

Remittance Prices Worldwide

Issue n. 11, September 2014

This Report reflects the latest trends observed in the data published in September 2014.

Remittance Prices Worldwide is available at <http://remittanceprices.worldbank.org>

Overview

The Remittance Prices Worldwide (RPW) database monitors remittance prices across all geographic regions of the world. RPW was launched by the World Bank in September 2008,ⁱ and remains a key tool to monitor the cost incurred by remitters when sending money along major remittance corridors. The recently launched fourteenth iteration of RPW covers 226 country corridors worldwide, originating from 32 remittance sending countries and destined for 89 receiving countries.

This Report uses data from RPW's most recent release to analyze the global, regional, and country specific trends in the average total cost of migrant remittances, as well as the factors influencing them. RPW is used as a reference for measuring progress towards the "5x5" objective,ⁱⁱ which has been endorsed by the G8 and the G20 and is being pursued in partnership with governments, service providers, and interested stakeholders.

Main Findings

Based on the data collected for the Q3 2014 release of RPW, and when compared to previous iterations,ⁱⁱⁱ the following main findings have been identified. All figures refer to the cost of sending USD 200 or the local currency equivalent.

- In Q3 2014, the Global Average total cost of sending remittances was recorded at 7.90 percent, declining from 8.14 percent in the previous quarter and falling for the first time below 8 percent.
- The Global Weighted average was recorded at 5.71 percent in Q3 2014 – a further decline from the last quarter when it was recorded at 5.85 percent –

suggesting that costs continue to be lower where larger volumes are transferred.

- The International MTO Index, which includes the Money Transfer Operators (MTOs) present in over 85 percent of the surveyed corridors, declined for the fourth consecutive quarter. The Index now stands at 8.04 percent in Q3 2014, down from 8.22 percent in Q2 2014.

- Significant improvements can be observed at the level of individual corridors since the launch of the 5x5 initiative. In Q3 2014, three quarters of all corridors have an average cost below 10 percent compared to only half 5 years ago and, in the same time period, the percentage of corridors with average cost that is over 15 percent has more than halved.

- The average cost for sending remittances from the G8 countries declined from 7.54 percent in Q1 2014 Q2 2014 to 7.49 percent in Q3 2014; the lowest level ever recorded and below 8 percent for the third consecutive quarter. Five G8 countries experienced a decline in Q3 2014, while the remaining three experienced minor increases. Russia remains the least expensive sending country in the G8 group, and Japan remains the most expensive although the cost has declined for the last five consecutive quarters.

- In Q3 2014, the cost of sending remittances from G20 countries was recorded at 7.98 percent; a decline from 8.12 percent in the previous quarter and a lifetime low. The average cost of sending money to the G20 countries that are included in RPW as receiving markets also declined from 8.39 percent in Q2 2014 to 8.04 percent in Q3 2014, reaching yet another lifetime low.

- The cost of sending remittances declined for all regions, with the exception of Latin American and the Caribbean (LAC).^{iv} South Asia (SAR) experienced the most notable decline and regained the position as least costly region to send money to, with an average of 5.97 percent, followed by LAC where the cost is 6.02 percent on average. The cost of sending money to Sub-Saharan Africa (SSA) stayed below 12 percent and declined for the third consecutive quarter, but remains the most expensive region of the world to send money to. MNA remained substantially stable in Q3 2014, while ECA and EAP experienced modest declines.

- The average total cost of sending money through commercial banks was 11.77 percent in Q3 2014, below 12 percent for the first time, but still well above the Global Average and the most expensive of all Remittance Service Provider (RSP) types. Post offices registered an increase in Q3 2014, now standing at 5.99 percent, up from 4.66 percent in the previous quarter, while the cost of sending money through MTOs has declined to 6.32 percent and now stands just a few basis points above that of Post Offices.


- Cash products remain the most widely available (41 percent of the sample), while other types of services – particularly on-line and account-to-account services – now represent 23 and 16 percent of the sample, respectively.

Global Average cost for remittances falls below 8 percent and major MTOs follow a similar trend

In Q3 2014, the Global Average total cost^v for sending remittances was 7.90 percent: a new lifetime low and the first time the index has fallen below 8 percent (see Figure 1). This represents a 1.03 percentage point decline over the last year, as in Q3 2013 the same figure was recorded at 8.93 percent.

The International MTO Index tracks the prices of MTOs that are present in at least 85 percent of corridors covered in the RPW database. This Index has decreased consistently in every quarter from Q3 2011 until Q2 2013, for a total decline of approximately 1.3 percentage points during that period.^{vi} A convergence between the Global Average and the International MTO Index continued until the Q1 2014, when the Index declined significantly to reach 8.35 percent and fell slightly below the Global Average for the first time. In Q3 2014, the Index was recorded at 8.04 percent, declining for the fourth consecutive quarter and maintaining its position slightly above the Global Average.

Figure 1 Global Average Total Cost for sending USD 200^{vii}



Global weighted average declines further, staying below 6 percent

In addition to the Global Average, a global weighted average total cost is calculated, which accounts for the relative size of the flows in each remittance corridor.^{viii}

The global weighted average of sending remittances, as illustrated in Figure 2, has, at times, shown a different pattern from the simple average. After declining for the first six consecutive iterations, from 2008 to Q3 2011, the global weighted average increased for the first time in Q1 2012. The upward trend continued in Q3 2012, when the global weighted average increased to 7.26 percent, but was reversed in the following quarter. Since Q1 2013, the weighted average has shown an overall declining trend, falling below 6 percent for the first time in Q1 2014. In Q2 2014, the global weighted average slightly decreased to 5.85 percent and experienced a more substantial decline in Q3 2014, now standing at 5.71 percent.

Figure 2 Global Weighted Average for sending USD 200




Corridors recording average costs below 10 percent increased significantly since 2009, corridors over 15 percent more than halved

Figure 3 shows that the overall downward trend reflected in the Global Average is even more evident when looking at the level of individual corridors.

While in the global figures the less virtuous cases prevent the averages from dropping to more desirable levels, observing the individual corridors shows the progress that has been made over the years, also thanks to the efforts generated by the “5x5 objective” initiative.

Figure 3 Distribution of Average Total Costs



The percentage of corridors where remitters could pay between 0 and 10 percent on average to send money home has increased significantly since 2009. In Q1 2009, this was the case for just over half of corridors; in Q3 2014, more than three quarters of RPW corridors fell in this range.

For the higher bands, the percentage has dropped: nearly one fifth of corridors (16 percent) had an average total cost above 15 percent in 2009; today, 7.1 percent of corridors do.


Average cost of sending from G8 countries falls to 7.49 percent

The G8 countries include the major sending countries in the world. The average cost for sending remittances from the G8 countries declined from 7.54 percent in Q2 2014 to 7.49 percent in Q3 2014, a new record low.

As Figure 4 illustrates, there are significant disparities in the cost structure across these countries (see also Table 1 in the Annex). The average cost of sending money from Japan, Canada, and France is above both the Global Average and the G8 average, while costs in Russia, the United States, Italy, and the United Kingdom are below. This has been relatively consistent for most

countries over the years, although Germany fell below the Global Average for the first time in Q2 2014 and has maintained this position in Q3 2014.

Figure 4 Total average in G8 countries



With the exception of France, US, and Italy, all other G8 countries registered at least a modest decline in the cost of sending remittances in the last quarter in Q3 2014. Russia – with an average cost of 1.83 percent in Q3 2014, down from 1.92 percent last quarter – experienced the largest decline in Q3 2014 and maintains the lowest average total cost across G8 countries. It is important to note that Russia has a unique environment where cross-border remittances are mostly conducted in the same currency and possible additional costs associated with a currency exchange are not known. The Russian market also benefits from relatively low fees charged by the providers when compared to the other G8 countries.

Canada, Germany, Japan, and the UK also experienced declines in Q3 2014. Canada fell from 9.50 in Q2 2014 to 9.31 percent in Q3 2014. Germany declined from 8.03 percent to 7.76 percent and fell below 8 percent for the first time. The average total cost of sending remittances from Japan continues to decline – falling from 14.00 percent in Q2 2014 to 13.74 percent in Q3 2014, the lowest ever recorded for Japan. Despite this, Japan remains the most expensive country in the G8 group. The UK also experienced a modest decline from 7.80 percent in Q2 2014 to 7.56 percent in Q3 2014.


On the other hand, slight increases were registered in USA, Italy, and France, from 5.78 to 5.92 percent, 6.70 to 6.83 percent and 10.65 to 10.74 percent,

respectively.

Costs of sending remittances to and from the G20 countries reach a new lifetime low

With the exception of Q3 2009, the cost of remitting from G20 countries^{ix} followed the same pattern as the Global Average, until Q1 2013. In Q2 2013, the two figures began to move in opposite directions, and continued to do so every quarter, with the exception of Q4 2013, when both indices declined. Once again, the cost of remitting from the G20 countries moved in the opposite direction to the Global Average cost in Q1 2014, but both indices declined in the following two quarters, as shown in Figure 5 (see also Table 1 in the annex). The cost of remitting from G20 countries was recorded at 7.98 percent in Q3 2014 down from 8.12 percent in Q2 2014 and below 8 percent for the first time.


Figure 5 Average cost of sending USD 200 from G20 countries



The average cost of sending money to the G20 countries that are included in RPW as receiving markets was recorded at 8.04 percent in Q3 2014, declining from 8.39 percent in Q2 2014. Apart from a few quarters, the average cost of sending money to the G20 countries has followed the pattern of the Global Average. The disparity between the average cost of sending money to the G20 and the Global Average increased over time, and reached a peak in Q3 2013 (see Figure 6 and Table 2 in the annex). The convergence between the two figures – first noted in Q4 2013 – was briefly interrupted in


Q2 2014, but resumed in Q3 2014 when the indices once again moved in the same direction.

Figure 6 Average cost of sending USD 200 to G20 countries



South Africa remains the most costly G20 country to send remittances from, with an average of 19.54, followed by Japan with an average of 13.74 percent (see Figure 7). The least expensive sending country, together with Russia, is Saudi Arabia (3.85), followed by Brazil (5.26), and the USA (5.92).


Figure 7 Average cost of remitting from G20 countries in Q3 2014



China is the most expensive country in the G20 to send money to, with an average cost of 10.49 percent in Q3 2014 (Figure 8).

In Q3 2014, Mexico and Turkey were the cheapest receiving markets in the G20 group, with averages of 4.48 and 6.91 percent, respectively.

Figure 8 Average cost of remitting to G20 countries in Q3 2014



South Asia regains position as least costly region to send money to, while Sub-Saharan Africa remains most expensive region to send money to, despite decline

The cost for remittance services varies significantly depending on the region where money is being sent (see Figure 9 and Table 3 in the annex). In Q3 2014, all regions, with the exception of Latin America and the Caribbean (LAC), experienced a decline in the cost of sending remittances.

The cost of sending money to LAC increased from 5.57 percent in Q2 2014 to 6.02 percent in Q2 2014, and ended the short-lived stint as the cheapest region to send money to. In Q3 2014, the average cost of sending money to South Asia (SAR) was recorded at 5.97 percent, representing a decline from the 6.45 percent recorded in the previous quarter – the largest of all the regions – and a return to the position of least costly region to send money to.

Due to the peculiarity of the Russian market and its heavy influence on the Eastern and Central Asia (ECA) region, two values have been calculated and considered: an average including and an average excluding Russia. The average including Russia declined slightly, from 6.35 in Q2 2014 to 6.17 percent in Q3 2014, largely driven by a decrease in the cost of sending money from Russia. The average excluding Russia declined from 7.92 in Q2 2014 to 7.67 in Q3 2014, remaining below 8 percent for the second quarter.


The average cost of sending remittances to the East Asia and Pacific (EAP) region was recorded at 7.92

percent in Q3 2014, representing a significant decline from last quarter when the cost was 8.38 percent and the first time below 8 percent in the lifetime of the index.

In Q3 2014, the cost of sending money to MNA region was recorded at 8.25 percent, remaining substantially stable compared to last quarter, when it was recorded at 8.29 percent.

The cost of sending money to the Sub-Saharan Africa (SSA) region declined in the last quarter – from 11.55 percent in Q2 2014 to 11.28 percent in Q3 2014 – staying below 12 percent for the third consecutive quarter. Still, SSA remains the most expensive region of the world to send money to. These results call for additional efforts of national authorities, as well as the international community, to improve the market for remittances in Africa.

Figure 9 Total averages by region of the world



Post offices remain the least expensive, banks the most costly

RPW tracks the cost of sending remittances for three main RSP types; commercial banks, MTOs, and post offices. Based on the data from this reporting period (see Figure 10), commercial banks continue to be the most costly RSP type. The cost of sending remittances using a commercial bank registered another decline, from 12.05 percent in Q2 2014 to 11.77 percent in Q3 2014, falling below 12 percent for the first time. Despite a modest decline, the cost of sending remittances through banks remains significantly higher than the Global Average and it is also well above the cost of using post offices and MTOs, which are 5.99 and 6.32

percent, respectively.

In Q3 2014, the cost of sending money through MTOs declined from 6.56 to 6.32 percent, reaching a new lifetime low and remaining below 7 percent for the third consecutive quarter.

Post offices remain the cheapest RSP type at 5.99 percent, representing another notable increase in average cost. The cost of sending through MTOs and Post offices appear to be converging.

Figure 10 Total averages by RSP type



Alternatives to cash products continue to emerge in the market

Cash services remain the most widely available (45 percent, see Figure 12) and one of the most cost effective ways to send money, with an average cost of 6.95 percent, as shown in Figure 11.

An increased number of account-to-account services have been recorded in Q3 2014 compared to previous iterations. This is generally due to many MTOs now offering the option to transfer money from the sender's bank account to the bank account of their beneficiary. In the last three years, two of the leading global MTOs have acquired Foreign Exchange companies that specialize in sending money to bank accounts. As these services become more common in the market, the average cost seem to have been little affected, with account service (to any bank) remaining close to 13 percent. The cost of transfers within the same bank (or to a partner bank in the receiving country) is significantly cheaper (7.79 percent) and has remained substantially stable in the last quarter.

Cash to account services are the cheapest product

type, at an average cost of 5.39 percent, and are becoming more widely available (8 percent of the sample, compared to 6 percent in previous quarters).

Services offered on-line continue to gain ground. As a proportion of available services covered in RPW, on-line services now account for 17 percent of the total sample, compared to 13 percent in previous iterations. A number of providers are emerging in this space, offering senders different options to pay for the transaction (from their bank accounts, with either a wire transfer or direct debit, or by debit or credit card). The sender can also choose different ways for the money to be delivered, for example to the beneficiary's bank account or in cash at an agent in the receiving country. The average cost for these services in the Q3 2014 was 5.71 percent.

Figure 11 Average cost by product type





Figure 12 Availability of product types



NOTES

ⁱ Several countries/regions operate their own databases to monitor remittance price activity at the national/regional level. The World Bank certifies national and regional remittance prices databases compliant with the minimum mandatory requirements for remittance databases. To date databases for Italy, Central America, Australia/New Zealand, Africa, Norway, France, and Germany have been certified. For more information, visit <http://remittanceprices.worldbank.org/National-Databases>.

ⁱⁱ The 5x5 objective refers to reduction of the Global Average total cost of migrant remittances by 5 percentage points in 5 years. It was adopted by the G8 at the 2009 L'Aquila summit where the commitment was made "to achieve in particular the objective of a reduction of the Global Average costs of transferring remittances from the present 10% to 5% in 5 years." In 2010, the G20 committed to a "significant reduction in the cost of remittances" and established a Development Action for Remittances.

ⁱⁱⁱ The first iteration of the database was released in September 2008. For the following five years, the RPW database was updated every six months with data releases published for Q1 and 3Q 2009, Q1 and 3Q 2010, Q1 and 3Q 2011 and Q1, and 3Q 2012. Starting in 2013, the RPW database will be updated quarterly. Data have been published for Q1 2013, Q2 2013, Q3 2013, Q4 2013, Q1 2014 and Q2 2014.

^{iv} The regions' abbreviations are as follows: East Asia and Pacific (EAP), Europe and Central Asia (ECA), Latin America and the Caribbean (LAC), Middle East and North Africa (MNA), South Asia (SAR), Sub-Saharan Africa (SSA).

^v The Global Average total cost is calculated as the average total cost for sending USD 200 with all RSPs worldwide; non-transparent RSPs (i.e. RSPs that do not disclose the exchange rate applied to the transaction) are excluded, as well as corridors from Russia, since in these cases the exchange rates were not provided and cost could be higher if data were complete.

^{vi} 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.

^{vii} 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.

^{viii} It is important to note that, while official data on remittance flows by bilateral corridors are currently not available, estimates (Ratha and Shaw 2007, updated in 2013, 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.

^{ix} In the final declaration of the Cannes Summit on November 3 and 4 2011, the G20 head of state committed to work towards the reduction of the average cost of transferring remittances from 10 to 5 percent by 2014. The G20 adoption of a target created the need for an index that specifically monitors the price of remittances in the G20 members. As some G20 countries are included in RPW as remittance senders, while others are listed as receivers, two different indexes are presented here: (1) average for sending remittances from the G20 member countries; and (2) average for sending remittances to the G20 member countries. The following G20 countries are included in RPW. Sending countries: Australia, Canada, France, Germany, Italy, Japan, Republic of Korea, Russia, Saudi Arabia, United Kingdom, and the United States. Receiving countries: China, India, Indonesia, Mexico, and Turkey. Countries that are both sending and receiving: Brazil and South Africa. Argentina is not included in RPW. The European Union does not appear as such in RPW, although most EU member countries are included in the database.

ANNEX: TABLES

Table 1 - Total average in G20 sending countries (%)

	2008	Q1 2009	Q3 2009	Q1 2010	Q3 2010	Q1 2011	Q3 2011	Q1 2012	Q3 2012	Q1 2013	Q2 2013	Q3 2013	Q4 2013	Q1 2014	Q2 2014	Q3 2014
Australia	-	-	13.98	14.38	13.57	15.21	14.82	11.02	10.84	11.07	10.21	10.19	9.12	9.80	9.60	8.88
Brazil	-	-	15.42	15.25	7.12	6.31	11.12	13.00	5.88	8.66	6.35	5.94	9.65	6.35	4.24	5.26
Canada	14.00	13.28	11.07	10.18	10.90	10.31	11.87	11.08	10.06	11.03	11.09	10.97	10.79	10.31	9.50	9.31
France	10.92	11.50	11.15	10.01	8.95	8.76	11.63	11.78	11.68	10.72	10.96	10.48	10.43	10.91	10.65	10.74
Germany	14.07	13.53	12.71	11.85	12.67	10.98	12.64	11.16	10.94	10.16	9.62	9.01	9.31	8.37	8.03	7.76
Italy	10.03	7.36	8.21	8.11	7.87	7.57	8.18	7.88	7.47	7.64	7.31	7.42	7.28	7.06	6.70	6.83
Japan	15.33	18.24	19.06	17.34	16.16	17.54	16.84	15.70	16.32	16.66	18.31	16.57	15.73	14.36	14.00	13.74
Korea	-	-	-	-	8.84	8.28	6.36	6.73	6.65	6.49	6.20	6.43	6.08	5.98	5.99	6.00
Russia	3.22	2.42	2.99	2.54	2.52	2.88	2.68	2.33	2.42	2.43	2.34	2.43	2.44	2.16	1.92	1.83
Saudi Arabia	5.20	3.86	4.72	4.42	4.60	4.38	4.13	4.22	4.25	3.93	4.46	4.05	4.19	4.09	4.45	3.85
South Africa	15.91	16.48	15.03	14.76	14.60	18.29	17.73	18.77	20.56	20.72	20.69	19.29	18.16	19.80	19.56	19.54
UK	10.26	10.27	9.05	8.29	8.07	8.33	7.73	7.93	7.88	7.96	7.69	8.40	8.38	7.86	7.80	7.56
USA	6.90	7.21	7.06	7.57	7.14	6.67	6.93	6.91	6.80	6.75	6.65	6.42	6.18	5.80	5.78	5.92
G8	10.26	10.32	8.80	8.37	8.40	8.36	8.53	8.49	8.31	8.53	9.19	8.44	8.20	7.73	7.54	7.49
From G20	9.23	9.07	9.49	9.04	8.92	9.11	9.19	8.98	8.87	9.12	9.52	8.72	8.16	8.31	8.12	7.98
Global	9.81	9.67	9.40	8.72	8.89	9.02	9.30	9.11	9.00	9.05	8.88	8.93	8.58	8.36	8.14	7.90

Table 2 - Total average in G20 receiving countries (%)

	2008	Q1 2009	Q3 2009	Q1 2010	Q3 2010	Q1 2011	Q3 2011	Q1 2012	Q3 2012	Q1 2013	Q2 2013	Q3 2013	Q4 2013	Q1 2014	Q2 2014	Q3 2014
Brazil	14.67	12.42	8.54	14.01	10.93	10.44	13.42	11.31	12.99	13.48	11.56	11.94	10.97	6.35	7.43	7.66
China	14.44	15.29	13.66	12.55	11.00	12.58	11.92	11.60	12.01	11.62	11.59	11.99	11.13	10.58	10.89	10.49
India	7.65	7.91	7.56	7.34	8.14	7.70	6.96	7.95	7.83	9.05	9.18	8.57	7.86	7.57	7.62	7.00
Indonesia	10.49	8.31	9.19	6.40	6.43	6.25	5.94	6.97	6.01	6.69	6.67	7.61	6.53	7.10	7.38	7.32
Mexico	5.80	7.01	5.95	7.42	7.37	6.58	5.97	5.86	5.56	5.31	5.67	4.41	5.29	4.48	4.51	4.48
South Africa	12.22	12.42	11.64	10.20	8.62	9.55	8.03	7.90	9.57	10.08	9.87	9.55	8.39	7.63	7.62	9.27
Turkey	12.17	11.26	11.63	10.05	9.58	9.25	8.76	8.76	7.75	7.26	8.43	7.95	7.24	7.02	7.28	6.91
To G20	9.74	10.18	9.99	9.88	9.44	9.80	9.80	9.79	10.08	10.11	9.81	10.57	8.86	8.25	8.39	8.02
Global	9.81	9.67	9.40	8.72	8.89	9.02	9.30	9.11	9.00	9.05	8.88	8.93	8.58	8.36	8.14	7.90

Table 3 - Total average by regions of the world (%)

	2008	Q1 2009	Q3 2009	Q1 2010	Q3 2010	Q1 2011	Q3 2011	Q1 2012	Q3 2012	Q1 2013	Q2 2013	Q3 2013	Q4 2013	Q1 2014	Q2 2014	Q3 2014
EAP	11.05	10.46	10.38	9.33	9.48	9.71	9.80	9.27	8.88	8.97	8.88	9.00	8.28	8.52	8.38	7.92
ECA	5.96	6.68	7.19	6.48	7.57	7.55	6.86	6.28	6.54	6.77	6.70	6.68	6.29	6.49	6.35	6.17
ECA (x Russia)	11.03	9.70	9.42	8.33	9.49	9.32	8.68	8.14	8.21	8.43	8.35	8.41	7.93	8.18	7.92	7.67
LAC	8.37	8.65	7.63	8.12	7.27	6.82	7.68	7.72	7.65	7.77	7.28	7.26	7.02	6.21	5.57	6.02
MNA	11.10	9.30	9.58	8.19	8.95	8.00	8.15	8.19	7.85	7.81	7.83	7.61	7.80	8.32	8.29	8.25
SAR	7.80	7.31	6.85	5.99	6.54	6.56	6.15	6.70	6.54	7.16	7.02	7.12	6.58	6.56	6.45	5.97
SSA	14.01	13.07	11.61	10.86	11.57	12.82	12.41	12.32	12.40	12.21	12.06	12.29	12.55	11.71	11.55	11.28
Global	9.81	9.67	9.40	8.72	8.89	9.02	9.30	9.11	9.00	9.05	8.88	8.93	8.58	8.36	8.14	7.90

See note iv for list of abbreviations