.36	6.73	6.65	6.49	6.20	6.43	6.08	5.98	5.99	6.00	6.20	6.19	6.09	5.43	5.54	5.61	5.33	5.06
Russia	2.88	2.68	2.33	2.42	2.43	2.34	2.43	2.44	2.16	1.92	1.83	2.44	2.82	2.51	1.92	1.95	2.11	2.05	1.71
Saudi Arabia	4.38	4.13	4.22	4.25	3.93	4.46	4.05	4.19	4.09	4.45	3.85	4.41	4.68	4.06	4.13	5.05	4.91	4.56	4.59
South Africa	18.29	17.73	18.77	20.56	20.72	20.69	19.29	18.16	19.80	19.56	19.54	19.76	18.00	16.79	15.19	16.59	16.20	16.72	16.95
UK	8.33	7.73	7.93	7.88	7.96	7.69	8.40	8.38	7.86	7.80	7.56	7.55	7.49	7.20	7.41	7.25	7.29	7.25	7.35
USA	6.67	6.93	6.91	6.80	6.75	6.65	6.42	6.18	5.80	5.78	5.92	5.97	5.92	6.30	6.04	5.93	6.03	6.06	6.09
G8	8.36	8.53	8.49	8.31	8.53	9.19	8.44	8.20	7.73	7.54	7.49	7.54	7.19	7.17	7.02	6.89	7.06	7.69	6.97
From G20	9.11	9.19	8.98	8.87	9.12	9.52	8.72	8.16	8.31	8.12	7.98	8.06	7.67	7.58	7.42	7.46	7.61	7.65	7.57
Global Average	9.02	9.30	9.11	9.00	9.05	8.88	8.93	8.58	8.36	8.14	7.90	7.99	7.72	7.68	7.52	7.37	7.53	7.60	7.42



Table 5 - Total average in G20 receiving countries (%)

	Q1 2011	Q3 2011	Q1 2012	Q3 2012	Q1 2013	Q2 2013	Q3 2013	Q4 2013	Q1 2014	Q2 2014	Q3 2014	Q4 2014	Q1 2015	Q2 2015	Q3 2015	Q4 2015	Q1 2016	Q2 2016	Q3 2016
Brazil	10.44	13.42	11.31	12.99	13.48	11.56	11.94	10.97	6.35	7.43	7.66	7.91	7.96	9.38	7.01	5.95	6.96	6.76	6.81
China	12.58	11.92	11.60	12.01	11.62	11.59	11.99	11.13	10.58	10.89	10.49	10.49	10.54	10.38	10.18	9.72	10.36	10.61	10.24
India	7.70	6.96	7.95	7.83	9.05	9.18	8.57	7.86	7.57	7.62	7.00	6.88	6.78	6.88	6.50	6.00	6.17	6.59	6.23
Indonesia	6.25	5.94	6.97	6.01	6.69	6.67	7.61	6.53	7.10	7.38	7.32	7.34	6.74	6.69	6.90	6.77	7.25	8.14	7.43
Mexico	6.58	5.97	5.86	5.56	5.31	5.67	4.41	5.29	4.48	4.51	4.48	4.37	4.62	5.30	5.59	4.75	5.09	4.97	6.35
South Africa	9.55	8.03	7.90	9.57	10.08	9.87	9.55	8.39	7.63	7.62	9.27	9.06	8.25	7.78	8.98	8.89	8.97	8.49	7.77
Turkey	9.25	8.76	8.76	7.75	7.26	8.43	7.95	7.24	7.02	7.28	6.91	6.42	6.72	6.79	6.95	6.89	6.94	6.55	7.40
To G20	9.80	9.80	9.79	10.08	10.11	9.81	10.57	8.86	8.25	8.39	8.02	7.99	7.93	8.08	7.42	7.10	7.51	7.83	7.56
Global Average	9.02	9.30	9.11	9.00	9.05	8.88	8.93	8.58	8.36	8.14	7.90	7.99	7.72	7.68	7.52	7.37	7.53	7.60	7.42

Table 6 - Total average by regions of the world (%)

	Q1 2011	Q3 2011	Q1 2012	Q3 2012	Q1 2013	Q2 2013	Q3 2013	Q4 2014	Q1 2014	Q2 2014	Q3 2014	Q4 2014	Q1 2015	Q2 2015	Q3 2015	Q4 2015	Q1 2016	Q2 2016	Q3 2016
EAP	9.71	9.80	9.27	8.88	8.97	8.88	9.00	8.28	8.52	8.38	7.92	8.12	8.13	8.11	7.82	7.97	8.33	8.49	8.24
ECA	7.55	6.86	6.28	6.54	6.77	6.70	6.68	6.29	6.49	6.35	6.17	6.22	6.11	6.02	5.89	6.48	6.48	6.40	6.36
ECA (excluding Russia)	9.32	8.68	8.14	8.21	8.43	8.35	8.41	7.93	8.18	7.92	7.67	7.54	7.20	7.18	7.10	7.51	7.47	7.51	7.49
LAC	6.82	7.68	7.72	7.65	7.77	7.28	7.26	7.02	6.21	5.57	6.02	6.03	6.14	6.78	6.29	6.04	5.92	6.02	6.17
MNA	8.00	8.15	8.19	7.85	7.81	7.83	7.61	7.80	8.32	8.29	8.25	8.63	8.41	8.21	8.37	7.42	7.46	7.63	7.02
SA	6.56	6.15	6.70	6.54	7.16	7.02	7.12	6.58	6.56	6.45	5.97	5.94	5.96	5.74	5.73	5.43	5.54	5.56	5.41
SSA	12.82	12.41	12.32	12.40	12.21	12.06	12.29	12.55	11.71	11.55	11.28	11.45	10.21	9.74	9.78	9.53	9.72	9.58	9.52
Global	9.02	9.30	9.11	9.00	9.05	8.88	8.93	8.58	8.36	8.14	7.90	7.99	7.72	7.68	7.52	7.37	7.53	7.60	7.42
Abbroviationau		Acia and	Desifier Fr	-	a and Can	tral Asia.		A	and the C		NANIA NA:	ddle Feet		Africa. C	A Couth		Cub Cobor		

Abbreviations: EAP- East Asia and Pacific; ECA- Europe and Central Asia; LAC- Latin America and the Caribbean; MNA- Middle East and North Africa; SA- South Asia; SSA-Sub-Saharan Africa



Notes

ⁱ The International MTOs Index includes all MTOs that are present in over 85 percent of RPW corridors. Thus far, it has included Western Union and MoneyGram, which operate in 99 percent and 92 percent of the country corridors covered in the database, respectively.

ⁱⁱ Figures for the global average were adjusted in Q1 2014 following a thorough clean-up of the entire database. Some values slightly vary from data published in the past.

ⁱⁱⁱ It is important to note that, while official data on remittance flows by bilateral corridors are currently not available, estimates (Ratha and Shaw 2007, last updated in 2014, available at http://go.worldbank.org/JITC7NYTT0) have been used in this calculation. These estimates are based on the Balance Of Payments (BOP) and factor in migrant stocks, destination country incomes, and source country incomes. The methodology for these estimates has been questioned, as well as the accuracy of official data on remittance flows and migrant stocks. However, this still represents the only available comprehensive dataset on bilateral remittance flows. It also seems likely that overall the dataset is sufficiently accurate to reflect at least the proportion between the different corridors, hence offering a good approximation to weight the relevance of each corridor in terms of flow size.

^{iv} For additional information on the methodology used to calculate SmaRT see <u>https://remittanceprices.worldbank.org/sites/default/files/smart_methodology.pdf</u>

^v Due to a technical change in the SmaRT Access Scoring procedures applied to all services in the RPW dataset, the Q2 2016 average is now recorded at 5.40 percent. This procedural change concerned the order in which SmaRT Access Criteria were applied. The procedure used in Q2 2016 resulted in exclusion of services that were accessible via alternative methods. For example, a Bank Account Transfer that was inaccessible via a Bank Branch location (the sending country's Bank Account Ownership level did not satisfy the SmaRT Access Criteria stated in Table 1) but was accessible via the Internet was not included in the calculation as performed in Q2 2016, as it was scored first on Bank Account Ownership. However, using the new procedure those services that have alternative access methods would have the appropriate SmaRT Access Criteria applied to them. Operating under the "savvy consumer" assumption, a remittance service client would access a Bank Account Transfer as in the example above via the Internet rather than use a Bank Branch or Agent location. Using this new procedure, we gain a clearer view of what services are most accessible and inaccessible in each corridor.

